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ABSTRACT

Wonders, Andrew. Ed.D., Organizational Studies in Education, Wright State University, 2024. Examining the nonprofit leader from the servant leadership theory: Impacts on board cohesion.

In the context of nonprofit organizations, servant leadership (SL) has been studied on a limited basis. The present study attempted to forge a new path by examining the impact of SL and cohesion in the realm of nonprofit organizations. A total of 91 board members from 32 organizations participated in the study. Five statistical models of mixed effects linear regression were used in the analysis. The first model utilized the eight subscales of SL as independent variables and overall cohesion is the dependent variable while the other four models used overall SL as the independent variable. Each model also had an independent variable that denoted whether a given respondent was the director of the board or a board member.

There is strong evidence to suggest a significant linear relationship between accountability and overall board cohesion (F(1, 80) = 5.65, p = 0.0198). There is also strong evidence to suggest a significant linear relationship between humility and overall board cohesion (F(1, 80) = 18.54, p < 0.0001). There is strong evidence to suggest a significant linear relationship between overall SL and attraction to group social (F(1, 87) = 7.96, p = 0.0059). There is strong evidence to suggest there is a significant linear relationship between overall SL and attraction to group task (F(1, 87) = 20.88, p < 0.0001). There is strong evidence to suggest there is a significant two-way interaction between role and group integration social (F(1, 86) = 8.05, p = 0.0057). There is not sufficient evidence to suggest there is a significant two-way interaction between role and group
integration task \( F(1, 86) = 0.30, p = 0.59 \). Overall, the use of the servant leadership theory by nonprofit executives proved to be an enhancement on overall board cohesion.
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CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

Background

Nonprofit organizations play a vital role in civic engagement, economic growth, and maintaining the fabric of our communities. Nonprofits can include many types of organizations, such as service organizations, chambers of commerce, childcare organizations, universities, hospitals, and religious organizations. In general, the word ‘nonprofit’ commonly refers to 501(c)(3) public charities, of which as of 2019, there were 1,298,348 in the United States (Hall, 2016). Additionally, there were 126,676 private foundations and an unknown number of religious organizations, which are not required to register with the IRS (Hall, 2016). Of the nearly 1.3 million organizations, the total wages of approximately $826 billion are paid to nearly 12.3 million employees per year. This number of employees is greater than both the construction and finance industries, just to name a few (Hall, 2016). With so much at stake for these organizations at the macro level, there is value in understanding types of leadership within the nonprofit sector.

Commonly, leaders within nonprofit organizations include an executive director and a collection of board members that governs the organization. Although effective nonprofit leadership shares similarities with traditional for-profit organizations, there are elements of nonprofit leadership that make it unique (Ronquillo et al., 2012). For example, nonprofit organizations are unique in their emphasis on mission, limited resources, competition for talent, traditionally lower salaries, and a reliance on donations and volunteers (Herman, 2016).

Much of the existing literature regarding nonprofits has traditionally focused on transactional and transformational leadership (Hassi, 2019; Rowold & Rohmann, 2009; Tims et al., 2011; Vecchio et al., 2008). The review of these leadership styles has shown that the
transformational style can be quite impactful. The transformational leadership style is concerned with the process of inspiring followers to accomplish things beyond what they believed their capabilities to be (Bass & Avolio, 1990). Transformational leadership can enhance employee satisfaction (Hassi, 2019), commitment (Alkahtani, 2015), citizenship behavior (Haghighi, 2016; Hassi, 2019), and innovation (Yıldız & Özcan, 2014). Although the examination of leadership styles within nonprofit organizations is prevalent in academic literature, servant leadership has been understudied in its application to the nonprofit setting (Palumbo, 2016). Therefore, there is usefulness of the proposed study for nonprofit organizations and the continuation of servant leadership.

Servant leadership, first identified prominently by Greenleaf (1970) summarized servant leadership through three poignant questions: (a) Do those served grow as a person? (b) Do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, and more likely themselves to become servants? and, (c) What is the effect on the least privileged in society? From those original questions, servant leadership theory has been tested and defined more clearly (Sendjaya et al., 2008; van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011). van Dierendonck and Nuitjen (2011) particularly moved servant leadership theory forward in academic literature, both in characteristics and measurement. Servant leadership characteristics include empowerment, accountability, standing back, humility, authenticity, courage, interpersonal acceptance, and stewardship. More importantly, servant leadership is well suited for the nonprofit sector because of its emphasis on the mission (Ronquilo, 2011), its focus on followers to meet organizational objectives (Palumbo, 2016), and its suitability to caring organizations (Liden et al., 2008).

With the growing body of work surrounding the definition of servant leadership, additional literature also followed to determine the theory’s usefulness. For instance, servant
leadership has been shown to improve personal growth, organizational citizenship behavior, and organizational effectiveness to name a few (Ehrhart, 2004; Liden et al., 2014, 2008; Mayer et al., 2008)

However, at present, research surrounding servant leadership within the nonprofit sector is limited. One such study reveals a strong correlation between servant leadership style and employee empowerment and commitment to the organization (Allen et al., 2018). In addition, research indicates that the presence of servant leadership results in higher levels of organizational trust (McAuley, 2019).

Another variable that has potential to impact workers in the nonprofit sector is that of cohesion. Cohesion is defined as a “dynamic process that is reflected in the tendency of a group to stick together and remain united in the pursuit of its instrumental objectives and/or for the satisfaction of member affective needs” (Carron & Brawley, 2000, p. 115). Cohesion has been examined in a variety of contexts, including sports teams, musical groups, education, work units, military, and families (Carron & Brawley, 2000; Cota et al., 1995; Lott & Lott, 1965). Cohesion has long been recognized as an important variable in the study of intra-group dynamics (Carron & Brawley, 2000). In traditional organizational settings, researchers have considered it to be the most important small group variable (Lott & Lott, 1965).

Carron and Brawley (2000) have identified three specific influences on cohesion: (a) cohesion results from a sense of belonging, (b) cohesion stems from the required coordination of work, and (c) cohesion develops from interpersonal and group attraction. Accordingly, the concept of cohesion includes social cohesion, and task cohesion. Social cohesion is concerned with the relationships distinct from the tasks that meet group objectives (Hackman, 2002). Task cohesion is encompassed by an individual attraction to a group based on the task being
performed (Carron & Brawley, 2000). A study by Doherty and Carron (2003) found that the task elements of cohesion were more important than the social aspects of cohesion. Specifically, the authors found that the prevalence of task cohesion positively impacted member effort, retention, and committee effectiveness. However, research surrounding the issues of servant leadership and cohesion for nonprofit organizations does not exist. Therefore, the purpose of the present investigation will be to examine the impact of servant leadership on cohesiveness within nonprofit organizations.

**Purpose and Methods**

Previous research has revealed several positive organizational and individual outcomes connected to the presence of servant leadership (Hu & Liden, 2011; Laub, 1999; Russell & Stone, 2002). Further, the importance of cohesion has been identified in a number of contexts but is lacking in the nonprofit setting. Thus, the present study will attempt to forge a new path by examining the impact of servant leadership and cohesion in the realm of nonprofit organizations.

From the perspective of the researcher, it would seem as though the emphasis on nonprofit mission would require a highly cohesive organization in order to achieve maximum effectiveness. Additionally, servant leadership would seem to be conducive to the importance of nonprofit mission-focus and be particularly helpful in dealing with staff, whose resources may be limited. This study will examine the impact of servant leadership on cohesion within nonprofit organizations. The first step in conducting this study will be to determine the level of servant leadership that exists at the executive level of the nonprofit organization. This level is often referred to as the executive director, although some nonprofits also use CEO. For the present study, this position will be hereby referred to as executive. To determine the presence of servant leadership, the researcher will utilize the servant leadership survey (SLS), which was developed
and validated by van Dierendonck (2011). Second, the SLS will be adapted and given to the
governing board of the nonprofit organization. Using this scale, a dichotomous grouping will be
established regarding the presence (or absence) of servant leadership at the governing board and
executive director level of the organization. From here, the researcher will complete a stratified
random sample of organizations with and without servant leadership to determine whether a
difference exists in the cohesion of the nonprofit board.

Cohesion will be measured within the governing board of the nonprofit organization.
Cohesion will be measured using the general environment questionnaire (GEQ) that was
developed and validated by Carron & Brawley (2000). The statistical analysis will examine
differences in the types of cohesion with or without the presence of servant leadership.

Research Questions

RQ 1. Which of the eight servant leader sub-scales from the executive director are
predictive of overall cohesion after controlling for whether the person was a board member or
executive and how long the current board had been together?

RQ 2. Is overall servant leadership predictive of attraction to the group-social (ATGS)
level after controlling for whether the person was a board member or executive and how long the
current board had been together?

RQ 3. Is overall servant leadership predictive of attraction to the group-task (ATGT) after
controlling for whether the person was a board member or executive and how long the current
board had been together?

RQ 4. Is overall servant leadership predictive of group integration-social (GIS) after
controlling for whether the person was a board member or executive and how long the current
board had been together?
RQ 5. Is overall servant leadership predictive of group integration-task (GIT) after controlling for whether the person was a board member or executive and how long the current board had been together?

**Anticipated Results**

Due to the uniqueness of nonprofit organizations, I expect cohesion to be significantly different on nonprofit boards when a high level of servant leadership is present with the nonprofit executive. More specifically, I expect that task cohesion to increase with the nonprofit board, both as a group construct and individual contrast when a high level of servant leadership exists with the nonprofit executive. Finally, I expect a high level of servant leadership from the nonprofit executive to create a significant difference in task cohesion as compared to social cohesion.
CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Nonprofit Organizations, A Brief History

To lay the groundwork for a study of leadership within nonprofit organizations, an understanding of nonprofit organizations is important. To start, nonprofits as a sector is historically quite new, dating to the early 1970s (Hall, 2016). However, elements of what we now describe as nonprofit can be seen in classical and even Biblical periods. This historical reality of the nonprofit sector points to a clear challenge for academics, in that nonprofits are not clearly defined.

The most common way to define a nonprofit is through taxation status. However, to say that an organization is a nonprofit because the organization receives a classification as a 501(c)(3) charitable tax-exempt designation by the IRS or even a 501(c)(4) civic organization is much too narrow a view of what a nonprofit is (Hall, 2016). For instance, religious organizations are not required to seek tax-exempt status, therefore not technically at 501(c)(3), yet they certainly fit the ideals of a nonprofit organization. Additionally, there are a wide variety of unincorporated associations such as Alcoholics Anonymous that fit in the idea of a nonprofit, but the very nature of the organization does not permit formal incorporating status. Therefore, the best that can be done is to understand the ideas and institutions that makeup what we know of today as the nonprofit sector (Hall, 2016).

The foundation of the nonprofit sector is in the giving of time and money, and these elements have been espoused since the earliest stages of American life. In 17th century America there was no clear distinction between the public and the private, as all corporations were considered public agencies (Seavoy, 1978). Therefore, the giving of time and money were woven into the fabric of all entities. Municipal corporations, religious congregations, and early colleges
were all examples of public agencies at the time. Colleges were governed by clergy and supported by government grants. These types of organizations accepted gifts from donors and cared for those dollars within endowed trusts (Friedman & McGarvie, 2003). Additionally, governing boards had authority on behalf of the members, there were no owners or stockholders, and were exempt from taxation (Hall, 2016).

The 18th century brought increased population, economic development, and business dealings with England and other European countries. The result were the enhanced rights of citizens, including freedom of speech, assembly, worship, understanding of the law, and economic rights (Hall, 2016). New institutions accompanied these innovative ideas. Voluntary associations, attributed to Benjamin Franklin, began to appear in Colonial America. Freemasonry, as an example, spread quickly throughout the colonies and provided a model for other similar associations. These organizations, such as the Sons of Liberty, proved to be an asset during the revolution by helping to organize and prepare citizens in their fight for independence. As the individualization of the colonies continued, religious life changed. Denominations expanded and grew to include the likes of Baptists and Methodists (Friedman & McGarvie, 2003). As this happened, denominations were given the same rights as previously established congregations, for example exemption from taxation. This precedent would carry into secular associations in the coming generations (Hall, 2016).

Post-revolution, voluntary associations came to be a symbol of distrust, as individuals were wary of the wealth behind these institutions. Some states went so far as to actively discourage private charity, such as Virginia (Friedman & McGarvie, 2003). In its preference for public over private institutions, the state of Virginia founded its state university in 1818.
(Friedman & McGarvie, 2003). Additionally, the distrust of wealth led to the resistance to charter corporations and to establish charitable trusts, mainly in the southern states (Hall, 2016). Conversely, the New England states promoted private entities of all types. By 1800, Massachusetts and Connecticut had chartered more corporations than all other states combined (Hall, 2016). Riding the rising tide of corporations, voluntary associations of all types, formal/informal, religious, and secular, also thrived. During these years, New England became the epicenter of education and science, seeing dollars poured into colleges, hospitals, museums, and libraries (Friedman & McGarvie, 2003). This growth in privately funded organizations was not without challenge, however. To take over Dartmouth College, the state of New Hampshire was challenged in the U.S. Supreme Court. The result of Trustees of Dartmouth College v. Woodward was a win for Dartmouth College, in keeping its institution private. Based on the protection of contract law in the constitution, the practical application for nonprofits of the future was that the institutions founded and financially supported by donors would be safe from government interference (Hall, 2016).

Also, in the first half of the 19th century, voluntary associations grew in stature and influence in public life. Organized nationally, with state and local chapters, these associations became the conduit for reformation on issues such as slavery. Churches began to develop national denominations supporting a variety of educational and charitable endeavors both domestically and abroad (Butler, 1990). This trend accelerated as European immigrants brought their traditions of voluntary service. At this time, the Roman Catholic Church, to which many Irish and German immigrants already belonged, began its massive wave of benevolence through schools, orphanages, and other social welfare organizations (Butler, 1990).
Voluntary organizations were also at the forefront during and after the Civil War. Organizations such as the U.S. Christian Commission mobilized fundraising efforts and volunteers to meet the needs of public health and medical care in the military (Friedman & McGarvie, 2003). During the reconstruction of areas pummeled by the war, the United States government turned to voluntary organizations to do such work as building and staffing schools and teaching vocational skills (Hall, 2016).

