

Innovation Management: Implications for Practice for Servant Leaders in Education

This manuscript has been peer-reviewed, accepted, and endorsed by the North American Chapter of the World Council for Curriculum and Instruction.



North American Chapter - WCCI

**Erin Lynch, Ed.D
Martha Dickerson Eriksson College of Education
at Austin Peay State University**

Abstract

Servant leadership is a form of leadership dedicated to the growth and empowerment of its followers. While there lacks substantial empirical validation as to the direct influence of servant leadership's effectiveness, literature does suggest powerful results from its presence in the workplace. Similarly, Innovation Management (IM), which has explicit stages of its use as a process, needs more empirical research. From their roots in the educational world, IM and intellectual capital (IC) are explained and theoretically discussed in the context as to the benefits to servant leaders in education and the use of IM as a means to further empower faculty and staff in a manner that increases their affective commitment and organizational loyalty which thereby enhances organizational outcomes like student performance.

**Journal of Interdisciplinary Education, Vol. 14, No. 1 – December 2014-December 2015
ISSN: 1092-7069 © 2014 North American Chapter – World Council for Curriculum and Instruction**

What still remains groundbreaking and progressive—Greenleaf’s concept of servant leadership—has transformed into an increasingly appealing philosophy of leadership for many. Within the same arena exist methods like strategic and transformational leadership, which the literature seeks to differentiate. Yet regardless as to how literature seeks to categorize notions of leadership, there is but a single legitimate use for power, which is and will continually be associated with the concept of leadership. The legitimacy of power is when it is used to serve (Nair, 1994). At the heart of servant leadership is the people. The focus on the empowerment of people is what distinguishes the servant from the transformational leader, but perhaps not from the strategic one. In an age that is saturated with information, the feasibility of the expert leader has waned and the need for strategic leaders who can cultivate the intellectual capital of their organizations through implementation of innovation management has been arisen. In no other field is the notion of leadership more valuable and critical than that of education.

While the topics of innovation management and intellectual capital have been discussed as overlapping concepts in previous literature regarding leadership styles (Bontis, 1999; Roos, Dragonetti, & Edvinsson, 1997; Subramaniam & Youndt, 2005; Sullivan, 1998), there has been minimal incorporation of servant leadership for educators into the literature (Crippen, 2004). This article seeks to illuminate the concepts of intellectual capital and innovation management through the paradigm of servant leadership for educators. In three sections the article will examine defining traits of servant leaders as strategic leaders juxtaposed to transformational leaders, explore and define components of the process of innovation management to include the role of intellectual capital, and will investigate the implications of innovation management for servant leaders, as well as the future implications for further empirical research in the area of servant leadership for educators.

Contemporary Leadership Methods

In the last 40 years, literature in the areas of business and management has sought to explore the psychosocial components guided by organizational administrators and leaders, and this has not yet translated to the field of education and its impact for educational leaders.

Concepts of effective leaders in education have been explored regarding the functionality of gender and leadership style, but restricted to transactional, transformational, and laissez-faire styles (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt & Van Engen, 2003). Despite Howard's (2005) synthesis of four leadership styles (fact-based, creativity-based, control/power-based, and feelings-based), all leadership styles simplify to two dimensions: relationship oriented and task orientated behavior (Bass & Stodgill, 1990; Bass, 2000; Bass, 1999). More recently, the concepts of servant leadership and transformational leadership have been compared in that they are both within the dimension of relationship oriented behaviors. While the two are seemingly similar, their underlying difference is what makes more impactful and relevant to educators than the other.

Transformational Leadership

Viewed as a preeminent method of leading educational change, and identified as a superior leadership style, transformational leadership has been classified as the ideal style in the operation of an organization (Bass, 1991; Bass, 1998; Hallinger, 2003). Since its earliest inception in the work of Burns (1978), the concept of transformational leadership has been more deeply explored in the works of Bass (1985), Yukl & Van Fleet (1992), and more recently Riggio (2008). Burns (1978) provided the concept of a transforming leader, as "the person who deals with both [analytical ideas and data and normative ideas] and unites them through disciplined imagination is an intellectual" and transforming leader (p.141). The earliest

discussion of the transformational leadership comes from Burns' (1978) definition, in which "the concept of intellectual *leadership* brings in the role of *conscious purpose* drawn from values...Intellectual leadership is *transforming leadership*" (p.142). As the precursor to transformational leadership, transforming leadership was categorized by the leader's ability to seek change through a non-transactional process, a process rooted in relationships. Described by as primarily a process, the leader and follower's observations of one another and their surrounding environment becomes the focus for transforming leaders is the ability to "mutually fortify" ideologies of leader and follower (Burns, 1978, p.250). The conceptualization of transforming leaders as being intellectual, ideological, and revolutionary became the basis for Bass' (1991) framework for transformational leadership. While Bass (1999) attributes Burns (1978) with the first use of the term transformational leader, it is actually Bass (1985) who coined the leadership style transformational leadership, based on the three traits discussed in Burns' (1978) work. Transformational leaders are those who use charisma, inspiration, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration to help followers move past their own self-interests (Bass, 1991; 1999, p.11). The motivation of the transformational leader is to "broaden and elevate the interests of the employees" (Bass, 1991, p.21), which can be through the use of individualized consideration, focusing on the developmental needs of individuals for empowerment, or through idealized influence, articulating high expectations and modeling them confidently (Bass, 1999; Dvir, Eden, Avolio, & Shamir, 2002; Kark, Shamir, & Chen, 2003). While the early work of Yukl (1981) predates the discussion of transformational leadership, Yukl (1981) supported the traits of sensitivity to subordinates, charisma, and supporting subordinates with difficult workloads as being effective traits for a leader. Yukl and Van Fleet's (1992) discussion of Trait Approach theory to effective leadership also validated the presence of traits

like concern for others, self-confidence, and integrity, which builds subordinate loyalty (Yukl, 1981). The traits of transformational leadership can also be found within servant leaders.

