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Effective leaders are good servants and the context of this study is service-leadership, in-the-field leadership, servant-stewardship, service quality and service-based leadership frameworks. This paper reports a qualitative (mixed method) exploratory study of service-leadership for the high demands of agile service delivery in the modern service industry-based economy. The study is a pre-study for further investigation and the three specific objectives are: (A) to review and explore general (mostly conventional) leadership styles, leadership philosophies and leadership frameworks in the context of the need for leadership renewal and leadership in crisis, and (B) to explore new leadership philosophies (potential frameworks) with a strong ‘service-leadership’ foundation for service quality in the service sector and (C) to explore measurement of service-leadership to provide insight (determine the values) to measuring service-leadership by means of two selected service-leadership instruments namely SERVQUAL and the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI). The overall results of this study led to the conclusion that the new AVL framework (among others identified) may become an established leadership model. Since this is an exploratory investigation, it is recommended that the three research objectives are regarded as the focal point for further studies among the members of the OLE (Operations Leadership Exchange) with proven successful service leaders (and leadership frameworks) for the demands of the new agile service economy. The international OLE membership organisation forms a significant part of this ever increasing service economy (in terms of the international GDP).
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INTRODUCTION

Leadership is in a crisis if all the variations of “misleadership” are studied. The crisis can be equated to an international pandemic in terms of shortage of business leaders. It is time to get to grips with leadership and to simplify the complexities of leadership frameworks so that they can be adopted and applied more often. This report is an attempt to review some conventional leadership frameworks and to identify and explore some new (and somewhat unconventional) leadership frameworks. It may be that the new frameworks are more authentic and exciting making it easier to sell, adopt, teach and apply. The time may have come to move away from some old ways and introduce a few fresh ones. Over decades research was done on leadership principles as an art and many advocates of leadership have changed their frameworks. Myerson (1996) is one example stating: “everything I thought I knew about leadership is wrong”. Changes in leadership thought came because of the
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need for renewal but changes were also made due to confusion regarding leadership perspectives. For decades one wave of leadership followed the other; for example: as the value-based school (O’Toole, 1996), identifying strategic leaders (Reardon and Rowe, 1998) and the multiple articles published about the differences between managers and leaders by Zaleznik (1977).

Leadership principles can be traced back to as far as the Egyptian hieroglyphics (2 300 B.C.), the works of sixth-century Chinese philosophers, the Bible and the Icelandic tales of Viking heroes and villains. The word "leadership" first appeared in the English language in the first half of the 19th century in literature referring to the British Parliament. Although the concept of leadership has been around for many centuries, it was only after the 1930s that it was formally researched and studied. Prior to the birth of the transformational leadership theory in 1978, studies on leadership focused on the manager's role and his or her relationship with followers. Since the 1980s, there has been a change in the way leadership is perceived. There has been a shift in the focus from control to the establishment of an environment in which people can be successful and organisational results can be positive (Barker et al., 2006; Grönfeldt and Strother, 2006).

The University of South Africa Graduate School of Business Leadership (SBL) recently (October 2012) presented its prestigious Leadership in Practice Award to Reverend Dr Frank Chikane in recognition of the legendary role he played as one of the pillars of South Africa's struggle for democracy and freedom. This annual award was initiated in 1989 and takes into account the nominee's business achievements over the past few years and the value these achievements have added to society and the South African economy at large. Reverend Dr Chikane is outspoken about serving one another and shared his views on leadership and his passion for the people of this country. He added that leadership must be defined around a reference point (value system) and that the South African people must 'fix' their own country, and not wait for someone else to do it. In addition, a visionary leader must serve all the people and corruption and the needs of the people cannot go hand in hand (Unisa intranet, 2012).

Leadership is the key factor for success in any economic industry, including service industries (Foster, 2010). In addition, Palmer (2008) states that most successful service organisations acknowledge that part of their success can be attributed to the quality of leadership. Yet, poor performance of service organisations can be linked to poor leadership. Furthermore, Spendlove (2007) states that effective leadership can also improve an organisation's operational success. According to Grönfeldt and Strother (2006), globalisation and advanced technology forces organisations to strive towards competitive advantages that are not easy to duplicate such as price or product and service quality.

to customers. This again indicates the importance of leadership (or service-leadership) in service organisations.

Problem investigated

It would be naive to think that leadership will ever be confined to a person or in one body of thought or in a single leadership style. It would be more realistic, although very bold, to think that one can get very close to such a new leadership framework (different styles can be followed from one framework). Leadership is a dynamic concept and is uniquely defined by every leader. The problem may be best described by Myerson (1996) "everything I thought I knew about leadership is wrong". Leadership may always be seen as in a crisis because the scarcity of true authentic leaders standing the test of time is always sought after. It seems that true leadership is a misnomer and hidden between many decades of lived leadership testimonies and published research. Crisis can be equated to an international pandemic in terms of shortage of business leaders and the time has come to get to grips with leadership (or is it service based leadership?) and to explore and reduce the complexities of effective leadership frameworks for them to be adopted and applied more often. The problem is complex but the problem statement is simply and explicitly stated as a leadership crisis in desperate need for solutions.

