

# **The Impact of Servant Leadership to Followers' Psychological Capital: A Comparative Study of Evangelical Christian Leader–Follower Relationships in the United States and Cambodia**

**Eric D. Coggins**  
**Liberty University**

**Mihai C. Bocarnea**  
**Regent University**

*This cross-cultural study tests a full-scale model of servant leadership as related to the four individual resources of psychological capital. The findings suggest that there is positive relationship between the follower-perceived practice of servant leadership and the followers' sense of psychological capital. Furthermore, the relationship between servant leadership and follower psychological capital is moderated by the respective followers' cultural setting. A hierarchical multiple regression was used to test the relationship between the five components of Barbuto and Wheeler's (2006) five-factor servant leadership model and Luthans, Youssef, and Avolio's (2007) four individual components of psychological capital. For the most part, the findings indicate that servant leadership is positively related to followers' self-ratings of psychological capital in both Cambodian and American samples. However, those relationships were found to be more important in the Cambodian setting.*

## **INTRODUCTION**

Since 2002, organizational behavior scholars have posited that positive leadership styles may have a positive impact on followers' outcomes including the development of positive psychological capital in followers. Servant leadership has been listed among such positive leadership styles (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). If servant leadership is a positive leadership style, then the practice of servant leadership within an organization may result in the development of psychological capital in follower-subordinates. What is more, this outcome may occur in for-profit and not-for-profit institutions alike, including in religious institutions (e.g., the Christian church) and across cultural lines (e.g., United States and Cambodia).

Nearly one third of the world's population claims to adhere to the Christian faith (Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life, 2011a). Moreover, population data sources (e.g., Barna Group, 2011; Gallup Poll, 2010; U.S. Department of State, 2011) have estimated nearly 133 million Americans claim to attend church on a weekly or near weekly basis, and 265,000 Cambodians claim to be members of the Christian faith community. Within the Christian church movements in both the United States and Cambodia, servant leadership as an organizational leadership philosophy has been held up as an ideal leadership style due to its perceived emphasis by its founding and central figure, Jesus of Nazareth (Bekker, 2010; Irving, 2011; Kimura, 2007; Niewold, 2007; Vinod & Sudhakar, 2011). Accordingly, at least some Christian organizations working in the United States and Cambodia (Kimura, 2007; Niewold, 2007) actively

encourage church pastors and other leaders to embrace servant leadership as a model as they seek to minister to the needs of the followers within their congregations and the community at large. Arguably, in their attempts to serve the needs of their followers, Christian church leaders teach Christian principles in order that, at least in part, Christian followers may be transformed in their attitudes and have a greater sense of psychological well-being as rooted in their religious faith. If this is indeed one intention of Christian leaders, perhaps it is appropriate to research whether (a) Christian leaders in American and Cambodian church organizations actively practice servant leadership and (b) followers in the American and Cambodian Christian communities believe they have a deeper sense of personal psychological well-being due to their Christian leaders' practice of servant leadership. Other considerations in such an examination could include (a) the perceived quality of the leader–follower relationship and (b) the influence of the cultural context of the Christian follower.

Positive Organizational Behavior (POB) theory suggests that positive ethical leadership styles (e.g., servant leadership) may result in positive outcomes in followers (e.g., follower development of psychological capital). However, POB theory was developed in the United States, a Western culture. The majority cultures of the United States and Cambodia, as some researchers have noted, could not be more different. Given the differences in American and Cambodian majority cultures, one could wonder whether Americans and Cambodians would differ in how they see the connection between servant leadership and the psychological well-being of followers.

The main purpose of this study was to examine whether causal relationships exist between servant leadership and the development of psychological capital and or posited component variables of servant leadership and psychological capital. More specifically, the study examined the multivariate relationship between followers' perceptions of leaders' practice of servant leadership and the same followers' perceptions of personal psychological capital including the potential relationship of five posited characteristics of servant leadership (altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship) to four posited characteristics of psychological capital (hope, self-efficacy, optimism, and resilience).

As suggested by the literature, this study followed two secondary purposes. The first secondary purpose of this present study was to investigate the moderating effects of the quality of leader–member exchanges on the relationship of the linear combination of five components of servant leadership to the four individual components of psychological capital. The other secondary purpose of this present study was to present a cross-cultural comparative study of the dominant cultures of the United States and Cambodia by investigating the differences (if any) between follower perceptions of servant leadership and psychological capital as found in the respective data gathered in the two countries. In order to accomplish this purpose, data for this present study were drawn from evangelical Christian local churches in the United States and Cambodia.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

This section offers a literature review in support of the theoretical framework informing the research hypotheses and research questions guiding this research as related to the core theoretical concepts of psychological capital, servant leadership, and leader–member exchange theory related to a comparative study of evangelical Christian local church leader–follower relationships in the United States and Cambodia.

## **SERVANT LEADERSHIP AND PSYCHOLOGICAL CAPITAL**

Walumbwa, Hartnell, and Oke (2010) suggested that leader behavior that is concerned with follower development contributes to the positive psychological well-being of followers. Servant leadership has been presented as a leadership style characterized by concern with follower development. If this is so, then it seems to follow that servant leadership contributes to the positive psychological well-being of followers. Barbuto and Wheeler's servant leadership model includes five components including (a)

altruistic calling, (b) emotional healing, (c) wisdom, (d) persuasive mapping, and (e) organizational stewardship.

### **Altruistic Calling and Psychological Capital**

Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) operationally defined altruistic calling as a deep-rooted desire to make a positive difference in others' lives. Research studies and conceptual papers (e.g., Hu & Liden, 2011; Liden et al., 2008; Searle & Barbuto, 2011; Walumbwa, Hartnell, & Oke, 2010) suggested a positive relationship between altruistic calling and the development of the four components of psychological capital (hope, self-efficacy, optimism, and resilience).

#### *Altruistic Calling and Hope*

Searle and Barbuto (2011) suggested that altruistic calling may be related to the development of the psychological capital component of hope. Hope in Luthans' (2002) model has been operationally defined as the degree to which an individual displays agency (willpower) and pathways (waypower) to achieve desired goals. Searle and Barbuto argued that servant leaders have a deep-rooted desire to meet the needs of others and help them acquire their desires and goals (Liden et al., 2008). Cerff and Winston (2006) explained, "Servant leaders possess the capacity to serve their followers in such a way that they would seek to enhance hope, particularly if this construct is lacking in their followers" (p. 4). Thus, it is proposed that the servant leader's perceived display of altruistic calling relates positively to followers' self-ratings of hope.

#### *Altruistic Calling and Self-Efficacy*

Walumbwa, Hartnell, and Oke (2010) and Hu and Liden (2011) suggested that servant leadership is positively related to the development of self-efficacy in individuals as well as groups within organizations. In Luthans' (2002) model, self-efficacy was drawn from Bandura (1985) and was operationally defined as the extent to which an individual has confidence that he or she possesses the ability to successfully complete a task or objective. As already established, servant leaders have a deep desire to help others fulfill their needs and deepest desires. P. T. P. Wong (2008) suggested that out of this desire, servant leaders motivate followers by affirming others through expressing the confidence they have in them. Bandura (1997) explained that confidence displayed by a respected other through persuasion can lead the follower to grow and attain a higher sense of self-efficacy or confidence. Thus, it is proposed that the servant leader's perceived display of altruistic calling relates positively to followers' self-ratings of self-efficacy.

#### *Altruistic Calling and Optimism*

As operationally defined by Luthans (2002), optimism refers to the extent to which an individual (a) expects things to work out as he or she desires and (b) treats undesirable events as temporary or permanent. If the deep desire of the servant leader (i.e., altruistic calling) leads him or her to develop self-efficacy and hope in followers, then one could imagine that it would not be much of a stretch to suggest that that same deep desire of the servant leader could help instill a deeper sense of optimism among followers. In speaking of teams, Hu and Liden (2011) wrote,

Servant leaders convey the importance of personal integrity, honesty, and fairness to the team which promotes authentic and problem-driven communication and creates a spiritual climate within the team. A spiritual climate leads team members to cooperate with and care for each other and to be optimistic about their team's capabilities to be effective. (p. 854)

Thus, it is proposed that the servant leader's display of altruistic calling relates positively to followers' self-ratings of optimism.

### *Altruistic Calling and Resilience*

Luthans (2002) defined resilience as an individual's ability to bounce back in the face of adversity, hardship, or unexpected and extreme success. Hu and Liden (2011) suggested that servant leaders display a deep desire to care for the well-being of the follower that "results in (among other things) enhanced team member confidence in their collective capabilities, even in the face of uncertainty and obstacles" (p. 854). If a servant leader's displayed desire to care for the well-being of followers motivates those followers to have confidence in the face of uncertainty and obstacles, then it is proposed that the servant leader's perceived display of altruistic calling relates positively to followers' self-rating of resilience.

### **Emotional Healing and Psychological Capital**

Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) operationally defined emotional healing as a commitment to and skill in facilitating the healing process from hardship or trauma. Like altruistic calling, research studies and conceptual papers (e.g., Hu & Liden, 2011; Liden et al., 2008; Searle & Barbuto, 2011; Walumbwa, Hartnell, & Oke, 2010) have suggested that the servant leader's commitment and skill to foster healing may have a positive relationship to the development of the four components of psychological capital (hope, self-efficacy, optimism, and resilience).

### *Emotional Healing and Hope, Self-Efficacy, and Optimism*

Searle and Barbuto (2011) also suggested that the servant leadership quality of emotional healing may be positively related to the psychological capital component of hope. As originally presented, Greenleaf (1970, 1977) hypothesized that servant leaders serve followers by listening, empathizing, and healing (see also Spears, 1995). Through factor analysis, Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) combined these constructs and labeled them emotional healing. Lee, Sudom, and McCreary (2011) found that the type of social support an individual receives (e.g., that offered by leaders as well as others) could lead to a higher sense of well-being and diminish the feelings of hopelessness. Luthans, Norman, Avolio, and Avey (2008) found that a supportive climate within an organization as exhibited by coworkers and supervisors can have a direct effect on the development of a follower-subordinate's levels of hope, self-efficacy, optimism, and resilience. Searle and Barbuto argued that the servant leader's deep care for the well-being of his or her followers leads them to penetrate emotional blocks, thereby helping followers overcome emotional barriers to accomplish their goals. Snyder (2000) alluded to the notion that hardship and distress could result in a lack of motivation, apathy, and despair. The servant leader, with his or her ability to empathize and listen, could enable followers to overcome such barriers (Liden et al., 2008). Furthermore, one counseling technique that came out of the positive psychology movement is called motivational interviewing. This technique, as used in clinical psychology as well as in the educational classroom, has shown to foster an individual's healing and give support to the development of hope, self-efficacy, and optimism. It is conceivable that the same results could occur in the workplace or church setting if practiced by supervisors or church leaders. Thus, it is proposed that the servant leader's perceived display of emotional healing relates positively to followers' self-ratings of hope, self-efficacy, and optimism.

### *Emotional Healing and Resilience*

Pipe and Bortz (2009) found that the reduction of emotional strain contributes to the overall resiliency and hardiness of an individual. Lee et al. (2011) found that the type of social support an individual received (e.g., empathy from a leader) was significantly and positively related to an individual's resilience factor. Luthans, Vogelgesang, and Lester (2006) argued that leaders help develop resilience in followers through devising organizational structures predisposed to the need for resilience and paying attention to the emotional states of those followers. Hu and Liden (2011) found that servant leadership enables team members to be persistent in the face of adversity. P. T. P. Wong (2008), Barbuto and Wheeler (2006), and Liden et al. (2008) characterized servant leaders as those who care about the well-being of their followers and provide emotional support through empathy. Luthans, Norman, Avolio, and Avey (2008) found that a supportive climate within an organization may lead to resilience because "those in a supportive climate will likely experience higher levels of resiliency as they would not be in fear of reprisal or punishment

due to their mistake” (p. 226). Thus, it is proposed that the servant leader’s perceived display of emotional healing relates positively to followers’ self-ratings of resilience.

### **Wisdom and Psychological Capital**

Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) operationally defined wisdom as a combination of awareness of surroundings and anticipation of consequences of potential actions. Research studies and conceptual papers (e.g., Liden et al., 2008; Searle & Barbuto, 2011; P. T. P. Wong, 2008) also have suggested that the trait of wisdom displayed by servant leaders may have a positive relationship with the development of the four components of psychological capital (hope, self-efficacy, optimism, and resilience).

#### *Wisdom and Hope*

Searle and Barbuto (2011) suggested that the servant leadership quality of wisdom may be positively related to the psychological component of hope. P. T. P. Wong (2008) argued that servant leaders are intelligent and knowledgeable and have foresight to see what will succeed in the long run. Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) labeled this servant leadership concept wisdom, an attribute that “facilitates the pathway thinking in individuals through environmental scanning and seeking to understand the possible consequences and implications of initiatives” (p. 112). Moreover, Searle and Barbuto explained that to develop hope in others, leaders have to have the capacity to look down the road of the future to identify potential roadblocks and help followers devise alternative routes. Thus, it is proposed that the servant leader’s perceived display of wisdom relates positively to followers’ self-ratings of hope.

#### *Wisdom and Self-efficacy*

Winston (2003) suggested that servant leadership-style behaviors have a positive impact on followers’ self-efficacy (Carthen, 2011). Wisdom as a construct in Barbuto and Wheeler’s (2006) servant leadership model refers to behaviors that result in “an awareness of surroundings and anticipation of consequences” (p. 318). P. T. P. Wong (2008) suggested that the servant leader’s awareness of surroundings included his or her ability to “understand people’s needs and feelings by talking to them on a personal level” (para. 66). Moreover, P. T. P. Wong (2008) argued that servant leaders see the potential in every person and want to bring out the best in them. Liden et al. (2008) highlighted “with knowledge of each follower’s unique characteristics and interests, leaders then assist followers in achieving their potential” (p. 162). If so, it could be argued that through wisdom, servant leaders can see the road before a follower and anticipate how the follower’s intended behaviors and actions impact their ability to develop and realize their potential. It stands to reason that guiding followers away from a path that will hinder them from realizing their potential to a path that is better suited for them will lead that follower to develop a higher sense of self-efficacy (Liden et al., 2008; Lord, Brown, & Freiberg, 1999). Thus, it is proposed that the servant leader’s perceived display of wisdom relates positively to followers’ self-ratings of self-efficacy.

#### *Wisdom and Optimism*

As in the case of altruistic calling, if a servant leader’s display of wisdom is positively related to followers’ self-efficacy and hope, it seems conceivable that a servant leader’s display of wisdom also will be positively related to followers’ development of optimism. As cited in Snyder (1994), Cerff and Winston noted that optimism, like hope, “can be influenced by situational factors” (p. 3). Such situational factors could include the influence of leaders and their respective leadership styles (e.g., servant leadership). Cerff and Winston observed further that leaders foster followers’ confidence and hope, resulting in heightened follower optimism. Wisdom can be placed at the beginning of the process of devising an environment that is conducive for goal fulfillment and a heightened sense of confidence which together may lead to a heightened sense of optimism. Wisdom can be placed at the beginning of the process in that it is by the awareness component of the wisdom construct that servant leaders remain abreast of the internal and external environment and devise strategies to minimize hindrances and maximize opportunities, thus fostering the sense of optimism about positive outcomes. Therefore, it is

proposed that a servant leader's perceived display of wisdom relates positively to followers' self-ratings of optimism.

#### *Wisdom and Resilience*

It can be argued that the servant leadership component of wisdom is also positively related to the positive development of resilience in followers. Fundamentally, the servant leader component of wisdom is about (a) understanding both the external and internal environment related to organizations and followers within organizations and (b) devising relevant strategies to alleviate or minimize the effects of negative influencers in order to maximize the opportunity for follower growth and follower need fulfillment (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006). Drawing from the work of Masten (2001) and Frederickson (2001), Luthans, Vogelgesang, and Lester (2006) intimated that leaders can help precipitate the growth of resilience in followers by paying attention to the environment and structuring the organizations around the need for resilience. More importantly, Luthans, Vogelgesang, and Lester suggested that by remaining aware of a follower's surroundings and emotional state, a leader can remind the follower to think positively and to find meaning in negative events which can assist in the development of resiliency. Thus, it is proposed that a servant leader's perceived display of wisdom relates positively to followers' self-ratings of resilience.

#### **Persuasive Mapping and Psychological Capital**

Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) operationally defined persuasive mapping as an ability of servant leaders to provide inspiration, convictions in vision, and motivation from followers. Although scant, preliminary research studies and conceptual papers (e.g., Searle & Barbuto, 2011; P. T. P. Wong, 2008) have suggested that this ability of servant leaders to provide inspiration, convictions in vision, and motivation from followers may have a positive relationship to the development of psychological capital (hope, self-efficacy, optimism, and resilience).

#### *Persuasive Mapping and Hope*

As in the case of the servant leadership components of altruistic calling, emotional healing, and wisdom, Searle and Barbuto (2011) suggested that the servant leadership component of persuasive mapping may be positively related to hope. Searle and Barbuto argued that servant leaders' persuasive mapping provides inspiration, convictions in vision, and motivation from followers through the articulation of clearly designed mental models. P. T. P. Wong (2008) argued that servant leaders' capacity for articulation and inspiration moves followers to meet goals. Developing followers' relative agency and pathways capacities are at the heart of the psychological capital construct. Thus, it is proposed that the servant leader's perceived display of persuasive mapping relates positively to followers' self-ratings of hope.

#### *Persuasive Mapping and Self-Efficacy*

The servant leadership construct of persuasive mapping also can be linked to the development of self-efficacy. P. T. P. Wong and Davey (2007) observed servant leaders (a) understand the needs and desires of their followers; (b) recognize the potential of their followers; (c) affirm followers by expressing confidence in them; and (d) empower them through an articulated, challenging vision that propels them to live for a higher purpose. Bandura (1997) suggested that such persuasive language by a respected other would lead to a heightened sense of confidence or self-efficacy by the follower. Thus, it is proposed that the servant leaders' perceived display of persuasive mapping relates positively to followers' self-ratings of self-efficacy.

#### *Persuasive Mapping and Optimism*

In establishing their framework for the persuasive mapping aspect of servant leadership, Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) employed language similar to that used by Bass (1985) to describe the inspirational motivation aspect of transformational leadership. Bass (1997) described the inspirational motivation

aspect of transformational leadership as the ability to “articulate an appealing vision of the future, challenge followers with high standards, talk optimistically with enthusiasm, and provide encouragement and meaning for what needs to be done” (p. 133). Boyett (2006) suggested that such inspirational motivation or persuasive mapping engenders optimism among followers. In another sense, P. T. P. Wong (2008) observed that servant leaders are optimistic themselves even in the bleak circumstances and inspire others to be optimistic. Thus, it is proposed that the servant leader’s perceived display of persuasive mapping relates positively to followers’ self-ratings of optimism.

#### *Persuasive Mapping and Resilience*

In essence, resilience refers to an individual’s capacity to persevere through and bounce back from the heat of difficult circumstances. In speaking of the optimistic nature of servant leadership, P. T. P. Wong (2008) argued that servant leaders know how to inspire followers to endure and overcome even through difficult circumstances. Although no research studies have been conducted to confirm the notion, P. T. P. Wong’s (2008) sentiment seems to propose that a servant leader’s perceived display of persuasive mapping relates positively to followers’ self-ratings of resilience.

#### **Organizational Stewardship and Psychological Capital**

Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) operationally defined organizational stewardship as the extent to which a servant leader prepares his or her organization to make a positive contribution to society and promotes a sense of community within the organization (see also Searle & Barbuto, 2011). To date, not one study has been reported that has examined the organizational stewardship aspect of servant leadership to the development of psychological capital or its four components. However, language in the literature seems to indirectly convey a positive relationship between the organizational stewardship component of servant leadership and the development of psychological capital and its four components in followers.

#### *Organizational Stewardship and Hope*

In the process of formulating his theory of hope, Snyder (as cited in Luthans, Avey, Avolio, & Peterson, 2010) began with the assumption that people are generally goal oriented; that is, they want to accomplish something. However, it seems reasonable to suggest that people want to accomplish more than something; rather, they want to accomplish something which they deem meaningful and/or worthwhile. Bailey et al. (2007) highlighted that hope is predicated on the value of a perceived outcome. Moreover, Scioli, Ricci, Nyugen, and Scioli (2011) highlighted that hope involves a commitment to action and a pursuit of transcendent goals. P. T. P. Wong (2008) argued that servant leaders create a meaningful work environment by involving followers in the excitement of doing something significant and purposeful. Wong (2008) also observed that servant leaders engage followers in team building and community building. Therefore, it is proposed that a servant leader’s perceived display of organizational stewardship relates positively to followers’ self-ratings of hope.

#### *Organizational Stewardship and Self-Efficacy*

Self-efficacy is an individual’s relative confidence level that he or she can accomplish a given task within a particular context. As a sign of internal confidence, self-efficacy acts as a source of intrinsic motivation. In terms of intrinsic motivation, self-efficacy has been linked with self-determination and feelings of purpose (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). Hernandez (2007) argued that leaders instill intrinsic motivation which leads to self-efficacy in followers by designing work and organizational processes that provide meaningfulness (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). Additionally, P. T. P. Wong (2008) suggested that servant leaders “generate intrinsic motivation by involving people in the excitement of doing something significant and purposeful” (p. 10). Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) showed that servant leaders prepare their organizations and individuals within those organizations to make a positive impact on society at large. Given these things, it is proposed that a servant leader’s perceived display of organizational stewardship relates positively to followers’ self-ratings of self-efficacy.

### *Organizational Stewardship and Optimism*

It was previously proposed that a servant leader's display of organizational stewardship was positively related to followers' hope. Bailey et al. (2007) found that optimism, although distinct from hope, was closely related to the construct of hope. The psychological capital component of optimism refers to the extent to which an individual makes positive attributions about the future. Therefore, it is proposed that a servant leader's perceived display of organizational stewardship relates positively to followers' self-ratings of optimism.

### *Organizational Stewardship and Resilience*

Luthans, Vogelgesang, and Lester (2006) as well as Fields and Winston (2012) highlighted that the ethical meltdowns of American corporations like Enron and Adelphia heightened the urgency of the call for more ethical forms of leadership that would guide organizations to be mindful of the common good of society at large as well as their profit margins. Luthans, Vogelgesang, and Lester suggested such meltdowns undermined workers' trust in leaders at work. One could imagine that such adverse effects also undermined workers' motivation to give their best on the job. Drawing on the first of Masten's (2001) three strategies for developing resilience, Luthans, Vogelgesang, and Lester argued that fostering resilience in employees is connected in part to a positive employer–employee psychological contract that further fosters trust and reciprocity. They suggested that an effective strategy for proactively developing resiliency in follower-subordinates is “to manage risks by creating an ethical and trustworthy culture” (p. 34). As previously described, Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) operationally defined organizational stewardship as the extent to which a servant leader prepares his or her organization to make a positive contribution to society and promotes a sense of community within the organization. It seems reasonable to infer that making a positive contribution to society and promoting a sense of community begin with the dedication to and practice of operating in an ethical manner.

Beyond leading an organization in an ethical manner, it seems reasonable to suggest that resilience can be heightened by the followers' perceived value of the cause or vision of the organization. Consider examples like (a) the injured athlete (e.g., Kirk Gibson in the 1988 MLB World Series) who mustered his or her best effort in the face of formidable odds to help his or her team win a championship or (b) the political dissident (e.g., Ghandi, American civil rights activist Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., South African Nelson Mandela; and Myanmar activist Aung San Suu Kyi) who endured scorn and imprisonment for the noble cause of liberty, equality, and justice for their fellow citizens. According to Barbuto and Wheeler (2006), organizational stewardship refers to a leader leading his or her organization to make a positive impact on society at large. In light of these arguments, it is proposed that the servant leader's perceived display of organizational stewardship relates positively to followers' self-ratings of resilience.

### **LMX and Servant Leadership**

Hu and Liden (2011) observed that the exchange process between leaders and their subordinate-followers is central to servant leadership theory (Liden et al., 2008). Barbuto and Hayden (2011) found strong positive relationships between followers' assessments of leaders' display of the five components of Barbuto and Wheeler's (2006) servant leadership and the quality of LMX. Pan (2010) found that LMX demonstrated a positive impact on subordinate psychological capital. Thus, this study investigated whether LMX (a) is correlated with servant leadership and psychological capital and (d) demonstrates a moderating effect on the relationship between the linear combination of the five servant leadership components and followers' sense of the four psychological capital components.

### **Research Hypotheses and Research Questions**

The theoretical framework proposed causal relationships between five posited characteristics of servant leadership and four components of psychological capital. Moreover, there was some suggestion that LMX may have a moderating effect on the relationship of servant leadership to psychological capital.

## Research Hypotheses

In light of these proposed relationships, the present study investigated the following research hypotheses and research questions:

- H<sub>1</sub><sup>a</sup>: American evangelical Christian followers' perceptions of church leaders' display of altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship are positively related to church followers' self-ratings of the psychological capital construct of hope.*
- H<sub>1</sub><sup>b</sup>: Cambodian evangelical church followers' perceptions of church leaders' display of altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship are positively related to church followers' self-ratings of the psychological capital construct of hope.*
- H<sub>2</sub><sup>a</sup>: American evangelical Christian followers' perceptions of church leaders' display of altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship are positively related to church followers' self-ratings of the psychological capital construct of self-efficacy.*
- H<sub>2</sub><sup>b</sup>: Cambodian evangelical Christian followers' perceptions of church leaders' display of altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship are positively related to church followers' self-ratings of the psychological capital construct of self-efficacy.*
- H<sub>3</sub><sup>a</sup>: American evangelical Christian followers' perceptions of church leaders' display of altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship are positively related to church followers' self-ratings of the psychological capital construct of optimism.*
- H<sub>3</sub><sup>b</sup>: Cambodian evangelical Christian followers' perceptions of church leaders' display of altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship are positively related to church followers' self-ratings of the psychological capital construct of optimism.*
- H<sub>4</sub><sup>a</sup>: American evangelical Christian followers' perceptions of church leaders' display of altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship are positively related to church followers' self-ratings of the psychological capital construct of resilience.*
- H<sub>4</sub><sup>b</sup>: Cambodian evangelical Christian followers' perceptions of church leaders' display of altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship are positively related to church followers' self-ratings of the psychological capital construct of resilience.*
- H<sub>5</sub><sup>a</sup>: American evangelical Christian local church followers' perceptions of the quality of church leader–follower exchanges have a moderating effect on the relationship between church followers' perceptions of the linear combination of church leaders' display of altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship and the same church followers' self-ratings of hope.*
- H<sub>5</sub><sup>b</sup>: Cambodian evangelical Christian local church followers' perceptions of the quality of church leader–follower exchanges have a moderating effect on the relationship between church followers' perceptions of the linear combination of church leaders' display of altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship and the same church followers' self-ratings of hope.*
- H<sub>6</sub><sup>a</sup>: American evangelical Christian local church followers' perceptions of the quality of church leader–follower exchanges have a moderating effect on the relationship between church followers' perceptions of the linear combination of church leaders' display of altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship and the same church followers' self-ratings of self-efficacy.*

- H<sub>6</sub><sup>b</sup>: Cambodian evangelical Christian local church followers' perceptions of the quality of church leader–follower exchanges have a moderating effect on the relationship between church followers' perceptions of the linear combination of church leaders' display of altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship and the same church followers' self-ratings of self-efficacy.*
- H<sub>7</sub><sup>a</sup>: American evangelical Christian local church followers' perceptions of the quality of church leader–follower exchanges have a moderating effect on the relationship between church followers' perceptions of the linear combination of church leaders' display of altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship and the same church followers' self-ratings of optimism.*
- H<sub>7</sub><sup>b</sup>: Cambodian evangelical Christian local church followers' perceptions of the quality of church leader–follower exchanges have a moderating effect on the relationship between church followers' perceptions of the linear combination of church leaders' display of altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship and the same church followers' self-ratings of optimism.*
- H<sub>8</sub><sup>a</sup>: American evangelical Christian local church followers' perceptions of the quality of church leader–follower exchanges have a moderating effect on the relationship between church followers' perceptions of the linear combination of church leaders' display of altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship and the same church followers' self-ratings of resilience.*
- H<sub>8</sub><sup>b</sup>: Cambodian evangelical Christian local church followers' perceptions of the quality of church leader–follower exchanges have a moderating effect on the relationship between church followers' perceptions of the linear combination of church leaders' display of altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship and the same church followers' self-ratings of resilience.*

#### *Research Questions*

- RQ<sub>1</sub>: Does the culture of evangelical Christian followers in the United States and Cambodia impact the perception of the display of altruistic calling by their church leaders?*
- RQ<sub>2</sub>: Does the culture of evangelical Christian followers in the United States and Cambodia impact the perception of the display of emotional healing by their church leaders?*
- RQ<sub>3</sub>: Does the culture of evangelical Christian followers in the United States and Cambodia impact the perception of the display of wisdom by their church leaders?*
- RQ<sub>4</sub>: Does the culture of evangelical Christian followers in the United States and Cambodia impact the perception of the display of persuasive mapping by their church leaders?*
- RQ<sub>5</sub>: Does the culture of evangelical Christian followers in the United States and Cambodia impact the perception of the display of organizational stewardship by their church leaders?*
- RQ<sub>6</sub>: Does the culture of evangelical Christian followers in the United States and Cambodia impact followers' self-perception of the psychological capital construct of hope?*
- RQ<sub>7</sub>: Does the culture of evangelical Christian followers in the United States and Cambodia impact followers' self-perception of the psychological capital construct of self-efficacy?*
- RQ<sub>8</sub>: Does the culture of evangelical Christian followers in the United States and Cambodia impact followers' self-perception of the psychological capital construct of optimism?*
- RQ<sub>9</sub>: Does the culture of evangelical Christian followers in the United States and Cambodia impact followers' self-perception of the psychological capital construct of resiliency?*

## **METHOD**

The overall research methodology employed for this study was a scientific, empirical, quantitative, non-experimental, cross-sectional survey design. It employed a nonrandom, convenience sampling design

to survey church followers from congregations in the United States and Cambodia. Researchers normally use one of two processes (e.g., random or convenience) when sampling a population for a respective research project. Nonrandom convenience samples are employed when the total relevant population is not known or it is logistically impossible to gain access to each relevant subgroup of a population due to time, geographical, and expense constraints (Creswell, 2009).

In this cultural comparative study of Christian leader–follower relationships within the United States and Cambodia. These countries were selected because (a) there has been a growing interest by Christian organizations from the United States to establish a Christian faith community in Cambodia since 1991 and (b) servant leadership, in at least some cases, has been encouraged as an ideal leadership style for Christian organizations in both the United States and Cambodia. Still, there are an estimated 300,000 churches spread among 50 states in the United States and 1,200 churches located in 24 provinces or populace centers in Cambodia, restricting the opportunity to gain a true random sample. Thus, pertinent data were gathered from volunteers who made themselves available to this research study. Participants in the United States were solicited through direct solicitation of a network of churches in California and indirect solicitation through social media and other Internet-based networks. Participants in Cambodia were identified through personal contact with church organizational leaders by way of social media and email or face-to-face contact. I traveled to Cambodia and made appointments with organizational leaders who helped me make appointments for the administration of the questionnaires.

West (2010) suggested a sample size should be determined in conjunction with the type of analytical “method the researcher proposes to employ” (p. 83). For this research study employing multiple regression analysis, Hair, Anderson, et al. argued for a minimum of 5 participants per independent variable but suggested that 15 to 20 samples per independent variable would yield a stronger result for a multivariate analysis. This present study included 10 variables for hierarchical multiple regression (HMR) analysis (five control and five predictor variables) and 16 independent variables (five control variables, five predictor variables, one moderating variable, and five product terms) for the MHMR. In total, (a) 235 surveys were collected from Cambodia, a ratio of 23.5:1 for the HMR and 14.7:1 for the MHMR, and (b) 164 surveys from the United States, a ratio of 16.4:1 for the HMR analyses and 10.3:1 for MHMR.

### **Instrumentation**

The measurement instruments employed in this research study were (a) the 23-item SLQ developed by Barbuto and Wheeler (2006), (b) the 24-item PCQ developed by Luthans, Avolio, Avey, and Norman (2007), and (c) the LMX-7 instrument designed by Graen et al. (1982).

#### *Barbuto and Wheeler’s (2006) SLQ*

Barbuto and Wheeler’s (2006) SLQ was devised to predict the extent to which leaders display servant leadership qualities as conceptualized by Greenleaf (1970, 1977; Spears, 1995). More specifically, the SLQ measures a set of five component variables (altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship) distilled through factor analysis of 11 characteristics as alluded to by Greenleaf (1970, 1977) and gleaned and delineated by Greenleaf’s mentoree and protégé Spears (1995, 2002). The resultant SLQ yielded 23 distinct items representing five factors with the following Cronbach alphas: (a) altruistic calling,  $\alpha = .82$ ; (b) emotional healing,  $\alpha = .91$ ; (c) wisdom,  $\alpha = .92$ ; (d) persuasive mapping,  $\alpha = .87$ ; and (e) organizational stewardship,  $\alpha = .89$ . The structure of the subscales was validated through confirmatory factor analysis indicating a good fit between the measurement model and the data. Convergent, divergent, and predictive validity of the subscales were also validated with servant leadership as well as the subscales found distinct from transformational leadership and LMX. However, it should be noted that Barbuto and Wheeler’s (2006) servant leadership construct did seem to share some properties with transformational leadership, and a subsequent study conducted by Dannhauser and Boshoff (2007) among Afrikaans in South Africa validated the model as a unidimensional construct representing servant leadership but failed to confirm the five factor structure.

### *Luthans, Avolio, Avey, and Normans' (2007) PCQ*

Luthans, Avolio, Avey, and Normans (2007) developed the PCQ for measurement of psychological capital in individuals within organizations and at the workplace (Avey, Luthans, et al., 2010). The PCQ consists of four subscales, each comprised of six items for a total of 24 items. The subscales were taken from (a) the six-item State Hope Scale developed by Snyder, Sympson, et al. (1996), (b) the eight-item Life Orientation Test developed by Scheier and Carver (1985) to measure optimism and pessimism, (c) the Role Breadth Self-Efficacy scale developed by Parker (1998), and (d) the 25-item Resilience Scale developed by Wagnild and Young (1993). According to their investigation, Luthans, Avolio, Avey, and Norman (2007) found “each of the four scales had considerable psychometric support across multiple samples in prior research and had been verified in workplace studies by themselves or in combination” (p. 554).

In constructing the PCQ scale, Luthans, Avolio, Avey, and Norman (2007) used two major criteria: (a) each of the four constructs (hope, self-efficacy, optimism, and resilience) would have equal weight, thus calling for the selection of the best six items from each scale, and (b) “the selected items should have face and content validity with being state-like and relevant to the workplace or adaptable to wording changes to make them relevant” (p. 554). In terms of reliability, the Cronbach alphas for each of the four six-item measures and the overall PsyCap measure were as follows: hope (.72, .75, .80, .76); self-efficacy (.75, .84, .85, .75); optimism (.74, .69, .76, .79); resilience (.71, .71, .66, .72); and overall PsyCap (.88, .89, .89, .89). Luthans, Avolio, Avey, and Norman admitted that the alphas for (a) the optimism scale in the second study (.69) and (b) the resilience scale in the third study (.66) did not reach generally accepted levels of internal consistency. However, they noted further, “the reliability of the overall PsyCap measure in all four samples was consistently above conventional standards” (p. 555). In terms of validity, Luthans, Avolio, Avey, and Norman (2007) employed procedures suggested by Schwab (1980) and Pedhazzer and Schmelkin (1991) to determine the requisite conditions for the PCQ. As outlined in Luthans, Avolio, et al.'s presentation of the PCQ, those suggested procedures included the establishment of (a) content validity wherein each aspect of the measure was equally weighted in the overall PsyCap instrument, (b) sufficient scale reliability, (c) a unitary factor structure consistent with the proposed latent variables, (d) convergent validity with other theoretically similar constructs, (e) discriminant validity with those constructs with which it is supposed to differ, (f) empirical validity with appropriate outcome constructs (i.e., significantly related to performance and job satisfaction), and (g) the ability to predict variance in these outcomes (i.e., performance and satisfaction) beyond other similar constructs.

### *Graen et al.'s (1982) LMX-7*

The LMX-7 was specifically designed to measure the LMX construct and has been the most widely recognized and employed measurement of the construct. According to Gerstner and Day (1997) and Northouse (2010), the LMX-7 measurement instrument is the most commonly used scale for measuring organizational LMX. The LMX-7 is a seven-item questionnaire designed by Graen et al. (1982) to assess three dimensions of the LMX including the degree to which leaders and followers (a) have mutual respect for each other's capabilities, (b) feel a deepening sense of mutual trust, and (c) have a sense of strong obligation to one another (Northouse, 2010). According to Northouse, “taken together, these dimensions determine the extent to which followers was part of the leader's in-group or out-group” (p. 164). The present study employs the LMX-7 instrument in order to examine what if any moderating effect LMX might have on the proposed relationship between servant leadership and psychological capital.

### *Translation of the Instruments*

The instruments employed for this study were developed in English. As Kliuchnikov (2011) found, instruments developed in one cultural context may lack validity in another (see also Gardberg, 2006). Thus, the researcher must make sure instruments have conceptual and functional equivalence in the culture where research is conducted (Gardberg, 2006; Kliuchnikov, 2011). One method to insure a close proximity of conceptual and functional equivalence is referred to as backtranslation (Brislin, 1970). Kliuchnikov described the process of backtranslation as a method by which two bilingual translators or

teams work on translation with (a) the first team translating the instrument from the original source to the target language followed by (b) the second team blindly translating the translated copy back to the original language (Brislin, 1970). Afterwards, the two copies are compared and corrections made as necessary. For the present study, the three measurement instruments were combined into one and backtranslated independently by two professional Khmer–English translation services.

## RESULTS

This study drew a total of 457 participants from local evangelical Christian churches including 175 from local evangelical Christians in the United States and 288 from Cambodia. The 457 participants were drawn from a convenience sample made available through personal contact with senior leaders of local churches in both the United States and Cambodia or through social media in the United States only (e.g., Facebook, Linked In, and Pastors.com). In the United States, 190 hard copies were distributed with 79 returned; the remaining 93 collected responses were generated online through Survey Monkey. In Cambodia, 352 hard copies of the survey instrument were printed and distributed to potential respondents with 288 returned. Of the returned surveys, 11 of the 175 from the United States and 53 of 288 from Cambodia came back with significant missing data or were filled out by those outside the design of the study (i.e., subjects were under the age of 21 or were lead pastors of their respective churches). Table 1 and 2 highlight participant demographics for the 399 respondents from the United States and Cambodia.

**TABLE 1**  
**DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF AMERICAN SUBJECTS (N = 166)**

Demographics	<i>N</i>	%
Gender		
Male	70	43.21
Female	92	56.79
Age		
21-30	23	14.20
31-40	20	12.35
41-50	38	23.46
51-60	51	31.48
61-70	23	14.20
71-80	2	1.23
Did not report	5	3.09
Denomination		
Evangelical Friends Church Southwest	44	27.16
Southern Baptist	62	38.27
Pentecostal	24	14.81
Wesleyan	10	6.17
Presbyterian	1	.62
United Methodists	4	2.47
Lutheran - Wisconsin Evangelical Synod	6	3.70
Independent	5	3.09
Nazarene	1	.62
Evangelical Free	1	.62
Chose not to report	4	2.47

Demographics	<i>N</i>	%
Followers' church tenure		
1-6 years	88	54.32
7-12 years	30	18.52
13-18 years	20	12.35
19-24 years	9	5.56
25-30 years	5	3.09
31+ years	5	3.09
Chose not to report	5	3.09
Years known lead pastor		
Average	158	9.36
1-6 years	90	55.56
7-12 years	29	17.90
13-18 years	15	9.26
19-24 years	11	6.79
25-30 years	8	4.94
31+ years	5	3.09
Chose not to report	4	2.47
Resident state		
California	114	70.37
Indiana	10	6.17
Texas	22	13.58
Pennsylvania	2	1.23
Virginia	2	1.23
Arizona	1	.62
Arkansas	1	.62
Illinois	1	.62
Kansas	1	.62
Maryland	1	.62
Michigan	1	.62
Mississippi	1	.62
Montana	1	.62
Tennessee	1	.62
West Virginia	1	.62
Wisconsin	1	.62
Did not report	1	.62

**TABLE 2**  
**DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF CAMBODIAN SUBJECTS (N = 235)**

Demographics	N	%
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	139	59.15
Female	93	39.57
Did not Report	3	1.28
<b>Age</b>		
21-30	154	65.53
31-40	25	10.64
41-50	18	7.66
51-60	22	9.36
61-70	11	4.68
71-80	1	.42
Did not report	4	1.70
<b>Denomination</b>		
Assemblies of God	59	25.11
Khmer Evangelical Church (CMA)	58	24.68
New Life Fellowship	40	17.02
Cambodian Friends Church (Quaker)	22	9.36
Independent	22	9.36
United Methodists	15	6.38
Free Methodists	8	3.40
Anglican	2	.85
Presbyterian	1	.42
Chose not to report	8	3.40
<b>Followers' church tenure</b>		
1-6 years	107	45.53
7-12 years	79	33.62
13-18 years	26	11.06
19-24 years	21	8.94
25-30 years	1	.42
Chose not to report	1	.42
<b>Years known lead pastor</b>		
1-6 years	109	46.38
7-12 years	76	32.34
13-18 years	25	10.64
19-24 years	15	6.38
25-30 years	3	1.28
31+ years	1	.42
Chose not to report	6	2.55
<b>Resident provinces</b>		
Phnom Penh	46	19.57
Battambang	31	13.19
Kandal	27	11.49
Sihanoukville	21	8.94
Takeo	20	8.51
Kompong Speu	19	8.09

Demographics	<i>N</i>	%
Banteay Meanchey	11	4.68
Kompong Cham	10	4.26
Mondulkiri	10	4.26
Kampot	8	3.40
Kompong Thom	6	2.55
Prey Veng	6	2.55
Pursat	6	2.55
Kompong Chhnang	4	1.70
Siem Reap	3	1.28
Kratie	2	.85
Oddar Meanchey	2	.85
Svay Rieng	2	.85
Rattanakiri	1	.42

Tables 3 and 4 include the descriptive statistics generated from the two data sets.

**TABLE 3**  
**DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF COMPONENT VARIABLES – UNITED STATES**

Variables	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	$\alpha$
Altruistic calling	163	3.87	.81	.88
Emotional healing	163	3.74	.86	.89
Wisdom	164	4.07	.73	.93
Persuasive mapping	162	3.81	.81	.89
Organizational stewardship	164	4.46	.62	.76
Confidence	163	4.75	.69	.85
Hope	163	4.58	.79	.82
Resilience	164	4.82	.73	.71
Optimism	163	4.51	.78	.81
LMX	160	3.53	.83	.90
Age	159	47.82	13.48	
Church tenure	159	9.10	9.06	
Tenure w/ lead pastor	160	9.26	8.86	

*Note.* Psychological capital variables were measured with the use of six-point scales. Servant leadership and LMX were measured with five-point scales. Church tenure refers to how many years a respondent attended their current church. Tenure with lead pastor refers to how many years a respondent knew the church leader.

**TABLE 4**  
**DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF COMPONENT VARIABLES – CAMBODIA**

Variables	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	$\alpha$
Altruistic calling	225	3.39	1.31	.83
Emotional healing	232	3.46	.95	.85
Wisdom	232	3.57	.91	.74
Persuasive mapping	224	3.52	.91	.80
Organizational stewardship	231	4.06	.79	.77
Confidence	233	4.75	.71	.75
Hope	235	4.70	.64	.72
Resilience	234	4.14	.78	.65
Optimism	231	4.22	.76	.52
LMX	235	3.24	.66	.82
Age	231	31.91	13.44	
Church tenure	234	8.24	5.64	
Tenure w/ lead pastor	229	8.39	6.61	

*Note.* Psychological capital variables were measured with the use of six-point scales. Servant leadership and LMX were measured with five-point scales. Church tenure refers to how many years a respondent attended their current church. Tenure with lead pastor refers to how many years a respondent knew the church leader.

#### **Correlations within the United States Only and Cambodia Only Sets**

This study employed multiple regression analysis to measure the relationship of the five components of Barbuto and Wheeler's (2006) servant leadership to each of four components of Luthan et al.'s (2007) psychological capital model. Pallant (2010) pointed out that multiple regression is based on correlation and includes checking for the relative strength and direction of correlations between independent and dependent variables included in a study.

Tables 5 and 6 present correlations of the predictor, moderator, outcome, and three control variables pertinent to this present study as they relate to the samples taken from the United States only and Cambodia only samples.

**TABLE 5**  
**MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND CORRELATIONS**  
**AMONG COVARIATES, PREDICTOR, AND OUTCOME VARIABLES**  
**UNITED STATES (N = 164)**

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1 Altruistic calling	3.87	0.81												
2 Emotional healing	3.74	0.86	.75**											
3 Wisdom	4.07	0.73	.70**	.68**										
4 Persuasive mapping	3.81	0.81	.63**	.69**	.62**									
5 Org. stewardship	4.46	0.62	.54**	.56**	.59**	.54**								
6 Confidence	4.75	0.69	0.14	0.15	0.14	0.1	0.14							
7 Hope	4.58	0.79	0.13	0.11	0.1	-0.01	0.1	.60**						
8 Resilience	4.82	0.73	0.03	0.01	0.07	-0.09	0.03	.40**	.56**					
9 Optimism	4.51	0.78	0.09	0.07	0.13	0.02	0.09	.36**	.54**	.50**				
10 LMX	3.53	0.83	.62**	.67**	.54**	.56**	.53**	.39**	.27**	0.1	.22**			
11 Age	47.8	13.5	0.11	0.12	.16*	0.04	0.04	0.06	0.09	0.08	.25**	0.1		
12 Church tenure	9.1	9.06	0.01	0.05	-0.06	-0.05	-0.06	0.09	-0.01	0.01	0.03	0.1	.19*	
13 Tenure w/ pastor	9.26	8.86	0.03	0.13	0.06	0.04	0.09	0.18	0.1	0.09	0.1	.23**	.18*	.72**

**TABLE 6**  
**MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND CORRELATIONS**  
**AMONG COVARIATES, PREDICTOR, AND OUTCOME VARIABLES – CAMBODIA (N = 235)**

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1 Altruistic calling	3.39	1.31												
2 Emotional healing	3.46	0.95	.67**											
3 Wisdom	3.57	0.91	.48**	.47**										
4 Persuasive mapping	3.52	0.91	.51**	.52**	.47**									
5 Org. stewardship	4.06	0.79	.53**	.57**	.49**	.48**								
6 Confidence	4.75	0.71	.20**	.19**	.16*	.26**	0.11							
7 Hope	4.7	0.64	.36**	.29**	.29**	.31**	.30**	.40**						
8 Resilience	4.14	0.78	0.12	.14*	.25**	.22**	.16*	.43**	.44**					
9 Optimism	4.22	0.76	.19**	.24**	.24**	.29**	.24**	.27**	.47**	.53**				
10 LMX	3.23	0.68	.64**	.58**	.48**	.42**	.51**	.27**	.37**	.30**	.25**			
11 Age	31.9	13.4	0.09	.19**	0.14	0.09	-0.04	.22**	0.09	.19**	0.11	0.08		
12 Church tenure	8.24	5.64	0.11	0.07	0.16	0.04	-0.03	0.14	0.04	0.08	0.06	0.09	.47**	
13 Tenure w/ pastor	8.39	6.61	0.08	0.08	0.09	0.03	-0.05	0.08	0	0	-0.01	0.04	.40**	.77**

Hierarchical regression analysis were run to test research hypotheses for each of the two samples.

*United States Hypotheses*

The results of the hierarchical regression analyses of the U.S. data set are shown in Table 7.

**TABLE 7**  
**REGRESSION RESULTS WITH CONTROL VARIABLES – UNITED STATES**

	Hope		Confidence		Optimism		Resilience	
	$\beta$	<i>t</i>	$\beta$	<i>t</i>	$\beta$	<i>t</i>	$\beta$	<i>t</i>
Age	.08	.95	.03	.10	.24	2.88**	.07	.76
Gender	-.13	-1.53	-.21	-3.06**	-.02	-.23	.00	.02
Denomination	-.11	-1.27	.00	.36	-.09	-1.11	-.07	-.68
Church tenure	-.21	-1.79	-.07	-.25	-.13	-1.08	-.12	-1.04
Years know leader	.23	1.97	.19	1.59	.15	1.26	.16	1.36
Altruistic calling	.25	1.78	.14	.97	.11	.78	.10	.67
Emotional healing	.05	.33	.02	.14	-.07	-.46	-.09	-.59
Wisdom	.00	.01	.02	.13	.08	.65	.14	1.18
Persuasive map	-.27	-2.29*	-.09	-.78	-.12	-.97	-.22	-1.77
Org. Stewardship	.05	.44	.13	1.21	.05	.49	.04	.40
<i>R</i>	.32		.34		.31		.24	
<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	10.30		11.80		9.5		5.6	
<i>F</i>	1.74		1.26		.46		1.01	

\**p* < .05. \*\**p* < .01.

Hypothesis 1<sup>a</sup> predicted a positive relationship between American evangelical church followers' perceptions of church leaders' display of altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship and the same church followers' self-ratings of the psychological capital hope. Neither the first model including the control variables only without the servant leadership components ( $R^2 = .05$ ,  $F[5, 148] = 1.52$ ,  $p > .05$ ) nor the second model of predictors including the five servant leadership components combined with the control variables ( $R^2 = .10$ ,  $F[5, 143] = 1.74$ ,  $p > .05$ ) accounted for a significant portion of the psychological capital hope variance. Therefore, since the linear combination of the five servant leadership components was not found significantly positively related to the psychological capital component of hope within the United States data set, Hypothesis 1<sup>a</sup> was not supported.

Hypothesis 2<sup>a</sup> predicted a positive relationship between American evangelical church followers' perceptions of church leaders' display of altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship and the same church followers' self-ratings of psychological capital component self-efficacy/confidence. In this case, the first model including the control variables only without the servant leadership components accounted for a significant amount of the psychological capital confidence variability ( $R^2 = .08$ ,  $F[5, 148] = 2.53$ ,  $p < .05$ ). However, the second model of predictors including the five servant leadership components combined with the control variables did not account for a significant portion of the psychological capital component self-efficacy variance ( $R^2 = .11$ ,  $F[5, 143] = 1.27$ ,  $p > .05$ ). This study is concerned with the results of the second model. Therefore, since the linear combination of the five servant leadership components was not found significantly positively related to the psychological capital component of confidence within the United States data set, Hypothesis 2<sup>a</sup> was not supported.

Hypothesis 3<sup>a</sup> predicted a positive relationship between American evangelical church followers' perceptions of church leaders' display of altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship and the same church followers' self-ratings of the psychological capital component optimism. As in the case of servant leadership to self-efficacy, the first model including the control variables only without the servant leadership components accounted for a significant

amount of the psychological capital component optimism variability ( $R^2 = .08$ ,  $F[5, 148] = 2.59$ ,  $p < .05$ ). However, the second model of predictors including the five servant leadership components combined with the control variables did not account for a significant portion of the psychological capital component optimism variance ( $R^2 = .10$ ,  $F[5, 143] = .46$ ,  $p > .05$ ). Again, this study is concerned with the results of the second model. Therefore, since the linear combination of the five servant leadership components was not found significantly positively related to the psychological capital component of optimism within the United States data set, Hypothesis 3<sup>a</sup> was not supported.

Hypothesis 4<sup>a</sup> predicted a positive relationship between American evangelical church followers' perceptions of church leaders' display of altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship and the same church followers' self-ratings of the psychological capital component resilience. As in the case with the psychological capital component hope, neither the first model including the control variables only without the servant leadership components ( $R^2 = .02$ ,  $F[5, 148] = .68$ ,  $p > .05$ ) nor the second model of predictors including the five servant leadership components combined with the control variables accounted for a significant portion of the psychological capital component resilience variance ( $R^2 = .06$ ,  $F[5, 143] = 1.01$ ,  $p > .05$ ). Therefore, since the linear combination of the five servant leadership components was not found significantly positively related to the psychological capital component of resilience within the United States data set, Hypothesis 4<sup>a</sup> was not supported.

#### *Cambodia Hypotheses*

The results of the HMR analyses of the Cambodia data set are shown in Table 8.

**TABLE 8**  
**REGRESSION RESULTS WITH CONTROL VARIABLES – CAMBODIA**

	Hope		Confidence		Optimism		Resilience	
	$\beta$	$t$	$\beta$	$t$	$\beta$	$t$	$\beta$	$t$
Age	.11	1.41	.20	2.71*	.06	.71	.16	1.97
Gender	-.13	-2.03	-.20	-2.78*	-.04	-.52	-.09	-1.26
Denomination	.03	.47	-.10	-1.22	-.11	-1.53	-.15	-2.13
Church tenure	.04	.37	.11	-1.17	.09	.80	.07	.61
Years know leader	-.10	-.96	-.12	-1.26	-.13	-1.20	-.15	-1.41
Altruistic calling	.21	2.33*	.06	.61	-.06	-.59	-.08	-.81
Emotional healing	-.04	-.37	-.05	-.54	.05	.53	-.07	-.67
Wisdom	.09	1.14	.03	.40	.08	1.00	.17	2.05*
Persuasive map	.12	1.47	.23	2.84*	.19	2.33*	.17	2.03*
Org. Stewardship	.12	1.41	.01	.10	.11	1.21	.09	.96
Adj. $R^2$	15.20		12.20		8.10		9.50	
$F$	8.30**		3.28**		4.74**		3.67**	

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ .

Hypothesis 1<sup>b</sup> predicted a positive relationship between Cambodian evangelical church followers' perceptions of church leaders' display of altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship and the same church followers' self-ratings of the psychological capital component hope. The first model including the control variables only without the servant leadership components did not account for a significant amount of the psychological capital component

hope variability ( $R^2 = .03$ ,  $F[5, 210] = 1.07$ ,  $p > .05$ ). The second model of predictors including the five servant leadership components combined with the control variables accounted for a significant portion of the psychological capital component hope variance ( $R^2 = .19$ ,  $F[4, 206] = 8.25$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and was positively related to followers' self-ratings of the psychological capital component hope. Therefore, since the linear combination of the five servant leadership components was found significantly positively related to the psychological capital component hope within the Cambodia data set, Hypothesis 1<sup>b</sup> was supported. However, it should be noted that the best predictive model using the significant findings excluded the servant leadership component of emotional healing as it added negatively to the regression equation. Moreover, Table 13 shows that only one of the five servant leadership components (i.e., altruistic calling,  $\beta = 2.33$ ,  $p < .05$ ) added significantly to the model.

Hypothesis 2<sup>b</sup> predicted a positive relationship between Cambodian evangelical church followers' perceptions of church leaders' display of altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship and the same church followers' self-ratings of the psychological capital component confidence. In this case, the first model including the control variables only without the servant leadership components accounted for a significant amount of the psychological capital component confidence variability ( $R^2 = .10$ ,  $F[5, 210] = 4.41$ ,  $p < .01$ ). The second model of predictors including the five servant leadership components combined with the control variables accounted for a significant portion of the psychological capital component confidence variance ( $R^2 = .16$ ,  $F[4, 206] = 3.24$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and was positively related to followers' self-ratings of confidence. Therefore, since the linear combination of the five servant leadership components significantly positively related to the psychological capital component confidence within the Cambodia data set, Hypothesis 2<sup>b</sup> was supported. However, it should be noted that (a) the best predictive model of servant leadership to confidence excluded emotional healing as it added negatively to the regression equation, (b) only one of the five servant leadership components (i.e., persuasive mapping,  $\beta = 2.84$ ,  $p < .05$ ) added significantly to the model, and (c) the control variables of age and gender each accounted for a significant amount of the variance in the servant leadership to confidence relationship both with opposite effects (i.e., age added positively and gender negatively to the regression equation).

Hypothesis 3<sup>b</sup> predicted a positive relationship between Cambodian evangelical church followers' perceptions of church leaders' display of altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship and the same church followers' self-ratings of the psychological capital component optimism. As with hope, the first model including the control variables only without the servant leadership components did not account for a significant amount of the psychological capital component optimism variability ( $R^2 = .03$ ,  $F[5, 210] = 1.22$ ,  $p > .05$ ). However, the second model of predictors including the five servant leadership components combined with the control variables (a) accounted for a significant portion of the psychological capital component optimism variance ( $R^2 = .13$ ,  $F[5, 205] = 4.69$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and (b) was positively related to followers' self-ratings of optimism. Therefore, since within the Cambodia data set, the linear combination of the five servant leadership components significantly positively related to the psychological capital component optimism, Hypothesis 3<sup>b</sup> was supported. However, it should be noted that (a) the best predictive model of servant leadership to the psychological capital component confidence would exclude the servant leadership component altruistic calling as it added negatively to the regression equation and (b) only one of the five servant leadership components (i.e., persuasive mapping,  $\beta = 2.33$ ,  $p < .05$ ) added significantly to the model. Furthermore, the results as related to the predictive ability of servant leadership to the psychological capital component optimism should be taken with caution for, as noted earlier, the Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient for optimism among the Cambodia sample ( $\alpha = .52$ ) figured well below generally accepted significance levels of  $> .70$ .

Hypothesis 4<sup>b</sup> predicted a positive relationship between Cambodian evangelical church followers' perceptions of church leaders' display of altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship and the same church followers' self-ratings of the psychological capital component resilience. Like the psychological capital component confidence, the first model including the control variables only without the servant leadership components accounted for a significant

amount of the psychological capital component resilience variability ( $R^2 = .06$ ,  $F[5, 210] = 2.84$ ,  $p > .05$ ). The second model of predictors including the five servant leadership components combined with the control variables (a) accounted for a significant portion of the psychological capital component resilience variance ( $R^2 = .14$ ,  $F[5, 205] = 3.46$ ,  $p > .01$ ) and (b) positively related to followers' self-ratings of resilience. Therefore, since the linear combination of the five servant leadership components positively related to the psychological capital component hope within the Cambodia data set, Hypothesis 4<sup>b</sup> was supported. However, it should be noted that in this case, (a) the best predictive model of servant leadership to the psychological capital component resilience would exclude the servant leadership components of altruistic calling and emotional healing as each one added negatively to the regression equation, (b) only two of the five servant leadership components (i.e., persuasive mapping,  $\beta = 2.03$ ,  $p < .05$ , and wisdom,  $\beta = 2.05$ ,  $p < .05$ ) added significantly to the model, and (c) the control variables of age and denomination each accounted for a significant amount of the variance in the servant leadership to resilience relationship with age adding positively and denomination adding negatively to the regression equation.

### **LMX as Moderator**

The second set of research hypotheses ( $H_5^a$ ,  $H_5^b$ ,  $H_6^a$ ,  $H_6^b$ ,  $H_7^a$ ,  $H_7^b$ ,  $H_8^a$ , and  $H_8^b$ ) predicted that the quality of LMX would demonstrate a moderating effect on the positive relationship between followers' perceptions of servant leadership displayed by their leaders and the same followers' self-rating of the four psychological capital components. This proposed moderating effect of quality of LMX was measured employing SPSS 18.0 to run MMR analyses. In order to measure the interaction between the predictor variables and the moderator, predictor and moderating variable data were centered. This technique of centering was performed in order to (a) divide out the unique portion of the variance latent in the interaction between the predictor and moderating variable(s) and (b) minimize the possibility of multicollinearity between the same predictor variables and the interaction variables. The results generated from those two sets of analyses are presented in this section and shown in Tables 8 and 9.

#### *LMX's Effect in the US Sample*

From the United States sample, the interaction effects of the LMX moderating variable upon the relationships between the five combined components of servant leadership and the four individual, Hypothesis 5<sup>a</sup> predicted that followers' perceptions of the quality of LMX have a moderating effect on the positive relationship between United States evangelical Christian local church followers' perceptions of their church leaders' display of servant leadership and the same church followers' self-ratings of hope. Hypothesis 6<sup>a</sup> predicted that followers' perceptions of the quality of LMX have a moderating effect on the positive relationship between American evangelical Christian local church followers' perceptions of their church leaders' display of servant leadership and the same church followers' self-ratings of confidence. Hypothesis 7<sup>a</sup> predicted that followers' perceptions of the quality of LMX have a moderating effect on the positive relationship between American evangelical Christian local church followers' perceptions of their church leaders' display of servant leadership and the same church followers' self-ratings of optimism. Additionally, Hypothesis 8<sup>a</sup> predicted that followers' perceptions of the quality of LMX have a moderating effect on the positive relationship between American evangelical Christian local church followers' perceptions of their church leaders' display of servant leadership and the same church followers' self-ratings of resilience.

The results of the analysis showed that within the United States sample, the moderating variable of LMX added positively to the model in relationship to each of the four individual psychological capital components. Yet, a statistically significant interaction ( $p < .05$ ) was found within two of four posited relationships. As shown in Table 9, the servant leadership components demonstrated a positive and statistically significant effect on psychological capital components hope and optimism but not confidence and resilience. Therefore, Hypothesis 5<sup>a</sup> and Hypothesis 7<sup>a</sup> are accepted, but Hypothesis 6<sup>a</sup> and Hypothesis 8<sup>a</sup> are not.

**TABLE 9**  
**MODERATING EFFECTS OF LMX UPON RELATIONSHIP OF SERVANT LEADERSHIP**  
**VARIABLES TO INDIVIDUAL PSYCAP VARIABLES – UNITED STATES**

Interaction effect with LMX	Adj. $R^2$	$\Delta$ Adj. $R^2$	ANOVA
Hope	.13	.05	$F(12, 142) = 2.83, p = .03 < .05$
Confidence	.20	.02	$F(13, 141) = 3.90, p = .12 > .05$
Optimism	.14	.06	$F(12, 142) = 3.14, p = .01 < .05$
Resilience	.04	.03	$F(12, 142) = 1.60, p = .09 > .05$

*LMX's Effect in the Cambodia Sample*

From the Cambodia sample, the interaction effects of LMX upon the relationships between the five combined components of servant leadership and the four individual components of psychological capital yielded are shown in Table 10. As previously stated in Chapter 2, Hypothesis 5<sup>b</sup> predicted that followers' perceptions of the quality of LMX have a moderating effect on the positive relationship between Cambodia evangelical Christian local church followers' perceptions of their church leaders' display of servant leadership and the same church followers' self-ratings of hope. Hypothesis 6<sup>b</sup> predicted that followers' perceptions of the quality of LMX have a moderating effect on the positive relationship between Cambodia evangelical Christian local church followers' perceptions of their church leaders' display of servant leadership and the same church followers' self-ratings of confidence. Hypothesis 7<sup>b</sup> predicted that followers' perceptions of the quality of LMX have a moderating effect on the positive relationship between Cambodia evangelical Christian local church followers' perceptions of their church leaders' display of servant leadership and the same church followers' self-ratings of optimism. Additionally, Hypothesis 8<sup>b</sup> predicted that followers' perceptions of the quality of LMX have a moderating effect on the positive relationship between Cambodia evangelical Christian local church followers' perceptions of their church leaders' display of servant leadership and the same church followers' self-ratings of resilience. As illustrated in Table 15, the quality of LMX was found to be statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ) within the Cambodian data set in one of the posited relationships between the five components of servant leadership and one of the four individual components of psychological capital (confidence) but not the other three (hope, optimism, and resilience). Therefore, Hypothesis 6<sup>b</sup> is supported; Hypothesis 5<sup>b</sup>, Hypothesis 7<sup>b</sup>, and Hypothesis 8<sup>b</sup> are not supported.

**TABLE 10**  
**MODERATING EFFECTS OF LMX UPON RELATIONSHIP OF SERVANT LEADERSHIP**  
**VARIABLES TO INDIVIDUAL PSYCAP VARIABLES – CAMBODIA**

Interaction effect with LMX	Adj. $R^2$	$\Delta$ Adj. $R^2$	ANOVA
Hope	.17	.01	$F(12, 203) = 4.67, p = .21 > .05$
Confidence	.18	.04	$F(13, 202) = 4.62, p = .02 < .05$
Optimism	.09	.00	$F(12, 203) = 2.86, p = .35 > .05$
Resilience	.15	.02	$F(12, 203) = 4.21, p = .06 > .05$

### Cultural Differences Related to Predictor and Outcome Variables

Independent sample *t* tests in order to answer Research Questions 1-9. The results of the analyses are reported in Table 11. As shown in Table 11, the comparison of the United States and Cambodia samples demonstrated significant differences in seven of the nine predictor and outcome variables. Specifically, significant differences were found in all five servant leadership components (altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational leadership) and two psychological capital components (optimism and resilience). However, significant differences were not found in the measurements of components hope and confidence. Thus RQ<sub>1</sub>-RQ<sub>5</sub>, RQ<sub>8</sub>, and RQ<sub>9</sub> are supported while RQ<sub>6</sub> and RQ<sub>7</sub> are not supported. It should be noted that the United States sample scored at higher levels than did the Cambodia sample in all seven component variables that demonstrated a statistically significant difference between the two country samples, and the Cambodia sample scored higher in the remaining two (hope and confidence).

**TABLE 11**  
**INDEPENDENT SAMPLES *t* TESTS – UNITED STATES TO CAMBODIA COMPARISON**

Country	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Significance
Altruistic calling				
United States	163	15.44	3.25	<i>t</i> (379) = -5.09, <i>p</i> < .05
Cambodia	225	13.58	3.93	
Emotional healing				
United States	163	14.94	3.45	<i>t</i> (391) = -.2.00, <i>p</i> < .05
Cambodia	230	14.21	3.67	
Wisdom				
United States	164	19.81	3.62	<i>t</i> (387) = -3.04, <i>p</i> < .05
Cambodia	225	18.64	3.83	
Persuasive mapping				
United States	162	15.25	2.99	<i>t</i> (378) = -3.48, <i>p</i> < .05
Cambodia	224	14.08	3.64	
Organizational stewardship				
United States	164	18.04	2.16	<i>t</i> (393) = -6.71, <i>p</i> < .05
Cambodia	231	16.25	3.16	
Hope				
United States	163	27.48	4.17	<i>t</i> (396) = 1.73, <i>p</i> > .05
Cambodia	235	28.18	3.86	
Confidence				
United States	163	23.64	3.66	<i>t</i> (394) = .24, <i>p</i> > .05

Country	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Significance
Cambodia	233	23.73	3.57	
Optimism				
United States	163	18.05	3.11	$t(392) = -3.78, p < .05$
Cambodia	231	16.86	3.05	
Resilience				
United States	164	24.09	3.34	$t(396) = -9.01, p < .05$
Cambodia	234	20.71	3.90	

## DISCUSSION

The present study examined whether positive relationships exist between followers' perceptions of leaders' display of servant leadership and the same followers' perceptions of personal psychological capital. I also examined the moderating effects of followers' perceived quality of leader-member exchange (LMX) in the relationship between followers' perceptions of leaders' display of servant leadership and the same followers' perceptions of personal psychological capital. In partial alignment with what has been suggested in previous theoretical and conceptual work, the findings of this present study indicated that servant leadership may be positively related to followers' sense of psychological capital (Searle & Barbuto, 2011). This relationship was moderated by followers' perception of the quality of LMX in only three of eight proposed relationships.

Servant leadership has been proposed as a positive ethical leadership style with a moral component whereby leaders display concern for the needs and development of followers and provide added value in terms of follower well-being (van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011; Walumbwa, Hartnell, & Oke, 2010; Walumbwa, Peterson, Avolio, & Hartnell, 2010; P. T. P. Wong & Davey, 2007). Avolio, Walumbwa, and Weber (2009) concluded that future servant leadership research should include follower-centric studies focused on the relationship of servant leadership to follower well-being. Psychological capital has been posited as one measure of internal psychological resources of individuals (leaders and followers alike) relevant to personal psychological well-being (Luthans, Luthans, & Luthans, 2004; Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007). Walumbwa, Peterson, Avolio, and Hartnell (2010) called for psychological capital to be studied in conjunction with positive ethical leadership styles including servant leadership. Searle and Barbuto (2011), Walumbwa, Hartnell, and Oke (2010), and Hu and Liden (2011) conceptualized and/or measured the relationship of servant leadership to individual components of psychological capital (hope, self-efficacy, optimism, and resilience). The present study addressed a gap in the literature by measuring the influence of the components of a full-scale model of servant leadership to the four individual resources of psychological capital. Adding to the existing research on servant leadership and psychological capital, the findings of the present study indicate that the practice of servant leadership may be positively related to followers' sense of psychological capital. However, the findings further suggest that (a) the relationship between servant leadership and follower psychological capital may be mitigated by the respective followers' cultural setting, and (b) each respective servant leadership component added or detracted to the model of a given psychological capital resource in various combinations and magnitudes. Additionally,  $R^2$  and  $\Delta R^2$  values demonstrated that the activities of leaders accounted for a relatively low percentage of the variance as related to followers' psychological capital in both country samples and especially in the United States sample. Hair, Black, et al. (2006) argued that low  $R^2$  and  $\Delta R^2$

values (even if statistically significant) indicate that a proposed relationship between predictor and outcome variables should be deemed as practically insignificant. Accordingly, the findings of this study seem to suggest that participants from the evangelical local church congregations in the United States and Cambodia perceive the impact of church leadership as practically insignificant in their everyday lives (Hair, Black, et al., 2006).

This present study extended both servant leadership and psychological capital research by offering models of the relationship between the two constructs based on quantitative analyses. Specifically, the findings of the statistical analyses indicated that the five servant leadership components in Barbuto and Wheeler's (2006) construct correlated with the four individual components of psychological capital in the Cambodia sample but not in the United States sample (except in the case of altruistic calling to hope in the United States sample). Moreover, whether control variables (age, gender, denomination, church tenure, tenure with church leader) were included or not, followers' perception of the linear combination of the five servant leadership components demonstrated a statistically significant positive relationship with followers' sense of four individual components of psychological capital in the cultural context of Cambodia but not in the context of the United States. The quantitative analyses of this present study yielded varying models in relation to the proposed relationships between the combination of servant leadership components and the four individual psychological capital components that extended available research.

This present study added to the available literature concerning the relationship of servant leadership to psychological capital and or psychological capital type components by extending previously devised conceptual models (e.g., Searle & Barbuto's [2011] conceptual model of servant leadership to the psychological capital component hope) and specifically measuring the relationships between a full model of servant leadership (e.g., Barbuto & Wheeler's [2006] five factor servant leadership model) and the four individual resources proposed in the psychological capital construct (Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007). What is more, this present study further extended the research of servant leadership and psychological capital by suggesting models that depict which of the five factors may have a relatively positive or negative impact on followers' sense of a particular psychological capital resource. Additionally, this study extended the research by showing that the models and the contributions of each servant leadership factor might be relative to the cultural context. Of practical significance, the resultant models yielded relatively low  $R^2$  values which indicated that local church followers in Cambodia and the United States perceived church leadership as adding relatively little to their personal sense of the four psychological capital resources.

Although prior conceptual models and conducted research has shown how servant leadership may impact psychological capital type resources (e.g., Hu & Liden, 2011; Searle & Barbuto, 2011; Walumbwa, Hartnell, & Oke, 2010), the present study extended servant leadership research by specifically measuring how each of the five factors in Barbuto and Wheeler's (2006) servant leadership model may influence followers' psychological capital. As Barbuto and Wheeler's (2006) model was derived from a factor analysis of Greenleaf's (1998; Spears, 1995) 10 component model, it could also be argued that this study extended servant leadership research in terms of Greenleaf's conceptual model (as gleaned by Spears, 1995). With two notable exceptions, the findings of this study indicated that the practice of servant leadership through the display of four of the five components in Barbuto and Wheeler's (2006) model may in fact have a positive influence on followers' sense of psychological capital (at least within the contexts of the local evangelical churches in the United States and Cambodia).

As a secondary concern, the present study extended servant leadership, psychological capital, and LMX theory research by measuring the moderating effects of follower perceptions of LMX in the proposed relationships between predictor and outcome variables. The results showed that the quality of LMX as perceived by local church followers correlated positively with all nine predictor and outcome variables in both country data sets except the psychological capital component of resilience in the United States data set. However, the results also showed that LMX demonstrated a statistically significant moderating effect in only three of eight regression models; that is, LMX showed a statistically significant moderating effect between the linear combination of the five servant leadership components and (a) hope

and optimism in the United States sample and (b) self-efficacy in the Cambodia sample. Few theorists have conceptualized a relationship between servant leadership and LMX theory (Barbuto & Hayden, 2011). Not one research study was found that conceptualized or specifically tested a relationship between LMX and psychological capital or its four resources. Like the present study, Barbuto and Hayden (2008) found strong positive relations between the five components of the Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) servant leadership model and the quality of LMX. Winston (2003) used LMX-type language when he posited that a leader's service to followers results in the followers' reciprocal service to the leader (see also Vondey, 2010). Walumbwa, Hartnell, and Oke (2010) as well as Hu and Liden (2011) drew from social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) to show how servant leadership positively impacts follower-subordinate attitudes such as self-efficacy and motivation to accomplish desired goals (psychological capital component hope). Despite the lack of supporting literature, this study found that LMX positively related to the five servant leadership components and the four psychological capital components in both country samples. These findings indicate that more research should be conducted in a variety of organizational and cultural contexts in order to gain a deeper understanding of how LMX impacts servant leadership and psychological capital and the relationship between the two.

Beyond the relationships proposed in the research hypotheses, the present research extended servant leadership and psychological capital research by measuring the differences in the culturally based perceptions of the nine components of those constructs. Indeed, the direct comparison of the data from the two country samples indicated that culture may make a difference in how respective respondents perceive the relationship between components of the two constructs. More specifically, (a) correlation and regression analyses as pertaining to the research hypotheses and (b) *t* tests as pertaining to the research questions demonstrated at least some differences between respondents of the two national cultures in how the respective participants perceived the nine predictor and outcome variables and the relationship between those predictor and outcome variables.

The findings of the present study show at least in part that leaders who desire to make a positive and long-term impact on their followers' sense of well-being should engage in servant leadership behaviors. The findings show that organizational leaders who demonstrate (a) a deep desire to make a positive difference in the lives of their followers (altruistic calling), (b) a profound awareness of the environment in which they operate (past, present, and future; internal and external; on the individual, organizational, and societal levels) along with the foresight as to how present and future actions will impact that environment (wisdom), (c) an ability to formulate and articulate a compelling vision applicable to the environment through use of persuasion and mental models as opposed to coercion and manipulation (persuasive mapping), while d) promoting and pursuing a sense of community within the organization and the common good for society at large (organizational stewardship) are likely to make a positive difference in the psychological well-being of followers. Indeed, the findings seem to indicate that recipients of servant leadership practices demonstrate a deeper sense of well-being in terms of psychological capital in that they show (a) the agency and pathways to begin and continue to the fulfillment of individual, team, and organizational goals (hope); (b) a fortified sense of self-efficacy in who they are and what they can accomplish (self-efficacy); (c) a propensity to expect positive outcomes from individual and collective efforts and make permanent attributions of positive events and short-term attributions about negative events (optimism); and (d) the fortitude to overcome obstacles and/or bounce back from adversity or extreme and unexpected success (resilience). These findings fit the limited amount of theory centered on the direct relationship of servant leadership to psychological capital resources (i.e., Searle and Barbuto's [2011] conceptual framework predicting a positive relationship between Barbuto and Wheeler's [2006] five components of servant leadership and the four components of psychological capital) as well as the limited research conducted on servant leadership that included elements of psychological capital (e.g., self-efficacy, goal setting and accomplishment, and optimism; Hu & Liden, 2011; Walumbwa, Hartnell, & Oke, 2010).

The findings of this study have implications for psychological capital theory. One key characteristic for inclusion in the psychological capital construct is that the psychological resource demonstrated state-like qualities, meaning previous research showed the particular psychological resource could be

developed and/or enhanced within individuals. Moreover, psychological capital theorists posited that these four resource components could be enhanced by positive leadership behaviors. This study has implications for psychological capital theory in that the findings show that the four resources could be influenced positively in various degrees within followers in conjunction with different combinations and magnitudes of the positive ethical leadership behaviors displayed in servant leadership.

The present study has implications for followers as well. Specifically, the findings of this present study indicate that followers who desire to grow in personal and professional development would likely benefit from seeking employment and other organizational environments led by organizational leaders who actively practice servant leadership behaviors. As related to the evangelical local church settings in the United States and Cambodia, church followers who desire to grow in their spiritual and service development may want to become members of congregations wherein church leaders actively practice servant leadership and offer discipleship training within the guises of servant leadership principles.

This study was conducted within the context of the evangelical Christian local church and has implications for leadership practices within that context. The findings show at least in part that church leadership that practices servant leadership demonstrates a positive impact on congregational members' sense of psychological well-being. Servant leadership has been espoused within the Christian movement due to its emphasis and practice by its founder Jesus of Nazareth (Bekker, 2010; Irving, 2011; Senjaya, Sarros, & Santoro, 2008). Bekker (2010) observed that recent scholarly models of Christian leadership emphasize imitation of Christ by emptying one's self in humility and becoming like a servant (Van Dierendonck & Patterson, 2010). Manala (2010) also suggested that servant leadership is a leadership style uniquely devised to carry out the functions of an effective church leader in that servant leadership is characterized by the desire to serve and empower followers (see also P. T. P. Wong & Page, 2003). Manala, speaking of the church pastor as servant leader, noted that "servant leadership focuses on service provision for the promotion of followers' development, growth, health, independence, interdependence, and survival" (p. 5). To make his argument, Manala employed language similar to that used by Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) in order to describe how effective Christian leaders facilitate congregational health and well-being. For instance, Manala described either implicitly or explicitly that effective pastoral leaders (a) display a sense of calling from God (altruistic calling), (b) relate in more supportive rather than coercive ways (emotional healing), (c) consider the current state of the congregation and its desired future by actively analyzing the internal and external factors that are capable of affecting the congregation positively or negatively (wisdom), (d) employ the powers of persuasion to effectively communicate the shared visions and thereby motivate commitment from congregants (persuasive mapping), and (e) develop internal organizational structures for establishing and maintaining interpersonal relationships essential to well-being of the staff and organization (community aspect of organizational stewardship). However, Manala cautioned that Christian leaders who want to be effective in their ministry must do more than talk the talk and be models through body language that exemplifies their spoken words. As indicated in the present study, those Christian leaders who desire to inspire Christian followers to grow and become more effective followers of Christ at church, home, and the workplace could consider practicing the tenets of servant leadership.

The findings of this study also have implications for cross-cultural leadership. Albeit not entirely, the findings demonstrate that respondents from the Western culture of the United States and the Eastern culture of Cambodia perceive differently concerning the measured components of servant leadership and psychological capital and the relationships between them. These findings fit with findings of other cross-cultural theorists and research studies in the sense that members of different cultural backgrounds think differently about how others' behaviors impact them (Fisher, 1988; Hall, 1977, 1989; Harris et al., 2004; Hofstede, 1980; House et al., 2004; Kraft, 1996; Northouse, 2010; Yukl, 2006). The implications of these findings are that those who lead in a cross-cultural environment will be more effective if they learn how to manage cultural differences in the workplace in such a way that optimizes cross-cultural synergy and collaboration within its ranks (Harris et al., 2004). Yukl (2006) observed, "Leaders are increasingly confronted with the need to influence people of other cultures and must be able to understand how people

from different cultures view them and interpret their actions” (p. 430). Moreover, Harris et al. suggested that

to create opportunities of collaboration, global leaders must learn not only the customs, courtesies, and business protocols of their counterparts from other countries, but they must also understand the national character, management philosophies, and mindsets of the people. (p. 17)

If this is the case, what attitudes should global leaders foster and what competencies should they develop in order to effectively manage a cross-cultural organization and optimize the impact of cultural contexts on that organization? One group of practitioners and cross-cultural trainers highlighted humility and teachability as two key attitudes for effective global leadership (Unite for Sight, Inc., 2011). Collins (2001) found that humility was a common characteristic for corporate heads who had guided their Fortune 500 companies from good to great performance. While Collins’ research centered on American corporations, Hunt (2002) observed that early success enjoyed abroad by American President Barack Obama was due in part to his “trademark humility” (p. 1). Humility can be defined as having a right attitude about one’s self, not thinking too highly or too lowly about one’s own stature or place in the world (Strom, 2003; van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011). Humility has been emphasized in a number of servant leadership constructs (Hale & Fields, 2007; Patterson, 2010; van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011). In relation to global leadership, humility allows global leaders to discard ethnocentric thinking and replace it “with sensitivity to cultural differences and an appreciation of a people’s distinctiveness” (Harris et al., 2004, p. 21) while seeking “to make allowances for such factors when communicating with representatives of that cultural group” (Harris et al., 2004, p. 21; also see Unite for Sight, Inc., 2011). Harris et al. further stated that the first step in managing cultural differences effectively is increasing one’s general awareness of the given host culture. This means that global leaders must be teachable, willing to engage the process of cross-cultural learning and learn the nuances that play into the cultural context of one’s host culture (Unite for Sight, Inc., 2011).

To conclude, from the mid-1990s through 2011, organizational behavioral scholars turned much attention to the discovery and measurement of behaviors that could have a positive impact on organizations and individuals within organizations (Cameron et al., 2003; Judge et al., 1998; Luthans, 2002). A main focus of this new research movement was the importance of personal well-being, both physical and mental, in affecting positive outcomes in life domains such as the workplace and other areas (Avey, Luthans, et al., 2010). In the wake of this new emphasis in organizational behavior research, certain scholars (e.g., Luthans, 2002; Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007) have identified positive psychological resources of individuals as well as positive ethical leadership behaviors that may be related to the psychological well-being of follower-subordinates and the promotion of positive psychological states of follower-subordinates within organizations including religious organizations (e.g., Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006; Fry, 2003; Gardner et al., 2005; Laub, 1999; Liden et al., 2008; Luthans & Avolio, 2003; Patterson, 2003; Spears, 1995). Two theoretical constructs to emerge from the new wave of research included psychological capital (Luthans, 2002; Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007) and various forms of servant leadership (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006; Liden et al., 2008; Patterson, 2003). The purpose of this study was to measure the potential relationship between leaders’ display of five servant leadership behaviors and followers’ personal sense of four individual components of psychological capital as well as the potential moderating effects of LMX on the relationship between servant leadership and followers’ sense of psychological capital. Although mixed and in large part inconclusive, the findings show that in various degrees, the combination of servant leadership qualities may indeed be positively related to followers’ personal sense of the four psychological capital resources. Consequently, this study adds to the body of knowledge regarding organizational behavior and leadership research of servant leadership and positive psychology of followers in that it was the first quantitative study to measure the impact of a full-scale model of servant leadership to the full model of psychological capital. As it was the first study to measure the impact of servant leadership on psychological capital, the study swung open the door to further research of how servant leadership can positively impact the

psychological well-being of followers in various organizations and cultural contexts. Indeed, this study demonstrated the potential to contribute to the theories of servant leadership and psychological capital as related to a number of contexts including Western cultures (i.e., the United States), Eastern cultures (i.e., Cambodia), religious organizations (i.e., evangelical Christian local church in a various cultures), organizations operating cross-culturally (i.e., religious and other types of organizations from the United States working toward the redevelopment of Cambodia), follower-centric studies, and cultural comparative studies.

Of final note, servant leadership as a modern organizational construct is still in its infancy. Even though it has been practiced by individuals and within some faith traditions throughout the ages, Greenleaf (1970, 1977; Spears, 1995) did not muse about servants becoming leaders until the 1970s. The proverbial torch to apply servant leadership to modern organizations was not picked up in earnest until the late 1990s. Thus, servant leadership is a relatively new construct and leadership type as are other positive ethical leadership types posited in the wake of the wave of unethical dealings in American business at the turn of the new millennium. As the emphasis of servant leadership is a relatively new construct, theorists have yet to come to a conclusion of what servant leadership is, how it behaves, and what ultimate impact it will have on the society at large. If theorists do not yet know how to describe it, it should not be surprising that most leadership practitioners in the United States and abroad would be slow to value and adopt it and apply it to their organizational situations and cultural contexts. In most cases, they do not know how, and it goes against their nature and cultural mindsets as to what an effective leader looks and acts like. Furthermore, it should not be surprising that a component like emotional healing (i.e., the notion that leaders would take time to provide emotional support for followers) would be difficult to accept in certain cultural contexts, especially those with high power distance orientations (e.g., an Eastern culture like Cambodia) or that value a pioneering, entrepreneurial, pull-yourself-up-by-your-bootstraps mentality like the United States.

## REFERENCES

- Avey, J. B., Luthans, F., Smith, R. M., & Palmer, N. F. (2010). Impact of positive psychological capital on employee well-being over time. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 15*(1), 17-28.
- Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 16*, 315-338.
- Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). *Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. Annual Review of Psychology, 60*, 421-449.
- Bailey, T. C., Eng, W., Frisch, M. B., & Snyder, C. R. (2007). Hope and optimism as related to life satisfaction. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 2*(3), 168-175.
- Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist, 37*(2), 122-147.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: Freeman.
- Barbuto, J. E., & Hayden, R. W. (2011). Testing relationships between servant leadership dimensions and leader member exchange (LMX). Retrieved from <http://www.leadershipeducators.org/Resources/Documents/Conferences/Milwaukee/Barbuto-Hayden%20FINAL.pdf>
- Barbuto, J. E., & Wheeler, D. W. (2006). Scale development and construct clarification of servant leadership. *Group & Organization Management, 31*(3), 300-326.
- Barna Group. (2011). *Barna Examines Trends in 14 Religious Factors over 20 Years (1991 to 2011)*. Retrieved from <http://www.barna.org/faith-spirituality/504-barna-examines-trends-in-14-religious-factors-over-20-years-1991-to-2011>.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Performance beyond expectations*. New York, NY: Free Press
- Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional–transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist, 52*(2), 133.