Servant Leadership

Characterized as demonstrating influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration, transformational leaders focus on exacting these traits for the purpose of organizational outcomes (Avolio & Bass, 2002; Avolio, Zhu, Koh, & Bhatia, 2004; Bass, 1991). Servant leaders also demonstrate influence whereas followers admire and emulate the leader, but for the servant leader his focus is the development of people (McMinn, 2001). Individualized consideration, where the transformational leader provides personal attention based on an equity formulation to meet the follower's specific needs, is also practiced by the servant leader whose focus is the empowerment of their followers. The intellectual stimulation characteristic of transformational leaders is also apparent in servant leaders (Avolio & Bass, 2002). Where followers of transformational leaders are encouraged "to be innovative and creative by questioning assumptions, reframing problems, and approaching old situations in new ways (Avolio & Bass, 2002, p.2), followers of servant leaders are encouraged to do the same but the literature defines its purpose as a commitment to the growth of people (Brewer, 2010; Russell & Stone, 2003; Spears, 2010; von Dierendonck, 2011). While transformational leaders demonstrate four traits, servant leaders demonstrate ten traits which have conceptually overlapping elements of psychosocial dimensions, some of which include listening, empathy, awareness, conceptualization, foresight, building community, and stewardship (Avolio & Bass, 2002; Brewer, 2010; Russell & Stone, 2003, p.146; Spears, 2010; vonDierendonck, 2011; Table 1.0). Despite the similarities, the literature regarding transformational and servant leadership is very explicit in that "the principle difference...is the

focus of the leader” (Stone, Russell, & Patterson, 2003, p.4). Bass and Stodgill (1990) articulate the servant leader “transcends beyond self-interest...for the group, organization, or society” (p.53). While the transformational leader may exhibit similar traits to that of the servant leader, the primary concern of the servant leader is to exhibit altruistic demeanor for their followers. This altruism can be strategically driven; a servant leader can demonstrate elements of strategic leadership and should for the purpose of implementing principles of innovation management.

Strategic Leadership

Strategic leadership is a top down management style that can include techniques of transformational or transactional leadership. A strategic leader’s focus is their effort to understand, interpret, and act on change (Davies, 2008, p.34). They are neither driven by the empowerment of their people nor the organizational outcomes; more recently strategic leaders have discussed the process of change on the learning of their subordinates, which inadvertently aids in the growth of the person, thereby providing more overlap to servant and transformational leadership styles. The following table (Table 1) illustrates the traits by leadership styles.

Table 1.0: Comparative traits in leadership styles

Leadership Style	Traits
Transformational	Charisma, inspiration, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Judge & Bono, 2000)
Servant	Listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to growth of people, building community (Spears, 1998)
Strategic	Dissatisfaction with present, prioritization of strategic thinking/learning, creation of mental models, creation of powerful personal and professional networks (Davies & Davies, 2008)

Strategic leaders demonstrate a concern for the organization as a whole, which includes the evolution of the organization (Boal & Hooijberg, 2001). His ability to impact change, through either transformational or transactional techniques, is uniquely tied to the concept of *absorptive* and *adaptive capacity* (Boal & Hooijberg, 2001). Where there is a prioritization toward thinking and learning, strategic leaders reflect the *absorptive capacity* identified in the literature (Boal & Hooijerg, 2001; Davies & Davies, 2008). Boal and Hooijberg (2001) define absorptive capacity as the capacity to not only recognize new information, but also to apply the newly assimilated information in a manner that improves the organization. In strategic leaders this ability is a conscious and purposeful act that combines intellectualism and idealism.

Contrarily, the adaptive capacity of strategic leaders involves the ability to be strategically flexible and strategic flexibility employs innovation management, which entails acting in both a proactive and responsive manner toward external competitors (Boal & Hooijberg, 2001). Despite Stone and Russell's (2004) stipulation that most of the literature in

servant leadership is philosophical (p.145), the externalized behaviors of adaptive and absorptive capacities of servant leadership are measurable from an empirical perspective.

Servant leader traits of conceptualization and foresight can be measured (Brewer, 2010; Spears, 2010; von Dierendonck, 2011) in school administration's ability to make curriculum decisions for the benefit of their student population preemptive to state actions, as well as proactive programmatic decisions that will positively impact faculty loyalty and decrease attrition rates. The Servant Leadership Behavior Scale developed by Sendjaya (2003) includes six-dimensions: transforming influence, transcendent spirituality, responsible morality, covenantal relationship, authentic self, voluntary subordination (Sendjaya, 2003). Large effect size has been established between studying theories like servant leadership and an individual's understanding of that theory, between servant leadership use and gender, and between servant leadership use and church loyalty by congregation (Fridell, Belcher, & Messner, 2009; Massey, Sulak, & Sriram, 2013; Wayne, 2009); however there still exists a need for empirical studies of servant leadership in education (Farling, Stone, Winston, 1999). The externalized behavior of servant leaders can be framed in the context of Innovation Management (IM), which is a strategic technique, and the convergence of theories regarding servant, strategic, and transformational leadership can be more adequately measured.

Innovation Management

Innovation Management (IM) is a relatively contemporary conceptualization of practices that have made organizations flourish. While IM's most notable presence in the literature is examined regarding manufacturing and technological developments (Bessant & Grunt, 1985; Quinn, 1985), its earliest presence is in the context of educational management (Bolam & Pratt,

1976; Havelock, 1971). Its roots in educational management and leadership merged with the literature of leadership theory (Abernathy & Clark, 1985; Ard-Barton, 1988; Burns, 1975). The concept of IM has been a longstanding one within various fields, but has just recently emerged within the field of education.

