

2006

An Exploration of the Barriers Which Impede the Effective Implementation of Servant Leadership in Latin American Evangelical Organizations: a Grounded Theory Study

Keith Robert Anderson.

AN EXPLORATION OF THE BARRIERS WHICH IMPEDE THE EFFECTIVE
IMPLEMENTATION OF SERVANT LEADERSHIP IN LATIN AMERICAN
EVANGELICAL ORGANIZATIONS: A GROUNDED THEORY STUDY

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in
Leadership and Education in
the Adrian Dominican School of Education of

Barry University

by

Keith Robert Anderson, B.A., M.Div., Th.M.

* * * * *

Barry University

2006

Area of Specialization: Leadership

APPROVAL PAGE

AN EXPLORATION OF THE BARRIERS WHICH IMPEDE THE EFFECTIVE
IMPLEMENTATION OF SERVANT LEADERSHIP IN LATIN AMERICAN
EVANGELICAL ORGANIZATIONS: A GROUNDED THEORY STUDY

DISSERTATION

by

Keith Robert Anderson

2006

APPROVED BY:

Carmen L. McCrink, Ph.D.
Chairperson, Dissertation Committee

Teri Melton, Ed.D.
Member, Dissertation Committee

Samuel Perkins, Ph.D.
Member, Dissertation Committee

Terry Piper, Ph.D.
Dean of Adrian Dominican School of Education

Copyright 2006 by Keith R. Anderson
All rights reserved.

ABSTRACT

AN EXPLORATION OF THE BARRIERS WHICH IMPEDE THE EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF SERVANT LEADERSHIP IN LATIN AMERICAN EVANGELICAL ORGANIZATIONS: A GROUNDED THEORY STUDY

Keith Robert Anderson

Barry University, 2006

Dissertation Chairperson: Dr. Carmen L. McCrink

Purpose

The founder of the Christian Church, Jesus Christ, modeled a form of leadership commonly referred to as “servant leadership” which is addressed extensively as such in extant literature. Although leaders in Latin American evangelical organizations may express agreement with the notion that servant leadership is what each evangelical leader should exercise, the apparent paucity of servant leader examples in these organizations demonstrates there are obstacles which make this leadership style difficult to implement. What are the barriers which make servant leadership a difficult endeavor for these Latin American leaders? This study examines the barriers which impede the effective implementation of servant leadership in Latin American evangelical organizations. It is believed that by identifying the barriers to servant leadership, Latin American evangelical leaders will be empowered to develop strategies to overcome the barriers thus enhancing their servant leadership potential.

Method

The theoretical framework for the study was based on the seminal writings of Robert Greenleaf (1977, 1991). Definitions of servant leadership proposed by Laub (2004) and Jesus Christ (Mark 10:42-45, and Matthew 23:11-12) were also applied. The cultural framework for the study offered by Hofstede (1997) did not prove itself useful for this particular study. The research method applied in this study was “grounded theory.” Grounded theory allows a research theory or theories to emerge from the participants themselves. The canons and procedures of Strauss and Corbin (1990) and Charmaz (2000) were applied for data analysis and coding.

Major Findings

An analysis of the data suggested ten major barrier categories to servant leadership among Latin American evangelical leaders. These ten categories were developed into ten proposed theories covering the following areas: character issues, sociocultural elements, family dynamics, issues specific to female leadership, disobedience to Scripture, spirituality issues particular to Evangelicals, servant leader terminology and practice, the academic and intellectual preparation of a leader, lack of vision, and, issues related to followers. The participants also proposed seven strategies for addressing many of the barriers. Implications and recommendations for future research studies are given.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Writing a dissertation is a journey in which many participate if it is to be successful. Family, friends, colleagues, and Barry faculty joined me in this meaningful journey. At the risk of omitting many significant fellow-travelers, I would like to mention a few who journeyed with me and were helpfully supportive.

Of all those who labored with me, none was more patient and loving than my wife, Judy, who deserves special honor. Her servant leadership example is one I cherish and treasure. To her I give my deepest thanks and appreciation. My children, now adults, were very encouraging, always asking questions, praying and being supportive as the writing moved along. My parents, my mother-in-law, and my siblings also traveled with me on this journey, encouraging and supporting me with their prayers and words of support.

Special thanks also goes to Dr. Carmen L. McCrink, whose valuable insights, expertise, comments, and direction helped shape the study. Her understanding of the Latin American culture was a great source of support and her availability for advice and interaction were commendable. Dr. Teri Melton and Dr. Sam Perkins challenged me with their insightful comments and suggestions. Dr. Melton's expertise in grounded theory was extremely valuable in helping me understand the best way to conduct this particular grounded theory study.

To my colleagues who work with me on the Latin America Training Network project, I thank them for their patience as well as their support and prayers. They, more than others, have had to shoulder many of my responsibilities which were neglected

while I focused on this study. I know their prayers were strategic in moving this project along.

To those 23 men and women who gave up their valuable time to be interviewed and share their thoughts on servant leadership, I owe a deep debt of gratitude. These men and women of God not only participated in a research study, they shared their personal journeys in servant leadership in such a way that their integrity, vulnerability and transparency will enable their fellow travelers to reap immeasurable benefit from their sacrifices. They demonstrated themselves to be true servant leaders. Though there may be few known servant leaders in Latin America, there are 23 servant leaders who humbly walk before their God as stewards of a vision, a task given to them by the One master who alone is worthy of service, and in the face of incredible barriers and obstacles, forge ahead because of their love for the people, the mission committed into their hands, and to their God whom they serve with all their hearts, minds, souls, and strength.

And last, but certainly not the least, I want to acknowledge God's role in this journey. Not only was the servant leadership example of Jesus Christ the supreme example of what it means to be a servant leader, but the daily direction, help, and strength He provided through His Spirit enabled the project to be completed. Anything of significance, value, or good that may come out of this research project is the direct result of what He has done. For anything else, I take full responsibility.

Para El sea toda la gloria

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
APPROVAL	ii
COPYRIGHT	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
Chapters	
I. THE PROBLEM	1
Introduction	1
Three Snapshots	1
Background of the Problem	2
Statement of the Problem	3
Purpose and Significance of the Study	3
Research Question	4
Definitions	4
Theoretical Framework	6
Limitations	7
Delimitations	7
Summary	7
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	9
Introduction	9
The Role of a Literature Review in Grounded Theory Studies	9
Overview of the Literature Review	10
Leadership Studies	11
Leadership Studies in General	11
Specific Leadership Theories	13
Servant Leadership	18
History of Servant Leadership	18
Servant Leadership Theory	19
Biblical Leadership	22
Biblical Leadership Theory	22
Biblical Leadership Literature in Spanish	25
Leadership and Culture	27
Leadership Theory as Western	27
Studies of National Cultures	28
Multicultural Leadership and Management Studies	28
Cross-cultural Leadership	30

	Theoretical Models of Cultural Values	33
	Latin American Leadership	36
	Summary	38
III.	METHODOLOGY	39
	Context of Research Methods	39
	Philosophical Paradigms	39
	Philosophical Paradigms as Interpretation	39
	Critical Realism.....	41
	The Research Paradigm.....	43
	Rationale for Selected Method.....	44
	Role of the Researcher	45
	Theoretical Sensitivity	46
	Data Generation.....	47
	Participants.....	47
	Instrument	48
	Data Collection and Procedures	49
	The Procedures Used to Protect the Participants	50
	Data Analysis.....	51
	The Intended Data Analysis Procedures	51
	The Procedures Used to Keep Track of the Research Process.....	54
	Steps to Ensure Credibility and Reliability	55
	Summary	56
IV.	FINDINGS	57
	Introduction	57
	Description of the Participants	57
	Data Analysis.....	59
	Components of a Latin American Leader's Profile as Contributed by the Participants.....	61
	Preferred or Positive Latin American Leadership Elements	62
	Character	62
	Vision and Goal Accomplishment	64
	Attention to Relationships.....	65
	Authority	66
	Skills and Abilities	68
	Intellectual Abilities.....	68
	Undesirable or Negative Traits of Latin American Leaders	69
	Negative Character Traits.....	69
	Isolation: Lonely, Separatist.....	73
	Lack of Authenticity	73
	Irresponsibility and Abandoning a Sense of Service	73
	Self-serving	74

Turf Protector	74
No Empowerment	74
Intellect, Vision, Skills, and Relationships	75
Summary Description of a Profile of a Latin American Leader	75
Additional Traits and Attributes from an Evangelical Perspective	76
Categories Indicating Positive or Desirable Characteristics of an	
Evangelical Latin American Leader.....	77
The Leader's Relationship to God.....	77
The Role of Scripture	78
Categories Indicating Negative or Undesirable Characteristics of	
an Evangelical Latin American Leader.....	78
Not Following Biblical Principles.....	79
Following Unbiblical Models or Categories	79
Spiritual Issues	80
The Evidence for and the Practice of Servant Leadership in Latin American	
Evangelical Organizations	81
The Presence of Servant Leadership	82
Participant Observations on Servant Leadership in	
Latin American Contexts	85
Difficulties Emerging From the Concept of Servant Leadership.....	86
Servant Leadership as an Option.....	86
The Barriers Which Impede the Effective Implementation of Servant	
Leadership in Latin American Evangelical Organizations	88
Introduction	88
Major Barrier One: Perceived Barriers Grounded in Specific Negative	
Character Traits of Man	89
Major Barrier Two: Sociocultural Elements	96
Major Barrier Three: Family Dynamics.....	103
Major Barrier Four: Pressures Impinging upon Female Leaders	
Which Create a Barrier for Women	105
Major Barrier Five: Disobedience of Scriptural Principles.....	106
Major Barrier Six: Spirituality Issues of Particular Concern to	
Evangelicals	109
Major Barrier Seven: The Inherently Difficult Issues Associated	
with Servant Leader Terminology and Practice	110
Major Barrier Eight: Deficiencies in the Area of Academic	
and Intellectual Preparation.	114
Major Barrier Nine: Lack of Vision.....	115
Major Barrier Ten: Detrimental Acts and Conditions Precipitated	
by a Leader's Followers	115
Strategies as Proposed by the Participants to Overcome the Barriers	
to the Effective Implementation of Servant Leadership in	
Latin American Organizations.....	117
Suggested Strategies to Remove Identified Barriers Through	
both General and Specific Teaching Initiatives	117

Suggested Strategies to Remove Identified Barriers Through Developing a Person's Character	118
Suggested Strategies to Remove Identified Barriers Through a Return to the Teachings of Scripture	119
Suggested Strategies to Remove Identified Barriers by Giving More Attention to Followers.....	119
Suggested Strategies to Remove Identified Barriers Through Invoking God's Participation in Removing Barriers.....	119
Achieving "Critical Mass" as a Suggested Barrier Removal Strategy	120
Being a Prophetic Voice as a Suggested Strategy for Removing Barriers..	120
Theory Generation.....	120
Focus Groups.....	122
Clear Connections with Antecedent Literature	123
Summary of the Findings	124
 V. DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS	 125
Introduction	125
Summary of the Study.....	125
Purpose and Significance of the Study.....	125
Method.....	126
Theoretical Framework	127
Limitations	128
Discussion of the Findings	129
Findings.....	129
Theory Building	129
Barrier Removal Strategies	131
Focus Groups	131
Conclusions of the Study.....	132
Recommendations for Further Research.....	132
Implications for Practice	133
Summary	134
 REFERENCES	 136
 APPENDIXES	 156
APPENDIX A. DEFINITION OF LEADERSHIP AND SERVANT LEADERSHIP	157
APPENDIX B. A SPANISH TRANSLATION OF THE DEFINITION OF LEADERSHIP AND SERVANT LEADERSHIP....	160
APPENDIX C. PROTOCOL (INTERVIEW QUESTIONS)	165
APPENDIX D. A SPANISH TRANSLATION OF THE PROTOCOL (INTERVIEW QUESTIONS)	168
APPENDIX E. COVER LETTER.....	172
APPENDIX F. A SPANISH TRANSLATION OF THE COVER LETTER.....	175
APPENDIX G. BARRY UNIVERSITY INFORMED CONSENT FORM	179

APPENDIX H.	A SPANISH TRANSLATION OF INFORMED CONSENT FORM	182
APPENDIX I.	TRANSLATION CERTIFICATE AND NOTARY SEALS	186
APPENDIX J.	RESEARCH WITH HUMAN PARTICIPANTS COMPLETION CERTIFICATE	188
APPENDIX K.	LIST OF PARTICIPANTS.....	190
APPENDIX L.	CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENTS.....	192

CHAPTER I
THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Three Snapshots

A few years ago, this researcher was helping a colleague obtain a visa for travel to a Latin American country. The visa had been granted by the government of that country, and the final step in the process was to get the signature of the consul general. As we sat in the office, we confidently expected the visa to be signed simply because we had received a telegram stating that the visa had been granted and would be waiting for us at the U.S. office. However, much to our surprise, the consul general informed us that even though we were told the visa was ready to be picked up, he was the one who had final say in whether or not to sign the visa. “After all,” he said, “Those may be the laws [down] there, but here, I am the one who makes the rules!”

A missionary in Latin America was once trying to help his seminary students find a way to help subsidize their seminary education. He took a group of students to a large retail store and asked to talk to the store manager about hiring these students. “Oh no,” was the reply, “students should not have to work with their hands!”

As the pastor of a church in Latin America spoke to his congregation, he repeated his words with passion and fervor, “I am your servant. As Jesus was a servant leader, so am I. Servant leadership is the model taught in the Bible, and I follow what the Bible teaches, and so should you.” Though his words were passionate, focused, and enthusiastic, those sitting on the benches below struggled with what was being said.

They knew that the pastor ran the church with an “iron fist.” Yes, he did serve, but only when it furthered his own interests.

Background of the Problem

The three snapshots mentioned above provide a collage of the various perspectives Latin Americans have had in understanding “leadership.” In the evangelical wing of the Christian church, little doubt surrounds the kind of leadership church leaders implement. Jesus Christ, the founder of the Church, commanded His followers to lead by serving. The personal paradigm Christ passed on to his followers was:

42: You know that in this world kings are tyrants, and officials lord it over the people beneath them. 43 But among you it should be quite different. Whoever wants to be a leader among you must be your servant, 44 and whoever wants to be first must be the slave of all. 45 For even I, the Son of Man, came here not to be served but to serve others, and to give my life as a ransom for many. Mark 10:42-45 (New Living Translation)

Why is leadership among Latin American evangelical leaders even an issue? One of the “problems” arises from a simple source: *the Bible*. Evangelicals profess to adhere faithfully to the teaching of Scripture, yet in many cases, there appears to be a significant disconnect observed between what the Bible teaches regarding leadership and what is practiced by those who implement it. The Bible presents a model of servant leadership, yet there are evangelical Latin American leaders who appear to practice something else.

The task of looking for answers is crippled by the fact that a survey of the literature on servant leadership yields a paucity of research studies which focus on servant leadership. Much of what is available to researchers in this area is data that is not grounded in research studies. Although literature in the field of servant leadership is growing, the vast majority of what is offered has little or no empirical research to substantiate conclusions. Thus, it is hoped that this study will make a significant

contribution to an under-researched area in leadership studies, specifically in the area of servant leadership.

Statement of the Problem

Within any religious community, there are assumptions, beliefs, values, and standards which guide the behavior of those who belong to the community of faith. Evangelical Christianity claims that the Bible is the “rule of faith” that guides the believer. The Bible contains the written record of the life of Jesus Christ, the founder of Christianity, and it is believed by evangelical Christians that the leadership “style” modeled by Jesus Christ is servant leadership (Blanchard & Hodges, 2004; Blackaby & Blackaby, 2001; Wilkes, 1998). Christ’s words and actions reveal a life of submission to the Father, or God, with service to others leading to ultimate surrender by offering His life as a vicarious sacrifice on a Roman cross. If servant leadership is what Jesus modeled for his disciples, why do his followers, and particularly (for the purposes of this study) those in the Evangelical Church in Latin America, find it so difficult to follow his servant leadership paradigm?

Purpose and Significance of the Study

If evangelical leaders are to emulate the servant leadership style of their founder, why is servant leadership not commonly practiced in all evangelical institutions and organizations? This study examined servant leadership in light of the difficulties experienced by Latin American evangelical leaders in the implementation aspects of servant leadership. It is believed that knowing what keeps evangelical Latin American leaders from putting servant leadership into practice will help the evangelical church at

large understand an important dimension of its leadership needs and thus be able to serve constituents more effectively and more biblically.

Research Question

This research study assumed that there are identifiable obstacles which impede the effective implementation of servant leadership among evangelical Latin American leaders. Thus, the question which guides the research for this study is the following: What theory or theories offer the best explanation to identify the factors which impede a Latin American evangelical leader from implementing the servant leadership style of Jesus? Another way of looking at this question is: Are there elements in the life experiences of an evangelical Latin American leader which make it difficult for that leader to practice an incarnational form of Jesus' leadership model? Throughout the research study, the question that was asked: Are there issues, elements, or other factors which deter a Latin American evangelical leader from implementing a biblical servant leadership style?

Definitions

Defining leadership is no easy task (Bass, 1990), especially when one considers that Bennis and Nanus (1997) identified over 850 unique definitions of leadership. Yet, in the face of a plethora of definitions, it is important to heed Laub (2004) who cautioned,

What happens when we don't create effective definitions? Why are definitions of leadership and servant leadership so essential? One reason is that if we don't define it we end up with non-definitions posing as definitions. You see this all of the time in the leadership literature. (p. 3)

For the purposes of this study, six terms need further clarification.

Leader does not necessarily refer to the person who is in a position of leadership. Rather, “A leader is a person who sees a vision, takes action toward the vision, and mobilizes others to become partners in pursuing change” (Laub, 2004, p. 4).

Leadership refers to “An intentional change process to which leaders and followers, joined by a shared purpose, initiate action to pursue a common vision” (Laub, 2004, p. 5).

Servant leader. The classic definition of a *servant leader* is given by Robert Greenleaf (1991) who wrote that “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” (p. 13, italics in the original).

Spears (2004) outlined 10 representative characteristics of servant leaders. Six key constructs describing servant leadership in action are offered by Laub (2004) who proposed “Servant leaders value people, develop people, build community, display authenticity, provide leadership, and share leadership” (p. 8). A servant leader is more an issue of mindset than it is an issue of attributes and behaviors.

First, if servant-leadership is reduced to a collection of admirable qualities and learned skills that are displayed in organizational settings, it is all too easy to forget that servant-leadership is, first, about deep identity.... [For Greenleaf] servant-leadership begins with an enlargement of identity, followed by behaviors. The reverse order-enlarging behaviors to mask identity-is false, and people know it. (Frick, 1998, p. 354)

Biblical servant leadership is the leadership model offered by Jesus Christ in the gospels. This follows the thought of Russell (2003) who stated, “The person who aspires to genuine servant leadership seeks to follow the footsteps of Christ. Humility and

sacrifice mark Jesus' path, but ultimately, it is the paradoxical route to greatness in the kingdom of God" (p. 8).

Evangelical as used in this study refers to that branch of the Christian church which ascribes ultimate authority to scripture (as opposed to the church or tradition), holds the gospel of Christ as central to its teaching, and teaches personal spiritual regeneration through faith in the work of Christ. When used as a noun, *Evangelical* will be capitalized.

Organization(s) in this study has a broad use. It refers not only to institutions but also to individual evangelical churches and agencies.

Other terms which may need further explanation will be defined later in the study.

Theoretical Framework

In order to understand servant leadership, it was necessary to base this study on prior research. The theoretical framework provided by the seminal writings of Robert Greenleaf (1977, 1991) was foundational to this study, but the specific framework (for the evangelical context in which this study is imbedded) was taken from the initial work of Laub (2004) in which definitions for servant leadership are proposed. The theoretical framework upon which the cultural value dimensions of leadership are understood are those proposed by Hofstede (1980, 1997). However, as seen in a grounded theory study, since new theory explains the process of an observed phenomenon, these theoretical frameworks were of greater service in guiding the research than in the formulation of the theories.

Limitations

This study has three limitations and one caution. One of the limitations of the study is inherent in the title by the use of the word *Evangelical*. Because the population chosen for the study is centered on a particular sociological group, *Evangelicals*, it may be difficult to generalize this study to other populations, particularly those which are not Evangelical. The second limitation is also based on the target population. Obstacles experienced by Latin Americans may not be the same obstacles as those experienced by non-Latin Americans. A third limitation of this study recognizes inherent problems when a study is based on the self-reporting of the participants who may have previously known the researcher.

A caution to be heeded is reflected in the fact that Latin America is not a monolithic culture. Although it is true that Latin Americans have similar roots and share much in common, there are certainly enough variables to lead one to assume that the differences among the countries themselves may require further studies which are country specific and region specific.

Delimitations

This study focuses only on Latin American leaders of the Evangelical Church, which could affect the generalizability of the study. The study does not go beyond the boundaries of the evangelical church, but rather is confined to that branch of the Christian church.

Summary

Three separate vignettes present a picture of leadership perspectives in Latin America. The specific topic of servant leadership raises initial questions regarding

servant leaders among Latin American evangelicals. One of the fundamental questions that surfaces focuses on identifying the barriers which impede Latin American evangelicals from implementing a servant leadership style in their organizations. Are there identifiable obstacles that impede these leaders from effectively exercising the role of a servant leader? In order to guide the study, specific terms have been defined; the theoretical framework provided by Greenleaf (1977, 1991), Laub (2004), and Hofstede (1980, 1997) have been selected; and the limitations and delimitations have been identified.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The role of antecedent literature in qualitative studies continues to be a subject of interest. Creswell (1994) noted that the purpose of a literature review in a quantitative study is "to provide direction for the research questions or hypotheses" (p. 22). Determining the purpose of a literature review in a qualitative study is more problematic. In quantitative studies, the researcher explores the literature in order to justify "the importance of the research problem" and provide a rationale for "the purpose of the study and research questions or hypotheses" (Creswell, 2004, p. 79). In qualitative studies, even though the review serves to justify the basis for the study, Creswell proposed that the literature for a qualitative study served a different function in that "the literature is not discussed extensively at the beginning of the study... [in order to allow] the views of the participants to emerge without being constrained by the views of others from the literature" (p. 79). Silverman (2000) developed this line of thinking even further and suggested that the data analysis should be completed before the literature review is written.

The Role of a Literature Review in Grounded Theory Studies

The purpose of a grounded theory study is "to generate or discover a theory, an abstract schema of a phenomenon that relates to a particular situation" (Creswell, 1998, pp. 55-56). This being the case, then the role of a literature review may vary from the role it may have in other research traditions.

The function of a literature review in a grounded theory study prior to doing the study itself is viewed as less critical than in a quantitative study. Strauss and Corbin (1998) support the notion that even though analysts from other research traditions may implement extensive reviews of the literature prior to beginning the field research, it is not necessary to do so beforehand in a qualitative study. These theorists fear that an extensive review of the literature may limit the researcher or even hinder the researcher through the influence of prior information. Their rationale is that "it is impossible to know prior to the investigation what the salient problems will be or what theoretical concepts will emerge" (p. 49). Hence, the initial review of the literature is intended to give the researcher a basic familiarity with the subject to be studied, giving care to allow the theories to emerge primarily from the study rather than the literature. Thus, the role of the literature is to serve as another voice to support or add additional perspectives to the emerging theories as well as enhance the researcher's theoretical sensitivity (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Creswell adds, "In grounded theory studies, case studies, and phenomenological studies, literature will serve less to set the stage for the study" (Creswell, 2003, p. 30).

Overview of the Literature Review

The literature review for this particular study focuses on foundational areas which serve as the backdrop for this analysis. These areas are classified into the following groups: general leadership studies, servant leadership, and works which address the issue of leadership and culture. This third area was selected because the focus of the research was on Latin American leaders, not Anglo American. The review concludes by

addressing specific topics which are relevant to this particular study, namely the Latin American leadership styles known as *caciquismo* and *caudillismo*.

When commencing the study, it was anticipated that a concentration on these four areas would shed light on issues such as: What is servant leadership? What is the context within which the theory of servant leadership has emerged? Are there studies which address the issue of leadership and culture, particularly in the Latin American culture? Are there studies which give particular attention to any barriers impeding the effective of servant leadership in a Latin American culture? If the focus of the study is servant leadership among Latin American evangelical leaders, what is the Biblical model of servant leadership these leaders are to follow?

It was also anticipated prior to study commencement that the review of the literature would contribute to what has emerged as a significant theory in this study. The key in the process was to allow the study to determine the major impediments to the effective implementation of servant leadership among Latin American evangelical communities and then compare the theories with what has been discussed in the literature review.

Leadership Studies

Leadership Studies in General

A comprehensive overview of leadership studies required extensive treatment. Fortunately, there was helpful literature which took a broad (and at times detailed) look at leadership and leadership studies in general. The massive work by Bernard Bass, *Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership*, is still without its equal in spite of the fact it was published 16 years ago (1990). This 1182-page volume (with 189 pages of double

column references) is the most complete one-volume survey of leadership studies yet published. The third edition (the first two editions were published in 1974 and 1981) contains eight major sections covering a broad spectrum of leadership studies.

Various recent works offer good overviews in the area of leadership studies. One of the most recent resources for the treatment of leadership theories is the third edition of *Leadership: Theory and Practice* by Northouse (2004). Although not overly detailed, this particular work gives an excellent overview of the major leadership theories, including a helpful analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of each theory.

Another comprehensive treatment of major leadership theories is the fifth edition of Yukl's *Leadership in Organizations* (2001). Although Yukl primarily discussed the topic of managers and manager effectiveness, a brief discussion on servant leadership is relegated to the chapter on ethical leadership. The anthology edited by Wren (1995) offered a different approach to leadership studies. This work brings together 64 articles on leadership categorized under 13 major headings. The articles include entries as ancient as Plato's *Republic*, as well as Robert Greenleaf's seminal article entitled *Servant Leadership*. Although the tendency of the articles favored those written in support of transformational styles of leadership, Wren attempted to be balanced in his presentation.

The eighth edition of Hersey, Blanchard, and Johnson's (2000) *Management of Organizational Behavior: Leading Human Resources* offered an excellent apologetic for situational leadership and helpfully situated their presentation within the context of other leadership studies, yet unfortunately did not include much discussion on servant leadership. A useful section of their work is their demonstration of how situational theory works with theories of motivation, management theories, and other leadership styles.

Shorter summaries and overviews of leadership theories can be found in articles by Heifetz (1998) and Siegrist (1999). An excellent overview of leadership studies has been put together by Drury (2005) for access on the Internet. One of the strengths of Drury's website is that it is geared toward the evangelical pastor and offers suggestions on how each leadership theory may be implemented within a church leadership context. A briefer, yet helpful, overview of leadership studies may also be found at the website of the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (2005).

Despite the many excellent general treatments of leadership, it should be noted that very few of those studies specifically address the subject of servant leadership as a major leadership style. Servant leadership, as it developed, did not attract the attention of many scholars.

Specific Leadership Theories

Servant leadership theory did not emerge in a vacuum. It was born within the context of other leadership styles, and possibly influenced more by the Judeo-Christian teachings of the Bible than by contemporary leadership theory. In order to understand the context in which servant leadership theory emerges, it is necessary to understand some of the antecedent theories.

It is not the purpose of this review to present a summary of all the leadership theories which have been developed but only those which this researcher intuitively suspects have potentially made the greatest impact on Latin American evangelical leaders. Chemers (2003) divides contemporary leadership theory into six periods: Great "man" and charisma (19th century), leadership traits (1920s and 1930s), styles and

behaviors (1940s and 1950s), contingency models (1960s and 1990s), transformational leadership (1980s and 1990s), and leadership and collective efficacy (2000s).

For the purposes of this study, the following leadership theories have been selected as offering studies foundational for this unique class of leaders: trait theory, style and situational leadership, transactional leadership, and transformational leadership.

Trait theory. Early leadership studies focused on leadership traits with the assumption that leaders were born with certain leadership characteristics such as dominance, motivation, extroversion, and integrity (Northouse, 2001). Leadership was viewed in terms of the innate qualities of those individuals who were great men throughout history. As leadership studies developed, there were attempts to establish a standard configuration of qualities with which certain individuals were born, thus propelling them into leadership. One of the first researchers to systematize the study of leadership traits, while arriving at the conclusion that there was no consistent combination of traits common to all leaders, was Ralph Stogdill (1948, 1974). Stogdill was able to carry out an extensive study in which he demonstrated it was not statistically possible to predict effective leadership based solely on traits (1948). Others, such as Northouse, have surveyed the various approaches to “trait theory” suggesting that five traits are central to the various lists which have been proposed by researchers. These five traits are intelligence, self-confidence, determination, integrity, and sociability. Earlier studies attempted to establish correlations between identifiable traits (such as height, weight, physical appearance, and emotional control) and leadership (Bass, 1990). In spite of the value of looking at leadership through the trait lens, the lack of consistent agreement on a standard list for all leaders has obligated this perspective on leadership to

currently be relegated to the backwaters of leadership studies. Although the Great Man theories may not have the research support needed to offer a definitive response to the key characteristics of what constitutes that Great Man, there is little doubt that a perception exists which intuitively leads people to believe that certain individuals are born to lead (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991; Likert, 1961). On the positive side, these studies drew research attention to leadership issues providing benchmarks for leadership qualities which could serve as a basis for further research (Northouse, 2001).