However, the post-Civil War era also brought new thinking into the philanthropic landscape. In 1869, Harvard’s President, Charles Eliot, posited a shift in direction for the university. To stimulate economic development, he desired to shift the university’s focus to that of a research institution (Eliot, 2020). The notion was met with enthusiasm by donors, many of whom were business leaders. This change was reflected in the governance of the university as well. Business leaders began to supplant clergy on its governing board. Additionally, curricular changes, increased specialization, and new professional schools began to reflect research toward economic development at Harvard (Curti & Nash, 1965).

The idea initiated at Harvard sent a new wave of philanthropic activity that can still be seen today. Universities became centers of philanthropic activity and aligned themselves closely with other research-minded institutions like hospitals and museums (Hawkins, 1992). Students of institutions such as Harvard began to populate the business industry and began to tackle issues in government such as public health, social welfare, and transportation. Amidst this changing landscape a few prominent voices began to offer their insight into the philanthropic endeavors of the United States, among them was Andrew Carnegie (Lagemann, 1999). By the late 1880s, Carnegie became one of the wealthiest individuals in the country through the railroad and steel industries. He proceeded to write a series of articles about issues such as the labor crisis and
handling of the industrial growth in the United States. One topic of particular interest was the handling of wealth by individuals such as himself. He condemned the passing of wealth to heirs and even recommended estate taxation to minimize the passing of large fortunes within families. He was also critical of traditional charity. Carnegie claimed that pure charity responded to suffering rather than focusing on the prevention of it. However, Carnegie believed that intelligent philanthropy could be integral to eliminating root causes of social problems and essential to continuing the economic progress in the country (Lagemann, 1999). Carnegie encouraged his peers to put their wealth toward endeavors that would produce the most lasting good to the mass of the population (Lagemann, 1999). Carnegie’s ideas included libraries, parks, museums, and educational institutions (Hall, 2016). In setting this example, Carnegie’s words and deeds eventually initiated a new wave of organized and focused philanthropy through individual foundations that would set initiatives on problems in education, health, and social welfare, to name a few (Hall, 2016).

Despite the call to action by Carnegie, wealthy business owners faced obstacles to large donations to various entities because state laws prohibited the donations. For example, the state of New York invalidated a multimillion-dollar gift to the New York Public Library by corporate lawyer Samuel Tildon (Hall, 2016). However, by 1893, public sentiment about the ultra-wealthy led to a coordinated effort to change charity laws by the states of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Illinois. The first foundation that would resemble current foundations was John D. Rockefeller's General Education Board. This foundation was established to help African American schools in the south, but later broadened to higher education as well (Lagemann, 1999). The grantmaking foundations were not the only charitable vehicle developed during this time.
In 1910, the city of Cleveland convened a committee to address the growing number of charities requesting funds paired with an overall decrease in charitable giving throughout the city (Hall, 2016). Part of the problem to be addressed was the validity of many charities throughout the city, the other was the frequency of donation requests. The result of the committee was the Cleveland City Community Chest. The community chest was an annual fund drive within the city of Cleveland. The community chest would validate the city’s charities, pool individual donations together, and redistribute those donations to the worthy charities. This idea spread to hundreds of towns and cities throughout the country and became what we know of today as the United Way (Hall, 2016). Another offshoot of the community chest idea was community foundations, which receive donations of many sizes for redistribution throughout the community. This remains a common philanthropic tool in most communities even today (Hall, 2016).

Although the progression of nonprofits up to the 1920s was significant, perhaps no other single event had as much impact on the sector as the Great Depression. Interestingly, when the effects of the Great Depression began to take effect, the primary means of remedy were voluntary associations, just as during revolutionary times (Hall, 2016). This was a direct result of President Hoover being opposed to expanding government. When Franklin D. Roosevelt entered office, his terms began similarly, with the creation of the National Recovery Administration (NRA). The NRA’s primary purpose was to stimulate economic revival through cooperation between business and government. However, the NRA was declared unconstitutional in 1935 (Friedman & McGarvie, 2003).

The failure of the NRA pushed Roosevelt toward massive public projects to restore the economy. Projects such as the works projects administration, civilian conservation corps, social security, subsidies in agriculture and other industries, and the introduction of income tax were all
examples of tools used by the government that had lasting impact on the nonprofit sector (Hall, 2016). Primarily, many of the programs initiated by Roosevelt were implemented by the state and local municipalities or by nongovernmental organizations (NGOs). These NGOs were funded by government contracts, user fees, and private contributions. Due to the new income tax structure, an incentive to contribute was created by way of a tax deduction for those individuals wanting to give charitably to these NGOs or other qualified nonprofits (Friedman & McGarvie, 2003).

After World War II, the progression of the income tax continued and donating became an integral incentive in minimizing that tax. By 1940, the number of tax-exempt organizations registered by the IRS was approximately 12,500 (Hall & Burke, 2006). This was alongside near 180,000 religious congregations and approximately 60,000 noncharitable nonprofits such as labor unions and fraternal organizations (Hall & Burke, 2006). By 1980, the number of tax-exempt organizations registered by the IRS was approximately 320,000 and increasing to 600,000 by 2006 (Hall & Burke, 2006). Religious congregations numbered 336,000 in 1980 and increased to 400,000 by 2006. Noncharitable nonprofits numbered 526,000 in 1980 and increased to 600,000 in 2006 (Hall & Burke, 2006). These numbers were fueled by many of the elements previously discussed, governmental programs that pushed implementation down to lower levels of government and nongovernmental agencies and incentives to donate to charitable organizations because of new and increasing tax structures (Salamon & Anheier, 1997).

The changes in tax code also had a massive impact on family type foundations as a device for avoiding taxation. Likely, there is no better example than that of the Ford Foundation, which was created in 1947 and immediately became the world’s largest. When Henry Ford died, the stock was divided into two classes. The voting stock was retained by the family, but
nonvoting stock was given to the Ford Foundation, thereby passing the company on to the next generation without any money in taxes (Friedman & McGarvie, 2003). The number of foundations in 1929 was 203 and by 1959 that number had grown to 2,058 (Hall & Burke, 2006).

The development of the nonprofit sector has been woven into the fabric of the United States. By way of voluntary organizations serving in the establishment of the republic, to individuals seeking public good because of their industriousness, to understanding the role of taxation and the incentives built into that system. All these elements can still be seen in today’s nonprofit sector, and they all have a part to play in understanding and leading today’s nonprofit organizations. During subsequent sections of this writing, we will draw upon these foundations as we examine leadership with them.

**Prominent Leadership Theories Related to Servant Leadership**

To give context to the topic of leadership at large, it’s important to recognize key historical theories in the leadership field and the ties to servant leadership. Historically, the universal trait approach focused on the search for a consistent set of personality traits in leaders. From Stogdill (1948) the traits included intelligence, alertness, insight, responsibility, initiative, persistence, self-confidence, and sociability. When it was clear that traits alone could not predict leadership, researchers turned to the behavior of leaders. In general, there are two kinds of behaviors, task behaviors and relationship behaviors (Stogdill, 1974). Task behaviors focus on goal achievement and relationship behaviors help leaders create comfort between themselves and their followers. As the study of leadership continued, many iterations of the balance between task and relationship have evolved. For instance, the leadership (or managerial) grid, from Blake and Mouton (1985) explained how leaders move their subordinates toward organizational goals through their concern for production and concern for relationship. This moved into a prominent
model called the situational approach to leadership. It is key to remember that the ideas of servant leadership are steeped in the behavior of our leaders as well as, in part, who the leaders are as people. Therefore, these underpinnings are valuable in understanding servant leadership.

**Leader-Member Exchange Theory LMX**

Leader-member exchange theory (LMX) focuses on the dyadic relationships that develop between leaders and followers as the basis for the leadership process (Dansereau et al., 1975). In this way, LMX helped to move the leadership discussion from examining the way leaders treated a collective group of followers, to the individual dyadic relationship that exists uniquely between the leader and each of their followers (Dansereau et al., 1975). From the initial conception, LMX developed into examining the quality of these leader-member relationships and the impact on positive outcomes for the leaders, the follower, their groups, and even the organization as a whole (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Some of the positive effects of high quality LMX include job performance, satisfaction, commitment, role clarity and turnover intentions (Gerstner & Day, 1997).

While the literature continued to explore the positive impacts of LMX, the theory was also linked to leadership development as whole. In this way, the dyadic relationship at the core of LMX develops over time between leaders and follower in three phases (Gerstner & Day, 1997). The stranger phase (Phase 1) is marked by contractual relationship, often in the bounds of the workplace (Gerstner & Day, 1997). The acquaintance phase (Phase 2) is a period of testing by the leader and the follower to determine if there is a mutual interest in expanding roles and responsibilities. Successful dyads are marked by trust and respect for one another. Finally, Phase 3 is the mature partnership phase (Gerstner & Day, 1997). This phase is marked by a high level of mutual trust, respect, and obligation toward one another. Interestingly though, LMX also has a
distinction between in-group and out-group dyads. This development previously described is typically reserved for those dyads that are in-group. This is contrary to out-group, where relationships do not progress beyond defined formal roles, often something like an employment contract (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995).

Due to the focus on these dyadic relationships in LMX, the connection to servant leadership is common. One common point of connection is that the servant leaders’ style often helps to facilitate high quality leader-member exchanges (Liden & Maslyn, 1998; van Dierendonck, 2011). Yet, the two are still seen as distinct. In LMX, the leaders are motivated to serve followers due to the anticipation of something in return. The servant leader is seen as putting the needs of the follower ahead of their own. Servant leadership is also distinct from LMX in that it focuses on elements such as humility, stewardship, and empowering subordinates (Chaudhry et al., 2021).

**Situational Approach**

The situational approach, sometimes referred to as the life cycle theory, builds upon the interplay of task and relationship, yet also brings into the discussion elements of LMX. In this theory, the notion being put forward is that certain behaviors are more effective in certain relationships. In the situational approach, the effectiveness of the leader requires an assessment of the subordinate and behavioral response by the leader to match that subordinate. The initial idea of Hersey and Blanchard (1977) was adapted numerous times to reach what is now referred to as the SLII model (Blanchard et al., 1993).

The two key factors that must be assessed by the leader are the subordinate’s competence and commitment. Based on the level of competence or commitment, the leader should respond with one of four leadership styles (Blanchard et al., 1993).
**Directive Style.** In this style the leader is responding to a subordinate who has lower competence but high commitment. In this style, the leaders give much more specific instructions about how to achieve goals and then supervise them more actively (Blanchard et al., 1993).

**Coaching Style.** The coaching style is effective when the subordinate has some competence but lower commitment. The leader must still make decisions about what goals are to be achieved and how to achieve them, but partners those behaviors with more encouragement and solicitation of follower input (Blanchard et al., 1993).

**Supportive Style.** The supporting style is best used when a subordinate is moderate to highly competent, but commitment varies for some reason. In this instance, supporting leadership style focuses on bringing out the best in the follower by listening, giving feedback, and quickly giving recognition. However, day to day decisions are left to the subordinate (Blanchard et al., 1993).

**Delegating Style.** Finally, the delegating style is implemented by the leader when the subordinate is highly competent and highly committed. In this situation, the leader allows the subordinate do their job well and eliminates interference, but still offers recognition and continues to instill confidence in the subordinate (Blanchard et al., 1993).

One note about this theory is that it is intended to be a development tool. The leader must be constantly accessing the changing competence and commitment of the follower and adapting their leadership style accordingly. Unlike the contingency theory, where the assumption was people are who they are, the situational model assumes movement, either positively or negatively. In either case, the leader must acknowledge and adapt (Blanchard et al., 1993).
Transformational model of leadership

Transformational leadership is a process that transforms people through emotions, values, ethics, standards, and long-term goals (Bass, 1990). James McGregor Burns (1978) is widely recognized for the development of distinguishing characteristics of transactional and transformational leadership. Bass (1985) is credited with taking ideas of transactional leadership, charismatic leadership from House (1976), and fully developing transformational leadership theory (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Transactional leadership is a summary of most leadership models, focusing on the exchanges that take place between a leader and their followers (Bass & Avolio, 1990). Typically, there is something of value exchanged, like a quid pro quo. Transactional leaders acquire influence because it is in the best interest of followers to do what they say. In doing so, little if any attention is paid to the personal development of the followers (Kuhnery & Lewis, 1987). These types of value exchanges are summarized here.

**Contingent rewards.** A reward for a mutually agreed upon goal (Bass, 1990).

**Management by exception.** This takes two forms, active and passive. A leader that utilizes active management by exception watches followers for deviations of organizational rules or standards and takes corrective action. A leader utilizing passive management by exception will only intervene when a problem arises or standards have not been met (Bass, 1990).

**Laissez-Faire.** In this approach, the leader takes a hands-off approach, giving no feedback or effort to assist followers in their growth (Bass, 1990).

Bass (1985) posited that transformational leaders were able to motivate followers beyond anyone’s expectations by (a) elevating a follower’s consciousness about the value of specific goals (b) convincing followers to put their team’s self-interest above their own (c) pushing followers to address higher-level needs (Bass, 1985). In the end, transformational leadership’s
chief concern is developing followers to their fullest potential (Bass & Avolio, 1990). To accomplish this, four factors are included in the transformational leadership model of leadership.

**Idealized influence.** The first factor is the emotional component of leadership. Much in line with the charismatic leader, the idealized influencer is a strong role model for followers. These leaders typically have high ethical standards and are trustworthy (Antonakis, 2012).

**Inspirational motivation.** This factor describes the leader who inspires followers by communicating lofty expectations. In doing so, followers are motivated to become committed to a shared vision of the organization (Bass & Avolio, 1994).

**Intellectual stimulation.** This factor requires leaders to stimulate the creativity, innovation, and problem-solving skills of their followers. While doing so, they challenge the status quo within the organization (Bass & Avolio, 1994).

**Individualized consideration.** This factor is emblematic of the leader who foster supportive organizational cultures and specifically addresses the individual needs of the followers.

Transformational leadership has been a focus of leadership study in the recent decades (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Evidence widely supports transformational leadership as an effective form of leadership. Studies using the multifactor leadership questionnaire (MLQ) have shown that transformational leadership is positively related to follower satisfaction, motivation, and performance (Antonakis, 2012). Much of this work has been focused on for-profit companies, the government, and educational institutions. Transformational leadership has repeatedly been positively associated with job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and patient safety in the healthcare setting through a systematic review of literature (Hussain & Khayat, 2021). Similarly,
in the education setting, transformational leadership is positively associated with quality organizational culture and student achievement (Gumus et al., 2018).