Since the arrival of the information age the concept of IM has become irrevocably nestled in business literature. Various researchers define innovation management, but the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) manual defined IM most concisely as “the implementation of a new or significantly improved product, or process, a new marketing method, or a new organizational method in business practices, workplace organization or external” (OECD, 2005, p.11).

This definition of IM encompasses the literature’s paradigmatic duality as to what innovation is: a process and an outcome (Mention, 2012). In the field of education new organizational methods become inextricably blurred between terms like best practices, and evidence or research-based. These terms all imply recycled methodologies for improved outcomes. But, it is that very duality Havelock (1971) that should speak to educational leaders. Additional definitions articulate IM as a process of fusing resources in “untried ways” and the “successful exploitation” of novel ideas (Adams, Bessant, & Phelps, 2006; Link & Ruhm, 2009).

A clearly defined need for IM has been identified in the literature. However, the Centre for Innovation and Business Development (CIDEM) studied innovation in multiple industries, none of which include education, and created five phases in which IM occurs (Ohme, 2002): creating new concepts, developing products, redesigning the production processes, redesigning the marketing processes, and managing knowledge and technology. These phases imply linearity between the phases, when others explain the process as a more dynamic one. Tovstiga and

Tulugurova (2009) explain the competitive benefits of innovation in the following context, “dynamic and continual conversion and recombination of the various forms of the enterprise’s knowledge leads to the creation of new knowledge and this contributes to the enterprise’s ability to differentiate itself” (p.71). This competitive benefit is supported in the work of Adams, Bessant, and Phelps (2006), in which the competitive success of an organization is based on the leader’s ability to manage the innovation process, and provide organizational leadership to which employees are receptive (Yukl, 2001). Innovation management is a highly people-focused methodology, despite the connotation of inherently non-humanistic terms like “competitive” and “organizational benefits.” The essence of IM is the value placed in the intellectual capital of the people, the value of faculty and staff and their intellectual capacities.

Intellectual Capital

Nearly a half a century ago, Havelock (1971) progressively discussed the need for utilization of knowledge, and within the same decade Greenleaf (1977, 1980) began his formulations of the legitimacy of servant leadership, a philosophy of leadership centrally devoted to the empowerment of people or the value of human capital (Greenleaf, 1977). Intellectual Capital (IC) in all variant forms within the literature focuses on the capacity of the people. Categorized as the most important asset to an organization, IC is viewed as the “stock of knowledge” to include staff skills and experiences, processes and practices, organizational interconnectivity, and resources created by the staff (Ahmadi, Parivizi, Meyhami, & Ziaee, 2012; Bontis, Crossan, & Hulland 2002; Carell, 2007; Ramanauskaitė & Rudzioniene, 2013). Viewed as knowledge that is of value to the organization, IC is an intangible resource that appreciates as an asset (Akpınar & Akdemir, 1999; Hendriks & Sousa, 2012; Mention, 2012, p.1; Moon & Kym, 2006). Educational servant leaders who maximize IM strategies also maximize and

empower their human capital because they validate their faculty's "collective capability to extract the best solution" (Akpınar & Akdemir, 1999, p.334).

The strategies of IC is evident in the development of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) within schools across the nation (DuFour & Eaker, 1998). PLCs have been applauded for creating a shared responsibility for the development of students, professional comradery of faculty, and increasing student achievement (Hord, 1997). Four components of IM exist: systems, structure, strategy, and culture (Akpınar & Akdemir, 1999; Mention, 2012).

Systems are the manner in which organizations process information, how they come to solutions for decision making, as well as the manner in which they communicate. The servant leader applies the traits of listening, empathy, awareness, or persuasion to extract the tacit and explicit knowledge of its organizational members to empower them (Brewer, 2010; Russell & Stone, 2003, p.146; Spears, 2010; vonDierendonck, 2011). For educational leaders being cognizant of these systems are critical. They send both explicit and implicit messages about the organizational values. For example, the use of data for instructional decision making is both explicit and implicit to the value of an educational organization. Explicitly educational leaders demonstrate that instructional decision-making must be rationally connected to data sets that adequately measure learning or student performance, but also implicitly because educational leaders can express varying levels of trust in the operationalization of the request for data use. For example, in K-12, requiring teachers to provide support of data-based instructional decisions without appropriate scaffolding of how to do so can be counterproductive to empowering traits of servant leaders. Likewise, in institutions of higher education, the ideation of using data for strategic planning can serve as counterproductive to faculty empowerment when there lacks follow through on operational elements required to plan based on the data.

Structure is the explicit arrangement of the organization that classifies the relationship of its members. In an organization led by a servant leader this structure often reflects principles of shared power and lower power distance indexes (PDI) which have externalized increases in employee's trust of the leader (Brewer, 2010; Dirks & Ferrin, 2002; Greenleaf, 1980; Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 1997; Hofstede, 1984; Neuschel, 1998; Sendjaya & Sarros, 2002; von Dierendonck 2011), which may be more difficult to alter in rank/tenure structured organizations. But the use of faculty committees and shared governance principles theoretically address minimizing the power distance indexes that would impede use of servant leadership by educational leaders. Since research already supports that decreasing shared governance will impact institutional effectiveness (Birnbaum, 2004), structural components should be identified by the servant leader in their efforts to support faculty and staff.