Style and situation. The weaknesses of the trait theories led two universities, Ohio State and the University of Michigan, to expand Stogdill's work and include leadership style and behaviors as important components of leadership (Northouse, 2001). Task behaviors and relational behaviors were identified as two crucial dimensions of leadership, thus suggesting that traits alone did not determine effective leadership. A third approach viewed the leader's style as a missing component in how leadership was to be viewed. The major proponents of the style approach were Blake and Mouton (1964, 1978, 1985), who developed a leadership grid which attempts to situate a leader's style on a grid bounded by an axis of concern for people and another axis quantifying a leader's concern for results.

Situational leadership traces its roots as a theory to the late 1960s and, as a continually revised theory, looks at the issue of leadership situations and identified additional components to effective leadership, stating that leadership has both a directive and a supportive dimension (Blanchard, Zigarmi, & Zigarmi, 1985; Hersey & Blanchard, 1977, 1993; Hersey, Blanchard, & Johnson, 1996; Hersey et al., 2000). To this was added the dimension of a follower's abilities and motivation. Thus, various combinations could

be applied contingent upon the strength or weaknesses of these factors. These researchers identified four leadership styles which would be applied according to the situation. These four styles are: directing, coaching, supporting, and delegating. Situational leadership is still a widely used and taught leadership style (Ivancevich, 1999).

Transactional leadership. James Burns (1978) is credited with directing the attention of leadership studies toward the areas of motivation and morality, and his contribution reflects a watershed in leadership studies. Burns identified two leadership styles: the transactional and transformational. These two styles may be contrasted in the following way: transactional leadership is essentially a bargaining process in which a leader (the one who initiates the process) and a follower negotiate a transaction in such a way that the leader is benefited, and the self-interest of the follower is served. An exchange takes place, and there is "transactional gratification" (Burns, 1978, p. 258). A transformational leader (or "transforming" as Burns called it) engages others "in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality" (p. 20). He explained that "transforming leadership ultimately becomes *moral* in that it raises the level of human conduct and ethical aspiration of both leader and led, and thus it has a transforming effect on both" (p. 20, italics in the original).

Transformational leadership. Transformational leadership theory has dominated the field of leadership studies for the past 20 years. Much of this can be attributed to the work of Bass and colleagues (1985) who built on the theories of James Burns. Pearce and Sims (2002) stated that, "The historical bases of the transformational leadership behavioral type are drawn from the sociology of charisma (Weber, 1946, 1947), charismatic leadership theory (House, 1977), and transforming/transformational

leadership (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978)” (p. 174). Bass (1997) himself saw his own work as elaborating on that of Burns.

Under the general rubric of transformational leadership are variations in emphases such as charismatic leadership (Conger & Kanungo, 1987), visionary leadership (Sashkin, 1988), “SuperLeadership” (Manz & Simms, 1989), and the “new leadership” (Bryman, 1992). Of those who have researched transformational leadership, Bass stands as one of the major contributors. Pearce and Sims (2002) summarized Bass’ contribution to the development of transformational leadership theory in the following way:

The behaviors contained in Bass's (1998) model include (a) charismatic leadership (or idealized influence), (b) inspirational motivation, (c) intellectual stimulation, and (d) individualized consideration. Thus, these three theoretical traditions form the basis of transformational leadership. Representative behaviors of this type include (a) providing vision, (b) expressing idealism, (c) using inspirational communication, (d) having high performance expectations, (e) challenging the status quo, and (f) providing intellectual stimulation. (p. 175)

Transformational leadership theory has been applied in various areas of leadership such as in the health care industries (Schwartz & Tumblin, 2002), education (Sergiovanni, 1990, 1996), business (Collins, 2001; Kotter, 1988; Kouzes & Posner, 1987), non-profits, (Drucker, 1990), and religious organizations (Darling, 1994; Malphurs, 1996; Maxwell, 1993, 1995, 1998, 2000, 2002, 2004).

Contemporary proponents for the application of transformational leadership styles would include the following representatives: Avolio and Yammarino (2002), Bennis (1989, 2003), Bennis and Nanus (1985), Blanchard (1998), Blanchard, Hybles, and Hodges (1999), Covey (1990), DePree (1989, 1992, 1997), Kotter (1988, 1996, 1999), Kouzes and Posner (1987), Maxwell (2000, 2004), and Tichy and Devanna (1997).

Servant Leadership

History of Servant Leadership

As a theory, “servant leadership” is increasingly becoming a focus of research attention. It is referenced by respected researchers (Bass, 2000; Covey, 1994; Senge, 1997; Wheatley, 1994) and is the focus of many research articles and monographs. Though it can be argued that servant leadership was a leadership model many years before Robert Greenleaf (1977, 1991) began promoting his theories, today Greenleaf is known as the father of contemporary servant leadership theory. Greenleaf’s writings have formed the basis of servant leadership studies since his seminal article, *The Servant as Leader*.

Greenleaf’s theory, which serves as a theoretical framework for this dissertation, offers the following definition 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, perhaps because of the need to assuage an unusual power drive or to acquire material possessions. For such it will be a later choice to serve-after leadership is established. The leader-first and the servant-first are two extreme types. Between them there are shadings and blends that are part of the infinite variety of human nature. (Greenleaf, 1991, p. 13, italics in the original)

How does one know that the leader is a true servant leader? To this, Greenleaf (1991) applies a test. He stated:

The best test, and difficult to administer, 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? (pp. 13-14, italics in the original).

Greenleaf’s seminal work on leadership, *The Servant as Leader*, written ca. 1969, has continually attracted attention. Although not necessarily a writer of lengthy treatises,

he did manage to write at least 34 published articles which have supplied scholars with a significant amount of material. His thoughts form the basis for most contemporary, non-religious, servant leadership studies. Of particular relevance for this study are Greenleaf's thoughts on the servant leadership roles of institutions in which he views the function of institutions as *people-building* or putting people first (Greenleaf, 1991).

The writings of Greenleaf have influenced a host of both researchers and popular authors in the area of leadership. An excellent collection of his writings has been brought together in *Servant Leadership* (1991) as well as *The Servant-Leader Within: A Transformative Path* (2003). Earlier, Frick and Spears (1996) published a number of Greenleaf's previously unpublished essays in their edited volume. The material contained in the volume is an invaluable source of articles on servant leadership. The tone for this volume is set by Robert Greenleaf. Other articles from the edited book, particularly those written by Joe Batten, Peter Block, Kenneth Blanchard, and John Gardiner, are cited in order to address specific issues of servant leadership.

The Greenleaf Center for Servant-Leadership in Indianapolis (<http://www.greenleaf.org/>) is a good source for materials on servant leadership. Spears, president and CEO of the Center, has taken a leading role in promoting Greenleaf's philosophy of leadership as noted in the aforementioned works.

Servant Leadership Theory

In spite of Greenleaf's groundbreaking writings over 20 years ago, it has been noted that although there are an increasing number of studies conducted in the area of servant leadership, "academic research on servant leadership is still in its infancy" (Stone, Russell, & Patterson, 2004; Drury, 2004; Northouse, 2001). Yet, Russell and Stone

(2002) observed, "Many theorists and researchers espouse Servant leadership as a valid model for modern organizational leadership. However, Servant leadership theory is somewhat undefined and not yet supported by sufficient empirical research" (p. 153). As of three years ago, these researchers pointed out that "the theory lacks sufficient scientific evidence to justify its widespread acceptance at this point in time" (p. 145) calling the servant leadership literature "indeterminate, somewhat ambiguous, and mostly anecdotal" (p. 145).

Research on servant leadership theory lags far behind nearly all other major theories, yet there is growing evidence that servant leadership theory is having a significant influence on contemporary leadership thinking. Journal articles and books on servant leadership are continually being produced even though "little empirical research currently supports the servant leadership concept" (Russell & Stone, 2002, p. 149). This has resulted in few conceptual models upon which to base servant leadership theory. Russell and Stone offered a servant leadership model based on attributes discussed in servant leadership literature. Page and Wong (2000) developed a conceptual framework for measuring servant leadership and identified four components of servant leadership. Their study was further refined by Dennis and Winston (2003), who confirmed 3 of 12 factors proposed by Page and Wong. The three factors are: vision, empowerment, and service.

Various doctoral dissertations are helpful with both general and specific applications regarding servant leadership. Foster (2000) examined the barriers to servant leadership, a theme which resonates with this study. Foster's focus was on the barriers in large corporations in the United States and offered suggestions on how to overcome

organizational barriers. Colandelo (2000) addressed democratic leadership styles and followership issues. Giving evidence to the fact that empirical studies on servant leadership are still embryonic, Patterson (2003) proposed a theoretical model for servant leadership resulting in seven constructs presented as virtues: love, humility, altruism, vision, trust, empowerment, and service.

Recent articles have contributed to the research base on servant leadership. Stone, Russell, and Patterson (2004) compared transformational and servant leadership and reached the conclusion that the difference between the two types of leaders is one of focus. These authors compared the attributes of both leadership styles and pointed out some significant overlaps. They concluded that,

The principal difference between transformational leaders and servant leaders is the focus of the leader. While transformational leaders and servant leaders both show concern for their followers, the overriding focus of the servant leader is upon service to their followers. The transformational leader has a greater concern for getting followers to engage in and support organizational objectives. (p. 354)

Schwartz and Tumblin (2002) argued for the implementation of servant leadership within healthcare organizations, admitting that the dominant leadership style within most healthcare organizations was transactional leadership. Lubin's (2001) study found congruency between visionary behaviors and 9 out of 10 servant leadership characteristics.

In recent years, the School of Leadership Studies at Regent University has sponsored conferences (round-table discussions) on servant leadership, producing some excellent papers focusing specifically on various dimensions of servant leadership. In a 2004 conference, considerable attention was given to defining and fine-tuning the concept of servant leadership. Laub (2004) proposed to cut through the confusing maze

of definitions by offering a typology for servant leadership studies. His typology begins by defining leader, leadership, follower, and management before attempting to define servant leadership. Ndoria (2004) asked the question whether one is born with a natural inclination toward servant leadership or whether servant leadership is a learned behavior. She presented the case that servant leadership behavior can be developed. Jefferson Ndoria (2004) examined the language of servant leadership, and Hellend (2004) offered an interpretive biography of how Maestro Henry Charles Smith became a servant leader.

Selected papers presented at the first conference sponsored by the School of Leadership Studies at Regent University are also relevant to this study. Patterson's (2003) and Dennis and Winston (2003) made valuable contributions. Laub (2003) offered an instrument (Organizational Leadership Assessment tool) that he designed to assess the level of servant leadership implementation in an organization.

Biblical Leadership

Because this study focuses on servant leadership among an evangelical population, it is necessary to review what Evangelicals have written on this subject. This literature is divided into four categories: general leadership principles taken from the Bible, literature based on Jesus as a leader, literature which focuses specifically on a Biblical servant leadership style, and a presentation of leadership literature in Spanish.

Biblical Leadership Theory

In recent years the number of books and articles on leadership based on the Bible has grown exponentially as interest in applying good leadership principles in the evangelical church gains momentum. The studies applied in these instances are, for the most part, personal studies of the individual authors who may or may not explain the

principles used to examine the Biblical record. Although the preferred methodological procedure of the authors is to start with Biblical principles, quite often these authors attempt to combine the latest in leadership research with Biblical principles. One of the most well-known of these authors is Maxwell (1993, 1995, 1998, 2000, 2002, 2004) who qualifies as both a Biblical and transformational leadership theorist. Maxwell's tendency is to oversimplify by reducing the leadership "how to's" down to "grocery lists." Like Maxwell, Hybles (2002) advocates Biblical leadership principles and underscores the crucial importance of practicing Biblical leadership in the church.

Anderson (1997) does not specifically base his work on servant leadership principles, but he does implicitly espouse servant leadership in his presentation. The Biblical terms used in his work for describing leadership are *shepherd*, *mentor*, and *equipper*. The father and son study by the Blackabys (Blackaby & Blackaby, 2001) is one of the finest and most complete studies of Biblical leadership to date. Although the language tends to be more transformational in content, servant leadership is certainly the underlying premise. "According to the Bible, God is not necessarily looking for leaders, at least not in the sense we generally think of leaders. He is looking for servants" (Blackaby & Blackaby, p. xi).

Biblical servant leadership. Evangelical literature that specifically focuses on Biblically-based servant leadership is not extensive, since many studies include servant leadership within a larger framework of leadership. Yet, there are monographs that suggest a systematic look at a servant leadership paradigm taken from Scripture.

One of the most recent additions to the body of Biblical leadership literature is offered by Burke (2004). Although he only dedicated one chapter specifically to servant

leadership, it is clear the servant leadership style permeates his thinking. One of the best entries on Biblical servant leadership is offered by Blanchard and Hodges (2003). Not only did the authors get at the core of what is Biblical servant leadership, but they combine its implementation with a situational leadership style, demonstrating a creative and potentially effective combination of models.

A classic entry was first written by Sanders in 1967 with the latest revised edition published over ten years ago (Sanders, 1994). Sanders combined the principle of servant leadership with what could be called Biblical trait theory by presenting a series of traits and skills of a Biblical leader guided by the principle of submission to God.

Rinehart's (1998) monograph on Biblical servant leadership is appropriately titled *Upside Down: The Paradox of Servant Leadership*. The title of this work betrays its conclusion. Similarly, the title of Cedar's (1987) book, *Strength in Servant Leadership*, also attempts to highlight the contrast between a misguided view of leadership and Biblical servant leadership. Foss (2001) looked at the principles of servant leadership but drew less from Scripture than the other studies in this category. Erwin's (2000) sequel to an earlier work offered a simple presentation of the various characteristics that make up a servant leader. Miller's (1995) interpretation of Scripture yields 10 keys to servant leadership. The overall thrust of these works present servant leadership as the Biblical paradigm for evangelical leaders and followers. Biblical leaders are viewed as strong leaders who served others and turned the leadership paradigm of their day upside down.

Leadership style of Jesus. Though more attention is given in the literature to Biblical leadership in general, there is a good selection of works devoted to the leadership style of Jesus. Wilkes (1998b) offered an excellent study which identified 7 principles

Jesus applied as a servant leader. Youssef (1986) proposed 18 leadership principles based on the life of Jesus, while Erwin (1997) suggested 14 leadership principles based on his life. Eight principles are culled from the life of Jesus in the Gospels, and 6 are taken from one of the Apostle Paul's texts from his letter to the Philippians. Hildebrand's (1990) presentation of Jesus' leadership style is one of the more comprehensive ones of this group and, in general, takes a chronological and linear look at the life of Jesus, culling leadership principles as Jesus moves through life on his way to death. Another entry which endorsed Jesus' leadership style is the parable written by Blanchard et al. (1999). Their view is summarized in the following way, "We believe there *is* a perfect practitioner and teacher of effective leadership. That person is Jesus of Nazareth, who embodied the heart and methods of a fully committed and effective servant leader" (p. xi, italics in the original). Miller (1996) based his study on the kingdom Jesus came to establish and lead.

It may be worth noting that the question of whether Jesus was a transformational leader (with a focus on organizational goals) or a servant leader (with a focus on the individual) has attracted very little attention. Murdock's (1996) *The Leadership Secrets of Jesus*, and Jones' (1995) *Jesus CEO: Using Ancient Wisdom for Visionary Leadership* are two popular works which should be mentioned since they specifically addressed the leadership style of Jesus.

Biblical Leadership Literature in Spanish

Original studies in Spanish on Biblical leadership are not common and, as a consequence, an overwhelming number of works in Spanish on Biblical leadership are translations from English texts. Of these, the following are noted: Blackaby and Blackaby

(2004), Hybels (2003), Miller (1999), Murdock (2002), Sanders (1995), and Wilkes (1998a). At least 15 of John Maxwell's books on leadership have been translated.

Original works in Spanish include the work of Batista (1998), who looks at servant leadership through the eyes of a Puerto Rican. In his study, Batista mentioned that a leader's motives may be an obstacle to obeying "kingdom" principles (p. iii) and he lamented the fact that many Christian leaders have been "hypnotized" by contemporary leadership theories which do not synchronize with kingdom principles. Although brief and sketchy, what Batista offered was one of the best original works in Spanish on servant leadership for the Christian community.

The work of Jiménez (1997) does not directly address the issue of servant leadership. Rather, Jiménez focused on the authority of six different kinds of church leaders without ever dipping into leadership research other than the Biblical text. A study with stronger research support was offered by Sánchez (2001), who based much of his study on contemporary leadership research. Although he appeared to espouse a transformational leadership style preference, he did state that the goal of leadership is to serve. This is similar to the work by Yocou (1991), who proposed that good leadership will reproduce itself in its followers; however, this particular examination does not touch on any leadership studies other than pastoral and spiritual works based on the Bible. Larson (1995), although not a Latin American, has written a book in Spanish designed to be used in an open university setting, where the reader can study leadership in a remote setting. It is the most complete original study on leadership in Spanish and includes references to leadership research. Larson also pointed to the leadership of Jesus as the leadership model to be implemented.

Leadership and Culture

The focus of this dissertation is on servant leadership in Latin America. Thus, it is necessary to examine the research which examines leadership, and to some extent, management, in a cross-cultural setting in order to have a better understanding of the intersection between the role of the leader and the place of culture as it impacts leadership and management.

Leadership Theory—Western

Evidence supports the view that links a significant amount of leadership theory to studies and researchers from North America (House, Wright & Aditya, 1997). This view did not escape the observation of Den Hartog, House, Habges, Ruiz-Quintanilla, and Dorfman (1999) who maintained House's assertion by noting the North American connection between the empirical evidence and the dominant leadership theories (Boehnke, Bontis, DiStefano, & DiStefano, 2003; Brain & Lewis, 2004; Shahin & Wright, 2004). Boehnke et al. referred to this view as "American-centric" (p. 5). A quick perusal of Bass' (1990) revised edition of his *Handbook* offers 189 pages of references confirming this North American perspective. Bass devoted a section to "Leadership and Diverse Groups," and addressed the subject of "Leadership in different countries and cultures." In a Korean study, Son (2000) concluded that traditional measures of leadership may be too Western. He suggested that, "since there was no discrimination by the respondents between authoritative and democratic leadership styles, the concepts embedded in these traditional measures of leadership may be too grounded in Western conceptions of leadership to serve well in the Korean context" (abstract).

Studies of National Cultures

Only a handful of studies apply an internationally comprehensive approach to the subject of leadership regionally across cultures. One of the most significant studies to date is an enormous research project called Project GLOBE (House, Javidan & Dorfman, 2001). Over 150 scholars representing 61 different countries and all the major regions of the world (except Antarctica) collaborated in a research project which focused on cross-cultural leadership studies. The meta-goal of GLOBE was "to develop an empirically based theory to describe, understand, and predict the impact of specific cultural variables on leadership and organizational processes and the effectiveness of these processes" (p. 492). The results of this research project have contributed to the understanding of leadership and culture around the world.

The study produced by Brodbeck, Frese, Akerblom, Audia, and Bakacsi (2000) and published as *Cultural Variation of Leadership Prototypes Across 22 European Cultures* was based on the European sub-sample of the GLOBE study. These researchers applied a 112-question instrument to 6,052 middle-level managers. One of the findings of the study revealed that the perceptions of the followers greatly influence the style of leadership.

Multicultural Leadership and Management Studies

House et al. (2001) observed, "Clearly, what is expected of leaders, what leaders may and may not do, and the influence leaders may have vary considerably as a result of the cultural forces in the countries or regions in which the leaders function" (p. 536).

These expectations are imported when multicultural workers enter into the workforce in

the United States. Thus, it is important to look at the research which addresses the multicultural dimensions of leadership in the North American culture.

Various studies and monographs look at cross-cultural dimensions of leadership within the context of North American culture. One of the best collections addressing this topic is the edited volume by Early and Erezs (1997) entitled *New Perspectives on International Industrial/Organizational Psychology*. These researchers contributed to a lengthy work to an overview of cross-cultural leadership studies carried out from 1989 to 1996. One of the intentions of the study was to update studies done after Bass (1990) completed his *Handbook*. This important work discusses issues such as international research, motivation, power relationships, and other relevant topics written by experts in the field.

Bass' (1990) *Handbook* dedicated an entire chapter to leadership in different countries and cultures. The justification for including such a chapter was based on the growing impact countries around the world were having on internationalization. Bass brought together over 100 studies that focused on managerial motivations, attitudes, and behaviors and how they were impacted by differences in cultural or sub-cultural groups. Bass included studies that look at similarities and differences, noting that differences among countries are the rule rather than the exception when one investigates the origins of their leaders in the public and private sectors. He also dedicated a significant amount of text to characteristics which describe cultures, focusing particularly on cultural values. He noted that, "four dimensions of values that are of particular consequence are traditionalism vs. modernity, particularism vs. universalism, idealism vs. pragmatism, and collectivism vs. individualism" (p. 772). Each one of these dimensions may be placed

on a continuum with specific countries located on some point of the continuum. By doing this, cultures and values for each country could be compared and contrasted. There is some overlap between Bass' and Hofstede's (1980) dimensions.

A helpful contribution to the study of leadership and culture is the fourth edition of Ferraro's (2002) *The Cultural Dimension of International Business*. Because of increasing global interdependence, cultural anthropologists are becoming more involved in business and commercial issues. Of particular interest is chapter five, which analyzes contrasting cultural values. Some of the values noted by Ferraro were taken from Hofstede's (1980) dimensions. Although this handbook is helpful for highlighting cultural issues for those leading in cross-cultural situations, the focus of the book is more on cross-cultural managers overseas than those in the United States.

A fascinating study by Leithwood and Duke (1998) reviewed cross-cultural educational leadership. The study examined articles published in English-language educational administration journals, going back to 1988. The researchers pointed out that when leadership research is done across different cultures, two starting points are possible: a grounded approach and a framework-dependent approach. The grounded approach, "begins with the collection of evidence about some aspect(s) of leadership," while the framework-dependent approach "begins with one or more existing conceptions of school leadership" (p. 32). Leithwood and Duke applied the grounded approach.

Cross-cultural Leadership

There are those who argue that one style of leadership works across cultures. Bass (1990) reported that "despite the wide variations in leadership preferences and behavior, Likert's argument is that, regardless of culture, there is one best way to lead" (p. 788). For

Likert (1963), the style of leadership which spans differences in culture is the democratic participatory approach.

Another study presented the perspective that there are leadership universals. Den Hartog, House, Habges, Ruiz-Quintanilla, and Dorfman (1999) argued for a controversial position, "namely that attributes associated with charismatic/transformational leadership will be universally endorsed as contributing to outstanding leadership" (p. 219). Others focus on an emphasis or principles. In the study by Boenke et al. (2003), one of the major findings was that among the six different regions of the world, variations in emphasis was detected and "that the main dimensions of leadership for extraordinary performance are universal. Only a few variations in emphasis exist among six different regions of the world" (p. 5). The leadership behavior they proposed is transformational behaviors. They concluded:

The clear implication of this study is to encourage all leaders to use transformational behaviors to generate this performance. Although leaders' applications of these behaviors will need to adapt to national differences, the transformational leadership style will universally help leaders work more effectively with people to reach their needs and create exceptional performance. (p. 14)

Yet there are those who beg to differ. Newman and Nollen (1996) point out that differences in national cultures call for differences in management practices. House, Wright, and Aditya (1997) stated that, "Clearly, what is expected of leaders, what leaders may and may not do, and the influence leaders have vary considerably as a result of the cultural forces in the countries or regions in which the leaders function" (p. 536).

There are those who question applying the vocabulary of generalized leadership behaviors across cultures (Smith, 1997). For example, one wonders if charismatic leadership would be interpreted the same way by all members of a multicultural team?

The input given by Smith suggested that the behavior may be interpreted in various culture-specific ways.

So is a global definition of charisma possible? There does exist a substantial empirical literature (Bass & Avolio, 1993) suggesting that charismatic leadership is valued in many countries around the world. Furthermore, it has been persuasively argued that charismatic leadership is particularly required in developing countries characterized by high-power distance and collectivist values (Jaeger & Kanungo, 1990; Sinha, 1995). However, the Bass questionnaire is U.S.-designed and has been used in other countries in an imposed etic manner, with few checks made on the meanings imputed to it in other cultures. Charisma may be best thought of as a quality that is global but imputed to leaders on the basis of behaviors that are culture-specific.

There were a few articles that look at related issues from a North American perspective. One such article, which looked at the issue of bosses, was written by Manz and Simpson (1998). The article by Newman and Nollen (1996) examined the fit between national culture and management practices. The subject of business culture is addressed by Deal and Kennedy (1998). The dissertation by Castro (2000) examined the issue of servant leadership in educational settings through a study conducted in Chile and the Philippines. Related cultural studies looked at leadership training in Asia. Conner (1996) examined the relationship between culture and adult leadership training in Thailand and Hwang (1992) studied the Biblical and cultural influences on leadership in Korean churches.

Theoretical Models of Cultural Values

Great efforts have gone into the endeavor of looking at cultures from a global perspective in order to discern whether or not there are common themes around which all cultures gather. Some significant studies have been carried out which address this issue in great detail.

One of the most, if not the most, important figure of modern history in the study of national cultures is the Dutch social scientist Geert Hofstede. Hofstede has written prolifically since the appearance of *Culture's Consequences* in 1980 in which he presented his initial four dimensions of culture and values: power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism versus collectivism, and masculinity versus femininity, each viewed as opposite poles on a scale. These four values formed the basis for interpreting cultures and were based on two surveys (1968 and 1972) producing 116,000 questionnaires for IBM employees in a total of 40 countries. His brief definition of culture is "mental programs." This definition is taken from the world of computers and technology.

In 1991, Hofstede reformulated his study (expanding to 53 countries) and added a fifth dimension, long-term vs. short-term orientation. These five dimensions have become a standard model for looking at cultures and though there are critics, the tendency has been to refine rather than refute. As will be seen, many studies have followed Hofstede's lead in interpreting cultural values. It is anticipated that his theories will form the basis for many of the suggestions in the conclusions of this study.

After the initial publication of his two major studies, Hofstede (1998, 1999a 1999b) continued researching the subject and published articles addressing the need for

international businesses to pay attention to the cultural dimensions of what they do. Few researchers in the study of national culture dimensions have been quoted or referenced as frequently as Hofstede (Bing, 2005).

Hofstede has not been without his critics. The title of one study reflects the conclusions of its author: *Hofstede Never Studied Culture* (Baskerville, 2003). Another recent study offers a critique of Hofstede's fifth national culture dimension (Fang, 2003). Bond (2002), writing from the Chinese University of Hong Kong, postulated that too many have given Hofstede more credit than he deserves, thus keeping further productive studies from being created. Roberts and Boyacigiller (1984) critically reviewed Hofstede's first edition comparing it with four other projects from the 1970s. Smith (2002) suggested that any serious cross-cultural study should give this review attention.

Those who support Hofstede's work are many. A Russian researcher, Naumov, analyzed Russian culture using Hofstede's dimensions (Naumov & Puffer, 2000). Hofstede's theories have also been applied to the culture in South Africa (Eaton & Louw, 2000), as well as India (Vishwanath, 2003). A study looked at phobic anxiety in 11 nations using Hofstede's dimensions as its theoretical model (Arrindell et al., 2004). Although broad use of Hofstede's dimensions does not prove his conclusions are correct, it is safe to say that his work has found a significant place among cross-cultural researchers.

Another Dutch social scientist, Fons Trompenaars (1994), conducted similar research and published his results a few years after Hofstede's second major study. Trompenaars researched 30 companies across 50 countries. Based on the results of his research on international businesses, he proposed the following seven categories of

culture: the universal versus the particular, individualism and collectivism, affective versus neutral, specific versus diffuse, status by achievement and economic development, the concept of time, and one's relationship to nature. Trompenaars was careful to apply results in practical ways for those who work cross-culturally overseas.

The Project GLOBE study is the third and most recent international study which examined global culture (House et al., 2001; House, Javidan, Hanges, & Dorfman, 2002). This project expanded Hofstede's dimensions and proposed nine total dimensions: uncertainty avoidance, power distance, collectivism I, collectivism II, gender egalitarianism, assertiveness, future orientation, performance orientation, and humane orientation. It can be seen that some of Hofstede's dimensions have been re-categorized and made more specific. Hofstede (1999a) supported the idea that as the development of theories and management continue over time, theories will become more international in nature as leadership and management principles are adapted to national cultural value systems.