Purpose and objectives

The study is a pre-study for a formal more comprehensive investigation among the Operations Leadership Exchange (OLE) in terms of service-leadership. The three specific objectives of this study are as follows:

(A) A review and exploration of leadership styles, leadership philosophies and leadership frameworks in the context of the need for leadership renewal and leadership in crisis.
(B) An exploration of new leadership philosophies (potential frameworks) with a strong 'service-leadership' foundation for service quality in the service sector.
(C) Measuring service-leadership (by means of pilot tests) to provide insight (determine the values) by means of two selected service-leadership instruments namely SERVQUAL and the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI).

METHODOLOGY

Cooper and Endacott (2007) refer to generic qualitative research, of which phenomenology and action research is applicable in this study. A qualitative mixed method (utilisation of different measuring instruments) was used to increase the breadth and depth of
understanding and to address the research problem. The researchers also selected this approach due to its personal nature and the purpose of the study as a whole (a pre-study for a comprehensive survey among the OLE).

The research was therefore exploratory and did not commit to a singular paradigmatic research practice, nor did it attempt to generalise results through external validity. The purpose was to address the research problem (find new insight, potential solutions or answers) and to generate one or more hypotheses. The research methods used (to be discussed in the results section to follow) fall in two categories - a non-empirical study was done in terms of a literature review, theory building and philosophical analysis with reference to section A and B. This research was not only inductive (to explore and test service leadership), but also deductive (to develop and enrich theory). Secondly, the empirical part of the study was a set of primary data obtained by means of pilot tests using two service-leadership instruments (LPI and SERVQUAL). This empirical survey was conducted at a professional educational service delivery organisation with reference to section C.

RESULTS

The research results are briefly reported in three sections, namely (A) leadership science and definitions reviewed, (B) new (and unconventional) leadership frameworks, and (C) the primary data are presented in terms of leadership measuring instruments. The research results are presented in the same sequence as the research objectives.

Leadership reviewed

The following section briefly discusses leadership definitions, leadership myths, service-based leadership, in-the-field leadership style, leadership measurement and conventional leadership frameworks.

Leadership science and leadership defined

Although the science of leadership was pre-dominantly studied from an economics and management sciences point of view, it is also a social science and interdisciplinary science. Naidoo (2012) (from the Department of Practical Theology, Unisa), for instance, addressed church leadership in the context of service-leadership, service quality and quality of being. She refers to personal transformation to the likeness of Christ (with reference to some religious leadership frameworks discussed in this report), ministerial formation and church leadership with a particular aptitude and maturity. Service-based leadership, in-the-field leadership style and service quality is the focus of this report due to the strong relationship between effective leadership and service quality. The following definitions in Table 1 describe leadership in terms of a strong service-undertone.

Myths about good leadership

John F. Kennedy may have been the most charismatic person ever to occupy the White House yet few presidents got as little done (Goetsch and Davis, 2012). Leadership may therefore not be a function of charisma. Abraham Lincoln and Harry Truman were effective leaders, but without charisma. Goetsch and Davis (2012) distinguish between popularity and leadership. Good leaders may be popular but they must be respected. Some of the most effective leaders are not popular and may be persecuted. Long-term followership grows out of respect and not popularity. The other characteristics to maintain followership are: service delivery, sense of purpose (and a purpose-driven life), self-discipline, honesty, credibility, common sense, stamina, commitment and steadfastness.

To lead people astray or to manipulate cannot be regarded as good leadership although it can be seen as “effective” in terms of achieving the goals of the leader. Many people are led by dictators leaving the follower in a worse position than before. “Misleadership” is caused by weak leadership frameworks causing wrong perceptions and multiple myths of leadership. Many leaders achieved a lot and influenced thousands of people negatively. The most common myths about leadership (Goetsch and Davis, 2012) are that leaders must be charismatic, leaders are born, leaders do not need to be learners,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drafke (2009)</td>
<td>“Leadership is the ability to influence the activities of others, through the process of communication, toward the attainment of a goal.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang and Berger (2010)</td>
<td>“Leadership is defined as “a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colquitt et al. (2011)</td>
<td>“Leadership is defined as “the use of power and influence to direct the activities of followers toward goal achievement”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
leaders control by manipulation and leadership exists only at the top.

