



Does “the servant as leader” translate into Chinese? A cross-cultural meta-analysis of servant leadership

Aaron McCune Stein, Chris M. Bell & Yan Ai Min

To cite this article: Aaron McCune Stein, Chris M. Bell & Yan Ai Min (2019): Does “the servant as leader” translate into Chinese? A cross-cultural meta-analysis of servant leadership, European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, DOI: [10.1080/1359432X.2019.1703681](https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2019.1703681)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2019.1703681>



Published online: 24 Dec 2019.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 2



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Does “the servant as leader” translate into Chinese? A cross-cultural meta-analysis of servant leadership

Aaron McCune Stein ^a, Chris M. Bell^b and Yan Ai Min^a

^aSchool of Business, Central South University, Changsha, China; ^bSchulich School of Business, York University, Toronto, Canada

ABSTRACT

Servant leadership is a popular style of ethically-based leadership developed in the cultural context of the United States and other Anglo-Saxon (Anglo) countries with a similar culture and managerial context. However, much of the empirical research on this leadership style has been conducted in China, a country with very different cultural and managerial traditions. It is not known whether the results of research conducted in China can be integrated into a general theory of servant leadership. It is also unknown whether servant leadership, which is widely promoted as an effective leadership style in Anglo countries, will be equally effective for all employee outcomes in China. To answer these questions, we perform a meta-analysis of servant leadership research ($k = 112$, $n = 35,716$) which compares the effects of servant leadership on employees in China with its effects on employees in Anglo countries. Results show that there is no significant difference in effect sizes between Chinese and Anglo employees for job performance, organizational citizenship behaviour, creative behaviour, affective commitment, and job satisfaction. The effect of servant leadership on leader-member exchange may be stronger for Anglo employees. Implications for servant leadership theory and managerial practices in China are discussed.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 14 March 2019
Accepted 8 December 2019

KEYWORDS

Servant leadership; Cross-cultural leadership; China; Confucianism; Meta-analysis

Servant leadership is an emerging leadership style which focuses on how leaders can help their followers grow, develop, and succeed (Liden, Panaccio, Meuser, Jia, & Wayne, 2014). Although servant leaders are concerned with organizational performance, they consider meeting the needs of individual followers as their primary goal, which differentiates servant leadership from similar leadership styles such as transformational or ethical leadership (Van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011, 2014). The servant leadership style has received much attention in the management literature because research shows that followers respond positively to servant leadership with increased in-role and extra-role performance, engagement, and commitment (Chen, Zhu, & Zhou, 2015; Chiniara & Bentein, 2016; Van Dierendonck et al., 2014). Like most other leadership constructs, the definition and measurement of servant leadership were developed entirely in Western countries, primarily in the United States. Management researchers have long warned that management theories developed in the United States may not be completely applicable nor fully capture the nature of the construct as it exists in another culture (Liden, 2012; Zhang et al., 2012). This raises questions about how much we can infer from servant leadership research conducted in China, a country with a very different culture, economy, and business practices as compared to the United States and other nations of the Anglo-Saxon model. Notably, much of the servant leadership research published in English language journals has in fact been conducted in China. Indeed, over three times as many publications on servant leadership use Chinese samples rather than samples from any other non-US country (Eva, Robin, Sendjaya, van Dierendonck, & Liden, 2018). The authors of these articles either

make the unstated assumption that their results can generalize to servant leaders and their followers in any country (e.g. Hu & Liden, 2011) or relegate the cultural context to a brief mention in the limitations section (e.g. Bao, Li, & Zhao, 2018). This is important because the servant leadership literature may be integrating Chinese findings into a general theory without properly qualifying those observations. An interesting corollary to this is that Chinese researchers are blithely applying the American theory of servant leadership without considering how it may apply differently to the context of Chinese leaders and followers. Chinese journals have published over one hundred articles on servant leadership, the vast majority of which use scales developed in the United States. Although the question of how servant leadership may operate differently in China is fertile soil for indigenous scholarship (Zhang et al., 2012), it is not a question that Chinese scholars have pursued.

Answering this question also has great relevance for how both Chinese and expat managers are trained. Academic research often informs MBA curricula and corporate leadership training programmes (Hannah, Sumanth, Lester, & Cavaretta, 2014), so it is likely that the next generation of professional Chinese managers will be exposed to servant leadership. Expat managers in China also need to know whether servant leadership, which is widely promoted in the West, will be effective with Chinese subordinates (Mittal & Dorfman, 2012). Because the United States and other Anglo countries made up 16.38% of Chinese import and 24.97% of Chinese export activity in 2017 (World Bank, 2017), exploring the effectiveness of Servant Leadership in China has great practical implications for international companies on both sides.

Lee, Lyubovnikova, Tian, and Knight (2019) meta-analysis found that the cultural values of power distance and collectivism did not moderate the effects of servant leadership on most employee outcomes. This might seem to suggest that servant leadership would be as effective in China, a country often considered high in power distance and collectivism, as it is in the United States. However, this conclusion is far from a given. The Chinese leadership process is shaped by a rich variety of cultural and institutional forces including Confucian values, relationalism, and political ideology, and cannot be simply defined in terms of power distance and collectivism (Chen & Lee, 2008; Ma & Tsui, 2015). Indeed, the values and actions of modern Chinese often deviate from what would be expected of a high collectivism, high power distance culture (Wang & Liu, 2010; Warner, 2014). For instance, research has found that individualist values have a greater influence on Chinese well-being than collectivist values do (Steele & Lynch, 2013) and Chinese employees strongly favour rewards based on equity rather than equality (Bozionelos & Wang, 2007). The varied and often paradoxical factors shaping the management process in China have led scholars to start considering “management with Chinese characteristics” as a unique managerial context which can only be fully understood by indigenous research (Warner, 2014). Therefore, the question of whether servant leadership works the same way in China as it does in the West is still an unsettled question.

We attempt to shed insight into that debate with a meta-analysis of servant leadership research which compares the effects of servant leadership in China with its effects in the United States and other Anglo-Saxon countries that share a similar cultural heritage and management traditions. Our study differs from previous meta-analyses in two ways. First, we focus on comparing effect sizes in Chinese and Anglo studies, which other meta-analyses have not done. Second, we include Chinese-language research on servant leadership. This is crucial because the majority of servant leadership research conducted in China has been published to Chinese-language journals. Our research includes forty-five Chinese studies which have never appeared in any previous meta-analysis. Failing to include this research would cause serious bias in the results of a comparative meta-analysis such as ours (Sutton, 2005).

Our primary contribution towards leadership theory is utilizing our unique sample to compare the effects of servant leadership in China and Anglo-Saxon countries on employee in-role performance, organizational citizenship behaviours, creative work behaviours, affective commitment, job satisfaction, and leader-member exchange. Ours is the first study of any kind comparing the effects of servant leadership in China and any Anglo-Saxon country. Ours is also the first leadership meta-analysis to include the large amount of relevant research published in Chinese, which is essential when the research question concerns Chinese employees and leaders. Additionally, our research contributes to practice by giving native Chinese and expat managers guidance on whether servant leadership should be applied to Chinese employees in the same way as it is applied to Western ones.

Servant leadership

Servant leaders are those who feel the essence of leadership lies in serving followers by helping them develop professionally and personally. They build close relationships with followers by paying attention to their individual needs, strengths, and goals (Chiniara & Bentein, 2016). A servant leader also helps followers develop efficacy and mastery by providing personalized mentoring and empowering followers to complete tasks by themselves (Liden et al., 2014). As the name suggests, servant leaders see followers as equals and treat them in an egalitarian, respectful, and tolerant manner (Van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011). The main difference between servant leadership and similar leadership styles such as transformational leadership is that servant leaders consider their subordinates' interests first and organizational goals second (Eva et al., 2018; Van Dierendonck et al., 2014).

Servant leaders play an important role in the development of followers' ethical behaviour by serving as a role model of proper ethics and holding followers accountable for the consequences of their behaviour (Van Dierendonck, 2011). Creating an ethical climate in their organization is important to servant leaders because their goal in developing followers is to create positive value not only in followers' lives, but also for the entire organization and even the entire society (Lemoine, Hartnell, & Leroy, 2019). Because of this, servant leaders strive to instil the meaning and value of work in their followers (Sendjaya, Sarros, & Santora, 2008).

Like many popular leadership constructs, servant leadership was developed primarily in the United States. Robert Greenleaf introduced the fundamental concept in his essay entitled *The Servant as Leader* (Greenleaf, 1970) and his subsequent book (Greenleaf, 1977), in which he reflected on a 38-year career of internal management development and consulting at AT&T. Among the 16 servant leadership scales identified by Eva et al. (2018), 14 were developed and/or validated entirely in the United States and two in other Western countries (Australia, the United Kingdom, and the Netherlands). Although these measurement instruments were developed to be relevant for the management context of Western countries and the United States in particular, Chinese scholars have almost exclusively used these instruments in their servant leadership research, which is apparent when looking at which scales are used in our population of studies (see Table 1).

Culture and servant leadership

In this study we compare the effects of servant leadership in China with its effects in Anglo-Saxon (Anglo) countries. Although servant leadership was developed in the United States, it should function largely the same in other Anglo countries. This is because the members of these countries share a common historical origin and cultural values such as individual liberty, egalitarianism, tolerance, and rule by law instead of relationships (Ashkanasy, Trevor-Roberts, & Earnshaw, 2002). Through discriminant analysis, the GLOBE project found that the Anglo countries had similar enough scores on many cultural values to be grouped into a unique culture cluster (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004). Using data from the World Values

Table 1. Servant leadership measures used in Chinese and Anglo research.

Servant Leadership Measure	Region and Type of Study				
	Anglo (published)	Anglo (unpublished)	China (English-language journals)	China (Chinese-language journals)	China (unpublished, Chinese language)
Ehrhart (2004)	7		7	6	4
Liden, Wayne, Zhao, and Henderson (2008)	4	4	4	4	3
Van Dierendonck and Nuijten (2011)	3	4			
Liden et al. (2015)	2	2	5	4	
Barbuto and Wheeler (2006)	2	2	1	2	4
Laub (1999)		11			
Winston and Fields (2015)	1	2			
Wang (2010)				2	3
Wang, Ling, and Zhang (2009)				1	3
Other	2	3	1	3	6

Survey, Minkov and Hofstede (2012) found that even when considering within-country variation in cultural values, Anglo countries were much more closely aligned on cultural values than countries from any other cultural group.

