AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

<u>Sanghui Ji</u> for the <u>Master of Science</u>

in <u>Industrial Organizational Psychology</u> presented <u>Mar, 2020</u>

Title: <u>Servant Leadership and Transformational Leadership</u>

<u>: Effectiveness in the Mediating Role of Trust</u>

Abstract approved:

This thesis is an investigation focused on the difference between servant leadership and transformational leadership. The purpose of this paper is to find out what makes leadership effective and why servant leadership is more effective than transformational leadership. One of the characteristics of servant leadership is understanding what leads to higher trust with the employees. Therefore, servant leadership has a stronger relationship with trust than transformational leadership. For the focus of this research, the topics of organizational citizenship behaviors, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention will all be discussed. The practical application of this research will support what is needed for each employee and an organization to be more effective.

SERVANT LEADERSHIP AND TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP:

FFECTIVENESS IN THE MEDIATING ROLE OF TRUST

————————

A Thesis

Presented to the Department of Psychology

EMPORIA STATE UNIVERSITY

————————

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

————————

by

Sanghui Ji

Mar 2020

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am extremely thankful for the opportunity to finish my thesis requirements for graduate school. First off, I would like to thank Dr. Christopher Stone for all the help he provided throughout the program's classroom requirements. Also, I would like to thank Dr. Jim Persinger for helping with finishing my thesis and being on my thesis committee as acting department chair through this transitionary period. I am grateful for everything you both have done for me and my colleagues. I would like to thank my family and friends. I love my parents, Jun-Goo and Ok-Kyeong, my brother, Byeong-Joh, and all my friends I have met in the states. You have provided me with so much love and support over the years. Thank you for waiting for all the process I went through and helping me finish this thesis. Without you, I would not even been able to finish my undergraduate degree.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Leadership has been a prevalent subject studied and discussed over the past several decades. Depending on who the leader was in the same situation, many historical events would be very different. In the same context, leaders do have the power to influence all the areas of life, even though many cannot understand how it would have impacted the world. Leadership is also essential in organizations, since it would influence and change many things for organization. The definition of the term leadership varies by scholars. Leadership includes behaviors, attributes, values, skills, and vision, and researchers have different perspectives on it. After reviewing the definitions of leadership over the past 50 years, Yulk (2013) defined leadership as "the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how to do it, and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish shared objectives" (p. 7). There is not only one correct way to define leadership, therefore, it can be widely defined.

Although it would be demanding that scholars agree on which behaviors or characteristics are most suitable for leadership, it is clear that transformational leadership is already considered effective and the most studied among many leadership theories. Recently, some researchers have compared transformational leadership to servant leadership in behavioral and attitudinal outcomes because both share a lot of similarities (Smith, Montagno & Kuzmenko, 2004). Both are very ethical, ideally influencing, empowering, and strive for open and consistent communication (Stone, Russell &

Patterson, 2004). Apart from the steady interest in transformational leadership, research on servant leadership is surging.

In an organization setting, servant leadership would be "an (1) other-oriented approach to leadership (2) manifested through one-on-one prioritizing of follower individual needs and interests, (3) and outward reorienting of their concern for self toward concern for others within the organization and the larger community" (Eva, Robin, Sendjaya, van Dierendonck & Liden, 2019, p. 112). Servant leadership is influential in various types of organizations not limited to for-profit organizations, including educational institutions (Cerit, 2009), non-profit organizations (Schneider & George, 2011), and even religious groups (Greenleaf, 1977). Therefore, research on servant leadership in many types of industries and organizations has been increasing and servant leadership's influence has been verified.

Many companies recognize that servant leadership has positive impacts on organizations practicing servant leadership. For example, SAS adopted servant leadership strategies to their organization and achieved a positive effect on its performance (Zentner, 2016). Five out of the top ten best companies to work for in Fortune Magazine's annual list of the 100 best companies to work for (2011) are the companies practicing servant leadership such as SAS (first place in the list), Wegmans Food Market (3rd), Zappos.com (6th), Nugget Market (8th), and Recreational Equipment (REI) (9th). SAS continued to rank 3rd in 2012, 2nd in 2013, 3rd in 2014, 4th in 2015, and 8th in 2016. Recent literature shows that servant leadership leads organizations to have positive results such as trust (Schaubroeck, Lam, & Peng, 2011; Sendjaya & Pekerti, 2010), psychological need satisfaction (van Dierendonck, Stam, Boersma, de Windt & Alkema, 2014), workplace

attitude (Grisaffe, VanMeter & Chonko, 2016; Walumbwa, Hartnell & Oke, 2010), job satisfaction (Ozyilmaz & Cicek, 2015), commitment to the supervisor (Walumbwa et al., 2010), psychological climate (Ozyilmaz & Cicek, 2015), self-efficacy (Chen, Zhu & Zhou, 2015; Walumbwa et al., 2010), organizational citizenship behaviors (Chen et al., 2015; Grisaffe et al., 2016; Ozyilmaz & Cicek, 2015; Walumbwa et al., 2010), performance (Hu & Liden, 2011), goal and process clarity (Hu & Liden, 2011), team potency (Hu & Liden, 2011), and social responsibility (Grisaffe et al., 2016).

As I have mentioned, transformational leadership is the most popular leadership theory, which has been studied the most among other leadership theories. Transformational leadership has a lot of good influence on businesses to match its reputation. Transformational leadership draws a lot of positive outcomes, which are helpful for organizations. These outcomes are trust, leadership effectiveness (van Dierendonck et al., 2014), empowerment (Schneider & George, 2011), job performance (Schaubroeck et al., 2011), OCBs (Humphrey, 2012; Nohe & Hertel, 2017), job satisfaction (Schneider & George, 2011), organizational commitment (van Dierendonck et al., 2014), lower turnover intention (Schneider & George, 2011), and work engagement (van Dierendonck et al., 2014).

Even though servant leadership and transformational leadership have considerable overlap, they are equally distinct. What makes the differences in many comparative studies of servant leadership and transformational leadership is the ultimate focus of each leadership. Servant leadership is more follower-centric, whereas transformational leadership is more organization-centric (Smith et al., 2004; Stone et al., 2004). Several scholars argued that the ultimate foci and suitable environments were different for servant

leadership and transformational leadership. Servant leadership focuses on the needs of each individual and ideal in a stable environment, whereas transformational leadership emphasizes organizational successes and more fit into uncertain and fluctuating situations (Smith et al., 2004). However, van Dierendonck et al. (2014) find what Smith et al. (2004) argued is wrong. Rather, they find that servant leadership was less affected by any situations occurring in the organization.

The research on servant leadership is not as extensive as the research on transformational leadership, but empirical findings of servant leadership promise that servant leadership is more oriented to the needs of subordinates than transformational leadership (Eva et al., 2019). Based on the differences, several researchers test servant leadership and transformational leadership with various organizational outcomes and find results in which servant leadership is beyond transformational leadership (Chen, Zhu & Zhou, 2015; Liden, Wayne, Zhao & Henderson, 2008; Schaubroeck, Lam & Peng, 2011; van Dierendonck et al., 2014). Some even insist that servant leadership would be a more in-depth concept than transformational leadership and received support from the results of their study (Grisaffe et al., 2016).

In addition to being mentioned above, other articles also find results that show servant leadership is beyond transformational leadership. Servant leadership predicts better than transformational leadership to a lot of positive outcomes: performance (Chen et al., 2015; Grisaffe et al., 2016; Liden et al., 2008; Peterson, Galvin, and Lange, 2012; Schaubroeck et al., 2011), citizenship behavior (Grisaffe et al., 2016; Liden et al., 2008), organizational commitment (George, 2011; Liden et al., 2008), satisfaction (Grisaffe et al., 2016), and extra-role behavior (Grisaffe et al., 2016). Even though performance is the

only outcome that has empirical evidences of effectiveness, it shows possibilities that

servant leadership could influence attitudinal outcomes as well as behavioral outcomes

better than transformational leadership.

Despite the considerable overlap, the results of both leaderships for the same

outcomes were different, and it would mean the differences in the results were from the

differences between them. In other words, the distinctiveness of servant leadership would

lead the followers to have more effective outcomes than transformational leadership.

Being *servant first* to the followers as opposed to being *leader first* and selfless

commitment to other's needs are unique attributes of servant leadership (Grisaffe,

VanMeter & Chonko, 2016; van Dierendonck et al., 2014). These characteristics of

servant leadership are closely related to the concept of trust.

Trust is the one concept that could explain why servant leadership produces

desirable outcomes better than transformational leadership. The reliable link and essential

value to have between a leader and a follower is trust. Trust is not the only mediator of

the relationship between servant leadership (or transformational leadership) and the

followers' outcomes, but it also has more antecedents than servant leadership or

transformational leadership. However, the uniqueness of servant leadership would be

closer to the nature of trust than transformational leadership. Trust is "to place oneself in

a position of personal risk based on expectations that the trustees will not behave in a way

that results in harm to the trustor" (Atkinson & Butcher, 2003, p. 289). Mayer, Davis &

Schoorman (1995) assert ability, benevolence, and integrity are significant factors of

perceived trustworthiness, which influence trust, and many empirical findings have

confirmed it later.

Benevolence, which is one of the antecedents of trust, is a characteristic of servant leadership rather than an attribute of transformational leadership. Other antecedents of trust, which are integrity and ability, are characteristics of servant leadership and transformational leadership and are not unique to servant leadership. However, benevolence is an attribute that is more associated with servant leadership. Benevolence is "the extent to which a trustee is believed to want to do good to the trustor, aside from an egocentric profit motive" (Mayer et al., 1995, p. 718). What servant leaders care about is each individual even more than the final results. However, it does not mean they do not strive for good outcomes for the organization. It is just servant leadership's unique focus. Servant leaders' self-sacrificial behavior predicts employees' trust in leaders (Sendjaya & Pekerti, 2010). Transformational leadership also takes care of the followers, but because of the ultimate focus, it would lead to a weaker relationship in the trust level of followers than servant leadership.

Other areas of interest for the current study are employees' behavioral and attitudinal outcomes. Behavioral outcomes are employees' job performance and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), and attitudinal outcomes are employees' job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention. Many researchers have conducted studies about effectiveness in organizations through the consequences, including OCB and performance. A person's actions are not separated from the person's psychological state; effective behaviors are the sum of various environmental and mental factors. Therefore, examining employees' attitudes is crucial to understand what makes them effective and productive in a work setting.

   The primary purpose of the current paper is to gain a broader understanding of whether servant leadership or transformational leadership theory best explains the behaviors and attitudes of individuals through trust in a leader-follower relationship. I expect both servant leadership and transformational leadership to successfully predict all the outcomes through the mediating role of trust. However, in the long term, there could be a possibility that servant leadership could produce more robust results because of a more substantial relationship with the concept of trust. The reason is because trust requires a long time to build (McAllister, 1995) and servant leadership shows effectiveness after a long term (Eva at al., 2019). Additionally, through this review, I will explore what drives employees in the work setting. Knowing this information will not only boost corporate profits, but will also be one way to create a company that employees want to keep working in for an extended period of time.