Service-based leadership for the service industries

A service delivery operation has a different mind-set than other operation systems linked to the market demands translated to core, intangible and peripheral service dimensions. Service and stewardship related leadership models are more applicable to these industries because the core business is service delivery and human interface. Serving the internal customer precedes external customer service. Service delivery has become more uncertain and demanding in the dynamic and nimble international service markets. Yielder and Codling (2004) assert that leadership in service delivery (such as in higher education) has become increasingly uncertain because of external challenges. According to Van et al. (2009), higher education institutions are constantly facing the pressures of change. According to Trivellas and Dargenidou (2009), the study of leadership in higher education is problematic because of dual control systems (professional and administrative authority) and unclear goals. Leadership has to be applied in both administrative and academic departments. Wang and Berger (2010) also identified several problems that seem to have infected higher education in the 21st century. They summarise the problems by stating that some of these leaders are simply incompetent and should never have been appointed as leaders.

There is a positive correlation between effective leadership and service quality (also discussed further in the report). Effective leaders have a global outlook, take risks and are servants. This service-ability influences the way in which work is performed and how people are managed and interact. The focus of many effective leaders is on transformation (Bratton, 2007; Kumar and Kumar, 2011) and forming followers to be better off. On the strength of this statement, one needs to determine the exact meaning of leadership. From a modern perspective, Foster (2010) maintains that leadership is based on service quality and a process in which followers are influenced (serviced) by a leader to achieve superordinate goals and so that these goals not only benefit the individual but also the group. In addition, Foster (2010) indicates that leadership is about giving in terms of sharing power. This relates to giving of self, being a servant and in-the-field leadership style. This is the “power-base” of service-leadership and assumes many dimensions of service quality and forms of service delivery such as the power of expertise (special knowledge), reward power (reward subordinates for goals achieved), coercive power (power to punish for not adhering to the rules), referent power (the leader is serving, charming and is liked), and legitimate power (power stems from the person’s position in the organisation).

In-the-field leadership style

Leaders who are not servants (with referent power) may therefore be disqualified as authentic leaders. This type of leadership style is very personal with close contact (an in-the-field style of leadership) and “getting dirty”. Empathy, creating mutual trust, reliability and responsiveness are therefore some crucial service quality dimensions. Service quality for internal customers should precede service quality for the external market. Foster (2010) listed the following key attributes for successful service-leadership, namely:

1. Service vision
2. High standards
3. In-the-field leadership style

The leader has to have a service vision. This is the mental picture that service quality is the lifeblood of the organisation and acknowledges that service quality is a key element in business success. Secondly, leaders must foster a quality culture with high standards in everything they do. Thirdly, leaders must have referent power in terms of an in-the-field leadership style. Because of the importance of customer’s contact in the service environment, the leader needs to be involved in-the-field (Foster, 2010).

The importance of measuring leadership

One can only manage and change what was measured. Those who regard Hitler as a good leader must measure its results (and legacy). Measuring leadership is important for many reasons and it is crucial to improve, adapt and create new leadership frameworks and styles. Leadership effectiveness can be measured by means of different instruments (leadership inventories). Leaders may be judged on service quality (a focus area of this report), type of influence on people, performance measures such as profit margins, market share, return on investment, productivity, quality and so forth. Other approaches to measuring leadership effectiveness include employee surveys that assess internal customer satisfaction (related to service quality) and the observed performance of the leader (including respect for their legitimacy) (Colquitt et al., 2011).

The LSI (leadership style inventory) (Rowe et al., 1995) can be used to either indicate what the effects of certain leadership styles are or to identify the needed behaviours prior to linking them to a particular leadership (or combined leadership) style. Although the LSI identifies only four styles (commanding, logical, inspirational and supportive), it covers a wide spectrum of related
leadership dimensions. One of its major strengths is thus to describe combinations of the basic leadership styles called “patterns.” Style pattern is not necessarily static although it resides in a body of thought (leadership framework) and it is preferable for leaders to develop the capacity to adapt their styles to the demands of situations. An example of how styles of leadership influence behaviour in critical areas of leadership is illustrated in Table 2.

Many similar leadership inventories (measuring instruments for leaders) are available. This report will explore (and report on empirical pilot tests) the LPI (leadership practices inventory) as well as the SERVQUAL instruments with reference to section C.

**Conventional leadership frameworks and models**

Teachable scientists need to be open to learn from everyone – it just seems that some leadership models may have become redundant. It may not have anything to do with age, since some Biblical frameworks seem to become more relevant than ever. Why should leadership models be so focused on situational factors? It may become too artificial or mechanistic or clinical to adapt leadership styles (and personalities) to situations. Table 3 provide examples of the conventional leadership frameworks and models (established frameworks).

The second part of the research results (B) will be discussed in terms of new (and unconventional) service-based leadership frameworks.

**New service-leadership frameworks**

The purpose of this section is not to introduce new leadership models, but to explore potential leadership frameworks for future studies. Anyone can have a body of thought (philosophy) or framework for leadership. The measurement and validation of it determines its value, areas for improvement and potential to be established.

