



SERVANT-LEADERSHIP IN CRISIS

A Case Study of the 2002 Evacuation of the International Christian Academy in Cote D'ivoire

— MICHAEL F. JAMES

Imagine, if you will, that you are at dinner with your family. After dinner, you sit at the table discussing the day's events with your wife and the sounds of gunshots ring out. You realize with a sinking feeling that the kids, as they often are after dinner, are outside playing. You run to the yard only to find it empty but alight with hundreds of tracers streaming overhead. Imagine your relief when, after a frantic search, you find your children huddled in the backyard or safe in a neighbor's home. You gather your family to wait out the battle, but your relief slowly fades as you realize the shooting is not stopping. As it turns out, your neighborhood is under siege. Your neighbors gather together to pick a leader to see them through the crisis. Whom do they choose? Do they seek the take-charge commando to lead them to safety, the proverbial Patton strutting back and forth in front of the American flag? Or do they select the caring nurturer who puts people first and collaborates on decisions, the Fred Rogers of the neighborhood? The staff of the International Christian Academy (ICA) in Cote d'Ivoire was faced with this dilemma. They credit their Fred



Rogers and the principles of servant-leadership with seeing them safely through.

Cote d'Ivoire¹ is a country in West Africa. It is about three-quarters the size of Texas and in 2014 was home to almost 23 million people (Résultats Définitifs RGPH, 2014). In the 1990s, a large influx of migrants into northern Cote d'Ivoire from Mali and Burkina Faso created tensions between these new immigrants and long-time Ivoirians (Mundt, 1997). During the 1995 presidential election, the ruling party passed a law requiring that both parents of a presidential candidate must be Ivoirian to be elected president. This rule ended the candidacy of the popular politician from the north, Alassane Ouattara². Anti-immigrant sentiment continued to rise until 2002. Then on September 19, troops from the immigrant-heavy northern part of the country mutinied, launching raids throughout the country. While government forces were able to maintain control of Yamoussoukro and Abidjan, the capital and largest city, respectively, the rebels were able to take over the northern part of the country, establishing their headquarters in the central Ivoirian town of Bouaké.

ICA was founded in 1962 as the Ivory Coast Academy by the Conservative Baptist Foreign Mission Society (now

¹ Cote d'Ivoire may be more familiar to Anglophones as The Ivory Coast. The UN has officially recognized Cote d'Ivoire as the official name in English, French, and Spanish. In addition, the people interviewed for this study exclusively used Cote d'Ivoire during the course of the interviews. I have, therefore, deferred to their common usage.

² Ouattara was eventually elected president in 2010 and is the incumbent leader of Cote d'Ivoire as of February 2015.



WorldVenture) to serve the children of their missionaries in West Africa. By 2002, the school had grown in size and enrollment from its initial 31 students to over 160. On the evening of September 19, many of the staff and students were enjoying a beautiful African sunset on their 20 acre campus in the central Ivoirian town of Bouaké.

Over the next ten days, the students and staff of ICA would endure a near-constant lockdown. Often the fighting took place at a safe, if not comfortable, distance from the school, but on at least two occasions government and rebel forces took up positions on opposite sides of the campus, literally firing at each other over the top. Stray mortars even crashed into buildings on campus. Eventually, the French army fought their way to Bouaké and evacuated everyone to the capital. Everyone reached Yamoussoukro safely, everyone except the school's director, Dan Grudda. He stayed at the campus to try and protect the buildings and ground from further harm in the hopes that when the fighting died down, the school could be reopened. This case study examines the leadership of this one man and how his dedication to the principles of servant-leadership ensured the safety of over 100 men, women, and children caught in the middle of a civil war. Some critics have labeled servant-leadership a "soft" leadership style that cannot be effectively employed in crisis situations (Nayab, 2011). As recent high-profile events in the United States have illustrated, there is probably no more desperate crisis for a school administrator than when someone is shooting at their students. By analyzing the crisis response



at ICA during the first Ivoirian civil war in 2002, this study attempts to answer the question: can servant-leadership be effective in a crisis?

A PRACTICAL MODEL: SEVEN PILLARS OF SERVANT-LEADERSHIP

Any discussion of servant-leadership must begin with Robert Greenleaf and *Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness* (1977). While many of the concepts of servant-leadership have been traced back to Gandhi, Buddha, Confucius, Jesus, and others, Greenleaf was the first to coalesce these varying ideas into an articulated, modern leadership theory.

Following the development of a theory, practitioners must determine how to apply the theory to everyday situations. The hallmark of Greenleaf's conception of servant-leadership is that the servant-leader is servant first (Greenleaf, 1977). But how does a production manager apply the concept of "servant first" to a deadline that has to be made or an employee who arrives late to work? A model must be developed to bridge the gap between theory and practice.

For years, this lack of a practical model plagued the field of servant-leadership. In 1997, 20 years after Greenleaf espoused his theory, Peter Northouse wrote that servant-leadership lacked the support of "well-designed, empirical research" (p. 245). Five years later, Russell and Stone (2002) were still lamenting the fact that "most of the servant-leadership literature is philosophical. . . Consequently, the theory lacks



sufficient evidence to justify its widespread acceptance at this point in time” (p. 145). Russell and Stone (2002) went on to pull from the theoretical literature nine functional attributes and 11 accompanying attributes of servant-leadership which they felt constituted “a rudimentary model of servant leadership” (p. 152).

Finally, in the late 2000s, authors began to articulate a practical and assessable model of servant-leadership. In 2008, Kent Keith identified seven key practices of servant-leadership. A year later, James Sipe and Don Frick (2009) identified seven pillars of servant-leadership. In 2010, Larry Spears identified ten traits of servant-leadership.

This study will use Sipe and Frick’s *Seven Pillars of Servant Leadership* (2009) as its model. Admittedly, the choice of this model is somewhat arbitrary, but, as detailed above, there is a dearth of servant-leadership models from which to choose. In addition, the existing models have a lot of overlap and many of the differences are merely semantic. Ultimately, I chose the Sipe and Frick model because their stated intention complements the purpose of this study. In their preface, they wrote, “This book was born of a desire to be concrete about how to *implement* Servant Leadership. . .” (Sipe & Frick, 2009, xii, emphasis in the original). Likewise, I designed this study to assess servant-leadership in practice; Sipe and Frick’s seven pillars provide concrete leadership characteristics that can be identified in real world situations and, therefore, assessed.

Sipe and Frick have extensively explored their seven pillars and I have no desire to duplicate their work here, but a



quick overview for those who might not otherwise be familiar seems in order. The following short summaries come directly from Sipe and Frick's titular 2009 book (pp. 5-6):

- Person of Character – Makes insightful, ethical, and principle-centered decisions.
 - Maintains Integrity
 - Demonstrates Humility
 - Serves a Higher Purpose
- Puts People First – Helps others meet their highest priority development needs.
 - Displays a Servant's Heart
 - Is Mentor-Minded
 - Shows Care & Concern
- Skilled Communicator – Listens earnestly and speaks effectively.
 - Demonstrates Empathy
 - Invites Feedback
 - Communicates Persuasively
- Compassionate Collaborator – Strengthens relationships, supports diversity, and creates a sense of belonging.
 - Expresses Appreciation
 - Builds Teams & Communities
 - Negotiates Conflict
- Has Foresight – Imagines possibilities, anticipates the future, and proceeds with clarity of purpose.
 - Visionary
 - Displays Creativity



- Takes Courageous & Decisive Action
- Systems Thinker – Thinks and acts strategically, leads change effectively, and balances the whole with the sum of its parts.
 - Comfortable with Complexity
 - Demonstrates Adaptability
 - Considers the “Greater Good”
- Leads with Moral Authority – Worthy of respect, inspires trust and confidence, and establishes quality standards for performance.
 - Accepts & Delegates Responsibility
 - Shares Power & Control
 - Creates a Culture of Accountability

It is not the purpose of this study to critique the seven pillars. I have limited this case study to determining if the seven pillars could be identified (in part or in whole) and if so were they effective.

METHODOLOGY

This paper is an instrumental case study using qualitative interviews. I interviewed four individuals who were present at ICA during the crisis period of September 2002. One was a student at that time; one was a teacher; one was a dormitory parent, and one was the dormitory administrator. All of the interview subjects were staff members at Dakar Academy in Dakar, Senegal at the time of the interviews. The interviews were conducted at Dakar Academy; three were conducted in the business manager’s office and the fourth, the dorm parent



at ICA, was conducted in his apartment on campus. All interviews were conducted the week of February 2, 2015.