Positive responses to the many studies conducted in the area of cross-cultural leadership may be seen in the many programs developed to offer help to those who desire to receive training in cross-cultural skills and sensitivity. One such program is discussed by Smith (1996). This program is a 10-day multicultural leadership training program applied in a multicultural school environment. The program is designed to assist leaders in knowing how to work in multiculturally diverse environments.

Latin American Leadership

A review of the literature regarding Latin American leadership styles indicated repeated references to *cacique* and its related term *caudillo*. A *cacique* may be defined simply as a ruler or chief and is explained by Kautzmann (1998) in the following way:

A type of Latin American powerbroker that tends to lack the charismatic qualities described above. These sociologists apply the name *cacique* to powerful, informal bosses on the local and state levels. The wealth and power of the *caciques* result from patron-client relationships enabling them to broker resources to which they have exclusive access. (p. 30-31)

The term *caudillo* means leader and is virtually a synonym for *cacique*. The Columbia Encyclopedia defines a caudillo as “military strongman” (*The Columbia Encyclopedia*, 2001). Kautzmann (1998) clarified the difference between the two terms citing Díaz (1972) and Friedrich (1965), who explained that “Some reserve the term *caudillo* for leaders who gained power on a national level” (p. 22).

For the purposes of this grounded theory study, the most relevant information on *caciques* in evangelical institutions comes primarily from four doctoral dissertations by Comiskey (1997), Kautzmann (1998), Prillaman (1998), and Wierenga (1996). Comiskey’s dissertation topic did not specifically address the issue of *caciquismo* (a state, mindset, or activity associated particularly with a *cacique* leadership style), but it did devote a significant portion to the issue of authority and *caciquismo* as it affects leadership in Protestant evangelical church cell groups. Kautzmann gave his attention to the issues of power, authority, and loyalty within the evangelical church in Venezuela. Prillaman’s dissertation looked at both Biblical and *caudillaje* (like *caciquismo* but implemented by *caudillos*) leadership patterns among evangelical church leaders in

Bolivia. The dissertation by Wierenga addressed the issue of authoritarian and participatory leadership styles, specifically in a new church environment in Venezuela.

The dissertation by Torres (1999) is helpful in demonstrating cultural differences between Brazilian and American styles of leadership. Other dissertations were helpful in understanding cross-cultural issues without specifically addressing the issue of the *cacique* style of leadership. Glicks's (2001) dissertation examined the issue of leader-effectiveness in cross-cultural environments.

Three dissertation studies focused on specific kinds of leadership styles in Venezuela. The study by Reyes (1997) explored leadership effectiveness of department chairpersons in a specific university. Ramos (1998) compared the leadership styles of high school principals in Alabama (United States) and Venezuela. Wierenga (1996) studied the tension between authoritarian and participatory leadership styles.

Literature which specifically compared *caciquismo* or *caudillismo* with servant leadership was minimal. Kautzmann's study (1998) offered the best treatment of the exercise of servanthood in a culture of *caciques*. He stated "that it is not a simple matter for a leader to act as a servant while at the same time maintaining authority and influence" (p. 226). He then affirmed that servanthood behaviors "...are clearly at odds with the spirit of *caudillaje*" (p. 230).

Because *caciquismo* is primarily a non-North American leadership style, it is necessary to look at literature that addressed the relevant cultural issues. Two monographs were quite helpful in understanding the issue of *caciquismo*. Although dated, the works by Mayers (1982) and Nida (1974) were invaluable in giving an anthropological and sociological perspective on the backgrounds that serve as the

foundation for this Latin American leadership style. Dealy's monograph (1977) on the interpretation of Latin American cultures is well-known among Latin American scholars. An excellent study of the roots of the authoritarian presidency in Latin America may be found in Sondrol's (1990) survey.

Summary

A review of the literature in the area of servant leadership studies has brought to light two significant issues: servant leadership studies have emerged as one of the newest areas of research in leadership studies and, consequently, few serious research studies have been conducted addressing servant leadership.

In this brief review of the literature, it has been noted that servant leadership is set within the context of transformational leadership, which is also a relatively new area of research, yet one which has gained greater attention. Biblical servant leadership within evangelical churches is a leadership paradigm which has been taught more than it has been examined. It was also presented that original studies in Spanish are nearly non-existent. Available literature in Spanish on servant leadership was borrowed and translated from authors who originally wrote in English.

A review of the literature addressing the cultural dimensions of leadership has revealed a number of international studies addressing the subject and a limited number of academic studies that focus on Latin American leadership issues. Dissertations addressing Latin American leadership provided the greatest amount of information to guide this grounded theory study.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this chapter was to establish the research methodology used to conduct the study. The following issues were addressed: the philosophical paradigm in which the study was situated, the rationale for the selected method of research, the role of the researcher, data generation and analysis, ethical considerations and steps to ensure trustworthiness.

Context of Research Methods

Social science research has applied two distinct research methods: qualitative and quantitative research. Quantitative research can trace its roots to the founder of positivism, Auguste Comte (1798-1857), whereas qualitative research has its origins in research conducted by social anthropologists, interpretivists, collaborative social research and action research studies during the last 100 years (Miles & Huberman, 1994). It was not the purpose of this study to compare the two research methods—supporters and critics of each method abound. This researcher agreed with the following observation regarding the general validity of both methods: “Positivistic methods are but one way of telling stories about society or the social world. These methods may be no better or no worse than any other methods; they just tell different kinds of stories” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 10).

Philosophical Paradigms

Philosophical Paradigms as Interpretation

Because “methodology is the philosophy of method of the study of the formation of knowledge” and “research methodology, in particular, deals with the philosophical

underpinnings of research methods", it is important that a researcher identify the philosophical underpinnings which guide the research process (Starcher, 2003, p. 55). As Slife and Williams (2003) pointed out,

There is no foreordained or self-evident truth about how science is to be conducted, or indeed, whether science *should* be conducted at all. Scientific method was formulated by philosophers, the preeminent dealers in ideas. These philosophers, *not* scientists, are responsible for the package of ideas now called *scientific method*. (p. 4)

Slife and Williams also argued "*the facts of science are themselves theory laden*. A prominent misconception of scientists is that they are objective observers of the world" (p. 5).

Both quantitative and qualitative research are research methods guided by beliefs and assumptions. Creswell (1998) commented on the qualitative research paradigm in the following way:

Qualitative researchers approach their studies with a certain paradigm or world view, a basic set of the beliefs or assumptions that guide their inquiries. These assumptions are related to the nature of reality (the ontology issue), the relationship of the researcher to that being researched (the epistemological issue), the role of values in a study (the axiological issue), and the process of research (the methodological issue). (p. 74)

Denzin and Lincoln (2000) opined:

All research is interpretive; it is guided by a set of beliefs and feelings about the world and how it should be understood and studied. Some beliefs may be taken for granted, invisible, only assumed, whereas others are highly problematic and controversial. Each interpretive paradigm makes particular demands on the researcher, including the questions he or she asks and the interpretations the researcher brings to them. (p. 19)

Thus, it is essential to acknowledge the philosophical substructure of the research methodology since the researcher's ontology, epistemology, and axiology determine, to a large extent, how the research is designed, conducted, and interpreted.

Critical Realism

The research that was conducted for this study was based on qualitative research methodology. The epistemology which undergirds many contemporary qualitative studies is postmodern social constructivism. However, the epistemology which most closely describes the researcher's personal epistemology was a critical realist epistemology. Critical realism accepts certain basic tenets of postmodernism without jettisoning entirely all the positivist assumptions about reality. Hendrickson (2004) offered the following insight:

Therefore, unlike some postmodern, subjectivist positions, that claim external reality cannot be known or does not exist, critical realism asserts that reality can be apprehended. On the other hand, critical realism rejects the positivistic notion of total objectivity since any view of reality will always be partial and incomplete. Human beings are fallible creatures, influenced by their perception of the world making total objectivity an unattainable goal. (pp. 79-80)

Although the descriptive term "critical realism" is not commonly used in research methodology texts, an Internet search on *google.com* yielded 43,700 hits, indicating an interest in this particular epistemological approach. As an epistemological system, critical realism has been a viable subject of study for over 60 years, in a sense predating postmodernism. Caldwell (2004) stated that, "Roy Bhaskar may be regarded as the founding father of critical realism, yet his first book, *A Realist Thought of Science* appeared in 1975 when postmodernism was still in its infancy" (Pratschke, 2003, p. 15). Harvey (2002) referred to the contributions of Roy Bhasker and described critical realism in the following way:

Working from a philosophical perspective known as "*critical realism*," Bhasker has challenged 60 years of idealist hegemony in the social sciences. Under his tutelage, critical realism has sought a middle way between positivism's fading path and the unchecked caprices of hermeneutic analysis. Consequently, critical realism avoids interpretive theory's many pitfalls by distinguishing sharply

between the obdurate reality of the world and what scientists say about it. It embraces naturalistic explanations in the social sciences without ignoring, at the same time, the fact men and women, unlike natural entities, actively reproduce their social world. This ameliorative "third path" is especially welcome in the social sciences, since the methodological and ontological foundations once forming their hegemonic center are now hopelessly fragmented. (p. 163)

Some scholars view critical realism as a synonym for postpositivism. What Guba and Lincoln (1994) identified as postpositivism, Cook and Campbell referred to as "critical realism" (as cited in Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 9). Denzin and Lincoln (1998) explained: "The positivist and post positivist paradigms ... work from within a realist and critical realist ontology and objective epistemologies, and rely upon experimental, quasi-experimental, survey, and rigorously defined qualitative methodologies" (p. 27).

Some view critical realism as a response to a dying postmodernism. López and Potter (2001) affirmed that postmodernism is dead and will be replaced by critical realism. Caldwell argued:

Critical realism, then, rescues us from the postmodernist nightmare and restores us to reality. We cannot manage without a concept of truth. There is (as most of us thought all along) a pre-existing external reality about which it is the job of science to tell us. (p. 11)

López and Potter asserted that, "Both critical realism and postmodernism emerged as intellectual responses (broadly speaking) to the same significant philosophical developments of the twentieth century" (p. 6), and they would undoubtedly agree with Barbour (1990) who explained that, "The basic assumption of realism is that *existence* is prior to *theorizing*. Constraints on our theorizing arise from structures and relationships already existing in nature" (p. 44). This statement goes against the tenets of postmodern thinking.

Critical realism, the philosophical paradigm which undergirds this grounded theory study, rejects two notions of commonly accepted philosophical canons; it rejects the positivistic notion that totally objective research is attainable, while at the same time it denies the postmodern view that all truth is subjective. Critical realism attempts to navigate between these two positions. Hiebert (1999) stated that,

Critical realist epistemology strikes a middle ground between positivism, with its emphasis on objective truth, and instrumentalism, with its stress on the subjective nature of human knowledge ... It affirms the presence of objective truth but recognizes that this is subjectively apprehended. (p. 69)

Vanhoozer (1998) concluded that, "Critical realism thus stands as a middle position between epistemological absolutism ('there is only one correct interpretive scheme') and epistemological relativism ('every interpretive scheme is as good as any other')" (p. 323).

Hiebert (1999) explained that,

Critical realism does not claim sheer objectivity for human knowledge. In fact, it argues that total objectivity, if that could be achieved, would not be knowledge, for knowledge is more than factual information. It is used by people to live their lives. Knowledge in critical realism is the correspondence between our mental maps and the real world; it is objective reality subjectively known and appropriated in human lives. (p.74)

The Research Paradigm

The selection of a research paradigm was crucial since the research paradigm imbeds within it the ontological, epistemological, axiological, and foundational perspectives of the researcher. Many excellent works have been written comparing the quantitative and qualitative research methods (Creswell, 1998, 2003; Denzin & Lincoln, 1998, 2000b; Lincoln & Guba, 1985, 2003). The present study was designed to be a qualitative study selected from one of the five traditions as described by Creswell (1998). Along with the issue of philosophical congruence between critical realism and certain

qualitative research traditions, there were additional reasons as to why this study was a qualitative research study:

1. No initial hypotheses were proposed at the outset of the study. Rather, the hypotheses emerged from the data.
2. The researcher sought to identify and value the multiple views of those interviewed.
3. The constraints of everyday life applying an emic perspective were pursued.
4. Rich description was used to communicate what emerges in the discovery process.

Rationale for Selected Method

This study proposed to identify the obstacles which impede the successful implementation of servant leadership among Latin American evangelical leaders. Of the five major qualitative traditions (Creswell, 1998), the method with the best fit for implementing the study was grounded theory.

Grounded theory facilitates the discovery of theory by developing a process by which a theory (or theories) emerges from the participants in the study. Thus, the process began by collecting and analyzing data before applying theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Grounded theory is designed to allow a theory (or theories) to surface from those being interviewed rather than proposing a hypothesis to be confirmed by those interviewed. "The centerpiece of grounded theory research is the development or generation of a theory closely related to the context of the phenomenon being studied" (Creswell, 1998, p. 56). Of the various methods used in qualitative research, grounded theory was the most appropriate for this research project.

The grounded theory research method allows the critical realist paradigm to be applied with greater flexibility. Because grounded theory accepts various positivistic assumptions while, at the same time, agreeing with certain postmodern critiques of those assumptions, applying a grounded theory method to the study balanced structure and rigor with a high regard for the individual perspectives of each participant.

Grounded theory, as developed by Strauss and Corbin (1990), is supported by canons and procedures. However, as Charmaz (2000) pointed out, “Grounded theory methods specify analytic strategies, not data collection methods” (p. 515). According to Charmaz as well as Starcher (2003), the following are canons and procedures used in grounded theory analysis: collecting and coding data as an interrelated process conducting memo writing as an “intermediate step between coding and the first draft of the completed analysis” (Charmaz, p. 517); identifying the basic units of analysis as concepts to be developed into categories and then associated; theoretical sampling based on the process of constant comparison which “helps us to identify conceptual boundaries and pinpoint the fit and relevance of our categories” (p. 519); the strategy of “sampling to refine the researcher’s emerging theoretical ideas” (p. 511); and, a “hypotheses about relationships among categories should be developed and verified as much as possible during the process” (Starcher, p. 64). This process concluded with the “integration of the theoretical framework” (Charmaz, p. 511).

Role of the Researcher

The role of the researcher in this grounded theory study was to facilitate a process that sought to identify the obstacles which blocked the successful implementation of effective servant leadership among Latin American evangelical servant leaders. The

researcher's role was to interview the participants in such a way so that their comments, ideas, and perspectives emerged freely. This kind of interaction placed the researcher in the category of participant observer since the researcher would be doing more than observing (the researcher would be participating as a facilitating interviewer). In order to accomplish this, the following suggestion by Creswell (1998) was followed as much as possible: "The investigator needs to set aside, as much as possible, theoretical ideas or notions so that the analytic, substantive theory can emerge" (p. 58). In order to minimize the effect of potential bias on the research process, the use of reflexivity was applied in order to bracket those biases, thus enhancing the researcher's ability to be aware of biases.

Theoretical Sensitivity

One of the key issues faced by the researcher in the study was the need to develop theoretical sensitivity. According to Strauss and Corbin (1990), theoretical sensitivity "refers to a personal quality of the researcher" (p. 41). This personal quality can be developed as the result of research, experiences and personal abilities that enable the researcher to conceptualize the data and develop a theory that is grounded in that data. The researcher must be aware of the ways in which he or she intersects and interacts with the data under investigation. Strauss and Corbin (1998) referenced Sandelowski (1993) in reminding the researcher:

Whether we want to admit it or not, we cannot completely divorce ourselves from who we are or from what we know. The theories that we carry within our heads inform our research in multiple ways, even if we use them quite un-self-consciously. (p. 47)

Of great importance was the need to balance objectivity and sensitivity (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Strauss and Corbin suggested that objectivity can be enhanced if the

researcher thinks comparatively, obtains multiple viewpoints of an event, develops a practice of stepping back to ask, “What is going on here?”, maintains a healthy skepticism, and follows the grounded theory procedures. Sensitivity was enhanced by immersion in the data, applying what one already knows (through prior experience, studies, knowledge) to the research, knowing the literature on the subject, and having a comparative base which one uses to examine the data.

It may well be that this process of becoming increasingly aware of the relationship between objectivity and subjectivity is more of an art than a science. Whatever the case, the researcher made every attempt to develop theoretical sensitivity and cultivated it in increasing measures throughout the study.

Data Generation

Participants

The criteria for selecting the participants was based on purposive sampling (Patton, 1990). This researcher has traveled extensively throughout Latin America and has met potential participants at public events for Latin American evangelical leaders. These public events included conventions, workshops, church services, and institutional meetings. Each potential participant was selected based on that person’s current or previous leadership role in a Latin American evangelical organization. The addresses, phone numbers, and e-mail addresses was public information. These participants included pastors of evangelical churches, directors of evangelical theological institutions, leaders, and board members of evangelical organizations. Each participant had experience in leadership in a Latin American evangelical organization.

It was anticipated that the researcher had prior knowledge of each participant including some knowledge of the participant's involvement in a significant evangelical leadership position in Latin America. Some of the participants had served as leaders in Latin America, and also resided in the United States.

In order to conduct the research, 23 individuals were selected to provide information relevant to the study. These individuals were Latin American evangelical leaders selected from the following countries: Mexico, Venezuela, Peru, Guatemala, Cuba, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Uruguay, and Costa Rica. These are countries that provided the researcher with numerous options for selecting participants, since the researcher had visited most of these countries and was acquainted with some of the evangelical leaders. Although it was evident that in the Latin American culture positions of leadership are reserved primarily (though not exclusively) for men, it was hoped that women would also agree to participate. It was important to clarify that the participants may or may not have been servant leaders themselves. The study was not designed to explore their experiences as servant leaders, but rather to identify barriers to servant leadership within their Latin American evangelical contexts. It should be noted that these leaders quite likely attended evangelical churches which follow a congregational form of church government.

Instrument

The primary method for gathering information was through interviews. Each participant was interviewed once, with each interview ranging in length from 22 to 131 minutes. Each participant received a definition of a servant leader (Appendix A) and then was asked a series of questions (Appendix C) that the researcher had developed based on

a comparative review of the literature. The questions developed for the interview were used with each participant or was modified as the coding and constant comparison process began. Since the participants were from various Latin American countries, the researcher was sensitive to the possibility that certain words or phrases in the questions themselves may not have shared the same semantic nuances for all participants.

The relationship that best facilitated the interaction between the participants and the researcher was that of participant observer. The researcher worked hard to facilitate and maintain neutrality as much as possible during the interview recognizing that certain commonalities exist which provide for familiar bridges of interaction between the researcher and the participant. It was quite likely that the researcher had previously been acquainted professionally or informally with the participants. This was of valuable assistance in establishing rapport quickly with the participants. However, the researcher had to be sensitive to the fact that the participants could have been inclined to say things the researcher may have wanted to hear. This placed some responsibility on the researcher to be sensitive and careful during the interview and coding process.

Data Collection and Procedures

The major portion of the data was collected through interviews, which served as the primary source for developing the grounded theory. On completion of the study, a comparison of data was expected to be made with the findings of the literature.

The participants received a letter of invitation to participate (Appendix E) and were then contacted either by electronic mail or by telephone to arrange for an interview at a time that was convenient for the participant. The interviews were conducted in person, whenever possible, otherwise the interviews were conducted over the telephone.

The interviews were conducted in Spanish and recorded on a portable digital recorder (with a special adapter for the telephone when necessary). Although there are those who point to the disadvantages of recording interviews (Weiss, 1994), in this researcher's opinion, the value of having a transcript of the interview outweighs the disadvantages. This researcher prior to the interview did not anticipate accessing any material which could potentially have embarrassed a participant. The researcher also exercised caution in assuring participant confidentiality. For this study, the interviews are stored in audio files, a computer hard drive as well as printed hard copies, all of which are stored in protected space and will be destroyed after six years.

The researcher made personal notes and memos during the interview to help with the interview process as well as to enable clarification. Each interview was transcribed in Spanish and then coded. Attempts were made to do the transcriptions personally, but when there were time constraints, the researcher contracted unrelated native Spanish speakers to transcribe the interviews. Citations used in the dissertation were translated into English. Even though some nuances are lost when one translates from one language into another, great effort was made by the researcher to do the translations into English himself as accurately and professionally as possible. Doing interviews in other languages has its risks, but the anticipated results should justify the study because it should contribute to literature much needed in this area.

The Procedures Used to Protect the Participants

In order to keep the information as confidential as possible, to protect the rights of the participants as individuals, to permit their information to be used in the study, and assure them of confidentiality since the study was not an anonymous study, no identifiers

were included in the study. Although Latin Americans are not as prone to press legal charges as are North Americans, especially in the context that this researcher has worked in his field for over 20 years, the participants were still required to sign a letter of consent to release the researcher from any legal action on the part of the participant (see Appendix G). The researcher was aware of the possibility that the participants may have questioned the signing of such a statement through a cultural lens interpreting it as a lack of trust to affect the interaction. The researcher was sensitive to this issue.

Data Analysis

The Intended Data Analysis Procedures

Strauss and Corbin (1990, 1998) offered a model for conducting data analysis in grounded theory studies, and it was anticipated that this model would be followed closely. The model has four components: open coding, axial coding, selective coding, and a conditional matrix.

Once an interview was completed, the researcher began the process of coding. In grounded theory, the coding process begins with identifying basic categories by means of open coding. Open coding is, “The analytic process through which concepts are identified and their properties and dimensions are discovered in the data” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 101). These concepts were then divided into subcategories and attempts were made to place all the possibilities on a continuum (Creswell, 1998). What is important to note is that the process of discovering these categories is not a linear process (Strauss & Corbin, 1990); instead, the process applied by the researcher included a constant comparison method of analysis technique throughout the coding process. Charmaz (2000) suggests various ways to apply the constant comparative process. These techniques include

comparing various kinds of data such as the comparison of experiences, views, accounts and situations of different people as well as comparing incidents, categories, and data with categories.

The next step in the coding process was axial coding, which is, “The process of relating categories to their subcategories, termed ‘axial’ because coding occurs around the axis of a category, linking categories at the level of properties and dimensions” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 123). Axial coding analyzes the data identified in the open coding process. This set of procedures looks for ways to link the categories revealed through the open coding process. "This is done by utilizing a coding paradigm involving conditions, context, action/interaction strategies and consequences" (Creswell, 1998, p. 96). When the data is put together in new ways, it is anticipated that certain discoveries about the connections will be made. Creswell (1998) stated that the researcher during this stage of analysis "identifies a central phenomenon ... explores causal conditions ... identifies the context and intervening conditions ... and delineates the consequences ... for this phenomenon" (p. 57).

Selective coding carries axial coding to a much higher and abstract level of analysis. Strauss and Corbin (1998) define it as, “The process of integrating and refining the theory” (p. 143). It is at this point that Creswell (1998) suggests that a "story line" be written based on the results of the previous step. Strauss and Corbin (1990) proposed a 5-step procedure. It is anticipated that during this process, relationships, patterns, connections, and categories are brought together into a theory grounded in the data. At this point, the researcher was able to confidently identify the obstacles to the effective implementation of servant leadership that emerged from the data.

A final suggested step in the analysis procedure was to apply a conditional matrix to the data. The conditional matrix is, “An analytic device to stimulate analysts’ thinking about the relationships between macro and micro conditions/consequences both to each other and the process” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 181). This is a visual portrayal of very broad categories crucial to the study. It is this visual portrayal of the data that “social, historical, and economic conditions influencing the central phenomenon are revealed” (Creswell, 1998, p. 57). If the results of the data are able to be presented in a visual format so as to graphically represent the results of the study, then the researcher will provide a conditional matrix. Visually diagramming the categories is a helpful tool in the process of connecting the various categories into a coherent theory or theories. This step was of significance because of the cross-cultural nature of the study.

A primary tool used by grounded theorists for facilitating the data analysis process is the practice of memoing. Memos are, “Written records of analysis that may vary in type and form” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 217). Strauss and Corbin place a great amount of importance on the memoing tool. “Writing memos and doing diagrams are important elements of analysis and never should be considered superfluous, regardless of how pressed for time the analyst might be” (p. 218). Memos also have a dual purpose of, “keeping the research grounded and maintaining that awareness for the researcher” (p. 218).

The researcher expected the research design to change slightly as the process unfolded, however, the four steps in the data analysis did not change. Added to replace the following (which you have highlighted in yellow): Minor modifications in the process were applied in two areas: the first was in the addition of two more female participants in

order to achieve stronger representation of the female participants and the second modification was to develop a conditional matrix using database spreadsheets rather than a visual conditional matrix since it appeared that the subject matter adapted itself well to the use of spreadsheet analysis. There may be a need to modify some of the elements of the design (such as broadening the scope of the kinds of participants selected for the study), but it is not anticipated that any major modifications will take place in this process.

In order to analyze the data, the researcher used a computer mediated analysis tool called *Atlas.ti 4.2*. As Silverman (2000) noted, this tool was “explicitly developed to enable a grounded theory approach, resulting in a program of considerable sophistication” (p. 168). This tool proved invaluable and time-saving in carrying out the coding process. The data was coded and categorized using those categories which arose from the interviews as analyzed by the program and named by the researcher. It was anticipated that the inter-relationships among the categories would yield the data that would enable the researcher to identify the barriers which impeded the effective implementation of servant leadership among Latin American evangelical leaders.

The Procedures Used to Keep Track of the Research Process

The primary procedure for keeping track of the research process was transcribed from audio recording. The written transcripts of the interviews and the digitized copies saved on the hard drive provided the researcher with a record of the research process. These records will be protected for six years before being destroyed.

Another procedure for keeping track of the research process were the written records provided by the memos. Memos contribute an audit trail of information that proves invaluable to the researcher.

Steps to Ensure Credibility and Reliability

Silverman commented that, “Doing ‘qualitative’ research should offer no protection from the rigorous, critical standards that should be applied to any enterprise concerned to sort ‘fact’ from ‘fancy’” (p. 12). Thus, it was important to identify the strategies used to ensure the credibility and reliability of the study. It was also helpful to heed Strauss (1997), who observed that the researcher’s interpretation, “will not be the only possible interpretation of the data (only God’s interpretations can make the claim of ‘full completeness’), but it will be plausible, useful, and allow its own further elaboration and verification” (p. 11).

Establishing trustworthiness, according to Krefting (1991), is determined by identifying the truth value, applicability, consistency, and neutrality of a study. Strategies for ensuring that these criteria are met are discussed below.

Three strategies were applied to establish the credibility and the reliability of the study: member-checking, participant feedback, and peer review. Member checking was carried out during the study as the interviews were conducted. Statements made by one member was “checked” in light of what other members had said. Once the data were analyzed and barriers had been identified, participant feedback and peer review were applied by means of focus groups. One focus group was composed of four to seven of those who had been interviewed for the study in order to receive their input on the conclusions. The second group was composed of four to seven Latin American leaders

who would be peers of those in the study. They also received the same data as the first focus group and were asked for their input regarding the analysis and the identification of the barriers. These focus groups received a condensed form of the results of the study and were asked to discuss these results as to whether or not the results reflected their own experiences. It was expected that there would be some variety in the responses, but it was hoped that the results of the discussions would confirm the theory or theories and would give final shape to the theory or theories which emerged from the study.

Summary

The study, *An Exploration of the Barriers which Impede the Effective Implementation of Servant Leadership in Latin American Evangelical Organizations: A Grounded Theory Study*, is designed to discover elements which are obstacles to a servant leader's effective implantation of the servant leadership style. This chapter has identified critical realism as the philosophical paradigm supporting this study and has stated that the research is designed as a qualitative study in the grounded theory tradition. The researcher applied purposive sampling to select the participants and conducted interviews with 23 evangelical Latin American leaders, coding the results by means of open, axial, and selective coding procedures. It was anticipated that the analysis of the data would uncover various theories which would identify specific barriers. The study was not an anonymous study, but efforts were applied to protect the confidentiality of the participants. The results of the research were evaluated for credibility and reliability by means of member-checking, participant feedback, and peer review.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Introduction

This study explored the barriers which impede the effective implementation of servant leadership in Latin American evangelical organizations. The research method used was “grounded theory,” as this qualitative method is designed to facilitate theory generation from the participants in the study as the researcher worked through the grounded theory coding process and theory formation. This chapter looks at the attributes and traits of both Latin American leaders and Latin American evangelical leaders and is followed by a discussion of the evidence for “servant leadership” and its viability in Latin American contexts. The focus of the study is then presented in a section which addresses the discovery of proposed barriers to the effective implementation of servant leadership in Latin American evangelical organizations. Various strategies for overcoming the barriers are proposed by the participants. Ten theories are proposed and presented as ten major barrier categories which impede the effective implementation of servant leadership in Latin American evangelical organizations. The chapter concludes with a summary of the findings.