Many leaders support the strong positive relationship between “quality service” and “quality leadership”. A leader impacts followers (and non-followers) in some kind of service dimension(s) by means of an in-the-field leadership style. A unique (and logical) feature of modern leadership styles in the changing world is that a leader rarely displays any one leadership style exclusively, although serving followers is a common denominator. All such leaders service and entice their followers’ commitment to fulfill difficult missions mandated by a dynamic environment. The models exist as frames of references (reference points or value systems) based on a combination of publications and experiences of the leaders themselves, biblical references and deductions made from these. Examples of modern leadership styles in the changing world include personal excellence frameworks, visionary leadership frameworks and servant-leadership frameworks.

The trait theory of leadership (Gibson et al., 1982) is an attempt to identify specific characteristics (physical, mental, personality) which are associated with leadership success. It relies on success which relates various traits to certain success criteria. The trait theory of leadership was complimented by value system theory (value system frameworks) and the experiential knowledge theory of leadership to identify more service-leadership frameworks. The following frameworks (bodies of thought underlying leadership styles and models) are identified, explored and summarised in Table 4.

These leadership frameworks are briefly discussed in the following section.

**Servant-stewardship leadership framework**

Most leaders of ancient times were servants of mankind. Many leaders have therefore demonstrated that the most effective followership can be achieved through serving people and being good stewards. Advocates of this framework believe those who serve best lead best. This implies putting employees, customers and the community ahead of their own personal needs. This is a powerful approach because employees who see managers as being good stewards (caring and looking after all types of resources) are more likely to buy into the concept (of being a steward) themselves. This approach seeks to go beyond employee’s empowerment to employee’s autonomy. Employees are given autonomy to think and act for the greater good of the larger group than just themselves. Naidoo (2012) indicated serving one another may be at the heart of most leaders. Service quality is regarded as a measure for leadership because servant-leadership is selfless. It is based on the premise that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader style</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>How to persuade</th>
<th>How to make changes</th>
<th>How to learn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commanding</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Directing</td>
<td>Rapidly</td>
<td>Doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Explaining</td>
<td>Carefully</td>
<td>Studying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational</td>
<td>Opportunities</td>
<td>Creating trust</td>
<td>Radically</td>
<td>Questioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>Facilitating work</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>Slowly</td>
<td>Listening</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Examples of conventional leadership frameworks and models.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership model</th>
<th>Critics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vroom–Yetton model of leadership (situational approach to leadership) (Gibson et al., 1982). This model specifies which leadership decision-making procedures will be most effective in each of several different situations. Two styles are autocratic, two are consultative and one is joint decision oriented.</td>
<td>Believe leaders can be trained but he designates five clinical decision-making styles and provide ”diagnosis decision rules”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiedler’s contingency model (situational approach to leadership) (Gibson et al., 1982).</td>
<td>Do not believe in training to make or improve leaders; focus on how to change situations and not people; proposes only three situational factors influencing leadership effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path-goal model (situational approach to leadership) (Gibson et al., 1982). This theory (framework) suggests that it is necessary for a leader to influence the followers’ perception of work goals, self development goals and paths to goal attainment.</td>
<td>The foundation of this model is one motivation theory (expectancy motivation theory). It proposes that leaders will be motivational to the extent that it helps subordinates cope with environmental uncertainties. It focuses merely on styles, although some believe it to be an improvement over trait and personal behaviour theories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational leadership model (situational approach to leadership) (French et al., 2009)</td>
<td>The popular model of Hersey and Blanchard is narrow-minded since leadership is much more than tell, sell, participate or delegate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic leadership framework is leading by personality and charm, instead of relying on authority. Charismatic leaders seek to fulfil organizational goals by instilling devotion. They engender the trust of the people through visible self-sacrifice and take personal risks. Charismatic leaders have the potential to elevate and transform an entire company (French et al., 2009)</td>
<td>Artificial use of body language and verbal language. High self-belief may seem arrogant and the danger lies in using personal powers to create a personality-based followership that may misguide (even deceive) people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional leadership (bases itself on getting things done through structure and a chain of command) (Barker et al., 2006)</td>
<td>The assumption of this style is rewards and punishment will motivate people. The transactional leader adopts a mere ‘telling’ style and negotiates a contract with subordinates in terms of structures and a formal system for rewards and discipline. Transactional leaders are too clinical although they follow a management by exception approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership(it focuses on effecting revolutionary change in organisations through a commitment to the organisation’s vision) (Barker et al., 2006)</td>
<td>Has much in common with charismatic leadership, with the major difference relating to the scope. Transformational leaders apply passion and energy at work to inject energy and enthusiasm to followers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

leaders put the needs of servants first, even at their own expense. They depart from the traditional leadership style of dominating and manipulating subordinates but rather empower the subordinate and act proactively to inspire them to perform. They are people focused and take time and effort to help subordinates understand their strengths and weaknesses. Some of the typical leadership dimensions related to this framework are:

1. Empathy, listening and love for people
2. Trust, respect and assurance
3. Reliability and steadfastness
4. Responsiveness and the urgency to help and serve