Strategy, the manner in which an organization seeks to fulfil its goals, will differ for the servant leader (Akpinar & Akdemir, 1999), since the primary goal of the servant leader is the empowerment of its followers. For the servant leader, organizational goals are admitted by-products to the principal goal of cultivating employee growth (Greenleaf, 1977); when this cultivation exists employees become "volunteers" committed to an institution, not because they work at zero-cost to the organization, but because they elect to remain loyal to the organization thus aiding in the fulfilment of organizational goals (Akpinar & Akdemir, 1999).

Culture is the environment established from the collective mindset, where there exist shared values and norms, and servant leaders are the visionaries who aid in shaping the culture of empowerment. Nelson and Winter (1982) discuss the "collective know-how" as residing in the culture of the organization; this development of a routine of servant leadership promotes collective endeavors and a culture of camaraderie rather than individualistic competition.

Application of the four components of innovation management, and their additional subsets of subcomponents like structuralized Knowledge Management (KM), technological application, idea evaluation, and benchmarking may appear to be a sequential or linear process, but innovation management is a transactional process that is dynamic and nonlinear (Van de Ven, 1999). For servant leaders, focusing on the empowerment and cultivation of their employees' individualized growth is more feasible through the study and application of Innovation Management (IM). The following sections will explore the implications of IM for servant leaders in education, and propose two benefits, followed by future implications for empirical research combining servant leadership and IM in the field of education.

Implications of IM for Servant Leaders

Implementing IM in organizations led by servant leaders is more efficient than in organizations without servant leaders. For example, affect-based trust is directly related to the use of servant leadership on account of cultivation of team-members and organizational community (Yoshida, Sendjaya, Hirst, & Cooper, 2014). There exists a likely connection between components like organizational culture and strategy as explained through latent factors needing further empirical examination, but managerial attitude as well as organizational behaviors must be congruent with the strategies to be implemented within the organization's culture (Adams, Bessant, & Phelps, 2006; Akpınar & Akdemir, 1999). Servant leaders are therefore more likely to implement IM than non-servant leaders because of the analogousness of IM strategies with the self-less and shared power structure of servant leadership. While IM is dynamic and nonlinear, the establishment of IM begins with the foresight and conceptualization of the servant leader, which Greenleaf (1977, 1980, 2002), defines as a leading trait of the servant leader. Greenleaf (1977) among others articulate that a servant leader needs to be capable

of foreseeing the unforeseen, which in the world of education may require diversity in engagement level. Servant leaders in education will need to be familiar with the political shifts that potentially impact educational reform and policy development to foresee the unforeseen. To demonstrate a central role in being a strategic visionary for the organization through their foresight and conceptualization (Fairholm, 1998; Kouzes & Posner, 1995; Neuschel, 1998; Turner, 2000), educational leaders will need to be engaged in reform movements from both grassroots and institutional levels. Spears (2010) aids Greenleaf's (1980) conceptualization of foresight by defining it as "a characteristic that enables the Servant Leader to understand the lessons from the past, the realities of the present, and the likely consequences of a decision for the future" (p.28). Familiarity with past reform initiatives, present trends in research and educational literature, and how educational decisions with these as conceptual framework will shape organizational success, are the three components to which Spears (2010) defines as observational behaviors for servant leaders. In so implementing IM, the servant leader in education can be a strategic visionary who can cultivate the intellectual capital of the organizational followers. This innovation can be helped or hindered depending on the organizational culture, but there are greater benefits to its application than stifling it (Adams, Bessant, & Phelps, 2006; Dougherty & Cohen, 1997).

Benefit for Followers. As previously discussed IM is the process of creating or combining resources in new and untried ways (Adams, Bessant, Phelps, 1996; Link & Ruhm, 2009; OECD, 2005) that involves the intellectual capital of members of an organization. The role of the servant leader is to cultivate this intellectual capital to empower the members of the organization (Brewer, 2010; Greenleaf, 1977, 1980; McMinn, 2001; Russell & Stone, 2003; Spears, 2010). According to Yoshida, et al. (2014), "strength of individuals and team relations

contribute to creativity and innovation” (p.2), and the empirical evidence from their study supports the value of IM for servant leaders. When servant leaders employ innovation management principles it enhances the trust of the employees (von Dierendonck, 2011). Innovation management and servant leadership are practices that align in a manner intuitive to the benefit of followers. Greenleaf’s (1977) principles of Servant leadership aiding “more autonomous” and “wiser, freer” employees align with the structural and cultural components of IM. Culturally, Davis and Rothstein (2006) validate the synchronous presence of servant leader values, their words and their deeds, which in turn increases employee’s view of the integrity of their leader. Increased perception of integrity of leadership has a correlation with job performance and satisfaction (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002) which Akpınar and Akdemir (1999) express externalizes as “volunteerism” of the employees. Employees who feel as though their ideas and contributions are valued have an increased sense of employee commitment (Meyers & Allen, 1991). While employee commitment to an organization is not related to job performance, employee commitment to supervisors or leaders is (Becker, Billings, Eveleth, & Gilbert, 1996; Piccolo & Colquitt, 2006). The affective commitment of an employee correlates to the level of interpersonal trust developed between employee and manager (Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002; Nyhan, 1999). Servant leaders who implement innovation management principles in their organization will only augment the level of interpersonal trust between leader and employee. With the focus of servant leaders on growth of individual employees, the organizational growth becomes a by-product of its implementation.

