Introduction

Even though the origins of servant leadership comes back to the 70s of the last century, however little attention has been given to servant leadership in academic literature until recently. The grandfather of servant leadership and person who has introduced the ideas is Robert K. Greenleaf. In his work ``Servant as Leader`` he defines who is servant leader and how can we identify servant leadership (Greenleaf, 1970). He further describes the core characteristics, gives thorough overview of his understandings about servant-leader. Greenleaf (1970) characterizes servant leadership as ''one who goes beyond self-interests''. This view is mentioned in other leadership theories, however did not have central position as it have in servant leadership (van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011). Important to mention that Greenleaf (1970) sees servant-leader as ''first among equals'', he is personally involved in creating opportunities for followers to grow. Scholars started to recognize servant leadership as an established theory about decade ago (Verdorfer & Peus, 2014). Today there is still little empirical evidence on how servant leadership works. Parris & Peachey (2013) in their study admit that servant leadership theory is capable to deal with different cultural contexts or organizational setting, however have to be explored in an empirical manner more thoroughly.

There is little attempts from academia to structure the concept of servant leadership into tangible framework (van Dierendonck, 2011). Recent researches have been dedicated to the identification of measures and characteristics of servant leadership. One of them is measure developed by van Dierendonck & Nuijten (2011). They have identified key characteristics and formed conceptual model of Servant Leadership Survey (SLS) (van Dierendock & Heeren, 2006; van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011). Revision of the SLS measure has been conducted in the UK, the Netherland, Germany and Italy (Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011; Pircher Verdorfer & Peus, 2014; Bobbio & van Dierendonck & Manganelli, 2012). Recently a comparative study across eight countries has been conducted to verify shortened SLS measure. Study confirms validity of the shortened SLS version in The Netherlands, Portugal, Germany, Iceland, Italy, Spain, Turkey, and Finland (van Dierendonck, de Sousa, Gunnarsdóttir, Bobbio, Hakanen, Verdorfer, Duyan & Carvajal, 2014). This study uses shortened 5-dimensional version

of the SLS measure which is still measuring essential aspects of the original SLS measure while increasing its cross-cultural stability (van Dierendonck et al, 2014).

With minor predetermined conditions empirical data was collected in Lithuanian context using 5-dimensional shortened SLS measure. Purpose of this is to investigate how well SLS measure holds in Lithuanian context. Based on previous studies in other countries we expect that SLS measure will be able to maintain its structure and therefore would lay the ground for servant leadership in Lithuania.

With the validated and reliable measurement tool scholars are encouraged to look deeper at the processes happening in servant leadership context. As already been mentioned lack of the empirical evidence is limiting its applicability, therefore to contribute to the investigation of the servant leadership this study develops theoretical model. Testing the outcomes of the theoretical model in Lithuanian context will help to contribute to servant leadership as a whole; and as well to the development of the servant leadership in Lithuania.

Another important aspect, besides validation of the SLS measure in Lithuanian context, is to understand how servant leadership earns respect. For follower to follow its leader, he must display certain behavioral characteristics (Graf, Schuh, Quaquebeke & Dick, 2012). Leader's aim is to understand what behavior to employ in favor to get respectful. In this study respect is defined as openness towards influence. This is a vital point, because the higher is the level of respect for the leader, the lower should be the level of resistance of the follower towards influence and vice versa. Van Quaquebeke & Eckloff's (2010) results suggest "...the more subordinates feel respected by their leaders, the more they will "return the favor" by being open to their leader's influence (p. 351).

To better understand how servant leadership fosters openness towards influence model gives mediator. Mediator is represented as identification with the leader assuming that servant-leader is fostering identification of follower with the leader and thus is able to earn respect (respect is defined as openness towards influence). As van Quaquebeke &

Eckloff's (2010) expected there is a strong correlation between perceived respectful leadership by followers and identification with the leader. Having this in mind we expect that identification with the leader will have positive effect on the openness of the followers towards influence by their leader.

There is no literature on the investigation of the servant leadership issues in Lithuanian context. To fulfill this gap the study aims to achieve these goals. (1) To investigate the SLS structure in Lithuanian context, (2) to examine and get deeper insights of how servant leadership can effect openness of the followers towards influence by their leader. With theoretical structure in mind author has designed questionnaire and collected the empirical data.