The interview subjects were only told that a case study of the ICA evacuation was being prepared. The term servant-leadership was not used until the end of the interview. To determine the extent to which the leadership of ICA used servant-leadership, interview questions were designed to elicit responses identifying the seven pillars of servant-leadership as identified by Sipe and Frick (2009). While not verbatim, I asked forms of the following questions to each subject:

1. Who were the leaders (both formal and informal) during the evacuation?
2. Were the needs of people put before the needs of the organization or vice versa? Can you provide examples?
3. How were communications handled? Did they work well or not well?
4. Was leadership exercised in collaboration or by a single individual or small group?
5. Did the leaders exercise foresight? Were they proactive rather than reactive?
6. Were the leaders adaptable? Did they move fluidly between plans as the situation changed or did they try to stick to one course of action?
7. Were decisions made consistent with the moral beliefs of the organization?

At the end of the interview, the subjects were asked if, based on their understanding of the term servant-leadership, they felt the leadership of ICA practiced servant-leadership.



Finally, each subject was asked if the leadership of ICA during the crisis was effective.

Answers to each of the questions were analyzed to determine which, if any, of the seven pillars of servant-leadership were present. Often, during the course of the interview, while answering a question designed to elicit evidence of a particular servant-leadership trait, the subjects would provide anecdotes or evidence of one of the other pillars of servant-leadership. In these instances, that anecdote or statement was noted as an example of each trait evidenced. Often times, the anecdotes reflected more than one leadership trait.

Every qualitative researcher must face the issue of bias in their research. Our own experiences and knowledge affect how we frame interview questions and can even affect our non-verbal behavior during the interview process, in turn potentially biasing, albeit unconsciously, the respondents answers. Researchers generally approach bias in one of two ways, either accepting the bias as part of the research process and reflectively analyzing its effects or attempting to recognize and bracket, or remove, its effects (Creswell, 2012). The choice is largely dictated by the epistemological approach to research with constructivists, for instance, tending to accept bias and post-positivists trying to eliminate it. In either case, however, researchers should be aware of their bias.

Bracketing, or *epoché*, is a phenomenological term first used by Edmund Husserl in 1913 (Husserl, 1962) and described as “the suspension of the trust placed in naturalistic beliefs regarding both the certainty of science and the



objectivity of the world” (Farina, 2014, p. 53). In modern parlance, it is simply the attempt to remove or “bracket” our biases from affecting the results of our research. Methods of bracketing include memoing, interviews, and reflexive journaling (Tufford & Newman, 2012).

The risk of researcher bias materially affecting this study was low. I was not a staff member at ICA and I did not experience the events first hand. I had, however, heard stories of the evacuation and had some preconceived notions about the event. In order to determine what level of bias I brought to the interview process, I conducted two bracketing interviews with former ICA staff members (Rolls & Relf, 2006). One was also a staff member at Dakar Academy at the time of the interview. The other was a staff member at Grace University in Omaha, Nebraska when interviewed. These bracketing interviews were conducted prior to the data collection interviews and the results were not included in the data analysis.

As a result of the bracketing interviews, I learned that most of what I thought I knew about the evacuation was wrong. I also learned that I had a preconceived notion about servant-leadership that, in practice, the efforts or abilities of any one person would be subsumed into the collective actions of the organization as a whole. In other words, I assumed the servant-leader would not be hailed individually as a great leader. By bracketing that bias, I was more open and able to hear the repeated commendations of Dan Grudda; by focusing on his actions, I was able to more clearly determine the servant-leadership principles at work.



FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The interviews revealed a remarkable unanimity amongst the interview subjects. The interviewer heard the same anecdotes time and again and the subjects were unanimous in their unqualified praise for the director and their opinion that he was a servant-leader. In answering the interview questions, the subjects revealed evidence of all seven pillars of servant-leadership as described by Sipe and Frick (2009). All four interview subjects identified five of the seven pillars. Three of the four subjects identified the remaining two, compassionate collaborator and systems thinker. Only the interview subject who was a student at the time of the crisis did not identify those two traits.

Rather than asking the participants to identify traits of servant-leadership, the theoretical tenets of which they might not be familiar, the interviewer encouraged the subjects to tell their stories and share their experiences of the crisis. The researcher then reviewed the transcripts to identify servant-leadership traits within their narratives. In this way, the subjects were empowered to describe servant-leadership in their own words as they experienced the events. The following sections detail the common anecdotes and identify the servant-leadership traits illustrated.

Tragedy Before the Crisis

Everyone hopes their first day on the job will be a huge success, that they will make a good impression, and that they set the stage for a long and glorious tenure. On Dan Grudda's



first day at work, armed men broke into his campus, held his staff at gunpoint, kidnapped his business manager, and shot one of his guards to death. He had to believe, as the first day drew to a close, that he wouldn't face any days more difficult than this. Unfortunately, if this is what he believed, he would be terribly and tragically wrong.

After this incident, which occurred three months before the civil war began, Mr. Grudda began to fear for the safety of the students that would soon be returning from summer break. While glad the attack had occurred during the summer, he was concerned what might have happened had there been students present or if another attack were to occur during the school year. With what little time remained in the summer, he worked with the administrative team to develop a campus lock-down plan. His plan evidenced foresight. Designed with input from all departments, evidencing compassionate collaboration and systems thinking, this plan was put into action the day the war started. The students practiced the plan repeatedly, ensuring that when the time came, everyone would know what to do. According to all four interview subjects, the practice had the desired result. When the shooting started and the campus was put into lock-down, most of the students and many of the staff, who were having dinner in the dining hall and had not heard the shots, thought the lock-down signal was another drill. They proceeded smoothly to their assigned places without incident. This thorough communication of the plan to students and staff is evidence of skilled communication.



Two months after the robbery, while out jogging, the head of the middle school boy's dormitory collapsed and died of a heart attack. This was a man who served *in loco parentis* for all of the middle school-aged boys; he was a husband and father of 3 young children who lived on campus as well. One day he left the dorm and never came back. Twenty-four hours later, civil war would break out just outside their front gate.

The death of this beloved staff member, both parent and parent-figure, further tested Mr. Grudda's leadership style. The eruption of hostilities just outside their campus complicated matters. The community needed time to grieve and support one another, but the entire campus was locked into eight individual enclaves with little communication between them. The lockdown was for their own good, but the self-imposed isolation made dealing with this death all the harder. In an example of putting people first, Mr. Grudda released the campus from its lockdown long enough to hold a memorial service in the chapel. As a compassionate collaborator, he made this decision, like almost all decisions during this time, in concert with the crisis committee formed of representatives from across the campus. As a systems thinker, however, he made one other decision: most of the people in the memorial service never knew that during that service, the chapel was surrounded by armed guards.

All four interview subjects shared both of these narratives. Two were present for both events; the other two were gone for summer break during the robbery, but were present for the second tragedy. They had heard of the first event from those



who experienced it. These stories give the first hint of Mr. Grudda's leadership style which was clearly servant-leadership.

Helping Others at Great Risk to Himself

The memorial service was not the only time Mr. Grudda broke the lockdown. During the lockdown period, a family member of one of the local staff became gravely ill. With the country in chaos, hospitals and doctor's offices were closed; medical help was unavailable. Mr. Grudda and the school nurse made their way to the staff member's home to provide what medical care they could. While the interview subject who related this tale could not remember the outcome, this willingness to suspend the normal policy and put himself at personal risk epitomizes a servant-leader who puts people first and is a person of character. Grudda's belief that the needs of people from a different country and a different culture were equal to, and possibly exceeded, the needs of people from his own is evidence of leading with moral authority.

Only one interview subject told this story. That subject was a member of the crisis committee, the leadership inner circle during this crisis. He was most likely the only one able to relate the story because Mr. Grudda's absence from the campus was kept a secret so as not to alarm the students and staff who came to rely on his presence as a sign that everything would be alright.

Measuring the Risk by Using a Moral Compass

The previous anecdote was not the only example of how Mr. Grudda led with moral authority. As the fighting reached a



crescendo, an SUV approached the front gate of the ICA campus. The leader of the government forces emerged demanding to speak with whoever was in charge. When Mr. Grudda came to the front gate, this military leader explained that the fighting was reaching a critical stage and he wasn't sure his forces would prevail. He feared that if his forces were defeated, the rebels would kill his wife and children. In the SUV were his two preschool-age children. That the ICA campus was the safest place in Bouaké was well-known, he explained. He begged Mr. Grudda to take his children and keep them safe from the rebels.