In this study, we draw on implicit theories of leadership to explain why Chinese employees may react to servant leadership differently than Anglo employees do. This stream of leadership research holds that individuals have their own implicit theories, or cognitive schemas, about the attributes and behaviours that are characteristic of an effective leader (Shondrick, Dinh, & Lord, 2010). In order to determine whether their manager is a good leader or not, individuals will engage in a comparison process where their manager's actual attributes and behaviours are compared with the ideal attributes and behaviours in their leadership schema. The closer the match, the more that manager is seen as an effective leader (Epitropaki & Martin, 2005). Individuals' implicit leadership schemas are formed from their life experience and socialization. Since people in the same culture typically have similar life experiences and learn similar cultural values, House et al. (2004) have proposed a culturally endorsed implicit leadership theory. This theory holds that because of their shared experiences and values, members of the same culture will hold similar implicit schemas about which traits effective leaders should have (Dorfman, Hanges, & Brodbeck, 2004).

The GLOBE project found Chinese' respondents schema of an effective leader differed somewhat from that of Anglo respondents. Although both groups had similar scores for team-oriented and humane leadership, the Chinese expressed a lower preference for participative leader behaviour, which is behaviour aimed at encouraging subordinate participation in decision-making (Fu, Wu, Yang, & Ye, 2008). Chinese also expressed a markedly higher preference for self-protective leader behaviour, or behaviour aimed at maintaining the leader's power and status (Dorfman et al., 2004). These differences in leadership preferences have often been attributed to differences in the cultural values of individualism-collectivism and power distance (see Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010; House et al., 2004). Since servant leadership was developed in a low power distance and individualistic country, many scholars had assumed that it would not be as effective in high power distance, collectivistic countries like China (Eva et al., 2018).

A recent meta-analysis by Lee et al. (2019) has tested whether country-level individualism and power distance moderate the effects of servant leadership on employee outcomes. They concluded that for most outcomes, these cultural dimensions do not moderate the effectiveness of servant leadership. While these results are a very important piece of evidence showing that servant leadership can be effective in many different cultures, one can nevertheless not infer from them that servant leadership will work the same way in China as it does in Anglo countries, because there is much more to Chinese culture than the dimensions of collectivism and power distance. Although these concepts are useful in explaining some aspects of Chinese behaviour, a wide range of other cultural values shape the leadership and followership process in China. First, Confucian values, which are still widely adhered to in China, prescribe the appropriate relationship between superior and subordinate as one where the subordinate is dependent on the superior and should give the superior absolute obedience and deference (Fu et al., 2008; Nie & Lämsä, 2015). Second, many scholars have criticized the appropriateness of describing Chinese culture as collectivistic, noting that collectivism as it is defined in the cross-cultural management literature does not match with many aspects of Chinese culture (Huang, Bedford, & Zhang, 2018; Wang & Liu, 2010). Third, because of China's unique position as the only authoritarian state with a highly developed capitalist economy, modern Chinese have a mix of cultural values, being highly individualistic in the pursuit of wealth and status while maintaining conservative views about social and political issues (Steele & Lynch, 2013; Tang, Wang, & Zhang, 2017). It is probable that the implicit leadership schema of Chinese employees has attributes in common with the schema of Anglo employees, as well as attributes unique to the Chinese cultural and managerial environment.

In the following sections, we first outline the reasons servant leadership may not work as well in China as in Anglo countries, followed by the reasons that it may be very effective for Chinese employees. We then present and test competing hypotheses about whether servant leadership has differential effects on Anglo and Chinese employees.

Why servant leadership may be less effective in China

There are several reasons why servant leader behaviour may not match Chinese employees' preferences. First, scholars have long contended that Chinese prefer a directive

leadership style. This preference may be due to the influence of Confucianism, which stresses that effective superior-subordinate relations can only occur when the superior gives direction and the subordinate accepts it unquestioningly (Chen & Lee, 2008; Nie & Lämsä, 2015). Political indoctrination campaigns from primary school through university have also instilled in Chinese people the belief that their leaders (in the Communist Party) know best and that social change can only be enacted by leaders (Lu and Shi, 2015). An early study by Dorfman et al. (1997) found that directive leadership was positively related to Taiwanese employees' satisfaction with their supervisor and organizational commitment, while no such effects were found on American employees. More recent research has showed that a controlling managerial style can actually increase Chinese employees' feelings of empowerment (Zhang, Chen, Chen, & Ang, 2014). Li and Nesbit (2014) have found that unlike in the West, in China top-down instruction is seen as a "soft HRM" practice which employees readily accept. Since directive leadership is not a typical behaviour of servant leadership, servant leaders may not fit this aspect of the Chinese leadership ideal.

Chinese employees also show less preference for participative leadership, or leader behaviours which involve employees in the decision-making process. Su and Wright (2012) have proposed that because of traditional Chinese values such as desire to preserve harmony in the workplace and deference to authority, Chinese employees are reluctant to express their opinions at work, which makes participative management practices much less effective in China. There is some research to support this view. The GLOBE project found that Chinese respondents rated participative leadership as a less effective behaviour than Anglos did (Dorfman et al., 2004; Fu et al., 2008). Recently, Li et al. (2018) found that for Chinese management consulting teams, directive leadership was significantly related to team efficiency, while participative leadership was not. This implies that delegating decision-making power to employees and encouraging them to act independently, which are key aspects of servant leadership, may not be as endorsed by Chinese employees as they are by Anglo employees.

Finally, Chinese believe that a leader's higher status should be apparent. Nie and Lämsä (2015) have proposed that because Confucianism stresses respect for authority, Chinese employees have greater respect for managers' positional power than Westerners do. In their qualitative research on Chinese mentor-mentee dyads, Zhou, Lapointe, and Zhou (2019) discovered that mentees felt they should be deferent and obedient to their mentor, even going so far as to consider the mentor a parental figure. From a national-level perspective, the GLOBE study found that Chinese view face-saving and status-conscious leader behaviours neutrally, while Anglos view them negatively (Dorfman et al., 2004; Fu et al., 2008). Servant leaders typically try to reduce the status differential between themselves and their followers, and some conceptualizations of servant leadership have even proposed that they "treat all people with radical equality" (Sendjaya et al., 2008, p. 407). Since Chinese respect authority and expect leaders to have higher knowledge and status, they may not view a servant leader as a prototypical leader.

Why servant leadership may be an effective leadership style in China

Despite the cultural differences between China and Anglo societies, there are some reasons why servant leadership may be just as effective in China. In traditional Chinese culture, the organization is seen as an extension of the family, with the leader playing a paternalistic role (Chen & Lee, 2008; Liden, 2012). Chinese paternalistic leaders require their employees to be obedient, but also have an obligation to treat their employees with benevolence and take care of their needs (Chen, Eberly, Chiang, Farh, & Cheng, 2014). This benevolence stems from paternalism's roots in Confucian ethics, wherein treating subordinates well is a mandate (Ma & Tsui, 2015). Modern Chinese managers still hold these values: in the GLOBE survey, "humane oriented" behaviours such as showing concern and being tolerant of subordinates were at least as valued by Chinese managers as by Anglo managers (Fu et al., 2008; Kabasakal & Bodur, 2004). The philosophy of servant leadership emphasizes that leaders not only provide work resources to followers, but also treat them with empathy and tolerance (Sendjaya et al., 2008; Van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011). These aspects of servant leadership match the Chinese concept of benevolent leadership and should be well-received by Chinese employees.

Besides benevolence to subordinates, displaying integrity is highly valued by Chinese managers, just as it is by Anglo managers. When surveyed about the qualities effective leaders should have, Chinese rank moral integrity at the top of the list (Hofstede et al., 2010). Part of traditional Chinese leadership is acting with virtue and modelling the correct behaviours for subordinates (Chen et al., 2014). As servant leadership is an ethically-based form of leadership, this style of leadership may be welcomed by Chinese employees. Some studies in the Chinese context have demonstrated that Chinese servant leaders are effective role models of ethical work behaviour, including customer service behaviours and prosocial behaviour towards co-workers (Chen et al., 2015; Zou, Tian, & Liu, 2015).

Testing different perspectives on servant leadership in China

Considering the arguments presented above, servant leadership may be less, equally, or even more effective in China compared to the West. Van Dierendonck and Nuijten (2011) have proposed that servant leadership behaviours may be divided into two broad categories: those relating to leadership, and those related to serving followers. Previous cross-cultural leadership research seems to suggest that Chinese may desire different behaviours on the leader side, but welcome the servant aspect in the same manner as their Anglo counterparts do. Indeed, much research indicates that servant leadership has significant, positive effects on employee outcomes like job performance, citizenship behaviours, and organizational commitment in China (Chen et al., 2015; Miao, Newman, Schwarz, & Xu, 2014; Wang et al., 2018b). However, no research has compared the magnitude of these effects in Chinese and Western contexts. In order to do this, we conduct several meta-analyses to test competing hypotheses regarding the differential effects of servant leadership on Chinese and Anglo

employee outcomes. Behavioural outcomes in our analyses include in-role job performance and organizational citizenship behaviours (OCBs), which are two primary dimensions of employee performance (Levy, 2009). Due to the relatively large number of studies examining how servant leaders influence employee creative behaviour, we were also able to include this outcome in our analysis. For employee attitudes, we include job satisfaction and affective organizational commitment, two attitudes which have received extensive attention in organizational research due to their large role in determining employee behaviour (Judge & Kammeyer-Mueller, 2012). Finally, we include LMX because research on every leadership style has positioned LMX as a crucial mediator in the relationship between leadership behaviours and employee outcomes (Gottfredson & Aguinis, 2017).

Hypotheses:

Servant leadership has a weaker (H1a-f)/statistically equivalent (H2a-f)/stronger (H3a-f) relationship with: a. job performance b. organizational citizenship behaviours c. creative behaviours d. affective commitment e. job satisfaction f. leader-member exchange for Chinese employees compared to Anglo employees.