Benefits for Organizational Outcomes. In an era of accountability, educational leaders are found culpable for the success or failure of their organizations, which creates an interesting paradox for the servant leader. While organizational outcomes are secondary for the servant

leader, there are benefits to the use of IM by servant leaders for organizations. For example, Yoshida et al. (2014) explains, “followers who see themselves as a reflection of the leader-follower relationship will be more willing to experiment with new ideas because there is a strong sense of psychological safety in such relationship” (p.3). In no other field is this as important as in education. For in the world of evolving and often revolving educational trends, classroom teachers need to have the willingness to experiment with new ideas. Experimenting with new ideas is a fundamental component to innovation, and since the intellectual capital of the organization is what stimulates growth in an organization’s operational performance (Carrell, 2007), the strategic use of IM by servant leaders serves as a more valuable contributing factor to success than external factors (Tovstiga & Tulugurova, 2009). Ultimately, high organizational performance as evidenced by measurable school-culture factors like student engagement and attendance, teacher attrition or satisfaction, and academic performance measures can be achieved through the combined application of servant leadership and IM (Melchar & Bosco, 2010)..

Innovation management and its subsequent mechanisms, like intellectual capital, create new avenues for competitive edge (Akpinar & Akdemir, 1999; Mention, 2012; Moon & Kym, 2006). In education, the competitive edge for educational leaders is the ability to recruit and retain highly effective educators. Increased affective loyalty to a school and its mission enhances organizational outcomes like student success. The servant leader must be responsible for the shared vision of the organization and literature suggests that the development of a learning organization is the most effective means of creating a psychologically safe organizational environment, an environment where followers and leaders have room to make mistakes, reflect, and then contribute to the goals of the organization (McGee-Cooper & Looper, 2001; Senge, 1990; von Dierendonck, 2011; Vera, & Crossan, 2004). Drucker (1998) examines the

development of innovation management through admitting the role of the leader is a combined effort of “hiring the right people, getting out their way” and working to establish the right roles for their employees. There is a great deal of effort involved in IM for the servant leader. Von Dierendonck (2011) explains that servant leaders actively elicit the contributions of others, and in application of IM the preponderance of its process is from contributions of others. Servant leadership is similar to Collins’ (2001) level five leadership, where it is the responsibility of the leader to get the “right people in the right seats” [on the bus] (p.13), but unlike Collins’ (2001), where the “Level 5 leader is more focused on organizational success and less on developing followers,” the interpersonal relational components like stewardship and authenticity are absent (von Dierendonck, 2011, p.1237). Authenticity and stewardship build the interpersonal trust between leader and followers which literature identifies as factors to developing affective commitment rather than normative commitment in employees (Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002). Increased affective commitment from employees benefits the organization and its outcomes. Educational organizations, whose practices and policies are not to develop high financial investment returns, instead build strong relationships with stakeholders, and contribute to the societal tapestry of its local community through focusing on enhancing the quality of life for others will inadvertently increase the external capital (Akpinar & Akdemir, 1999; Burlington, 2005). External capital like community loyalty to an organization will also aid in the organizational outcomes. Despite the strong theoretical connections between servant leadership and use of innovation management in the literature, there needs a stronger empirical base in the research.

Future Implications for Research

This review acknowledges a first step to identifying connections between servant leadership and innovation management will be to empirically validate and operationalize the characteristics of servant leaders in educational leaders. The problem has been that the use of exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis of surveys developed over the last decade (beginning with Laub (1999) to von Dierendonck (in press) have not substantiated the 6-12 characteristics typically identified as traits of a servant leader (von Dierendonck, 2011; Laub, 2004). Other surveys, including Sendjaya's (2003) Servant leadership Behavior Scale (SLBS), Liden, Wayne, Zhao, & Henderson's (2008) Servant leadership Questionnaire (SLQ), and von Dierendonck & Nuijten's (2011) have sought to establish validity in measuring servant leadership traits. The latent nature of the characteristics, as well as the difficulty of thoroughly establishing the multidimensional nature of the traits through factor analysis, has been the most frequent limitation in empirical validation. The difficulty in defining servant leadership empirically makes it more difficult to analyze correlations between servant leaders and innovation management use. Establishing empirical evaluations of servant leadership through convergent validity testing between multiple tools such as Sendjaya's (2003) SLBS, Laub's (1999) Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA), and von Dierendonck's (2011) SLS—each of which is from the perspective of the follower rather than leader—would provide a foundational empirical basis for future research.

Despite the literature's assertion that servant leadership theory requires more substantial empirical research (Bass, 2000) using innovation management as an outcome component could aid in the empirical research. Innovation as an outcome of the application of servant leadership could be empirically evaluated. Two innovation surveys exist: Anderson and West's (1998) Team Climate Inventory (TCI) and De Dreu's (2006) Team Innovation survey. The TCI allows

employees to rate their perceived levels of innovation, while De Dreu's (2006) allows organizational leaders to evaluate the innovation performance of their employees. Using both would provide validity to assess innovation.

De Dreu's (2006) team inventory survey would be more effective with hierarchical regression modeling. Historically in the private sector, the method for measuring innovation has been through quantifying Research & Development (R&D) expenditures and resulting patents (Mohnen & Mairesse, 2010), which is not as easily translatable to the education field. Global methods for evaluating IM have not altered much (Mohnen & Mairesse, 2010), despite Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) standardization of the definition of innovation. Again, while functional in industries like technology, automotive, and healthcare, quantifying R&D and patents is not as functional as an output measurement for educational organizations, non-profit organizations with a social marketing initiatives, and institutes of higher education (IHE). The perceived innovation management on part of leaders and followers theoretically would increase organizational effectiveness. While servant leadership serves as a predictor of team effectiveness, research demonstrates the direct effect of servant leadership on team innovation is not significant, but the "influence of servant leadership on employee creativity through leader identification [exists] when support for innovation is high" (Irving & Longbotham, 2006, 2007; Yoshida et al., 2014; p.6).