With evidence in support of the effectiveness of transformational leadership, it was only a matter of time before the theory began to be applied to the nonprofit setting, yet it has been limited. Riggio et al. (2004) wrote that the essence of transformational leadership, to develop followers to reach their highest potential, was particularly appropriate for the nonprofit organization. Egri and Herman (2000) reported that nonprofit leaders were more receptive to the idea of transformational leadership than their for-profit counterparts in organizations that provided similar products or services for the environmental industry. Jaskyte (2004) showed a positive relationship between the existence of transformational leadership and organizational values and the degree of agreement between employees about those values, this is known a cultural consensus.

One consistent debate in the academic discussion of leadership is the difference between transformational leadership and servant leadership (van Dierendonck, 2011). Servant leadership focuses on humility, authenticity, and interpersonal acceptance, none of which are present in transformational leadership (van Dierendonck, 2011). Transformational leaders focus on organizational objectives, inspiring their followers to higher performance for the sake of the organization. The servant leaders focus is their concern for followers by creating conditions that enhance followers’ wellbeing and functioning and thereby facilitate the realization of a shared vision; servant-leaders trust followers to do what is necessary for the organization (Stone et al., 2004).

One example of a study that focused on the difference between transformational and servant leadership came from Parolini et al. (2009). The study focused on the distinction that the
servant leaders primary aim is follower needs, whereas transformational leaders are more
directed toward organizational goals. A sample of 511 persons working in different types of
organizations like corporations, nonprofit organizations, academic institutions, and religious
organizations filled out 19 semantic differential scales. Discriminant analysis confirmed that
servant-leaders are perceived as focusing more on the needs of the individual as compared to the
transformational leader, whose allegiance is with the organization (Parolini et al., 2009).

**Leadership Challenge**

Kouzes and Posner (2006) began their research into characteristics most admired in
leaders starting in 1980. Over 75,000 individuals across the globe have provided survey data
about the individuals they most admired and were willing to follow since that time. Four
characteristics have consistently been top-ranked through the years and across the globe. Leaders
must be honest, forward-looking, inspiring, and competent (Kouzes & Posner, 2006).
Additionally, Kouzes and Posner (2006) have found that intelligence, fairmindedness,
broadmindedness, supportiveness, straightforwardness, and dependability are also vital. As a
result, Kouzes and Posner (2006) developed a model including five practices of excellent
leaders.

**Model the way.** Excellent leaders lead through their words, lives, and actions. They find
their voice through the clarification of their own values, and they set an example by aligning
their actions to those values. This bleeds over into their organizations, because their actions align
with the shared values of the organization (Kouzes & Posner, 2006).

**Inspiring a shared vision.** Excellent leaders imagine exciting possibilities and enlist
others to join them in this vision (Kouzes & Posner, 2006).
Challenge the process. Leaders who excel seek innovative ways to change, grow, and improve. They are willing to take risks by generating small wins and learning from mistakes (Kouzes & Posner, 2006).

Enable others to act. Excellent leaders strengthen others by promoting cooperative goals and strengthen others by sharing power (Kouzes & Posner, 2006).

Encourage the heart. Leaders recognize the contributions of others by showing appreciation for individual excellence. They also celebrate organizational victories and generate community among the organizational members (Kouzes & Posner, 2006).

Emotional Intelligence

Another prominent theory of leadership worth discussing is emotional intelligence. Although intelligence (IQ) has been shown to be a vital component for leaders during investigations into trait theory, research into emotional intelligence (called EI or EQ) has been shown to be a greater indicator of effective leadership (Goleman et al., 2013). Through their research, Goleman et al. (2002) developed the EI model of leadership that revolves around building resonance. Their research suggests that there are many paths to leadership success, but the most effective leaders will demonstrate strength in at least one competence from each of the four fundamental areas of EI. Personal Competence as explained by Goleman et al. (2013) is the capabilities that determine how leaders manage themselves. The four fundamental areas are Self-Awareness, Self-Management, Social Awareness, and Relationship Management. As described by Goleman et al. (2013), the subcomponents are as follows:

Self-Awareness

Emotional self-awareness. Leaders high in emotional self-awareness are attuned to how their feelings affect them and their job performance.
**Accurate self-assessment.** Leaders excelling in self-awareness know their limitations and their strengths and can exhibit a sense of humor about themselves.

**Self-Confidence.** As a result of the high self-confidence, leaders can identify strengths and lean into those to excel. They also have a self-assurance that helps them stand out in group settings.

**Self-Management**

**Self-Control.** Leaders with emotional self-control are able to manage disturbing emotions and even channel them to be useful.

**Transparency.** Leaders who are transparent authentically live out the values they profess.

**Adaptability.** Leaders with adaptability are comfortable with ambiguities and are able to handle multiple demands without impacting their focus or energy.

**Achievement.** Leaders who excel in achievement have standards that drive them to constantly seek performance improvements for themselves and those they lead.

**Initiative.** Leaders excelling in initiative seize and create opportunities and are effective at cutting through red tape when necessary.

**Optimism.** Leaders excelling in optimism see opportunity when others may see a threat or a setback.

**Social Competence.** The capabilities that determine how leaders manage relationships.

**Social Awareness**

**Empathy.** Leaders with empathy listen attentively and can attune themselves to a wide variety of emotional signals, even those that are unspoken. The result is the ability to associate themselves to diverse groups of people well.
Organizational awareness. A leader who is organizationally aware is able to detect important social networks and identify power relationships. In doing so they understand the political forces within organizations and unspoken rules to operate effectively in those situations.

Service. Leaders with a high service competence stimulate a culture conducive to meeting the needs of the client or customer so relationships remain stable.

Relationship Management

Inspiration. Inspirational leaders draw followers in with compelling vision and shared mission. In doing so, they transcend day-to-day tasks to make work compelling.

Influence. Leaders who excel in influence are persuasive and engaging, knowing how to build buy-in from key people and networks.

Developing others. Leaders show a genuine interest in others and are interested in cultivating other people's abilities. They excel in giving timely and constructive feedback.

Change catalyst. Leaders excel by being change agents able to recognize a need for change, challenge the status quo, and champion that change with compelling arguments.

Conflict management. Those leaders who excel in conflict management understand the different perspectives of a conflict, engage all parties, and find a common ideal that everyone can support.

Teamwork and collaboration. Leaders effectively create an atmosphere of collegiality and model respect, helpfulness, and cooperation.

Authentic Leadership

Luthans and Avolio (2003) first proposed authentic leadership as a theory. Avolio and Gardner (2005) identified the following dimensions of authentic leadership: positive moral perspective, self-awareness, balanced processing, relational transparency, positive psychological
capital, and authentic behavior. Authentic leaders have standards of moral character and are keenly aware of how they are perceived by others (Avolio et al., 2004). This self-awareness tells us that, authentic leaders are cognizant of their strengths, knowledge, beliefs, and values. Furthermore, they are very transparent on this self-awareness, therefore sharing information about themselves to followers (Avolio et al., 2004). Authentic leadership is seen as a root to other forms of leadership including transformational and servant leadership (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). Authentic leadership also has a developmental focus. That is, authentic leaders care about both the moral development of the leader and development of authenticity in their followers (Avolio & Gardner, 2005).

In comparing authentic and servant leadership, research has supported servant leadership and authentic leadership as distinct constructs, yet they are related (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). Both servant and authentic leadership represent personalized approaches to leadership and seem useful for leadership development (Kiersch & Peters, 2017). Both theories also follow the path of developing leadership by combining competencies that are internal and external (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). Internally focused competencies include those related to accurately understanding who one is and what one values. Externally focused competencies include those targeting relationships with followers or behaviors that impact other people (Kiersch & Peters, 2017). However, servant leadership is distinct because of its focus on follower’s empowerment, a focus on humility, and its desire for community stewardship (van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011).

**Servant Leadership Theory**

The message of servant leadership is often associated with Christianity and other religions and is a defining characteristic in leaders such as Mother Theresa and Martin Luther King, Jr. (Sendjaya et al., 2008). However, it was Robert Greenleaf (1970) who was the first to
introduce servant leadership as a possible leadership theory. In doing so, Greenleaf offered the first definition of servant leadership:

The servant-leader is servant first. It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first. The conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead. The best test is the following: Do those served grow as a person? Do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, and more likely themselves to become servants? And, what is the effect on the least privileged in society? Will they benefit, or at least not further be harmed? (p. 24)

In this definition, servant leadership pinpoints the character of the individual and their commitment to serve others through practice, thereby leading to a better society. As compared to other leadership styles, Greenleaf’s idea was distinctive because it focused on the well-being of the individual first, whereas other leadership styles focused primarily on organizational well-being. Greenleaf believed the path to organizational effectiveness followed an upward trajectory, beginning with the well-being of the individual (Stone et al., 2004). Although powerful, Greenleaf’s message has proven to be difficult in model construction (Parris & Peachey, 2013; Prosser, 2010). It was only recently, through a systematic literature review, that the scholarly community accepted calling servant leadership a theory, as opposed to a more generalized philosophy of leadership (Parris & Peachey, 2013).

**Characterizing Servant Leadership**

Empirical research about servant leadership theory did not fully begin to take shape until 1999 (Farling et al., 1999). Since then, research into servant leadership has largely been devoted to model development through characterization, measurement of servant leadership, and outcomes of servant leadership (Parris & Peachey, 2013).
Greenleaf (1970) predicted that servant leadership would be difficult to operationalize. To that accord, many have cited that a deficiency in the theory is due to a lack of academic agreement on a definition (Parris & Peachey, 2013; van Dierendonck, 2011). To overcome this deficit, researchers have spent much of the research on characterizing and measuring servant leadership (Anderson, 2009; Parris & Peachey, 2013). In fact, throughout the various publications on servant leadership, over 44 characteristics in different models have been offered, which highlights the lack of consensus in this area (van Dierendonck, 2011). To investigate this area of the research, it is fair to offer two perspectives. Spears (1998), by analyzing Greenleaf’s writings, proposed 10 characteristics of servant leadership:

- **Listening.** Identifying the will of the group or individual by simply hearing the problem and rearticulating and clarifying the issue.

- **Empathy.** Seeking to accept and understand others, even if that means refusing to recognize their performance as acceptable.

- **Healing.** Seeing the opportunity to restore other humans to wholeness.

- **Awareness.** The ability to view a situation holistically, often through a keen sense of one’s self-awareness.

- **Persuasion.** As opposed to reliance upon coercion, servant leaders convince others in the direction they wish to go.

- **Conceptualization.** The ability to nurture other’s dreams and create a shared vision.

- **Foresight.** Understanding that the outcome of a decision can be informed by lessons from the past.

- **Stewardship.** Making the commitment to serve the needs of other individuals and entities.
Commitment to the growth of people. Nurturing the personal, professional, and spiritual growth of the people around the leader.

Building community. The commitment to creating a community of workers from individuals within an organization, the spread of which is essential for healthy individuals and organizations.

If the work by Spears is a starting point from much of the academic writing on servant leadership characteristics, then van Dierendonck and Nuitjen (2011) could serve as an endpoint in the discussion. In their work, van Dierendonck and Nuitjen have moved servant leadership theory forward in academic literature, both in characteristics and measurement. For now, van Dierendonck and Nuitjen servant leadership characteristics are summarized below:

Empowerment. Empowerment refers to a characteristic that fosters self-confidence, information sharing and self-directed decision making (Konczak et al., 2000). The servant leader believes every individual has value and deserves recognition and strives to realize each person’s abilities (Greenleaf, 1998)

Accountability. Although often dismissed in servant leadership theory, servant leaders use accountability to transfer responsibility for an outcome to individuals and teams (Konczak et al., 2000; van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011).

Standing back. Standing back is the extent to which leaders give priority to the interest of the follower. In other words, servant leaders who stand back can allow followers to receive recognition for their successes (van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011).

Humility. Humility specifies the servant leader’s ability to put one’s own accomplishments and talents in a proper perspective (Dennis & Bocarnea, 2005). By humility,
servant leaders understand their own strengths and weaknesses. Humility forces leaders to seek the contributions of others to overcome limitations (van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011).

**Authenticity.** Authenticity is the servant leader’s ability to be consistent in behaviors and individual personality (Harter, 2002). Secondarily, servant leaders engage in behaviors that satisfy organizational needs (van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011).

**Courage.** Courage is the idea of taking new approaches and challenging traditional behaviors by using forward-thinking to problem solve (Greenleaf, 1998; Hernandez, 2008; Russell & Stone, 2002).

**Interpersonal acceptance.** Interpersonal acceptance means understanding and experiencing the feelings of others, much like empathy (George, 2000). Empathy is the ability to adopt compassion toward another person’s feelings, forgiveness, and trust (Ferch, 2005). Interpersonal acceptance leads to high-quality interpersonal relationships (van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011).

**Stewardship.** Servant leaders use stewardship to take responsibility for the larger institution (Hernandez, 2008). By setting a proper example, servant leaders can foster an environment where social responsibility and loyalty are favored. Social responsibility is an obligation to a common good that stretches beyond self-interest (van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011).

**Outcomes of servant leadership**

As the viability of servant leadership theory has improved, a number of studies have shown the value of servant leadership to individuals and organizations (Parris & Peachey, 2013). As noted, servant leaders are focused on the individual first, believing that quality organizational outcomes will flow up from quality individual outcomes. In Greenleaf’s three questions resurface...
consistently within the academic literature. These three questions are to be used when determining whether servant leadership exists in a certain setting: (1) Do those served grow as persons? (2) In being served, do those persons become healthier, freer, wiser, more autonomous, and more likely to become servants themselves? (3) What is the effect on the least privileged in society? In keeping with these three questions, much of the research on servant leadership, as it relates to outcomes, can be grouped into similar categories: (1) organizational citizenship behavior, (2) personal growth, (3) benefitting society as a whole through organizational effectiveness (Greenleaf, 1998).

*Organizational citizenship behavior.* Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is the most common research relationship in the array of servant leadership studies (Eva et al., 2019). Following OCB refers to the nonrequired contributions made by team members to the organizations that employ them (Chiniara & Bentein, 2018). Ehrhart (2004) reported that servant leadership had a direct positive impact on OCB behaviors. Neubert et al. (2008) reported a positive correlation between servant leadership and a helping and creative behavior. The presence of servant leadership was also found to be highly correlated to team effectiveness in a study by Irving & Longbotham (2007), who highlighted the keys to effectiveness as honest self-evaluation, fostering collaboration, valuing other team members, accountability and supportiveness, all keys to OCB. Mahembe and Engelbrecht (2013) supported this link between servant leadership and team effectiveness while also reporting increased affective team commitment. Hu and Liden (2011) showed the presence of servant leadership enhanced goal and process clarity along with team potency. Along the lines of OCB, servant leadership has been positively linked to helping behavior (Neubert et al., 2016), collaboration among nurses (Garber...
et al., 2009), corporate social responsibility (Grisaffe et al., 2016), and proactive behavior (Bande et al., 2016).