**Personal excellence leadership (PEL) framework**

This framework is based on the principle of quality of being. Naidoo (2012) refers to transformation of the inner being and refers to personal traits for exemplary
Table 4. Leadership frameworks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership frameworks</th>
<th>Degree of service-leadership emphasis and general comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Servant-stewardship leadership framework</td>
<td>1. Leadership strongly related to service delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Not solely biblically based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal excellence leadership (PEL) framework</td>
<td>1. Leadership strongly related to service delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Biblically based framework of quality of being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality first leadership framework</td>
<td>1. Leadership strongly related to service quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Excellence is preceded by quality leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln leadership framework</td>
<td>1. Leadership strongly related to service delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Testimony of in-the-field leadership style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New era leadership (NEL) framework</td>
<td>1. Leadership moderately related to service delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Strong focus on the power of self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munroe leadership framework</td>
<td>1. Leadership strongly related to service delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Biblically based framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The School of Joseph Leadership (SJL) framework</td>
<td>1. Leadership strongly related to service delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Biblically based framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Authentic Visionary Leader (AVL) framework</td>
<td>1. Leadership strongly related to service delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Is based on a combination of service-leadership frameworks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

leadership. The body of thought is that character and personal power precedes quality of service, quality of organisation and quality of life. The focus is not on a few attributes, but on the essence of mankind’s existence and creation. The framework is based on who you are and what you as individual can be. People are not supposed to be 100% imitators because all of us are created and equipped to be unique. The main element of this framework is talent management, to be your best and do your best. This framework focuses on several types of intelligence including spiritual intelligence (SQ) and the empowerment of the internal customer through spiritual leadership (Goetsch and Davis, 2012). The PEL framework can be summarised by the following cornerstones:

1. Quality of being refers to a physical body (PQ), the soul (IQ or intellect, ability to choose, the mind and EQ or emotional intelligence) and the spiritual body (SQ) (Goetsch and Davis, 2012).
2. PEL is dependent on Godly intervention, discipline and a purpose-driven life.
3. PEL is a choice to address imperfection.
4. PEL testifies personal power and it builds respect and reputation.
5. PEL is based on healthy relationships, forgiveness, respect, stewardship and a positive attitude.

Quality first leadership framework

Total quality management (TQM) is a holistic approach to quality at the source. A kingdom can be used as a good analogy for quality. Kingdom citizens should always be on the cutting edge of excellence not doing things halfway. The king demands the best and if the citizens love the king, they will give their best. This view relates to quality at the source and a deliberate focus on quality in everything we do. Goetsch and Davis (2012) are leading authorities in quality management and safety management and their view of leadership is also predominantly towards a leadership for quality framework. This “model” could be driven by the passion for excellence and becoming a person of excellence.

Such a model could have quality (quality management and excellence) as the underlying motivator, vision and objective. To achieve quality of product and service will be difficult without quality leadership. A true quality culture rubs-off to everything besides window-dressing.

Lincoln leadership framework

The history of Lincoln provides a personal framework of someone that made a difference at the cost of self. This
New era leadership (NEL) framework

This body of thought may be related to the new age movement. Van (2009) provides most dimensions of this body of thought believing leadership is a moral and ethical undertaking. This framework may be named the New Age Leadership framework with its religious and psychological truths of self and the power within. It believes every person has enough personal power left to carry out that of which he/she is convinced. Van (2009) supports a wide variety of religious leaders such as Mohandas Ghandi, John Maxwell, Robert Schuller and Oprah Winfrey. Their body of thought centres on humanism with a strong focus on self, self-esteem and self-determination to succeed. There is a strong focus on human potential, self-management, self-knowledge, tenacity and responsibility. Although they seem to support the discipline and other difficulties of leadership (to be a hard master of yourself and to be lenient to everybody else) they seem to be promoting a self-god philosophy supported by the New Age Movement in a general submission to some form of “goodness” and against some “evil”.

Munroe’s leadership framework

Myles Munroe is a pastor in Nassau Bahamas and is a frequent visitor to South Africa. He has a strong focus on service quality and although he is strongly respected as a consultant he is also ear-marked (and criticized) as a “prosperity theologian”. He has a remarkable biblical view of leadership and is known for his kingdom principles (Munroe, 2006), advocating leaders to think and behave like a kingdom resident and ruler. The main aspects of his leadership framework can be summarised as follows:

1. Everyone is a leader: leadership resides in every human being and God never created mere followers.

Leaders can transform followers into leaders and he therefore states that leaders must stop living to “make a living” and start living to make a difference.

2. Servant-leadership and stewardship: if you can serve you can lead. Leadership is not measured by how many people serve you, but how many people you serve.

3. Leaders have dominion: mankind was created to have dominium over the earth (plant and animals) and not people. True leaders do not manipulate.

4. The lion and the eagle: God identifies Himself with the lion (its attitude) and the eagle (its vision). He states “an army of sheep led by a lion will always defeat an army of lions led by a sheep”.