This is highly transferable to the practices of educational leaders. Theoretically, increased teacher creativity enhances educational innovation which can lead to more frequent applications of differentiated instructional practices in classroom where evidence demonstrates an impact on student performance outcomes (McLeskey, Waldron, & Redd, 2014; Subban, 2006; Tomlinson, 2014; Tomlinson, & McTighe, 2006). In future research, innovation outputs could serve as the

dependent variable, whereas servant leadership would serve as the independent variable with controlling for demographic variables. Triangulation of servant leadership survey data, innovation management performance outcomes, and content analysis of interviews regarding the presence of innovation management components in school cultures can be specifically applied to diminish the potential for misinterpretation of data (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Webb, Campbell, Schwartz, & Sechrest, 1966). Yoshida et al. (2014) also validated the need for empirical studies of servant leadership as a predictor of outcome variables, and through conducting studies that control for other leadership styles. Therefore, studies exploring latent factors between servant leadership and other leadership styles like transformational or strategic need to be conducted.

Conclusion

First discussed in the literature of Havelock (1971) nearly half a century ago, innovation was viewed as a means of utilizing knowledge for educational leaders, and as this concept shifted to the manufacturing and technological fields (Bessant & Grunt, 1985; Quinn, 1985) it was applied to the development of new and untried combinations of processes for the development of new products (OECD, 2005). Its birth as a concept is rooted in the field of education, and in this area, IM demonstrates invaluable utility. Innovation management (IM) is the process of empowering people to contribute their valuable tacit and explicit knowledge, or the process of maximizing the intellectual capital of an organization's members, in a systematic manner (Carrell, 2007; Link, Ruhm, & Siegel, 2014). The intellectual capital of an organization is the only asset that appreciates in value while also contributing to the organization's sustainable competitiveness (Akpınar & Akdemir, 1999; Maditinos, Chatzoudes, Tsairidis, & Theriou, 2011; Mention, 2012). The intellectual capital of a company, as measured in its human capital and their collective capacity to provide knowledge of value, through creativity and ideation, is one of the

multiple structural components necessary for organizational growth (Akpınar & Akdemir, 1999; Hendriks & Sousa, 2012; Mention, 2012; Moon & Kym, 2006).

For the servant leader, managerial attitude shapes the culture of the organization (Adams, Bessant, & Phelps, 2006), and as supported in more recent studies, has an impact on employee's creativity and team innovation (Yoshida et al., 2014). A culture of innovation in an educational setting is one which can be encouraged or obstructed by a leader (Dougherty & Cohen, 1997). Implications for servant leaders to apply innovation management principles are supported the literature of organizational management. The core components of innovation management include: creating a culture of innovation, creating new concepts, developing products, redesigning the marketing processes, and managing knowledge and technology (Terre i Ohme, 2002). Each component is inextricably linked to the human capital and intellectual capacity of its members, and the servant leader's level of work to cultivate the intellectual capacity of the members has two primary benefits. First is the benefit of the people, and the second benefit is to that of the organization.

Theoretically, by using IM of the intellectual capital of the organizational members, servant leaders can increase the affective commitment of employees thereby ensuring their loyalty to the leader and inadvertently positively impacting organizational outcomes like student performance outcomes (Nyhan, 1999; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002). The theoretical elements of innovation management and servant leadership demonstrate a need for more empirical studies; beginning with the operationalization of servant leadership which has been attempted by numerous researchers (Bass, 2000; Liden, Wayne, Zhao, & Henderson, 2008; von Dierendonck & Nuijten's, 2011, among others) followed by empirically measuring innovation as a process with use of intellectual capital (Abernathy & Clark, 1985; Becker,

Billings, Eveleth, & Gilbert, 1996; Evangelista & Sirilli, 1995). Despite the lack of empirical evidence for the benefits of servant leaders using innovation management for the empowerment of their followers, there is an extensive amount of theoretical literature that begs the servant leader to consider the value of its use (Yoshida, et al., 2014). As Drucker (1985) articulates, “Most innovations...especially successful ones, result from a conscious, purposeful search for innovation opportunities which are found in only a few situations” (p.4). Implementing strategies of innovation management is such a deliberately purposeful action for the servant leader that they can foster a culture of innovation for their followers that change “few situations” for innovation opportunities to multiple situations; validating and enhancing the personal and professional growth of their followers along the way.

References

Abernathy, W. J., & Clark, K. B. (1985). Innovation: Mapping the winds of creative destruction.

Research Policy, 14(1), 3-22.

Adams, R., Bessant, J., & Phelps, R. (2006). Innovation management measurement: A review.

International Journal of Management Reviews, 8(1), 21-47.

Akpinar, A.T. & Akdemir, A. (1999). Intellectual capital. In Third European Conference

Organizational, and Capabilities, OKCL. Retrieved from:

<http://joanes.opf.slu.cz/vvr/akce/turecko/pdf/Akpinar.pdf>

Ard-Barton, D.L. (1988). Implementation characteristics of organizational innovations: Limits

and opportunities for management strategies. *Communication Research*, 15(5), 603-631.

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2002). *Developing potential across a full range of leadership cases*

on transactional and transformational leadership. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum

Associates.

Avolio, B. J., Zhu, W., Koh, W., & Bhatia, P. (2004). Transformational leadership and

organizational commitment: Mediating role of psychological empowerment and

moderating role of structural distance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(8), 951-

968.

Bass, B. M. & Stogdill, R. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory,*

research, & managerial applications. (3rd). New York: The Free Press.

Bass, B.M. (2000). The future of leadership in learning organizations. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 7(3), 18-40.

Bass, B. M. (1991). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(3), 19-31.

Bass, B. M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industrial, military, and educational impact*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum

Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8(1), 9-32.

Becker, T. E., Billings, R. S., Eveleth, D. M., & Gilbert, N. L. (1996). Foci and bases of employee commitment: Implications for job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(2), 464-482.

Bessant, J. & Grunt, M. (1985). *Management and manufacturing innovation in the United Kingdom and West Germany*. Bristol: Ashgate.