Throughout the study reader will be gradually introduced to the concept of servant leadership. Starting from the origins of the servant leadership and following the key characteristics of a servant leader. Next, the reader will be introduced to the theoretical model of the study. For the investigation of elevated hypothesis, the author has conducted various statistical tests. A Confirmatory Factor Analysis was used to test the structure of servant leadership in Lithuanian context. As well model fit was implemented in favor of testing the endurance of theoretical model. By the exploration of data results, the reader will become aware of core findings of the research. Results of the research show strength of the characteristics of servant leadership in Lithuanian contexts, as well as vitality of the theoretical model. By reading this work one will gain comprehensive knowledge of servant leadership in Lithuanian context, will be able to address various issues related with servant leadership.

CHAPTER I

Firstly, this part presents concept of servant leadership developed by Robert K. Greenleaf, gives definitions and overview of servant-leader characteristics by several authors. Secondly, tries to reflect on differences between servant leadership and transformational leadership, and gives critical overview of servant leadership theory. This part creates a foundations for further investigation and hypotheses elevation.

Leadership

Leadership is one of the most frequently researched topics in the behavioral science (Parris & Peachey, 2013). But why leadership is so interesting? Colbert, Kristof-Brown, Bradley & Barrick (2008) suggest that leadership is interesting and its importance lies in the ability of the leaders to sustain the economic, political and organizational effectiveness and success. There is no universal definition on leadership; however there are two aspects upon which we can draw a conclusion that it́s actually a type of a leadership (Hannay, 2009). The first aspect is that leadership is seen as a long-term vision and persuasion of organizational goals. The second aspect is an ongoing process between leaders and followers which is seen as another important aspect that describes leadership. Moreover, Northouse (2012) claims that there are as many definitions of leadership as there are scholars working in this field. Northouse (2012) himself contributed to this by defining leader as one who tries to influence a group or individual people to seek common goals. The latter view is represented in this study. There exist many leadership theories that tries to explain how good management is done. While attempting to explain leadership has shifted from its initial point to new perspective and started to focus on relationship between followers and leaders; then it shifted into processes that investigating leadership as interaction (Northouse, 2012).

Yukl (2002) conceptualizes the process of the investigation of leadership, where all part can be illustrated as structure of four levels (Figure 1):

1) An intra-individual process. Uses values, skills, personality traits, motivation to explain processes on an individual level.

2) A dyadic process. This process investigating the relationship that occurs between the leader and another individual (usually follower).

3) A group process. This process is viewed from group perspective. How the leader is capable of contributing to the higher effectiveness of the group.

4) An organizational process. Referring to the adaptation and organizational changes.

Yukl (2002) explains that vast majority of leadership theories keeps attention only on one particular level.

Worth to say, recently people-centered organizations has gained financial and

managerial success, therefore and bigger attention. This could be the answers for corporate world and its leaders who are seeking for applicable leadership theory capable of dealing with the challenges of the 21st century (Parris & Peachey, 2013). Therefore, impact which people-centered approach might have on the organization have to be taken seriously, because this approach has potential to bring new success and achievement. This view is shared by the servant leadership theory, that keeps its focus on satisfying followers need in the first place.

Servant Leadership

The godfather of servant leadership theory is Robert K. Greenleaf (1904-1990), who in the 70s of the last century has released a set of essays about servant leadership. R. Greenleaf in his essays explains how he came up with servant leadership theory. Below is s passage written by R. Greenleaf himself:

> *"The idea of the servant as leader came out of reading Hermann Hesse's "Journey to the East". In this story we see a band of men on a mythical journey, probably also Hesse'e own journey. The central figure of the story is Leo, who accompanies the party as the servant who does their menial chores, but who also sustains them with his spirit and his song. He is a person of extraordinary presence. All goes well until Leo disappears. Then the group falls into disarray and the journey is abandoned. They cannot make it without the servant Leo. The narrator, one of the party, after some years of wondering, finds Leo and is taken into Order that had sponsored the journey. There he discovers that Leo, whom he had known first as servant, was in fact the titular head of the Order, its guiding spirit, a great and noble leader. (2002, p. 28)"*

In his essay "The Servant as Leader" he defines servant leadership. According to R. Greenleaf (2002, p. 27):

> *"... it begins with the natural feelings that one want to serve, to serve first. Then conscious choice brings one aspire to lead. That person is*

sharply different from one who is leader first, perhaps because of the

need to assuage an unusual power drive or to acquire material

possessions. For such, it will be a later choice to serve – after

leadership is established. The leader-first and the servant-first are

two extreme types. Between them there are shadings and blends that

are part of the infinite variety of human nature."

Moreover R. Greenleaf describes what distinguishes servant leadership from other theories. He notice that:

"...difference manifests itself in the care taken by the servant-first to

make sure that other people´s highest priority needs are being served.

The best test, and difficult to administer, is: Do those served grow as

persons?; do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer,

more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants?"

(2002, p. 28).

R. Greenleaf reveals two traits that accompany servant leadership. On the one hand leader is a servant; on the other hand he is a great leader who keeps the group together. His greatness inspires the group to follow after him and his servant nature gives the group confidence and reliability in their journey. At first it might look that servant-first and leadership are two opposites , however in the Hesse's example R. Greenleaf understands that these two contrasting concepts are able to learn to live together. Servant-leader has a desire to serve his followers and most importantly, he is placing followers' interests above personal (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006). Furthermore, servant-leader emphasizes on ethical behavior, morals; he is concerned about follower's grow and success, supporting them in professional as well as personal manner (Russel & Stone, 2002). Servant-leader has higher commitment to growth and prosperity of their followers than in any other leadership theory (Choudhary, Akhtar & Zaheer, 2013). Hannay (2009) pointing out that servant-leader serves and supports the group in everything this group is capable of becoming. Greenleaf (2002) suggests that in favor of having this kind of group the leader must leave more space for participative thinking, personal growth, decision making, and personal autonomy. However, it should be noted that servant-leader is "first among equals" (van Dierendonck, 2011). Thus, servant-

leader is the one who does not use his power to give orders, but rather uses his power to persuade and convince people (van Dierendonck, 2011). By overcoming individual selfishness the servant-leader builds up a viable structure which can boost up effectiveness of the organization. Greenleaf (2002) pointing out that follower will perceive leader as servant only if he proves that he is a servant in the first place and a leader in the second.

Greenleaf (2002) makes another point to servant leadership theory. Likewise there is servant leadership, there can be servant institutions as well. He gives example which organizational structure are more likely to adopt new leadership pattern within organization. Greenleaf (2002) suggest that these organizations are more likely to be public institutions like universities, hospitals, churches, volunteer organizations. Such approach changes the traditional vertical top-down power, where the leader at the top of the pyramid with the most power. At the same time the rest of the people tries to pursue orders and fulfill leader's will. In servant institution the power of the order is distributed more equally among people of the organization. The goal of this policy is to create enough leaders at many level to sustain effectiveness, while taking more responsibility on individual level (Russel & Stone, 2002). Thus, servant-leader's ability to multiply and share it's power create new managerial perspective.

R. Greenleaf has left the scientific community without empirically examined theoretical servant leadership model. As a result today there is a vast spectrum of definitions and models in the field of servant leadership (van Dierendonck, 2011).

Yukl, G. (2002). Leadership in Organizations. (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Characteristics of servant leadership

One of the most influential person in shaping up Greenleaf's ideas into the model that characterizes servant-leader is Larry C. Spears. Being a head of Greenleaf's Center for numerous years, he has published 10 books on servant leadership and gained his experience with most of his work being non-empirical (Parris & Peachey, 2013). While analyzing Greenleaf's original work Larry C. Spears has distinguished 10 characteristics of a servant-leader. Spears (2002) points out a set of 10 characteristics which are of critical importance and central in the development of servant-leader. Following is the summary of servant leadership characteristics developed by Spears (2002). Spears (2002) stresses that a set of servant-leader characteristics is by no mean an ultimate list and variation of other characteristics and behaviors is possible. Various other authors have committed to the work in identifying new characteristics for servant-leader.