Due to the nature of OCB, this is the variable that is likely most similar to the cohesion. Yet, in the most comprehensive systematic review of literature on the topic of servant leadership, cohesion is only mentioned one time (Eva et al., 2019). That is the reference to cohesion being a mediator in an examination of servant leadership and the quality influences of task performance and OCB. Therefore, while there could be perceived similarities between OCB and cohesion, a distinction in the constructs does exist (Chiniara & Bentein, 2018).

*Personal Growth.* Servant leadership is also found to be positively associated with a variety of attitudinal related outcomes related to employment that reflect the idea of personal growth (Eva et al., 2019). For instance, seeking personal growth has to do with seeking one’s potential, accepting positive and negative qualities, and striving for purpose in one’s life. Mayer et al. (2008) reported that the presence of servant leadership was relevant to the psychological needs of followers. Meeting these needs is crucial, as it relates to many of the needs-based motivational theories of psychology (van Dierendonck, 2011).

Servant leadership has positively correlated with follower empowerment and personal commitment to the organization (Cerit, 2009; Earnhardt, 2008; Jaramillo et al., 2009; Sendjaya & Pekerti, 2010). With greater commitment comes increased job satisfaction at the individual level (Cerit, 2009; Jenkins & Stewart, 2010; Mayer et al., 2008). The presence of servant leadership is also positively correlated to intrinsic job satisfaction and is negatively related to turnover intentions (Anderson, 2009; Cerit, 2009; Chen et al., 2015; Jenkins & Stewart, 2010; Liden et al., 2014; Mayer et al., 2008).
Organizational effectiveness. Organizational outcomes of servant leadership have also been a focus of research. Servant leaders have positively correlated to creating a serving culture (Liden et al., 2014). A culture of serving was positively related to organization performance, employee job performance, creativity, and customer service in the restaurant industry (Liden et al., 2008, 2014). With the presence of servant leadership, there has been a positive correlation to organizational trust, ethical work climates, building a caring community and creating a culture where followers become servants (Jaramillo et al., 2015; Joseph & Winston, 2005; Parris & Peachey, 2013). Finally, there is a positive correlation between servant leadership and fair treatment (Ehrhart, 2004). Fair treatment fosters trust within the organization. The presence of servant leadership is linked to individual trust toward the organization (Joseph & Winston, 2005). Finally, trust can enhance collaboration within the organization (Joseph & Winston, 2005; Sendjaya & Pekerti, 2010; Washington et al., 2006).

As a result of the growing positive relationships between servant leaders and their followers, Barnabas et al. (2010) called for the need to make students aware of servant leadership in business schools. They particularly point to the need for ethical decision-making that is engrained in the idea of servant leadership.

Nonprofit Leadership

Nonprofit organizations have been popularly summarized by saying that nonprofits require voluntary action for public purposes (Payton, 1988). Unlike a government, nonprofit organizations have no power to implement taxes, unlike for-profit organizations, nonprofit organizations lack a clear and overriding objective, to maximize profit (Herman, 2016). Drucker (1990) said the nonprofit neither supplies goods or services like the for profit nor does the nonprofit control like the government, the nonprofit’s output is a “changed human being.” When
it comes to leadership, nonprofits face pressure to operate like a normal business in terms of efficiencies and continual operational and strategic changes (Suarez, 2011). Nonprofit leadership must do this while relying heavily on volunteers, donations, limited resources for staff, competition with other sectors for talent, and emphasizing mission over profit (Herman, 2016; Suarez, 2011; Tidwell, 2005). This is not to suggest that leadership within nonprofit organizations is completely unlike that of the private sector, but the chief concern is to examine which elements of traditional leadership study apply equally to nonprofits and point out those areas where differences are known (Akingbola, 2013; Ronquillo et al., 2012).

With this as a backdrop, the study of leadership in nonprofit organizations has broadly taken two distinctive paths based upon the characteristics of the nonprofit organizations. The first path is to examine the executive leader of the organization, hereafter referred to as the executive, although this position is often referred to as the executive director in a nonprofit setting. The second primary path in the study of nonprofit leadership is to examine the board of directors (board). Together, these two entities are responsible for the leadership of the nonprofit organization. However, the way these two integral parts of the organization work together is a topic in and of itself. Therefore, the direction of this review will first cover the literature of these two roles and their unification, then cover the leadership of the board as a unit, then examine the literature on the specific role of the executive. To be clear, there have been other parts of leadership studied in the nonprofit setting, for instance the leadership of the board chair specifically (Harrison et al., 2013). However, that research is a small subset of the examination of the executive and the board.
The Executive and Board Governance

Per U.S. law, the governing board is ultimately at the top of the nonprofit organizational hierarchy, being accountable for the conduct of the organization as a steward of the public’s interest (Hopkins & Gross, 2016). The legal framework for understanding who holds ultimate governing authority in the nonprofit setting is also supported in academic literature. Flowing from Max Weber’s bureaucratic ideas, organizations need to be hierarchically arranged to be effective instruments of attaining goals (Renz, 2016). In the application to nonprofits, this puts the board at the top of the hierarchy and at the forefront of leadership for the organization. Practically, this is straightforward yet highly idealistic (Herman, 2016). The relationship between the board and the executive is much more complex than simply saying the executive is an agent of the board (Herman, 2016).

Herman and Renz (2008) suggested that best way to view the relationship between executives and the board is to view it from a social constructivist lens. Under the idea of social constructivism, the hierarchically imposed order is understood to be a result of the interactions the stakeholders within the organization (Herman, 2016). A few examples will help to illustrate this idea. Hodge and Piccolo (2005) found that the primary revenue source for nonprofit organizations impacted the amount of board involvement. Nonprofits that relied prominently on donations as a revenue source relied more heavily upon board involvement, whereby commercially and government funded nonprofits had boards that were overwhelmingly overseers (Hodge & Piccolo, 2005). In a study of critical events within nonprofit organizations, Heimovics and Herman (1990) examined nonprofit organizations to see where responsibility was attributed in critical events. In events that were deemed successful, the board and executive most often credited the executive with that successful event. In unsuccessful events, the same groups
attributed the most responsibility for the failure to the executive. Concurrently, in these unsuccessful events, the executive assigned the most responsibility to themselves (Herman & Heimovics, 1990). This psychological centrality exists because of information flow. The executive is at the center of information flow between the organization and the board. This puts the nonprofit executive at the center of the organization informationally (Heimovics & Herman, 1990).

The reason these discussions become important toward examining leadership within nonprofit organizations is that it would be overly simplistic to say that leadership in a nonprofit organization begins and ends with the board. The board certainly has a role in leading the organization. However, factors including the type of organization, the nature of the relationship between the board and executive and the executive him or herself, make it vital to examine the executive and the board as integral in leading the organization. Additionally, if we tend to assign responsibility for the success of the organization to the executive, we should be examining what they specifically do in the leading of the organization (Herman, 2016).

The Executive as Nonprofit Leader

From the previous section, we know that the way the nonprofit board and the executive interact is vital as it relates to the overall leadership in the nonprofit organization. This reality makes the nonprofit executive leadership discussion unique because the executive must understand that part of their leadership within the organization as a whole is focused toward the developing their boards to carry out their own duties and responsibilities (Herman, 2016). Herman and Heimovics (1990) confirmed that there is indeed a difference between the way nonprofit executives lead their board and lead their staff. In their study, the most effective nonprofit executives, as determined by independent nominations and sampling, provided far
more board specific leadership as compared to those nonprofit executive’s that were deemed to be less effective (Herman & Heimovics, 1990). As a result of this work, the idea of board-centered leadership became prominent in the nonprofit sector.

**Board-Centered Leadership.** The idea of board-centered leadership flows from resource-dependence theory (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978). Resource-dependence theorists suggest that the effectiveness of an organization is derived from the management of the groups that an organization depends for resources. Within the nonprofit sector, one of those groups is certainly the board (Middleton, 1987; Herman & Tulipana, 1985). As referenced previously, Herman and Heimovics (1990) developed the idea of board-centered leadership through a study of effective nonprofit executives. In their study, they utilized Yukl’s leadership behaviors taxonomy and as adapted by Quinn (Yukl, 2012), to show the difference between staff-oriented actions and board-oriented actions. The Yukl study was representative of the way an executive would lead staff. From the study, six behaviors specifically directed toward the board were representative of effective nonprofit executives (Yukl, 2012).

*Facilitating interaction in board relationships.* The executive works to see that board members are engaged in satisfying interactions with each other and the executive. In this way, the executive is a skilled listener and arbiter of differences (Heimovics & Herman, 1990).

*Showing consideration and respect toward board members.* The executive understands that board service is an exchange and works toward satisfying the needs of the board member (Heimovics & Herman, 1990).

*Envisioning change and innovation for the organization with the board.* In understanding the nature of information flow and their role, the executive keeps board members aware of
changing external dynamics. In doing so, the executive encourages board members to seek new opportunities or improve efficiencies (Heimovics & Herman, 1990).

Providing useful and helpful information to the board. Again, in understanding the centrality of information, the executive is skilled at knowing what information is critical for board knowledge and what information must be dealt with between executive and staff. The effective executive is particularly skilled about disseminating unfortunate news quickly and concisely (Heimovics & Herman, 1990).

Initiating and maintaining structure for the board. The executive works with the board chair specifically to maintain consistent procedures and meeting annual objectives as a board (Heimovics & Herman, 1990).

Promoting board accomplishments and productivity. The executive sets ambitious standards for board participation and encourages members to complete tasks and meet deadlines (Heimovics & Herman, 1990).

The External Nature of Nonprofit Leadership

The value of board-centered leadership in the nonprofit sector stands out as an area of uniqueness in comparison to for profit entities. However, effective executives are also keen at working through their boards to position the nonprofit organization in their environment (Herman, 2016). In this line of thinking, a multiple frame analysis, developed by Bolman and Deal (2013), is useful. An organizational perspective, or frame, is a way for executives to ponder organizational realities. The four frames are structural, human resource, political and symbolic (Bolman & Deal, 2013):
**Structural Frame.** The structural frame deals with order and continuity in the organization. In this frame, conformity to accepted standards and the creation of administrative systems is paramount.

**Human Resource Frame.** The focus of this frame is to balance the goals of the organization with the aspirations of its most valuable asset, the employees. The focus is on open communication, team building, and collaboration.

**Political Frame.** The executive who embraces the political frame understands external environment, particularly as it relates to the use of scarce resources. Executives in the political frame use their understanding of external individuals and organizations to build alliances with prominent stakeholders that can be influential for their own organization.

**Symbolic Frame.** The symbolic frame is most oriented toward the charismatic type executive. Organizations are socially constructed and therefore membership determines the individual interpretations of the organization. Executives lean on ceremonies, rituals, and artifacts to create a unifying system of beliefs and cast a vision for the organization's future.

Heimovics et al. (1993) extended their research on critical events and board centered leadership by applying the previous frameworks to nonprofit organizations. Although the structural frame was the most dominant frame used, the executive who utilized the political frame was significantly more effective through critical events. The critical events described in the study were primarily external to the organization, including things such as alliances, mergers, fundraising, and relationships with government alliances. These types of events differ from personnel action or issues implementing some type of administrative system. This is not to say that those effective executives ignore the other frames, but they were keenly aware of the political frame to guide their organizations through critical events (Heimovics et al., 1993).
The study about executive frame orientation was followed by another study on espoused executive leadership compared to actual leadership (Heimovics, Herman, & Jurkiewicz, 1995). In summary, executives were more likely to say that they led from a structural or human resource framework, than a political one. This was true, even if their actual leadership displayed more of a political framework (Heimovics et al., 1995).

**Nonprofit Leader as Social Entrepreneur**

Largely seen as a response to the challenging funding environment of operating a nonprofit, some the idea of the nonprofit as a social enterprise has emerged (Dees, 1998). It is now nearly an expectation that nonprofits seek funding from a variety of sources, such as the sale of services and goods. Some are reporting that overall, 70% of nonprofit revenue is from the sales of goods and services (Wing et al., 2008). In doing so, the leaders of nonprofits have positioned the organization to be seen more as a social enterprise. A social enterprise is viewed as a type of strategy to engage in social purpose initiatives that generate income (Dees, 1998). An example could be something as simple as a gift shop within a museum to raise money for the parent nonprofit organization to a very specific healthcare related initiative that does job-specific training for a hospital under the umbrella of a nonprofit organization (Van Brackle, 2011).

The idea of social enterprise as a strategy can be a challenging proposition for the nonprofit leader. On one hand, being in a social enterprise can challenge the notion of what it means to be a nonprofit. However, the sale of goods and services can be a major validation that the nonprofit is creating a good or offering a service that is valuable in the marketplace, making the enterprise that much more important (Van Brackle, 2011). Although there are legal and organizational implications when discussing a social enterprise, there are also leadership implications. Nonprofit leaders in this vein are seen more as catalysts for innovative ideas with
an elevated level of influence both in their organization and industry. These leaders are very much entrepreneurial (Dees, 1998). Such leaders are innovative, resourceful, value-creating and opportunity oriented and their primary focus and concern is social change (Dees, 1998). Scholars in this area of study point to the importance of a catalyst that possesses the commitment to the idea and the reformation of a system. Yet, these catalysts seem to surround themselves well with a group of individuals that shares the same vision (Sharir & Lerner, 2006).

A true social enterprise and entrepreneurial leaders must also handle unique challenges. Goal displacement or mission drift can be a legitimate challenge when the allure of a market enterprise is evident. This generates additional challenges when funding the expansion of the social enterprise becomes prominent. For instance, in taking services to new markets there is capital that must be acquired to make the expansion a reality (Van Brackle, 2011). Additionally, staff are at risk of feeling dissonance when multiple objectives are paramount. Evidence has suggested that an organization that has adopted a social enterprise strategy has a different pace and risk which can impact staff cohesion and a shared commitment of the mission of the organization (Cooney, 2006).

Further, nonprofits entities that have engaged in a social enterprise strategy struggle to maintain their previously established support from traditional outlets such as grants and donors (Tuckman et al., 2006). This is such a dilemma that some organizations have had to restructure their organization in a way to protect social enterprise while preserving tax-exempt identity (Tuckman et al., 2006). In summary, a nuance of the examination of leadership in the nonprofit sector is the reality that many leaders may need to display those behaviors and characteristics of the entrepreneur as much as anything else (Van Brackle, 2011).
The Board as Nonprofit Leader

Within United States law, every nonprofit is required to have a governing body, commonly referred to as a board of directors or board of trustees. Ultimately, the board is accountable to the community, state, clients, and beneficiaries (Renz, 2016). Although the body of knowledge about boards has grown since the 1990’s, the amount of information about effective boards is limited, especially in community-based settings (Renz, 2016; Renz & Andersson, 2013).

As it relates to leadership of the organization, the nonprofit board is collectively responsible for clarifying the organization’s mission, vision, goals, and strategic direction. The summary of core functions and responsibilities identified by Renz (2016) is outlined here:

**Lead the organization.** Provide overall strategic direction and leadership for the organization.

**Establish policy.** Proactively create policy to guide and protect the organization.

**Secure essential resources.** As related to the strategic direction of the organization, assist in securing key resources.

**Ensure effective resource use.** In accomplishing the strategic direction of the organization, ensure resources acquired are utilized effectively.

**Lead and manage chief executive performance.** Support, advise, and give performance feedback to the executive of the nonprofit organization.

**Engage constituents.** Assist the organization in developing and sustaining ongoing relationships with constituents.

**Ensure and enable accountability.** To ensure the voracity of accountability and ethical operations, ensure policies and procedures are in place.
Ensure board effectiveness. Amongst themselves, ensure the board operates effectively.

In addition to the key functions of boards, there also common dimensions of board competence outlined below (Jackson & Holland, 1998). These competencies were laid out in identification of boards that were determined to be more effective, according to Holland and Jackson (1998) and further confirmed by Cornforth (2001).

Contextual competence. The board understands the culture, values, mission, and norms of the organization it governs.

Educational competence. The board collectively takes steps to ensure the flow of information amongst itself and knows its own roles, responsibilities, and performance.

Interpersonal competence. The board nurtures their own members development as a group, fostering a sense of cohesiveness and teamwork.

Analytical competence. The board draws upon multiple perspectives to develop solutions to complex problems.

Political competence. The board members understand that a primary responsibility is to develop and maintain positive relationships with key constituencies.

Strategic competence. The board shapes the direction of the organization to ensure the best strategic approach for the future of the organization.

Cohesion

Historically, cohesion has been a widely studied and important variable in the study of dynamics in small groups (Greer, 2012). Some social scientists have even called cohesion the most important of all variables in small groups (Carron & Dennis, 1998; Lott & Lott, 1965). Cohesion has been specifically examined since the early 1950s, when Festinger et al. (1950) defined cohesion as the “total field of forces causing members to remain in a group” (p. 547). In
that, the focus was on what brought people together. Gross and Martin (1952) suggested the idea of forces attracting an individual to a group focused too much on the individual. Their definition of cohesion “was the resistance of a group to disruptive forces” (p. 547). From this perspective, a highly cohesive group would be able to endure unfavorable occurrences. This turned the discussion to resisting all those pressures that could tear a team apart instead of the attractiveness that brings the team together. Ultimately, these beginnings in the study of cohesion both have their place in the current discussion.

Today’s definition of cohesion is a “dynamic process that is reflected in the tendency of a group to stick together and remain united in the pursuit of its instrumental objectives and/or for the satisfaction of member affective needs” (Carron & Brawley, 2000, p. 115). This definition highlights four key characteristics of cohesion. First, cohesion is multidimensional, meaning there are many factors that keep a group sticking together and the factors can vary from group to group. Second, cohesion is dynamic. This refers to the idea that cohesion on a team can change over time and those factors that create an initial cohesion may not be the factors that keep the team cohesive over several years. Third, cohesion is instrumental, meaning all teams form for a purpose. Even groups that appear to be purely social in nature serve a purpose for the individuals within the group. Lastly, cohesion has an affective dimension. This refers to the fact that social relationships may or may not be present at the onset of the group or they may develop over time. However, the social cohesion that is part of the group results from both task and social interactions (Carron & Eys, 2012).

The idea of cohesion often takes two forms. Social cohesion is concerned with the relationships distinct from the tasks that meet group objectives (Hackman, 2002). Task cohesion is encompassed by an individual attraction to a group based on the task being performed (Carron
& Brawley, 2000). This is strikingly like ideas proposed Festinger et al. (1950). For both the task and the social, it is also important to distinguish between individual cohesion and group cohesion, for both the task and the social. For instance, an individual could have personal reasons for being drawn to the group that are task related, like enhancing their own skill. However, the group itself could be drawn together because of the desire to do their best (Carron & Brawley, 2000).

The topic of group cohesion has been studied in many different settings including families, education classes, work units, military units, musical groups, and athletic teams (Cota et al., 1995). Cohesion has been shown to correlate to a multitude of outcomes. Most importantly, researchers have been interested in understanding the relationship between cohesion and performance. The conclusion has been that in most cases, group cohesion will enhance group performance (Beal et al., 2003; Casey-Campbell & Martens, 2009; Evans & Dion, 1991; Mullen & Copper, 1994). To understand enhanced performance correctly, it is important to distinguish between performance as behavior and performance as outcome. So, the impact of cohesion on performance is on the doing not necessarily the outcome (Casey-Campbell & Martens, 2009). This is the case because performance outcomes are impacted by a vast number of variables that could ultimately impact the result, outside the control of the group or individual (Beal et al., 2003). Additionally, the mediators between cohesion and performance have also been investigated at length. For instance, the relationship between cohesion and performance is enhanced when tasks require higher levels of interdependency (Beal et al., 2003). Also, when coordination is a requirement of performance, cohesion is vital (Forsyth, 2021). Through this research, the overriding sentiment is that when teams are more cohesive, members share a stronger mutual commitment to achieving tasks and are more likely and willing to work together.
cooperatively (Beal et al., 2003; Mullen & Copper, 1994). Out of this cooperation, members increase communication and direct their attention toward achieving team goals and overall performance is enhanced (Beal et al., 2003; Casey-Campbell & Martens, 2009; Mathieu et al., 2015)

In addition to the interest in performance, the impact of cohesion has also been affirmed as it relates to employee retention (Doherty & Carron, 2003), positive group member attitudes (Greer, 2012), group member satisfaction (Cota et al., 1995) and decreased absenteeism (Odom et al., 1990). Furthermore, recent studies have shown that cohesion has a positive impact on collective efficacy (Paskevich et al., 1999), group creativity (Craig & Kelly, 1999), cooperation (De Cremer & Leonardelli, 2003) and sacrifice (Prapavessis & Carron, 1997). Cohesion is also linked to anxiety. That is, those team members rating high in social cohesion have reduced anxiety (Eys et al., 2003). Finally, cohesion is favorable in overall adherence (Brawley et al., 1988; Prapavessis & Carron, 1997; Widmeyer et al., 1992). Adherence refers to things like following team rules, decreased absenteeism, dropout rates, and even effort during practice. In some studies, the reduction of individual effort when people are working in groups, called social loafing, was decreased in groups when cohesion was prevalent (Karau & Williams, 1993).

**Antecedents of Cohesion**

Eitzen (1975) noted that cohesion is enhanced when group members are more similar to the group in terms of race and social background. Despite what would seemingly make sense as it relates to cohesion, further research does not necessarily build upon Eitzen. For instance, Widmeyer et al. (1992) identified 32 potential antecedents for group cohesion. The least important on the survey was similarity in social background and racial similarity. Of course, this is to say nothing of whether behavior supported the survey questions. This is also to say nothing
of whether all female groups are generally more cohesive than all male groups, etc. Multiple studies looking specifically at gender have generally been inconclusive on this issue (Thompson & Albinson, 1991).

Another cohesion enhancer is shared attitudes, beliefs, and motives. When a group is on the same page in these areas, greater cohesion is a likely result. When initial similarity is present in these areas, group cohesion is more likely to be formed. Cohesion is also enhanced when things are sacrificed to be a part of the team. Prapavessis and Carron (1997) found that personal sacrifices, such as time, increased task and social cohesion. From there, conformity to group norms increased. Consider, as an example, a time when a player sacrificed health by subjecting themselves to continued injury for the sake of the team, cohesion could be increased. The following is a summary of the key antecedents of group cohesion.

*Attraction* has to do with any variable that positively influences attraction to other individuals within the group such as attitudes, values, reward interest (Forsyth, 2021). This also refers to the value individuals place on the group as a whole unit (Marmarosh et al., 2005). *Task commitment*: groups are more cohesive when the individual members seek a common goal and are motivated to work together as a unit to achieve that goal (MacCoun et al., 2006). *Social categorization and identification*: the degree of cohesion in a group can be traced to the member’s identification with the group. Put another way, does the group confirm the social identity of the individual? If so, the group is likely to be more cohesive (Jackson & Smith, 1999).

*Group affect*: the intensity of the group can impact cohesion as well. Those groups that are more cohesive typically share emotional experiences and even display collective mood states. *Group structure*: As group structures grow to be more stabilized, cohesion tends to also increase. Particularly during the group development stage of norming, groups develop patterns of behavior
which will enhance cohesion. **Entitativity;** this refers to the idea that some groups simply look cohesive. The idea the outsider perceives a unity within the group will therefore enhance the cohesiveness of the group internally. This can be through unified actions, physical features or even physical proximity (Thurston, 2012)

**Cohesion and Leadership**

Although the examination of cohesion is vast, it primarily focuses on the result that cohesion produces, mainly performance from the group. What is less know is the impact a leader has on the cohesion of the group. One type of leadership that has been examined is transformational leadership. Jung and Sosik (2002) found a positive relationship between transformational leadership and cohesion due to the highlighted importance of cooperation and alignment of follower values. Also, the charismatic leadership style has been the focus of positive link between leadership and cohesion (Wang et al., 2005).

Additionally, leader behavior that correlates positively to higher rates of cohesion is the focus on finishing tasks through the leader is providing instruction and positive feedback (Juntumaa et al., 2007; Westre & Weiss, 1991). As an example group members who perceived their leaders to be providing positive feedback also had higher perceptions of team cohesion (Juntumaa et al., 2007).

Within leadership, the way in which decision are made also has an impact on cohesion (Carron & Chelladurai, 1981). Perceptions of cohesiveness rise when more participatory approaches are used in the decision-making process. Less cohesion is evident when decisions are strictly autocratic. Something as simple as setting goals together as a team, has a positive impact on both task and social cohesion (Brawley et al., 1988; Kozub & McDonnell, 2000)
Cohesion in the Nonprofit Setting

The specific literature on cohesion in the nonprofit setting where boards are nearly exclusively volunteers is limited at best (Doherty, 1998). Perhaps one reason for the lack of information is that collective spirit is another term like cohesion, yet not as developed in academic literature. Collective spirit has been shown to be a key attribute of an ideal board (Knauf et al., 1991; Papadimitriou, 1999). Despite this, cohesion in the volunteer board setting has shown that task cohesion was a more important indicator of cohesion than social (Doherty & Carron, 2003). Additionally, task and social cohesion was positively correlated with board member satisfaction and the perceived effectiveness of the committee (Doherty & Carron, 2003). Despite this lack of specific application of cohesion in the nonprofit setting, the following is a summary of correlates from multiple settings.

Satisfaction is the difference between what one wants and what one gets from their job and a prominent study or work outcome in organizational behavior (Chelladurai, 2007). The consensus in literature finds a reciprocal relationship between cohesion and satisfaction, so when satisfaction increases so does cohesion, and vice versa (Carless & De Paola, 2000; Widmeyer & Williams, 1991). Effort is the reflection of one’s motivational state (Chelladurai, 2007). Research reflects the notion that those work groups with higher cohesion will have greater member motivation, effort, and participation and reduced social loafing (McKnight et al., 1991).

Adherence is seen as the likelihood that an individual will continue in their involvement with a group. As it relates to cohesion, those groups determined to be more cohesive show a positive correlation to adherence (Carron et al., 1988; Spink & Carron, 1992).

Effectiveness. Cohesive groups have been shown to perform more effectively than less cohesive groups (Mullen & Copper, 1994). In addition, those groups reflecting higher cohesion
can overcome disruptive events better than their less cohesive counterparts (Brawley et al., 1988; Tesluk & Mathieu, 1999).
CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether or not nonprofit board cohesion was impacted by the presence of servant leadership in the executive. Cohesion is multilayered and multifaceted and is potentially impacted by a wide range of variables. Therefore, the study is most interested in the following research questions:

RQ 1. Which of the eight servant leader sub-scales from the nonprofit executive are predictive of overall cohesion after controlling for whether the person was a board member or executive and how long the current board had been together.

RQ 2. Is overall servant leadership predictive of attraction to the group-social after controlling for whether the person was a board member or executive and how long the current board had been together.

RQ 3. Is overall servant leadership predictive of attraction to the group-task after controlling for whether the person was a board member or executive and how long the current board had been together.

RQ 4. Is overall servant leadership predictive of group integration-social after controlling for whether the person was a board member or executive and how long the current board had been together.

RQ 5. Is overall servant leadership predictive of group integration-task after controlling for whether the person was a board member or executive and how long the current board had been together.

Population and Sample Selection

To effectively administer the research project, the researcher focused on nonprofit organizations in the statistical metro area referred to as Dayton/Springfield/Kettering, Ohio. The
definition of the statistical metro area is defined by the U.S. Census Bureau (U.S. Census Bureau, 2022). The total population of that geographic area is 1,080,282 according to the 2019 U.S. Census Bureau estimates. The researcher feels as though this geographic element is important when fulfilling the process of receiving survey data, as will be discussed in subsequent sections. With the zip codes and jurisdictional names to match the statistical metro area, the researcher pulled existing nonprofit organizations according to those registered the IRS and available. Based on an initial screening, there are approximately 7,000 organizations within the state of Ohio in the IRS database.