Birnbaum, R. (2004). The end of shared governance: Looking ahead or looking back. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 2004(127), 5-22.

Boal, K. B., & Hooijberg, R. (2001). Strategic leadership research: Moving on. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 11(4), 515-549.

Bolam, R. & Pratt, S. (1976). *The management of innovation in schools*. Open University Press.

Bontis, N. (1999). Managing organisational knowledge by diagnosing intellectual capital: framing and advancing the state of the field. *International Journal of technology management*, 18(5), 433-462.

Bontis, N., Crossan, M., & Hulland, J. (2002). Managing an organizational learning system by aligning stocks and flows. *Journal of Management Studies*, 39(4), 437-469.

Burlington, B. (2005). *Small giants: Companies that choose to be great instead of big*. New York: Penguin.

Burns, R.O. (1975). *Innovation: The management connection*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books

Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Brewer, C. (2010). Servant-leadership: A review of literature. *Online Journal of Workforce Education and Development*, IV(2). Retrieved from:

<http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1008&context=ojwed>

Carrell, J. (2007). Intellectual capital: An inquiry into its acceptance. *Business Renaissance Quarterly*, 2(1), 67-96.

Crippen, C. (2004). Servant-Leadership as an effective model for educational leadership and management: First to serve, then to lead. *Management in Education*, 18(5), 11-16.

Davies, B. J., & Davies, B. (2004). Strategic leadership. *School leadership & management*, 24(1), 29-38.

Davis, A. L., & Rothstein, H. R. (2006). The effects of the perceived behavioral integrity of managers on employee attitudes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 67(4), 407-419

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of Qualitative Research* (3rd ed., pp. 1-28). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

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

- Dierendonck, D. von (2011). Servant leadership: A review and synthesis. *Journal of Management*, 37(4), 1228-1261.
- Dierendonck, D. von & Nuijten, I. (2011). The servant leadership survey: Development and validation of a multidimensional measure. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 26(3), 249-267.
- Dougherty, D. & Cohen, M. (1995). Product innovation in mature firms. In Bowman, E. and Kogut, B. (eds), *Redesigning the Firm*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- De Dreu, C. K. (2006). When too little or too much hurts: Evidence for a curvilinear relationship between task conflict and innovation in teams. *Journal of Management*, 32(1), 83-107.
- Drucker, P. F. (1998). The discipline of innovation. *Harvard Business Review*, 76(6), 149-157.
- DuFour, R., & Eaker, R. (1998). *Professional learning communities at work: Best practices for enhancing student achievement*. Bloomington, IN: National Educational Service
- Dvir, T., Eden, D., Avolio, B. J., & Shamir, B. (2002). Impact of transformational leadership on follower development and performance: A field experiment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(4), 735-744.
- Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & Van Engen, M. L. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: a meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129(4), 569.
- Evangelista, R., & Sirilli, G. (1995). Measuring innovation in services. *Research Evaluation*, 5(3), 207-215.
- Farling, M. L., Stone, A. G., & Winston, B. E. (1999). Servant leadership: Setting the stage for empirical research. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 6(1-2), 49-72.
- Fridell, M, Belcher, R.N, & Messner, P.E. (2009) Discriminate analysis gender public school

- principal servant leadership differences. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*. 30(8), 722 - 736
- Greenleaf, R.K. (1977, 2002). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*, New York, NY: Paulist Press
- Greenleaf, R.K. (1980), Servant: retrospect and prospect. In Spears, L.C. (Ed.), *The power of Servant Leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers (pp. 17-60).
- Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33(3), 329-352.
- Havelock, R.G. (1971). *Planning for innovation through dissemination and utilization of knowledge*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research.
- Hendriks, P. H., & Sousa, C. A. (2013). Rethinking the liaisons between intellectual capital management and knowledge management. *Journal of Information Science*, 39(2), 270.
- Hofstede, G. (1984). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values* (Vol. 5). Sage.
- Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (1997). *Cultures and organizations*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hord, S. M. (1997). Professional learning communities: Communities of continuous inquiry and improvement. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
- Howard, W. C. (2005). Leadership: Four styles. *Education*, 126(2), 384-391.
- Irving, J. A., & Longbotham, G. J. (2006). Servant leadership predictors of team effectiveness: Findings and implications. *Proceedings of the American Society of Business and Behavioral Sciences*, 13(1), 862-873.
- Irving, J. A., & Longbotham, G. J. (2007). Team effectiveness and six essential servant

- leadership themes: A regression model based on items in the organizational leadership assessment. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 2(2), 98-113.
- Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2000). Five-factor model of personality and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(5), 751.
- Kark, R., Shamir, B., & Chen, G. (2003). The two faces of transformational leadership: empowerment and dependency. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(2), 246.
- Kouzes J.M. & Posner, B.Z. (1993). *Credibility: How leaders gain and lose it, why people demand it*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Laub, J.A. (1999). Assessing the servant organization: Development of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) instrument. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60 (02),
- Laub, J. (2004). Defining servant leadership: A recommended typology for servant leadership studies. *Servant Leadership Roundtable*. Retrieved from:
http://strandtheory.org/images/Laub_-_Defining_Servant_Leadership.pdf
- 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.
- Link, A. N., Ruhm, C. J., & Siegel, D. S. (2014). Private equity and the innovation strategies of entrepreneurial firms: Empirical evidence from the small business innovation research program. *Managerial and Decision Economics*, 35(2), 103-113.
- Maditinos, D., Chatzoudes, D., Tsairidis, C., & Theriou, G. (2011). The impact of intellectual capital on firms' market value and financial performance. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 12(1). 132–151.
- Massey, J., Sulak, T., Sriram, R. (2013). Influences of theory and practice in the development of