Description of the Participants

For this study, 23 participants were selected from among a purposive sample of Latin American evangelical leaders. No participant refused the invitation to participate in the interviews. Two leaders were interviewed face-to-face, but the rest were interviewed by a land line telephone or via Internet technology (Vonage or Skype).

The interviews were conducted from San José, Costa Rica, over a period of two months between March 7, 2006, and May 10, 2006. Each participant received e-mail copies of three documents prior to the interview. These emails contained the following attachments: an invitation to participate (Appendix F), the Informed Consent Form (Appendix H), and a document containing various leadership definitions (Appendix B). Each interview was recorded using a Sony ICD-ST25 digital recorder and then downloaded to a desktop computer and immediately copied to a CD for back-up. Initially, the researcher recorded the entire interview, but it soon became apparent that it was not necessary to record the reading of the leadership definitions since each one of the participants was required to read the same document out loud. Consequently, the digital recorder was turned off after the participant responded to the first four questions of the interview and then turned back on after reading the leadership definitions. The interviews were initially transcribed by the researcher as well as a contracted Costa Rican university student who was required to sign the Third Party Agreement (Appendix L). However, as the digital files to be transcribed increased, it became necessary to recruit and hire more transcribers, thus five more transcribers were hired. Each transcriber was required to sign the confidentiality agreement (Appendix L). Once the interviews were transcribed, each participant received a copy of the transcription to ensure reliability in the transcription process. Although only two participants suggested changes, all were given the option of modifying or clarifying anything said in the interview which did not get stated clearly. To protect identities, the real names of the participants are not used.

The 23 adult leaders were from nine Latin American countries (Appendix K): Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Mexico, Peru, Uruguay,

and Venezuela. Eighteen participants were male and 5 were female. The approximate ages of the participants ranged from 32 years to over 80 years old, with the median age approximately 51 years old. The participants represented the following leadership positions: educational leaders (6), denominational leaders (5), organizational leaders (5), senior pastors (5), conference speaker (1), and a senior pastor's wife (1). The average recorded time of the interviews was 40 minutes for the females and 58 minutes for the males. All interviews but one was conducted in Spanish.

Data Analysis

The data generated by the interviews were coded following the suggested general canons of grounded theory data analysis (Corbin & Strauss, 1990). Although the coding process may appear initially as a theory to be linear and sequentially structured, and in general practice it does tend to be linear, in the actual carrying out of the analysis, it also tended to be iterative and cyclical .

Each participant was asked to respond to 10 questions (see Appendix C). An 11th question was added to the first 10, which simply gave the participants the opportunity to share with the researcher any thoughts they might have on leadership in general. It was also felt necessary to modify the order of the questions asked since the order in the protocol began with a question which asked for their personal definitions of leadership. This researcher felt it would be more productive if the interviews began with question 4, a much more general and non-threatening question, and then work back in inverse order to question 1.

Once the interviews were transcribed, the researcher sent each participant a copy of the transcription in order for the participant to review and check the accuracy of the

transcription. In only two instances were changes suggested by the participant. This step helped support the reliability of the transcriptions.

Upon receiving input from the participant regarding the transcribed interview, the researcher then entered the transcription into a specialized software program called *Atlas.ti.4.2*. This software allowed the researcher to identify the initial codes in the open coding data analysis process. This step was followed by axial coding in which the researcher identified specific themes and patterns. Selective coding was the final step in the coding process. Broad themes and patterns surfaced which yielded the emerging theories as presented by the participants. It was important to constantly review the initial codes identified in the open coding process; thus the technique of constant comparison was applied in order to refine the emerging body of information. The researcher would constantly sweep through the documents by examining the code categories to see where codes could be combined to yield a stronger database. The researcher also found it helpful to develop separate spreadsheets to manage the number and frequencies of codes emerging from the data. This also enabled the researcher to look at the data from various perspectives. The number of times a specific code was mentioned or identified helped give direction in determining the value and importance of the code. The greater number of times a code appeared in the data (called references in this study), the more attention was given to the code for determining emergent themes.

During the coding and the constant comparison process, the technique of memoing was applied extensively. Nearly 200 memos were written or entered into the computer throughout the data analysis and coding process. These memos served to record the researcher's initial thoughts as well as to help guide the process of analysis. Once the

findings were identified and classified, the conclusions were presented to three participants and one non-participating leader. Initially, the groups were to have each been integrated by four to seven members. Unfortunately, cancellations, illness, and unforeseen circumstances at the last minute by the participants limited the number of participants who gave input regarding the findings of the study.

Components of a Latin American Leader's Profile as Contributed by the Participants

What is the profile of a Latin American leader? What do Latin Americans consider to be the desirable or positive elements shaping the profile of a Latin American leader? What is leadership to a Latin American evangelical leader? Dorcas, a female educator, described leadership as, "The capacity to, I believe, to guide, to guide with a specific vision, a group, I would say." Another female participant, Ana, the wife of a senior pastor, said,

I believe that the leader is the person who serves as a guide, that, to whom you go to so that you may be helped, to give you a hand, but also allows you to walk your own path, right?

Pedro, a well-known Latin American leader, described leadership in the following way:

Leadership begins when a person feels a vision, has a vision, for example a vision of service to the community, feels the needs of the people, perceives it, captures it and then has a vision on how to accomplish it. [The leader] proposes, and if the, and if the people (pause), hum (pause) have an affinity with him, captures, the, the process of the vision of this person and makes that person the leader, and, um (pause) there is a mutual understanding. The leader looks for the masses to give a vision, and the vision provides a charisma which captures it as well.

These three Latin American leaders each share what they believe is the essence of a leader and leadership. Each one brings to light some important characteristics of what a

leader is or what he or she needs to do. Yet, how does what they say correspond with the data provided by 20 other Latin American leaders?

Preferred or Positive Latin American Leadership Elements

The 23 participants in this grounded theory study identified 133 traits and attributes which together give shape to the desirable or positive profile of a Latin American leader. These specific traits and attributes blend together to yield a profile of a Latin American leader and may be grouped into one of six major traits or attributes.

These attributes in order of coded reference frequencies are: character, vision, attention to relationships, authority, skills and abilities, and intellectual abilities.

Character

By far, the largest constellation of individual traits belonged to those in the character category (74 references). These traits refer to those which are specifically rooted in the character and personality of the individual. With the exception of the integrity trait, the traits do not necessarily imply a moral category. The traits which form the constellation of the character component of the Latin American leader's profile may be sub-grouped into four distinct subcategories: charismatic, drive, decision-maker, and integrity.

Charismatic. The primary character trait a Latin American leader should have, according to the participants of this study, is charisma. The charismatic leader is one who influences other people, is a communicator, is able to inspire others to follow, is dynamic and is a recruiter. Diego, a senior pastor and denominational leader, described the role of charisma.

It seems that in my country, one would recognize those who have charisma as successful leaders, right? It is something that people recognize in a leader as

having that element, um, that attracts, that the personality of the leader is overpowering. It seems to me that there has been much, much, much of this. Although there may be agreement on what is preferred by Latin Americans, there may not necessarily be agreement as to whether or not a charismatic leader was necessarily good. For example, Mario, a regional organizational leader who supervises Latin American ministry leaders, added this word of caution when asked how a Latin American would define leadership.

How would they define it? Not like I would, but you know, I get somebody who has a dynamic, upfront, attractive, charismatic personality. That's what I think most people look for (pause), which I don't think is correct, but, you know (pause) usually those people end up abusing people. They attract people, but they're not good leaders.

Drive. As shared by the participants, drive is that aspect of the character which pushes the leader to strive toward the completion of a goal. This includes mobilizing, motivating, commitment, consistency, and perseverance. Ricardo, an organizational leader, described this trait as, "The conviction regarding the steps which need be taken, the constancy to, to do them, and... the energy to do it many times."

Mobilization. Mobilization is that unique ability a Latin American leader needs to enlist followers to pursue a vision. Daniel, a well-known senior pastor and educator, points this out by saying, "on the other hand, he must have the ability to, to, to initiate a passionate commitment from others to follow him in seeking the vision of that preferred future." Mario saw mobilizing as an important component of the leadership process when he said, "They do have a vision or have something that they want to get accomplished so they try to mobilize people... to get that thing done."

Decision-maker. The Latin American leader was viewed by the participants as a person who must be decisive in making decisions. Being a decision maker, change agent

and one who initiates people and processes are important character traits leaders must have according to the participants. The data suggest that in the Latin American mind, a leader is viewed as one who is proactive in decision making. David, a gregarious denominational leader, when listing out the positive traits of the leader described decision making as very important.

I believe the leader should be a proactive person, in other words not passive, but rather a person who makes decisions, a person who moves ahead, let's say a type A person, that, that walks without needing to be pushed.

Integrity. Integrity, as presented by the participants, is that dimension of the character which reflects a leader's ethical and moral wholeness and completeness. As a character quality, integrity is the direct correspondence between the good one claims to possess on the inside and the external dimensions of observed behavior. Aspects of integrity mentioned by the participants include values, respect, humility, high moral standards, accountability, balance, and [moral] character. Lilia, a respected educational leader, stressed the integrity aspect of a leader's character. For Lilia, the leader "must be a person who has (pause) traits (pause) defined along the lines of morals, ethics, and must have values."

Vision and Goal Accomplishment

Although the total sum of codes comprising the character component of the Latin American leader's profile make up the largest constellation of positive leadership traits, vision as a single code was mentioned more than any other code, second only to authority. As a preferred or desirable trait for a Latin American leader, vision was mentioned 15 times. However, vision is identified 56 times total when it is linked to negative leadership traits and servant leader traits, thus making it a key leadership trait.

The nine codes associated with the vision category are: vision; guide; goal accomplishment; calling; vision is linked to a purpose; credibility-incremental change; knows where he is going; purpose is clear; and strategic thinker.

The role that vision has in the profile of a leader is easily seen by the number of times vision was mentioned by the participants. Lilia described the strategic role that vision has in effective leadership.

OK (pause) well (pause) I believe that for a citizen of my country, a leader is a person who has a vision (pause) and has clearly defined guidelines to accomplish the goals, short, medium and long-term, to accomplish that (pause) that vision that he has established (pause) and [steps which] are successful to the extent that he knows how to share with other people the steps, one at a time, that he wants to develop to reach his (pause) his goal.

José, an educational leader, adds to Lilia's stress on vision by focusing on the accomplishment of goals.

Then the leader, using the resources which God gives, such as talents, gifts, abilities, etc., utilizes, eh, specific leadership behaviors to influence the followers toward, ah, the accomplishment of goals that are mutually beneficial both for the leader as well as the follower.

Attention to Relationships

For the leaders who participated in the study, relationships were a valued element of a Latin American leader's profile. According to these leaders, a good Latin American leader places a high value on relationships; the leader serves others, demonstrates care and empathy, and empowers. The value placed on relationships is reflected in the care a leader has in guiding his or her followers to the accomplishment of a goal. Rafael, a veteran denominational leader who has held various denominational responsibilities over the years, likened the leader's relationship to followers as a life-style. He put it this way:

“Listen, leadership is a calling, a vocation, a lifestyle, to say it in a few words, a lifestyle in which a person serves others, guiding them toward a defined goal.”

However, relationships for these leaders go beyond a simple formality. As Rafael said above, it’s a way of life. This way of looking at relationships is captured vividly by Serafino, a senior pastor of a growing church, and now living in the United States. Here is how he painted a picture regarding the importance of relationships:

For them [the followers], it is very important that I go with my children and my wife to their house, or that they call me by telephone [and say], "Look, Serafino, my daughter is having a birthday, we’re going to have a cake." I go by for 10, 15 minutes, we cut the cake, we drink something refreshing. I still feel that for them, it's more important for them that I be present with them in a difficult or important moment in their life, more then, that I be in front of them every Sunday or every Wednesday. In other words, to say it in one word, in one expression, I believe that leadership for the Latin, for the Latins, is basically relational and not intellectual.

Authority

Comments regarding authority, power, and control will be shared below as these attributes are used and abused in authoritarian and controlling ways by leaders; however, the participants were very clear that authority and power are part of the Latin American leader’s profile. These traits are not necessarily negative, even though negative experiences abound. One of the interesting phrases shared by Francisco, a senior pastor and denominational executive, was the phrase *mano dura* (heavy hand). From his point of view, followers expect a leader to have a heavy hand, at least in his country. This is how he put it: “OK, for example, here in my country one of the characteristics for, for a person to be considered as a good leader is that he have a ‘heavy hand,’ (pause) yes, because that is what the people want.”

Patricia, a pastor's wife and conference speaker, recognized the need for a leader to have authority but also shared a caution as experience had taught her that quite often authority implied the potential for abuse. In her mind, the leader was one who,

Has authority, but is also humble, eh, one who treats all equally, who is just, eh, who is admirable. But, for society in general, I believe that, sadly, there are no great expectations of a leader because of the bad experiences with leaders.

It may be surprising that authority is not mentioned with greater frequency by the participants as a preferred trait of the Latin American leader given the popular caricatures of Latin American leaders as dictators and tyrants. One may speculate the reason for this is that authority (possibly viewed as positional power) is already assumed by these evangelical leaders. It will be noticed that when the subject of the negative leadership traits are discussed, authority, control, and power are discussed with more frequency as negative traits when they are exercised as authoritarian, controlling, and abuse of power.

Associated with authority is the trait labeled as "model." Modeling is considered as an authority and power trait when modeling functions as referent power. Serving as a model is a powerful leadership tool applied by Latin American leaders. Dorcas, a female educator, referred to this when she reflected, "I would say that more than anything, it [leadership] has much to do with expectations people have of the person, that the person is a model for one's life, worthy to imitate (pause) to follow."

Lilia, an educational leader, made a similar observation. She connected the role of modeling with authority.

Lilia: Ah, well, I believe that a good leader is one who, ah, may be an example, and is able, ah, to make decisions. I believe that, I believe that the issue of being a model is very important in that, in the power, in our context, right? There's always hope, or certain expectations related to what would be the characteristics of the qualities that a leader should bring together, right?

Researcher: Mm hm.

Lilia: Because people expect that the leader should be inside, within this, this model, which aren't necessarily always Biblical characteristics, right? And sometimes there are other things that, that also, ah, are added for one to see. But it's true that the leader is a model in all those distinctive areas so that the leader may have, shall we say, moral authority, right? That may, that may, ah, guide, guide people who, that the people may see in him not only all that he says, but also what he does, right? I would say that it has much to do with the expectations that the people have of that person, that is a model for one's life, worthy to imitate, right? To follow and, ah, one who is able to make decisions.

Skills and Abilities

It is not uncommon to think of leaders in terms of what they are able to do skillfully such as the leader's ability to implement decisions, practices, or policies.

Leaders may be valued in terms of how well they are able to carry out their tasks.

Although there may be overlap with those who may think of skills as managerial or administrative, Daniel felt that the citizens of his country would mention "skills" as the number one positive leadership trait.

I believe there are two, ah, two things that those in my country, the people would mention more, ah. I believe that, ah, they would understand that more in terms of, ah, the implementation of procedures, policies, ah, the establishment of, of, of rules to follow. Ah, this leads me to think a little more that the common understanding, ah, not on a corporate level but rather on a popular level and at the level of the church, it's more of a managerial attitude (pause) ah (pause). But, then, I believe that (pause) they would understand that more as implementation, applying rules and, ah, standards to follow.

Intellectual Abilities

Although not cited as frequently as other traits, abilities in the area of intellect and knowledge were also noted. According to the participants, the Latin American leader must have a grasp of social issues as well as an understanding of his or her own historical context, realize the importance that degrees have in an Anglo context, be a learner, be academically and Biblically prepared, and possess self-knowledge.

Undesirable or Negative Traits of Latin American Leaders

The data provided by the participants yielded less than half the number of total references for undesirable or negative leadership (55) when compared to the total references for preferred or positive leadership (133). There may be various explanations for this, but one reason may be that the questions in the protocol were not designed to make a quantitative comparison. Another possible reason for the greater percentage of positive traits is that the participants were chosen from a population that may naturally desire to emphasize the positive over the negative traits. A third reason may be that participants were not asked to list the negative traits of leaders; thus negative traits were mentioned less in response to the first five questions. It was not until the participants were asked regarding the opposite of servant leadership that the negative traits began to surface in greater quantities.

Negative Character Traits

The data provided by the participants yielded 55 negative or undesirable references. These traits were identified and grouped into nine distinct major categories: controlling, arrogance, power wielding, isolation, lack of authenticity, irresponsibility, self-serving, turf protecting, no empowerment, and others. It should be noted that there may be overlap among the various trait categories since determining the motivation behind a particular trait may not always be easily determined.

Controlling. Authoritarianism, as a means of control, is a pervasive negative leadership trait according to the participants. When asked to comment on the negative characteristics of a Latin American leader, the very first descriptor shared by Patricia, a conference speaker, was “authoritarian.” “Authori (pause) authoritarian, bossy, abusive

(laughter). How profess (pause) how (pause) my vocabulary, how refined! (laughter) Are you recording this?”

Authoritarianism was described by Daniel as a powerfully common element in the Latin American society. He described authoritarianism this way:

A person who monopolizes, accumulates all, eh, the authority, all the power, all the presence, ah, visibility, all the prestige, is, is a very strong tendency (pause). And, authoritarian in the sense that this idea of service does not exist. To the contrary, it's a powerful devotion to the personality; it's a propensity [to think] that I am the important man and all others should follow me, should listen to me, should obey me, and this word is what is used quite often.

Francisco echoed Daniel's perception and pointed out its consequences when he says, "...because of the excess of control, pastoral ministry is not developed well.”

Arrogance. The specific category of arrogance is composed primarily of the following five specific traits, attributes or activities: pride, self centeredness or self-serving, *protagonismo*, jealousy, and recognition. *Protagonismo* is a word that describes the desire of the leader (or any other person) who wants to place oneself in center stage.

As a negative character trait, pride was mentioned or implied in 14 separate references by eight participants. As a negative leadership trait, pride does not tolerate rivals who undermine a leader's superior position. Daniel brought this to the forefront as he described how this was seen in his country.

I believe it would be good to discover some models in my country so we can say, "well, there is a good one." But, clearly one of the problems is that when one highlights the name of a person, of a person by first and last name, that is something that many do not like. Because, if this person is a model, then where do I stand? And they do not like that there be models that are not they themselves.

The second major negative trait reflecting the “arrogance” complex of negative leadership is a “self-serving” attitude. Manuel, another insightful leader, described this

attitude trait as one that influences both Evangelicals and non-Evangelicals. When asked about the opposite of servant leadership, Manuel responded in the following exchanges.

Manuel: The opposite would be, the, leadership which becomes lordship, right? A lordship, in which, instead of humility and love there is egoism. That would be the opposite.

Researcher: Um hm.

Manuel: Serving myself.

Researcher: Hm.

Manuel: And not serving the Lord nor my brothers, right?

Researcher: Uh hm.

Manuel: Like the politicians say, “Be served by the people and not serve the people!”

Latin Americans use the word *protagonismo*, similar to the English word, protagonist, in a negative sense to describe a leader’s striving or desire to have the main role or play the most significant part in an activity or position. The negative trait of *protagonismo* may be included in this negative character set. Senior pastor Esteban, who also has a leadership position in a non-evangelical occupation, described a constellation of related terms which included *protagonismo*, particularly as it related to negative leadership in particular evangelical churches.

But I also think that there are other factors (pause). There is com, competition, and the competition at times in the churches where it exists; there is also much *protagonismo*, and there are other people who want to be protagonists. There is also envy; there is also favoritism, right?

Jealousy and recognition are mentioned together as negative character traits even though they are separate codes in the coding process. Mario brings the two traits together implicitly when he refers to people, “A lot of people don’t have satisfaction in watching

other people be successful.” Dorcas also linked recognition with a negative trait in the following way, “...one who seizes on his status of power and considers leadership as power, right? And then that gives him certain, certain prestige, certain recognition.”

Power Wielding: Caciques and Caudillos. Diego made reference to a power-wielding leadership style applied by those known in Latin America as *caciques* or *caudillos*. Although the terms are not entirely synonymous, quite often they are used interchangeably in normal conversation. Both have historical roots dating back to the Spanish conquest. Diego defined the term in the following passage:

I would say that the cultural model I referred to a moment ago is the *cacique*, right? [The *cacique* is] one who takes a, a position and defends his position and does not allow that others, that others, eh, take his, take a place, a function that he, that he defends. Then, I would say that is the other, the other extreme. One who does not allow others (pause), and they may have a cause, but ultimately what they desire is, is to be served and not to serve.

The *cacique* leadership style is usually used to refer to leadership in a pejorative sense. José offered the following insight:

José: Look, there you will have to enter into the various aspects of leadership which culturally are sickly, right?

Researcher: Uh huh.

José: For example, the leader, the, the, the *cacique*.

Mario described the pervasiveness of this negative Latin American leadership style.

Ah, you know, basically we are very selfish. Leadership is equated in Latin America with power, with yelling, with a (pause), control, with having more (pause) with being recognized, with (pause) you know, all those things. So, people want that. You know, the *caudillo* model. You want to be the chief of the clan. You want to be the Indian chief; you want to be the politician who gets rich and has all the other stuff that you cannot otherwise. (Pause) You know?

Isolation: Lonely/Separatist

Although the data received from the participants did not reveal the reasons as to why isolation was a negative trait, it was presented as not being positive. Further probing may have revealed this trait as a consequence rather than a core trait. However, the data suggested it should be included in the list of negative traits. Francisco described this in the following way:

Francisco: Me, I have friendships and I love to play soccer, and I have rum with cola (pause), but I maintain my level of friendships very superficially. I do not go into depth, in which I could say to you, "Listen Keith, you know what? I'm having problems with (pause) alcohol. I have the tendency that when I get depressed I look for liquor."

Researcher: Um hm.

Francisco: Then, in that aspect, is when he [the leader] is vulnerable and logically, because he has no feedback from other people; it is very difficult.

Lack of Authenticity

Lack of authenticity was another negative trait mentioned by the participants.

Jorge compared hypocritical leaders to the Pharisees of the New Testament. "They justify themselves and live deceitfully. They tell others to do something and then they do just the opposite, like the Pharisees..."

Irresponsibility and Abandoning a Sense of Service

Abandoning one's sense of service could be viewed as a consequence of allowing the above-mentioned traits consume the leader, thus influencing the leader to no longer serve the followers. Lucas, a senior pastor now living in the United States, described pastors who, arriving at a certain level of prestige, no longer viewed themselves as serving their people.

When they [leaders] arrive at the apex of leadership, something is totally lost, and one moves on to another perspective, another plane, another mentality (pause). I no longer get up to serve [someone else] a glass of water, because now a glass of water must be brought to me.

Self-serving

The participants also saw a negative dimension in leadership among those who were self-serving as leaders. Pedro shared his awareness of leaders who benefited themselves at the expense of the people: “Very rarely, very rarely do I see leaders who are servants. Rather, I see leaders who benefit from, from, from the masses in order to live better, to have treasures, to have possessions.”

Mario viewed self-serving leaders as manipulators of people, charismatic leaders who are negative in their leadership styles and only use their charismatic abilities for self-serving purposes: “Yeah, they attract them, but they manipulate them. But usually they just want to use people as (pause) pawns and to be able to get objectives accomplished for themselves.”

Turf Protector

Another common negative trait mentioned in the context of character issues is that of a turf protector. Turf protecting occurs, according to the participants, when a leader has arrived at a point at which he or she now has a personal “kingdom” to protect and will defend it at all costs. Patricia explained it this way.

Once again, in our context, it is costly (pause), because we don't trust, because we don't want someone else to rob us of the position that cost me so much to arrive at so that he may be the same as me.

No Empowerment

It follows logically that if a leader is authoritarian, controlling and engaged in protecting his or her “turf,” then the leader will not show interest in empowering his or

her followers since empowering, by definition, suggests relinquishing a certain amount of control a leader has over followers. It also shows up in the leader's disinterest in gifting his or her organization with a legacy of new leaders. Diego gave the following explanation.

I have lived this myself because I have planted the church, and we have, and we are going through a time where, we want to leave the church in the hands of others, and have others assume more of the (pause), not only that they share or fulfill certain functions of leadership, but begin sharing the burden of ministry, and that ideally from among them will emerge, emerge another leader who will ultimately, and this is something difficult I believe, but that, but that ultimately will be capable of substituting or take the place of the pastor or leader that initiated the work right? That is something that I see among Latinos and Latin Americans; that at times they do not have on their horizon: work in a way that ultimately develops a leader who, ah, will carry on the functions and be the reliever, right? At times I do not, I do not, I do not see clearly in our culture that we work for that, right? I see that in our cultural models, political models, we tend toward a dictatorship; in other words, there are leaders who want to perpetuate themselves, right? And you know, there are limits, but, if they were able, they would remove those limits to continue perpetuating themselves.

Intellect, Vision, Skills, and Relationships

Other negative characteristics mentioned by the participants were less frequently noted. These characteristics may be grouped in one of the following four areas: lack of intellectual preparation, lack of vision, skills deficiencies, and negative leader-follower relationships. Because most of these particular characteristics were mentioned in response to questions concerning the barriers to effective servant leadership than in the discussion on general leadership characteristics, the discussion regarding these particular areas will be addressed in that section.

Summary Description of a Profile of a Latin American Leader

According to the responses of the participants of this study, a Latin American leader has various admirable characteristics which equip the leader to be effective in his

or her cultural context. A Latin American leader's profile brings together six major positive or desirable traits or attributes: character, vision, attention to relationships, authority, skills and abilities, and intellectual abilities. Along with the positive characteristics, the participants identified negative characteristics which were grouped into nine named categories: controlling, arrogance, power wielding, isolationism, lack of authenticity, irresponsibility, self-serving, turf protecting, and no empowerment.

Additional Traits and Attributes from an Evangelical Perspective

In reviewing Robert Greenleaf's (1991) definition of servant leadership, José pointed out that there was no reference to God as the one who energizes the leader to serve. Greenleaf's definition, though it could be interpreted as having a spiritual focus, does not necessarily imply anything outside the leader as being the cause behind the desire to serve. Greenleaf simply stated that servant leadership "begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first" (p. 13), leaving the divine dimension out of the definition and calling it a "natural feeling."

The evangelical participants in the study viewed God as the prime mover energizing the serving leadership a leader gives. This element came out very clearly in the divine dimension the participants (who were all Evangelicals) added to the positive dimensions of Latin American leadership. The participants in the study added two categories to positive leadership traits: relationship to God and the role of Scripture.

Categories Indicating Positive or Desirable Characteristics
of an Evangelical Latin American Leader

An analysis of the data showed that the participants added two characteristics to the list of positive or desirable traits of a Latin American leader. These two characteristics are the leader's relationship to God and the role of Scripture.

The Leader's Relationship to God

Evangelical leaders would applaud Greenleaf's emphasis on the servant leader as a steward, one who is not an owner but an administrator of the vision. Lilia explained her perspective on this.

Leadership (pause), leadership is assuming (pause), the responsibility for carrying out a project that God has committed, one which should be transmitted to other people (pause) in such a way that they will accompany him, so that they, all together, will achieve the goal and once having achieved the goal, the (pause), the leader will help all to feel that they are of equal importance to him in achieving the objective that was being sought and that the only glory and the only, the only person who should be exalted is the Lord, because we are no more than instruments in the service and the hands of God.

The emphasis on the leader's relationship to God could be clearly seen as participants viewed the leader as a servant of God who follows the leadership style of Jesus. Jorge commented on the serving leader as one who serves God. He said, "A good leader is distinguished when he knows who he serves. In the case of a Biblical leader, (pause) he is leader and servant of God first and of his Lord." Regarding the evangelical leader's need to follow the example of Jesus, Lilia was insistent on this point when she unequivocally declared, "It is a model we should imitate, and it is the only model we are to imitate." Carlos strengthened these two thoughts by bringing them together as he discussed how Jesus followed the example of His Father as He depended on His heavenly Father.

It is even more complete, and because He [Jesus] takes his leadership from a superior law and a superior authority, superior meaning the father, God the father, they are the same. He said it at various times, “I do not speak on my own. Rather, I speak what the father has told me to speak.” Do you understand?

The Role of Scripture

The second emphasis added by Evangelicals to the positive characteristics of Latin American evangelical leaders is the role Scripture (the Bible) plays in the life of the leader. According to the participants, an evangelical leader should obey Scripture. José referred to Scripture as a “plumb line” using the metaphor as a comparative analysis tool describing Scripture as a standard by which all things are measured, thus making it a “plumb line” for life.