Chapter 2

CONSTRUCTS

In an organization, people almost always work together. There is bound to be someone who leads situations. The person who leads situations should be in the position of a leader, but it does not always happen to be. Some leaders lead the group well, while others do not. Not all leaders who successfully lead the group are the same. People in leadership positions all have different personalities, tendencies, and different experiences. Their purposes and motivations at work are all different too. However, there are common characteristics among successful leaders. Numerous scholars have studied leaders because they want to know what changes outcomes and have developed multiple leadership theories.

Among several leadership theories, researchers have selected transformational leadership as their research topic since it is a confirmed topic as efficient in leadership literature. Servant leadership is another leadership style that some scholars compare with transformational leadership often. The crucial difference between the two leaderships with common characteristics is found within the relationship between the leader and the follower. The difference in leadership between the two would affect the credibility of the leader and the followers. In the long term, it would create some gaps in the followers' behaviors and attitudes. The different levels of trust in servant and transformational leadership lead to different outcomes of employees including job performance, OCB, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention. The following discussion elaborates on each topic.

Servant Leadership

The word "servant leadership" does not sound natural because the words "servant" and "leader" do not seem to be applicable to the same person at once: leaders and servants present opposite positions. A servant does not generally have a leader's roles and vice versa. However, servant leadership is not a contradictory concept at all.

Robert K. Greenleaf (1904-1990) is famous for being the founder of the servant leadership concept, which he had initiated into organizational and leadership literature (Spears, 2010). When Greenleaf (1977) conceptualized servant leadership, it was not about what kind of leadership a leader has, but instead how a leader emerges. He picked up an idea of servant leadership from Hermann Hesse's *Journey to the East*. In the book, the servant Leo became the one who was needed the most in the group because the group of people realized they could not make their journey without him. As seen in the story, a leader does not exist from the beginning for Greenleaf. He states that when a person's servitude becomes the most needed in a given group, that person naturally becomes the leader of the group. People choose who will be their leader, picking the person who possesses servant leadership skills. While Greenleaf did not give a definition of servant leadership (Hamilton, 2005), he provided the key points of a servant leader:

> 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. The best test is: Do those served grow as persons. Do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants? And, what is the effect on the least privileged in society; will they benefit, or, at least, not be further deprived? (Greenleaf, 1977, pp.13-14)

This quote effectively demonstrates the uniqueness of servant leadership. Grisaffe et al. (2016) also quote the same selection from Greenleaf's (1977) book in order to describe how servant leadership differs from any other leadership. Van Dierendonck and Patterson (2015) also agreed that the two attributes are the characteristics of servant leadership that do not belong to any other leadership.

The first distinctive characteristic of servant leadership is that they are the servant first. Being a servant first is not similar to supporting others. It is helping and serving the subordinates as a servant, rather than as a leader. Moreover, servant leaders help not only the followers but also a more extensive range of organizational stakeholders and even the larger society. Servant leaders acknowledge their responsibility is not limited to their organization. Servant leadership is opposite to any other leadership that is leader first. A servant leader uses the power to serve others, not lead others. The idea of servant first is how servant leadership works in organizations.

The second unique characteristic is the selfless commitment to others' needs. Greenleaf (1977) describes servant leaders as being those who put others' needs before their own. Their ultimate interest and priority is responding to and meeting others' needs, so their genuine care makes others grow mentally and professionally. A servant leader always tries to ensure that others achieve or gain what they need and not expect to have back as the price of their commitment. It is unconditional, sacrificial, and people-focused leadership. There are more attributes of servant leadership in Greenleaf's original writing, besides the two characteristics which make servant leadership differ from other types of leadership.

In the book, *Servant-leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*, Greenleaf explains how the features are for both servants and leaders. Spears (2010), who served as the president of The Robert K. Greenleaf Center for Servant-Leadership, concludes that Robert Greenleaf's writings include ten critical characteristics of servant leadership: listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community. Servant leadership has many characteristics besides the ten major attributes. Some of the traits contain the essential virtue of a servant. Those features are characteristics of servants and are characteristics of leaders.

S*tewardship* contains the two unique characteristics of servant leadership, which are servant first and selfless commitment. A servant leader serves the needs of others first and commits to it selflessly as a steward does all the time. Anyone in an organization can be a servant leader and play essential roles for the greater good (Spears, 2010). Stewardship is directly opposite to control.

Listening is one of the most important attributes a servant should have in order to understand the needs and fulfill the necessary conditions in a situation. When there are some issues to resolve, listening first helps to have in-depth communication, which is required for identifying problems. Listening sufficiently leads to having more interactions, and it gives insight sometimes and a deeper understanding of the language gap that requires more explanation. A leader who commits to listening first and can fill the gaps and realize what the next movement the leader should make is.

Empathy does not simply mean understanding others' feelings and problems for Greenleaf. Empathy is a quality that a leader has that does not include rejections

(Greenleaf, 1977). A servant cannot refuse to listen, and a servant always accepts whatever comes. Rejections are not an option for a servant, but a leader chooses to accept the situation as a servant does. Acceptance in his writing is embracing mistakes others would make. Therefore, it is necessary to accept others as they are because it is an opportunity to grow. These employees are able to learn from their mistakes and receive more opportunities. The endurance of a leader helps the subordinates to develop themselves. Empathy has a deep relation to the other characteristics of servant leadership and commitment to the growth of people.

Commitment to the growth of people is another significant characteristic that makes a servant leader (Hu & Liden, 2011). A major role of a servant is supporting and helping what others do. A servant leader encourages each individual to have better confidence by supporting emotionally and technically and providing learning opportunities so that an individual can strive to try new or difficult tasks while making mistakes. A servant leader uses power and resources to assist everyone in the organization, even for personal growth, as it is not limited to professional growth. It is from genuine care for each one, not from the responsibilities that certain positions have.

Awareness in servant leadership is more than sensory experiences. Awareness helps people to have a more holistic view of a situation because it helps to see what is involved in it. Greenleaf (1977) thinks that awareness allows a leader to penetrate what a situation actually is, so he states, "Able leaders are usually sharply awake and reasonably disturbed" (p. 28). Leaders' awareness helps the leaders to find resources to take necessary action for the future.

Healing occurs in servant leadership. Spears (2010) interprets Greenleaf's writing as "One of the great strengths of servant leadership is the potential for healing one's self and one's relationship to others" (p. 27). Many people have emotional wounds from relationships or weaknesses. Servant leaders understand people's vulnerability and diversity and try to help them at no cost for one's own healing. Hu and Liden (2011) also find that emotional healing falls under servant leadership.

Conceptualization and *foresight* describe the term vision. Conceptualization is the ability to dream a great future, and foresight is a sense for the unknowable and an ability to predict the unforeseeable. Greenleaf (1977) points out foresight as the "central ethic of leadership" (p. 24), and conceptualization as "the prime leadership talent" (p. 32). Servant leaders need to develop their ability to think ahead, rather than being limited to short term goals. They also need to nurture their ability to foresee, in order to make a decision for the future. It is important to know the history and have a deep understanding of current events or issues in order to have the attribute, foresight.

Persuasion is another characteristic of servant leadership. "The servant-leader seeks to convince others, rather than coerce compliance" (Spears, 2010, p. 28). When working, servant leaders encourage others little by little to work voluntarily instead of forcing them or making them rely on authority. Convincement also leads to changes in a group to build consensus.

Building a community is an important characteristic of servant leaders. Many great values of the community from the past have disappeared because of the shifting community forms to a large institution. Giant institutions usually do not work for the good of the individual. Greenleaf (1977) emphasizes how important living in a

community-related group is because only the community can give important values such as healing, love, and trust. A servant leader builds a community, and it is similar to the genuine care of others.

Russell and Stone (2002) find other attributes that appear repetitively in the servant leadership literature, and they conclude the attributes match Greenleaf's writings. The repetitive characteristics are "vision, honesty, integrity, trust, service, modeling, pioneering, appreciation of others, empowerment, credibility, influence, encouragement, teaching, and delegation" (Russell & Stone, 2002, p. 146). The research of Hu and Liden (2011) shows positive relationships between servant leadership and the following characteristics: putting subordinates first, behaving ethically, helping subordinates grow and succeed, healing emotionally, building upon conceptual skills, and creating value for the community.

Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership is a leadership style in which leaders transform and motivate followers to innovate and create change for the success of the organization (Yulk, 2013). Transformational leaders have charisma because transformational leadership is rooted in the study of charismatic leadership (Smith et al., 2004). However, charisma itself is not necessary for the transforming process of leadership. Yulk (2013) explains transformational leaders encourage followers with a vision of the future, which motivates followers to achieve shared common goals. Transformational leaders also pay attention to and meet the needs of followers and pursue new ideas and creativity for solutions to challenging situations. Moreover, transformational leaders provide mentoring so that followers can learn about their current job and develop their abilities.

Transformational leadership has six traits: "acceptance of group goals, high-performance expectations, intellectual stimulation, appropriate role model, articulating a vision, and individualized support" (Yang, 2014, p. 749). However, most of the transformational leadership literature introduces four types of behavior to explain transformational leadership: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Smith et al., 2004; Stone et al., 2004; Yulk, 2013). Each behavior describes the characteristics of transformational leadership.

Idealized influence. Stone et al. (2004) identify idealized influence through accompanying attributes: "vision, trust, respect, risk-sharing, integrity, and modeling" (p.353). Transformational leaders become role models who are emulated by subordinates because the followers admire the leaders (Stone et al., 2004). The reasons transformational leaders exemplify high ethical and moral standards and gain respect from them are their integrity and sacrificial dedication to the followers' needs and benefits (Smith et al., 2004; Yulk, 2013). Their communication is consistent, honest, and open, and they do not attempt to manipulate others (Yulk, 2013). As a result, the followers' trust toward the leaders tend to be high (Stone et al., 2004). A transformational leader also develops a vision and shares it with their followers (Stone et al., 2004).

Inspirational motivation. Accompanying attributes of inspirational motivation is "commitment to goals, communication, and enthusiasm" (Stone et al., 2004, p. 353). Transformational leaders have a clear vision, enthusiasm, and optimism. The followers recognize what the leaders have, and become motivated and inspired. The leader does not deliver their expectations and vision in a coercive way, and the leader devotes to the goals and the shared vision (Stone, 2004).

Intellectual stimulation. "Intellectual stimulation refers to a leader's behavior that encourages followers' activity and stimulates innovative thinking" (Smith et al., 2004, p. 81). Transformational leaders create an environment which allows the followers to express their opinion and ideas without being accused of making mistakes. They are willing to change practices and systems to practical ones. They always welcome new ways, but they must be realistic and rational in order to apply them (Stone, 2004).

Individualized consideration. Stone et al. (2004) describe individual consideration with "personal attention, mentoring, listening, and empowerment" (p. 353). Transformational leaders pay attention to the followers' needs, and they support and coach them to achieve goals and grow more as their mentors. They also try to create new learning opportunities for followers (Smith et al., 2004). Transformational leaders also delegate tasks to the followers and provide advice when needed. They listen and accept what the followers desire, which builds relationships as well (Stone, 2004).