Upon reducing the organizations down to the statistical metro area of Dayton/Springfield/Kettering, the researcher will use the National taxonomy of exempt entities (NTEE) system to group the different type of nonprofit organizations. The NTEE core codes (NTEE-CC) system of classification is supported and used by IRS determination specialists to distinguish nonprofit organizations during the phase of determining federal tax-exempt status. The reduction process allowed for a comprehensive sample frame of nonprofit organizations. With nonprofit organizations categorized, a computer-generated random sample of nonprofit organizations was pulled from each category. This process should result in the best possible sample of organizations from across the Dayton/Springfield/Kettering statistical metro area.

**Instrumentation - Servant Leadership**

Collectively, there have been a total of 16 measures of servant leadership in academic literature (Eva et al., 2019). However, not all measures have been developed as fully as others. Hinkin (1995) suggested that most of the organizational research initially lacked content validity. In response, Hinkin generated comprehensive guidelines to scale development. These guidelines built upon Churchill (1979) and included a seven-step process to evaluating scale development.
These seven steps include item generation, content adequacy assessment, questionnaire administration, factor analysis, internal consistency assessment, construct validity, and replication (Hinkin, 1995). As Eva et al. (2019) reviewed the measurements used in servant leadership literature, only three instruments successfully utilized the guidelines as offered by Hinkin and are now recommended by Eva et al. Those three instruments are the servant leadership measure (SL-7) from Liden (2015), the servant leadership behavior scale (SLBS) from Sendjaya (2018), and the servant leadership survey (SLS) from van Dierendonck and Nuitjen (2011).

The SL-7 is a global measure of servant leadership that is relatively straightforward, making it a good pair with other instruments to ensure the overall questionnaire not excessively lengthy. The SL-7 is distinct in that it has an added focus on the community element of servant leadership. Thinking back to Greenleaf (1977), there was a keen emphasis on the positively impacting the community around the organization, and is reflected in the instrument of servant leadership. This instrument also leans toward the competency of conceptual skills, which is the ability to see the organization from the broad perspective and seen as an important at the executive level of any organization (Kouzes & Posner, 2006).

The full version SLBS as a six dimension, 35 item instrument developed by Sendjaya (2008). It has subsequently been shortened and validated in a form known as the SLBS-6 and also passed the guidelines as offered by Hinkin (1995). However, for a full testing of servant leadership, the original SLBS should be utilized. The unique element of the SLBS is the spiritual dimension. Again, the use of the spiritual dimension harkens back to Greenleaf’s original ideas about what he thought was involved in the construct of servant leadership. That is, Greenleaf (1998) theorized that servant leadership relies on humility garnered through spiritual insights.
Therefore, any study looking to examine the spirituality construct of servant leadership may find the SLBS or SLBS-6 most useful.

Lastly, the SLS developed by van Dierendonck and Nuitjen (2011) consists of eight dimension and 30 items. The focus of the SLS is that it captures the reality of the servant leader being servant, but also being leader. A juxtaposition that makes servant leadership in general difficult to grasp. In this way, the servant leader must empower their staff while simultaneously holding them accountable. Just as with Sendjaya (2008), a shortened version of the SLS was developed and validated but the full version is optimal.

Through the SLS, van Dierendonck and Nuitjen (2011) appeared to establish the most comprehensive and the strongest (from a factorial perspective) measuring device of servant leadership. The SLS used four independent studies to provide a clear portrayal of servant leadership. van Dierendonck and Nuitjen used civil servants, educators, and white-collar workers to confirm the eight characteristics of servant leadership, as previously listed. All dimensions had factor loadings of over .80 (van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011). Convergent validity was displayed between the SLS and Ehrhart (2004) and Liden et al. (2008) servant leadership measurements. In addition, the SLS displayed discriminant validity by differentiating servant leadership from transformational leadership, ethical leadership, leader-member exchange (LMX) and transactional leadership (van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011). The primary hindrance of van Dierendonck’s work, as it relates to its use in the United States, is the fact that all the research was conducted internationally.

Perhaps in response to the cultural limitations of the SLS, a recent study examined the cross-cultural invariance of the SLS in eight countries (Netherlands, Portugal, Germany, Iceland, Italy, Spain, Turkey and Finland) with a sample 5201 respondents (van Dierendonck et al.,
The researchers concluded that the eight-characteristic version of the SLS was a good fit, but a condensed version of the SLS that included five dimensions was also sufficient (X² = 2227.886, df = 130, CFI = 0.97, TLI = 0.96, SRMR = 0.03), representative of all countries in the study. The five characteristics that remained after testing were empowerment, humility, standing back, stewardship, and authenticity. These characteristics were factorially valid, internally consistent, and held cross-nationally (van Dierendonck et al., 2017).

For the current study, the SLS is the instrument of choice. Just as the SLS reflects the delicate nature of the servant leader balancing their role as a servant and also their role as a leader, the nonprofit executive finds themselves in a delicate position from the framework of the board and the organization. They are legally bound to the desires of their board, but still have a staff that views them as the ultimate leader of the organization. These delicate balances should reflect positively the idea that servant leaders in the role of nonprofit executive would uphold board cohesion while leading the organization forward more effectively.

Table 1.

Servant leadership characteristics and measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Servant Leadership Characteristics</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liden et al. (2015, 2008)</td>
<td>Emotional healing</td>
<td>SL-7; 28 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sendjaya et al. (2008, 2018)</td>
<td>Creating value for community</td>
<td>SLBS; 35 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van Dierendonck et al. (2017); van Dierendock and Nuijten (2011)</td>
<td>Conceptual skills</td>
<td>SLS; 30 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empowering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helping subordinates grow and succeed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Putting subordinates first</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Behaving ethically</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voluntary subordination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authentic self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Covenantal relationship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsible morality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transcendental spirituality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transforming influence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standing back</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authenticity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Courage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpersonal acceptance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stewardship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

54
Throughout the review of literature, the case for utilizing specific instruments of servant leadership and cohesion was made. The servant leadership from van Dierendonck & Nuitjen (2011) will be utilized. This instrument includes 28 items and eight dimensions. The full-length instrument questions are listed below and divided by dimension. When research was conducted, we used the numerical implementation of the instrument. To tailor this instrument to the current study, some of the language was be adapted. Primarily, the term manager was changed to executive, as the nonprofit board members completed the survey about the nonprofit executive. The new language is in brackets. Additionally, the nonprofit executive completed the survey, responding to him or herself. The Likert scale included with this instrument is from 1-7; 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

**Empowerment**

1. My manager [executive] gives me the information I need to do my work well.
3. My manager [executive] helps me to further develop myself.
4. My manager [executive] encourages his/her staff to come up with new ideas.
12. My manager [executive] gives me the authority to make decisions that make my work [board role] easier for me.
20. My manager [executive] enables me to solve problems myself instead of just telling me what to do.
27. My manager [executive] offers me abundant opportunities to learn new skills.

**Standing Back**

5. My manager [executive] keeps himself/herself in the background and gives credit to others.
13. My manager [executive] is not chasing recognition or rewards for the things he/she does for others.

21. My manager [executive] appears to enjoy his/her colleagues’ success more than his/her own.

**Accountability**

6. My manager [executive] holds me responsible for the work I carry out.

14. I am held accountable for my performance by my manager [executive].

22. My manager [executive] holds me and my colleagues responsible for the way we handle a job.

**Forgiveness**

7. My manager [executive] holds me and my colleagues responsible for the way we handle a job.

15. My manager [executive] maintains a hard attitude towards people who have offended him/her at work.

23. My manager [executive] finds it difficult to forget things that went wrong in the past.

**Courage**

8. My manager [executive] takes risks even when he/she is not certain of the support from his/her own manager.

16. My manager [executive] takes risks and does what needs to be done in his/her view.

**Authenticity**

9. My manager [executive] is open about his/her limitations and weaknesses.

17. My manager [executive] is often touched by the things he/she sees happening around him/her.
24. My manager [executive] is prepared to express his/her feelings even if this might have undesirable consequences.

28. My manager [executive] shows his/her true feelings to his/her staff (board).

**Humility**


18. My manager [executive] tries to learn from the criticism he/she gets from his/her superior (the board).

25. My manager [executive] admits his/her mistakes to his/her superior.

29. My manager [executive] learns from the different views and opinions of others.

30. If people express criticism, my manager [executive] tries to learn from it.

**Stewardship**

11. My manager [executive] emphasizes the importance of focusing on the good of the whole.


26. My manager [executive] emphasizes the societal responsibility of our work.

**Instrumentation – Cohesion**

Although cohesion and its impact of group performance has been vast, there have been consistent challenges in measuring the construct (Salas et al., 2015). First, cohesion has been used as a term to catch a multitude of concepts, therefore leading to multiple definitions that support various subdimensions. For instance, the task subdimension leads to a definition that attracts group members together based on the shared commitment to achieving goals and objectives (Carron et al., 1985; Festinger, 1950). Another definition would support the social subdimension, suggesting that cohesion is the closeness within the group based on social
relationships (Carron et al., 1985; Seashore, 1954). Yet others may encompass the subdimensions of belongingness (Shaw, 1981), group pride (Beal et al., 2003), or morale (Cartwright & Zander, 1960). In a review of cohesion studies, most used a multidimensional approach, and the dimensions most frequently examined were that of task and social (Salas et al., 2015).

Another challenge of measuring cohesion is whether it should be viewed as an individual, group, or multilevel construct (Casey-Campbell & Martens, 2009). Similar to the view of dimensionality, academics have used all approaches, but the highest frequency used in academic studies, and those studies producing the most significant measured relationship use a measurement that examines cohesion at the group and the individual levels (Salas et al., 2015). One of the keys to this discussion is understanding whether individuals should be assessing complex interactions between group members (Cota et al., 1995). One solution to this issue is simply aggregating the individual beliefs of group members, which assumes that the group is nothing more than a collection of individual beliefs. Another potential solution to this issue is having groups reach a consensus for each item of a questionnaire, although in practice may be quite difficult. Finally, some studies have utilized informants within the group to make responses about the groups (Lindsley et al., 1995).

Although the literature about the dimensionality and level of cohesion as a construct is wide ranging, it is key to selecting the correct instrument to assess cohesion. The reality is that the nature of this study is trying to assess the impact of a style of leadership on cohesion, as opposed to much of the literature that is attempting to see if cohesion is impactful on performance. Therefore, the study would propose capturing as much information about cohesion as possible. One option that the literature would support is a three-dimensional approach to
measuring cohesion, including task cohesion, social cohesion, and group pride (Beal et al., 2003; Mullen & Copper, 1994).

However, the most widely used instrument to measure cohesion, especially with the desire to examine multidimensionality and the multilevel nature of cohesion is the group environment questionnaire (GEQ) (Carron et al., 1985). Although the GEQ was originally developed for examination of cohesion in athletic teams, it has been adapted for use in many types of groups (Casey-Campbell & Martens, 2009). In totality, the GEQ ultimately assesses four dimensions. The task dimension at the individual and group level as well as the social dimension at the individual and group level. The GEQ is based upon a meta-analysis of group cohesion studies that has been subsequently validated (Carron & Brawley, 2000), and appears to be the most widely used instrument in the study of cohesion (Casey-Campbell & Martens, 2009).

Similar to the use of the SLS, the GEQ was adapted for use in the current study. This required the exclusion of references to team or team activities such as practice. Due to the need to alter this instrument, the original verbiage was placed in brackets. Additionally, some of the original questions did not even apply to the nonprofit board setting. For display purposes here the instrument is separated by different elements of cohesion but was administered numerically within the study. In total the GEQ has 18 items separated into four total categories. First, cohesion is separated by social and task cohesiveness. Then, social and task is further separated by individual attraction to the groups and group integration. The responses to the GEQ are based on a Likert (1-9) scale. 1 being strongly disagree, 9 being strongly agree.

**Individual attraction to the group – social (ATGS)**

1. I do not enjoy being a part of the social activities of this board [team].
3. I am not going to miss the members of this board [team] when my term ends [the season ends].

5. Some of my best friends are on this board [team].

7. Omit item [I enjoy other parties rather than team parties].

9. For me, this board [team] is one of the most important social groups to which I belong.

**Individual attraction to the group – task (ATGT)**

2. I am not happy with the amount I contribute to this board [of playing time I get].

4. I’m unhappy with my board’s level of commitment to improve [team’s level of desire to win].

6. This board [team] does not give me enough opportunities to contribute to the organization [improve my personal performance].

8. I do not like the way this board conducts its operations [style of play of this team].

**Group integration – social (GIS)**

11. Omit item [Members of our team would rather go out on their own than together as a team].


15. Our board [team] would like to spend time together outside of board meetings [in the off season].

17. Members of our board [team] do not stick together outside of organized board meetings [practice and games].

**Group integration – task (GIT)**

10. Our board [team] is united in trying to reach its goals for performance.
12. We all take responsibility for any loss or poor performance by the organization [our team].
14. Our board [team] members have conflicting aspirations for the organization’s [team’s] performance.
16. If members of our board [team] have problems, [in practice] everyone wants to help them so we can get back together again.
18. Our board [team] members do not communicate freely about each other’s [athlete’s] responsibilities [during competition or practice].

**Demographics**

Additionally, demographic data was gathered as a part of the survey data. The demographic data included, age, gender, education level, and years of experience with the nonprofit organization. Additionally, the questionnaire included one question about the length of time the board has been together in its current composition. This is critical as length of time the board has existed in its current composition will become a control variable. The survey was implemented on an online survey tool, Qualtrics.

**Procedures**

Upon gathering the list of nonprofit organizations discussed under the settings and participant information, the research continued with the ultimate goal of a group-self-administered survey (Remler & Van Ryzin, 2015). This approach seeks to engage a specific group within an organization and give instructions to that group on completing the survey. In this case, the group that will be engaged is the executive and the board of the nonprofit organization. The key to this approach is to assess the board of directors.
To begin, an email of introduction was sent directly to the executive directors of the sample nonprofit organizations. This letter served the purpose of introducing the study and researchers to the nonprofit executives. Through this dialogue, the intent was able to present the research study directly to the executive and the board at an official board meeting or through a descriptive email that presents the purpose of the study and links for those individuals to take the survey. The survey was administered and responses collected in Qualtrics.

Data analysis was completed with the SAS software. Prior to any analysis, data cleaning and removal of missing data was performed. Frequency distributions were used to check for other errors and outliers. The analysis continued by looking at summary statistics to include mean, standard deviations, and frequency counts for the eight dimensions of servant leadership and the four components of cohesion along with the demographic data.