In other words, if you don't have a standard, if you don't have a, a plumb line like a bricklayer, right, a plumb line, if you don't have something that you know is the standard, then you cannot treat, you cannot detect that your attitude is, is, is not theologically consistent.

Jorge also insisted on the value of following scriptural principles.

I also believe that among the components that are shared, there should be clarity on the responsibility of what one does in his specific vision, but of course, these components are important, but one should first be tightly connected to the word of God above anything else.

Categories Indicating Negative or Undesirable Characteristics of an Evangelical Latin American Leader

It will be seen below that there is considerable overlap between the negative or undesirable characteristics of Latin American leader and the barriers which impede a Latin American evangelical leader from effectively implementing servant leadership in his or her organization. Therefore, the treatment of these characteristics in this section will be brief and summative.

It is unfortunate that evangelical leaders are not immune to issues which undermine evangelical leadership. Along with all the other negative traits experienced by non-evangelical leaders, there is also added to it the need to measure up to the “plumb line” mentioned by José above. Carlos offered a brief snapshot of the problem within the ranks of evangelical leaders when a leader does not follow the Biblical standards.

We see sometimes that he works for his own agenda and amasses power and fortune, which is how we are seeing it today (pause). The leadership in Latin America has followed a model which is not Biblical, a model (pause) of people with Rolex watches, people with Mercedes-Benz cars, people constructing buildings and finding fortunes, even here in my city and in Latin America.

The negative or undesirable characteristics of an evangelical leader, as mentioned by the participants, may be grouped into three basic categories: not following Biblical principles, following unbiblical models or categories, and spiritual issues.

Not Following Biblical Principles

Even though Evangelicals affirm the Bible as their rule of faith, it is not necessarily a faith consistently put into practice. In response to the question of how Jesus’ principle of servant leadership is practiced in evangelical churches, Jorge, with a concerned look on his face replied softly, “Sometimes it’s not practiced.”

Following Unbiblical Models or Categories

Added to the fact that at times Biblical servant leadership is not practiced, participants believed that leaders fall prey to the temptation of following unbiblical categories. In the words of Esteban, this was a big issue. He described certain evangelical leaders in the following way. “[They] seek other interests, fame, a good reputation, ah, ah, perpetuate themselves, perpetuate themselves in power, right, dishonest gains, and other things, right? These things have nothing to do with the gospel of Christ, right?”

Spiritual Issues

The third group of undesirable or negative traits that participants gave was that of spiritual issues that inflict evangelical leaders. Spiritual issues, from the participants' point of view, refer to matters of the heart as those matters are placed in the context of what the God of Scripture requires. It is a recognition of the tension between good and evil in which mankind finds itself and the conviction held by the evangelical participants that God has something to say about the tension and what should be done about it. When the evil proclivities of human nature get the best of the leader, then the heart is affected. Serafino viewed this negative condition of an evangelical leader as a disease and gave three examples, one of which is mentioned here.

One of the sicknesses is, one I already mentioned earlier, believing oneself to be indispensable, believing oneself to be needed, believing oneself to be the man of God in every circumstance experienced by the members and by the families of the members. This is a terrible sickness, the sickness of seeing oneself as indispensable, the man of God indispensable as a solution for all the problems of the whole world.

Latin American evangelical leaders are not immune to the problems that face leaders of many other faiths and beliefs. The leaders who participated in this study were able to identify three centers of attention which they feel are responsible for negative or undesirable leadership traits among evangelical leaders in Latin America: not following Biblical principles, following unbiblical models or categories, and spiritual issues. The participants also identified two positive resources for Evangelicals as they acknowledged the role Scripture plays in the life of evangelical leaders and the exercise of leadership under the guidance and direction of God.

The Evidence for and the Practice of Servant Leadership
in Latin American Evangelical Organizations

Though servant leadership as a Biblical model has been practiced since Biblical times, the academic study of servant leadership begins in earnest with the writings of Robert Greenleaf (1977). This researcher proceeded on the assumption that the participants had little or no knowledge of the study of servant leadership. Thus, the participants were asked to read statements presenting servant leadership based on both secular and Biblical principles. As already discussed, servant leadership, as presented in leadership studies, does not draw an automatic connection between the leader and service rendered on behalf of the will of God. Those connections are left up to the evangelical leader as he or she reads through the literature on servant leadership.

The data provided by the participants regarding servant leadership leaned heavily on what they knew from the Bible and less (or possibly not at all) from servant leadership studies. There were two exceptions: two participants, both educators, were knowledgeable from an academic standpoint regarding servant leadership studies. It is quite possible that for some of the participants, the reading of the servant leader statements (Appendix B) was the first time any of them had encountered the notion of servant leadership from a non-Biblical perspective. For example, Rafael, a denominational leader, after reading Greenleaf's definition of servant leadership, stated the following:

Now the question, "do those who are being served grow as persons?" appears to be a very serious question, which, at this moment, is jolting me regarding ministry, because I don't know. I don't know if I could answer 100 percent in the affirmative, in good conscience, that the persons I am serving are becoming more healthy, because I have not placed myself in a position to examine the results of [my] leadership. I just take it for granted and I have not analyzed it. It seems

logical, it seems logical, and reasoning now, that one, the best test of leadership, is that those who are being served are growing and that they have, and that they arrive at possessing those qualities, but I confess, this definition takes me by surprise.

It would not be illogical to think that other participants may have felt the same way even if they did not express those thoughts to the researcher.

The Presence of Servant Leadership

After reading the definitions, the researcher asked the participants if they knew of any leaders in their immediate contexts who practiced servant leadership. The participants responded in one of three ways: servant leaders do exist; servant leaders do not exist; or, servant leaders do exist, but there are very few of them.

Servant leaders do exist. Dorcas was quite positive in her response as she reflected on a leader in her circle.

But yes, I have known many people who (pause), that, that have understood, right, that, that he is a servant leader and is there to serve and that his life has been just that and is not trying to defend anything. He has simply been, has been a servant. Manuel, knew many servant leaders in his context, at least in his earlier years.

Yes I have known some leaders. I began in ministry when I was 21 years old, very young. At that time I had the opportunity to get to know here in my country some leaders who truly reflected greatly the spirit of the leadership of Jesus (pause); they gave me an example of what it meant to be a leader (pause) Christian. Those are the ones I first knew in my youth.

Servant leaders do not exist. At the other end of the spectrum there were those who did not know of any servant leaders in their contexts. Two participants gave surprising responses when asked about servant leaders. When Ana was asked how servant leadership was practiced in the evangelical contexts she knew, she broke out in laughter and exclaimed, “Oh God!” Lucas’s response was more subdued, but also disheartening.

Lucas: Well, if I answer, eh, to give you can answer just to please you I would have to lie.

Researcher: Please don't (laughter)

Lucas: I don't want to lie.

Researcher: Um hm. Thank you.

Lucas: Um (pause), I do not see much the quality of a servant among the leaders.

Servant leaders do exist, but there are very few. Other participants were more optimistic about servant leaders and servant leadership practice in evangelical organizations while at the same time recognizing the lack of servant leaders. This was by far the largest category of responses to the question (10 participants). Francisco reflects this view.

Researcher: Are there good examples of good servant leaders in your country?

Francisco: Good examples of servant leaders? Yes.

Researcher: There are?

Francisco: Yes, just like there are of the other kind, there are these as well. But, you know what? They are very scarce Keith, very scarce.

Bernardo hypothesized that the lack of more evidence for servant leadership was due to the fact that so many servant leaders are “anonymous.” Pablo suggested that in order to find servant leaders, one must look beneath appearances.

David's response to the question summarizes the feelings and opinions of this large group of participants. He mused,

Yes, I do know them, but they appear to me to be the least recognized. In other words, I do know people who fulfill this. I know pastors, I know leaders in churches, and I know people who do not even have an organizational title, but they fulfill this function. But it appears to me that they are in the minority, and are the least recognized, and sometimes I think that someday they will be at the front of those who will receive recognition. But, yes there are, in other words, there are

and one sees them, automatically; in other words, eh, it is something that one sees automatically in them, people willing to go beyond what is required.

Six participants gave an insightful explanation as to why there was so little evidence of servant leadership in evangelical Latin American organizations. Carlos summarized this perspective when he observed,

Of course, the majority. Look, here I have to say something to you; the majority are good leaders but they are anonymous, because they do not have the money to appear on television or radio. They are working constantly with indigenous peoples, translating their languages, doing Christian works of compassion, starting churches, working in the jungles.

Carlos went on to say,

They do not seek to appear in magazines. Eh, they do their work and some who are prudent fear publicity, because publicity brings difficulties and encourages personal vanity. Therefore, they prefer to continue working humbly, fulfilling their mission in the best way they are able.

Ana, in spite of her laughter as her first response to the question, after regaining her composure, observed that there were in fact servant leaders in her context, but that more were needed (this opinion was also shared by another participant).

Ana: Well, undoubtedly yes, undoubtedly there are, yes there are.

Researcher: Uh hm.

Ana: Yes there are.

Researcher: OK.

Ana: I believe that there are people who, who are leaders because they are showing their service, and, this service in which they are leading and are devoted to the Lord.

Researcher: Uh hm.

Ana: So, yes, I believe there are people (like that). Now (pause) I believe we need more.

Participant Observations on Servant Leadership in Latin American Contexts

How did the participants view servant leadership within their Latin American contexts? Although this was not a direct question addressed to the participants, the data revealed three significant observations made by the participants: servant leaders are servants of God (they serve under a higher authority), servant leadership is a mindset issue, and servant leadership is a stewardship issue.

Servant leaders are servants of God. The notion of servant leaders being servants of God (or serving under a higher authority) was highly referenced by over half of the participants. Bernardo summarized this in the following way:

Uh (pause) a good leader is one who (pause) maintains two key contact points. A good leader is one who maintains a key connection with God, to know what direction in which to go, and a key connection with the people, to also hear the people, see their needs, and be able to lead them toward the place where God wants those people to go.

The concept that the servant leader is a servant of God was a fundamental identity issue for Esteban. The concept of “leader” is one that he resisted.

Yes (pause), yes, I have to tell you, ah, (pause), that (pause) I (pause) well, I'm going to tell you (pause). First, I'm not very much in agreement with, with the term “leader.” I am not in agreement with the term “leadership,” nor “leader.” In what sense am I not in agreement? In the sense that it has carried with it a concept which is very executive, very humanistic, very corporate. In that sense I am not in agreement. I have to accept that because of the social context in which we live, well there are, one has to use that term, but I would stay always with, with the term “servant of God.” For me, the leader, the Christian, should be a servant of God, at the service of God and of the people, for whom Jesus shed his love.

Servant leadership is a mindset issue. The second contribution made by the participants regarding servant leadership in Latin America is that servant leadership is a mindset issue. Referring to servant leadership in his country and after reading statements on servant leadership from question five, José said,

I would say that normally it is not practiced. And is not practiced because people need to understand that servant leadership, as I believe we read somewhere, it is not (pause); it is first an attitude of the heart, which gets translated as a thought, which is translated into an action, OK?

Ricardo's comment supported this.

Eh (pause) something else that draws my attention is that the leadership of a servant leader has more to do with what one thinks than with the style of leadership, because it is true that the style can be done in any way. Nevertheless I believe that it is the attitude that counts, an attitude of service, an attitude of service, of concerning oneself for those, for those followers, for the group which, the group which one is guiding and directing.

Servant leadership is a stewardship issue. The third notion shared by a significant group of participants was that of stewardship. Four participants viewed stewardship as Greenleaf (and Scripture) would present it. For the researcher, it was surprising that stewardship was not mentioned more explicitly, even though stewardship as a concept was implicit in many of the statements. Stewardship was certainly not absent from the thoughts of the participants. It comes through quite clearly in the statements made by Jorge when he said, "But I believe that, that what God has given us does not belong to us, it is for the church, it is for the church."

Difficulties Emerging from the Concept of Servant Leadership

The negative aspects or difficulties the participants had with the concept of servant leadership, other than those discussed above, will be treated in the next section under barriers. Thus, to avoid overlap, the discussion will be treated there rather than in this section.

Servant Leadership as an Option

Did the participants view servant leadership as a viable option for evangelical leaders in Latin American organizations? Although that question was not posed directly,

it is quite clear from the data that servant leadership was more than just an option. When the participants were asked to respond to make any comments they desired regarding the reading of the definitions of servant leadership, their responses were indicative of how they not only agreed with the servant leadership framework, but also with the need to be a servant leader. Consider Pedro's response after completing the reading of the definitions:

Look, I share that completely. I believe that the concept of servant leader coincides greatly with my own thought. And the, the nine points that the author posits of Biblical servant leadership, eh, I share all of them. Very good. They are well done.

Jorge did not see any difficulty whether or not one is to serve as a servant leader.

OK, well, for me, I am pleased with the definition from the perspective, yes, from a human perspective. It appears to be an interesting attitude because it seeks to serve others before serving oneself. But one thing that I believe brings healing and balance in our case, for those of us who are believers, is that first we serve Christ before we serve man having a healthy attitude, not pompous. God always will invite us to serve man, because it was the example of Christ, but knowing that we first serve God, because sometimes we try to please others as it says in the text, and we can abandon pleasing the Lord.

Servant leadership was not viewed as merely a viable option. With reference to the model of leadership presented by Christ (included in the definitions read by each participant), Pablo made the following significant comment:

No definition will embrace such a broad and complex concept, which is sometimes misused, like the one we all have such as leadership, being a leader. Ah, I have no criticism of the definition given by Jesus (pause), and accept it as wise, as wise without even examining it (pause), of course I examine it to apply it.

It may be likely that many, if not all of the participants would have supported Pablo's statements.

The Barriers Which Impede the Effective Implementation of Servant Leadership in Latin American Evangelical Organizations

Introduction

Barriers to the effective implantation of servant leadership in Latin American evangelical organizations were identified as participants responded directly to the question (number 9) requesting the identification of obstacles to servant leadership in evangelical organizations. There is no intention of identifying which barriers are considered serious or great threats to servant leadership nor was that question asked. Even the number of times a certain obstacle or barrier was cited is not necessarily a trustworthy indication of which barriers are the greatest threats to servant leadership. This study only attempts to explore those barriers which emerged to identify them. Other studies will be proposed later to determine the relative values, significance, importance and related aspects of each barrier. This study will not examine in detail each one of the barriers since each barrier deserves its own dissertation study. The researcher will present evidence from the coded interviews which led to the discovery and theoretical identity of the perceived barrier. Thus, the researcher will not go into more detail than is necessary to illustrate the barrier from the participants' own words.

A major barrier category was defined as an identifiable set of codes which could be easily associated with a major barrier theme. The findings (theories grounded in the data shared by the participants) revealed ten identifiable major barriers to the effective implementation of servant leadership in Latin American evangelical organizations. The ten major barriers which emerged from the study were in the following areas: a leader's negative character traits; the presence of specific sociocultural elements; family

upbringing; issues specific to women in leadership; disobedience to Scriptural teaching; spirituality issues; servant leader terminology and practice; deficient academic and intellectual preparation; a lack of vision; and, certain behaviors of followers.

Major Barrier One: Perceived Barriers Grounded in Specific Negative Character Traits of Man

As mentioned above, character refers to those traits which are specifically rooted in the character and personality of the individual without implying any religious categories. It was evident by the overwhelming number of negative codes related to character (97), that the participants placed great importance on the character dimension of leaders.

Character, for the participants, has significant influence affecting the relationship between the leader and his or her followers. A lack of character has a negative influence on developing and preserving relationships, as may be seen in Jorge's comments:

In my personal life, I have people around me who have great knowledge, but I don't trust them because of their character. They have not shown trustworthiness, they have not shown strength, firmness, stability, and at a time when they are in a trial, they break, they come apart and that, I don't want to follow someone like that, but I prefer someone who may not know as much, but I can see that the heart is transparent, is sincere, is honest, is whole, makes mistakes and recognizes it, asks for forgiveness. So, that is what I expect of a leader, not that the leader be perfect, but that the leader be trustworthy.

For Esteban, what distinguished a good leader is the leader's character. For Diego, one can not separate a leader's God-given vision from the leader's character. Thus, character was viewed as foundational to leadership. Diego explained this when he said, "This is very important: the vision of the leader is given by God and this is not separated from the character of, of the leader."

The categories that integrated the character barriers emanated from various sources in the leader's character set of traits. There was no suggestion on the part of the participants that all sources of the components of the barrier needed to be present in order for the barrier to be significant since each one of the sources was considered a barrier. The participants identified six primary barriers related to a leader's character which could significantly impede a leader's effective implementation of servant leadership in a Latin American evangelical organization. These six character barriers are: a desire to control and a hunger for power; egocentrism; the abuse of authority and power; lack of authenticity of the leader; irresponsibility; and no desire or inclination to empower followers.

The desire to control and a hunger for power as a character barrier. The desire to control and a hunger for power are linked together as a significant barrier to the effective implementation of servant leadership among evangelicals in Latin American organizations. Of the 97 coded references for barriers which are related to character issues, 31 are associated with this network of barrier codes. It is not difficult to sense how these two forces would be opposed to servant leadership.

Jorge saw the desire for control as a desire which emanated from motives of the heart.

It is even more difficult when it is a problem of motivation or the intention of the heart, and I believe that the attitude of the heart is important, the ability to use, serve, but not force. I believe this is something quite problematic; man always wants to control and manipulate.

Francisco agreed with the desire to control as coming from inside man. He linked the desire for power as the result of worries over insecurities.

Francisco: Then, because of excessive control, there is no healthy development of pastoral ministry. Then, no, that is how they control everything, that is how people are controlled that is how everything is controlled... one of the obstacles is just that, the desire for power as result of worries over insecurities.

Researcher: Uh huh.

Francisco: And I believe they do not see obedience as voluntary but rather required.

Researcher: Eh, I'm not sure I understand that, Francisco. Eh, the obedience...

Francisco: Yes, yes, in other words, there is something (pause). Use this word, control.

Of special interest in this category are *caciquismo* and *caudillismo*, which were discussed above as negative character traits of Latin American leaders. These two cultural traits rooted in character are also highly connected to authoritarianism (discussed below). Five participants (nearly 25% of the total) saw these two leadership styles as significant barriers to servant leadership. Of all the participants, Diego was the most insightful regarding the difficulties these two leadership styles present for servant leadership. When asked about barriers, Diego mentioned the model of the *cacique* in the following response:

Yes, even as you mention here, maybe it's cited, no? Speaking maybe of a model, or of a cultural model that there was at that time, speaking of tyrants, and I would say the cultural model to which I referred a little bit ago is that of the *cacique* no? The one who takes a, a position and he finds his position and does not allow others, that others, take a place or a function that he defends.

Egocentrism as a character barrier. The second largest group of barrier codes associated with character were those grouped around the theme of egocentrism. Eighteen out of 97 references associated with character were found in this group. The group is composed of the following codes: competition, pride, jealousy, not wanting feedback, individualistic, self-serving and *protagonismo*.

Ricardo referred to egocentrism as an innate part of man. "Um, in other words, it is, um, I would say innate egocentrism. Eh, first I think of myself, eh, and then if there's time, I think of someone else."

Carlos explained how subtle pride can be as it creeps into the life of an evangelical leader.

You know that a gift pushed to an extreme is converted into a weakness. Then, for example, a person who is a good orator, is persuasive, arrives at a point in which if he is not subject to the Holy Spirit he can go off base, he seeks his own glory, right?

Although desiring to be the best is not necessarily a barrier, when that desire is linked to an egocentric character trait, then servant leadership becomes difficult. Patricia shared how competition can be detrimental.

Patricia: Another obstacle could be that, competition. How it has cost (pause) because we are a people, putting myself in the context of my country, ah, and I believe that many Christian organizations, how it is cost us to arrive at what we now have, where we now are, then there is much competition, right? Who has the most members? Or, who has the (pause) the (pause) what? (pause) the biggest instruments? Or, the choir? Whatever.

Researcher: Yes.

Patricia: There is a great, a great sense of competition.

Another contributor to this significant character barrier in this category is *protagonismo* (nine references). As shared by Diego and Esteban, *protagonismo* is understood in the leadership context as the attempt to seize the spotlight for oneself. This negative leadership desire is pervasive in some contexts as Esteban describes, "There is much *protagonismo*. There are many people who want to be the protagonists. There are also envies; there are also favoritisms, right?"

The improper exercise of authority and power as character barriers. As a leadership term, authority was referred to by the participants more than any other term (76 references to authority). At first glance, it would seem surprising that authority was not viewed by the participants as a significant barrier to servant leadership. However, the data suggest the barrier issue is not with the authority of the leader but rather the improper exercise of authority. This would indicate that authority was viewed by the participants more in neutral terms than negative terms, possibly because of the relationship between authority and legitimate power. However, the barrier would present itself when authority is exercised improperly. José observed the following.

So that is, that is, you can learn leadership by means of a healthy model of authority or you can learn a toxic leadership by means of an unhealthy model of authority. And that is not just in my country. That is anywhere in the world, right?

Daniel “protected” the notion of authority by making a distinction between authority and power.

First of all, I would strongly emphasize power instead of the authority of a person (pause). The emphasis on power quite often comes with the position, the title, the leader's salary. However, the emphasis on authority does not come from the position but from a calling of God; it comes with the commissioning; it comes from the vision of God.

Jorge also distinguished between legitimate authority and the barriers created by authoritarianism.

[A good leader is] one who is focused on what he wants, and who, who uses all the necessary resources on behalf of reaching that objective without using nor abusing the authority nor force, because there are people who confuse authority with authoritarianism and as a result unhealthy leadership styles materialize.

Lack of authenticity as a character barrier. The lack of authenticity was revealed by the participants as a significant barrier to servant leadership. This barrier group was integrated by people pleasing, no vulnerability, lack of feedback, and loneliness.

Authenticity and transparency are necessary components of servant leadership; thus, deficiencies in these areas would create barriers for servant leaders.

There may be many reasons as to why evangelical leaders experience loneliness, but as Francisco pointed out, some of this may be intentional. He shared that a pastor, “Experiences loneliness by choice. The pastor is very alone.” Although solitude is certainly needed by leaders, it does have the potential of creating the image that a pastor as invulnerable, thus blocking the need for authenticity. That may be why Francisco pointed out, “Then to be a servant leader, one must develop vulnerability.”

If there is a perception that authenticity is enhanced by feedback, then lack of feedback would contribute to blocking authenticity. Francisco was also clear on the need for feedback received by servant leaders as it related to a lack of transparency with followers. In a very personal exchange during the interview, he shared the following hypothetical situation (also mentioned above).

Francisco: Me, I have friendships and I love to play soccer, and I have rum with cola... but I maintain my level of friendships very superficially. I do not go into depth, in which I could say to you, "Listen Keith you know what? I'm having problems with... alcohol. I have a tendency that when I get depressed I look for liquor.

Researcher: Um hm.

Francisco: Then, in that aspect, is when he [the leader] is vulnerable and logically, because he has no feedback from other people, it is very difficult.

A lack of authenticity with followers may lead an evangelical leader to fall into the trap of doing ministry only to please people. Manuel wisely pointed this out. “The leader can fall into temptation and preach and teach to please people. The apostle Paul says that he did not preach to please men; he preached to please God.”

As may be the case with other contributing factors to the barriers, this factor (pleasing people) has the potential of leading people to imitate unhealthy models. Manuel explained it this way,

They see that their church does not grow by thousands and thousands of believers as in other churches. Then comes the temptation to imitate, imitate those other churches as to the kind of message that is preached and especially the kind of liturgy that is practiced.

Irresponsibility as a character barrier. The participants astutely revealed a character barrier which may be surprising in its identity: irresponsibility as a character barrier. As described by the participants, irresponsibility was presented as the conscious or unconscious refusal to function as a servant leader. This member of the character barrier group is integrated by codes such as abandoning a sense of service, abdicating responsibilities, letting others do it, and complacency.

Jorge described this contributing element in the following way:

One of the things that I believe is a characteristic of the church, of a leader, is that we should be energetic. I have always seen, God looks for people who work, not vagabonds, for he says "Be strong and courageous." He wants us to fight for what He has given us. So, there is no warrior spirit, a proper warrior, a healthy warrior, and I believe that we must fight every day, even with criteria that comes at every moment. We have to see what is coming and know how to evaluate it in order to decide what should be accepted and what should be rejected. There is a mental laziness, there is, like a lethargy.

Lucas, sharing as a senior pastor, painfully described the abandonment of service as a regrettable fact. "At least in my experience, in all the years that I've had, uh, uh, in the gospel, I see that there is, when one arrives at the high position of leadership, the aspect of service is enormously lost."

Pablo, in a summary statement on servant leadership, gave the following explanation:

I believe that in our culture, uh, both natural and Latin American, we tend to, uh, evade our leadership responsibilities, uh, the most difficult ones, which are the nearest to us, to go to those which are easier, but more distant.

No desire or inclination to empower as a character barrier. The lack of empowerment is understood as a character issue because of the potential motives behind the withholding of power from followers. Four participants viewed this as a barrier. Mario commented on how the selfish desire (a character issue) affects empowerment.

You know, they do get things done. Now what they get done sometimes is very selfish. It's not the common good or it's not something that empowers (pause) and (pause) equips and (pause) motivates others. It's just something that they want to get done.

In the realm of evangelical leadership, Serafino, by means of a hypothetical conversation, showed how lack of empowerment is connected to character issues and, thus, is a character barrier.

Here you all must obey me because I am the man of God. No one has the right to question what comes from heaven and what I am saying here comes from heaven. And because God has spoken to me, you must obey me by faith, because that's the way it is, it is from God." For me, that is a ministry sickness because you take away the opportunity for other human beings, who also have the Holy Spirit, to enhance, to share, to nurture an idea, to enrich an idea because you have the disease that you are the man of God and what you do this right.

Major Barrier Two: Sociocultural Elements

A second major barrier category is one integrated by specific sociocultural issues. Sociocultural issues are those issues which the participants directly linked to the culture inherited from Spain or to the unique dimensions or characteristics of the Latin American culture. The sociocultural barriers are elements described by the participants as those which have either influenced or penetrated the evangelical church. For Pablo, this is more than just a problem in Latin America. It is something faced by Christians in a much larger context as well.

There are many other customs which throughout all of history, pagan customs, barbaric, which have been applied in all societies which Christianity must replace and redeemed with the noble idea of the human being, the reflection of God, the image and likeness of God....

It is worthy to note that over half the participants (12) noted cultural issues in general as a barrier to servant leadership. This number increases when the participants discuss specific factors. The six sociocultural barriers are: economic hardship; corporate or imported models; the influence of the state church on Evangelicals; elements of the Spanish and indigenous cultures; social class issues; and, political models.

Economic hardship as a sociocultural barrier. Nearly one out of five (17%) participants mentioned economic hardship as a barrier to servant leadership. Economic hardship may not have been mentioned as a barrier by leaders from a well developed country, but since the majority of the participants were from developing countries, there appeared to be great sensitivity on their part in identifying this as a barrier. Ricardo recognized this barrier when he said,

One of (pause), one of (pause), the things which impedes, uh, I believe has to do with the origin of, of the leader. Uh, I believe it is more difficult for my country and I would say even for Latin America generally, that it be implemented, even in the churches, a, a, a leadership of, of a servant, because many of those leaders, of those persons who arrive, uh, at these leadership positions, come from homes and (pause), places with great needs in every way, economic, affective, etc. Then when they arrive at these positions and these places, uh, for all practical purposes are interested in staying in those positions, because (pause) it gives a sense of well-being, but also an economic well-being, many times, and in this way [it] makes them to not pay attention to what the Bible says.

Manuel, speaking from the perspective of a different developing Latin American country, said,

Manuel: And then comes the obstacle which the Latin American leader here faces. We know that the majority of pastors, eh, do not have full economic support.

Researcher: Um hm.

Manuel: And they suffer poverty, their children, eh, suffer poverty, his wife suffers poverty, and all that creates an, an environment, right? It's contrary to what the leader wants to carry out.

Corporate or imported models as sociocultural barrier. Corporate and imported models were mentioned by two participants. However, since it was apparent from the literature review that the vast majority of leadership and management models were developed by sources outside of Latin America, this could be a significant barrier.

Dorcas, as a female educator, had her finger on the pulse of this problem as she described the pressures placed on Latin American leaders from these corporate models.

I believe that there is a, an influence regarding what it is to be a leader, to be in a leadership position in the secular world. I believe that in part this has affected the church. In many, in many cases, many principles are taught which come, for example, from the studies in administration and things like that which have made, which were put together, that were put together by other people (pause) in the secular world, and many of those principles have been applied to the church (pause) what it means to be a boss, what it means, well, many things.

Carlos illustrated the point well in a vivid and lengthy description of the sinister influence these models can have on leaders.