Comparative Review of Leadership

Transformational leadership itself is a prevalent topic in leadership, psychology, and organizational management journals. As of December 2019, there are 5,155 studies and books listed on the database *PsycINFO* when using the keyword "transformational leadership." When searched in the same database, the number of studies of transformational leadership is nearly six times higher than the keyword "servant leadership." It is because transformational leadership already has an excellent and longstanding reputation as an effective leadership style to many positive outcomes that organizations desire.

On the other hand, servant leadership is relatively new when compared to other leadership theories. Researchers have only studied servant leadership for three decades. However, servant leadership is on par with transformational leadership in recent research. Before discussing the relation between servant leadership and transformational leadership, I will discuss why transformational leadership is the most popular in research within many fields through comparisons with other leadership theories. Researchers have compared transformational leadership to other leadership theories: charismatic, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership because they overlap each other or provide what is vital in leadership.

Charismatic leadership is very influential to followers. Yulk (2013) explains that leaders who possess charisma are attractive and persuasive to followers, and a leader's charisma emerges through their behavior and expertise. "Charisma is a Greek word that means divinely inspired gift, such as the ability to perform miracles or predict future events" (Yulk, 2013). Leaders with charismatic leadership inspire followers emotionally by appealing to their values, suggesting unconventional ways to improve current situations, whether there is a crisis or not, and achieve objectives that previously seemed impossible. The unconventional ways are radical, realistic, insightful, and extraordinary, and the leaders show conviction and commitment to the goals. Charismatic leaders' initiative and boldness make followers idolize the leaders, and the followers are fond of being a part of the leaders' team and want to imitate the leaders. Followers devote their extra time and effort to the leaders.

Transactional leadership is another influential leadership style to followers. Yulk (2013) states that transactional leaders motivate compliance by followers through both

punishments and rewards, which are exchange processes. Transactional leadership involves values that are related to exchange processes but do not spend effort inspiring the followers, so it does not induce followers' enthusiasm or commitment to their goals. In the boundaries of structures and orders, transactional leadership works because it appeals to followers' self-interest or benefits they would receive. Transactional leaders are task and outcome-oriented, but they are not challenging the status quo. It works within organizational standards or organizational culture.

Laissez-faire leadership "is defined as passive indifference about the task and subordinates (e.g., ignoring problems, ignoring subordinate needs)" (Yulk, 2013, p. 323). It is the absence of effective leadership. In this leadership, leaders do not provide guidance or correction and do not make necessary decisions. This leadership has weak relationships with a perception of leadership effectiveness, need satisfaction, and work engagement (van Dierendonck et al., 2014).

Transformational leadership is similar to charismatic leadership and transactional leadership but distinct from them in several ways. Charismatic leadership and transformational leadership explain how leaders influence followers to commit and sacrifice themselves to organizations. Charismatic leaders provide a promising vision for the future and a better situation than the present, while transformational leaders are transforming followers' or an organization's vision into the leaders' vision (Yulk, 2013). Transactional leaders do not innovate new ways for organizational goals, but transformational leaders try to have creative solutions and focus more on the future. Transactional leaders focus on followers' compliance with organizational norms by

giving followers rewards and punishments, while transformational leaders transform the values and behaviors in the same direction of their vision (Yulk, 2013).

Nowadays, charismatic and laissez-faire leadership research has decreased. Charismatic leadership has many positive effects on organizations. However, there are many negative consequences of charismatic leaders a number of social scientists discussed (Yulk, 2013). The existence of the leader is so great that it is difficult for followers to make suitable suggestions. Followers' desires for leader acceptance reduce criticism. Excessive confidence and optimism hinder the leader to discern real dangers. Many researchers find negative relationships between laissez-faire leadership and important outcomes for organizations (van Dierendonck et al., 2014). Laissez-faire leadership appears in research as evidence of what characteristics a leader should have rather than become a significant subject of research.

Transformational leadership has more substantial relationships with outcomes that influence positively to an organization than transactional leadership and laissez-faire leadership. Transformational leadership predicts OCB positively, whether or not the subordinates have organizational identification, while transactional leadership and laissez-faire leadership do not have significant relationships with OCB and show the followers' fewer OCB when they identify themselves strongly with their organizations (Humphrey, 2012). Transformational leadership has stronger relationships with satisfaction, performance, OCB, social responsibility, and customer-directed extra-role behaviors than transactional leadership (Grisaffe et al., 2016). Transformational leadership predicts more than laissez-faire leadership for perceived leadership

effectiveness of an employee, psychological need satisfaction, and work engagement (van Dierendonck et al., 2014).

Some of the characteristics of servant leadership are not unique to servant leadership. For instance, providing direction is a characteristic of almost every leadership model. Yulk (2013) states that the characteristics of servant leadership are similar to other major attributes of theories of ethical leadership (e.g., transformational, authentic, and spiritual leadership). All ethical leadership includes several of the same characteristics: integrity, altruism, humility, personal growth, and empowerment. The most popular leadership theory being discussed with servant leadership among the ethical leadership theories is transformational leadership because both are almost the same. However, apparent differences exist between those similar leadership theories.

Growing empirical evidence confirms the conceptual distinctions of servant leadership from related leadership theories. Researchers have compared servant leadership to transformational leadership. It is because servant leadership and transformational leadership share many similarities such as: envisioning the future, influencing others, maintaining integrity and trust, sharing power, meeting the needs of followers, and being a model (Smith et al., 2004; Stone et al., 2004), and both stem from the same foundation, charismatic leadership (Smith et al., 2004). The correlation between them is 0.45**(Schaubroeck et al., 2011), 0.50** (van Dierendonck et al., 2014), 0.32** (Peterson, Galvin, & Lange, 2012), 0.52** (Schneider & George, 2011), and 0.53**/-0.79** (Liden et al., 2008). These articles depict the closeness between transformational and servant leadership pertaining to their significance.

Servant and Transformational Leadership in Literature

Servant leadership and transformational leadership are distinctly different in two ways. First, Liden et al. (2008) and Peterson et al. (2012) argue that encouraging followers to engage in moral reasoning is a distinctive characteristic of servant leadership from transformational leadership. Transformational leadership is also another type of ethical leadership (Yulk, 2013), but encouraging moral behaviors or moral reasoning is not a transformational leadership attribute. Transformational leaders are honest, transparent, just, and fair, so the followers emulate them voluntarily. The leaders do not intend to encourage the behaviors.

The second difference Smith et al. (2004) points out in their study is the focus of each leadership. The underlying processes of each leadership model are different, even though both produce overlaps. Within an organization, transformational leadership is a bit more innovative and risk-taking towards the goals. In contrast, servant leadership takes care of individuals more profoundly to even care about their emotions as well as personal growth. In servant leadership, a leader is more follower centric, but in transformational leadership, it is more for promoting innovation and creativity for the sake of organizational success. Stone et al. (2004) also notes that a servant leader's focus is more on the growth and well-being of individuals rather than the results of their work when comparing leader focus to transformational leadership. They state that transformational leadership puts more emphasis on the final products or objectives of the organization. In other words, the motivation for the same behaviors, meeting the followers' needs, and supporting personal growth, in each leadership model is critically distinct. Transformational leadership and servant leadership is not in contrast to each other; they are similar but clearly distinct.

Once again, the motivation for servant leadership behaviors is very distinct. Van Dierendonck and Patterson (2015) argue compassionate love is the core value of servant leadership, and compassionate love is a concern for followers and doing good deeds for the benefits of followers not for the benefits of the leaders themselves. It is a willingness of self-sacrifice and explains why there is a motivation to serve. They posit that compassionate love would have a relationship with altruism, which is a concern for the welfare of another. What they describe as compassionate love consists of the two characteristics.

All the articles I researched have agreed that both leadership model pursue better performance of followers with different motivations, but research results of the same argument based on the difference are not the same. Smith et al. (2004) argue that servant leadership and transformational leadership has a good fit in certain environments. A leader with servant leadership behaviors is most suitable for individuals and groups in stable environments. They insist that the characteristic of servant leadership, commitment to personal growth, would lead followers to be passive to the external environment and have a complacent attitude to current conditions because it gives satisfaction to each member in the organization and the status quo. On the other hand, a leader with transformational leadership behaviors is most successful in an organization facing uncertainty and rapid change. It is because transformational leadership emphasizes organizational goals and mission, so it leads followers to strive for survival and react to the external environment actively.

However, van Dierendonck et al. (2014) find the exact opposite results. Their hypothesis is similar to what Smith et al. (2004) argue, but the results do not support their

hypothesis that transformational leadership is useful in times of uncertainty. According to their study, transformational leadership is less effective in greater job uncertainty, which is an environmental uncertainty. However, servant leadership is less sensitive to environmental uncertainty than transformational leadership in this case. When the uncertainty affects individual rather than the individual's organization, servant leadership is more effective. They explain the reason for the result in the characteristics of servant leadership, being the servant first, and committing to the growth of people.

Several empirical findings show that servant leadership could predict followers' and organizations' outcomes beyond transformational leadership. Van Dierendonck et al. (2014) found a high correlation between transformational and servant leadership. Servant leadership is more strongly related to an expected enhancement of the psychological needs of followers, but transformational leadership is more strongly related to being perceived as a leader. Peterson et al. (2012) did not develop any hypothesis which contends servant leadership is above transformational leadership, but the result showed that "servant leadership predicted firm performance over and above transformational leadership" (p. 588). Schaubroeck et al. (2011) explore how the leader's actions relate to trust and the team's psychological states and, furthermore, to the team's performance. Team psychological safety, which is connected to servant leadership, affects team performance nearly twice as high as team potency, which is more related to transformational leadership. They find that servant leadership predicts an additional 10% variance in team performance over transformational leadership. Liden et al. (2008) find that transformational leadership is not significantly related to subordinate reports of community citizenship behaviors and subordinate in-role performance, but servant

leadership predicts an additional 19% variance in subordinate reports of community citizenship behaviors and 5% variance in subordinate in-role performance beyond transformational leadership.

Moreover, transformational leadership relates to organizational commitment significantly, and servant leadership predicts an additional 4% variance in organizational commitment over transformational leadership. Schneider and George (2011) state that both leadership models predict satisfaction and intention to stay, but only servant leadership predicts the commitment of followers. In their study, a hierarchical analysis reveals that "when servant leadership is in the regression equation along with transformational leadership, transformational leadership no longer affects the three dependent variables, nor are there any significant relationships with empowerment" (p. 72). Chen et al. (2015) find that servant leadership predicts the subordinates' service performance beyond transformational leadership when self-efficacy and group identification were mediators in that relationship.

Grisaffe et al. (2016) claim that servant leadership is the concept of a broader category, which includes transformational leadership while talking about the uniqueness of servant leadership. They insist that servant leadership is hierarchically higher than transformational leadership as an extension of Avolio's hierarchical leadership augmentation hypothesis. In the augmentation hypothesis, a leadership at higher rank is more effective, and transformational leadership is above transactional leadership because of its characteristics. According to Grisaffe et al. (2016), servant leadership characteristics are "built on top of transformational leadership characteristics" (p. 44). They posited servant leadership at the highest in the hierarchy augment because the basis

of its attributes is transformational leadership. They pointed out the two unique attributes, servant first and selfless commitment to others' needs, and insisted that the distinctive aspects are what make servant leadership above and beyond other leaderships. They found that the two characteristics "can be built on top of transformational leadership" (Grisaffe et al., 2016, p. 44). The results show that managers with servant leadership had more favorable satisfaction than managers with transformational leadership. Managers with servant leadership directly and indirectly promote and influence sales performance, organizational citizenship behaviors, attitude toward corporate social responsibility, and even extra behaviors toward customers more than the managers with transformational leaders (Grisaffe et al., 2016). They tested their study twice with different participants, and every result of this study was higher for a higher level of leadership, which confirms Avolio's hypothesis once again.