To analyze the data, five statistical models were utilized. The five statistical models were mixed effects linear regressions, as they contained both fixed effects and a random effect. The fixed effects included instrument construct, time the board has been together, and member type. The random effect was the board. The first model utilized the eight subscales of SL as independent variables and overall cohesion is the dependent variable. The other four models used overall SL as the independent variable and each dimension of cohesion ATGS, ATGT, GIS, and GIT as the response variables. Each model also had an independent variable that denoted whether a given respondent was the director of the board or a board member. This allowed for testing whether relationships existed between the variables of interest were dependent upon whether the respondent was a nonprofit board director or nonprofit board member. Another independent variable for the length of time the board had been together was also included (<one year, one year, two years, three years, four≤). This was done to control for any effects this might
have on the response variables of interest. Two-way interaction terms were included between the SL scales and the role of the respondent to investigate whether any relationships differ based on whether the person is a board member or the director. Non-significant two-way interactions were removed so that the main effects of the variables of interest could be assessed directly. A random effect for which board the respondents belonged to was also included to account for any correlational results for members of the same board.

Regarding the sample needed to complete the study and fulfill statistical significance, the primary objective was to reach a sample of 30 units, or groups. A unit was achieved when the nonprofit executive and at least one board member from the same organization completed the described instruments. Of course, the ideal scenario in this study will be achieved when the nonprofit executive and 100% of the same nonprofit board complete the survey. However, as a goal, the study would prefer 50% of the nonprofit organization board to respond to the survey. As we examined the board responses to the questionnaire, our evaluation of servant leadership will rely on the mean scores of the nonprofit board. The mean score of both the nonprofit board and the executive was measured for cohesion.

**Summary**

The essence of this study is to examine the impact of servant leadership on cohesion at the top level of the nonprofit organizations. Based on the structure of nonprofit organizations, the top level is the board along with the executive director. The nature of nonprofit organizations is that the focus of the organization should be on the mission of that organization. Therefore, cohesiveness at the top level of the organization is critical. In particular, the cohesion based upon the task is seen as vital and a primary focus of this study. It is expected that the presence of servant leadership by the executive will result in a higher level of task cohesion, both as an
individual (individual board member attraction to group) and as a group construct (entire board cohesiveness) as compared to nonprofit organizations where the executive expresses a lower level of servant leadership. Additionally, we expect to find that servant leadership has a greater impact on task cohesion than social cohesion. Again, this reflects the nature of nonprofit organizations in general, where the purpose of the organization should be paramount and the focus of connectivity.
CHAPTER IV. DATA ANALYSIS

Descriptive Statistics

In total, 38 organizations participated in the survey. From those 38 organizations a total of 123 board members participated. However, due to missing data in the surveys or an unwillingness to participate in the survey at some level, only 32 directors and 91 board members were used in the analysis. The following tables are a summary of the descriptive statistics used in the survey.

Table 2.

*Descriptive statistics for servant leadership and cohesion variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SL: Empowerment</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL: Standing Back</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL: Accountability</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL: Forgiveness</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL: Courage</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL: Authenticity</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL: Humility</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL: Stewardship</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL: Overall</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>6.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: ATGS</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: ATGT</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: GIS</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: GIT</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Overall</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>6.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.

*Descriptive statistics for servant leadership and cohesion variables by role*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board</td>
<td>SL: Empowerment</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL: Standing Back</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL: Accountability</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL: Forgiveness</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL: Courage</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL: Authenticity</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL: Humility</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL: Stewardship</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL: Overall</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>6.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C: ATGS</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C: ATGT</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C: GIS</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C: GIT</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C: Overall</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>6.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>SL: Empowerment</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>6.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL: Standing Back</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL: Accountability</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL: Forgiveness</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL: Courage</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL: Authenticity</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL: Humility</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL: Stewardship</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL: Overall</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C: ATGS</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C: ATGT</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C: GIS</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C: GIT</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C: Overall</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>5.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.

*Frequencies and percentages for role*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>73.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.

Frequencies and percentages for number of years of service as director on the board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years as Board Director</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than one year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One year</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four or more years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>68.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.

Frequencies and percentages for number of years of service as a member of the board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years as Board Member</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One year</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five or more years</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.

Frequencies and percentages for number of the current board has been together

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Board Years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than one year</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One year</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>47.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four or more years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

To analyze the data, five statistical models were run using SAS, version 9.4. The five statistical models were mixed effects linear regressions, as they contained both fixed effects and a random effect. The fixed effects included instrument construct, time the board has been together, and member type. The random effect was the board. The first model utilized the eight subscales of SL as independent variables and overall cohesion is the dependent variable. The
other four models used overall SL as the independent variable and each of ATGS, ATGT, GIS, and GIT as the response variables. Each model also had an independent variable that denoted whether a given respondent was the director of the board or a board member. This allowed for testing whether relationships existed between the variables of interest were dependent upon whether the respondent was a nonprofit board director or nonprofit board member. Another independent variable for the length of time the board had been together was also included (<one year, one year, two years, three years, four≤ years). This was done to control for any effects this might have on the response variables of interest. Two-way interaction terms were included between the SL scales and the role of the respondent to investigate whether any relationships differ based on whether the person is a board member or the director. Non-significant two-way interactions were removed so that the main effects of the variables of interest could be assessed directly. A random effect for which board respondents belonged to was also included to account for any correlational results for members of the same board.

RQ 1. Which of the eight servant leader sub-scales are predictive of overall cohesion after controlling for whether the person is a board member or director and how long the current board has been together?

The full model with the interaction terms between role and each of the SL subscales was run first. Model assumptions were assessed via residual plots and deemed to have been met. The results are given below in Table 1. Since the two-way interactions are in the model, we do not directly interpret the significance, or lack thereof, of any of the subscale main effects or role main effect.
Table 8.

Mixed effects regression results for two-way interaction model for RQ1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Num DF</th>
<th>Den DF</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Board Years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL_Empowerment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL_Standing Back</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL_Accountability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL_Forgiveness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL_Courage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL_Authenticity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL_Humility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>13.46</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL_Stewardship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL_Empowerment*Role</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL_Standing Back*Role</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.0501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL_Accountability*Role</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL_Forgiveness*Role</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL_Courage*Role</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL_Authenticity*Role</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL_Humility*Role</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL_Stewardship*Role</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In brief, all the p-values for the interactions are greater than 0.05 (although the Standing Back interaction is close at p = 0.0501), there is not sufficient evidence to suggest there are any significant two-way interactions between role and any of the SL subscales. This means there is not any evidence that the strength of the linear association between any of the eight subscales and overall board cohesion is dependent on role. Therefore, the interaction terms were removed, and the main effects were assessed directly. The results are given in Table 2. Here and throughout, statistically significant variables are denoted in boldface.

For a more in-depth explanation of the Table 1 results: There is not sufficient evidence to suggest there is a significant relationship between overall board cohesion and Empowerment*Role (F(1, 72) = 0.5, p = 0.48), Standing Back*Role (F(1, 72) = 3.97, p = 0.0501), Accountability*Role (F(1, 72) = 1.42, p = 0.24), Forgiveness*Role (F(1, 72) = 1.98, p =
0.16), Courage*Role (F(1, 72) = 1.88, p = 0.18), Authenticity*Role (F(1, 72) = 0.34, p = 0.56), Humility*Role (F(1, 72) = 0.01, p = 0.91), or Stewardship*Role (F(1, 72) = 0.03, p = 0.86).

Table 9.

Mixed effects regression results for main effects model for RQ1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Num DF</th>
<th>Den DF</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>0.0232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Board Years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL_Empowerment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL_Standing Back</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL_Accountability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>0.0198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL_Forgiveness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL_Courage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL_Authenticity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL_Humility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>18.54</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL_Stewardship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is strong evidence to suggest there is a significant linear relationship between Accountability and overall board cohesion, with all else held constant (F(1, 80) = 5.65, p = 0.0198). The estimated coefficient is 0.18. This means for every one-point increase in Accountability, on average, overall board cohesion increases by 0.18 points, with all else held constant.

There is also strong evidence to suggest there is a significant linear relationship between Humility and overall board cohesion, with all else held constant (F(1, 80) = 18.54, p < 0.0001). The estimated coefficient is 0.51. This means for every one-point increase in Humility, on average, overall board cohesion increases by 0.51 points, with all else held constant.

There is also strong evidence to suggest there is a significant linear relationship between Stewardship and overall board cohesion, with all else held constant (F(1, 80) = 6.18, p = 0.015).
The estimated coefficient is -0.28. This means for every one-point increase in Stewardship, on average, overall board cohesion decreases by 0.28 points, with all else held constant.

There is also strong evidence to suggest there is a significant mean difference in overall cohesion between board members and directors, with all else held constant (F(1, 80) = 5.36, p = 0.0232). The estimated mean is 0.4 higher for board members than directors. A 95% confidence interval (CI) for the true mean difference among all such subjects is (0.06, 0.75).

No other significant relationships were detected. Plots of each of the significant linear relationships broken down by role are given in Figures 1–3. These plots have been adjusted for the effects of the other variables in the model (using the mean of each of the other SL subscales and the mode of current board years). If different values for the other variables in the model were used, the vertical orientation of the lines would change, but the slopes and distance between lines would remain constant. The slopes of the lines correspond to the given coefficient of the SL subscale and the vertical difference between lines corresponds to the difference between board members and directors. Note that this difference is constant (0.4 points) but may appear different in different plots since the scale of the vertical axis differs between plots.
Figure 1.

*Predicted overall cohesion for accountability by role*

![Graph showing fit for C_Overall, with SL_Accountability on the x-axis and Linear Predictor on the y-axis. The graph includes lines for different roles: Board and Director. The fit is computed with various SL scores and how many years have passed.]

Figure 2.

*Predicted overall cohesion for humility by role*

![Graph showing fit for C_Overall, with SL_Humility on the x-axis and Linear Predictor on the y-axis. The graph includes lines for different roles: Board and Director. The fit is computed with various SL scores and how many years have passed.]
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RQ 2. Is overall servant leadership predictive of attraction to group-social (ATGS) after controlling for whether the person is a board member or director and how long the current board has been together?

The full model with the interaction term between role and ATGS was run first. Model assumptions were assessed via residual plots and deemed to have been met. There is not sufficient evidence to suggest there is a significant two-way interaction between role and ATGS (F(1, 86) < 0.05, p = 0.99). This implies there is not enough evidence to believe that the linear relationship between ATGS and overall SL differs between the two roles. Therefore, the interaction term was removed, and the model was re-run and the main effects were assessed directly. The results are given in Table 9.
Table 10.

*Mixed effects regression results for main effects model for RQ2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Num DF</th>
<th>Den DF</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Board Years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL_Overall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>0.0059</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is strong evidence to suggest there is a significant linear relationship between overall SL and ATGS, with all else held constant (F(1, 87) = 7.96, p = 0.0059). The estimated coefficient is 0.34. This means for every one-point increase in overall SL, on average, ATGS increases by 0.34 points, with all else held constant.

There is not sufficient evidence to suggest there are any significant mean differences between Roles (F(1, 87) = 1.98, p = 0.16) or number of years the current board has been together (F(4, 87) = 0.87, p = 0.49).

A plot of the linear relationship between overall SL and ATGS broken down by role is given in Figure 4. Like the prior plots it is broken down by role for descriptive purposes, but this time that difference was not statistically significant.
RQ3. Is overall servant leadership predictive of attraction to group-task (ATGT) after controlling for whether the person is a board member or director and how long the current board has been together?

The full model with the interaction term between role and ATGT was run first. Model assumptions were assessed via residual plots and deemed to have been met. There is not sufficient evidence to suggest there is a significant two-way interaction between role and ATGT ($F(1, 86) = 0.09, p = 0.77$). This implies there is not enough evidence to believe that the linear relationship between ATGT and overall SL differs between the two roles. Therefore, the interaction term was removed and the model was rerun and the main effects were assessed directly. The results are given in Table 11.
### Table 11.

*Mixed effects regression results for main effects model for RQ3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Num DF</th>
<th>Den DF</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Board Years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL_Overall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>20.88</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is strong evidence to suggest there is a significant linear relationship between overall SL and ATGT, with all else held constant ($F(1, 87) = 20.88$, $p < 0.0001$). The estimated coefficient is 0.53. This means for every one-point increase in overall SL, on average, ATGT increases by 0.53 points, with all else held constant. There is not sufficient evidence to suggest there are any significant mean differences between roles ($F(1, 87) = 2.98$, $p = 0.09$) or number of years the current board has been together ($F(4, 87) = 0.37$, $p = 0.83$). A plot of the linear relationship between overall SL and ATGT broken down by role is given in Figure 5.
RQ4. Is overall servant leadership predictive of group integration-social (GIS) after controlling for whether the person is a board member or director and how long the current board has been together?

The full model with the interaction term between role and GIS was run first. Model assumptions were assessed via residual plots and deemed to have been met. The results are given in Table 1112.
Table 12.

*Mixed effects regression results for two-way interaction model for RQ4*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Num DF</th>
<th>Den DF</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Board Years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL_Overall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL_Overall*Role</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>0.0057</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is strong evidence to suggest there is a significant two-way interaction between role and GIS (F(1, 86) = 8.05, p = 0.0057). This implies there is enough evidence to believe that the linear relationship between GIS and overall SL differs between the two roles. The estimated coefficient for the interaction term is 1.03. This coefficient represents the difference in slope of the board role compared to the director role, so the interpretation is for every one-point increase in overall SL, on average the GIS for board members increases by 1.03 points more than that of directors. To directly look at the two coefficients for the roles, the coefficient for directors is -0.58 and the coefficient for board members is 1.03 + (-0.58) = 0.45. This means that for directors, for every one-point increase in overall SL, on average, GIS decreases by 0.58 points. For board members, for every one-point increase in overall SL, on average, GIS increases by 0.45 points. We can more broadly say that as overall SL increases GIS tends to decrease for directors, but as overall SL increases GIS tends to increase for board members.

There is not sufficient evidence to suggest there are any significant mean differences in GIS between the various numbers of years the current board has been together (F(4, 86) = 0.5, p = 0.74). Note that we don’t directly interpret the significance or lack thereof for the role or overall SL main effects since the interaction term is in the model. A plot of the linear relationship between overall SL and GIS is given in Figure 6. The non-parallel nature of the two regression lines is indicative of the significant two-way interaction.
RQ5. Is overall servant leadership predictive of group integration-task (GIT) after controlling for whether the person is a board member or director and how long the current board has been together?