Carlos: Then, then these negative models come from politics, worldly, managerial models and corporate models taken to an extreme. Um, churches that are run as if they were a corporation on Wall Street. That is not good because, a secular author said that there are two engines which move Wall Street; in other words, world finances are energized by the two engines of fear and covetousness. Those are the two engines of the "stock market" and of all financial movements. Fear, resulting from a [potential] loss and, on the other hand, covetousness, "greed," obtaining profits.

Researcher: Yes.

Carlos: And this is what distinguishes the world of business, but it should not be carried into the church. But many have taken systems; I myself have recommended administrative systems, "management," professionally for the churches, the church in Latin America has needed it, but many have pushed this to

an extreme, and it has now become a goal, in running everything impersonally with human planning, and to deposit money in bank accounts and to do business.

The influence of the state church on Evangelicals as a contributing factor to the sociocultural barrier. Although the leadership styles in the Roman Catholic Church are not the same today as they were years ago, the evident hierarchical style of leadership exercised by the traditional ecclesiastical structure of the region has impacted evangelical leadership as well. The traditional hierarchical leadership structure creates a series of expectations on the part of new converts who expect evangelical leaders to behave the same way as what he or she experienced in the state church. Carlos had an insightful comment describing how that leadership structure has influenced the evangelical church in Latin America.

And the final model which I have to tell you, which doesn't help, is the model of the traditional religion in Latin America. It is a pyramidal authority structure, a pyramid, which is the Catholic Church. We can't not mention it. The pope, there are the priests, right, and there, nothing is ever questioned. And then this model is in the churches as well, where the pastors are not able to be questioned because they have the final word and it is difficult, um, to deal with them. These are the great problems we have, Keith.

Francisco's perspective supported Carlos's comments.

Francisco: You remember that we were formed in a Roman Catholic culture, where there is a priest who was the one who said everything, and there was a totally passive church community. Then, when you come to the evangelical church which does not understand worldview much, then I need to behave like a pastor too, in other words, I am a pastor by conviction but a priest in function, and the people see me that way. And the other, excuse me, and the other is that the people feed on that and grow.

Researcher: Uh ha.

Francisco: The people are helped by that; the influence of the Roman Catholic Church.

Elements of the Spanish and indigenous cultures as sociocultural barriers. The conquest and colonization of the Latin American continent was led by Spanish fortune seekers called *conquistadores* (Nida, 1974). The culture imposed by the Spaniards over 500 years ago was one the participants believed continued to be felt even today. Francisco saw a direct link between an unhealthy coercive power and the cultural inheritance of the region.

In Latin America what is used is coercive power by means of control, by means of excessive control, because of the poor formation of leadership which we have had as a consequence of the Spanish conquest. Then, these, I believe, are the barriers which impede the person's exercise of other kinds of power in their leadership within the church.

Mario, a leader now living in the United States, observed that unhealthy leadership patterns should not be blamed only on foreign models but that these patterns are inherently imbedded in the culture.

Mario: And the culture I'm talking about ah, you know, not a (pause), it's not transcultural. In other words, it's not coming from the U.S. or Germany or Japan. It's right there.

Researcher: Yeah.

Mario: It's their, it's their roots. It's the *conquistadores*. The Spanish that came over and what did they do? They exploited the land, they got rich, they raped the Indian people, they raped the women there. They had, you know, a feudal system, they were the lords, they were the *Dons*, and that, uh, was the way it happened. And then people got upset, and they just overthrew them and they became those. And in politics, that's the way it is today.

As mentioned above, as well as in the literature review, *caciquismo* and *caudillismo* are similar forms of authoritarian leadership styles passed on to Latin Americans from the Spanish culture. Ricardo directly connected *caciquismo* with the inherited Spanish culture.

But I would also say that the culture, in other words, in general culture has not provided good models for leadership. Um (pause), in, in many places, for example, in, in, eh, there is something here which we call *cacique*, right? He is the person who bosses and tells everybody else what to do. This, in a sense, that also is learned, and maybe not all, but those who become part of leadership possibly but they have in mind is, "well, I'm going to be a leader, I'm going to be a boss like, like that person who was a *cacique* in my community." Uh, that is a person who decides what should be sold or not sold, what should be done or should be not done, in a specific place and in a specific community. And this has to do with the culture.

Although *machismo* (an excessive display of masculine characteristics) could be included as a member of this barrier group, it will be discussed below along with family issues as barriers.

Social class issues as a sociocultural barrier. Along with the economic issues as barriers mentioned above, the social class issue (as a contributing factor to the social cultural barrier) was a surprising discovery for the researcher. Five participants expressed that a leader needs to understand the social class of his or her followers in order to know what kind of leadership is expected. Lack of awareness regarding this posed a significant barrier. Jorge described what was meant.

With marginal people [the lower social classes], a liberator is what is expected. This is what I have seen when I have worked with marginal groups. But when I work with professional groups, they want someone who is more participative, they are part of the solution; then they don't see me as a father. So, I believe that my experience bears this out regarding the group with whom I work and the conditions in which they find themselves.

Pedro explained this a little more precisely.

Well, in my country, depending on the social level, each would have its own explanation, uh, a point of view. For example, the middle class always thinks of a, other leadership, that is managerial. In the lower class, however, they desire a *caudillo* who will solve their problems. Therefore leadership has much to do with the economic situation and with the culture. In Latin America, for example, I don't know; they do not like a leadership that shares with the people, that asks for all opinions, or requests, uh, that the people give an opinion regarding how he is doing. Also, the people like a *caudillo*-type leadership because this is how the

culture was taught from five centuries ago when Christianity five centuries ago (pause) was imposed with *caudillo* leadership type.

Serafino explained how this is applied:

There are those, the more intellectual, who appreciate that you have good preaching, but I was always in churches where the culture was of lower class, except "Bethel" and "New Jerusalem." In these first churches where I was, they were not preoccupied as to whether or not I would preach a great sermon. In "Bethel" and "New Jerusalem," they were concerned about that, but even in "Bethel" and "New Jerusalem" there were many people there, in "Bethel" and "New Jerusalem," who were concerned as to how close I was to them at any time; would I go eat with them in their home, would I accept an invitation to go to a party with them because a child had a birthday and they wanted to cut the cake (pause)? That for them was important, that their pastor be with them in their bad moments and in their joyful moments, in their moments of triumph. Keith, I am convinced of this.

It should be noted that this particular issue makes empowerment difficult since the marginal classes do not seek empowerment but liberation. They do not seek participation through empowerment but benefits.

Political models as contributing factors to the sociocultural barrier. Three participants believed that political models have the potential of working against the effective implementation of servant leadership. Although this may vary from country to country in Latin America, the perceptions of these participants merited listing political models as an identifiable barrier. Carlos explained it this way.

The model of worldly politics, eh, is a sinister model that has destroyed many ministries because it is the opposite of Christian leadership. Christian leadership is serving everyone; the worldly political model is that all serve me (pause) it is the opposite. Then, subtly, this gets introduced.

Lucas shared a similar perspective on the influence of politics. He believed that leadership in the church follows the pattern of political models and can no longer be differentiated. The following was his input:

There is a difference between leadership which is not Christian, political leadership, social, whatever it may be, and Christian leadership. Um, and the Lord says, "That among you things should be different." It should not be the same. I believe that, um, um, one of the obstacles is that mentality which views things as the same, even though the Lord said, "Among you things should be different," um, and the Lord says to them that, "The kings of this world lord it over," um (pause) "the people who are in their, in their, under their dominion. Among you it should be different." Then I believe that one of the things that (pause) there is a definition or better yet, there is no sensitivity regarding what is the difference. I, I, I am completely convinced that, um, there is no, there is no differentiation, and that is why one of the first obstacles is to differentiate the concept that the Lord gives; you understand? That is a main obstacle.

Diego describes how a political model (the example of a union boss) infiltrates a church.

Then the Biblical model, the one we're called to assume, sometimes the leaders or the pastors today, reproduce models which they have learned, which they have learned by experience in society. For example, if someone, if it is said that someone was a good leader of a group, of a union, then they will feel that the person can also be one in the context of the church, and that's not necessarily true, right?

Major Barrier Three: Family Dynamics

Various code groups form the barrier of family dynamics as perceived by the participants. This barrier brings together the following themes: unhealthy relationships with other members of the family and the attitude of *machismo*.

Unhealthy relationships with other members of the family. The participants viewed the family home of a potential leader as having a significant affect on the servant leadership abilities of a Latin American leader. Francisco explained this significant leadership context.

Look, for example, leadership in the family has been lost, especially the leadership of the male. If you look, um, um, that's another problem. Let's say, culturally we, for example, on the coast, um, the husband, or one's father; he is responsible to bring money to the house, and to give, and to put things in order. But, the one who gives leadership to the family is the wife. And, at the parent [teacher] conferences at the schools, they do not go; the wives go. The wife is the

one who helps the child do homework. So (pause) he gives leadership signals in certain areas but in others he maintains control, especially in those areas which give him power.

It was clear that in the minds of four participants that one's upbringing in the family played a major role in how the child would exercise leadership as an adult.

Ricardo vividly described these adverse family dynamics which affected servant leadership potential.

But many, many of these homes are, eh, homes with problems. Sometimes they are homes where the mother has to work, um, a lot; the father is absent, or the father, um, culturally does not dialogue much with the children, which is if there is a father in the family. Then, I believe that this is part of this, how would we call it, the, the, the leadership, the model that we copy, um, the boss or the father as an absent father (pause) and this impacts (pause) and this molds, well, the life of the person as it relates to leadership.

José shared how his father's relationship with him affected him as a person. He also speculated that he suspected that the formative years of childhood influenced leadership styles, not just in Latin America.

I remember that in my house for example, my father was an extremely authoritarian man, and the, the, the method for learning was the belt, the abuse, the physical abuse by means of the belt. And that is what I learned and that is what I applied until I realized the horror of what I was doing. So, that is, that is, you can learn leadership by means of a healthy model of authority or you can learn toxic leadership by means of an unhealthy application of authority. And that is not only found in my country; it is anywhere in the world, right? So we say that you can find this in any environment where there is a figure which you consider as, as paternal in the sense of being an authority, um, um, which could be in a classroom, an office, in your home, watching your mother and father interact, etc.

Attitude of machismo. Three participants identified *machismo* as a barrier, but generally in the context of the family. *Macho*, as a descriptor, was used by the participants to describe a strong, authoritarian, male superiority figure in relationship to females and children. Diego said the following.

If I could mention another model, it would be the model of the *macho*, right? Here we find the model of the macho who only wants to boss, give orders, and does it within the context of the family, does it within the context of a group of (pause) in a context of a smaller group with friends, etc. He wants to impose a specific action and will oppose all those who do not follow him.

It should be noted that there was also a perception that not all elements of machismo in the family were negative. Diego also made mention that one of the positive elements was the protective posture of a *macho* when he defended his family.

*Major Barrier Four: Pressures Impinging Upon Female Leaders
Which Create a Barrier for Women*

It is doubtful the male participants would have mentioned pressures on the females as constituting a potential barrier to servant leadership, yet it was surprising that the five female participants did not focus much on barrier issues unique to females. Only two of the five females mentioned anything at all regarding obstacles in this area.

The leadership definition shared with each participant (Appendix C) was noted by Patricia as a good definition which also included females. “Many women would fit under this definition,” she said. She shared that there were women in leadership because men had failed to assume leadership positions in the evangelical churches (she gave no reasons). Even though it was noted by Patricia that many women served in churches, she mentioned that they did not necessarily serve in leadership positions. Diego demonstrated sensitivity to the issue by recognizing the role of women in Latin American churches.

That is another interesting part. In Latin America it seems to me that it is more, more evident that women are assuming a specific participation in, in serving, that, that gives them authority and that they ultimately are literally assuming positions of leadership in the evangelical context, right? And it is not difficult to find this female leadership, even at the level of pastors within certain evangelical groups, that have that, that have that openness to, to give space to female leadership, right?

Dorcas noted that there are obstacles women face generally in church leadership (whether it be servant leadership or otherwise).

As a woman, one confronts another type of obstacle in the church, right? And that is that many men do not recognize their authority, right, that one may have in the spiritual areas. And (pause) then they don't want to be, well, "directed" shall we say, right, eh, eh, (pause) by women.

For Dorcas, male resistance to female leadership was a reason for the presence of a barrier. Although this issue has cultural roots as well as a theological basis among Evangelicals regarding the role of women in church leadership, it nevertheless was pointed out as a barrier. It was mentioned by two females as an identifiable barrier.

Patricia spoke of it this way.

I would like to mentioned two other things. Um, the obstacles which, one of the obstacles to overcome, as they say, that must be overcome in order to effectively implement servant leadership, um, especially in the area of women, is the, the teaching of the women in order for them to develop their abilities, the abilities that God has given to them. Um, beginning with the capacity to dream, and individually accomplish those dreams. Because our identity as women has been linked so tightly with the male and with the children that sometimes, it is very difficult to dream and to have vision, to go beyond and overcome that role, right? And I believe that, it will be a huge responsibility for the leaders of the churches to, to take into account that there is a younger generation, women of a younger generation whose identity is not 100 percent identified as only being a wife and mother.

Major Barrier Five: Disobedience of Scriptural principles

This particular barrier may possibly only concern those who view the Bible as authoritative and as their rule of faith and may or may not identify the following factors as barriers. However, because this study focuses on the barriers for Evangelicals, this barrier is included as a significant barrier (51 references). Included in this barrier category are five elements: deviation from following Biblical principles, the adoption of

secular models over Scripture, the lack of a Biblical worldview, trivializing Scripture, and church traditions.

Deviation from following Biblical principles. Deviating from what is taught by the Bible was seen as contributing to the barrier impeding the effective implementation of servant leadership. An overwhelming number of references (31) in this barrier category indicate how important the participants felt about this particular factor. The following words from Jorge summarized the overwhelming viewpoint of the participants.

Then I believe that is an obstacle, when [leaders] are not Biblical, they implement leadership using good criteria, human concepts or philosophies. And if I speak as one who is called to serve God and if we are servants and ministers of Christ, before anything else we need to center in on his word. Therefore, an aspect that impedes effective and healthy leadership is that many of them are not being Biblical.

Adoption of secular models over Scripture. Participants also viewed the adoption of secular models over Scripture as obstacles to servant leadership. Much of this, according to Manuel, is a result of imitation rather than obedience to Scripture. His insight on the subject went beyond the act of disobedience. For him, once a leader disobeys and stops following the models as set forth in Scripture, the problem gets more complicated.

Then comes the temptation to imitate, to imitate other churches regarding the kind of message that is preached and especially the worship service that is practiced. The worship service, the, the liturgy that is practiced needs to be attractive, emotional, captivating, right? One pastor from South America told me a few years ago that he had felt that the programs for the church service(s) for the Evangelicals in Latin America are being written by people from up north, especially from Hollywood.

How does this impact the church? Bernardo gave the following assessment.

I believe that today, um, some organizations have lost that focus and are applying a leadership which is more secular, where work is done a certain way, um, um,

only as a secular leader and not as a servant leader in all of its magnitude regarding how, regarding how Jesus said. That is my perception.

Lack of a Biblical worldview. The problem, as Patricia and José perceived it, was an issue of worldview. The evangelical church, and its leaders in particular, lack a Biblical worldview. This was cited by three participants. In fact, for Patricia, this was the greatest barrier to be addressed. The evangelical world view, which is based on how the Bible presents answers to ultimate questions in ontology, epistemology, and axiology, must inform how one interprets culture as well. Patricia explained briefly: "For me, the first obstacle is, is changing the worldview of the concept of servant (pause) because of all that I said regarding the context (pause) cultural, right?"

Trivializing Scripture. Pablo lamented the fact that the Bible is treated so trivially. Rather than treating the Bible with respect, sobriety, and seriousness, the Bible is treated superficially and of little consequence. He commented, "Then the obstacle which presents itself for us Christians is a bad reading or a superficial reading of the word of God."

Church traditions. Along the same lines, participants shared that, for whatever reason, church traditions may become obstacles to the effective implementation of servant leadership. Manuel observed that, "There is a sense in which the same ecclesiastical system may be an obstacle, because the ecclesiastical system sometimes it, it gives more importance to the traditions of the elders, right?" Unfortunately as Esteban pointed out, these church traditions at times have taken precedence over Biblical teaching.

There are also doctrinal positions held by the authorities of the church, in which many times leaders must submit to without, without those positions being, let's say, very Biblical. So, I believe, there are, there are factors that can impede.

Major Barrier Six: Spirituality Issues of Particular Concern to Evangelicals

Other barrier categories identified by the participants and related specifically to Evangelicals (without necessarily excluding non-Evangelicals) were those elements addressing the leader's connection with God (25 references), carnality, and specific "soul" sicknesses.

The leader's connection with God. For the evangelical participants in the study, a leader's relationship with God must be a priority. When this relationship is not a priority for the leader, then it creates problems. Pedro proposed this as one of two obstacles to servant leadership.

I see two obstacles: one is the lack in the leader of having a serious devotional life... a genuine relationship with God, to know God, to know Jesus, to know the word of God, to know the commandments of God, of beginning now to fulfill them. That creates an obstacle, the devotional life of the leader.

Rafael, as a denominational president, expressed concern over this particular issue and saw it as a barrier.

I think there are various orders of factors, the first being of the spiritual order, it is a spiritual order. I believe that when the leader loses sight of the Lord, he may fall, he may experience a barrier to being a servant. When he stops looking at the Lord and begins to look at himself, or to see things, those things which he has achieved by means of his ministry of service, it's easy to fall into the trap of leaving behind being a servant (pause) and that happens easily.

Carnality. Carlos and David referred to this spiritual issue as "carnality."

Carnality is a term used to refer to satisfying the desires of the flesh in ways prohibited by the Bible. Although these are related to the egocentric character elements mentioned above, within the context of carnality, they are included as an issue of spirituality.

Carlos pointed out the issue of carnality when he said, "There are also a series of obstacles pointed out by structure, which is carnality, or how would we want to call it?"

Specific “soul” sicknesses. A final contribution to the issue of spirituality was the mention of three identifiable “soul sicknesses” which support this discussion. These three “sicknesses” were identified as the following: a leader’s feeling of indispensability; a leader’s inflated perception of Divine approval; and, a leader’s perception of success.

When asked about servant leadership barriers, Serafino shared his thoughts:

Well, look, I could talk to you Keith about the barrier of these three sicknesses or the three as just one barrier. If I have one of these sicknesses, it is quite difficult even though I appear to be a servant, it is quite difficult that I be a servant leader like the kind we are speaking about. In other words, if I am one, then I am one at a very basic level, very insignificant, not as God would like and not really as I would like. For example, if my disease is the desire to influence, the desire to think for others, the desire to decide for others, and the people give me an opportunity because they call me and they ask me, well, the table is served for my pride. Then I decide for other people, I think for other people and I believe that I am doing a service for God. But really, I am not doing it. I am not serving in a sense, [but] I am not helping the people to grow when I think and decide for them. That is very obvious. Then with one of these sicknesses or all three sicknesses we now have a barrier that keeps one from being a leader according to the style of Jesus Christ.

Major Barrier Seven: The Inherently Difficult Issues Associated with Servant Leader Terminology and Practice

The data from the participants clearly demonstrated the paucity of servant leaders in Latin America. As indicated in the section on servant leadership, of the 23 participants, three (13.5%) indicated that servant leadership did not exist in Latin America, and 10 (43.5%) participants indicated there were very few servant leaders in Latin America. Thus, over half (57%) of the participants agreed that there were few or no servant leaders in Latin America. Although David agreed that servant leaders do exist and servant leadership was practiced, he observed,

I will say that a high percentage of people who are carrying out a leadership labor in, in our organizations see themselves as leaders but do not see themselves as servants. Then, if we speak of the servant leader, I would say that the percentage

is minimal. If we speak of leader servants, then I would say that the percentage is quite high.

The factors which contribute toward the barrier created by the inherently difficult issues associated with servant leader terminology and practice is composed of the following groups of codes: servant and leader are seen as incompatible (incongruent) concepts, the lack of good models, servant leadership is not an appealing leadership style, servant leaders may not see fruit for a long time, the cultural image communicated by the term “servant” carries negative cultural baggage, and the fact that it is so difficult to lead from the position of a servant.

Servant and leader seen as incompatible (incongruent) concepts. For some of the participants, when the words “servant” and “leader” were juxtaposed and placed together it created dissonance in their thinking. Santiago struggled with bringing the two concepts together. “Um (pause) how can those two ideas be in one’s head at the same time? Well, sometimes I don’t understand it.” The explanation given by Esteban (also mentioned earlier) provided one window on how this thinking has come about.

Yes (pause), yes, I have to tell you, ah, (pause), that (pause) I (pause) well, I'm going to tell you (pause). First, I'm not very much in agreement with, with the name leader. I am not in agreement with the term leadership, nor leader. In what sense am I not in agreement? In the sense that it has carried with it a concept which is very executive, very humanistic, very corporate. In that sense I am not in agreement. I have to accept that because of the social context in which we live, well there are, one has to use that term, but I would stay always with, with the term servant of God. For me, the leader, the Christian, should be a servant of God, at the service of God and of the people, for whom Jesus shed his love.

The lack of good models. Three participants believed that the lack of good models was a barrier to the effective implementation of servant leadership. Not having good models contributed to the barrier. Bernardo made the following observation:

One factor that I see as rare today is the lack of servant leader models. I believe that (pause) the, the, in order for someone to develop a leadership like Jesus, one needs to see it, as the disciples saw Him. It needs to be audiovisual teaching. It can not only be a, a lesson taught in a classroom. And I believe that there, uh, that is a key aspect, the ability to find (pause) models to follow, models in which one can see servant leadership.

Servant leadership as not an appealing leadership style. This contributing factor to the barrier under discussion is compounded by the fact that participants did not think leaders saw servant leadership as an attractive “option.” Francisco explained it this way.

Look, the, the pastors or the leaders of the mega-churches are not servant leaders. They are, they are dictators because they fear that if they become servant leaders, their empire will collapse. It's that if I build an empire, I need to sustain it, however that may be, but I will sustain it. Thus, being servant leaders [is] not very attractive. It is not an attractive leadership.

Servant leaders not seeing fruit for a long time. Three participants, one male and two female, observed that another difficulty with the concept of servant leadership was the fact that it takes time for a servant leader to see the fruit of his or her labors. Having to wait for years before a leader sees the fruit of his or her efforts constituted a barrier as was pointed out by Esther.

We have known persons, we have personally known people we have shared with, with leaders we have seen who began as servants 100 percent in the ministry, and now after many years, let's say 20 years, is when they are able to see, possibly the fruit, a, tangible fruit of all the efforts of, of so many years.

Lilia added to this but also stressed that the evangelical leader who is “sowing” for the Lord need not be so concerned about seeing the fruit.

That is how I think the life a servant leader should be. Maybe as long as the leader is living, he does not see the fruit of the seed which has been sown, but if we sow for the Lord, His word says that it will not return empty. We are sure that what we have planted will bear fruit and fruit in abundance and if we sow servant leaders, they will become servant leaders...

The cultural image communicated by the term “servant” as carrying negative cultural baggage. For others, the concept or theology of “servant” leadership is a misleading concept in the Latin American culture because of the images conveyed by the term. The following insight offered by Francisco is enlightening.

Francisco: Um hm. Even though in the secular world toward “servant” is not use much.

Researcher: You don't hear it much, right?

Francisco: Um hm. Yes, because let's say (pause), when a person suddenly sees the word "servant," he sees it like, like, like “menial.” On the other hand, the, the, it's as if here I am the menial one, but in leadership, I am the one who bosses. That is, that is the context of the Latin.

From the perspective of the participants, there is certainly a great amount of history behind the meaning of “servant” that is not helpful. Patricia explained that this negative predisposition has historical roots.

I believe that in our Latin context, and in my country specifically, it is extremely difficult, ah, to develop and consciously have this concept of servant leadership because of, because of our cultural and historical background. From (pause) having been conquered, having our people be the people who, already living in our country, the conquered indigenous nations, having been taken to be slaves of, of the Spaniards, then, and they were called servants, and they were called servants. In other words, it was the equivalent to being an Indian. An Indian was a slave, was one who was a servant, and you're practically slaves, right?

The difficulty of leading from the position of a servant. Another significant factor that contributes to this barrier is the realization that it is hard to be a real servant. Ana shared her thoughts on this.

To serve others and not be the first, this, this is difficult. It requires humility, uh, and, as I was saying, that, that before, at least in the church where, the evangelical church where I was born, uh, not only as the daughter of Christian parents, but also born in Jesus Christ, there, uh, I saw that more than here, and I'm not sure that's it, but here we have put aside the aspect of being a servant, and at times we want to be served instead of being servants, because being a servant requires diligence, requires work.

Major Barrier Eight: Deficiencies in the Area of Academic and Intellectual Preparation

Although there were 20 references shared by the participants which identified as a barrier the deficiencies in academic and intellectual preparation of a leader, it was surprising that more participants did not share this as a barrier given the strategies suggested on how to remove barriers as mentioned in the next section. These barriers are concentrated in three particular factors: the lack of intellectual/academic preparation, a focus on models and not on character, and the lack of personal development.

The lack of intellectual/academic preparation. For Pedro, the second barrier to servant leadership that he identified was the lack of academic and intellectual preparation. He estimated that 90 percent of the evangelical leaders in his country lacked adequate academic and intellectual preparation. He placed the blame for this on the following: “Because they have been formed by a doctrine that (pause) the Christian leader does not need academic or intellectual preparation.”

Focus on models and not on character. However, even when there was teaching and training taking place, Jorge believed the focus was more on training than on modeling, with no real learning taking place. This barrier is complicated because of the lack of good models. He compared much of what happens in academic preparation to imported franchises.

Another aspect is that possibly we have concerned ourselves more with models and not in developing the character of the leaders and we have for example (pause) one sees at times chain restaurants like McDonald's, or pizzas, or, then we do multiply a number of things for growth and we're very good in developing quantity but we are not forming, we're not discipling. Then, we don't have servants of whom I could say, “That is how a leader behaves.”

The lack of personal development. In his list of obstacles to servant leadership, Daniel saw lack of personal development as an obstacle. He had observed too many ill-equipped people giving leadership.

In my country there are those who do not see themselves as leaders. They see themselves as people in charge, as people in charge of the church or as people who have been named to do leadership. But because they do not see themselves as leaders nor understand well, they do not develop those areas of direction or the character a leader should have. Those, uh, uh, qualities, attributes, tools which they are not born with, but must be developed, elements so simple as for example, putting others to work, humility, love, a concern for others, the ability to dream regarding the future, the ability to move current resources, the ability to establish in relationship with God, like the relationship that Moses had.

Major Barrier Nine: Lack of Vision

Given the high frequency vision had as a characteristic of a Latin American leader (referenced 56 times), it was curious to note that only Lucas mentioned lack of vision as a barrier. “Another obstacle for me, and I’ve always emphasized this, is a lack of, a vision, even when one has a vision and is not able to develop the vision.”

Major Barrier Ten: Detrimental Acts and Conditions Precipitated by a Leader’s Followers

In a region of the world which presents itself as highly relational, it was not surprising that the participants identified a barrier related specifically to followers. Detrimental acts and conditions precipitated by followers were identified as activities for which followers were responsible which affected a leader in a negative manner, thus, becoming a barrier to the effective implementation of servant leadership in Latin American evangelical organizations. In this barrier category, the following components are mentioned: the expectations followers may have of leaders; followers misleading leaders; and, dysfunctional followers.

The expectations followers may have of leaders. It is interesting that certain expectations followers have of their leaders can contribute to the creation of a barrier. It was mentioned that there are followers who do not want leaders to be participative in their styles and would prefer the strong *caudillo* style of leadership (mentioned by five participants). It would be difficult for a leader to exercise servant leadership if the followers want the leader to exercise his or her authority in an authoritative manner. Pedro expressed how this has happened.

Well, in my country, depending on the social level, each would have its own explanation, ah, a point of view. For example, the middle class always thinks of a, a leadership that is managerial. In the lower class, however, they desire a *caudillo* who will solve their problems. Therefore leadership has much to do with the economic situation and with the culture. And Latin America for example, I don't know, they do not like a leadership that shares with the people, that asks for all opinions, or requests, uh, that the people do, ah, opinion regarding how he is doing. Also, the people like a *caudillo*-type leadership because this is how the culture was taught from five centuries ago when Christianity five centuries ago (pause) was imposed with *caudillo* leadership.

Followers misleading leader. Pedro also explained how followers can mislead leaders by causing the leader to drift or stray from his or her vision.

That last virtue which I told you, "compromise," because...as I told you earlier, the masses attempt to deviate one, and one cannot compromise. Many observers, many counselors, give a leader advice in order to deviate him, and one must persevere, maintain himself, and be immovable in the, in relation to the vision.