5. Sacrifice and obedience: there are so few leaders today because everybody wants to live and nobody wants to die to self. You may be alone and attract persecution as your vision will attract enemies.

6. Leadership is about service and empowerment (not power): to empower others. Leadership is not about manipulation, it is about inspiration.

7. Vision is more important than sight: sight shows you what is and vision shows you what “could be” – the greatest enemy of vision is sight as we should walk by faith (things one cannot see and things one hopes for). Vision is the most important force on earth because vision sets you apart from the present and vision creates the leader and then the leader creates the vision.

The school of Joseph Leadership (JSL) framework

This framework was deducted (compiled) based on the remarkable story of Joseph as a role model with reference to the book of Genesis. The “assessors” of leadership practices for exemplary leadership may base his standard on this school of thought. His assessment proved Joseph to be a man of excellence, because he was tested in all areas of his being (body, soul and spirit). He was put in charge, to be a servant, he was thrown in a dark pit, he was sold to the Ishmaelites, he was tested in hard physical conditions in the desert, he was tempted by a woman, he was thrown in jail and finally he had to pass the test of pride. After the total assessment he was declared a leader.

Joseph had spiritual discernment and was trusted with a country. Pharaoh said to Joseph, “Since God has made all this known to you, there is no one so discerning and wise as you. You shall be in charge of my palace, and all my people are to submit to your orders. Only with respect to the throne will I be greater than you.” So Pharaoh said to Joseph, “I hereby put you in charge of the whole land of Egypt.” Josephs’ rise to power in the land of Egypt was directly related to his ability to be faithful in prison and to his ability to discern (and interpret dreams).

Joseph was trusted with a heritage. With all his position and power, Joseph was able to see that God was actually trusting him was something far greater than a country. He trusted him with a heritage and the saving of lives.
Authentic Visionary Leadership (AVL) framework

This framework may become the body of thought for authentic exemplary leadership. The “reference point” of this framework is the power of vision combined with dimensions of the other preferred “new” frameworks (e.g., PEL and JSL). What type of leader is agile and capable to strengthen an economy and make a nation stronger? What type of leader will stand the test of time? Who will go beyond mere conventional IQ and EQ sources of intelligence? Which framework of leadership will be necessary to develop leaders that have the potential to solve challenging problems and to also anticipate (foresee and discern) the problems of tomorrow. It will have to be good enough to develop authentic visionary leaders whose styles really match any organization’s needs and help ensure that all organisations can succeed in a turbulent global marketplace. This authentic visionary leader will have to be able to adapt and have the capacity to apply more than just his or her dominant leadership style.

LEADERSHIP MEASURING INSTRUMENTS

Leadership must be measured for multiple reasons (as indicated earlier). Leaders need followers and they must determine the status of their impact on followers. Leaders as individuals can also be measured and their styles (or patterns) of leadership can be scrutinised. Frameworks of leadership need to be tested and improved prior to becoming established leadership models. The rich body of knowledge available will bring us to a place to refine, simplify and select. In the rich library of leadership knowledge we also find measuring instruments as standard questionnaires and inventories such as the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), the Transformational Leadership Behaviour Inventory (TLI), the Leader Assessment Inventory (LAI), the Follower Belief Questionnaire, the Attributes of Leader Behaviour Questionnaire, the Conger-Kanungo (CK) scale, the SERVQUAL instrument, the Transformational Leadership Questionnaire (TLQ), the Global Transformational Leadership (GTL) scale, the Leadership Style Inventory (LSI) and the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) to mention a few.

This section reports the results of a personal empirical survey conducted at a professional educational service delivery organisation. The following two instruments were selected to be explored (and tested) within the context of service leadership at an educational service provider:

1. Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI)
2. SERVQUAL instrument

Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI)

Findings from more than 350 doctoral research projects applying the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) in the service sectors presented a number of interesting conclusions, as highlighted below (Kouzes and Posner, 2003a):

1. LPI scores are positively related to internal customer satisfaction (internal service quality) and employee commitment levels.
2. Education providers (in the service industries) from high-performing schools report consistently higher LPI scores for their principals than teachers from less effective schools.
3. LPI scores of hospital managers are significantly correlated with constituent reports of workplace empowerment, job satisfaction, internal service quality and productivity.
4. Effective bank managers have consistently higher LPI scores than less effective managers. Findings such as these have been recorded all over the world. Studies in the USA, Canada, Mexico, Europe, Asia, Japan and Australia have revealed that job satisfaction, productivity and organisational commitment are significantly correlated with the FPEL (five practices of exemplary leadership) (Kouzes and Posner, 2003a).