Method

Literature search

The first step of our English language literature search was to perform keyword searches in the Web of Science, Google Scholar, and all ProQuest databases. The keywords used were *servant leadership* and one of the following terms related to our correlates of interest: *citizenship behaviour*, *in-role*, *extra-role*, *performance*, *commitment*, *satisfaction*, *LMX*, *leader-member exchange*, *innovat**, and *creat**. Second, we examined the citations of the servant leadership reviews written by Van Dierendonck (2011), Parris and Peachey (2013), and Eva et al. (2018). Third, we performed a search of the two journals dedicated exclusively to servant leadership, *Servant Leadership: Theory and Practice* and *The International Journal of Servant Leadership*. Fourth, we searched the conference proceedings of the Academy of Management, Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, and the European Association of Work and Organizational Psychology to identify unpublished studies. Attempts were made to contact authors of all conference papers found. Fifth, we searched for Chinese language literature using the China National Knowledge Infrastructure (<http://www.cnki.net>), a national database supported by China's Ministry of Education which contains virtually all articles published in Chinese journals as well as a large number of graduate theses (Li, 2010). There were no restrictions on publication year, but studies published in languages other than English and Chinese were excluded. During this initial literature search we only saved studies that included correlations between variables, and 230 studies were identified in this way.

Study inclusion criteria and coding

The initial pool of studies was narrowed down by excluding those that did not include a sample size. As we were interested only in workplace outcomes, studies conducted with samples

from churches or volunteer organizations were removed. Studies that aggregated outcome variables to the team or department level were also removed. To ensure we only measured the affective type of organizational commitment, following Riketta (2002) we only included studies using scales specifically measuring this type of commitment, such as Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993) Affective Commitment Scale and Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire. We followed the method of Ng & Feldman, 2013, Ng & Feldman, 2012) for the employee outcome of creative behaviour and included studies that measured both "creative behaviour" and "innovative behaviour," considering that creativity is a crucial component of innovative behaviour. Because many studies focused specifically on servant leadership in the service industry, measures of service performance (e.g. Liao & Chuang, 2004) and OCBs in a service context (e.g. Dimitriades, 2007) were considered as measures of job performance and OCBs, respectively. After these steps, we were left with 116 independent samples from 112 studies.

Studies were coded as "Anglo" when they were conducted in one of the countries included in the Anglo-Saxon culture cluster as identified by the GLOBE project. These countries included the United States (45), Canada (3), the United Kingdom (1), and New Zealand (1). No studies from the other Anglo nations of Ireland, Australia, or South Africa were found that included our correlates of interest. In total our analysis included 22 published and 28 unpublished Anglo studies. Studies were categorized as "Chinese" when they were conducted in the People's Republic of China, Hong Kong, Macau, or Singapore; however there was only one study each from the latter three regions. In total our analysis included 39 published and 24 unpublished Chinese studies.

All studies were coded by publication status. Studies including employee behaviour (job performance, OCBs, and creativity) were coded according to whether the behaviour was self- or other-rated. The first author and two Canadian students coded all English-language studies, reaching 94% agreement. Chinese-language studies were coded by the first author and several Chinese students, reaching 96% agreement. All disagreements about coding were resolved through discussion between the authors and coders.

Meta-analytic methods

We first conducted separate meta-analyses to determine the estimated true score correlation (ρ) between servant leadership and its outcomes in Anglo and Chinese groups. A 95% confidence interval was also calculated to show the precision of this estimate. Second, we used meta-regression to test whether a significant difference exists between the estimated correlations in Anglo and Chinese groups. Meta-regression is a method used to determine whether study-level covariates have a significant relationship with the effect size of studies. In a meta-regression, the regression coefficient represents how many units the dependent variable (effect size) will change for each unit change in the independent variable (for continuous covariates) or for each level of the independent variable (for categorical covariates). The statistical significance of the regression coefficient is used to determine whether the covariate is

a significant moderator of the effect size in question (Borenstein, Hedges, Higgins, & Rothstein, 2009).

We utilized the “Morris” estimator developed by Brannick, Potter, Benitez, and Morris (2019). In this approach, individual correlations are corrected for unreliability in the predictor and criterion. Studies are weighted by combining the individual within-study variance with an overall estimate of the random effects variance component. In their simulations, Brannick and colleagues demonstrated that this method produces more accurate estimates of the mean and confidence intervals than the commonly-used Schmidt and Hunter (2015) and Borenstein et al. (2009) methods, while avoiding the disadvantages of each method.

In our study, the use of meta-regression is basically analogous to a subgroup comparison or ANOVA. Although meta-regression is commonly used with continuous variables, this method works equally well with categorical variables, such as cultural membership in our study (Tipton, Pustejovsky, & Ahmadi, 2019). There are two reasons we use the regression method instead of subgroup comparisons. The first is that meta-regression allows us to pool the variance estimates of our two subgroups instead of estimating them separately. Based on the results of their simulation study, Rubio-Aparicio et al. (2019) recommended that in mixed-effects models with categorical moderators, variance estimates should be pooled, especially when the overall number of studies is small, which is the case in our study. The second reason is that conducting meta-regressions with the metafor package for R (Viechtbauer, 2010) allows us to utilize the Knapp and Hartung (2003) correction for estimating the standard error of regression coefficients. This method is considered a best practice for meta-regression (Tipton et al., 2019) and reduces Type 1 error rates compared to Borenstein et al. (2009) widely-used subgroup comparison method (Rubio-Aparicio et al., 2019). In our analyses, the random-effects variance component was calculated using the restricted maximum likelihood estimator, which performs better than other estimators when the number of studies is small (Gonzalez-Mulé & Aguinis, 2018).

If the reliability of variables was not reported, we used the average reliability across all studies for reliability corrections. In the interest of using the most accurate estimates of average reliability, average values from a larger meta-analysis ($K = 152$) which includes all of our studies were used. One of the studies including job satisfaction used a single-item measure of satisfaction. Following the approach used by Wanous, Reichers, and Hudy (1997), we estimated the reliability of this measure at 0.70. Objective measures of job performance were not corrected for unreliability because they are relatively unbiased and estimating the reliability of these measures is difficult (Martin, Guillaume, Thomas, Lee, & Epitropaki, 2016).

Many studies did not report a single correlation between servant leadership and the outcome but did report correlations between multiple dimensions of servant leadership and an outcome variable or between servant leadership and multiple dimensions of an outcome variable. In these cases, a composite correlation was made according to the method of Schmidt and Hunter (2015, pp. 442–446). In some cases there was not enough information given to make a composite, so we simply averaged the correlations of each dimension with the outcome variable.

Results

Hypotheses 1a-f, 2a-f, and 3a-f predict that the effect size of servant leadership on employee outcomes will be smaller, the same size, or larger for Chinese employees than for Anglo employees, respectively. In order to test these competing hypotheses, we entered the culture in which the study was conducted as a categorical (dummy) variable in a mixed-effects meta-regression model. Specifically, this variable takes a value of “0” if the study was conducted in an Anglo society or “1” if it was conducted in a Chinese society. When the sign of this coefficient is positive, it means that the Chinese score is estimated to be higher than the Western score, and vice versa for a negative sign. The value of the coefficient is merely an estimate given by the software and may not equal the exact difference between Anglo and Chinese estimated true score correlations. Instead, we use the p -value produced by the Knapp and Hartung (2003) t -test as our criterion to determine whether or not the dummy variable representing China is a significant moderator of the overall effect size. In other words, if the p value associated with a regression coefficient is less than 0.05, then cultural membership is a significant moderator of servant leadership’s effects.

Results of our analysis are displayed in Table 2. For the outcomes of job performance, OCBs, creative behaviour, affective commitment, and job satisfaction, the p -values of the regression coefficient are all very large, indicating that belonging to the Chinese group has no significant influence on effect sizes. Therefore, hypotheses 2a-e were conclusively supported by our results. This means that from a statistical standpoint, servant leadership had effects of equal magnitude for Anglo and Chinese employees on five of our six outcomes.

The Anglo effect size for LMX was larger and this difference was marginally significant at the $p = 0.06$ level. This means that Hypothesis 1f (servant leadership has stronger effects on LMX in Anglo countries) appears to be supported by our initial results. However, we considered the possibility that different scores for LMX may be caused by the nature of the studies analysed. In two of the four Anglo studies, a composite correlation was calculated using servant leadership dimensions that

Table 2. Meta-analysis and meta-regression results.

Outcome	Group	K	N	ρ	CI	I^2	β	p-value
OCB	Anglo	8	1284	0.43	[0.35, 0.52]	32.39%	0.036	0.63
	China	23	7318	0.46	[0.37, 0.54]	92.08%		
JP	Anglo	9	2161	0.29	[0.15, 0.43]	84.96%	0.032	0.66
	China	19	6755	0.32	[0.24, 0.40]	89.09%		
CB	Anglo	6	2455	0.31	[0.09, 0.53]	93.54%	−0.023	0.78
	China	12	4496	0.29	[0.20, 0.38]	86.40%		
AC	Anglo	19	5459	0.55	[0.44, 0.67]	95.13%	−0.011	0.91
	China	8	2337	0.54	[0.37, 0.72]	94.71%		
JS	Anglo	25	6449	0.65	[0.58, 0.72]	89.47%	0.035	0.54
	China	11	5416	0.68	[0.60, 0.76]	89.58%		
LMX (CE)	Anglo	4	717	0.80	[0.64, 0.96]	69.86%	−0.153	0.24
	China	15	4323	0.66	[0.53, 0.79]	97.08%		
LMX	Anglo	4	717	0.90	[0.89, 0.91]	0.00%	−0.244	0.06
	China	15	4323	0.66	[0.53, 0.79]	97.27%		

Note. OCB = organizational citizenship behaviour, JP = in-role job performance, CB = creative behaviour, AC = affective commitment, JS = job satisfaction, LMX CE = conservative estimate of leader-member exchange. CI = 95% confidence interval around the estimate of the true score effect size (ρ). β is the regression coefficient of the dummy variable that represents cultural membership. p-value is the corresponding p value of each regression coefficient.

had unusually low correlations between them. Due to the way the composite is calculated, the lower these inter-correlations are, the larger the composite estimate and its upward correction for unreliability will be (see Schmidt & Hunter, 2015, pp. 442–446 for details). This results in an estimated correlation between servant leadership and LMX of 0.90, which we believe is unrealistically high. In contrast, the Chinese LMX studies did not require any composite correlations. To see whether this affected our results, we made a conservative estimate of the Anglo effect size by taking the average correlation of each servant leadership dimension with LMX and average reliability of each dimension. When using this estimate, the regression coefficient is no longer significant. This means that we are unable to say with certainty whether the effect of servant leadership on LMX is really stronger for Anglo employees or whether this is a statistical artefact.

To measure homogeneity in our meta-analyses, we computed the I^2 statistic, which is the percentage of variance due to real differences in population effects rather than sampling error (Kepes, McDaniel, Brannick, & Banks, 2013). Borenstein, Higgins, Hedges, and Rothstein (2017) have proposed that I^2 values of 25%, 50%, and 75% represent small, moderate, and large levels of heterogeneity. From Table 2 it is clear that even within cultural groups, most of our estimated effect sizes have large amounts of heterogeneity, indicating that many other moderators of these effects exist (Kepes et al., 2013).

Robustness checks

Supplementary analysis of higher-quality studies

Many experts have pointed out that including methodologically weak studies in a meta-analysis increases heterogeneity and reduces accuracy in the estimation of ρ (Aguinis, Pierce, Bosco, Dalton, & Dalton, 2011; Schmidt & Hunter, 2015). To identify how these low-quality studies affected our results, we conducted a second meta-analysis using higher quality studies. If the pattern of results we observe in the main analysis remains the same when only higher quality studies are included, this provides strong evidence that these results are robust and stable (Kepes et al., 2013). We only used objective study features to determine which studies could be considered higher quality (Aguinis et al., 2011). The first criterion was publication in an academic journal. The second criterion was that job performance, OCBs, and creative behaviour were other-rated. We had hoped to include only studies that temporally separated measurement of servant leadership and employee attitudes, as this is an effective measure to reduce common method bias for self-reported attitudinal variables (Johnson, Rosen, & Djurdjevic, 2011). However, this was not possible because too few studies took this measure.

Methodological study features (self vs. other ratings, published vs. unpublished) are typically included as additional covariates in meta-regression analysis. We chose not to do this for two reasons. First, these have been explored as moderators in other meta-analyses (e.g. Lee et al., 2019) and are not the focus of this study. Second, including these as covariates would reduce the statistical power available to detect the moderating effect that is the focus of our study. Unfortunately, there were only two

higher-quality studies for the Anglo creative behaviour group, which is below Schmidt and Hunter (2015) commonly-used standard that a meta-analysis should include at least three studies, leaving us unable to include this outcome in our analysis.

Results of this supplementary analysis are displayed in Table 3. None of the regression coefficients are significant at less than $p < 0.05$, except for the non-conservative estimate of LMX. This pattern of significance is the same as that found in our main analysis, indicating that our analysis is relatively robust to the effects of including studies of low methodological quality. Additionally, heterogeneity in most subgroups remained high, which indicates that methodological factors were not responsible for most of the variance in our effect sizes.

Schmidt-Hunter meta-analysis

An alternative meta-analysis method is the Schmidt-Hunter method, which is often used in psychometric meta-analysis. Unlike the Brannick et al. (2019) method we used, the Schmidt and Hunter (2015) method does not incorporate a random effects variance component into the weights of individual study effect sizes. This has the consequence of increasing differences in weighted effect sizes when the random effects variance is large and number of studies is small, as is the case in our meta-analyses (Brannick et al., 2019; Kepes et al., 2013). This implies that using the Schmidt-Hunter method would result in a wider gap between Anglo and Chinese effect size estimates and possibly lead to the discovery of significant moderating effects.

Table 3. Meta-analysis and meta-regression results for higher-quality studies.

Outcome	Group	K	N	ρ	CI	I^2	β	p-value
OCB	Anglo	4	570	0.41	[0.18, 0.64]	59.26%	−0.019	0.87
	China	9	3117	0.38	[0.23, 0.53]	92.30%		
JP	Anglo	4	614	0.29	[0.19, 0.38]	0.00%	0.015	0.89
	China	9	3800	0.30	[0.15, 0.44]	92.36%		
AC	Anglo	10	4159	0.59	[0.49, 0.69]	90.97%	−0.065	0.45
	China	4	1208	0.53	[0.31, 0.75]	89.25%		
JS	Anglo	6	3932	0.49	[0.31, 0.67]	94.23%	0.157	0.07
	China	8	4365	0.65	[0.54, 0.75]	88.14%		
LMX (CE)	Anglo	4	717	0.80	[0.64, 0.96]	68.66%	−0.199	0.11
	China	9	2690	0.61	[0.45, 0.77]	96.42%		
LMX	Anglo	4	717	0.90	[0.89, 0.91]	0.00%	−0.291	0.02
	China	9	2690	0.61	[0.45, 0.78]	96.74%		

Note. OCB = organizational citizenship behaviour, JP = in-role job performance, CB = creative behaviour, AC = affective commitment, JS = job satisfaction, LMX CE = conservative estimate of leader-member exchange. CI = 95% confidence interval around the estimate of the true score effect size (ρ). β is the regression coefficient of the dummy variable that represents cultural membership. p-value is the corresponding p value of each regression coefficient.

Table 4. Schmidt-Hunter meta-analysis results.

Variable	ρ Anglo	ρ China	t-value	Significant difference
OCB	0.44	0.47	0.75 (29)	NO
In-Role Performance	0.27	0.30	.57 (26)	NO
Creative Behaviours	0.45	0.30	1.52 (16)	NO
Affective Commitment	0.6	0.52	0.97 (25)	NO
Job Satisfaction	0.54	0.64	1.96 (34)	NO
LMX	0.9	0.68	4.06 (17)	YES
LMX (conservative)	0.79	0.68	1.78 (17)	NO

Note. ρ Anglo = estimated population correlation in Anglo studies subgroup; ρ China = estimated population correlation in Chinese studies subgroup. Significant difference results reflect a t statistic that is significant at $p < 0.05$ (two-tailed).

To test this possibility, we replicated our meta-analysis using the methods of Schmidt and Hunter (2015). The results of this analysis are displayed in Table 4. To determine whether there was a significant difference between Chinese and Anglo groups, we used the *t*-test method proposed by Aguinis, Sturman, and Pierce (2008, p. 16). Summary results from this meta-analysis are displayed in Table 3, and full results are available on request from the authors. As expected, there is a larger difference between effect sizes, especially for job satisfaction and creative behaviour. However, except for LMX, none of these differences was significant at less than $p = 0.05$. These results indicate our conclusion that servant leadership is equally effective in China as in Anglo countries is not sensitive to the choice of meta-analytic method used.

Publication bias

We tested for publication bias using the best practice methods described in Aguinis et al. (2011) and Kepes et al. (2013). The distribution of study effect sizes was plotted with the standardized effect size on the horizontal axis and standard error on the vertical axis, as recommended by Sterne, Becker, and Egger (2005) and Kepes et al. (2013). Then, the Egger regression test (Egger, Smith, Schneider, & Minder, 1997) was used to determine whether the distribution of sample effect sizes is asymmetrical. For our outcomes of OCB and innovative behaviour, this test was significant. However, an examination of the funnel plots showed that these distributions presented with more studies on the lower left than on the lower right. This kind of asymmetry is the opposite of the way that publication bias would be expected to present (Duval, 2005), so we can conclude that publication bias is not a serious concern in our study.

Discussion

Our research set out to answer the question of whether servant leadership is as effective in China as it is in the Anglo-Saxon cultural context for which it was originally developed. We answered this question through a meta-analysis of servant leadership research conducted in Anglo countries and in China. Results showed that the estimated true score correlations between servant leadership and job performance, OCBs, creative behaviour, satisfaction, and affective commitment were not significantly different between Chinese and Anglo research, while servant leadership had a stronger effect on LMX in the Anglo group.

In order to examine the robustness of our results, a secondary analysis was conducted which excluded unpublished studies and studies where behaviour was self-rated. In this analysis the pattern of significant and non-significant differences was almost identical to that in our main analysis. We also found the same pattern of significance using an alternative meta-analytic method which is more likely to find a significant difference between subgroups. These alternative analyses provide some evidence that our research findings regarding the lack of differences between servant leadership in Chinese and Anglo cultures are robust.

Theoretical implications and directions for future research

Our research contributes to the leadership literature by answering the open question of whether servant leadership has similar effects on Chinese employees as it does on employees in the United States and similar Anglo-Saxon cultures. Management and leadership research in China has generally taken one of two opposing perspectives (Barney & Zhang, 2009). The first is that Western leadership theories are adequate, with minimal or no modification, to explain the motivation and behaviour of Chinese workers. The other is that due to unique characteristics of Chinese culture, Western leadership theories are inadequate to fully explain the behaviour of Chinese employees (Chen & Lee, 2008), or even that Western theories “contribute very limited knowledge and may sometimes misrepresent the leader-member relationship in the non-Western context” (Zhang et al., 2012, p. 1065). Although many servant leadership studies have been conducted in China, very few have even questioned which of these two perspectives applies to servant leadership. Because of their intense publication pressure, Chinese management scholars have typically adopted Western constructs wholesale and used them in deductive quantitative research because this is seen as the quickest and easiest way to conduct research (Barney & Zhang, 2009; Honig et al., 2018). The result of this trend is that leadership research conducted in China, whether by foreign or native scholars, has glossed over the cultural context and assumes that the results can be generalized to servant leaders and their followers in any country. Previous scholars have raised concerns about this practice (Tsui, 2009). Nevertheless, our findings imply that the results of research conducted in China can be applied to the development of a general, universal theory of servant leadership.

Our analysis shows that servant leadership is very effective in China. However, it does not reveal exactly why this is so. Some mediating mechanisms are likely to be the same across cultures, such as LMX, which recent research suggests may be the primary mechanism through which all leader behaviours influence employees (Gottfredson & Aguinis, 2017). In support of this, Lee et al. (2019) found that LMX was the strongest mediator of servant leadership's effects. Although our results show LMX may have a slightly stronger effect on Anglo than on Chinese employees, we believe LMX will also be a primary mediating mechanism in China. Because China has a relational culture, Chinese employees place great importance on building a high-quality exchange relationship with their leader, and respond to LMX with positive attitudes and behaviours (Chen, Friedman, Yu, Fang, & Lu, 2009; Hwang, 2000; Nie & Lämsä, 2015).

However, some mediating mechanisms are likely to be stronger in one culture than in the other. Research on indigenous Chinese leadership provides some hints about which mediators might be more influential for Chinese workers, although these hints are not very clear. For example, research on traditional Chinese leadership has stressed felt obligation as the mechanism through which leader benevolence increases employee effort (Chen et al., 2014; Chen, Tsui, & Farh, 2002). Similarly, the literature on workplace *guanxi* (the Chinese concept of personal relationships) stresses reciprocal obligations between supervisor and subordinate (Chen, Chen, & Huang, 2013). However, social

exchange relationships are prevalent in every culture (Liden, Sparrowe, & Wayne, 1997) and social exchange has been used as the theoretical basis for many servant leadership studies conducted in the United States and other Anglo countries. It is unclear how the obligations felt by Chinese employees to repay their supervisor's provision of support and resources are different than those felt by Anglo employees. Another mediator that may be more powerful for Chinese employees is affective trust. Some Chinese scholars have proposed that the difference between the American concept of LMX and the Chinese concept of *guanxi* is that LMX is "an equity-matching relationship, where contribution and competence, not feelings, serve as the key components" (Nie & Lämsä, 2015, p. 856), but an employee's affective feelings for his or her boss are a necessary part of high-quality *guanxi* (Chen et al., 2013). This suggests that when a servant leader provisions benefits to employees, a Chinese employee might react by developing affective trust for that leader, while an Anglo employee's trust would be more cognitively based (McAllister, 1995). However, Anglo scholars have also proposed that affect is an essential part of an employee's relationship with his or her leader, and affect is a dimension of the widely-used LMX-MDM scale (Law, Wang, & Hui, 2010; Liden & Maslyn, 1998). Clearly more research is needed to explain how Chinese employees are motivated by kind and benevolent leaders in a way that Anglo employees are not.

Besides differential mediating mechanisms leading to similar outcomes, we should consider other possible explanations for our results. One of these stems from a deficiency of doing research based on frameworks of culture dimensions or values: these values are not static (Gelfand, Aycan, Erez, & Leung, 2017; Morris, Chiu, & Liu, 2015). It is possible that because of the influence of demographic change, economic reform, and globalization in China, the role of traditional Chinese values in the manager-subordinate relationship has declined to the point where this relationship operates much the same as it does in Anglo countries. Chinese firms have widely adopted Western human resource practices in order to increase the fairness and effectiveness of selection, appraisal, promotion, and rewards management (Chen, Su, & Zeng, 2016; Warner, 2014). In modern Chinese companies many of these crucial HR decisions are made according to rules and regulations instead of managerial whims, which has reduced the influence of Chinese cultural values on these aspects of employees' work life. Additionally, the work values of younger Chinese employees are shifting towards those of their Anglo counterparts. During the shift from institutional collectivism to a market economy, the Chinese have become increasingly materialistic and self-oriented (Tang et al., 2017). The generation of employees born in the 1980s and 1990s expect that work should fulfill their higher-order psychological needs for participation, autonomy, and achievement (Xie & Chen, 2014; Yang, Y, & Wu, 2018). The younger a Chinese employee is, the more they value the intrinsic rewards of work such as a sense of competence and impact (You, Sun., & Lei, 2013). Van Dierendonck et al. (2014) have shown that fulfilment of these needs is the primary mechanism through which servant leadership increases follower engagement and performance, so servant leaders should have a greater capability to influence younger Chinese workers than older ones. Future

research may test the age of subordinates as a boundary condition of the effect of servant leadership on Chinese employee outcomes.

Practical implications

Our research has implications both for what should be taught to Chinese managers and how Chinese managers should treat their subordinates. The next generation of Chinese managers are currently being trained in Chinese business schools, where it is likely that they will be exposed to Western leadership theories during their study (Warner, 2014). Servant leadership has also become part of mainstream Chinese management research, with over 100 servant leadership papers published to Chinese journals in the last ten years. This trend raises the question of whether the future class of Chinese professional managers should be taught that this is an effective way to manage their subordinates. Based on the results of this study, we believe that servant leadership should be promoted to Chinese students as an effective leadership style, with the caveat that it may not be the best style for every situation.

Some scholars have suggested that Chinese employees are very accepting of authoritarian and directive leadership (Dorfman et al., 1997) or even that strict punishments and discipline are necessary to force Chinese employees to perform their assigned tasks (Su & Wright, 2012). Our research suggests otherwise. Servant leadership is virtually the opposite of authoritarian leadership, and yet its effects on task performance show no difference between effect sizes for Chinese and Anglo employees. We believe that Chinese managers would be well served to shift their managerial style away from directive leadership and towards positive, developmental leadership behaviours such as behaviour modelling, feedback, and power sharing which are typical of the servant leadership approach. We also suggest that Chinese managers pay attention to whether employees' psychological needs for growth, autonomy, challenge, and development are being fulfilled. As the Chinese standard of living improves, employees' material needs are increasingly met, and so the generation of employees born after 1980 and 1990 puts more emphasis on fulfilling their psychological needs through work (Yang et al., 2018). Paying attention to employee needs is crucial for servant leaders, who want to help their employees improve job and personal skills (Chiniara & Bentein, 2016). Therefore, consciously paying attention to employees' intrinsic needs should be a key step for Chinese managers to implement the servant leadership style.

Our results also have implications for the many expat managers working in China. There is no shortage of books in the academic and popular press that describe the unique features of Chinese culture and caution the reader that Chinese think, communicate, and act differently than members of Anglo, Western, or even other East Asian cultures (e.g. Zhang, Harzig, & Fan, 2017). Although there are certainly many cultural differences that expats working in China need to be aware of, our research suggests that expat managers may be able to use the leadership styles they are familiar with effectively in China. Many servant leadership behaviours such as mentoring, empowerment, and giving subordinates individualized attention are common across most conceptions of "effective

leadership” in Anglo countries (Hannah et al., 2014; Lemoine et al., 2019). Our research suggests that Anglo managers do not need to change these aspects of leadership behaviour when they are dealing with Chinese subordinates.

Limitations

Our study suffers from two common limitations of meta-analyses. The first is that although we include a large number of graduate dissertations, we only include correlations from one truly unpublished and unused dataset. Efforts were made to contact authors of unpublished research, but very few of them responded. Thus, we cannot exclude the possibility that our research suffers from publication bias due to missing many non-significant results that were banished to the file drawers of their respective authors. However, our publication bias analysis indicated that our effect size estimates were not influenced by missing studies. A second common limitation is that most of our studies were cross-sectional in nature (Aguinis et al., 2011). This is especially concerning for our estimates of the relationship between servant leadership and employee attitudes, which may be artificially inflated by common method bias. Even in our pool of higher quality studies, many researchers did not temporally separate measurement of servant leadership perceptions and other attitudes.

Our research may also be criticized on the grounds that we grouped all Anglo-Saxon countries together instead of using research only from the United States. It is certainly true that these countries have differences between them. However, these differences appear to be much smaller than those between other cultural groups of similar nations (Minkov & Hofstede, 2012). In addition, Anglo-Saxon countries share common managerial traditions and heritage (Hofstede et al., 2010).

Another limitation is that we cannot analyse mediation, leaving us unable to say anything regarding the mechanisms through which servant leadership influences employees. It is common to use meta-analytic structural equation modelling to examine mediation in meta-analyses. These kind of analyses usually use estimates from other meta-analyses to estimate the correlations between mediator and outcome variables (Landis, 2013). However, to examine differential mediation paths for Chinese and Anglo samples, we would need to draw on the results of other meta-analyses conducted using only Chinese and only Anglo samples. Compiling the studies for these extra meta-analyses is unfortunately beyond the scope of the present study.

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to thank Dr. Guan Yan Jun for his suggestions, as well as Dan Jacobson and Vanessa Tassone for their assistance with coding.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

ORCID

Aaron McCune Stein  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2410-079X>

References

- Aguinis, H., Pierce, C. A., Bosco, F. A., Dalton, D. R., & Dalton, C. M. (2011). Debunking myths and urban legends about meta-analysis. *Organizational Research Methods*, 14, 306–331.
- Aguinis, H., Sturman, M. C., & Pierce, C. A. (2008). Comparison of three meta-analytic procedures for estimating moderating effects of categorical variables. *Organizational Research Methods*, 11, 9–34.
- *Allen, S., Winston, B. E., Tatone, G. R., & Crowson, H. M. (2018). Exploring a model of servant leadership, empowerment, and commitment in nonprofit organizations. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 29, 123–140.
- Ashkanasy, N. M., Trevor-Roberts, E., & Earnshaw, L. (2002). The anglo cluster: Legacy of the British empire. *Journal of World Business*, 37, 28–39.
- *Barbuto, J. E., & Hayden, R. W. (2011). Testing relationships between servant leadership dimensions and leader member exchange (LMX). *Journal of Leadership Education*, 10, 22–37.
- *Bao, Y., Li, C., & Zhao, H. (2018). Servant leadership and engagement: A dual mediation model. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 33, 406–417.
- Barbuto, J. E., & Wheeler, D. W. (2006). Scale development and construct clarification of servant leadership. *Group & Organization Management*, 31, 300–326.
- Barney, J. B., & Zhang, S. (2009). The future of Chinese management research: A theory of Chinese management versus a Chinese theory of management. *Management and Organization Review*, 5, 15–28.
- *Bingham, J. D. (2017). *Personal power and trust as mediators of the relationship between servant leadership and affective organizational commitment* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from https://nsuworks.nova.edu/hsbe_etd/130
- *Bavik, A., Bavik, Y. L., & Tang, P. M. (2017). Servant leadership, employee job crafting, and citizenship behaviors: A cross-level investigation. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 58, 364–373.
- Borenstein, M., Hedges, L. V., Higgins, J. P. T., & Rothstein, H. R. (2009). *Introduction to meta-analysis*. West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons.
- Borenstein, M., Higgins, J. P., Hedges, L. V., & Rothstein, H. R. (2017). Basics of meta-analysis: I2 is not an absolute measure of heterogeneity. *Research Synthesis Methods*, 8, 5–18.
- Bozionelos, N., & Wang, L. (2007). An investigation on the attitudes of Chinese workers towards individually based performance-related reward systems. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18, 284–302.
- Brannick, M. T., Potter, S. M., Benitez, B., & Morris, S. B. (2019). Bias and precision of alternate estimators in meta-analysis: Benefits of blending Schmidt-Hunter and Hedges approaches. *Organizational Research Methods*, 22, 490–514.
- *Caffey, R. D. *The relationship between servant leadership of principals and beginning teacher job satisfaction and intent to stay* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <https://mospace.umsystem.edu>
- *Cerit, Y. (2010). The effects of servant leadership on teachers’ organizational commitment in primary schools in Turkey. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 13, 301–317.
- *Chan, S., & Mak, W. M. (2014). The impact of servant leadership and subordinates’ organizational tenure on trust in leader and attitudes. *Personnel Review*, 43, 272–287.
- *Chang, D. W. (2015). *A study on the influence of servant leaders on organizational citizenship behaviour - the mediating effect of organizational identification* (Master’s thesis). Retrieved from <http://www.cnki.net>
- *Cai, W., Lysova, E. I., Khapova, S. N., & Bossink, B. A. (2018). Servant leadership and innovative work behavior in Chinese High-Tech Firms: A moderated mediation model of meaningful work and job autonomy. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 1767.
- Chen, C. C., Chen, X. P., & Huang, S. (2013). Chinese guanxi: An integrative review and new directions for future research. *Management and Organization Review*, 9, 167–207.
- Chen, C. C., & Lee, Y. T. *Leadership and management in China* (2008). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Chen, L., Su, Z. X., & Zeng, X. (2016). Path dependence and the evolution of HRM in China. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 27, 2034–2057.