Dysfunctional followers. Other components of this group are those codes which identify dysfunctional followers as contributing to a barrier. These dysfunctional followers could be those which have adopted unhealthy team dynamics. As Mario shared,

And then that's when you have a dysfunctional team. There's no internal cohesion, everybody's divided, you know, you have some people gossiping and , then it's set. You won't make a difference. And that's when you will never be able to serve.

Strategies as Proposed by the Participants to Overcome the Barriers to the
Effective Implementation of Effective Servant Leadership in
Latin American Evangelical Organizations

Even though the participants were asked (question number ten) to suggest strategies for overcoming the barriers faced by servant leaders in Latin American evangelical organizations, quite often as a participant would identify a barrier, there was a tendency on the part of that participant to immediately suggest a way to overcome the barrier, a tendency reflecting good leadership. Yet, many more barriers were identified than suggested strategies on how to overcome those barriers. The participants suggested seven strategies or ideas that they felt would help address the issue of overcoming the barriers. These seven suggestions addressed the following areas: teaching (both general and specific); addressing character issues; a return to Scripture; facilitating relationships between leaders and followers; strategies invoking the participation of God; achieving critical mass; and, exercising a prophetic voice. It was interesting to note that the participants did not imply that they themselves were already implementing any of these strategies.

*Suggested Strategies to Remove Identified Barriers through Both
General and Specific Teaching Initiatives*

General teaching initiatives would include such things as a greater emphasis on teaching in the church, the development of teaching programs and curriculum, and the development of decentralized teaching initiatives. Specific teaching strategies addressed particular subjects or emphases needed to be taught. These areas were the following:

1. A focus on character (being) more than on skills (doing)
2. Teaching which helps the leader understand the impact of culture

3. Sensitivity regarding how social classes affect leadership styles
4. Confronting *machismo*
5. Modeling and mentoring
6. The role of women in leadership positions and strategies for teaching women
7. The historical and social context of ministry
8. The need to differentiate between leadership and discipleship (many leaders who want to train leaders do not focus on leadership training but discipleship training.)

*Suggested Strategies to Remove Identified Barriers through
Developing a Person's Character*

It logically follows that if character barriers were such a large general category, then strategies in the area of character formation would be greatly needed. However, it was surprising that more strategies for overcoming these barriers were not suggested. The participants identified three crucial areas of character formation. Notably, few specific strategies on how to implement these teaching strategies were proposed.

1. Authenticity. By authenticity, the participants were referring to the development of greater transparency and vulnerability.
2. The proper use of authority and power. Participants felt that if leaders would only recognize that servant leaders are administrators (or stewards) and not owners, then authority and power would be abused less.
3. Greater accountability. This would be achieved by more external evaluations and internal evaluations supported by feedback, accountability systems, and tighter requirements for leadership positions.

Suggested Strategies to Remove Identified Barriers through a Return to the Teachings of Scripture

The participants identified not following or obeying or misinterpreting the writings of the Bible as creating barriers to the effective implementation of servant leadership. At one point, Carlos felt the situation was so bad that he suggested the evangelical church needed to experience its own reformation. Thus, the following strategies were proposed to remove these barriers:

1. Apply a balanced understanding of the teaching of Scripture.
2. Give obedience to the authority of the word of God.
3. Return to the centrality of the Bible in the lives and ministry of leaders.

Suggested Strategies to Remove Identified Barriers by Giving More Attention to Followers

The participants identified three strategies for enhancing relationships with followers as well as nurturing the growth and leadership potential of those followers. The following strategies were suggested:

1. Develop mentoring relationships with followers.
2. Cultivate a focus on the value of people.
3. Cultivate the development of new leaders (a legacy).

Suggested Strategies to Remove Identified Barriers through Invoking God's Participation in Removing the Barriers

Invoking the assistance of God in overcoming a particular barrier or barriers would seem to be a logical proposal for the evangelical population given the worldview of the Evangelicals. Three suggestions were given by the participants, each overlapping with the other two.

1. Ask for God's guidance.

2. Exercise prayer.
3. Seek the supernatural intervention of God, especially in developing a healthy heart to overcome authoritarianism.

Achieving “Critical Mass” as a Suggested Barrier Removal Strategy

The proposed strategy of achieving a “critical mass” was proposed as a strategy within the context of the paucity of servant leaders in Latin America. Because there are so few servant leaders and very few models available as examples to follow, it is necessary to arrive at a “critical mass” of servant leaders so that a greater presence of servant leaders will move it from the shadows of minority status to one of greater visibility and respectability. Also, critical mass is needed in the area of promoting servant leadership, that is, as in “getting the word out.”

Being a Prophetic Voice as a Suggested Strategy for Removing Barriers

This suggested strategy given by five participants referred to having the courage to confront the barriers (much like how the Old Testament prophets confronted the sinful practices of the people of their day). The best way to explain this suggestion is to let Diego speak for the group.

We are not very much aware at times, but sometimes we have to remove the mask and confront it and work with the Biblical model, right, so that this becomes incarnated in the practice of leadership. That would be another, uh, another action.

Theory Generation

The data from the participants suggest the existence of at least ten major barrier categories which affect the effective implementation of servant leadership in Latin American evangelical organizations. These ten major categories were identified by analyzing and coding the data produced by the interviews of the 23 participants and then

identifying barrier categories which offer the best explanation of the data. The following theories best explain the ten barrier areas.

1. Negative character traits of man function as barriers to the effective implementation of servant leadership among Latin American evangelical leaders.
2. The presence of specific sociocultural elements function as barriers to the effective implementation of servant leadership among Latin American evangelical leaders.
3. How a child is reared in a family may create a barrier at the time when the child becomes an adult leader making it difficult for him or her to implement servant leadership effectively as a Latin American Evangelical.
4. Female leaders face issues and circumstances which create a barrier for women to effectively implement servant leadership in Latin American evangelical organizations.
5. Not obeying Scriptural principles is a barrier to the effective implementation of servant leadership in Latin American evangelical organizations.
6. There are specific issues in the area of spirituality for Evangelicals which function as barriers to the effective implementation of servant leadership in Latin American evangelical organizations.
7. Inherently difficult issues associated with servant leader terminology and practice are major barriers to the effective implementation of servant leadership in Latin American evangelical organizations.

8. A leader's deficiencies in the area of academic and intellectual preparation create barriers which impede the effective implementation of servant leadership in Latin American evangelical organizations
9. The lack of vision creates a barrier which impedes the effective implementation of servant leadership in Latin American evangelical organizations.
10. A leader's followers can affect a leader in such a way that it becomes a major barrier to the effective implementation of servant leadership in Latin American evangelical organizations.

Focus Groups

Two separate focus group meetings were convened by the researcher for the purpose of participant feedback and peer review of the results of the study. Although the intention was to gather two groups composed of four to seven leaders in each, one group selected from the participants and the other group from non-participants, the total number of members of the two groups was only four. Three participants agreed to meet with the researcher to give input regarding analysis and the identification of the barriers but only one non-participant met with the researcher. The reasons for the low number of members of the two groups were for reasons beyond the control of the researcher. Last-minute changes and cancellations were a problem. Five non-participants cancelled within 24 hours of the focus group meeting.

Both the participant group and the non-participant peer group positively confirmed the identification of the barriers and affirmed the study as reflecting their own life experiences with servant leadership. One member felt there were some key barriers missing from the list, but the member was reminded that only those barriers which

emerged from the interviews were listed. Another member observed that teaching rated high as a strategy for removing barriers, yet lack of teaching was not mentioned as the barrier most cited in the list of ten barriers. All those who reviewed the results affirmed their validity as coinciding with their personal experiences and perceptions. The peer review participant observed that even though the study professed to look at Latin American organizations, he commented that nearly all the examples given by the participants were church related. However, the peer-review participant did not see that as a major issue.

Clear Connections with Antecedent Literature

Although much work will need to be done to connect the current study, which is very broad and general in its focus, with specific studies on elements and factors revealed that will require further studies, three observations connecting this study with previous studies may be made. As was mentioned in the review of the literature, charismatic leadership may be a universal leadership trait (Bass & Aviola, 1993). The data from this study suggest that charisma was highly valued by the Latin American participants of this study.

A second observation addresses the opinion of Batista, who refers to leaders who have been “hypnotized” by contemporary leadership theories. These leadership theories do not necessarily synchronize well with the Biblical leadership theories.

A final observation may be made regarding the comment made by Kautzmann (1998) in reference to the principle of servanthood and the spirit of *caudillaje*. His observation is that these two are at odds with one another.

Summary of the Findings

This study explored the barriers which impede the effective implementation of servant leadership in Latin American evangelical organizations. To carry out this study, the grounded theory method was selected because of the attention and care grounded theory applies in allowing a theory or theories to emerge from the data presented by the participants. In order to locate the barriers within the Latin American context, this chapter presented the following profiles of a Latin American leader: a composite profile of a Latin American leader (primarily grounded in the responses to question four), the composite profile of an ideal or good Latin American leader (primarily grounded in answers to questions one and two), and the composite profile of a Latin American evangelical leader (primarily grounded in answers to question three). The chapter then discussed the evidence for servant leadership and its viability in Latin American contexts. The focus of this study was then presented in the section which addressed ten general barrier categories which impede the effective implementation of effective servant leadership in Latin American evangelical organizations. The identity of the barriers was followed by a section presenting a discussion of seven strategies proposed by the participants on how to overcome many of the identified barriers. The participants of two focus groups affirmed the results of the study. Three observations were made referring to the findings and the connection between three of the findings and the antecedent literature.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

Introduction

Leadership for the evangelical community is assumed to be based on the leadership style modeled by Jesus Christ, the founder of the Christian Church. As this leadership style is examined in reference to the evangelical leaders of Latin American organizations, the question is raised as to the identification of any obstacles which may impede the effective implementation of servant leadership in the Latin American evangelical community. The question may also be asked as to the existence of any barriers which may make it difficult for a leader to implement servant leadership.

Summary of the Study

Purpose and Significance of the Study

There exists a perception in the evangelical Church that it is difficult for leaders of Latin American evangelical organizations to implement servant leadership. If evangelical leaders are to emulate the servant leadership style of their founder, Jesus Christ, why is servant leadership not commonly practiced in *all* evangelical institutions and organizations? This study examined servant leadership in light of the difficulties experienced by Latin American evangelical leaders in the implementation aspects of servant leadership.

It is hoped that this study will make a significant contribution to both the theoretical research on servant leadership in Latin America as well as shed light on knowing what impedes evangelical Latin American leaders from practicing servant leadership. Knowledge of these barriers will help the evangelical Church at large

understand an important dimension of its leadership needs and, thus, be able to serve more effectively and more biblically.

Method

This study proposed to identify the obstacles which impede the successful implementation of servant leadership among Latin American evangelical leaders. Of the five major qualitative traditions (Creswell, 1998), the design and canons of grounded theory (Charmaz, 2000; Corbin & Strauss, 1990) provided appropriate tools for identifying the barriers which impede the effective implementation of servant leadership in Latin American evangelical organizations. As a research tool, grounded theory facilitated the emergence of a theory or theories as participants explored and shared their beliefs, experiences, and perceptions regarding the implementation of servant leadership in Latin America. The role of the researcher was to facilitate a process by which the theory or theories emerge from the participants rather than enter into the research process with a predetermined theory to test. The epistemological paradigm which supported this particular grounded theory research process is the *critical realist paradigm*. Because both critical realism and grounded theory accept various positivistic assumptions, while, at the same time, are able to agree with certain postmodern critiques of those assumptions, structure and rigor was balanced with a high regard for each participant's individual perspective.

The research was conducted interviewing 23 participants utilizing a structured interview protocol. The participants ranged from around 30 to 80 years in age, with the average age being about 51. Five females and 18 males were interviewed. The participants were all Latin American representing nine different countries. Six

participants were educational leaders, 5 were denominational leaders, 5 were organizational leaders, 5 were senior pastors, 1 was a conference speaker, and 1 was a senior pastor's wife. The average recorded time of the interviews was 40 minutes for the females and 58 minutes for the males. All interviews but one was conducted in Spanish.

The coding of the data followed the accepted process and procedures for grounded theory as the researcher applied open, axial, and selective coding as well as constant comparison and memoing. The analysis of the data revealed 10 major barrier areas identified by the participants.

Theoretical Framework

The seminal writings of Robert Greenleaf (1977, 1991) served as the background to this study. The work of Greenleaf provided an understanding of servant leadership from an organizational and individual perspective. A reading of Greenleaf's definition of servant leadership provided clear boundaries for the interviews. Although the researcher at first anticipated that Hofstede's (1980, 1997) studies could provide a framework for understanding the cultural dimensions of servant leadership, the interviews with the participants were not conducive to pursuing the explanations since the purpose of the study was to identify barriers rather than to explain the reasons behind the barriers. The researcher was disappointed that the theoretical framework provided by Hofstede's research did not prove to be more helpful, but an understanding of the research design demonstrated that the design of this study did not include elements that would have brought Hofstede's theories into greater interface with the study. Hofstede's work has great explanatory power. For example, the researcher could have compared the responses of the high-power distance participants (those from Venezuela and Mexico) with the low-

power distance participants (those from Costa Rica) to see how their answers compared. However, because the value of grounded theory lies in its genius to propose new theory rather than to explain theories, Hofstede's work was not a significant tool for this particular study as initially thought and may prove to be of greater value in proposing theories which explain the barriers as those barriers apply to each country.

Although the study did not take into account that the participants would bring their own theological frameworks into the study, it became quite clear that their understandings of Jesus' leadership greatly influenced their perceptions of servant leadership. It would be safe to assume that being students of the Bible, they would have been more familiar with that source of leadership writings than with Greenleaf or others. The biblical definition of servant leadership, as stated by Jesus, was well known by all the participants and appeared to have a significant influence on their responses to the questions. As can be seen from the theories generated by the study, the theoretical frameworks initially thought useful for this study will have a greater role as future studies are conducted.

Limitations

This study is limited by various aspects of the target population. Because the target population is Evangelical, it necessarily limits the generalizability of the study as potentially generalizable only for Evangelicals. Another limitation is identified by the fact that the target population only includes Latin Americans. Evangelicals in other regions of the world may or may not experience the same barriers as those in Latin America. A third limitation of the study is that even though the study covers Latin America in general, Latin Americans are not a monolithic culture. Each country has its

own idiosyncrasies. Thus, care must be exhibited in generalizing the findings. A final limitation of the study is based on the relationship the researcher has had with most of the participants for many years. Although some of the participants were met for the first time when the participant was interviewed, other participants have known the researcher for nearly 19 years. This could possibly have influenced how the participants responded to questions.

Discussion of the Findings

Findings

Servant leadership, as modeled by Jesus Christ, is not only the leadership style an evangelical leader should implement, it was also viewed by the participants as a viable leadership style for leaders of Latin American evangelical organizations. Yet, participants identified barriers to implementing effective servant leadership which the researcher was able to group into ten major barrier categories. Major categories were identified as those areas which brought together compatible themes. The 10 major categories which emerged from the study were in the following areas: a leader's negative character traits, the presence of specific sociocultural elements, family upbringing, issues specific to women in leadership, disobedience to Scriptural teaching, spirituality issues, servant leader terminology and practice, deficient academic and intellectual preparation, a lack of vision, and certain behaviors of followers.

Theory Building

Analysis of the data suggests the existence of 10 major barriers which may potentially obstruct the effective implementation of servant leadership in Latin American evangelical organizations. There is no intention of stating which barriers are the most

serious or the greatest threats to servant leadership. Even the number of times a certain barrier is cited is not necessarily an indication of which barriers are the greatest threats to servant leadership. The intent of the study was only to explore the subject and propose the theories which most clearly identified the barriers. It is hoped that other studies will determine the relative importance of each barrier.

The researcher proposes the following 10 theories as to the identity of the 10 barriers:

1. Negative character traits of man function as barriers to the effective implementation of servant leadership among Latin American evangelical leaders.
2. The presence of specific sociocultural elements functions as barriers to the effective implementation of servant leadership among Latin American evangelical leaders.
3. How a child is reared in a family may create a barrier at the time when the child becomes an adult leader making it difficult for him or her to implement servant leadership effectively as a Latin American evangelical.
4. Female leaders face issues and circumstances which create a barrier for women to effectively implement servant leadership in Latin American evangelical organizations.
5. Not obeying scriptural principles is a barrier to the effective implementation of servant leadership in Latin American evangelical organizations.
6. There are specific issues in the area of spirituality for Evangelicals which function as barriers to the effective implementation of servant leadership in Latin American evangelical organizations.

7. Inherently difficult issues associated with servant leader terminology and practices are major barriers to the effective implementation of servant leadership in Latin American evangelical organizations.
8. A leader's deficiencies in the area of academic and intellectual preparation create barriers which impede the effective implementation of servant leadership in Latin American evangelical organizations.
9. The lack of vision creates a barrier which impedes the effective implementation of servant leadership in Latin American evangelical organizations.
10. A leader's followers can affect a leader in such a way that it becomes a major barrier to the effective implementation of servant leadership in Latin American evangelical organizations.

Barrier Removal Strategies

The participants were asked to suggest strategies they thought would address the issue of how to remove or eliminate the barriers. Seven strategies were suggested: the carrying out of general and specific teaching initiatives, developing a person's character, a return to the teachings of Scripture, giving more attention to followers, invoking God's participation in removing the barriers, achieving "critical mass", and, being a prophetic voice.

Focus Groups

The researcher convened two separate focus groups for the purpose of participant feedback and peer review of the findings. The four members of the groups affirmed the ten theories as corresponding with their experiences.

Conclusions of the Study

Recommendations for Further Research

This study has opened a window into the experience and implementation of servant leadership in Latin American evangelical organizations. This researcher is not aware of any other study of this kind which looks at servant leadership in Latin America with such a comprehensive scope. It is hoped that future studies will follow which will support or improve on the results of this study.

Although this study has revealed a significant amount of data, and may have generated more questions than answers, the following are suggestions for further research studies which are needed:

1. Each barrier theory should be tested individually to see if the results are consistent with this study.
2. Each of the ten major barrier categories needs to be tested as to its validity in a specific country. Latin America is not a monolithic culture. For example, Latin American countries described by Hofstede with High-Power Distance (such as Venezuela, Guatemala, and Mexico) will have a different perspective on servant leadership than one with Low-Power Distance such as Costa Rica.
3. A study should be conducted to determine how the barriers “feed” the “dark side” of servant leadership? In other words, if *caciquismo* and *caudillismo* are accepted cultural models for a Latin American leader to follow, how does that cultural model strengthen the forces which oppose servant leadership?

4. Because only an evangelical population was sampled, other studies should be conducted which would include non-Evangelicals comparing non-evangelical responses to Evangelical.
5. A test should be designed to examine whether or not the definitions required to be read by the participants were too "North American" in nature. It is quite possible that the words chosen, the phrasing of the questions, the way the questions were asked were overly influenced by a non-Latin American cultural bias.
6. More work needs to be done in the area of strategic initiatives to address the issue of how to remove the barriers. The data suggested that it is much easier to identify barriers than it is to know how to overcome the barriers.
7. Further study could reveal some of the barriers as symptoms rather than a true barrier. Thus, a study should be designed to examine and identify the relationship between causes and symptoms.
8. A future study should look at servant leadership in specific categories of barriers: educational institutions, specific denominational churches, evangelical organizations (such as faith mission groups) and others.

Implications for Practice

This study has revealed significant barriers to the effective implementation of servant leadership in Latin American organizations. The ten proposed theories identifying the major barriers provide Evangelicals in Latin America with a daunting task: assuming the barriers to be legitimate, how will these barriers be overcome so that the servant leadership model exemplified by Jesus Christ is lived out effectively throughout Latin America? It is hoped that future researchers will be encouraged by this study to continue

exploring these barriers and propose concrete solutions as to how the barriers may be overcome or removed.

One final implication is the need to express admiration to those men and women who, in the face of tremendous barriers, are still able to skillfully lead the evangelical church in Latin America. Because the parameters of this study kept the focus on the unpleasant issues related to servant leadership, it is easy to overlook the contributions of these great leaders. There is little doubt that had this study focused on the positive aspects of the work of the many servant leaders in Latin America who work behind the scenes empowering their followers, developing the legacy of a new generation of leaders, serving others with great humility, conviction, vision, and integrity, the tone of this study would have been quite different. Lest one be tempted to think that servant leadership among Latin American evangelicals is in total disarray, one only needs to spend time with those men and women who faithfully exercise their callings through servant leadership.

Summary

This chapter has given a summary of the study which explored the barriers to the effective implementation of servant leadership in Latin American organizations. The difficulties Latin American evangelical leaders have in the effective implementation of servant leadership in their organizations offer a rationale for the significance of the study. The grounded theory method was presented as the research paradigm best suited for conducting the study because of its design to facilitate the emergence of theories which would best explain the barriers. The theoretical framework supporting the study was the seminal work on servant leadership as developed by Robert Greenleaf, and, as a by-

product, the life and ministry of Jesus Christ. The work of Hofstede on the cultural dimensions of leadership was not viewed as a significant theoretical framework for identifying barriers.

Ten major barriers were proposed and presented as ten barrier theories. The ten major barrier areas were the following: a leader's negative character traits; the presence of specific sociocultural elements; family upbringing; issues specific to women in leadership; disobedience to Scriptural teaching; spirituality issues; servant leader terminology and practice; deficient academic and intellectual preparation; a lack of vision; and, certain behaviors of followers.

Seven strategies were proposed by the participants as to how the identified barriers could be overcome or removed: the carrying out of general and specific teaching initiatives; developing a person's character; a return to the teachings of Scripture; giving more attention to followers; invoking God's participation in removing the barriers; achieving "critical mass"; and, being a prophetic voice.

The results of the study were presented to two focus groups. One group was designed to give participant feedback and the second was designed as a peer review group. All members of the groups affirmed the results of the study. Eight suggestions for further research studies and various observations on implications for practice are included in the discussion.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, L. (1997). *They smell like sheep: Spiritual leadership for the 21st century*. West Monroe, LA.: Howard Publishing Company.
- Arrindell, W. A., Eisemann, M., Oei, T. P. S., Caballo, V. E., Sanavio, E., Sica, C., et al. (2004). Phobic anxiety in 11 nations: Part II. Hofstede's dimensions of national cultures predict national-level variations. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 37, 627-643.
- Avolio, B. J., & Yammarino, F. J. (2002). *Transformational and charismatic leadership: The road ahead*. Amsterdam: JAI Press.
- Barbour, I. G. (1990). *Religion in an age of science. The Gifford Lectures, 1989-1991* (Vol. 1). San Francisco: Harper.
- Baskerville, R. (2003). Hofstede never studied culture. *Accounting Organizations and Society*, 28, 1-14.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (3rd ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist*, 52(2), 130-139.
- Bass, B. M. (2000). The future of leadership in learning organizations. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 7(3), 18-40.
- Batista, J. D. (1998). *Atrévete a ser un líder: Un reto a un nuevo, pero antiguo modelo de servir*. Isabela, Puerto Rico: Self published.

- Bennis, W. (1989). *On becoming a leader*. New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.
- Bennis, W. (2003). *On becoming a leader: The leadership classic--updated and expanded*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Publishing.
- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders*. Toronto: Fitzhenry & Whiteside.
- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1997). *Leaders: Strategies for taking charge*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Bing, J.. (2005). *Hofstede's consequences: The impact of his work on consulting and business practices*. Retrieved August 30, 2005 from <http://www.itapintl.com/hofstedesconsequences.htm>.
- Blackaby, H., & Blackaby, R. (2001). *Spiritual Leadership: Moving people onto God's agenda*. Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers.
- Blackaby, H., & Blackaby, R. (2004). *Llamado a ser un lider de Dios: Como Dios prepara a sus siervos para el liderazgo espiritual*. Miami: Caribe-Betania Editores.
- Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1964). *The managerial grid*. Houston: Gulf Publishing.
- Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1978). *The new managerial grid*. Houston: Gulf Publishing.
- Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1985). *The managerial grid III*. Houston: Gulf Publishing.
- Blanchard, K. (1998). Servant-leadership revisited. In L. C. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant-leadership* (pp. 21-28). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

- Blanchard, K., & Hodges, P. (2003). *The servant leader: Transforming your heart, head, hands & habits*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, Inc.
- Blanchard, K., Hybles, B., & Hodges, P. (1999). *Leadership by the book: Tools to transform your workplace*. New York: William Morrow & Company, Inc.
- Blanchard, K., Zigarmi, P., & Zigarmi, D. (1985). *Leadership and the one minute manager: Increasing effectiveness through situational leadership*. New York: William Morrow & Company, Inc.
- Block, P. (1993). *Stewardship: Putting service ahead of self interest*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Block, P. (1996). *Stewardship: Choosing service over self-interest*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Block, P. (1998). From leadership to citizenship. In L. C. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant-leadership* (pp. 87-95). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Boehnke, K., Bontis, N., DiStefano, J. J., & DiStefano, A. C. (2003). Transformational leadership: An examination of cross-national differences and similarities. *The Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 24(1), 5-15.
- Bond, M. H. (2002). Michael Harris Bond, Reclaiming the individual from Hofstede's ecological analysis-A 20-year Odyssey: Comments on Oyserman et al. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128(1), 73-77.
- Brain, K., & Lewis, D. (2004). Exploring leadership preferences in multicultural workgroups: An Australian case study. *The Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 25(3), 263-278.

- Brodbeck, F. C., Frese, M., Akerblom, S., Audia, G., & Bakacsi, G. (2000). Cultural variation of leadership prototypes across 22 European countries. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 73*, 1-29.
- Bryman, A. (1992). *Charisma and leadership in organizations*. London: Sage.
- Burke, H. D. (2004). *Less is more leadership: 8 secrets to how to lead & still have a life*. Eugene, OR: Harvest House Publishers.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Caldwell, R. (2004). *How to get real*. Retrieved February 6, 2004, from <http://www.philosophynow.org/issue42/42caldwell1.htm>
- Castro, F. R. (2000). The development of serving leadership: The case of the Church Educational System in Chile and the Philippines. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 61* (06A), 2116.
- Cedar, P. (1987). *Strength in servant leadership*. Waco: Word Books.
- Charmaz, K. (2000). Grounded theory: Objectivist and constructivist methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln, (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 509-535). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Chemers, M. M. (1995). Contemporary leadership theory. In J. T. Wren (Ed.), *The leader's companion: Insights on leadership through the ages*. New York: The Free Press.
- Chemers, M. M. (2003, September 24). *Leadership & organizational effectiveness*. Power Point Presentation at the IBM Symposium on the Co-Evolution of Technology-Business Innovations. Retrieved Jan 12, 2005, from <http://www.almaden.ibm.com/coevolution/pdf/chemers.pdf>

- Colangelo, A. J. (2000). Followership: Leadership styles. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61 (05A), 1934.
- Collins, J. (2001). *Good to great: Why some companies make the leap and others don't*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Comiskey, J. T. (1997). Cell-based ministry as a positive factor for church growth in Latin America. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 58 (02A), 497.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Towards a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(4), 637-647.
- Conner, D. W. (1996). Personal power, authority, and influence: Cultural foundations for leadership and leadership formation in northeast Thailand and implications for adult leadership training. *Dissertation Abstracts International*. 57 (12A) 5015.
- Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (1979). *Quasi-experimentation: Design and analysis issues for field settings*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Covey, S. R. (1990). *Principal-centered leadership*. New York: Fireside Books - Simon and Schuster.
- Covey, S. R. (1994). Serving the one. *Excellence*, 11(9), 3-4.
- Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Creswell, J. W. (2004). *Educational Research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill-Prentice Hall.
- Darling, P. W. (1994). *New wine: The story of women transforming leadership and power in the Episcopal Church*. Cambridge, MA: Cowley Publications.
- Deal, T. E., & Kennedy, A. A. (1998). Strong cultures: The new "old rule" for business success. In G. R. Hickman (Ed.), *Leading organizations: Perspectives for a new era* (pp. 327-335). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dealy, G. C. (1977). *The public man: An interpretation of Latin American and other Catholic countries*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Den Hartog, D. N., House, R. J., Habges, P. J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A., & Dorfman, P. W. (1999). Culture specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: Are attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed? *Leadership Quarterly*, *10*(2), 219-257.
- Dennis, R., & Winston, B. E. (2003). A factor analysis of Page and Wong's servant leadership instrument. *The Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *24*(8), 455-459.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1998). *The landscape of qualitative research: Theories and issues*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2000a). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2000b). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research., In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln, (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 1-28). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- DePree, M. (1989). *Leadership is an art*. New York: Dell Publishing.
- DePree, M. (1992). *Leadership jazz*. New York: Doubleday.
- DePree, M. (1997). *Leading without power: Finding hope in serving community*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Drucker, P. (1990). *Managing the nonprofit organization: Practices and principles*. New York: HarperBusiness.
- Drury, S. L. (2004). *Servant leadership and organizational commitment: Empirical findings and workplace implications*. Paper presented at the 2004 Servant Leadership Research Roundtable, Regent University, Virginia Beach.
- Drury, S. L. (2005). *The writing of Sharon Drury: Leadership theory for pastors-30 research-based models*. Retrieved February 15, 2005, from <http://www.drurywriting.com/sharon/>
- Early, P. C., & Erez, M. (1997). *New Perspectives on International Industrial/Organizational Psychology*. San Francisco: The New Lexington Press.
- Eaton, L., & Louw, J. (2000). Culture and self in South Africa: Individualism-collectivism predictions. *Journal of Social Psychology, 140*(2), 210-217.
- Erwin, G. E. (1997). *The Jesus style*. Cathedral City, CA: Yahshua Publishing.
- Erwin, G. E. (2000). *Handbook for servants*. Cathedral City, CA: Yahshua Publishing.
- Fang, T. (2003). A critique of Hofstede's fifth national culture dimension. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management, 3*(3), 347-368.