1. Listening. This characteristic emphasizes communication, listening intently to others and identification of the will of a group.
2. Empathy. It relates understanding people and accepting their nature and uniqueness.
3. Healing. This characteristic is related to the ability of supporting those who need help and are spiritually broken.
4. Awareness. It corresponds to self-awareness, the understanding of ethics and values.
5. Persuasion. This attribute reflects the position of servant-leader on influencing others by persuasion, facts and arguments rather than positional power.
6. Conceptualization. It refers to the ability of looking at the issue from another point of view, thinking out of the box and broadening conceptual thinking into a future.
7. Foresight. Ir refers to the ability to predict the outcomes of the situation.
8. Stewardship. It refers to the ability of servant-leader to conceal personal wish and persuasion of his own ambitions for the greater good of the whole.
9. Commitment to the growth of people. It corresponds to the commitment of the

servant-leader to the growth of other people in a personal, professional and spiritual manner.

10. Building community. It corresponds to the idea of building communities for those who belong to a given institution, organization.

Parris & Peachey (2013) in their work define James A. Laub as the third of the most cited authors in servant leadership theory. In his dissertation James A. Laub developed 6 key characteristics (Organizational Leadership Assessment) which lead to an effective servant-attitude organization. Laub (1999) admits that items where developed to assess the whole organization and the leadership of the organization in the first place. Further, to assess both (whole organization and the leadership of the organization) he employs participants with personal experience. Laub's (1999) work focuses on achieving the highest possible organizational health. However, he does not pay attention to the assessment of servant leadership on individual level. Following is the summary of six characteristics of an effective servant-attitude organization developed by James A. Laub (1999).

1. Values people. It emphasizes the belief in people, the maintenance of the importance of people, putting people before individual self-interests.

2. Develops people. It relates to learning and growing, the development of new potentials, shaping others up through encouragement.

3. Builds community. It relates to treating people well, emphasizing on teamwork, allowing individuality of style and expression.

4. Displays authenticity. It relates to state of being by being open to others, self-aware, open to input from others, also by maintaining integrity, honesty, and ethical behavior.

5. Provides leadership. It relates to the ability of envisioning future, taking initiative, intuitive sense of an organizational directive, understanding what it takes to achieve goals, form a vision.

6. Shares leadership. It relates to sharing its power, empowering others, using personal influence rather than positional power.

Russell & Stone (2002) point out that if servant leadership differs from other leadership

theories, than such leaders would expose different behavior, therefore it would be possible to observe different characteristics of a servant-leader. After literature review Russell & Stone (2002) have identified 20 distinguishable characteristics of a servant-leader. Some of them are the same as developed by Larry C. Spears (2002) and some of them are just named differently. However, all of the characteristics in Larry C. Spears' list are included between those which have been developed by Russell & Stone. They have classified the characteristics of a servant-leader into two categories. In the first category there are those which result in a repetitive prominence in the literature and are named as "functional attributes". Those which are categorized as "accompanying attributes" of servant-leader are remaining attributes. By that the authors had in mind that they are "prerequisites to effective servant leadership" (Russell & Stone, 2002). Following (Table I) is the summary of "functional attributes" and "accompanying attributes" developed by Russell & Stone (2002).

Table I

There are more academic works that adopt the theoretical idea of servant leadership. This in its in turn helped to increase the number of empirical researches conducted in servant leadership theory. The assessment done by Parris & Peachey (2013) and Van Dierendonck (2011) shows that there is no common generality on servant leadership theory and largely it lacks consensus on definition and theoretical framework. This strategy resulted in a number of various approaches in characterization of servant leadership. Table I gives a summary of existing approaches in the characterization of servant leadership among scholars.

Servant Leadership vs. Transformational Leadership

Various studies have been conducted in comparing servant leadership and transformational leadership. Bass (2000) gives a contrast between the two leaders. He explains a servant-leader as the one who goes beyond self-interests and serves others as its main leader's aim. Also, he explains transformational leadership as the way to balance your own and others' interests for the good of the organization. Smith, Montagno & Kuzmenko (2004) suggest that transformational leadership occurs when ''leader inspires followers to share vision, empowering them to achieve vision, and provides the resources necessary for developing their personal potential'', whereas servant leadership ''views a leader as a servant of his/her followers'' (p. 80). Finally, Parolini (2007) conducted empirical investigation on the differentiation between servant leadership and transformational leadership in the organizational context. Parolini, Patterson & Winston (2009) makes differentiation between two leadership theories "...by their focus on the needs of the organization, inclination to lead first, allegiance toward the individual"; and than adding definition of transformational leadership as "influence through conventional charismatic approaches as well as control'', and in the case of servant leadership "influence through unconventional service as well as through offering freedom or autonomy'' (p. 289).