The full model with the interaction term between role and GIT was run first. Model assumptions were assessed via residual plots and deemed to have been met. There is not sufficient evidence to suggest there is a significant two-way interaction between role and GIT ($F(1, 86) = 0.30, p = 0.59$). This implies there is not enough evidence to believe that the linear prediction between GIT and overall SL differs between the two roles. Therefore, the interaction term was removed and the model was rerun and the main effects were assessed directly. The results are given in Table 13.
There is strong evidence to suggest there is a significant linear prediction between overall SL and GIT, with all else held constant (F(1, 87) = 26.87, p < 0.0001). The estimated coefficient is 0.52. This means for every one-point increase in overall SL, on average, GIT increases by 0.52 points, with all else held constant.

There is also evidence to suggest there is a significant mean difference between roles (F(1, 87) = 6.46, p = 0.0128), with all else held constant. The estimated mean is 0.46 points higher for board members. A 95% CI for the true mean difference among all such subjects is (0.10, 0.82). There is not sufficient evidence to suggest there are any significant mean differences in GIT between the various numbers of years the current board has been together (F(4, 87) = 0.5, p = 0.74). A plot of the linear prediction between overall SL and GIT broken down by role is given in Figure 7.

Finally, Cronbach alpha were found to be good, with the following results for the SLS: Empowerment .85; Accountability .82, Standing Back .86, Humility .90, Authenticity .76, Courage .78, Forgiveness .83, Stewardship .74. Cronbach alpha results for the GEQ were the following: ATGS .74, ATGT .87, GIS .80, GIT .89.
Figure 7.

*Predicted GIT for Overall SL by Role*

![Graph](image-url)
CHAPTER V. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

To analyze the data, five statistical models were run using SAS, version 9.4 including mixed effects linear regressions, incorporating both fixed effects and a random effect. The fixed effects in these models encompassed three independent variables: instrument construct, time the board has been together, and member type. Meanwhile, the random effect considered was the board to account for within-group correlations.

The first model examined the predictive relationship between eight subscales of servant leadership (SL) as independent variables and overall cohesion as the dependent variable. The subsequent four models investigated the association between overall servant leadership (SL) (independent variable) and each dimension of cohesion, including attraction to group-social (ATGS), attraction to group-task (ATGT), group integration-social (GIS), and group integration-task (GIT) (response variables). Additionally, each model incorporated an independent variable indicating whether the respondent was the director of the board or a board member. This allowed for exploring potential variations in the predictive relationships based on the respondent's role within the nonprofit organization.

Furthermore, an independent variable capturing the length of time the board had been together was included in each model. This variable was divided into categories representing different time frames: less than one year, one year, two years, three years, and four or more years. Its inclusion aimed to control for any effects that the duration of board tenure might have on the response variables of interest.

To investigate potential differences in relationships based on the respondent's role, two-way interaction terms were incorporated between the SL scales and the respondent's position as a
board member or director. Non-significant two-way interactions were subsequently eliminated, enabling a direct assessment of the main effects of the variables of interest.

Finally, a random effect was included to account for any correlation among members of the same board. This random effect aimed to address potential clustering of responses within boards and ensure robust statistical analysis.

**Discussion – Significant Dimensions of Servant Leadership**

The results of the present study indicate that the servant leadership dimensions of accountability, humility, and stewardship were significant predictors of overall nonprofit board cohesion. This is consistent with research previously discussed. Although the direct link between overall servant leadership and cohesion is limited, the established positive link between servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is substantial (Ehrhart, 2004; Eva et al., 2019). OCB is the nonrequired contributions made by team members to their organization, so perceived similarities could be concluded between OCB and cohesion, even as both constructs are distinct.

More interesting are the dimensions of servant leadership that were found to have a significant impact on cohesion. The most interesting is the idea accountability. Accountability implies that board members who are held to a certain standard of expectations will more likely embrace and uphold their individual and collective responsibilities, both to the organization and to each other, and will contribute to a greater sense of unity and collaboration within the board. Accountability aligns with research from Juntumaa et al. (2007) & Westre & Weiss (1991) that shows leaders who focus on finishing tasks by providing instruction and offering positive feedback enhance cohesion.
Of the prominent SL instruments, only van Dierendonck’s (2011) included the dimension of accountability. This is because SL and accountability usually do not go together in people’s minds as a part of serving. However, this research shows that one of the better ways we can serve a group, in this case a board, is to set expectations and see that those expectations are met. The usefulness of accountability is also interesting in this setting, because as we know, board members are volunteers. We often make assumptions that with volunteers, we will take what we can get. However, this study shows that displaying accountability even amongst volunteers is important to establish a sense of cohesion that is important for a board who operates effectively. Another connection to the previous research is found in Prapavessis & Carron (1997). They found that personal sacrifices such as time increased both social and task cohesion. When accountability is present, this often leads to sacrifices on behalf of those being held accountable, so this part of the study does seem to reflect existing research in the field.

The other dimensions of SL that proved to be significant are less surprising. Humility emerged as another significant predictor of board cohesion. Humility is demonstrating a willingness to listen, learn from others, and acknowledge their own limitations. This trait fosters an atmosphere of openness and mutual respect. In turn, this study shows that humility helps to enable board members to work together towards common goals. The predictive relationship between humility and board cohesion suggests that a humble leadership style contributes to the creation of a supportive and cooperative board culture.

Additionally, stewardship was found to be a significant predictor of board cohesion. Stewardship refers to the ethical and responsible management of organizational resources and the commitment to serve the best interests of the organization and its stakeholders. Prioritizing stewardship demonstrates a shared dedication to the mission and vision of the organization,
promoting a sense of unity and purpose among board members. Especially in a nonprofit setting this finding underscores the importance of viewing leadership as a service-oriented role and highlights how a focus on stewardship contributes to a cohesive board environment.

These findings have important implications for nonprofit organizations and their leadership development practices. By recognizing the significance of accountability, humility, and stewardship in predicting board cohesion, organizations can prioritize these servant leadership dimensions when selecting and developing board members. Investing in leadership development programs that cultivate these qualities can enhance board effectiveness and contribute to the overall success of the organization.

It is worth noting that while accountability, humility, and stewardship were significant predictors of board cohesion, there may be other factors that also influence board dynamics. An area of future research could explore additional dimensions of servant leadership or consider the interaction of these dimensions with contextual factors such as board size, diversity, or organizational culture. Nonetheless, the findings of this study provide valuable insights into the role of servant leadership in shaping nonprofit board cohesion and offer practical implications for organizations seeking to cultivate an effective and harmonious board environment.

Discussion – Dimensions of Cohesion

The study reflects a positive predictive relationship between overall servant leadership and all constructs of cohesion. This includes individual social, individual task, group social, and group task cohesion. With the nature of a nonprofit organization, a leader who is willing to serve enhances group cohesion for task related purposes. After all, board members typically have a connection to the cause in which they are being drawn to the work. Therefore, when examining the results of this study, the enhancement of task related cohesion fits well in the nonprofit
setting. However, social construct of cohesion was also positively impacted by the presence of servant leadership by the executive director.

In conclusion, the evidence regarding the predictive relationship between overall servant leadership and attraction to the group (social cohesion) is mixed. While some studies support a significant predictive relationship, others present contrasting findings or no significant association. It is important to consider additional factors that can influence social cohesion, such as team dynamics, shared goals, communication, and individual differences. Further research is needed to better understand the ability to predict the relationship between overall servant leadership and social cohesion in different organizational and team contexts.

The final element for discussion in this study has to do with the differentiation between the two roles examined in this study. The results reflected the fact that there was not a significant difference in the models between board results and executive director results. However, board results displayed consistently higher marks for servant leadership than the director themselves. This could be attributed to the desire of the board to speak more favorably about their executive director than the executive is willing speak about him or herself.

**Limitations**

While the survey conducted for assessing servant leadership and cohesion within a nonprofit board aimed to provide valuable insights, there are certain limitations that should be acknowledged.

The study findings are limited by the specific sample of board members who participated in the survey. It is important to note that the sample may not be fully representative of the entire board population due to factors such as self-selection bias or limited participation rates. As a result, the generalizability of the findings to the broader board community may be limited.
The survey relied on self-reported responses from board members, which can introduce potential bias. Respondents may have provided socially desirable responses or may not have accurately recalled their experiences or perceptions. This could lead to response biases, such as the tendency to overestimate positive aspects of servant leadership or cohesion, or to underreport any challenges or areas of improvement.

The surveys also focused on servant leadership and cohesion may not capture the full range of factors influencing board dynamics and effectiveness. Other important variables, such as board composition, decision-making processes, or external environmental factors, were not explicitly addressed in the survey. Consequently, the study findings may not provide a comprehensive understanding of the complexities involved in board functioning.

Additionally, the survey may not fully consider the unique contextual factors that exist within the nonprofit organization or board being studied. Each organization has its own distinct characteristics, such as size, mission, culture, and governance structure, which can significantly impact servant leadership and cohesion. Therefore, the survey findings may not be directly applicable or generalizable to other nonprofit boards or different organizational contexts.

The survey measurement tools and scales used to assess servant leadership and cohesion may have inherent limitations. While efforts were made to use validated instruments, there is always a possibility of measurement error or subjective interpretation of the survey items. Furthermore, the survey may not capture all dimensions or nuances of servant leadership and cohesion, potentially limiting the depth of understanding.

The survey employed a cross-sectional design, capturing data at a single point in time. As a result, it is not possible to establish causality or determine changes in servant leadership and cohesion over time. Longitudinal studies or experimental designs would be necessary to
overcome this limitation and provide more robust evidence of the predictive relationships between servant leadership, cohesion, and board effectiveness.

The survey may be subject to nonresponse bias, as not all board members may have participated. Those who chose not to respond may hold different opinions or experiences from those who did respond, potentially introducing bias into the findings. Nonresponse bias could affect the overall representativeness of the results and limit the generalizability of the findings.

Despite these limitations, the survey serves as a valuable starting point for understanding servant leadership and cohesion within the specific nonprofit board under investigation. Future research should consider these limitations and employ complementary methodologies to gain a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding of these important board dynamics.

**Future Research**

As discussed in the literature review, the connection between servant leadership and cohesion in the nonprofit setting is rather limited. In fact, the connection between servant leadership and cohesion in total is limited. Therefore, the potential for extending research on the impact of cohesion through servant leadership is possible. From that perspective, this topic could be examined outside the nonprofit setting, to include traditional work groups, military, or athletic teams to name a few.

Returning to the nonprofit setting in particular, there is certainly room for expansion of the results of cohesion and the specific dimensions of cohesion. This would be especially helpful as it relates to the board of a nonprofit organization. For instance, does a greater level of cohesion actually enhance the performance or satisfaction of the board. Previous studies about cohesion would certainly suggest that its applicability would extend to a specific type of work team such as a nonprofit board, but investigation would be worthwhile.
Lastly, returning to servant leadership, the view of servant leadership from the perspective of the board should be considered. The nature of this study and how data was gathered reflect similar views of the servant leadership that existed within the organizations. However, perhaps conducted in other ways, the boards’ view of the presence of servant leadership may vary and that unique view could change the perspective of the cohesiveness. This idea, to gain a perspective of servant leadership from those who are being led has applicability for future research in the area of servant leadership, whether that is in a nonprofit setting or other.
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- Coordinated all athletic schedules with University Scheduling and Events to ensure proper management of athletic and University scheduling needs
Broadcast Compound Manager, Stadium Miyagi, Host Broadcast Services for the 2002 World Cup, June 2002
- Responsible for scheduling all deliveries for Host Broadcast Services at Stadium Miyagi during the 2002 World Cup
- Managed the day-to-day Host Broadcast Service needs at Stadium Miyagi, such as cabling requirements and placement, receiving and distributing broadcast products, handling parking requirements, and resolving accreditation issues

Venue Logistics Manager, Deer Valley Resort, Salt Lake Organizing Committee for the Olympic Games, January 2001 - March 2002
- Responsible for the transportation, distribution, set-up, warehousing, re-supply, control, tear-down, and recovery of all SLOC-owned inventory used at the Deer Valley Resort for the Salt Lake 2002 Winter Games
- Trained, scheduled, and directed an assistant and a nine-man crew in the Logistics operations at the Olympic Winter Games
- Managed the Master Delivery Manifest in coordination with the Secret Service and multiple vendors, such as Fed Ex and Sysco, for all deliveries entering the secure area of the Deer Valley Resort
- Oversaw the operation of all utility vehicles, such as snowmobiles and ATV's, used at the Deer Valley Resort through maintenance and training programs

Venue Logistics Supervisor, Darling Harbour Venue, Sydney Organizing Committee for the Olympic Games, July - October 2000
- Assisted in the organization and implementation of all procedures to: efficiently and effectively transport, distribute, warehouse, control, and disperse logistical goods, such as furniture and sport equipment
- Responsible for the planning and implementation of logistical job specific training, including manual handling instruction, for fifteen volunteers
- Supervised the logistical actions of ten crew members during the Olympic Games to ensure the proper restocking of supplies at the Darling Harbor Venue

Professional Memberships:
- North American Society for Sport Management

Teaching:

Courses Taught

| 2018 – 2022 | Principles of Emergency Management |
| 2013 – 2020 | Facility Design and Management |
| 2013 – Present | Financing Sport Operations |
| 2014 – Present | Event Planning and Production |
| 2014 – 2020 | Organizational Behavior in Sport |
| 2014 – Present | Principles of Management |
| 2013 - 2022 | Administration of Interscholastic Athletic Departments |
| 2018 – 2022 | Creative Problem Solving |
2016 – 2019 Business Professions
2014 – 2016 Legal Issues in Sport
2010 – 2012 EDL 301, Principals of Leadership

Scholarship:


Service:

Community:

2022 – Present Board Member, Miami Valley Non-Profit Collaborative
2018 – 2022 Served on a community park committee, assisting to raise over $80,000 in funding for improvements
2017 – 2018 Served on FAAC at Cedarville University
2017 – 2018 Facilitator, Leadership Development Institute at the Life Enrichment Center
2016 – 2018 Apex Community Church, House Church Shepherd
2016 – 2017 Fit to be Tied Facilitator
2014 – 2016 Shepherd Preparation Course, Apex Community Church
2013 – 2014 Volunteer Director of Shoeless 5K, benefitting Shoes for the Shoeless
2010 – 2015 Maple Tree Cancer Alliance, Health and Wellness Expo Volunteer
2011 - 2013 Men’s Community Bible Study, Oakwood OH
Habitat for Humanity, Volunteer