- Bekker, C. J. (2010). A modern history of the concept of service as leadership in four religious traditions. In D. van Dierendonck & K. A. Patterson (Eds.), *Servant leadership: Developments in theory and research* (pp. 55-66). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Boyett, J. H. (2006). Transformational leadership: The highly effective leader–follower relationship. *The Science of Leadership*. Retrieved from [http://www.jboyett.com/files/Transformational\\_Leadership.pdf](http://www.jboyett.com/files/Transformational_Leadership.pdf)
- Brislin, R. W. (1970). Back-translation for cross-cultural research. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 1(3), 185-216.
- Cameron, K., Dutton, J., & Quinn, R. (2003). *Positive organizational scholarship*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Carthen, J. (2011). Positive psychology as the conduit for the enactment of servant leadership in an organizational framework. *Proceedings of ASBBS*, 18(1), 781-790.
- Cerff, K., & Winston, B. E. (2006). *The inclusion of hope in the servant leadership model*. Paper presented at the Servant Leadership Research Roundtable, Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA.
- Collins, J. (2001). *Good to great*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.
- Dannhauser, Z., & Boshoff, A. B. (2007). Structural equivalence of the Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) Servant Leadership Questionnaire on North American and South African samples. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 2(2), 148-168.
- Fields, D., & Winston, B. (2012). *Development and evaluation of a new parsimonious measure of servant leadership*. Paper presented at Servant Leadership Research Roundtable, Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA.
- Fisher, G. (1988). *Mindsets*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Gardberg, N. A. (2006). Reputatie, reputation, r putation, reputazione, ruf: A cross-cultural qualitative analysis of construct and instrumental equivalence. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 9(1), 39-61.
- Gardner, W. L., Avolio, B. J., Luthans, F., May, D. R., & Walumbwa, F. (2005). Can you see the real me? A self-based model of authentic leader and follower development. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 373-394.
- Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1997). Meta-analytic review of leader member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(6), 827-844.
- Graen, G. B., Novak, M., & Sommerkamp, P. (1982). The effects of leader–member exchange and job design on productivity and satisfaction: Testing a dual attachment model. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 30, 109-131.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1970). *The servant as a leader*. Indianapolis, IN: Greenleaf Center.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York, NY: Paulist Press.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1998). *The power of servant leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Barrett-Koehler.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of theory. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*, 16, 250-279.
- Hair, J. E., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2006). *Multivariate data analysis* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson-Prentice Hall.
- Hale, J. R., & Fields, D. L. (2007). Exploring servant leadership across cultures: A study of followers in Ghana and the USA. *Leadership*, 3(4), 397-417.
- Harris, P., Moran, R., & Moran, S. (2004). *Managing cultural differences: Global leadership strategies for the 21st century*. Burlington, MA: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Hernandez, M. (2007). *Stewardship: Theoretical development and empirical test of its determinants* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from Duke Library. Retrieved from [http://dukespace.lib.duke.edu/dspace/bitstream/handle/10161/177/D\\_Hernandez\\_Morela\\_a\\_052007.pdf?sequence=1](http://dukespace.lib.duke.edu/dspace/bitstream/handle/10161/177/D_Hernandez_Morela_a_052007.pdf?sequence=1)
- Hu, J., & Liden, R. C. (2011). Antecedents of team potency and team effectiveness: An examination of goal and process clarity and servant leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(4), 851-862.

- Hunt, J. B. (2002). A comparative analysis of the management & leadership competency profiles reported by German, US and Australian managers. *International Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 5, 263-281.
- Irving, J. A. (2011). Leadership reflection: A model for effective servant leadership practice: A biblically-consistent and research-based approach to leadership. *Journal of Biblical Perspectives in Leadership*, 3(2), 118-128.
- Judge, T. A., Erez, A., & Bono, J. E. (1998). The power of being positive: The relation between positive self-concept and job performance. *Human Performance*, 11, 167-187.
- Kimura, R. (2007). *Developing Christian relief and development NGOs' Cambodian staff toward becoming servant leaders*. Paper presented at the Servant Leadership Research Roundtable, Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA.
- Kliuchnikov, A. (2011). Leader's authenticity influence on follower's organizational commitment. *Emerging Leadership Journeys*, 4(1), 70-90.
- Kraft, C. H. (1996). *Anthropology for Christian witness*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- Laub, J. A. (1999). *Assessing the servant organization: Development of the Servant Organizational Leadership Assessment (SOLA) instrument* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9921922)
- Lee, J. E. C., Sudom, K. A., & McCreary, D. R. (2011). Higher-order model of resilience in the Canadian forces. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 43(3), 222-234.
- Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19(2), 161-177.
- Lord, R. G., Brown, D. J., & Freiberg, S. J. (1999). Understanding the dynamics of leadership: The role of follower self-concepts in the leader/follower relationship. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 78(3), 167-203.
- Luthans, F. (2002). The need for and meaning of positive organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 695-706.
- Luthans, F., & Avolio, B. (2003). Authentic leadership development. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton, R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organisational scholarship: Foundations of a new discipline* (pp. 241-259). San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Luthans, F., Avey, J. B., Avolio, B. J., & Peterson, S. J. (2010). The development and resulting performance impact of positive psychological capital. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 21(1), 41-67.
- Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Avey, J. B., & Norman, S. M. (2007). Positive psychological capital: Measurement and relationship with performance and satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, 60, 541-572.
- Luthans, F., Luthans, K. W., & Luthans, B. C. (2004). Positive psychological capital: Beyond human and social capital. *Business Horizons*, 47(1), 45-50.
- Luthans, F., Norman, S. M., Avolio, B. J., & Avey, J. B. (2008). The mediating role of psychological capital in the supportive organizational climate-employee performance relationship. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29, 219-238.
- Luthans, F., Vogelgesang, G. R., & Lester, P. B. (2006). Developing the psychological capital of resiliency. *Human Resource Development Review*, 5(1), 25-44.
- Luthans, F., Youssef, C. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2007). *Psychological capital*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Manala, M. J. (2010). A triad of pastoral leadership for congregational health and well-being: Leader, manager, and servant in a shared and equipping ministry. *HTS Theologise Studies/Theological Studies*, 66(2), 1-6.
- Masten, A. S. (2001). Ordinary magic: Resilience processes in development. *American Psychologist*, 56(3), 227-238.

- Newport, F. (2011). Christianity remains dominant religion in the United States. *Gallup*. Retrieved from <http://www.gallup.com/poll/151760/christianity-remains-dominant-religion-united-states.aspx>
- Niewold, J. (2007). Beyond servant leadership. *Journal of Biblical Perspectives in Leadership*, 1(2), 118-134.
- Northouse, P. G. (2010). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pallant, J. (2010). *SPSS Survival Manual* (4th ed.). Berkshire, England: McGraw-Hill.
- Pan, Y. (2010). *Abstract: The impact of LMX to career success based on the psychological capital perspective*. Paper presented at the 2nd International Conference on Information Science and Engineering, Hangzhou, China.
- Parker, S. K. (1998). Enhancing role breadth self-efficacy: The roles of job enrichment and other organizational interventions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(6), 835-852.
- Patterson, K. A. (2003). *Servant leadership: A theoretical model* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3082719)
- Patterson, K. A. (2010). *Servant leadership and love*. In D. Van Dierendonck & K. Patterson (Eds.), *Servant leadership: Developments in theory and research* (pp. 67-76). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pedhazur, E. J. & Schmelkin, L. P. (1991). *Measurement, design and analysis: An integrated approach*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life. (2011a). *Global Christianity: A report on the size and distribution of the world's Christian population*. Retrieved from <http://pewresearch.org/pubs/2151/>.
- Pipe, T., & Bortz, J. (2009). Mindful leadership as healing practice: Nurturing self to serve others. *International Journal for Human Caring*, 13(2), 34-38.
- Scheier, M. F., & Carver, C. S. (1985). Optimism, coping, and health: Assessment and implications of generalized outcome expectancies. *Health Psychology*, 4, 219-247.
- Schwab, D. P. (1980). Construct validity in organizational behavior. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 2, 3-43.
- Scioli, A., Ricci, M., Nyugen, T., & Scioli, E. R. (2011). Hope: Its nature and measurement. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, 3(2), 78-97.
- Searle, T. P., & Barbuto, J. E. (2011). Servant leadership, hope, and organizational virtuousness: A framework exploring positive micro and macro behaviors and performance impact. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 18(1), 107-117.
- Sendjaya, S., Sarros, J. C., & Santora, J. C. (2008). Defining and measuring servant leadership behaviour in organizations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 45(2), 402-424.
- Snyder, C. R. (1994). Hope and optimism. In *Encyclopedia of human behavior: Vol. 2*. (pp. 535-542). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Snyder, C. R. (2000). *Handbook of hope*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Snyder, C. R., Sympson, S. C., Ybasco, F. C., Borders, T. F., Babyak, M. A., & Higgins, R. L. (1996). Development and validation of the state hope scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 321-335.
- Spears, L. C. (1995). *Reflections on leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's theory of servant leadership influenced today's top management thinkers*. New York, NY: John Wiley.
- Spears, L. C. (2002). Introduction: Tracing the past, present and future of servant-leadership. In L. C. Spears (Ed.), *Focus on leadership* (pp. 1-18). New York, NY: John Wiley.
- Strom, M. (2003). Humility. In C. Baker (Ed.), *The Seven Heavenly Virtues of Leadership* (pp. 3-15). Brisbane, Australia: McGraw-Hill.
- Unite for Sight, Inc. (2011). *Module 6: Language barriers and working with translators*. Retrieved from <http://www.uniteforsight.org/cultural-competency/module6>
- U.S. Department of State (2011). *Cambodia: International religious freedom report 2011*. Retrieved from <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/192829.pdf>
- Van Dierendonck, D., & Nuijten, I. (2011). The Servant Leadership Survey: Development and validation of a multidimensional measure. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 26, 249-267.

- Van Dierendonck, D., & Patterson, K. (2010). *Servant leadership: Developments in theory and research*. New York, NY: Palmgrave Macmillan.
- Vinod, S., & Sudhakar, B. B. (2011). Servant leadership: A unique art of leadership! *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 2(11), 456-467.
- Wagnild, G. M., & Young, H. M. (1993). Development and psychometric evaluation of the resiliency scale. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 1(2), 165-178.
- Walumbwa, F. O., Hartnell, C. A., & Oke, A. (2010). Servant leadership, procedural justice climate, service climate, employee attitudes, and organizational citizenship behavior: A cross-level investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95, 517-529.
- Walumbwa, F. O., Peterson, S. J., Avolio, B. J., & Hartnell, C. A. (2010). An investigation of the relationships among leader and follower psychological capital, service climate, and job performance. *Personal Psychology*, 63(4), 937-963.
- West, G. R. B. (2010). *Expert, coercive, legitimate, referent, and reward power bases as moderating variables upon the relationships between service, humility, and shared vision with affective organizational commitment and job satisfaction among members of the U.S. Navy* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3425742)
- Winston, B. E. (2003). *Extending Patterson's servant leadership model: Explaining how leaders and followers interact in a circular model*. Paper presented at the Servant Leadership Research Roundtable, Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA.
- Wong, P. T. P. (2008). *Servant leadership and positive management*. Retrieved from [http://www.drpaulwong.com/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=85:servant-leadership-and-positive-management&catid=42:cl&Itemid=59](http://www.drpaulwong.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=85:servant-leadership-and-positive-management&catid=42:cl&Itemid=59)
- Wong, P. T. P., & Davey, D. (2007). *Best practices in servant-leadership*. Paper presented at Servant Leadership Research Roundtable, Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA.
- Wong, P. T. P., & Page, D. (2003). *Servant leadership: An opponent-process model and the revised servant leadership profile*. Paper presented at Servant Leadership Research Roundtable, Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA.
- Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in organizations* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.