The LPI seems to be the most widely applied instrument in leadership assessment research and has been referred to as “the most reliable leadership development instrument available today” (Kouzes and Posner, 2003a). This statement is confirmed by the fact that the LPI is identified as an appropriate leadership assessment instrument in recent journal articles and doctoral theses (Leigh et al., 2010; Matviuk, 2010a; Matviuk, 2010b; Abdullah, 2009; Manchano-Smoak et al., 2009; Artley, 2008; Garraway, 2008; Quagliieri et al., 2007). The LPI has been applied as a research instrument in a variety of sectors, including higher education (Marcketti et al., 2011; Langbein, 2010; Vasquez-Guignard, 2010; Wardell, 2010; Suwandeel, 2009; Hyatt, 2007; Aaker, 2003; Broome, 2003).

After hundreds of interviews, thousands of case analyses and hundreds of thousands of survey questionnaires, it was discovered that leaders follow similar behavioural and service delivery patterns in guiding and leading others (Kouzes and Posner, 2003a). From these similar patterns, the following leadership framework of five dimensions (related to service leadership) were identified and referred to as “exemplary leadership” (Kouzes and Posner, 2003a):

1. MODEL THE WAY – credibility is the foundation of leadership and if people do not believe the messenger, they will not believe the message. Leaders model the way by their integrity, values and example.
2. INSPIRE A SHARED VISION – leaders inspire a shared vision by envisioning the future and enlisting others in a common vision.
3. CHALLENGE THE PROCESS – leaders challenge the process by searching for opportunities and by experimenting, taking risks, and learning from experience.
4. ENABLE OTHERS TO ACT – leaders empower others to act by fostering collaboration and strengthening others.
5. ENCOURAGE THE HEART - leaders encourage the heart by serving people, recognising contributions and celebrating positive results and achievements.

The LPI instrument is personal (with reference to the PEL model) and gives leaders 360-degree feedback on their leadership behaviours. Leaders succeed in their roles on the strength of the quality of the relationship they have with their followers. One of the main reasons why leaders fail is inadequate service to the internal customer and poor relationships with constituents. Leaders who adopt and engage in the exemplary leadership framework tend to be more effective than those who are not (Kouzes and Posner, 2003a; Kouzes and Posner, 2003b).

The LPI methodology

The LPI questionnaire consists of 30 statements that address behaviours when people are at their personal best. Responses are captured on a ten-point scale with behavioural anchors. For each statement, the respondent indicates how often the leader engages with that particular behaviour. Responses range from 1 (almost never) to 10 (almost always). Six questions are related to five of the five practices of exemplary leadership. A high value represents more frequent use of a particular behaviour. Computerised scoring software provides feedback along a number of dimensions, including comparisons by respondent category and rankings by frequency. The LPI has proven to be both reliable and valid on the basis of more than 25 years of research and more than 200 academic studies and master’s dissertations used the instrument (Kouzes and Posner, 2003a; Kouzes and Posner, 2003b). Responses are captured on a ten-point scale with behavioural anchors. For each statement, the respondent indicated how often the leader engaged with that particular behaviour. The responses ranged from 1 to 10. The scale items on the “LPI self” and “LPI observer” questionnaire are displayed as follows:

1 = almost never; 2 = rarely; 3 = seldom; 4 = once in a while; 5 = occasionally; 6 = sometimes; 7 = fairly often; 8 = usually; 9 = very frequently; 10 = almost always.

When analysing data from, for example, the MLQ questionnaire, it is stated that “the Leader form would naturally contain a bias, the Rater form is considered to be the more important of the two” (Transformational leadership, 2010). Similarly, Kouzes and Posner (2003a) state that in order to minimise bias, responses from the “LPI observer” are used for analyses instead of responses from the “LPI self”. Hence for the purpose of this study, only the data from the “LPI observer” were used. The section below briefly elaborates on the LPI’s psychometric properties, its validity and reliability as developed and reported by Kouzes and Posner (2003a).

Psychometric properties of the LPI

The LPI has been extensively applied in various industries and has proven reliable to identify the behaviours of effective leaders. Based on data from over 200,000 respondents, the LPI continues to demonstrate sound psychometric properties (Kouzes and Posner, 2003a). Kouzes and Posner (2003b) used the instrument over 20 years and validated the five practices of the exemplary leadership framework as a constant and reliable description of what leaders do to achieve extraordinary things in organisations.

Reliability

All five leadership practices have strong internal reliability scores (above 0.75 for the “self” version and above 0.85 for the “observer” version). Test-retest reliability scores are high in the 0.90 “plus” range. This means that if the LPI is applied and then reapplied a few months later using the same or similar observers, the scores will be generally consistent. The tests also indicated that there is no social desirability unfairness (Kouzes and Posner, 2003a; Kouzes and Posner, 2003b).