- servant leadership in students. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 12(1), 74-91.
- Melchar, D. E., & Bosco, S. M. (2010). Achieving high organization performance through servant leadership. *The Journal of Business Inquiry*, 9(1), 74-88.
- Mention, A.L. (2012). Intellectual capital, innovation and performance: A systematic review of the literature. *Business and Economic Research*, 2(1), 1-37. ISSN: 2162-4860
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61(1), 20-52.
- Meyer, J.P. & Allen, N.J. (1991). A three component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1, 61-89
- McGee-Cooper, A. & Looper, G. (2001). *The essentials of servant-leadership: Principles in practice, Innovations in Management*. Waltham, MA.
- McLeskey, J., Waldron, N. L., & Redd, L. (2014). A case study of a highly effective, inclusive elementary school. *The Journal of Special Education*, 48(1), 59-70.
- McMinn, T.F. (2001). The conceptualization and perception of biblical Servant leadership in the southern Baptist convention. Louisville, KY: Southern Baptist Theological Seminary
- Mohnen, P., & Mairesse, J. (2010). Using innovation surveys for econometric analysis. *CIRANO-Scientific Publication*, (2010s-15). Retrieved from:
<http://secure.cirano.qc.ca/pdf/publications/2010s-15.pdf>
- Moon, J.Y. & Kym, H.G. (2006). A model for the value of intellectual capital. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 23(3), 253-269
- Nair, K. (1994). *A higher standard of leadership: Lessons from the life of Gandhi*, San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Nelson, R., & Winter, S.G. (1982). *An evolutionary theory of economic change*.

Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Neuschel, R.P. (1998), *The Servant Leader: Unleashing the power of your people*. East

Lansing, MI: Vision Sports Management.

Nyhan, R. C. (1999). Increasing affective organizational commitment in public organizations:

The key role of interpersonal trust. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 19(3), 58-70.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2005). *Oslo manual: Guidelines for*

collecting and interpreting innovation data (3rd). Paris. OECD publishing.

Piccolo, R. F., & Colquitt, J. A. (2006). Transformational leadership and job behaviors: The

mediating role of core job characteristics. *Academy of Management journal*, 49(2), 327-340.

Quinn, J. B. (1985). Managing innovation: controlled chaos. *Harvard Business Review*, 63(3),

73-84.

Riggio, R. E. (2008). Leadership development: The current state and future expectations.

Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 60(4), 383.

Roos, G., Dragonetti, N. C., & Edvinsson, L. (1997). *Intellectual capital*. In J. Roos (Ed.).

Macmillan.

Russell, R. F., & Stone, A. G. (2002). A review of Servant leadership attributes: Developing a

practical model. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 23(3), 145-157.

Sendjaya, S. (2003). Development and validation of Servant leadership behavior scale. Servant

- Leadership Research Roundtable. Regent University. Retrieved from:
http://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/sl_proceedings/2003/sendjaya_development_validation.pdf
- Sendjaya, S., & Sarros, J. C. (2002). Servant leadership: Its origin, development, and application in organizations. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 9(2), 57-64.
- Senge, P.M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of learning the organization*. New York, New York: Double Day. Retrieved from: <https://www.e-education.psu.edu/files/geog583/file/Lesson%201/TheFifthDiscipline.pdf>
- Spears, L. C. (2004). Practicing servant-leadership. *Leader to leader*, 2004(34), 7-11.
- Stone, A. G., Russell, R. F., & Patterson, K. (2004). Transformational versus Servant Leadership: A difference in leader focus. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 25(4), 349-361.
- Subban, P. (2006). Differentiated Instruction: A research basis. *International education journal*, 7(7), 935-947.
- Subramaniam, M., & Youndt, M. A. (2005). The influence of intellectual capital on the types of innovative capabilities. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(3), 450-463.
- Sullivan, P. H. (Ed.). (1998). *Profiting from intellectual capital: Extracting value from innovation*. John Wiley & Sons
- Terre i Ohme, E. (2002). *Guide for managing innovation*. Barcelona: Generalit de Catalunya (CIDEM) Retrieved from: <http://www.inovacijos.lt/inopagalba/cms/711t.pdf>
- Tomlinson, C. A. (2014). *Differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners*. ASCD
- Tomlinson, C. A., & McTighe, J. (2006). *Integrating differentiated instruction & understanding*

by design: Connecting content and kids. ASCD.

Tovstiga, G., & Tulugurova, E. (2009). Intellectual capital practices: A four-region comparative study. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 10(1), 70-80.

Van de Ven, A.H. (1999). *The innovation journey*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Vera, D., & Crossan, M. (2004). Strategic leadership and organizational learning. *Academy of Management Review*, 29(2), 222-240.

Wayne, M.A. (2009). Identifying a relationship between servant-leadership and church climate [Dissertation]. Northcentral University. DAI,70(4), 1202A. Proquest. Accession No. AAI3353722

Webb, E. J., Campbell, D. T., Schwartz, R. D., & Sechrest, L. (1966). *Unobtrusive measures* Chicago: Rand McNally.

Yoshida, D. T., Sendjaya, S., Hirst, G., & Cooper, B. (2014). Does servant leadership foster creativity and innovation? A multi-level mediation study of identification and prototypicality. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(7), 1395-1404.

Yukl, G. (1981). *Leadership in organizations* (1st ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Yukl, G. & Van Fleet, D.D. (1992). Theory and research on leadership in organizations. In Mary Dunnette and Leatta Hough (Eds). *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 3 (2nd ed.). (pp. 147-197). Palo Alto, CA, US: Consulting Psychologists Press

Yukl, G.A. (2001). *Leadership in organizations*. National College for School Leadership. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall