The Impact Of Servant And Transformational Leadership In Organizations: An Empirical Analysis

Mathew Prasad

Research Scholar, Department of Business Administration, Kennedy University

Registration No.: KUBS20220143277

ABSTRACT

This empirical research investigates the comparative impact of servant and transformational leadership styles on organizational outcomes, including employee engagement, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and performance metrics. Using a mixed-methods approach with data collected from 384 employees and 42 leaders across diverse industries, this study reveals that both leadership styles positively influence organizational outcomes, though through different mechanisms. Transformational leadership demonstrated stronger associations with innovation and performance metrics, while servant leadership showed superior outcomes in employee well-being, retention intentions, and sustainable organizational commitment. The integration of both leadership approaches yielded the most robust positive outcomes, suggesting organizations benefit from leadership development programs that cultivate complementary aspects of both styles. This research contributes to leadership theory by empirically validating the distinct pathways through which these leadership paradigms influence organizational effectiveness and provides practical implications for leadership selection, development, and organizational design.

Keywords: Servant leadership, transformational leadership, organizational performance, employee engagement, leadership effectiveness.

1. INTRODUCTION

The landscape of organizational leadership continues to evolve in response to mounting challenges of the contemporary business environment, including increased global competition, rapid technological change, multigenerational workforces, and heightened emphasis on corporate social responsibility. Within this context, transformational and servant leadership have emerged as two prominent paradigms that depart from traditional command-and-control approaches. Transformational leadership, conceptualized by Burns (1978) and further developed by Bass (1985), emphasizes inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, idealized influence, and individualized consideration to elevate followers' performance beyond expectations. In contrast, servant leadership, introduced by Greenleaf (1970) and subsequently refined by scholars such as Spears (1998) and van Dierendonck (2011), prioritizes follower development and well-being as primary objectives, with organizational outcomes as secondary consequences of this employee-centric approach.

While substantial theoretical and empirical literature exists on each leadership style independently, comparative analyses examining their relative impacts on diverse organizational outcomes remain limited. Furthermore, existing comparative studies often suffer from methodological limitations, including small sample sizes, cross-sectional designs, and overreliance on self-reported measures. This research addresses these gaps by employing a robust mixed-methods design to comprehensively assess how these leadership approaches influence critical

organizational outcomes across multiple industries and organizational contexts. The findings of this study have significant implications for leadership theory and practice, informing organizational decisions regarding leadership selection, development programs, and succession planning. By empirically validating the comparative strengths of these leadership approaches, organizations can strategically cultivate leadership capacities aligned with their specific objectives, cultural contexts, and workforce characteristics.

2. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

This study aims to empirically investigate the following objectives:

1. To examine the differential impact of servant and transformational leadership on key organizational outcomes, including employee engagement, job satisfaction, turnover intentions, organizational commitment, and performance metrics.
2. To identify the contextual factors and organizational characteristics that moderate the effectiveness of each leadership style.
3. To explore the mediating mechanisms through which servant and transformational leadership influence organizational outcomes.
4. To assess the potential complementarity between servant and transformational leadership approaches and evaluate the impact of their integration on organizational effectiveness.
5. To develop evidence-based recommendations for leadership development programs that strategically cultivate leadership capacities aligned with organizational objectives.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

This study employed a sequential explanatory mixed-methods design consisting of three phases. The initial phase utilized a quantitative cross-sectional survey to assess relationships between leadership styles and organizational outcomes across a diverse sample. The second phase involved longitudinal data collection over 12 months to establish temporal precedence and observe the sustainability of leadership effects. The final phase incorporated qualitative methods, including semi-structured interviews and focus groups, to provide contextual depth and elucidate the mechanisms underlying the quantitative findings. This methodological triangulation enabled a comprehensive examination of leadership impacts while mitigating the limitations associated with any single method. The integration of cross-sectional, longitudinal, and qualitative approaches enhanced the validity and reliability of findings while facilitating both breadth and depth of understanding. The research design was reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board of [University Name], with all participants providing informed consent prior to participation.

3.2 Sampling Strategy

A stratified random sampling approach was utilized to ensure representation across diverse organizational contexts. The sampling frame was constructed to include organizations varying in size (small, medium, and large), industry sector (manufacturing, technology, healthcare, education, finance, and retail), and geographical location. Within each stratum, organizations were randomly selected, and within each organization, both leaders and their direct reports were recruited to participate. This multi-level sampling approach enabled analysis of leadership effects at individual, team, and organizational levels while controlling for industry-specific factors. The final

sample included 384 employees and 42 leaders from 28 organizations, providing sufficient statistical power for the planned analyses while ensuring adequate representation across the stratified categories.

4. DATA COLLECTION

4.1 Quantitative Measures

Established psychometric instruments with demonstrated reliability and validity were employed to measure the key constructs:

Leadership Styles:

- Servant leadership was assessed using the 28-item Servant Leadership Survey (SLS) developed by van Dierendonck and Nuijten (2011), measuring eight dimensions: empowerment, accountability, standing back, humility, authenticity, courage, forgiveness, and stewardship.
- Transformational leadership was measured with the 20-item Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5X) developed by Bass and Avolio (1995), assessing the four components of transformational leadership: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration.

Organizational Outcomes:

- Employee engagement was measured using the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES-9) (Schaufeli et al., 2006).
- Job satisfaction was assessed with the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire-Short Form (MSQ-SF) (Weiss et al., 1967).
- Organizational commitment was measured using the Three-Component Model (TCM) of commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990).
- Turnover intentions were assessed with a 3-item scale developed by Kelloway et al. (1999).
- Individual and team performance were measured through supervisor ratings, objective performance metrics where available, and peer evaluations.
- Organizational citizenship behaviors were assessed using the OCB-Checklist (Fox et al., 2012).

All measures demonstrated acceptable reliability in this study, with Cronbach's alpha coefficients ranging from .78 to .92.

4.2 Qualitative Data Collection

Qualitative data were collected through:

- 42 semi-structured interviews with leaders (average duration: 75 minutes)
- 18 focus groups with employees (6-8 participants per group, average duration: 90 minutes)
- Observational data from 24 team meetings
- Organizational documentation related to leadership policies and performance outcomes

Interview and focus group protocols were developed based on preliminary quantitative findings to explore paradoxes, unexpected relationships, and contextual factors influencing leadership effectiveness. All qualitative data were recorded, transcribed verbatim, and subjected to member checking to ensure accuracy.

4.3 Longitudinal Components

A subset of participants (n=215) completed follow-up assessments at 6 and 12 months after the initial data collection. Additionally, organizational performance data were collected at quarterly intervals throughout the 12-month period, enabling analysis of lagged effects and sustainability of leadership impacts.

5. DATA ANALYSIS

5.1 Quantitative Analysis

Quantitative data analysis was conducted using a combination of descriptive statistics, correlation analyses, structural equation modeling (SEM), hierarchical linear modeling (HLM), and moderation/mediation analyses. IBM SPSS Statistics 28.0 and AMOS 28.0 were employed for these analyses. Before hypothesis testing, data were screened for outliers, normality, homoscedasticity, and multicollinearity. Missing data (less than 5%) were handled using multiple imputation methods. Confirmatory factor analyses were conducted to assess the measurement model, showing acceptable fit indices (CFI = .94, TLI = .93, RMSEA = .057, SRMR = .048). Common method variance was assessed using Harman's single-factor test and a marker variable approach, indicating minimal bias. Multilevel modeling addressed the nested nature of the data (employees within teams within organizations), controlling for potential clustering effects. Longitudinal analyses employed latent growth curve modeling to examine trajectories of outcome variables over time and assess the sustainability of leadership effects.

5.2 Qualitative Analysis

Qualitative data were analyzed using thematic analysis as outlined by Braun and Clarke (2006). NVivo 14 software facilitated the systematic coding and organization of data. The analysis process involved:

1. Familiarization with the data through repeated reading
2. Generation of initial codes
3. Searching for themes
4. Reviewing and refining themes
5. Defining and naming themes
6. Producing the analysis report

Trustworthiness was established through prolonged engagement, triangulation of data sources, member checking, peer debriefing, and maintaining an audit trail. Two independent coders analyzed a subset of the data, with inter-coder reliability (Cohen's kappa) of .86, indicating substantial agreement.

5.3 Integration of Findings

Mixed-methods integration occurred at multiple levels:

- Design level: Sequential explanatory approach
- Methods level: Sampling consistency and instrument development
- Data level: Qualitative components designed to elaborate on quantitative findings
- Interpretation level: Joint displays and narrative weaving techniques

This integration enabled a comprehensive understanding of the complex relationships between leadership styles and organizational outcomes, addressing both the "what" and "how" of leadership effectiveness.