- Chen, X. P., Eberly, M. B., Chiang, T. J., Farh, J. L., & Cheng, B. S. (2014). Affective trust in Chinese leaders: Linking paternalistic leadership to employee performance. *Journal of Management*, 40, 796–819.
- Chen, Y., Friedman, R., Yu, E., Fang, W., & Lu, X. (2009). Supervisor–Subordinate guanxi: Developing a three-dimensional model and scale. *Management and Organization Review*, 5, 375–399.
- Chen, Z. X., Tsui, A. S., & Farh, J. L. (2002). Loyalty to supervisor vs. organizational commitment: Relationships to employee performance in China. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 75, 339–356.
- *Chu, H. W. *Employee perception of servant leadership and job satisfaction in a call center: A correlational study* (Doctoral Dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Database. (UMI No. 3326206).
- *Chen, Z., Zhu, J., & Zhou, M. (2015). How does a servant leader fuel the service fire? A multilevel model of servant leadership, individual self identity, group competition climate, and customer service performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100, 511–521.
- *Chiniara, M., & Bentein, K. (2016). Linking servant leadership to individual performance: Differentiating the mediating role of autonomy, competence and relatedness need satisfaction. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 27, 124–141.
- *Deng, Z. H., & Chen, W. Z. (2012). The impact of servant leadership on employee's work behaviors: Job satisfaction as a mediating variable. *Science of Science and Management of S. & T.*, 33, 172–180.
- Dimitriades, Z. S. (2007). The influence of service climate and job involvement on customer-oriented organizational citizenship behaviour in Greek service organizations: A survey. *Employee Relations*, 29, 469–491.
- Dorfman, P. W., Hanges, P. J., & Brodbeck, F. C. (2004). Leadership and cultural variation: The identification of culturally endorsed leadership profiles. In R. J. House, P. J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. W. Dorfman, & V. Gupta (Eds.), *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies* (pp. 513–564). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Dorfman, P. W., Howell, J. P., Hibino, S., Lee, J. K., Tate, U., & Bautista, A. (1997). Leadership in Western and Asian countries: Commonalities and differences in effective leadership processes across cultures. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 8, 233–274.
- *Drury, S. *Employee perceptions of servant leadership: Comparisons by level and with job satisfaction and organizational commitment* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <https://olagroup.com>
- Duval, S. The trim and fill method (2005). In H. R. Rothstein, A. J. Sutton, & M. Borenstein (Eds.), *Publication bias in meta-analysis* (pp. 127–145). West Sussex: John Wiley and Sons.
- Egger, M., Smith, G. D., Schneider, M., & Minder, C. (1997). Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. *British Medical Journal*, 315, 629–634.
- Ehrhart, M. G. (2004). Leadership and procedural justice climate as antecedents of unit-level organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 57, 61–94.
- *Engelhart, E. F. (2012). *The relationship of servant leadership on teacher satisfaction and teacher retention* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Database. (UMI No. 3511317).
- Epitropaki, O., & Martin, R. (2005). From ideal to real: A longitudinal study of the role of implicit leadership theories on leader-member exchanges and employee outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 659.
- Eva, N., Robin, M., Sendjaya, S., van Dierendonck, D., & Liden, R. C. (2018). Servant leadership: A systematic review and call for future research. *The Leadership Quarterly*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2018.07.004
- *Fan, M. (2014). Relationship of servant leadership and teachers' job satisfaction. *Teaching Staff Development*, 2014, 58–59.
- Fu, P. P., Wu, R., Yang, Y., & Ye, J. Chinese culture and leadership. In J. S. Chhokar, F. C. Brodbeck, & R. J. House (Eds.), (2008) *Culture and leadership around the world: The GLOBE book of in-depth studies of 25 societies* (pp. 877–909). New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gelfand, M. J., Aycan, Z., Erez, M., & Leung, K. (2017). Cross-cultural industrial organizational psychology and organizational behaviour: A hundred-year journey. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102, 514–529.
- Gonzalez-Mulé, E., & Aguinis, H. (2018). Advancing theory by assessing boundary conditions with metaregression: A critical review and best-practice recommendations. *Journal of Management*, 44, 2246–2273.
- Gottfredson, R. K., & Aguinis, H. (2017). Leadership behaviours and follower performance: Deductive and inductive examination of theoretical rationales and underlying mechanisms. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 38, 558–591.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1970). *The servant as leader*. Retrieved from <https://www.greenleaf.org/products-page/the-servant-as-leader/>
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant-leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York, NY: Paulist Press.
- *Han, R. (2014). *Hotel employees' perceptions of supervisors' servant leadership behaviours, and relationships with employees' affective commitment* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/etd/13953>.
- Hannah, S. T., Sumanth, J. J., Lester, P., & Cavarretta, F. (2014). Debunking the false dichotomy of leadership idealism and pragmatism: Critical evaluation and support of newer genre leadership theories. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35, 598–621.
- Henning, P. (2016). *The relationship between servant leadership and employee job satisfaction in a Colorado nonprofit organization* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 10165397).
- *Hodoh, S. G. (2016). *Servant leadership: An effective leadership model for achieving optimal productivity* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 10100517).
- Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (2010) *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Honig, B., Lampel, J., Baum, J. A., Glynn, M. A., Jing, R., Lounsbury, M., ... Van Witteloostuijn, A. (2018). Reflections on scientific misconduct in management: Unfortunate incidents or a normative crisis? *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 32, 412–442.
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (Eds.). (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hu, J., & Liden, R. C. (2011). Antecedents of team potency and team effectiveness: An examination of goal and process clarity and servant leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96, 851–862.
- *Huang, J., Jia, Y., Gui, M., Zhu, Y. H., & Liu, T. (2015). The influence of servant leadership on employee proactive and creative performance - based on the mediating mechanisms of leader-member exchange and work engagement. *Science & Technology Progress and Policy*, 33, 145–149.
- *Huang, C., Qian, J., Jin, Z., & Wang, B. (2017). Unlocking the mask: A close look at how servant leaders influence people. *Current Psychology*, 37, 958–965.
- Huang, Y. H., Bedford, O., & Zhang, Y. (2018). The relational orientation framework for examining culture in Chinese societies. *Culture & Psychology*, 24, 477–490.
- Hwang, K. K. (2000). Chinese relationalism: Theoretical construction and methodological considerations. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 30, 155–178.
- *Jaramillo, F., Grisaffe, D. B., Chonko, L. B., & Roberts, J. A. (2009). Examining the impact of servant leadership on sales force performance. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 29, 257–275.
- *Jenkins, M., & Stewart, A. C. (2010). The importance of a servant leader orientation. *Health Care Management Review*, 35, 46–54.
- *Johnson, R. E., Rosen, C. C., & Djurdjevic, E. (2011). Assessing the impact of common method variance on higher order multidimensional constructs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96, 744–761.
- *Jordan, M. K. (2014). *Determining the relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction among U.S. Navy personnel* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI: 3684590).
- *Ju, X. H. (2014). *The impact of servant leadership on employee performance: The mediating role of organization-based self-esteem* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <http://www.cnki.net>
- *Johnson, H. L. (2016). *Servant leadership in intercollegiate athletics: Follower perceptions of NCAA Division II athletic directions* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI: 10112115).
- *Irving, J. A., & Berndt, J. (2017). Leader purposefulness within servant leadership: Examining the effect of servant leadership, leader follower-focus, leader goal-orientation, and leader purposefulness in a large U.S. healthcare organization. *Administrative Sciences*, 7, 1–20.
- *Jang, J., & Kandampully, J. (2018). Reducing employee turnover intention through servant leadership in the restaurant context: A mediation study

- of affective organizational commitment. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 19, 125–141.
- Judge, T. A., & Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D. (2012). Job attitudes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 63, 341–367.
- Kabasakal, H., & Bodur, M. (2004). Humane orientation in societies, organizations, and leader attributes. In R. J. House, P. J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. W. Dorfman, & V. Gupta (Eds.), *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies* (pp. 565–602). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Kepes, S., McDaniel, M. A., Brannick, M. T., & Banks, G. C. (2013). Meta-analytic reviews in the organizational sciences: Two meta-analytic schools on the way to MARS (the Meta-Analytic Reporting Standards). *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 28, 123–143.
- Knapp, G., & Hartung, J. (2003). Improved tests for a random effects meta-regression with a single covariate. *Statistics in Medicine*, 22, 2693–2710.
- Landis, R. S. (2013). Successfully combining meta-analysis and structural equation modeling: Recommendations and strategies. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 28, 251–261.
- *Lapointe, É., & Vandenberghe, C. (2018). Examination of the relationships between servant leadership, organizational commitment, and voice and antisocial behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 148, 99–115.
- Laub, J. A. (1999). *Assessing the servant organization: Development of the servant organizational leadership (SOLA) instrument* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from olagroup.com
- Law, K. S., Wang, H., & Hui, C. (2010). Currencies of exchange and global LMX: How they affect employee task performance and extra-role performance. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 27, 625–646.
- Lee, A., Lyubovnikova, J., Tian, A. W., & Knight, C. (2019). Servant leadership: A meta-analytic examination of incremental contribution, moderation, and mediation. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*. Advance online publication. Doi: 10.1111/joop.12265.
- 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. *The Academy of Management Annals*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.5465/annals.2016.0121
- Levy, P. E. (2009). *Industrial organizational psychology: Understanding the workplace*. New York, NY: Worth Publishers.
- *Li, H. J., Su, J., Sun, J., Ma, F., Dong, X. M., & Gong, J. (2017). The influence of servant leadership on employee performance - based on the mediating effect of organizational citizenship behavior. *Chinese Scientist*, 2017, 115–116.
- Li, L. (2010). The application of CNKI knowledge network node system in information retrieval. *Sci-Tech Information Development and Economy*, 20, 100–102.
- Li, G., Liu, H., & Luo, Y. (2018). Directive versus participative leadership: Dispositional antecedents and team consequences. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 91, 645–664.
- Li, S., & Nesbit, P. L. (2014). An exploration of the HRM values of Chinese managers working in Western multinational enterprises in China: Implications for HR practice. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 25, 1529–1546.
- Li, X. (2017). *A study on relationship among servant leadership, affective commitment, and employee's voice behaviour* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <http://www.cnki.net>
- *Li, S. Z. (2011). *The relationship between servant leadership, organizational commitment, work performance - An intra organizational study* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <http://www.cnki.net>
- *Li, M. M. (2015). *A study on the relationship between servant leadership and employee performance in the appliance chain enterprises* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <http://www.cnki.net>
- *Li, L. (2016a). *Study on the effects of servant leadership on organizational citizenship behaviour: A mediating approach of employee relationship* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <http://www.cnki.net>
- *Li, W. (2016b). *Research on the effects of servant leadership on employee job satisfaction and brand internalization* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <http://www.cnki.net>
- Liao, H., & Chuang, A. (2004). A multilevel investigation of factors influencing employee service performance and customer outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47, 41–58.
- Liden, R. C. (2012). Leadership research in Asia: A brief assessment and suggestions for the future. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 29, 205–212.
- Liden, R. C., Panaccio, A., Meuser, J. D., Jia, H., & Wayne, S. J. (2014). Servant leadership: Antecedents, processes, and outcomes. In D. V. Day (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of leadership and organizations* (pp. 357–380). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Liden, R. C., & Maslyn, J. M. (1998). Multidimensionality of leader-member exchange: An empirical assessment through scale development. *Journal of Management*, 24, 43–72.
- Liden, R. C., Sparrowe, R. T., & Wayne, S. J. (1997). Leader-member exchange theory: the past and potential for the future. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 15, 47–120.
- *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, 161–177.
- *Liu, C. Z. (2011). *Research on the influence of servant leadership on organizational citizenship behaviour* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <http://www.cnki.net>
- *Lin, Y. Y., Xu, H. Y., & Wang, Z. (2015). How does servant leadership influence follower creativity: The role of work motivation and leader-member exchange. *Human Resources Development of China*, 2015, 50–57.
- *Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Meuser, J. D., Hu, J., Wu, J., & Liao, C. (2015). Servant leadership: Validation of a short form of the SL-28. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 26, 254–269.
- *Liu, Y. (2016). *The influence of servant leadership on employee performance mechanism* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <http://www.cnki.net>
- *Ling, Q., Lin, M., & Wu, X. (2016). The trickle-down effect of servant leadership on frontline employee service behaviors and performance: A multilevel study of Chinese hotels. *Tourism Management*, 52, 341–368.
- *Liu, P., & Shi, J. (2018). Transmission of service from leader to followers: A parallel multiple mediator model. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 46, 769–782.
- Lu, J., & Shi, T. (2015). The battle of ideas and discourses before democratic transition: Different democratic conceptions in authoritarian China. *International Political Science Review*, 36, 20–41.
- *Lu, J. T., Zhang, Z., & Jia, M. (2016). Servant leadership and employee creativity: A mediated moderation model. *Forecasting*, 36, 9–15.
- *Lu, J. T., Zhang, Z., & Jia, M. (2017). The cross-level effects of servant leadership on employees' organizational citizenship behaviors: A mediated moderating model. *Management Review*, 29, 187–199.
- *Luo, J. (2018). *The mechanisms of servant leadership on proactive behaviors: A study based on cognitive evaluation theory* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <http://www.cnki.net>
- Ma, L., & Tsui, A. S. (2015). Traditional Chinese philosophies and contemporary leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 26, 13–24.
- *Marmo, S. (2016). *Sustaining the role of social work in hospice care: Social workers' perceptions of job satisfaction, interdisciplinary collaboration, and organizational leadership* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI: 10189596).
- Martin, R., Guillaume, Y., Thomas, G., Lee, A., & Epitropaki, O. (2016). Leader-Member exchange (LMX) and performance: A meta-analytic review. *Personnel Psychology*, 69, 67–121.
- *Mayer, D. M., Bardes, M., & Piccolo, R. F. (2008). Do servant-leaders help satisfy follower needs? An organizational justice perspective. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 17, 180–197.
- McAllister, D. J. (1995). Affect-and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 24–59.
- *McDonnell, H. N. (2011). *Examining job satisfaction, emotional intelligence, and servant leadership: A correlational research design* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI: 3507047).
- *McKenzie, R. A. (2012). *A correlational study of servant leadership and teacher job satisfaction in a public education institution* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI: 3537800).
- *McCune Stein, A., & Yan, A. M. (2018). *The effect of affectivity on leadership ratings*. Unpublished manuscript.

- *McCune Stein, A., & Ai Min, Y. (2019). The substitutive relationship between high-commitment HRM and servant leadership: A social exchange perspective. *Management Research Review*, 42, 1169–1186.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 538–551.
- *Miao, Q., Newman, A., Schwarz, G., & Xu, L. (2014). Servant leadership, trust, and the organizational commitment of public sector employees in China. *Public Administration*, 92, 727–743.
- Minkov, M., & Hofstede, G. (2012). Is national culture a meaningful concept? Cultural values delineate homogeneous national clusters of in-country regions. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 46, 133–159.
- Mittal, R., & Dorfman, P. W. (2012). Servant leadership across cultures. *Journal of World Business*, 47, 555–570.
- *Mo, L. J. (2013). *The impact of servant leadership on employees' in-role performance, innovative behaviour, and helping behaviour* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <http://www.cnki.net>
- *Mitterer, D. M. (2017). *Servant leadership and its effect on employee job satisfaction and turnover intent* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations>
- Morris, M. W., Chiu, C. Y., & Liu, Z. (2015). Polycultural psychology. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 66, 631–659.
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14, 224–247.
- *Neubert, M. J., Kacmar, K. M., Carlson, D. S., Chonko, L. B., & Roberts, J. A. (2008). Regulatory focus as a mediator of the influence of initiating structure and servant leadership on employee behaviour. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 1220–1233.
- *Neubert, M. J., Hunter, E. M., & Tolentino, R. C. (2016). A servant leader and their stakeholders: When does organizational structure enhance a leader's influence? *The Leadership Quarterly*, 27, 896–910.
- *Newman, A., Neesham, C., Manville, G., & Tse, H. H. (2018). Examining the influence of servant and entrepreneurial leadership on the work outcomes of employees in social enterprises. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 29, 2905–2926.
- 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, 49–62.
- Ng, T. W., & Feldman, D. C. (2012). A comparison of self-ratings and non-self-report measures of employee creativity. *Human Relations*, 65, 1021–1047.
- Ng, T. W., & Feldman, D. C. (2013). A meta-analysis of the relationships of age and tenure with innovation-related behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 86, 585–616.
- Nie, D., & Lämsä, A. M. (2015). The leader-member exchange theory in the Chinese context and the ethical challenge of guanxi. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 128, 851–861.
- *Overstreet, R. E., Hazen, B. T., Skipper, J. B., & Hanna, J. B. (2014). Bridging the gap between strategy and performance: Using leadership style to enable structural elements. *Journal of Business Logistics*, 35, 136–149.
- *Panaccio, A., Henderson, D. J., Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., & Cao, X. (2015). Toward an understanding of when and why servant leadership accounts for employee extra-role behaviours. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 30, 657–675.
- Parris, D. L., & Peachey, J. W. (2013). A systematic literature review of servant leadership theory in organizational contexts. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 113, 377–393.
- *Peng, Z. Q. (2013). *The relationship between servant leadership and organizational citizenship behaviour: Effects and moderating effects* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <http://www.cnki.net>
- *Qiang, X. (2016). Influence mechanisms of elementary and middle school principal servant leadership on teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Educational Development*, 2016, 66–71.
- *Piong, C. (2016). *Servant leadership, organizational commitment, and perceived organizational support in the restaurant industry* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI: 10249857).
- *Ragasis, J. A. (2018). *The influence of servant leadership and transformational leadership on faculty job satisfaction and performance in higher education* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI: 10826237).
- References marked with * are used in the meta-analysis.
- Riketta, M. (2002). Attitudinal organizational commitment and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 257–266.
- *Ruan, C. (2010). *The effects of authoritarian leadership and servant leadership on subordinates' work outcomes* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <http://www.cnki.net>
- *Rubino, M. J. (2012). *Descriptions of organizational servant leadership practices, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment at faith-based higher education institutions* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI: 3528063).
- Rubio-Aparicio, M., López-López, J. A., Viechtbauer, W., Marín-Martínez, F., Botella, J., & Sánchez-Meca, J. (2019). Testing categorical moderators in mixed-effects meta-analysis in the presence of heteroscedasticity. *The Journal of Experimental Education*. Advance online publication. DOI: 10.1080/00220973.2018.1561404
- *Rude, W. J. (2004). *The connection between servant leadership and burnout* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <https://www.twu.ca>
- Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E. (2015). *Methods of meta-analysis: Correcting error and bias in research findings*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- *Schwepker, C. H., & Schultz, R. J. (2015). Influence of the ethical servant leader and ethical climate on customer value enhancing sales performance. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 35, 93–107.
- *Schwarz, G., Newman, A., Cooper, B., & Eva, N. (2016). Servant leadership and follower job performance: The mediating effect of public service motivation. *Public Administration*, 94, 1025–1041.
- Sendjaya, S., Sarros, J. C., & Santora, J. C. (2008). Defining and measuring servant leadership behaviour in organizations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 45, 402–424.
- *Shen, S. Q. (2010). Research on the difference between servant and transformational leaders. *Acta Agriculturae Jiangxi*, 22, 195–198.
- *Shi, Y. (2017). *An empirical study on the influence of the employees' job satisfaction under servant and paternalistic leadership in the C hospital - salary situation as the regulating action* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <http://www.cnki.net>
- Shondrick, S. J., Dinh, J. E., & Lord, R. G. (2010). Developments in implicit leadership theory and cognitive science: Applications to improving measurement and understanding alternatives to hierarchical leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21, 959–978.
- Steele, L. G., & Lynch, S. M. (2013). The pursuit of happiness in China: Individualism, collectivism, and subjective well-being during China's economic and social transformation. *Social Indicators Research*, 114, 441–451.
- Sterne, J. A. C., Becker, B. J., & Egger, M. (2005). The funnel plot. In H. R. Rothstein, A. J. Sutton, & M. Borenstein (Eds.), *Publication bias in meta-analysis* (pp. 75–99). West Sussex: John Wiley and Sons.
- Su, Z. X., & Wright, P. M. (2012). The effective human resource management system in transitional China: A hybrid of commitment and control practices. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23, 2065–2086.
- *Sun, J. M., & Wang, B. Y. (2009). The relationship between servant leadership and employees' performance. *The 4th Annual China Management Studies Meeting Proceedings* (pp. 244–254), Beijing, China: The Chinese Academy of Management.
- *Sun, X. (2018). *Research on the impact of servant leadership on organizational citizenship behaviour - felt obligation as the mediating variable* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <http://www.cnki.net>
- Sutton, A. J. (2005). Evidence concerning the consequences of publication and related biases. In H. R. Rothstein, A. J. Sutton, & M. Borenstein (Eds.), *Publication bias in meta-analysis* (pp. 175–192). West Sussex: John Wiley and Sons.
- Tang, N., Wang, Y., & Zhang, K. (2017). Values of Chinese generation cohorts: Do they matter in the workplace? *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 143, 8–22.
- *Thompson, R. S. (2002). *The perception of servant leadership characteristics and job satisfaction in a church-related college* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <https://scholars.indstate.edu>
- *Tian, Y. H. (2016). *Study on the influence mechanism of servant leadership on work engagement among employee* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <http://www.cnki.net>