Scholars have drawn parallels between these two types of leadership. Similar characteristics between servant leadership and transformational leadership have been identified as: influence, vision, trust, credibility, integrity, and modeling (Stone, Russell & Patterson, 2004). Smith et al. (2004) analyze the characteristics and behaviors proposed by Laub (1999) and Spears (2002) who suggest that much of the servant leadership may be involved within transformational leadership. These two theories of leadership are competing on the organizational success. However, a transformational leader focuses on the commitment of the organization and follows the objectives of the organization; meanwhile a servant-leader keeps his focus on the service of being a servant. Smith et al. (2004) ''reveal that servant leadership does not substantially account for the behaviors of the intellectual stimulation dimension'' in the organization; and transformation leadership "has less emphasis on leaders behaviors associated with

the valuing of individuals at an emotional level and less emphasis on learning from others'' (p. 84). However, results of Choudary, Akhtar & Zaheer (2013) shows that transformational leadership has higher impact on organizational learning and therefore enhances organizational performance. Smith et al. (2004) admit that encouragement and affirmation in the case of servant leadership do not necessary promote innovation and creativity, whereas in the case of transformational leadership innovative endeavors are more likely. Risk-taking behavior and initiative are seen as important aspects which may lead to organizational success. Here, on the one hand servant leadership does not stress the importance of this kind of behavior as an essential characteristic, and on the other hand transformational leadership is strongly associated with risk-taking and initiative for the good of the organization (Humphreys, 2005). Therefore Humphreys (2005) suggests that transformational leadership is likely to be more effective in the time of substantial changes, as oppose to servant leadership. Schneider & George (2010) identified servant leadership as a better predictor where the structure of the organization does not require a strong hierarchical subordination.

While organizations are getting bigger and more complex to manage demand for dynamic leadership styles will receive more attention from management. Empirical evidence suggest that both leaderships promote effectiveness and better organizational performance. Both leadership employees very attractive and often similar characteristics. Choudary, Akhtar & Zaheer (2013) pointing out that servant leadership and transformational leadership have many in common, like both influence followers, empowers followers, listen to followers, encourages them for professional and personal development, and both promote organizational performance through organizational learning. As Greenleaf (2002) pointing out servant leadership seem to be more appropriate in public like institutions, whereas transformational leadership could have higher demand in institutions with constant and dynamic changes (Smith et al., 2004; Schneider & George, 2010; Humphreys, 2005)

Criticism of Servant Leadership Theory

Like any other theory servant leadership has its weak and strong points. Not all scholars agree on the insights of servant leadership. Furthermore, scholars point out that servant leadership is more philosophy than a theory. This is supported by Greenleaf (2002) himself, where he admits that servant leadership is more like lifestyle. It's difficult to observe a line which distinguishes servant leadership as a theory, philosophy or a way of life. Parris & Peachey (2013) suggest that this could be the reason why servant leadership has been abandoned for a few decades despite the fact that Greenleaf has published series of essays in the 70s of last century.

The theory of servant leadership has its limitations and has been criticized by various authors. For instance, van Dierendonck (2011) points out that there is still no alliance on essential characteristics of servant leadership within multidimensional framework which would be directly linked to Greenleaf's ideas. So far there is no definition of agreement on what is servant leadership in terms of leadership behavior (van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011). Among some scholars there is a belief that a servant-leader will not be able to draw a sharp line between being a servant and a leader. ''Followers often will try to take advantage of what they deem weakness'' (Whetstone, 2002, p.389). In other words, a servant-leader can become an object to manipulation by followers (Bowie, 2000). Servant leadership is also criticized by unrealistic perception of human egocentric nature. Mankind selfish ambitions, willingness to seek power and control do not fit well with servant leadership's altruism and compassion, therefore substantially may bring to unusual situations (Johnson, 2001). Besides, the practice of servant leadership in some institutions such as prisons or psychiatric hospitals seems out of place (Whetstone, 2002). Leadership in an organization focuses on maximization of effectiveness, performance or profit. Therefore, it seems possible that a servant-leader can lose the ground and end-up with one-minded and passive followers by trying to be everyone's friend (Anderson, 2009). In spite of all the criticism a servant-leader has the ability to navigate its followers to the right path. The following chapter provides an insight into the development of the theoretical model of the Master Thesis.