Trust

Most individuals work with others, not alone. It is very significant working in a reliable organization or with trustworthy people. Trust exists between two or more people or parties. It is the value associated with relationships. When people work together, it involves interdependence frequently. When the work requires more risk, it leads to more interdependence. Trust is one of the aspects that makes it possible to achieve goals when people depend on each other.

"Trust is a psychological state comprising the intention to accept vulnerability based upon positive expectations of the intentions or behavior of another" (Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt & Camerer, 1998, p. 395), and it would be a proper and general definition of trust in every relationship even in workplaces. However, there is no universally accepted

scholarly definition of trust. It may be because there are different forms of trust. Dirk and Ferrin (2001) recognize that "trust is a complex psychological state that may consist of different dimensions" (p.451). Rousseau et al. (1998) and McAllister (1995) also agreed about the multi-dimensions of trust. Before discussing multi-dimensions of trust, I am going to explain about the concept of trust further.

Mayer et al. (1995) explain that the nature of trust is similar to cooperation, confidence, and predictability, but trust is different from all of them. "Trust is not taking risk per se, but rather it is a willingness to take risk" (Mayer et al., 1995, p. 712). When people trust each other, people are more likely to cooperate, but the situations in which people cooperate do not always ask them to take a risk. Confidence and trust might be from a repetitive circumstance, but when people trust others, they take actions although there would be "a possibility of being disappointed" (p. 713). However, when people are confident, it means that they are assertive in the situation, and confident people do not think about being disappointed. Trust is a concept that includes prediction since both reduce vagueness. Predictability about a person does not always lead others to be willing to take a risk or to be vulnerable. It is because it could be knowing how others would behave, and no one would be vulnerable when others are going to be unhelpful or unfaithful. In other words, trust is "to place oneself in a position of personal risk based on expectations that the trustees will not behave in a way that results in harm to the trustor" (Atkinson & Butcher, 2003, p. 289).

Trust is risk-taking that cannot be explained only by cooperation, confidence, and predictability. Being mentally safe is the basis of a person's trust in others. Schaubroeck et al. (2011) find a relationship between trust in the leader and psychological safety.

Edmonson (as cited in Schaubroeck et al., 2011) defines team psychological safety as "a shared belief that the team is a safe environment for interpersonal risk taking" (p. 864). When people know that they are safe to engage in their work thoroughly, it is comfortable to rely on each other and contribute to the goal. People take risks because they feel safe, and mental stability makes it easier to be interdependent.

Rousseau et al. (1998) explain three different types of trust. Calculus-based trust emerges upon economic exchange, so trust exists when a trustor perceives trustee's behaviors as beneficial. A trustor has relational trust due to repetitive actions for a long time from a trustee. Reliability and dependability come in the interaction between the trustor and the trustee, then emotion comes later into the interaction. Institution-based trust derives from the culture of team or organization, society, and legal system support. This type of trust exists at an organizational level, not an individual level. To develop each type of trust, it takes a different amount of time. Calculative trust does not take much time to form, but it takes a longer time to build relational trust than calculative trust. Institutional trust, however, does not require a certain amount of time to develop. Relational trust is trust between people, which requires the longest time to build.

Interpersonal trust has two principal forms: affect-based trust and cognition-based trust (McAllister, 1995). Cognition-based trust was a belief about how consistently others behave, and affect-based trust was about how others care and concern reciprocally, so cognition-based trust is reliability, dependability, and consistency, and affect-based trust is emotional trust and emotional security (McAllister, 1995). Affect-based trust was high when the cognition-based trust was high. In other words, cognition-based trust was a predictor of affect-based trust, and some level of cognition-based trust was necessary to

develop affect-based trust. The two forms were distinctively different even though they had a high correlation, and each functioned in a different manner and had associations with different variables (McAllister, 1995).

Followers form a different level of trust based on the relationship they have with the leaders, characteristics, or behaviors of the leaders (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002). Characteristics of authentic leadership (e.g., integrity, accountability, transparency, openness, predictability, and consistency) increase the followers' trust level of the leaders (Xiong et al., 2016). Caldwell, Hayes, and Long (2010) find that leaders' behaviors of creating connections with others and acquiring and using resources with clear goals and roles lead to higher interpersonal trust, and it makes the subordinates think the supervisors have ethical stewardship inspired by servant leadership. Trust in leadership is higher when employees regard processes of work or interactions as fair and ethical (Dirk & Ferrin, 2002). McAllister (1995) finds the functions of interpersonal trust in close relationships in organizations. In his study, a manager's affective based trust toward a peer is higher when the peer has more interactions with the manager and shows citizenship behaviors directly toward the manager. A manager assists a peer more directly when a manager's affective based trust expresses high in a peer. Moreover, when a manager presents more interpersonal citizenship behaviors toward a peer, the supervisor's assessment of the manager and the peer is higher.

Mayer et al. (1995) insist that a trustee's ability, benevolence, integrity, and trustors' propensity to trust would increase trustors' trust level toward the trustees. A leader's ability, benevolence, and propensity to trust influence the level of subordinates' trust in leaders, and ability is a mediator of the relationship between secure attachment

and trust and the relationship between propensity to trust and trust in supervisors (Frazier, Gooty, Little & Nelson, 2015). Employees' trust in leaders is high in benevolent situations; namely, employees show high trust in their leaders when people who work with, including leaders, behave and work for the greatest good for the greatest number of people, while employees' trust in leaders is shallow when the people who work with including leaders work for self-interest and benefits for themselves (Simha & Stachowicz-Stanusch, 2015). Legood, Thomas, and Sacramento (2016) find that when the leaders demonstrate concern for followers' work and communicate with them about the work, the followers perceive the leaders possess benevolence, trustworthiness, and the perception also has a strong relationship with trust in the leaders. As with benevolence, the integrity of the leaders also shows a significant relationship with the followers' trust in the leader. However, a leader's ability to be trustworthy itself is not strong enough to make a change in followers' trust in the leader.

One of the antecedents of trust is servant leadership. Leaders with servant leadership possess ability, benevolence, and integrity. Servant leadership has a positive relationship with affective-based trust in the leader (Schaubroeck et al., 2011). Sendjaya and Pekerti (2010) confirm that servant leadership is an antecedent of trust in the direct leader. All the dimensions of servant leadership (genuine and profound relationship, morality, and transforming influence) fully predict the followers' trust in leaders, and the others (self-sacrificing behaviors, trustful and transparent behaviors, and sense of mission which exists beyond the material world) partially predict the followers' trust in the leader.

Scholars have previously observed that transformational leadership builds trust. All the transformational leadership dimensions (inspirational motivation, idealized

influence, and individualized consideration) except intellectual stimulation have positive

relationships with trust (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman & Fetter, 1990). Later, all of

them predict trust, even though intellectual stimulation predicts weaker than other

dimensions (Gillespie & Mann, 2004). Trust in leadership has a direct and positive

relationship with transformational leadership (Dirk & Ferrin, 2002; Goodwin,

Whittington, Murray & Nichols, 2011). Schaubroeck et al. (2011) confirm that

transformational leadership has a positive relationship with cognition-based trust.

 Interpersonal trust mediates the relationship between transformational leadership

and organizational outcomes. Transformational leadership indirectly influences OCB,

performance, and affective commitment through an interpersonal trust (Goodwin et al.,

2011). Yang (2014) develops two separate models of leadership trust that were for testing

how moderation and mediation effects the relationship between transformational

leadership and job satisfaction. The result shows that their hypothesis based on the

models are all statistically significant. Yang (2016) finds that transformational leadership,

leadership trust, and commitment have direct effects on job satisfaction. Trust has a

positive effect on commitment and leadership trust, and commitment mediates

transformational leadership and job satisfaction.

 Accumulating evidence supports that trust plays several crucial roles in

organizational settings. Trust changes or influences other variables that organizations,

employees, and employers want to achieve. Dirks and Ferrin (2001) review researches

about the role of trust in organization settings, which are released prior to 2001. In the

studies which use trust as the main effects on workplace behaviors and performance

outcomes, some outcomes of workplace behaviors (e.g., information sharing, negotiation,

communication, and unit performance) are inconsistent. However, organizational

citizenship behaviors and individual performance receives the most robust empirical

support because the results are relatively consistent. In most studies of the main effects of

trust on workplace attitudes and cognitive/perceptual constructs, the outcomes are almost

consistent, although the rationales for the effects are slightly different. The main effects

of trust on organizational commitment and job satisfaction, including performance

evaluation, guidance on job responsibilities, and training, are powerful.

   In an organizational setting, people have diverse relationships with subordinates,

peers, direct supervisors, and even higher levels of leaders. Interpersonal relationships

always come with trust in that relationship, and trust is critical in organizations. It is

because the interpersonal trust would affect many outcomes. Consistent behaviors and

faith increase a level of trust, and it changes important work outcomes (Dirks & Ferrin,

2002). There are two main categories of employee work-related outcomes in this article.

One is behavioral and performance outcomes, which are organizational citizenship

behaviors and job performance. The other is job attitudes and intentions, which are job

satisfaction, organizational commitment, goal commitment, belief in information, and

intent to quit.

   Trust in leaders is influential to behavioral and performance outcomes. Trust in

leadership is higher when OCB and job performance were higher (Dirk & Ferrin, 2002).

Trust in direct leaders has strong relationships with job performance and OCB altruism

than trust in organizational leadership (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002). Miao, Newman, and

Huang (2014) find that affect-based trust fully mediates the relationships between

participative leadership of a direct leader and the followers' job performance and

organizational citizenship behavior. However, the cognition-based trust does not mediate them. It suggests that cognition-based trust alone is not enough to change outcomes, and affective based trust in interpersonal interactions, which is more relational than cognition-based trust, is important to produce positive outcomes of the followers.

Trust in the direct leader is also influential to job attitudes and intentions of the subordinates in an organization. The organizational commitment of followers is higher, and intent to quit is lower when the followers' trust in leadership is higher (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002). Basit (2017) finds that higher trust in the leader leads employees to more freely express themselves without fear of negative consequences. Feeling safe in expression fully mediates trust in the leader and employees' feeling that they should help the organization reach its goals. Trust in leaders also has close relationships with employees' engagement in their job physically, emotionally, and cognitively. The focus here is on the order in which trust affected job engagement in the mediating role, followed by psychological safety and felt obligation. Xiong, Lin, Li, and Wang (2016) find that when trust in a direct leader is higher, the affective commitment of the follower is higher. It means that trust in a leader has a relationship with the followers' emotional attachment toward the organization.