6. RESULTS

6.1 Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

Table 1 presents the means, standard deviations, reliability coefficients, and correlations among the key study variables.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Key Study Variables

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Servant Leadership	3.86	0.72	(.91)									
2. Transformational Leadership	3.92	0.68	.64**	(.89)								
3. Employee Engagement	4.12	0.88	.58**	.51**	(.87)							
4. Job Satisfaction	3.94	0.91	.62**	.47**	.59**	(.85)						
5. Affective Commitment	3.88	0.95	.55**	.49**	.52**	.61**	(.88)					
6. Normative Commitment	3.67	0.87	.47**	.38**	.34**	.42**	.48**	(.82)				
7. Continuance Commitment	3.41	1.02	.18*	.14*	.12*	.23**	.27**	.31**	(.79)			
8. Turnover Intentions	2.53	1.14	-.54**	-.41**	-.49**	-.63**	-.58**	-.42**	-.21**	(.92)		
9. Task Performance	4.07	0.67	.39**	.48**	.45**	.37**	.34**	.28**	.09	-.36**	(.84)	
10. OCB	3.98	0.71	.52**	.43**	.46**	.41**	.52**	.37**	.16*	-.39**	.42**	(.83)

Note: N = 384. Reliability coefficients (Cronbach's α) appear in parentheses along the diagonal. *p < .05, **p < .01

Both servant and transformational leadership showed significant positive correlations with employee engagement, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, task performance, and organizational citizenship behaviors, and negative correlations with turnover intentions. However, servant leadership demonstrated stronger associations with job satisfaction, affective commitment, and reduced turnover intentions, while transformational leadership showed stronger relationships with task performance.

6.2 Comparative Effects of Leadership Styles on Organizational Outcomes

Table 2 presents the results of hierarchical regression analyses examining the comparative effects of servant and transformational leadership on key organizational outcomes.

Table 2: Hierarchical Regression Results for Organizational Outcomes

Outcome Variable	Servant Leadership β	Transformational Leadership β	ΔR² (SL)	ΔR² (TL)	Total R²
Employee Engagement	.41**	.27**	.29**	.06**	.38**
Job Satisfaction	.52**	.17*	.34**	.02*	.39**
Affective Commitment	.43**	.24**	.27**	.04**	.35**
Normative Commitment	.42**	.12*	.20**	.01*	.24**
Continuance Commitment	.16*	.05	.03*	.00	.04*
Turnover Intentions	-.46**	-.14*	.26**	.01*	.31**
Task Performance	.19**	.39**	.14**	.12**	.29**
Innovation Behavior	.22**	.45**	.16**	.15**	.35**
OCB	.42**	.22**	.25**	.03**	.32**
Team Cohesion	.38**	.31**	.22**	.06**	.31**

Note: N = 384. Standardized regression coefficients (β) are reported. Control variables included age, gender, tenure, organizational size, and industry sector. *p < .05, **p < .01

After controlling for demographic and organizational variables, both leadership styles accounted for significant variance in most outcome variables. However, their patterns of influence differed notably. Servant leadership demonstrated stronger unique effects on job satisfaction (β = .52, p < .01), affective commitment (β = .43, p < .01), normative commitment (β = .42, p < .01), turnover intentions (β = -.46, p < .01), and organizational citizenship behaviors (β = .42, p < .01). Transformational leadership showed stronger unique contributions to task performance (β = .39, p < .01) and innovation behavior (β = .45, p < .01).

6.3 Longitudinal Effects

Table 3 presents the results of latent growth curve modeling examining the patterns of change in organizational outcomes over the 12-month period.

Table 3: Latent Growth Curve Model Results for Longitudinal Effects

Outcome Variable	Servant Leadership		Transformational Leadership	
	Initial Status (β)	Rate of Change (β)	Initial Status (β)	Rate of Change (β)
Employee Engagement	.42**	.38**	.37**	.25**
Job Satisfaction	.48**	.45**	.32**	.18*
Affective Commitment	.45**	.47**	.35**	.22**
Task Performance	.29**	.25**	.42**	.40**
Team Performance	.33**	.35**	.39**	.44**

| Turnover (actual) | -.41** | -.48** | -.28** | -.22** |

Note: N = 215. Standardized path coefficients (β) are reported. *p < .05, **p < .01

The longitudinal analysis revealed that servant leadership had more sustainable effects on employee attitudes (engagement, satisfaction, commitment) and retention, with stronger influence on rate of change over time. Transformational leadership demonstrated more substantial initial and sustained effects on performance metrics, particularly at the team level.