CHAPTER II

Firstly, this part presents the SLS measure and determine desirable outcomes. Secondly, elevate hypotheses and introduces to the concept of identification with the leader, and openness towards influence in the context of servant leadership. In general, this part aims to built theoretical model for examination and investigation of the relationships.

Measurements

Parris & Peachey (2013) pointing out that servant leadership is investigated on qualitative and quantitative level. In their study they conducted systematic literature review of 39 empirical studies of servant leadership theory. Findings of the systematic literature review illustrates that theory is tested across variety of context, cultures and disciplines. Among which 11 are qualitative and 27 quantitative studies. Studies was conducted in 11 countries, where quality assessment classifies 22 studies as high, 12 medium and 5 as low quality. Empirical studies on servant leadership increasing quickly, so are number of frameworks. This led to validation and development of reliable empirical frameworks. James A. Laub (1999) was first to develop an instrument in measuring characteristics and the behavior of servant leadership. In his dissertation he applied a Delphi method which resulted in six key areas and formed Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) measurement. Since then OLA has been used in various fields, especially in health organizations (Parris & Peachey, 2013). However, as van Dierendonck & Nuijten (2011) point out, in spite of its important role in servant leadership studies, OLA has a very high intercorrelation between the six key areas and therefore its multidimensional nature is lost.

Servant leadership holds a wide set of characteristics. Therefore, it's crucial to guarantee the multidimensionality of the concept (van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011). The development of servant leadership measurement is not limited only to Laub's (1999) work but there are several other attempts as well. One of the attempts is van Dierendonck's (2011) key characteristics of servant leadership behavior. He has identified series of servant leaderships behavior that can be classified as ''an operationalized definition of servant leadership grounded in the different conceptual

models as described in the literature'' (van Dierendonck, 2011, p.1234). Servant leadership behavior identified by van Dierendonck (2011) and subsequently integrated in Servant Leadership Survey (SLS) is a measurement used in this study (van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011). In fact, the Master Thesis foundation is a shortened version of the SLS survey, which is 5-dimensional as opposed to original 8-dimensional measure (van Dierendonck et al., 2014).

1.2.2 Measure of Servant Leadership Survey (SLS)

Dirk van Dierendonck and Inge Nuijten (2011) have developed a Servant Leadership Survey (SLS). Based on extensive literature review and experts' judgment they came up with 99 items. The validation of multidimensional instrument was conducted in two countries resulting in 1571 participants. Van Dierendonck & Nuijten (2011) have used combined exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis resulting in eight-dimensional measure of 30 items. With this survey van Dierandonck & Nuijten (2011) provide a clear picture of what could be improved on an individual level, as well as on the organizational level. The SLS survey provides good internal consistency and reliability, therefore assuring further usage of measurement among scholars. As a result, SLS survey contributed to the development and investigation of servant leadership theory as a valid and reliable instrument.

Based on the insights from literature and expert interviews from European Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership van Dierendonck & Nuijten (2011) have defined a preliminary model of eight characteristics of servant leadership. However, the Master Thesis focuses on shortened SLS measure developed by van Dierendonck, de Sousa, Gunnarsdóttir, Bobbio, Hakanen, Verdorfer, Duyan & Carvajal (2014). Van Dierendonck et al. (2014) in their work examines 5-dimensional structure of the shortened SLS measure, which confirmed to be cross-culturally equivalent structure. The SLS instrument gives a comprehensive integration of servant leadership theory based on prior researches (Pircher & Peus, 2014). Following is the description of five characteristics.

1. Empowerment. This dimension enables personal development of people. It encourages people in pro-active and self-confident behavior. This dimension provides a sense of personal power. Greenleaf points out (as cited in van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011) that ''the intrinsic value of each individual is the central issue of empowerment; it is all about recognition, acknowledgment, and realization of each person's abilities and what the person can still learn'' (p. 251).