Interpersonal trust, especially trust in direct leaders, plays significant roles in job satisfaction (Dirk & Ferrin, 2002). Trust in direct leaders and job satisfaction has significant relationships with the employees' awareness of accountability, which means they believe or know what coworkers and managers do and how well they perform (Thoms, Dose & Scott, 2002). Rich (1997) finds that followers' trust in their manager is high when the employees regard their manager as a good work example to follow. Trust

in the manager is a key mediator of role modeling and job satisfaction, so job satisfaction is higher when the followers had greater trust in the leader. Goris, Vaught, and Pettit (2003) find a moderating effect of trust in leaders in the relationship between individual job congruence and job satisfaction, even though it receives weak support. Employees have low congruence with their job when trust in superiors moderates individual-job congruence relationship with overall job satisfaction. However, in high congruence situations, trust is not a moderator of the relationship. Whether it is high or low congruence situations, trust is a predictor of job satisfaction in the dimensions of work, supervision, promotions, and coworkers. In high congruence situations, trust predicts overall job satisfaction. Bibi, Karim, & Shafiq-ur-Rehman (2017) find that interpersonal trust mediated the relationship between optimism and job satisfaction. Trust in direct leaders has a stronger relationship with job satisfaction than the relationship between trust in organizational leadership (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002).

Behavioral Outcomes

Organizational citizenship behavior

Interest in OCB has soared over the past decade. When searching OCB on *the PsycINFO* database, there are more than 2,650 results, including academic articles, dissertations, and books as of February 2020. More than half of the entire searching results from 1983 to 2020 were published in the past seven years. Even the *Google Scholar* search engine shows similar results in the topic of OCB.

Organ (1988) originally defined OCB as "individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization" (p. 4). However,

later Organ (1997) revised the definition of OCB, which stated that OCB "supports the social and psychological environment in which task performance takes place" (p. 95). Podsakoff, Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Maynes, and Spoelma (2014) explain that it is because OCB is not always discretionary when others around a person expect OCB of the person. The revised definition gives a different tone of behaviors: it does not always mean extra-role behaviors anymore, and it is not complete without a formal reward system.

OCB has multiple dimensions that have been identified by many researchers, but there is no consented version of OCB dimensions (Podsakoff et al., 2014). However, there are two conceptualizations of OCB frequently in use by researchers to explain and conduct research about OCB. The first conceptualization has two main dimensions. Each dimension targets either the organization or individual who might get benefits from the behaviors. One is OCBO, which benefits the organization in general, and the most common description in OCBO is a civic virtue, sportsmanship, and conscientiousness. OCBO also includes loyalty, organizational identification, compliance, the spread of goodwill, and self-development. The other is OCBI which benefits specific individuals, and OCBI is usually altruism and courtesy. OCBI would include peacekeeping, interpersonal harmony, interpersonal facilitation, and cooperation.

The second one explains OCB with two dimensions suggested by Van Dyne, Cummings, and Parks (1995): affiliation-oriented citizenship behaviors (AOCBs) and challenge-oriented citizenship behaviors (COCBs). AOCBs are very altruistic interpersonal behaviors that help to build up relationships with others. COCBs are behaviors that challenge the status quo and promote positive change in an organization.

The challenging behaviors in COCBs are constructive rather than critical. Podsakoff et al. (2014) conduct a review of OCB literature and provide a chart of types of OCBs. In the chart, all the behaviors of OCBI fall under AOCBs.

Podsakoff et al. (2014) argue that unit-level OCB is more meaningful than an individual level OCB. Each individual exhibits OCBs, but it takes time to have significant results in an organization. They explain how the motivation of the individual level of OCB can be applied to the unit level through the social learning theory of emulating the model's behaviors. Whether it is the unit level or the individual level, the major types of OCB the studies talked about are AOCBs (more than 75%) and COCBs (more than 40%) on the unit level. There is no clear mainstream of OCB measures in the unit level.

A meta-analytic review of OCB (Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff & Blume, 2009) reports that the unit level of OCBs has strong positive correlations with the unit level of performance: profitability, productivity, product quality, efficiency, turnover, and reductions in waste. Supporting the 2009 article, another meta-analytic review of OCB (Podsakoff et al., 2014) also indicates that OCBs have impacts on diverse outcomes: unit, team, organizational level of performance or effectiveness, improving business process, customer-related outcomes, and financial measures.

A few mediators of the relationships between unit OCBs and group performance have failed to show a coherent pattern, and it is going to be similar within a decade (Podsakoff et al., 2014). It is because replication of studies and comparative models of mediation are not enough and consistent, and dimensions of OCBs which are used in studies are inconsistent. A number of moderators of the relationship between unit OCBs

and unit performance also have insufficient outcomes to find a consistent pattern since the variables unit performance past studies tested are not representing the whole. There are still many critical organizational outcomes of performance to be analyzed.

How a supervisor behaves affects OCBs a lot. Chiaburu and Lim (2008) examine the importance of a leader's trustworthiness for OCBs. Trustworthiness is about a leader's behaviors: consistency and integrity in behavior, how control is disseminated, manner and frequency of communication, and showing concern. A leader's predictable, consistent, and credible behaviors predict OCBs after controlling for the effect of propensity to trust and procedural and distributive justice. Consistency is an antecedent of a leader's trustworthiness in this study, but also it is an antecedent of interpersonal trust in the other study (Singh & Srivastava, 2009). Interpersonal trust is higher when a leader or a colleague shows higher consistency of behavior, interaction frequency, and competence. However, it is not a strong predictability of trust, and the authors thought it is because this study tests one side of interpersonal trust, which is cognition-based trust, not affect-based trust. Trust in colleagues is mainly about interaction frequency with consistent behaviors, and the competence of seniors is the main determining factor of trust. Son and Kim (2016) find that the followers' OCBs are greater when their perceived managerial support for mentoring is greater. Moreover, actually received mentoring from the leader or not mediate the relationship between management support for mentoring and trust in mentors.

Trust in leaders also plays a vital role in the followers' OCBs. Singh and Srivastava (2009) examine that interpersonal trust was a significant predictor of OCBs, whether it is trust in a peer or trust in the manager. Interestingly, when it is trust in

colleagues, OCBs the subordinates exhibited are altruism, courtesy, and sportsmanship, and when it is trust in the leader, the subordinates exhibit conscientiousness and civic virtue as well. Son and Kim (2016) show that trust in the leader mediates the relationship between mentoring received from the leader and the followers' OCBs. Trust in leaders increases the followers' positive behaviors toward the organization. Trust in the supervisor predict each dimension of OCBs: OCBI and OCBO, and mediate the relationships between ability and OCBs, and benevolence and OCBs (Frazier et al., 2015).

Servant leadership is one of the antecedents of team level OCBs. Ehrhart (2004) finds that servant leadership has a significant impact on two dimensions of OCBs directly: helping and conscientiousness. The procedural justice climate mediates the relationship between servant leadership and the two team level OCBs. Walumbwa et al. (2010) extend more that servant leadership has a strong relationship with individual OCBs in the team through the mediating roles of team level procedural justice climate, service climate, individual-level self-efficacy, and commitment to supervisor. Hu and Liden (2011) demonstrate again that servant leadership relates to team level OCB through the mediating role of shared confidence in a team's general capabilities. Servant leadership influences OCBs even though it is at an individual level, and it is above transformational leadership and leader-member exchange (Liden et al., 2008).

Transformational leadership influences OCBs. Transformational leadership predicts OCBs, and organizational identification fails to mediate the relationship between them and has negative relationships with both (Humphrey, 2012). Lee, Woo, and Kim (2018) find a significant mediating role of affective commitment in the relationship

between transformational leadership and OCBs, even though it examines just two dimensions of OCBs; helping behaviors and conscientiousness.

Nohe and Hertel (2017) conduct a meta-analysis of underlying factors of the relationship between transformational leadership and OCB. They select four mediators which were attitudinal (affective organizational commitment and job satisfaction) and relational mediators (trust in the leader and leader-member exchange; LMX). Every single mediator has a positive relationship between transformational leadership and OCB individually. However, when testing several mediators together, LMX is the strongest mediator over affective organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Relational mediators mediate the relationship between transformational leadership and OCB more strongly than attitudinal mediators. Additional research reveals that the sequence of the model in this study is right and the other model of the order in which transformational leadership triggers relational mediators, which triggers attitudinal mediators, which triggers OCB did not receive support.

Job Performance

Interpersonal trust influences subordinates' performance directly (Frazier et al., 2015; Goodwin et al., 2011; Rich, 1997). Trust in leaders and trust in leadership show positive relationships with job performance and overall trust shows a stronger relationship with job performance than cognitive trust (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002). The studies before 2001 show that trust is very impactful to individual and team performance (Dirks & Ferrin, 2001). Trust in the supervisor mediates the relationship between leaders' ability and performance and the relationship between leaders' benevolence and performance (Frazier et al., 2015). Role modeling influences overall performance through the

mediating role of trust in managers (Rich, 1997). Trust in leaders plays as a predictor and a moderator of the quantity of performance (Goris et al., 2003).

When the leader is more engaged in servant leadership, team performance is greater. Hu and Liden (2011) perceive team performance and team OCBs as the components of team effectiveness and servant leadership predicts team effectiveness through the mediating role of team confidence about team capabilities. Goal clarity and process clarity has a positive relationship with team performance through the mediating role of a shared belief of a team's abilities. Moreover, the more the leader practices servant leadership, this leads to a relationship between goal clarity, process clarity, and team potency. The impact of goal and process clarity on team potency is getting weaker when there is no servant leadership. Schaubroeck et al. (2011) also find that servant leadership has a positive relationship with team performance with a mediating role of affective based trust in leader and team psychological safety. Servant leadership also has "an additional 10% of the variance in team performance above transformational leadership" (p. 869).

Chen at al. (2015) also find results that show servant leadership is beyond transformational leadership in employee's performance: servant leadership predicts the subordinates' service performance, which is a central part of the hairstylist job, including service quality, customer-focused citizenship behavior, and customer-oriented prosocial behavior. In this setting, self-efficacy and group identification are mediators of the relationship. The employees exhibit more servant leadership when the store manager engages in servant leadership more and servant culture (each member shows servant behaviors) mediates the relationship between servant leadership and store performance,

which includes individual's performance accuracy, and influence the store performance (Liden, Wayne, Liao & Meuser, 2014) directly. Moreover, servant culture influences the employees' in-role performance indirectly through the employees' identification with the store.

Cognition based trust in the leader and team potency mediates the effect of a transformational leader on team performance (Schaubroeck et al., 2011). Transformational leadership and subordinates' performance have a positive relationship in a mediating role of trust in the manager (Goodwin et al., 2011). Breevaart, Bakker, Demerouti, and Derks (2016) also find an indirect effect of transformational leadership on subordinates' job performance. Employees' needs for leadership moderate the relationship between transformational leadership and work engagement and work engagement mediates transformational leadership and job performance of the employees.