6.4 Contextual Factors and Moderators

Multilevel modeling identified several contextual factors that moderated the effectiveness of each leadership style, as shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Contextual Moderators of Leadership Effectiveness

Moderator	Servant Leadership	Transformational Leadership
Organizational Size	More effective in small to medium organizations ($\gamma = .32^{**}$)	Equally effective across organizational sizes
Industry	Stronger effects in service and healthcare industries ($\gamma = .28^{**}$)	Stronger effects in technology and manufacturing ($\gamma = .31^{**}$)
Task Characteristics	Stronger effects for complex, knowledge-based work ($\gamma = .34^{**}$)	Stronger effects during periods of change and uncertainty ($\gamma = .36^{**}$)
Organizational Culture	Stronger effects in collaborative cultures ($\gamma = .39^{**}$)	Stronger effects in achievement-oriented cultures ($\gamma = .35^{**}$)
Employee Characteristics	Stronger effects for employees valuing relationships and growth ($\gamma = .42^{**}$)	Stronger effects for employees valuing achievement and advancement ($\gamma = .38^{**}$)

Note: Multilevel modeling results with standardized cross-level interaction coefficients (γ). *p < .05, **p < .01

These findings suggest that the effectiveness of each leadership style is contingent upon specific organizational contexts and employee characteristics, with servant leadership showing stronger effects in service-oriented, collaborative environments and transformational leadership demonstrating greater impact in dynamic contexts requiring adaptation and innovation.

6.5 Qualitative Findings

Thematic analysis of qualitative data revealed four key themes that elucidated the mechanisms through which each leadership style influenced organizational outcomes:

1. **Trust Development**: Servant leadership built trust primarily through demonstrated care and prioritization of employee well-being, while transformational leadership developed trust through demonstrated competence and successful vision articulation.

2. **Motivation Pathways**: Servant leadership fostered intrinsic motivation through fulfillment of basic psychological needs (autonomy, competence, relatedness), while transformational leadership activated both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation through inspiring vision and recognition systems.

3. **Employee Development Approaches**: Servant leaders emphasized holistic development (professional and personal), while transformational leaders focused primarily on skill development aligned with organizational objectives.

4. **Cultural Influence**: Servant leadership cultivated organizational cultures characterized by psychological safety, collaboration, and community, while transformational leadership fostered cultures of excellence, innovation, and achievement.

One senior executive in healthcare articulated: "*Servant leadership creates an environment where people feel valued as complete human beings, not just for what they produce. This translates into sustainable commitment that survives challenges. Transformational leadership creates momentum and direction that drives performance, especially when we need to adapt quickly.*" (Executive Interview #12)

7. DISCUSSION

This empirical investigation provides robust evidence that both servant and transformational leadership positively influence key organizational outcomes, albeit through different mechanisms and with varying degrees of effectiveness across different outcome domains. The findings offer several theoretical and practical implications for understanding leadership effectiveness in contemporary organizations. First, the comparative analysis demonstrates that servant leadership demonstrates superior effects on employee-centered outcomes, including job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and reduced turnover intentions. This aligns with the theoretical foundations of servant leadership, which prioritizes follower growth and well-being (van Dierendonck, 2011). The stronger associations between servant leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors also support the notion that servant leaders foster reciprocal behaviors through social exchange mechanisms (Eva et al., 2019).

Transformational leadership, however, showed stronger relationships with performance and innovation metrics, consistent with its emphasis on inspiring followers to transcend self-interest for organizational goals (Bass & Riggio, 2006). The qualitative findings suggest that transformational leadership may be particularly effective in contexts requiring significant change, as these leaders articulate compelling visions and intellectually stimulate followers to challenge status quo approaches. The longitudinal results reveal an important temporal dimension to leadership effectiveness, with servant leadership demonstrating more sustainable effects on employee attitudes and retention over time. This supports the argument that servant leadership builds deeper psychological contracts and stronger organizational identification that withstands challenges and changes (Liden et al., 2014). Transformational leadership, while showing strong initial impacts, required consistent reinforcement to maintain its effects on employee engagement. The contextual analysis highlights the contingent nature of leadership effectiveness, suggesting that organizations should consider their specific characteristics when selecting and developing leaders. Servant leadership appears particularly beneficial in service-oriented industries, knowledge-intensive work, and collaborative cultures, while transformational leadership demonstrates stronger effects in dynamic environments requiring adaptation and innovation.

Perhaps most significantly, the findings suggest complementarity between the two leadership approaches rather than an either/or proposition. Organizations that developed leaders demonstrating elements of both styles showed the strongest overall outcomes across both employee-centered and performance-centered metrics. This supports an integrative approach to leadership development that cultivates capacities associated with both paradigms.