2. Standing back. This dimension refers to the ability of the leader to share support and success with his followers. The leader gives the priority, credits to followers and tries to keep himself at the background of the success. Van Dierendock & Nuijten point out that this dimension ''should be closely related to most other aspects of servant leadership such as authenticity, empowerment, humility, and stewardship'' (p. 252).

3. Humility. The leader admits his weaknesses and limitation. He is not afraid to acknowledge that he needs support from others. This dimension assumes that the leader is open to recognize his mistakes and cooperates with others to correct them. ''Humility arises from a proper understanding of one's weak and strong points. Servant leader acknowledge their limitation and therefore actively seek the contribution of others in order to overcome those limitations'' (van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011, p. 252).

4. Authenticity. This dimension refers to the sense of who you really are. The leader expresses true feelings and shows natural emotions to others in life and work accordingly. Harter defines authenticity (as cited in van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011) as the matter ''to expressing the ''true self'', expressing oneself in a way that is consistent with inner thought and feelings'' (p. 252).

5. Stewardship. This dimension refers to the ability of the leader to take greater responsibility for the good of the whole instead of the wish to persuade his own

ambitions and interests. Thus, such a leader may become a role model to the followers ''by setting the right example and stimulating the others to act in the common interests'' (van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011, p. 252).

The purpose of the authors of the SLS measure in creating an effective servant leadership measurement tool is fulfilled. The SLS has proved its reliability in various countries (Bobbio et al, 2012; Verdorfer & Peus, 2014, van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011; van Dierendonck et al, 2014). Figure 1 illustrates 5-dimensional SLSmeasure which is still capable of measuring essential aspects of the original SLS measure, meanwhile improving its cross-cultural stability (van Dierendonck et al. 2014). Appendix 1 provides all of the used items of 5-dimensional SLS measure.

Constructing Theoretical Model

This Master Thesis is dealing with a type of leadership that exposes various characteristics. These characteristics are used to determine whether servant leadership can or cannot give desirable outcomes. In this part of the paper the author will show and explain the readers concept behind and what are expected outcome.

Every type of leadership wants to increase its performance and servant leadership is not an exception (Northouse, 2012). However, servant leadership differs from other types in its approach towards achieving higher performance results. The unique trait that differentiates servant leadership from other types of leadership is the desire to be a servant to its followers in the first place (Greenleaf, 1970). Such an approach can give a new perspective in the performance of leadership where followers are absolutely positive on giving up their independence towards influence. By being more tolerant and open to the influence of leadership they may boost up the performance of the organization. However, this could be possible only if there is a trade-off between the leader and a follower, where the first one devotes to the servant-leader approach and the second - to the openness towards influence (Greenleaf, 2002). To support the statement that servant leadership is capable of unlocking the openness towards influence a mediator has been used as a complementary part to the theoretical framework. The reason of adding the mediator is to understand to what extend the effect of servant leadership on openness towards influence is mediated by the identification with the leader.

Figure 2 illustrates servant leadership and its impact on the openness towards influence. Presumably the effect of servant leadership on the openness towards influence through identification with the leader will have higher and more powerful outcomes. Despite the expectations from the mediator, servant leadership should still be capable of fostering openness towards influence because of the characteristics it possesses and because of its foundational idea of being a servant in the first place. Therefore, servant leadership should be a valid instrument which can help to foster followers to open up their thoughts towards the influence of a servant-leader.

The first contribution to investigate is whether servant leadership structure holds in Lithuanian context. Based on the encouraging results that have been conducted in various countries to assess the structure of the SLS measure, the author expects to be able to replicate the SLS measure on the data that have been collected in Lithuanian context. Therefore, the first hypothesis is stated.

Identification with the Leader

The second contribution to make is the investigation of the identification with the leader and whether it will strengthen servant leadership positions on the openness towards influence. Mael & Ashforth (1992) specify identification as ''specific form of social identification where the individual defines him or herself in terms of their membership in a particular organization'' (p. 105). To examine organizational identification Mael & Ashforth (1992) provide items that were originally designed to measure educational organization. However, the terminology of original items can be modified to serve the purpose of this study. Therefore, following advice from of Mael & Ashforth (1992) terminology in measuring organizational identification was modified. For instance, the term ''school'' was changed to ''manager''. In Appendix 2 the reader can see modified 6-items for measuring identification with the leader.

Leaders who think and act in the name of the group and not just for their own interests have a positive impact on the perception of the followers; willingness to follow their leader; higher motivation (van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2005). Therefore, the leader that displays values which work for the good of the whole group is judged by the followers of this group in a more positive manner. Then the leader who displays values, which coincide with followers' inner leader values, should trigger a positive identification with the leader and most importantly this should give the leader better ways to influence his followers (Eckloff & van Quaquebeke, 2008).

1. The followers' identification with their leader depends on how well imaginable values of the leader coincide with the values the real leader displays (Graf, Schuh, van Quaquebeke & van Dick, 2012; van Quaquebeke, Kerschreiter, Buxton & van Dick, 2010).

Here the leader does not display personal followers' values, but rather values that are seen by the followers for the person who holds the position of a leader in the organization. In such case when followers feel that the leader represents values of the group it is more likely to positively identify themselves with their leader (van Quaquebeke et al. 2010). It is assumed that the followers who identify themselves with the leader are more likely to be willing to be influenced compared to those who do not

identify themselves with the leader (van Quaquebeke et al., 2010).

Values guide people in their social life. They are indicators which demonstrate what people are up to, what they are concerned about or whom they want to be associated with (Lord & Brown, 2001). Likewise, identification with the leader is guided by the values that people hold. Followers evaluate values which the leader displays and in the case of favorable leadership they identify overlapping values, in this way establishing trust among the followers (van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2005; Ullrich, Christ & van Dick, 2009; van Knippenberg & Hogg, 2003). Thus how the identification with the leader is capable of strengthening servant leadership's positions on openness towards influence. Therefore, the second hypothesis is stated.

 Therefore it is expected that the nature of a servant-leader will respond to followers' values they hold about leadership; and the better imaginable values of a leader will match real leader the better and stronger is identification with the leader (Eckloff & van Quaquebeke, 2008).

Servant Leadership and Openness towards Influence

Performance of Servant Leadership

An increasing number of organizations have adopted servant leadership as a core corporate philosophy or a foundation for their mission statement (Spears, 2002). Among these are The Toro Company, Southwest Airlines, Synovus Financial Corporation, Service Master Company, The Men's Warehouse, TD Industries. Spears (2002) pointing out there are several companies which are using servant leadership in their corporate culture and have managed to made to *Fortune 100 best companies to work for in America*.

Benjamin S. Lichtenwalner in his public resource modernservantleader.com (n.d.) has identified and created a list of companies that are practicing servant leadership. The criteria for this list is any public reference to servant leadership like: documented statement, organizational views, articles or organizational blogs. Up to now list comprises of 111 companies. All these companies are known for practicing servant leadership and several of them are in the *Fortune 100 best companies to work for in America* as for 2014. To name a few: SAS (2), Wegmans Food Markets(12), The Container Store (28), Nagget Market (36), Zappos.com (38), Whole Foods Market (44), QuikTrip (48), Marriot International (57), Aflac (58), Darden Restaurants (74), TD Industries (82) and Nordstorm (89). 12 companies that claims to practice servant leadership have made to the Fortune 100 list, what gives a good example for other companies.

Many companies achieved great results by exposing servant leadership values. One of the company is Southwest Airlines. Company started to operated over 30 years ago and since the first work day started to practicing servant leadership. Here is how president of Southwest Airlines Collen Barret (2008) says about servant leadership at Wharton University: "...we do build our [hierarchical] pyramid a little bit different, we say at the top of our pyramid in the terms of the most important priority is our employees. I spend 95% of my time on employees and on delivering pro-active customer service to our

employees. If I do good enough job of that, they [employees] in turn spend their life trying to assure that our second the most important customer in our pyramid, which is our passenger, feel good about the service they are getting and if they [passengers] feel good enough about it, hopefully will use service again".

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6TgR95vnM0c#t=377

http://modernservantleader.com/featured/servant-leadership-companies-list/