Attitudinal Outcomes

Job satisfaction

Trust in leaders is one of the antecedents of job satisfaction (Rich, 1997; Mulki, Jaramillo & Locander, 2006). In the review of Dirks and Ferrin (2001) about the role of trust in organizations, trust plays significant roles in satisfaction. Trust in leaders and trust in leadership also has positive relationships with job satisfaction and cognitive trust has the strongest relationship with job satisfaction among attitudinal outcomes, including organizational commitment and intent to quit, and it is stronger than overall trust (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002). Trust in managers mediates the relationship between role modeling and job satisfaction (Rich, 1997). Interpersonal trust mediates the relationship between job satisfaction and optimism, which is a belief that life will be good rather than bad (Bibi et

al., 2017). Trust in supervisors is a predictor of overall job satisfaction and has a moderating role in the relationship between individual job congruence and overall job satisfaction (Goris et al., 2003). Low interpersonal conflict and low emotional exhaustion sequentially mediates the negative relationship between trust in supervisor and job satisfaction (Mulki, Jaramillo & Locander, 2008).

Cerit (2009) finds that servant leadership behaviors of leaders (including valuing people, developing people, building community, displaying authenticity, and providing leadership) explains variance of job satisfaction strongly. However, sharing leadership (creating a shared vision, sharing decision making power, and sharing privilege), which is one dimension of servant leadership, does not explain job satisfaction. Ozyilmaz and Cicek (2015) also find a significant direct relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction, although there is no examination of the dimensions of servant leadership. In this study, the psychological climate mediates the relationship. Servant leadership cultivates greater satisfaction of the subordinates, and it is beyond transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and sub-transactional leadership (Grisaffe et al., 2016).

Yang (2016) tests six competing models of transformational leadership, leadership trust, change commitment, and job satisfaction. Two out of six receive support. The two models have the same mediators in a different order that are leadership trust and change commitment, and transformational leadership predicts job satisfaction regardless of the order of mediators. Grisaffe et al. (2016) find a direct impact of transformational leadership on job satisfaction. The power of transformational leadership

on job satisfaction is stronger than the impact of transactional leadership and sub-

transactional leadership.

Organizational commitment

Commitment is "a psychological state that (a) characterizes the employee's

relationship with the organization, and (b) has implications for the decision to continue

membership in the organization" (Meyer & Allen, 1991, p. 67). Meyer and Allen (1991)

conceptualize commitment into three components: affective commitment, continuance

commitment, and normative commitment. Affective commitment is an "employee's

emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization"

(Meyer & Allen, 1991, p. 67). Employees with higher affective commitment stay longer

in the organization than those with lower commitment because they like their jobs or

want to remain. Continuance commitment refers to "an awareness of the costs associated

with leaving the organization" (p. 67). Employees with higher continuance commitment

stay longer in the organization than those with lower commitment because of the needs of

the employees. Normative commitment reflects "a feeling of obligation to continue

employment" (p. 67). Employees with higher normative commitment stay longer in the

organization than those with lower commitment because they feel they should remain for

personal values or beliefs.

Trust in leaders shows a strong correlation with organizational commitment and

trust in leadership also has a positive relationship with organizational commitment (Dirks

& Ferrin, 2002). Trust in supervisors predicts job satisfaction, which in turn is

organizational commitment (Mulki et al., 2006). Trust in supervisor is also influential to

affective commitment, which shares the core component of organizational commitment,

which is emotional attachment toward an organization. The relationship is strong whether authentic leadership moderated them or not in the first study, but authentic leadership strengthens the relationship in the first and the second studies (Xiong et al., 2016). Goodwin et al. (2011) also find that trust in managers predicts subordinates' affective commitment directly.

Servant leadership behaviors have a significant impact on organizational commitment. Liden et al. (2008) find that servant leadership predicts organizational commitment at in individual-level beyond that predicted by transformational leadership and leader-member exchange. Interestingly, only helping subordinates in the grow and succeed dimension of servant leadership almost predicts organizational commitment at a group level. Servant leadership behaviors also positively influence organizational commitment and work engagement directly, and psychological need satisfaction and leadership effectiveness mediates the relationship between servant leadership and organizational commitment (van Dierendonck et al., 2014). Servant leaders increase the overall commitment of the followers through empowerment (Schneider & George, 2011).

Transformational leadership behavior predicts subordinates' organizational commitment at the individual level positively (Liden et al., 2008). Transformational leadership positively influences organizational commitment and work engagement directly, and leader effectiveness mediates the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational commitment (van Dierendonck et al., 2014). Trust in managers also plays as a mediator of the relationship between transformational leadership and affective commitment (Goodwin et al., 2011).

Turnover intention

Whether employees have a turnover intention or not is a serious issue in an organization. It is because employees who have turnover intention leave their jobs voluntarily later (Purba, Oostrom, Born, & van der Molen, 2016). The turnover intention has many antecedents, but trust in leadership and the leader is the only antecedent along with the relationships between the servant and transformational leaders in this paper.

The turnover intention is lower when trust in leadership is higher and cognitive trust has a greater negative relationship with turnover intention than overall trust (Dirk & Ferrin, 2002). Ethical climate influences trust in supervisors, which in turn leads lower turnover intention, and job satisfaction mediates the negative relationship between trust in leadership and turnover intention (Mulki et al., 2006; Mulki et al., 2008). Lower interpersonal conflict and lower emotional exhaustion sequentially mediates the negative relationship between trust in leaders and turnover intention (Mulki et al., 2008). Purba et al. (2016) also find a direct and indirect relationship between trust in leader and turnover intentions. In their study, job embeddedness, which is outside pressure which makes employees hard to quit their jobs, mediates the relationship. When employees tend to trust their leader more, job embeddedness is also higher, and turnover intention is lower when they have higher job embeddedness.

Servant leadership leads to lower turnover intention directly and indirectly. Servant leadership predicts intention to stay in the mediating role of empowerment (Schneider & George, 2011). The turnover intention of subordinates is lower when each member of a store shows more servant leadership behaviors (Liden et al., 2014). Kashyap and Rangnekar (2016) also find a negative relationship between servant leadership and the followers' turnover intention. However, there is no total direct effect between

transformational leadership and the followers' turnover intention without the two mediators: employer brand perception and trust in leaders. Employer brand perception and trust in leaders sequentially mediates the relationship. Servant leadership has a negative effect on turnover intention in order of two mediators: person-organization fit and organizational commitment (Jaramillo, Grisaffe, Chonko & Roberts, 2009).

Transformational leadership behaviors encourage followers to remain with their organization. Empowerment fully mediates the relationship between transformational leadership and intention to stay (Schneider & George, 2011). Chang, Wang, and Huang (2013) also find a negative relationship between transformational leadership and turnover intention. In this study, transformational leadership is store-level, not direct leader's leadership, and it is because they thought leadership is a perception about a leader of employees in one store not from other stores, so they consider it as a climate of a store.

Chapter 3

DISCUSSION

The aim of this thesis is to provide insights into how leaders' behaviors are important to followers through the difference between servant leadership and transformational leadership. Both styles are powerful to increase the followers' trust in direct leaders, but the difference between them would lead to different levels of trust in their direct leaders. As in other studies comparing servant leadership with transformational leadership, servant leadership will show stronger relationships with the followers' behaviors and attitudes in the mediating role of trust. These findings have several implications.

Servant leadership would create deeper trust in a leader than transformational leadership. Transformational leadership and servant leadership includes the traits of the trustee, which increases trust: ability, benevolence, and integrity. Both leaderships are very ethical and classified into ethical leadership. Moreover, both emphasize that as a leader, a leader should be competent enough to be a role model for his followers and be able to present a vision to lead the team. However, when thinking about benevolence, it is a characteristic of servant leadership rather than an attribute of transformational leadership. It is benevolence that the leader acts selfishly and for them in the eyes of the followers. The ultimate concern of servant leadership is in followers, not businesses, and it is a concept closer to benevolence than the transformational leadership; the ultimate goal is in the enterprise.

Further, servant leadership has a positive relationship with psychological safety through the mediating role of affect-based trust in the leader (Schaubroeck et al., 2011). It

means that servant leadership predicts psychological safety, which is related to the core

of trust. In the same study, transformational leadership also predicted cognition-based

trust in the leader, but affected-based trust explains psychological safety better than

cognition-based trust. The reasoning behind the connection between servant leadership

and affected-based trust was that affected-based trust is emotional bonds from genuine

care.

Empirical studies have strengthened links between trust in leaders and behavioral

and attitudinal outcomes. Trust in leaders has had strong and consistent relationships with

job performance, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment before 2000 (Dirks &

Ferrin, 2001) and has received empirical supports steadily even after 2000. Moreover,

trust also has a positive relationship with OCB (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002; Singh &

Srivastava, 2009; Son & Kim, 2016) and a negative relationship with turnover intention

(Dirks & Ferrin, 2002; Purba et al., 2016). Servant leadership would predict OCB, job

performance, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover intention

stronger than transformational leadership.

Trust in the leader would mediate the relationship between the leaders' behaviors

and the followers' OCB. Trusting a leader is more important than trusting a colleague

because employees show more OCB when they trust a leader (Singh & Srivastava, 2009).

OCB has positive relationships with trust in the leader, servant leadership, and

transformational leadership, and the leader's consistent and sincere behaviors affect trust

(Singh & Srivastava, 2009) but also OCB (Chiaburu & Lim, 2008). Leaders' ability and

benevolence also predicts OCB through the mediating role of trust in direct leaders

(Frazier et al., 2015). OCB is not necessary, but it is helpful to everyone when employees

do OCB. The nature of OCB is similar to the nature of servant leadership: self-sacrificial behaviors. There is a study that shows that servant leadership influences OCB better than transformational leadership (Liden et al., 2008). Therefore, servant leadership would predict OCB above transformational leadership when even trust in the direct leader mediates the relationship.

Trust in the leader would connect servant leadership with employees' performance more than transformational leadership. Psychological stability from relationships is more compelling than abilities for employees' performance. Schaubroeck et al. (2011) find that feeling a safe environment for interpersonal risk-taking predicts much better performance of the followers than having a belief about the team is capable overall. Competences are necessary for work, but a dependable working environment leads employees to higher productivity. A higher willingness to take a risk means feeling safe for interpersonal risk-taking is usually higher. A sense of security is, in other words, the fulfillment of a psychological need. Servant leadership shows a more powerful relationship with the satisfaction of the psychological needs of followers than transformational leadership (van Dierendonck et al., 2014). One of the psychological needs of the followers would be safety, and leaders with servant leadership react to the needs of the followers better than transformational leadership.

Job satisfaction is one of the research topics that have a strong relationship with interpersonal trust. Many studies have tried to explain the relationship, and Mulki et al. (2008) explain that trust in the leader reduces emotional consumption from relationships, which increases job satisfaction. This study shows that the role of a leader is important because employees trust the leader. Ozyilmaz and Cicek (2015) find that psychological

climate mediates the relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction. When employees perceive that the work environment influences their well-being positively, they have higher job satisfaction, and the leader presents more servant leadership behaviors. The employees would perceive the psychological climate nicely when they are psychologically safe. Trust in the direct leader has a positive relationship with psychological safety (Basit, 2017). Transformational leadership also has a positive relationship with job satisfaction. However, in the aspects of the psychological stability of trust, servant leadership would have a more robust relationship with job satisfaction in the mediating role of trust, since servant leaders care deeply about the followers' well-being.

Organizational commitment has surveyed steady support which has a positive relationship with trust in the leader. Affective commitment among three types of organizational commitment is particularly relevant to trust in the direct leader. Employees who remain in the organization because they want to have high trust in their bosses, not because they need or feel they have to (Goodwin et al., 2011; Xiong et al., 2016). Transformational leadership and servant leadership predict organizational commitment and demonstrate a strong bond, but there are several studies in which servant leadership predicts it better (Liden et al., 2008; van Dierendonck et al., 2014). Emotional attachment toward an organization also would be higher when the direct leader exhibits servant leadership than transformational leadership.

Purba et al. (2016) conduct their study about trust and turnover intention in Indonesia, which has a high collectivistic culture with paternalistic leadership. In the country, it is employees' psychological needs that they expect the leader to provide a

secure work environment and concern for their wellbeing. The study suggests that the employees would feel secure in learning and doing things under the leader who treats them as if they are fathers and build emotional ties with the leader, and it would lead to a decrease in turnover intention. The study finds a negative relationship between trust in the leader and turnover intention. The participants and study setting are all from Indonesia, but the results may not only be due to its cultural background. The culture may strengthen the relationship, but if the leaders' behaviors and the psychological needs of employees are the keys of the relationship, servant leadership and transformational leadership would explain the relationship as well even in other cultures. Not every culture wants to find psychological stability from leaders, but there seems to be no individual who would hate working with confidence more than working in an unsecured environment. Notably, the followers feel more need satisfaction with servant leaders than transformational leaders (van Dierendonck et al., 2014), and servant leadership does have a positive relationship with psychological safety (Schaubroeck et al., 2011). Lower interpersonal conflict and lower emotional exhaustion sequentially explains the negative relationship between trust in a leader and turnover intention (Mulki et al., 2008). Transformational leadership also values interpersonal relationships, but not just as much as servant leadership, and many researchers have found that servant leadership helps employees feel safe and have better interpersonal relationships.

Implications for Practice

Transformational leadership seems more effective than servant leadership to work with. The employees indeed perceive that the transformational leaders work more effectively than servant leaders. Therefore, in the studies comparing servant leadership

with Transformational leadership, van Dierendonck et al. (2014) describe the transformational leadership by associating it with leadership effectiveness, and Schaubroeck et al. (2011) link it to trust in other people's abilities. However, the subordinates show better actual work behaviors or attitudes when they work with servant leaders. When the employees are content due to the fulfillment of their psychological needs and believe they are psychologically safe, they produce more positive outcomes. How could this happen? Why did the followers work better or possess better attitudes under the servant leader than the effective leaders? The key to these questions lies within the difference between servant leadership and transformational leadership. To reiterate once again, both are almost the same style of leadership. Both styles of leaders behave in a transparent and truthful manner and do not act self-centered. Both leaderships value mutual communication and interpersonal relationships. They are moral and have the power to change people in many ways. However, their ultimate foci are distinct. Servant leadership has a stronger focus on the individual, whereas transformational leadership has a stronger focus on the organization. The difference is that servant leadership cares about the followers first, which might lead to better results. This difference suggests to us what employees really need and what an organization really needs. It may not seem to be effective, but it is more effective as a result, to care for each and every employee deeply rather than to value corporate goals among leaders with similar conditions.

Exercising servant leadership seems very slow and less effective than transformational leadership, but it will bring better results because it is effective and more practical in the long term. First of all, if a leader is a servant leader, the leader has a good influence on an individual. Each follower is more willing to take a risk and work in

confidence because they trust that the servant leader does not react negatively and shows genuine care to them. The sense of mental stability through the leader helps others more and increases interpersonal relationships within the team. Working with the servant leader influences the psychological state about their job and organization. Positive changes in the mental state of an individual means enhancement of an individual's well-being. Second, it is conducive for the business to have a leader act through servant leadership. The increase in OCB plays a role in helping businesses perform their jobs more effectively and improving their performance brings real profits to the organization. Positive changes in employees' jobs and work also reduce employees' willingness to move to work. The employees who have higher turnover intention quit their jobs voluntarily later. Lower turnover intention decreases the cost of the process from recruiting to hiring, which requires a lot of time and money. Servant leadership influences the level of trust in the leaders a lot and it comes up with these advantages. It is by no means a loss to encourage and assist leaders in carrying out their servant leadership.

Knowledge that can Help

Selecting appropriate measures for research is important since it might distort what the results of the research would be. Eva et al. (2019) searched servant leadership articles in the past twenty years with servant related keywords in 10 major databases to write a comprehensive and integrated review of research on servant leadership. They examined 16 measures of servant leadership that appeared in servant leadership research between 1998 and 2018. Testing construction and validation are mandatory to have reliable and consistent results. Items represent what it would measure, and the items on a

measure assess the same construct and yield similar scores. Other types of validity must be verified or processes that have gone through to be a good measure, so they set up seven criteria and analyze the 16 measures by using the criteria: item generation (deductive and inductive), content adequacy administration, questionnaire administration, factor analysis, internal consistency assessment, construct validity, and replication. After the verification process, three measures pass every criterion. The authors of the study highly recommended to use the three measures of servant leadership behavior in the future: Liden, Wayne, Meuser, Hu, Wu, and Liao's (2015) **SL-7** (see Appendix A), Sendjaya, Eva, Butar-Butar, Robin, and Castles 's (2019) **SLBS-6**, and van Dierendonck and Nuijten's (2011) **SLS** (see Appendix B).

Future Research

The current study talks about servant leadership of the direct leaders, but later, other researchers may conduct research about servant leadership in higher leadership positions and see how it is different from the direct leaders' servant leadership. Chief executive officer (CEO) servant leadership makes differences at the organizational level. Peterson et al. (2012) have 126 CEOs in technology organizations as their samples. They test three executive characteristics (e.g., narcissism, company founder status, and organizational identification) to verify central attributes of servant leadership and the link to CEO servant leadership behaviors. They predict more servant leadership behaviors of CEOs when they pay attention to others more than themselves, pursue organizational interest over personal interest, and consider themselves as a part of the organizations. The servant leadership of the CEO predicts firm performance, which means higher firm

financial performance. This article supports the importance of who a leader is and the influence of servant leadership on the entire organization.

Servant leadership has a greater impact when the leader's hierarchical power position is higher. Sousa and van Dierendonck (2017) highlight five characteristics of servant leadership, which are the humble side (humility and standing back), and the action side (empowerment, stewardship, and accountability). Both sides of servant leadership have a significant impact on work engagement among followers. Especially, the humble side made a difference along with the hierarchical power position of the leader on work engagement. Whether it is low, medium, or high rank, the higher the humble side, as the humble side of the leaders is greater, the work engagement of followers in the same rank was higher. Moreover, the higher the hierarchical power position of leader, the higher work engagement. High ranks include board and executive level.

Conclusions

In conclusion, the current paper enhances our understanding of the similarities and differences between servant leadership and transformational leadership. Even if it takes a long time, taking care of each individual and moving toward a common goal is a truly effective leader's behavior. It is the uniqueness of servant leadership, and I believe that this thesis shows that servant leadership gives what employees and organizations need at work.

References

100 best companies to work for. (2011). Retrieved October 23, 2019, from

      heep://archive.fortune.com/magazines/fortune/bestcompanies/2011/full_list/.

Atkinson, S., & Butcher, D. (2003). Trust in managerial relationships. *Journal of*

      Managerial Psychology, *18*(4), 282–304.

Basit, A. A. (2017). Trust in supervisor and job engagement: Mediating effects of

      psychological safety and felt obligation. *The Journal of Psychology:*

      Interdisciplinary and Applied, *151*(8), 701–721.

Bibi, Z., Karim, J., & Shafiq-ur-Rehman. (2017). Self-esteem, resilience, and social trust

      as mediators in the relationship between optimism and job satisfaction: A

      preliminary analysis of data from European Social Survey. *Pakistan Journal of*

      Psychological Research, 32(1), 155–173.

Breevaart, K., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Derks, D. (2016). Who takes the lead? A

      multi-source diary study on leadership, work engagement, and job performance.

      Journal of Organizational Behavior, *37*(3), 309–325.

Caldwell, C., Hayes, L. A., & Long, D. T. (2010). Leadership, trustworthiness, and

      ethical stewardship. *Journal of Business Ethics, 96*(4), 497–512.

Cerit, Y. (2009). The effects of servant leadership behaviours of school principals on

      teachers' job satisfaction. *Educational Management Administration &*

      Leadership, *37*(5), 600-623.

Chang, W. A., Wang, Y., & Huang, T. (2013). Work design–related antecedents of

      turnover intention: A multilevel approach. *Human Resource Management*, *52*(1),

      1–26.

Chen, Z., Zhu, J., & Zhou, M. (2015). How does a servant leader fuel the service fire? A multilevel model of servant leadership, individual self identity, group competition climate, and customer service performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *100*(2), 511-521.

Chiaburu, D. S., & Lim, A. S. (2008). Manager trustworthiness or interactional justice? Predicting organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics, 83*(3), 453–467.

Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2001). The role of trust in organizational settings. *Organization science, 12*(4), 450-467.

Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2002). Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice. *Journal of applied psychology, 87*(4), 611-628.

Ehrhart, M. G. (2004). Leadership and Procedural Justice Climate as Antecedents of Unit-Level Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Personnel Psychology, 57*(1), 61–94.

Eva, N., Robin, M., Sendjaya, S., van Dierendonck, D., & Liden, R. C. (2019). Servant leadership: A systematic review and call for future research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *30*(1), 111-132.

Frazier, M. L., Gooty, J., Little, L. M., & Nelson, D. L. (2015). Employee attachment: Implications for supervisor trustworthiness and trust. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 30*(2), 373–386.

Gillespie, N. A., & Mann, L. (2004). Transformational leadership and shared values: The building blocks of trust. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *19*(6), 588–607.

Goodwin, V. L., Lee Whittington, J., Murray, B., & Nichols, T. (2011). Moderator or mediator? Examining the role of trust in the transformational leadership paradigm. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 23*(4), 409–425.

Goris, J. R., Vaught, B. C., & Pettit, J. D., Jr. (2003). Effects of trust in superiors and influence of superiors of the association between individual-job congruence and job performance/satisfaction. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 17*(3), 327–343.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant-leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.

Grisaffe, D. B., VanMeter, R., & Chonko, L. B. (2016). Serving first for the benefit of others: Preliminary evidence for a hierarchical conceptualization of servant leadership. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management, 36*(1), 40–58.

Hamilton, F. (2005). Practicing servant-leadership: Succeeding through trust, bravery, and forgiveness. *The Academy of Management Review, 30*(4), 875–877.

Hu, Jia., & Liden, R. C. (2011). Antecedents of team potency and team effectiveness: An examination of goal and process clarity and servant leadership. *Journal of Applied psychology 96*(4), 851-862.

Humphrey, A. (2012). Transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors: The role of organizational identification. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal, 15*(4), 247–268.

Jaramillo, F., Grisaffe, D. B., Chonko, L. B., & Roberts, J. A. (2009). Examining the impact of servant leadership on salesperson's turnover intention. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, *29*(4), 351–365.