- Ferraro, G. P. (2002). *The cultural dimension of international business* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Foss, M. W. (2001). *A servant's manual: Christian leadership for tomorrow*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Foster, B. A. (2000). Barriers to servant leadership: Perceived organizational elements that impede servant leader effectiveness. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61 (05A), 1935. (UMI No. AAI9974230).
- Frick, D. M. (1998). Understanding Robert K. Greenleaf and servant-leadership. In L. C. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant-leadership* (pp. 353-358). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Frick, D. M., & Spears, L. C. (Eds.). (1996). *On becoming a servant leader: The private writings of Robert K. Greenleaf*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Glick, N. D. (2001). Situational leadership in cross-cultural environments: The relationship between cross-cultural experience, culture training, leadership style, and leader-effectiveness in the United States foreign service. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62, 666.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977, 1991). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (Ed.). (2003). *The servant-leader within: A transformative path*. New York/Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105-117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Harvey, D. L. (2002). Agency and community: A critical realist paradigm. *Journal for the theory of social behaviour*, 32(2), 163.
- Heifetz, R. A. (1998). Values in leadership. In G. R. Hickman (Ed.), *Leading organizations: Perspectives for a new era* (pp. 345-346). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Helland, M. R. (2004). *Maestro-Understanding the development of a servant leader*. Paper presented at the 2004 Servant Leadership Research Roundtable, Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA.
- Hendrickson, M. G. (2003). *Issues in online learning and building virtual learning communities in Latin America: An exploratory study (Costa Rica, Venezuela, Peru, Mexico)*. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64 (11A), 4019. (Personal copy).
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. (1977). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. (1993). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources* (6th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. H., & Johnson, D. E. (1996). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. H., & Johnson, D. E. (2000). *Management of organizational behavior: Leading human resources* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hiebert, P. (1999). *Missiological implications of epistemological shifts*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International.

Hildebrand, H. P. (1990). *The model of servant-leadership*. Burlington, Ontario: Welch Publishing Company Inc.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Cultures consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (1997). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hofstede, G. (1998). A case for comparing apples with oranges: International differences in values. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 39(1), 16-31.

Hofstede, G. (1999a). Problems remain, but theories will change: The universal and the specific in 21st-century global management. *Organizational Dynamics*, 28(1), 34-44.

Hofstede, G. (1999b). Think locally, act globally: Cultural constraints in personnel management. *Management International Review*, 38(2), 7-26.

House, R., Javidan, M., & Dorfman, P. (2001). Project GLOBE: An Introduction. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 50(4), 489-505.

House, R. J., Wright, N. S., & Aditaya, R. N. (1997). Cross-cultural research on organizational leadership: A critical analysis and a proposed theory. In P. C. Early & M. Eretz (Eds.), *New perspectives on international industrial/organizational psychology* (pp. 535-625). San Francisco: The New Lexington Press.

- Hwang, T. Y. (1992). Confluence and conflict: Biblical and cultural influences on leadership of Korean churches (Biblical influences). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 53 (07A), 2416.
- Hybels, B. (2002). *Courageous leadership*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Hybels, B. (2003). *Liderazgo audaz*. Miami: Editorial Vida.
- Ivancevich, J. M. (1999). *Organization and behavioral management* (5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Jiménez, C. (1997). *El liderazgo bíblico genuino*. Nashville: Betania..
- Jones, L. B. (1995). *Jesus CEO: Using ancient wisdom for visionary leadership*. New York: Hyperion.
- Kautzmann, E. P. (1998). *Authority and interpersonal loyalty in the exercise of power within evangelical churches and church related organizations in urban Venezuela (urban communities)*. (Doctoral dissertation, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 1998). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 59, 874.
- Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1991). Leadership: Do traits matter? *The Executive*, 5, 48-60.
- Kotter, J. (1988). *The leadership factor*. New York: The Free Press.
- Kotter, J. (1996). *Leading change*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School.
- Kotter, J. (1999). *John P. Kotter on what leaders really do*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (1987). *The leadership challenge*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Krefting, L. (1991). Rigor in qualitative research: The assessment of trustworthiness. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 45, 214-222.

- Larson, P. A. (1995). *Liderazgo espiritual*. Barcelona: CLIE.
- Laub, J. (2003). *From paternalism to the servant organization*. Paper presented at the 2003 Servant Leadership Research Roundtable, Regent University School of Leadership Studies, Virginia Beach, VA.
- Laub, J. (2004). *Defining servant leadership: A recommended typology for servant leadership discussions*. Paper presented at the 2004 Servant Leadership Research Roundtable, Regent University School of Leadership Studies, Virginia Beach, VA.
- Leithwood, K., & Duke, D. L. (1998). Mapping the conceptual terrain of leadership: A critical point of departure for cross-cultural studies. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 73(2), 31-50.
- Likert, R. (1961). *New patterns of management*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Likert, R. (1963). Trends toward a world-wide theory of management. *Proceedings, International Management Congress*, 2, 110-114.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. S. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. London: Sage Publications.
- López, J., & Potter, G. (Eds.). (2001). *After postmodernism: An introduction to critical realism*. New York: The Athlone Press.
- Lubin, K. A. (2001). Visionary leader behaviors and their congruency with servant leadership characteristics. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62 (06A), 2645.
- Malphurs, A. (1996). *Values-driven leadership: Discovering and developing your core values for ministry*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.
- Manz, C. C., & Simms Jr., H. P. (1989). *Superleadership: Leading others to lead themselves*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Manz, C. C., & Simpson Jr., H. P. (1998). Tyrannosaurus Rex: The boss as corporate dinosaur. In G. R. Hickman (Ed.), *Leading organizations: Perspectives for a new era* (pp. 181-192). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Maxwell, J. C. (1993). *Developing the leader within you*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, Inc., Publishers.
- Maxwell, J. C. (1995). *Developing the leaders around you: How to help others reach their full potential*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, Inc., Publishers.
- Maxwell, J. C. (1998). *The 21 irrefutable laws of leadership: Follow them and people will follow you*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, Inc., Publishers.
- Maxwell, J. C. (2000). *Failing forward: Turning mistakes into stepping stones for success*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, Inc., Publishers.
- Maxwell, J. C. (2002). *Leadership 101: What every leader needs to know*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, Inc., Publishers.
- Maxwell, J. C. (2004). *Relationships 101: What every leader needs to know*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, Inc., Publishers.
- Mayers, M. K. (1982). *A look at Latin American lifestyles*. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, Inc.
- Miller, C. (1995). *The empowered leader*. Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers.
- Miller, C. (1999). *El lider con poder: Diez claves del liderazgo de servicio*. El Paso: Mundo Hispano.
- Miller, M. D. (1996). *Kingdom leadership: A call to Christ-centered leadership*. Nashville: Sunday School Board of the Baptist Convention.
- Murdock, M. (1996). *The leadership secrets of Jesus*. Tulsa: Honor Books.

- Murdock, M. (2002). *Secretos del liderazgo de Jesús: Las habilidades y reazgos claves del líder exitoso*. Grand Rapids: Vida Publishers.
- Naumov, A. I., & Puffer, S. M. (2000). Measuring Russian culture using Hofstede's dimensions. *An International Review*, 49(4), 709-718.
- Ndoria, J. L. (2004). *Servant leadership: A natural inclination or a taught behavior*. Paper presented at the 2004 Servant Leadership Research Roundtable, Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA.
- Ndoria, J. (2004). *Servant leadership: Is it an academic jargon or a lifestyle?* Paper presented at the 2004 Servant Leadership Research Roundtable, Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA.
- Newman, K. L., & Nollen, S. D. (1996). Culture and congruence: The fit between management practices and national culture. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 27(4), 753-779.
- Nida, E. A. (1974). *Understanding Latin Americans: With special reference to religious values and movements*. Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library.
- NLT. (1996). Mark 10:42-45. In *Holy Bible: New living translation*. Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House Publishers, Inc.
- Northouse, P. G. (2001). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Northouse, P. G. (2004). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Page, D., & Wong, T. P. (2000). A conceptual framework for measuring servant-leadership. In S. Adjibolosoo (Ed.), *The human factor in shaping the course of history and development*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Patterson, K. A. (2003). Servant leadership: A theoretical model, (Doctoral dissertation, Regent University, 2003) *Dissertation Abstracts International* , 64 (02A), 570.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Pearce, C. L., & Sims, H. P. (2002). Vertical versus shared leadership as predictors of the effectiveness of change management teams: An examination of aversive, directive, transactional, transformational, and empowering leader behaviors. *Group Dynamics*, 6(2), 172-197.
- Pratschke, J. (2003). Realistic models? Critical realism and statistical models in the social sciences. *Philosophica*, 71, 13-38.
- Prillaman, J. B. (1998). *Influences of Biblical and "caudillo" leadership patterns on the values and practices of evangelical church leaders in Bolivia* (Doctoral dissertation, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 1998). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 59, 4456.
- Ramos, S. A. (1986). Using the lead instrument to compare leadership styles of selected secondary school principals in Alabama with a group of principals in Venezuela (cross-cultural study). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 47 (09A), 3270.
- Reyes, R. I. (1997). *Leadership effectiveness of department chairpersons in the university of Los Andes (Mérida, Venezuela)* (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Florida, St. Petersburg, FL, 1997) *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 58,683.

- Rinehart, S. (1998). *Upside down : The paradox of servant leadership*. Colorado Springs, CO: NavPress.
- Roberts, K., & Boyacigiller, N. (1984). Cross-national organizational research: The grasp of the blind man. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 6, pp. 423-475). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.
- Russell, R. (2003). *A practical theology of servant leadership*. Paper presented at the 2003 Servant Leadership Research Roundtable Regent University School of Leadership Studies, Virginia Beach, VA.
- Russell, R. F., & Stone, G. A. (2002). A review of servant leadership attributes: Developing a practical model. *The Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 23(3), 145-157.
- Sánchez, J. O. (2001). *El líder del siglo XXI*. Miami: Editorial Unilit.
- Sanders, J. O. (1994). *Spiritual leadership* (3rd ed.). Chicago: Moody Press.
- Sanders, J. O. (1995). *Liderazgo espiritual*. Grand Rapids: Kregel.
- Sashkin, M. (1988). The visionary leader. In J. A. Conger & R. N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness* (pp. 122-160). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schwartz, R. W., & Tumblin, T. F. (2002). The power of servant leadership to transform health care organizations for the 21st-century economy. *Archives of Surgery*, 137(12), 1419-1427.
- Senge, P. (1997). Creating learning communities. *Executive Excellence*, 14(3), 17-18.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1990). Adding value to leadership gets extraordinary results. *Educational Leadership*, 47(8), 23-27.

- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1996). *Leadership for the schoolhouse: How is it different? Why is it important?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc. Publishers.
- Shahin, A. I., & Wright, P. L. (2004). Leadership in the context of culture: An Egyptian perspective. *The Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 25(6), 499-511.
- Siegrist, G. (1999). Educational leadership must move beyond management training to visionary and moral transformational leaders. *Education*, 120(2), 297-303.
- Silverman, D. (2000). *Doing qualitative research: A practical handbook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Slife, B. D., & Williams, R. N. (1995). *What's behind the research?: Discovering hidden assumptions in the behavioral sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Smith, P. B. (1997). Cross-cultural leadership: A path to the goal? In P. C. Early & M. Eretz (Eds.), *New perspectives on international industrial/organizational psychology* (pp. 626-639). San Francisco: The New Lexington Press.
- Smith, P. B. (2002). *Culture's consequences: Something old and something new*. *Human Relations*, 55(1), 119-135.
- Smith, S. (1996). Leadership training for cultural diversity. *MultiCultural Review*, 5(1), 33-38.
- Son, J. H. (2000). The impact of Confucianism on Korean Principal's leadership style and job satisfaction. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61 (02A), 452.
- Sondrol, P. C. (1990). Intellectuals, political culture and the roots of the authoritarian presidency in Latin America. *Governance*, 3(4), 416-437.

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. *History of leadership research*. (n.d.).

Retrieved February 15, 2005, from

<http://www.sedl.org/change/leadership/history.html>

Spears, L. C. (2004). The understanding and practice of servant-leadership. In L. C.

Spears & M. Lawrence (Eds.), *Practicing servant leadership: Succeeding through trust, bravery, and forgiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Starcher, R. L. (2003). Africans in pursuit of a theological doctorate: A grounded theory study of theological doctoral program design in a non-western context.

Dissertation Abstracts International, 64 (05A), 1518. (Personal copy).

Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *Journal of Psychology*, 25, 35-71.

Stogdill, R. M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York: Free Press.

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

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Tichy, N. M., & Devanna, M. A. (1997). *The transformational leader: The key to global competitiveness*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

- Torres, C. V. (1999). Leadership style norms among Americans and Brazilians: Assessing differences using Jackson's Return Potential model. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60 (08B), 4284.
- Trompenaars, F. (1994). *Riding the waves of culture: Understanding diversity in global business*. New York: Irwin Professional Publishing.
- Vanhoozer, K. J. (1998). *Is there meaning in this text?: The Bible, the reader, and the morality of literary knowledge*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Vishwanath, A. (2003). Comparing online information effects: A cross-cultural comparison of online information and uncertainty avoidance. *Communication Research*, 30(6), 579-599.
- Weiss, R. S. (1994). *Learning from strangers: The art and method of qualitative interview*. New York: The Free Press.
- Wheatley, M. J. (1994). *Leadership and the new science: Learning about organizations from an orderly universe*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Wierenga, R. A. (1996). Coping with caudillismo: The tension between authoritarian and participatory leadership styles in the development of the new church in Caracas, Venezuela. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 57, 3554.
- Wilkes, C. G. (1998a). *El liderazgo de Jesús: Como ser un líder servidor*. El Paso: Casa Bautista de Publicaciones.
- Wilkes, C. G. (1998b). *Jesus on leadership: Discovering the secrets of servant leadership from the life of Christ*. Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House Publishers, Inc.
- Wren, J. T. (Ed.). (1995). *The leader's companion: Leadership insights through the ages*. New York: The Free Press.

Yocou, R. C. (1991). *El líder conforme al corazón de Dios*. Miami: Editorial Unilit.

Youssef, M. (1986). *The leadership style of Jesus*. Wheaton, IL: SP Publications, Inc.

Yukl, G. (2001). *Leadership in organizations* (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

Definition of Leadership and Servant Leadership

Definition of Leadership and Servant Leadership

Note to the Participant

Participant: There are many ways that Biblical servant leadership may be understood. For the purposes of this research study, the following paragraphs are designed to give you a basic understanding of Biblical servant leadership. What is written below is not a detailed definition of Biblical servant leadership, but it will serve as a reference point in our discussions. Thank you.

Keith R. Anderson

Definition of a Leader

A leader is not necessarily a person who has the position of leadership. Rather, "A leader is a person who sees a vision, takes action toward the vision, and mobilizes others to become partners in pursuing change" (Laub, 2004, p. 4).

Definition of a Servant Leader

A servant leader is defined by Greenleaf in the following way:

The servant-leader *is* servant first. . . . It begins with a natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve *first*. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead. . . . The leader-first and the servant-first are two extreme types. Between them there are shadings and blends that are part of the infinite variety of human nature.

The difference manifests itself in the care taken by the servant-first to make sure that other people's highest priority needs are being served. The best test, and difficult to administer, is: Do those served grow as persons? Do they, *while being served*, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants? (Greenleaf, 1991, pp. 13-14)

Components of Biblical Servant Leadership

Jesus referred to leadership in the following way:

You know that in this world kings are tyrants, and officials lord it over the people beneath them. But among you it should be quite different. Whoever wants to be a leader among you must be your servant, and whoever wants to be first must be the slave of all. For even I, the Son of Man, came here not to be served but to serve others, and to give my life as a ransom for many. Mark 10:42-45 (New Living Translation) He also said, "He who is greatest among you shall be your servant. And whoever exalts himself will be humbled, and he who humbles himself will be exalted." Matthew 23:11-12 (New Living Translation)

Biblical servant leadership is assembled using the following components:

1. An understanding that servant leadership is more a mindset than a style of leadership.
2. An awareness that the vision he or she has received is from God and that God expects that leader to be the one who is primarily responsible for mobilizing and empowering followers to accomplish the vision.
3. A faithful adherence to Biblical principles in fulfilling the vision.
4. An understanding that leadership is an act of service, not a position to be protected.
5. An attitude which demonstrates that service is designed for the good of those being led over the leader's own benefit.
6. An awareness that there may be more than one way to implement servant leadership in mobilizing followers to accomplish the vision (since the key to servant leadership does not depend on the style of leadership but focuses on the followers).
7. Power is used to serve, not to coerce or manipulate.
8. A high priority is focused on the value of those being served by the leader.
9. Servant leadership values the following virtues (Patterson, 2003): love, humility, altruism, vision, trust, empowerment, and service.

APPENDIX B

A Spanish Translation of the Definition of Leadership and Servant Leadership

The following pages of Appendix B reflect the initial sequencing of number as per the original proposal. The page number at the bottom of the pages are included to reflect authenticity of the Spanish translation of the documents.

APPENDIX C

Protocol (Interview Questions)

Protocol (Interview questions)

Initial Questions

Below are various questions which will be used for the interviews. The first four questions are those which are general in nature and are designed to elicit an awareness of leadership and leadership practices in the participant's own setting.

1. How do you define leadership?
2. In your opinion, what distinguishes a good leader?
3. What is expected of a good leader in the context in which you lead?
4. How would the implementation of good leadership be described by the citizens of your native country?

Once the researcher and the participant have concluded their dialogue regarding the first four questions, the researcher will ask the participant to read Appendix A (which summarizes Biblical servant leadership). The following questions will be asked after the participant has read the paragraphs in Appendix A. As noted in the proposal, these questions may be modified after the initial interviews in order to allow the researcher to focus on specific issues which may be more productive than those addressed by the questions below.

5. How do you react to each of the three definitions you just read (a reference to Appendix A):
6. Jesus said that, "Whoever wants to be a leader among you must be your servant, and whoever wants to be first must be the servant of all." How does this work out in evangelical organizations?
7. What would be the opposite of servant leadership?

8. Which leaders do you know who match the requirements of Biblical servant leadership?
9. What are the obstacles that leaders of evangelical churches and institutions must overcome which keep them from implementing or exercising the kind of leadership Jesus describes?
10. If there are barriers, what are some ways these barriers to servant leadership may be overcome?

APPENDIX D

A Spanish Translation of the Protocol (Interview Questions)

The following pages of Appendix D reflect the initial sequencing of number as per the original proposal. The page number at the bottom of the pages are included to reflect authenticity of the Spanish translation of the documents.

APPENDIX E

Cover Letter

Dear Research Participant:

Your participation in a research project is requested. The title of the study is *An Exploration of the Barriers Which Impede the Effective Implementation of Servant Leadership in Latin American Evangelical Organizations: A Grounded Theory Study*. The research is being conducted by Keith Anderson, a doctoral student in the Leadership and Education department at Barry University, and is seeking information that will be useful in the field of Leadership. The aim of the research is to identify the barriers which impede the effective implementation of servant leadership in Latin American organizations. In accordance with this aim, the following procedures will be used: each participant will be asked to respond to four basic questions on general leadership issues and then be asked to read a definition of a leader, servant leader and the components of Biblical servant leadership. This short reading will be followed by the researcher asking the participant to respond to further specific questions regarding leadership and servant leadership. Some participants may be asked to participate in a follow-up interview of approximately 30 to 60 minutes to probe further or clarify any ambiguities which may have surfaced from the initial interview. Participants may also be asked to participate in a focus group for the purpose of peer review. We anticipate the number of participants to be 20.

If you decide to participate in this research, you will be asked to do the following: to read the cover letter and the consent form showing your consent to participate in this study. The subsequent interviews will be recorded in a digitized audio format and will take approximately 60 to 90 minutes and you will be asked to be on time for the interviews. If it is not possible for us to have a personal interview, we will have the interview by telephone. Within a week after the completion of the transcription of the interview, you will be sent a copy of the transcript, either faxed, mailed, personally presented, or sent electronically to a secure address of your choosing and then be asked to read the Spanish transcript to ascertain whether what you said is actually represented in the transcript and amend if necessary.

Your consent to be a research participant is strictly voluntary. Should you decline to participate or should you choose to drop out at any time during the study, there will be no adverse effects for you, your ministry, or your organization.

While this is not an anonymous study, there are no known risks involved in this study and the information supplied will be held confidential. Although there are no direct benefits to you, your participation in this study has the potential of contributing to a deeper comprehension of servant leadership and will contribute to a growing understanding of how servant leadership is implemented in a Latin American context. Your experience as a leader will benefit other leaders and potential leaders throughout Latin America. Servant leadership is a subject which has very little research data from the Latin American context, thus, your participation will make a significant contribution to this under-researched leadership subject.

As a research participant, information you provide will be held in confidence to the full extent permitted by law. Any published results will refer to group averages only and

no names will be used in the study. While the study is being conducted, data will be kept in a locked file in the researcher's home. This researcher will store the data recording and transcripts containing data collected from the interviews in a locked file cabinet at home for six years after which the researcher will destroy them. Your signed consent form will be kept separate from the data.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the study or your participation in the study, you may contact me, Keith Anderson, at (954) 665-3649, my supervisor, Dr. Carmen McCrink, at (305) 899-3702, or the Institutional Review Board point of contact, Ms. Nildy Polanco, at (305) 899-3020.

Thank you for your participation.

Sincerely,
Keith R. Anderson

APPENDIX F

A Spanish Translation of the Cover Letter

The following pages of Appendix F reflect the initial sequencing of number as per the original proposal. The page number at the bottom of the pages are included to reflect authenticity of the Spanish translation of the documents.

APPENDIX G
Barry University
Informed Consent Form

Your participation in a research project is requested. The title of the study is “An exploration of the barriers which impede the effective implementation of servant leadership in Latin American evangelical organizations: A grounded theory study.”

The research is being conducted by Keith Anderson, a doctoral student in the Leadership and Education department at Barry University, and is seeking information that will be useful in the field of leadership. The aim of the research is to identify barriers to servant leadership as experienced by Latin American leaders of the evangelical church. In accordance with these aims, the following procedures will be used: personal interviews with leaders of the Latin American evangelical church. We anticipate the number of participants to be twenty.

If you decide to participate in this research, you will be asked to do the following: participate in an interview of approximately 60 to 90 minutes. The interviews will be recorded in a digitized audio format. This may include a follow-up interview of approximately 30 to 60 minutes to probe further or clarify any ambiguities which may have surfaced from the initial interview. If it is not possible for us to have a personal interview, we will have the interview by telephone. Within a week after the completion of the transcription of the interview, you will be sent a copy of the transcript, either faxed, mailed, personally presented, or sent electronically to a secure address of your choosing and then be asked to read the Spanish transcript to ascertain whether what you said is actually represented in the transcript and amend if necessary. Participants may also be asked to participate in a focus group for the purpose of peer review. We anticipate the number of participants to be 20.

Your consent to be a research participant is strictly voluntary and should you decline to participate or should you choose to drop out at any time during the study, there will be no adverse effects or negative response on the part of the researcher.

While this is not an anonymous study, the risks of involvement in this study are minimal and the information supplied will be held confidential. Your involvement will include a short time commitment on your part in order to participate in the interview(s). The researcher will be sensitive to your time constraints in finding the best time to carry out the interview. There are no known risks to you. Although there may be no direct benefits to you, your participation in this study may help our understanding of how to implement Biblical servant leadership more effectively within the evangelical churches of Latin America.

As a research participant, information you provide will be held in confidence to the extent permitted by law. Any published results of the research will refer to group averages only and no names will be used in the study. Data will be kept in a locked file in the researcher's office. Audio tape recordings will be securely stored and will be destroyed after three years. Your signed consent form will be kept separate from the data. All written data will be retained for six years and then destroyed.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the study or your participation in the study, you may contact me, Keith R. Anderson, at (954) 966-1832, my supervisor, Dr. Carmen McCrink, at (305) 899-3702, or the Institutional Review Board point of contact, Ms. Nildy Polanco, at (305) 899-3020. If you are satisfied with the information provided and are willing to participate in this research, please signify your consent by signing this consent form.

Voluntary Consent

I acknowledge that I have been informed of the nature and purposes of this experiment by Keith R. Anderson and that I have read and understand the information presented above, and that I have received a copy of this form for my records. I give my voluntary consent to participate in this experiment.

Signature of Participant

Date

Researcher

Date

APPENDIX H

A Spanish Translation of Informed Consent Form

The following pages of Appendix H reflect the initial sequencing of number as per the original proposal. The page number at the bottom of the pages are included to reflect authenticity of the Spanish translation of the documents.

APPENDIX I

Translation Certification and Notary Seals Document

APPENDIX J

Human Participant Protections Education for Research Teams

Completion Certificate



Human Participant Protections Education for Research Teams

Completion Certificate

This is to certify that

Keith Anderson

has completed the Human Participants Protection Education for Research Teams online course, sponsored by the National Institutes of Health (NIH), on 07/13/2005.

This course included the following:

- key historical events and current issues that impact guidelines and legislation on human participant protection in research.
- ethical principles and guidelines that should assist in resolving the ethical issues inherent in the conduct of research with human participants.
- the use of key ethical principles and federal regulations to protect human participants at various stages in the research process.
- a description of guidelines for the protection of special populations in research.
- a definition of informed consent and components necessary for a valid consent.
- a description of the role of the IRB in the research process.
- the roles, responsibilities, and interactions of federal agencies, institutions, and researchers in conducting research with human participants.

National Institutes of Health
<http://www.nih.gov>

[Home](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Policies](#) | [Accessibility](#) | [Site Help](#) | [Site Map](#)

A Service of the National Cancer Institute



FIRSTGOV

APPENDIX K

List of Participants

List of Participants

In some cases, the digital recorder was turned off while the participant read the definitions from Appendix B. Thus the recording times as noted were approximately four to five minutes shorter than the actual interview. Countries represented: Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Mexico, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela Average estimated age of participants: 51 years old (youngest, approximately 32 years old and the oldest, approximately 80 years old.

Names (in the order that transcriptions entered into the computer)	Interview date (2006)	Total length of interview (minutes)	Length of recorded interview (minutes)	Leadership Position
1. Jorge	March 7	131	67	Denominational leader
2. Carlos	March 19	60	55	Organizational leader
3. Serafino	March 23	96	85	Senior pastor
4. José	March 27	67	58	Educational leader
5. Diego	March 28	86	82	Senior pastor
6. Patricia	April 1	102	90	Conference speaker
7. Francisco	April 3	72	65	Denominational leader
8. Mario	April 4	54	52	Organizational leader
9. Ricardo	April 23	52	46	Organizational leader
10. David	April 25	115	59	Denominational leader
11. Daniel	April 25	52	44	Organizational leader
12. Pedro	April 27	22	18	Educational leader
13. Pablo	April 29	96	62	Educational leader
14. Santiago	April 30	24	21	Senior pastor
15. Lilia	April 28	37	30	Educational leader
16. Lucas	May 1	24	22	Senior pastor
17. Esther	April 30	28	26	Senior pastor wife
18. Manuel	May 2	32	30	Educational leader
19. Dorcas	May 1	32	28	Educational leader
20. Ana	May 3	45	24	Organizational leader
21. Rafael	May 3	55	32	Denominational leader
22. Esteban	May 6	48	26	Senior pastor
23. Bernardo	May 10	38	23	Denominational leader

APPENDIX L
Confidentiality Agreements

This work is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Barry University Institutional Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in open access Theses by an authorized administrator of Institutional Repository.