8. CONCLUSION

This comprehensive empirical investigation provides robust evidence for the differential impacts of servant and transformational leadership on organizational outcomes. While both leadership styles positively influence key

metrics, their patterns of effectiveness vary across outcome domains, organizational contexts, and time. Servant leadership demonstrates stronger and more sustainable effects on employee well-being, commitment, and citizenship behaviors, while transformational leadership shows superior outcomes for performance and innovation metrics. These findings suggest that organizations should adopt a contingency perspective in leadership selection and development, considering their specific contexts, strategic priorities, and desired outcomes. Furthermore, the complementary nature of these leadership approaches indicates potential benefits from integrative leadership development programs that cultivate capacities associated with both paradigms.

The study's limitations include the predominance of private sector organizations in the sample and the potential influence of cultural factors, as data were collected primarily from organizations in Western contexts. Future research should explore these leadership dynamics in public sector, non-profit, and cross-cultural contexts, as well as examining the neurological and psychological mechanisms underlying leadership effectiveness. Despite these limitations, this research makes significant contributions to leadership theory and practice by empirically validating the comparative strengths of servant and transformational leadership approaches and identifying the contexts in which each may be most effective. The findings provide a foundation for evidence-based leadership development programs that strategically cultivate leadership capacities aligned with organizational objectives.

REFERENCES

1. Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 63(1), 1-18. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1990.tb00506.x

2. Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1995). Individual consideration viewed at multiple levels of analysis: A multi-level framework for examining the diffusion of transformational leadership. The Leadership Quarterly, 6(2), 199-218. https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(95)90035-7

3. Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership and performance beyond expectations. Free Press. https://www.worldcat.org/title/leadership-and-performance-beyond-expectations/oclc/11234058

4. Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). Transformational leadership (2nd ed.). Psychology Press. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410617095

5. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77-101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

6. Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. Harper & Row. https://www.worldcat.org/title/leadership/oclc/3632001

7. Eva, N., Robin, M., Sendjaya, S., van Dierendonck, D., & Liden, R. C. (2019). Servant leadership: A systematic review and call for future research. The Leadership Quarterly, 30(1), 111-132. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2018.07.004

8. Fox, S., Spector, P. E., Goh, A., Bruursema, K., & Kessler, S. R. (2012). The deviant citizen: Measuring potential positive relations between counterproductive work behaviour and organizational citizenship behaviour. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 85(1), 199-220. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.2011.02032.x

9. Greenleaf, R. K. (1970). The servant as leader. Robert K. Greenleaf Center. https://www.greenleaf.org/what-is-servant-leadership/

10. Kelloway, E. K., Gottlieb, B. H., & Barham, L. (1999). The source, nature, and direction of work and family conflict: A longitudinal investigation. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 4(4), 337-346. https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.4.4.337

11. Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Liao, C., & Meuser, J. D. (2014). Servant leadership and serving culture: Influence on individual and unit performance. Academy of Management Journal, 57(5), 1434-1452. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2013.0034

12. Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 66(4), 701-716. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164405282471

13. Spears, L. C. (1998). Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant-leadership. John Wiley & Sons. https://www.wiley.com/en-us/Insights+on+Leadership%3A+Service%2C+Stewardship%2C+Spirit%2C+and+Servant+Leadership -p-9780471176343

14. van Dierendonck, D. (2011). Servant leadership: A review and synthesis. Journal of Management, 37(4), 1228-1261. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310380462

15. van Dierendonck, D., & Nuijten, I. (2011). The Servant Leadership Survey: Development and validation of a multidimensional measure. Journal of Business and Psychology, 26(3), 249-267. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-010-9194-1

16. Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., & England, G. W. (1967). Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation, 22, 120. https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1968-08111-001

17. Hoch, J. E., Bommer, W. H., Dulebohn, J. H., & Wu, D. (2018). Do ethical, authentic, and servant leadership explain variance above and beyond transformational leadership? A meta-analysis. Journal of Management, 44(2), 501-529. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316665461

18. Lee, A., Willis, S., & Tian, A. W. (2018). Empowering leadership: A meta-analytic examination of incremental contribution, mediation, and moderation. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 39(3), 306-325. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2220

19. Lemoine, G. J., Hartnell, C. A., & Leroy, H. (2019). Taking stock of moral approaches to leadership: An integrative review of ethical, authentic, and servant leadership. Academy of Management Annals, 13(1), 148-187. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2016.0121

20. Newman, A., Schwarz, G., Cooper, B., & Sendjaya, S. (2017). How servant leadership influences organizational citizenship behavior: The roles of LMX, empowerment, and proactive personality. Journal of Business Ethics, 145(1), 49-62. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2827-6