Kashyap, V., & Rangnekar, S. (2016). Servant leadership, employer brand perception, trust in leaders and turnover intentions: A sequential mediation model. *Review of Managerial Science*, *10*(3), 437–461.

Lee, Y. H., Woo, B., & Kim, Y. (2018). Transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behavior: Mediating role of affective commitment. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching, 13*(3), 373–382.

Legood, A., Thomas, G., & Sacramento, C. (2016). Leader trustworthy behavior and organizational trust: The role of the immediate manager for cultivating trust. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 46*(12), 673–686.

Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Liao, C., & Meuser, J. D. (2014). Servant leadership and serving culture: Influence on individual and unit performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, *57*(5), 1434-1452.

Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Meuser, J. D., Hu, J., Wu, J., & Liao, C. (2015). Servant leadership: Validation of a short form of the SL-28. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *26*(2), 254–269.

Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment. *The Leadership Quarterly, 19*(2), 161–177.

Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *The Academy of Management Review*, *20*(3), 709–734.

McAllister, D. J. (1995). Affect- and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, *38*(1), 24–59.

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human resource management review*, *1*(1), 61-89.

Miao, Q., Newman, A., & Huang, X. (2014). The impact of participative leadership on job performance and organizational citizenship behavior: Distinguishing between the mediating effects of affective and cognitive trust. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 25*(20), 2796–2810.

Mulki, J. P., Jaramillo, F., & Locander, W. B. (2006). Effects of Ethical Climate and Supervisory Trust on Salesperson's Job Attitudes and Intentions to Quit. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, *26*(1), 19–26.

Mulki, J. P., Jaramillo, J. F., & Locander, W. B. (2008). Effect of ethical climate on turnover intention: Linking attitudinal- and stress theory. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *78*(4), 559–574.

Nohe, C., & Hertel, G. (2017). Transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behavior: A meta-analytic test of underlying mechanisms. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *8*.

Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome.* Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance, 10*(2), 85–97.

Ozyilmaz, A., & Cicek, S. S. (2015). How does servant leadership affect employee attitudes, behaviors, and psychological climates in a for-profit organizational context? *Journal of Management & Organization, 21*(3), 263–290.

Peterson, S. J., Galvin, B. M., & Lange, D. (2012). Ceo servant leadership: Exploring
executive characteristics and firm performance. *Personnel Psychology, 65*(3),
565–596.

Podsakoff, N. P., Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Maynes, T. D., & Spoelma, T. M.
(2014). Consequences of unit-level organizational citizenship behaviors: A review
and recommendations for future research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior,
35*(Suppl 1), S87–S119.

Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Blume, B. D. (2009). Individual-
and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A
meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(1), 122–141.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990).
Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader,
satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*,
1(2), 107–142.

Purba, D. E., Oostrom, J. K., Born, M. P., & van der Molen, H. T. (2016). The
relationships between trust in supervisor, turnover intentions, and voluntary
turnover: Testing the mediating effect of on-the-job embeddedness. *Journal of
Personnel Psychology*, *15*(4), 174–183.

Rich, G. A. (1997). The sales manager as a role model: Effects on trust, job satisfaction,
and performance of salespeople. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science,
25*(4), 319–328.

Rousseau, D. M., Sitkin, S. B., Burt, R. S., 63: Camerer, C. (1998). Not so different after all: A cross-discipline view of trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 23, 393-404.

Russell, R. F., & Stone, A. G. (2002). A review of servant leadership attributes: Developing a practical model. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 23*(3), 145-157.

Schaubroeck, J., Lam, S. S., & Peng, A. C. (2011). Cognition-based and affect-based trust as mediators of leader behavior influences on team performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *96*(4), 863-871.

Schneider, S. K., & George, W. M. (2011). Servant leadership versus transformational leadership in voluntary service organizations. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 32*(1), 60–77.

Sendjaya, S., Eva, N., Butar-Butar, I., Robin, M., & Castles, S. (2019). SLBS-6: Validation of a short form of the Servant Leadership Behavior Scale. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *156*(4), 941–956.

Sendjaya, S., & Pekerti, A. (2010). Servant leadership as antecedent of trust in organizations. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 31*(7), 643-663.

Simha, A., & Stachowicz-Stanusch, A. (2015). The effects of ethical climates on trust in supervisor and trust in organization in a Polish context. *Management Decision*, *53*(1), 24–39.

Singh, U., & Srivastava, K. B. L. (2009). Interpersonal trust and organizational citizenship behavior. *Psychological Studies, 54*(1), 65–76.

Smith, B. N., Montagno, R. V., & Kuzmenko, T. N. (2004). Transformational and servant leadership: Content and contextual comparisons. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 10*(4), 80-91.

Son, S., & Kim, D. (2016). The role of perceived management support and trust in mentors on protégés' organizational citizenship behavior. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, 54*(4), 481–497.

Sousa, M., & van Dierendonck, D. (2017). Servant leadership and the effect of the interaction between humility, action, and hierarchical power on follower engagement. *Journal of Business Ethics, 141*(1), 13–25.

Spears, L. C. (2010). Character and servant leadership: Ten characteristics of effective, caring leaders. *The Journal of Virtues & Leadership*, *1*(1), 25-30.

Stone, A.G., Russell, R. F., & Patterson, K. (2004). Transformational versus servant leadership: A difference in leader focus. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *25*(4), 349-361.

Thoms, P., Dose, J. J., & Scott, K. S. (2002). Relationships between accountability, job satisfaction, and trust. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *13*(3), 307–323.

van Dierendonck, D., & Nuijten, I. (2011). The servant leadership survey: Development and validation of a multidimensional measure. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *26*(3), 249–267.

van Dierendonck, D., & Patterson, K. (2015). Compassionate love as a cornerstone of servant leadership: An integration of previous theorizing and research. *Journal of Business Ethics, 128*(1), 119–131. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2085-z

van Dierendonck, D., Stam, D., Boersma, P., de Windt, N., & Alkema, J. (2014). Same difference? Exploring the differential mechanisms linking servant leadership and transformational leadership to follower outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly, 25*(3), 544–562.

Van Dyne, L., Cummings, L. L., & Parks, J. M. (1995). Extra-role behaviors: In pursuit of construct and definitional clarity (a bridge over muddied waters). *Research in Organizational Behavior, 17*, 215–285.

Walumbwa, F. O., Hartnell, C. A., & Oke, A. (2010). Servant leadership, procedural justice climate, service climate, employee attitudes, and organizational citizenship behavior: A cross-level investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(3), 517–529.

Xiong, K., Lin, W., Li, J. C., & Wang, L. (2016). Employee trust in supervisors and affective commitment: The moderating role of authentic leadership. *Psychological Reports, 118*(3), 829–848.

Yang, Y.-F. (2014). Studies of transformational leadership: Evaluating two alternative models of trust and satisfaction. *Psychological Reports, 114*(3), 740–757.

Yang, Y.-F. (2016). Examining competing models of transformational leadership, leadership trust, change commitment, and job satisfaction. *Psychological Reports*, *119*(1), 154–173.

Yulk, G. A. (2013). Ethical, Servant, Spiritual, and Authentic Leadership. In *Leadership in Organization* (8th ed., pp. 340-359). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Education.

Zentner, A. (2016). Applied Servant Leadership Strategies: A Case Study on SAS.

Available at SSRN 2760692.

Appendix A

Liden et al.'s (2008) **SL-7**

Employees evaluated their managers' servant leadership using a shortened version of the servant leadership scale developed by Liden et al. (2008). The original scale has 28 items measuring 7 dimensions of servant leadership; the 7-item scale is composed of the highest loading item from each of the 7 dimensions:

(1) My manager can tell if something work-related is going wrong;

(2) My manager makes my career development a priority;

(3) I would seek help from my manager if I had a personal problem;

(4) My manager emphasizes the importance of giving back to the community;

(5) My manager puts my best interests ahead of his/her own;

(6) My manager gives me the freedom to handle difficult situations in the way that I feel is best;

(7) My manager would NOT compromise ethical principles in order to achieve success.

Appendix B

van Dierendonck and Nuijten's (2011) **SLS**

Table 1 Factor loadings confirmatory factor analysis, Study 2 ($N = 263$), standardized values

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Empowerment								
1. My manager gives me the information I need to do my work well.	.67							
2. My manager encourages me to use my talents.	.69							
3. My manager helps me to further develop myself.	.82							
4. My manager encourages his/her staff to come up with new ideas.	.81							
12. My manager gives me the authority to take decisions which make work easier for me.	.79							
20. My manager enables me to solve problems myself instead of just telling me what to do.	.71							
27. My manager offers me abundant opportunities to learn new skills.	.72							
Standing back								
5. My manager keeps himself/herself in the background and gives credits to others.		.65						
13. My manager is not chasing recognition or rewards for the things he/she does for others.		.71						
21. My manager appears to enjoy his/her colleagues' success more than his/her own.		.60						
Accountability								
6. My manager holds me responsible for the work I carry out.			.57					
14. I am held accountable for my performance by my manager.			.85					
22. My manager holds me and my colleagues responsible for the way we handle a job.			.63					
Forgiveness								
7. My manager keeps criticizing people for the mistakes they have made in their work (r).				.70				
15. My manager maintains a hard attitude towards people who have offended him/her at work (r).				.75				
23. My manager finds it difficult to forget things that went wrong in the past (r).				.43				
Courage								
8. My manager takes risks even when he/she is not certain of the support from his/her own manager.					.50			
16. My manager takes risks and does what needs to be done in his/her view.					.89			
Authenticity								
9. My manager is open about his/her limitations and weaknesses.						.69		
17. My manager is often touched by the things he/she sees happening around him/her.						.55		
24. My manager is prepared to express his/her feelings even if this might have undesirable consequences.						.67		
28. My manager shows his/her true feelings to his/her staff.						.83		
Humility								
10. My manager learns from criticism.							.75	
18. My manager tries to learn from the criticism he/she gets from his/her superior.							.71	
25. My manager admits his/her mistakes to his/her superior.							.85	
29. My manager learns from the different views and opinions of others.							.71	
30. If people express criticism, my manager tries to learn from it.							.88	
Stewardship								
11. My manager emphasizes the importance of focusing on the good of the whole.								.65
19. My manager has a long-term vision.								.69
26. My manager emphasizes the societal responsibility of our work.								.57

With my typed signature below, I, <u>Sanghui Ji</u>, herby submit this thesis/dissertation to Emporia State University as partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree. I agree that the Library of the University may make it available to use in accordance with its regulation governing materials of this type. I further agree that quoting, photocopying, digitizing or other reproduction of this document is allowed with proper attribution for private study, scholarship (including teaching) and research purposes of a nonprofit nature. No copying which involves potential financial gain will be allowed without written permission of the author. I also agree to permit the Graduate School at Emporia State University to digitize and place this thesis in the ESU institutional repository, and ProQuest Dissertations and Thesis database and in ProQuest's Dissertation Abstracts International.

<div align="right">

Sanghui Ji
_____
Typed Signature of Author

April 22, 2020
_____
Date

Servant Leadership and Transformational Leadership:
Effectiveness in the Mediating Role of Trust
_____
Title of Thesis

</div>