Validity

The five practices of the LPI are orthogonal, meaning they do not measure the same behaviour but five different practices. The LPI also has concurrent, face and predictive validity. Concurrent validity means that high LPI scores are correlated with positive outcomes such as credibility or commitment to employees. Face validity means that the results make sense, while predictive validity means that the results can be used for predictions such as high or low performance. The results of the LPI, for instance, can distinguish between high-performing and low-performing leaders. Leadership behaviour as measured by the LPI is related to positive organisational outputs. These relationships have been found across industries and disciplines, in public and non-profit organisations as well as in the private sector, regardless of individual differences such as, gender, ethnicity, age and so forth. These findings are relatively consistent in countries around the world (Kouzes and Posner, 2003a; Kouzes and Posner, 2003b).

Results of the pilot-test of the LPI

The utilisation of the LPI instrument was tested prior to
further implementation. This study focused on a higher education service provider in South Africa with five delivery sites (campuses). The LPI questionnaire was used to collect data on the leadership practices of campus principals. The LPI survey included seven staff members (selected by the principal) as well as the principal’s manager who then completed the LPI (n = 40) questionnaire.

Table 5 below provides a summary of the LPI scores obtained from the five campuses of the higher education provider. In addition to the LPI mean scores for each campus, the mean scores of the five practices were also calculated. Although there were few variances in the scores, the lowest score was obtained in the leadership practice of “Enable others to act” while “Inspire a shared vision” obtained the highest score. It would therefore seem that to improve service quality, campus principals should start by addressing the practice of “Enable others to act” by fostering collaboration and strengthening others. The results of the survey are summarised in Table 5.

The data in the table support a better understanding of actual service leadership levels and how leadership levels differ between campuses.

### The SERVQUAL instrument

The strong relationship between service quality and effective leadership make SERVQUAL an ideal instrument to use for service-based leadership. Foster (2010) sees the value of SERVQUAL in its ability to identify several “gaps” in service delivery (service-leadership). Examples of these gaps are:

1. the gap between service quality specifications and the service that is actually provided
2. the gap between customer expectations and management’s perception of these expectations
3. the gap between management’s perception of what customers want and the specifications that management develop to provide the service.

The education service provider provided cooperation in terms of a high response rate of 336 (selected randomly out of a possible 1000 students) from one campus. The institution assisted the researchers with this electronic survey in terms of accessibility and administration of the data. The student’s perception of service delivery (P) versus his/her expected service score (E) was measured and the gap score is given as the difference between P and E. The primary direct service quality dimensions that were selected for the purposes of this exploratory investigation are: empathy, trust (and assurance), reliability and responsiveness. The data of the survey of this pilot test are provided in Table 6.

This utilization of this instrument indicated many possibilities. More service quality dimensions (for a service-leadership model) can be added, more campuses can participate and other unique leadership frameworks can be incorporated.

### CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Definitions of leadership, conventional leadership frameworks (and models) and misconceptions about leadership were reviewed because of the need to improve due to an ever increasing general need for strong leadership and service-based leadership for the demands of the new agile service economy.

The international pandemic in terms of a shortage of national and business leaders can easily be overcome if the leadership frameworks (or models) available can be deployed. There is certainly no shortage of leadership knowledge but rather a shortage of willing leaders adopting more powerful frameworks. If leadership is seen as complex then the time has come to get to grips with less number of frameworks, to simplify them and to deploy them. The purpose of this study was not to identify one single new leadership framework, but to explore new ones in the context of service-based leadership for service industries. Effective leadership has a strong service practice stating that if you can serve you can lead. Effective leaders are good servants and the context of this study was service-leadership, in-the-field leadership, servant-stewardship, service quality and service-based leadership frameworks. Empathy, creating mutual trust, reliability and responsiveness are some crucial service quality dimensions of service-leadership. Quality
of service (and the measurement of service quality) was therefore identified as the common denominator of most of the new leadership frameworks and directly related and applicable for the agile service economy. The three objectives of this study were achieved in terms of:

(A) Conventional leadership styles, leadership philosophies and leadership frameworks in the context of the need for leadership renewal and leadership in crisis were reviewed and explored. We concluded that there is much room for improvement and renewal because of the many misconceptions of leadership.

(B) New leadership philosophies (potential leadership frameworks or bodies of thought for authentic leadership) were identified and explored with a strong ‘service-leadership’ foundation for service quality in the service sector with reference to the in-the-field leadership style. Several of these frameworks (such as the AVL framework) indicate huge promise but need further study and validation.

(C) Explored measurement of service-leadership (by means of pilot tests) to provide insight (determine the values) to measuring service-leadership by means of two selected service-leadership instruments namely SERVQUAL and the LPI. It was concluded that a rich library of instruments are available with endless possibilities. These two instruments were pilot tested and it was shown (among other aspects) that current and new service leadership frameworks can be measured by such instruments.

The overall results of this study led to the hypothesis that the new AVL framework (among others identified) may become an established leadership model and it is
recommened that the OLE members (employed at service organisations) be targeted for the testing, identification and development of new leadership frameworks. The OLE membership of 350 of the world's leading service delivery organisations, serving 4500 operations and supply chain professionals can be a collective benchmark for new (also unconventional) service-based leadership models (such as AVL).
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