- *Tian, Q. T. (2017). The impact mechanism of servant leadership on employees' CO-OCB. *Economic Survey*, 34, 112–117.
- *Tian, Q. T., & Wan, J. B. (2017). The impact of servant leadership on subordinates' "servant behavior" in public sector. *Soft Science*, 31, 66–70.
- Tipton, E., Pustejovsky, J. E., & Ahmadi, H. (2019). A history of meta-regression: Technical, conceptual, and practical developments between 1974 and 2018. *Research Synthesis Methods*, 10, 161–179.
- *Trivers, G. A. (2009). *Servant leadership's effects on trust and organizational citizenship behaviours* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3444127).
- Tsui, A. S. (2009). Editor's introduction—Autonomy of inquiry: Shaping the future of emerging scientific communities. *Management and Organization Review*, 5, 1–14.
- Van Dierendonck, D. (2011). Servant leadership: A review and synthesis. *Journal of Management*, 37, 1228–1261.
- Van Dierendonck, D., Stam, D., Boersma, P., De Windt, N., & Alkema, J. (2014). Same difference? Exploring the differential mechanisms linking servant leadership and transformational leadership to follower outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25, 544–562.
- *Van Dierendonck, D., & Nuijten, I. (2011). The servant leadership survey: Development and validation of a multidimensional measure. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 26, 249–267.
- Viechtbauer, W. (2010). Conducting meta-analyses in R with the metafor package. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 36, 1–48.
- *Wang, B. Y. (2010). Servant leadership: Scale modification and effects. *Theoretical Investigation*, 2010, 153–156.
- *Von Fischer, P., & De Jong, D. (2017). The relationship between teacher perception of principal servant leadership behaviour and teacher job satisfaction. *Servant Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 4, 53–84.
- Wang, C. C., Ling, Q., & Zhang, X. J. (2009). Scale development and validation of servant leadership in Chinese organizations. *Nankai Business Review*, 12, 94–103.
- Wang, G., & Liu, Z. B. (2010). What collective? Collectivism and relationalism from a Chinese perspective. *Chinese Journal of Communication*, 3, 42–63.
- *Wang, F. F. (2011). *The empirical research about the relationship of servant leadership, organizational citizenship behaviour, and employee turnover* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <http://www.cnki.net>
- *Wang, J. Q., Wu, W., & Lu, X. H. (2017). Influence of servant leadership on employee work outcomes: Mediating role of affective trust. *Journal of Beijing Technology and Business University (Social Sciences)*, 32, 104–111.
- *Wang, Z., Song, M., Peng, J., & Zhang, Y. Q. (2018a). Understanding the relationship between servant leadership, service-oriented human resource management, and employee service innovation. *Management Review*, 30, 47–68.
- *Wang, Z., Xu, H., & Liu, Y. (2018b). Servant leadership as a driver of employee service performance: Test of a trickle-down model and its boundary conditions. *Human Relations*, 71, 1179–1203.
- Wanous, J. P., Reichers, A. E., & Hudy, M. J. (1997). Overall job satisfaction: How good are single-item measures? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 247–252.
- Warner, M. (2014). *Understanding management in China: Past, present, and future*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- *Williams, A. W. (2012). *The impact of servant leadership on follower outcomes: Testing the mediating roles of stewardship climate and trust* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3539173).
- *Wilson, D. F. (2013). *Servant leadership and job satisfaction in a multicultural hospitality organization: A quantitative, non-experimental descriptive study* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI: 3597448).
- *Washington, R. R. (2014). *Empirical relationships among servant, transformational, and transactional leadership: Similarities, differences, and correlations with job satisfaction and organizational commitment* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3265529).
- *Whisnant, B., & Khasawneh, O. (2014). The influence of leadership and trust on the sharing of tacit knowledge: Exploring a path model. *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly*, 6, 1–17.
- *Williams, J., Brandon, W. A., Hayek, R. S., Haden, M., S., P., & Atinc, G. (2017). Servant leadership and followership creativity: The influence of workplace spirituality and political skill. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 38, 178–193.
- Winston, B., & Fields, D. (2015). Seeking and measuring the essential behaviors of servant leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 36, 413–434.
- *Wu, W. K., & Yao, D. (2009). Relationship between servant leadership and employee satisfaction. *Chinese Journal of Management*, 6, 338–341.
- *Wu, L. Z., Tse, E. C. Y., Fu, P., Kwan, H. K., & Liu, J. (2013). The impact of servant leadership on hotel employees' "servant behavior". *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 54, 383–395.
- *Wu, M. (2016). *The impact of servant leadership on employee innovative behaviour - organizational trust as mediator* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <http://www.cnki.net>
- World Bank. (2017). *World integrated trade solution* [database]. Retrieved from wits.worldbank.org
- Xie, Y. H., & Chen, J. (2014). Influence of need for employee involvement on new generation employees' leadership preference. *Chinese Journal of Management*, 11, 1326–1332.
- *Xu, H. Y., & Wang, Z. (2016). How does servant leadership influence employee performance: The roles of customer orientation and leader identification. *Journal of Psychological Science*, 39, 1466–1472.
- *Xu, D. H. (2007). *A study of servant leadership and its relationships with outcome variables under background of Chinese culture* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <http://www.cnki.net>
- *Xing, J. (2013). *Empirical research on the servant leadership, LMX, and organizational commitment* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <http://www.cnki.net>
- *Xu, H. (2014). *Servant leadership in the process of employees' innovation research* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <http://www.cnki.net>
- *Yang, J. (2016). *The influence of servant leadership on employee turnover intention and creativity* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://www.cnki.net>
- *Yang, J., Liu, H., & Gu, J. (2017). A multi-level study of servant leadership on creativity: The roles of self-efficacy and power distance. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 38, 610–629.
- *Yan, A. M., Xiao, Y. G., & Tang, M. (2017). The cross-level analysis of servant leadership and employee's job performance: Psychological safety as a mediating variable. *Journal of Central South University (Social Science)*, 23, 74–81.
- *Xu, L. (2018). *A research on servant leadership, perceived insider status, and employee voice behaviour: The moderating role of leader-member exchange* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <http://www.cnki.net>
- Yang, J., Y. C. S., & Wu, J. (2018). Work values across generations in China. *Chinese Management Studies*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1108/CMS-12-2017-0357
- *Yavas, U., Jha, S., & Babakus, E. (2015). Relative effects of leadership and technology on bank employees' job outcomes. *Services Marketing Quarterly*, 36, 173–187.
- You, J., Sun., Y. C., & Lei, H. (2013). An empirical study of generational differences in work values for Chinese new generation. *Soft Science*, 27, 83–93.
- *Yu, H. B., Guan, X. Y., & Zheng, X. M. (2014). Paternalistic leadership creates work performance, servant leadership delivers job satisfaction: Integration of two types of leadership behaviors. *Science of Science and Management of S. & T.*, 35, 172–180.
- Zhang, L. E., Harzig, A., & Fan, S. X. (2017). *Managing expatriates in China: A language and identity perspective*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Zhang, X., Fu, P., Xi, Y., Li, L., Xu, L., Cao, C., ... Ge, J. (2012). Understanding indigenous leadership research: Explication and Chinese examples. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23, 1063–1079.

- Zhang, Z. X., Chen, Z. X., Chen, Y. R., & Ang, S. (2014). Business leadership in the Chinese context: Trends, findings, and implications. *Management and Organization Review*, 10, 199–221.
- *Zhang, X. J. (2009). Multi-level influences of servant and paternalistic leadership on innovative behavior: The mediating effect of psychological empowerment. *China Management Studies*, 9, 156–173.
- *Zhang, Y. L. (2013). *A study on the relationship of servant leadership and service quality of financial enterprise* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <http://www.cnki.net>
- *Zhu, Y., & Wang, X. C. (2015). Servant leadership and employee voice behaviour: The role of leader-member exchange and employee goal orientation. *Journal of Psychological Science*, 38, 426–432.
- *Zhang, Z., Lee, J. C. K., & Wong, P. H. (2016). Multilevel structural equation modeling analysis of the servant leadership construct and its relation to job satisfaction. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 37, 1147–1167.
- *Zhu, X. Y. (2016). *The influence of servant leadership and paternalistic leadership on employees' work behaviour* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <http://www.cnki.net>
- *Zhou, A. J., Lapointe, É., & Zhou, S. S. (2019). Understanding mentoring relationships in China: Towards a Confucian model. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 36, 415–444.
- Zou, W. C., Tian, Q., & Liu, J. (2015). Servant leadership, social exchange relationships, and follower's helping behaviour: Positive reciprocity belief matters. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 51, 147–156.