This request put Mr. Grudda in a very difficult position. Both sides of the civil war had taken pains to keep ICA out of the line of fire. The staff and students were well-known and well-liked in the community and had touched the lives of soldiers and leaders on both sides of the civil war. For this reason, ICA was respected and protected. But if the presence of the enemy commander's children became known to the rebels, the school's neutrality might well be questioned and the students and staff might find themselves the target of a rebel attack. On the other hand, refusing the request of one of the national army's commanders could well bring reprisals from that side as well. The commander's fears were not unwarranted; killing women and children is a fairly common practice in Africa's civil wars (Dallaire, 2003).

Mr. Grudda solved the problem by turning to his internal values system and the values of the school itself. He accepted the care of these two young girls. In communicating this



decision to the staff, he explained that the mission of the school was first and foremost about the well-being of children. He was unable to leave children exposed to harm if he could take steps to shield them. If the rebels were victorious and did break in and find these two girls, he would give them the same explanation and make clear that their children were welcome there as well. His knowledge of the Ivorian people, having grown up in Cote d'Ivoire, made him confident that this would be a persuasive argument.

The worst-case scenario never arose. A few days later, the government commander returned for his girls and evacuated them to a safer part of the country. This incident exemplified the traits of “person of character,” “puts people first,” “has foresight,” “leads with moral authority,” and in his communications with the staff, “skilled communicator.” Three of the interview subjects relayed this story. Only the subject that was a student at the time didn't mention it. Since he was locked down in the boy's dormitory and segregated from the girl's dormitory where the commander's daughters stayed, he was probably unaware of the situation.

Courage Under Fire

During the worst of the fighting, tracers streaked the sky above the campus of ICA. As the government forces on one side and the rebel forces on the other fired blindly at each other, mortar shells would occasionally crash down on campus. In the midst of this firefight, Mr. Grudda received a call that he was needed to handle an urgent situation at the front gate, 20



minutes away by foot. Without hesitating, he got up, walked out the front door, and calmly made his way up the path to the front gate. He did not run; he did not duck for cover. He merely walked. When he returned, several of the staff asked him how he was able to walk so calmly through such a frightening battle. His reply, as related by one of the research participants, epitomizes the servant-leadership traits of “puts people first” and “person of character.” He answered, “I was terrified. Everything in me wanted to take cover and crawl to the front gate, but I knew everyone was watching me, especially the kids. If they had seen me run or duck, they would have been more afraid than they already were.”

All four of the interview subjects related this seemingly insignificant incident which speaks to the effect the moment had on the students and staff and confirms Mr. Grudda’s foresight about the importance of his demeanor. Understanding the importance of non-verbal communication also shows Mr. Grudda to have been a skilled communicator. As has been previously mentioned, putting the mental well-being of the students ahead of his own safety evidences “putting people first” and that Grudda was a “person of character.”

Leave No One Behind

After all of the staff and students had been evacuated, Dan Grudda remained. Safely under the care of the French military, he watched as the more than 100 people he had led through the crisis, including his wife and children, drove off campus, most for the last time. He told his wife that he had to remain behind



to try and protect the school from the rebels and the current French occupants. Dan's wife, Nancy, wrote a manuscript of her experiences for her family and friends. While the author did not have access to this manuscript, one of the interview subjects was able to relate some of the contents. In making the decision to stay, Mr. Grudda told his wife, "If things get bad, I have my backpack and I'll walk out to Guinea," a distance of over 500 km.

This anecdote evidences the servant-leadership traits of systems thinking and foresight, but seems to violate the principle of putting people first. Certainly, the perceived needs of the organization were put ahead of the needs of his wife and children. This illustrates two of the dilemmas of servant-leadership. First, not every servant-leader can act in perfect accord with the traits of servant-leadership all the time. Second, the theory of servant-leadership must come to grips with how to deal with conflicts amongst the traits. How, for instance, does a leader deal with a scenario in which putting one group of people first disadvantages others or violates his moral code? Are some of the pillars more preeminent than others?

Three days later, Mr. Grudda did finally leave ICA. With the French army restoring some normality to the country, Mr. Grudda chose to make the journey to Yamoussoukro for one last visit with the students and staff before they left the country. The one-hour journey under normal conditions was now taking eight. As he prepared to make the journey, he took the time to call each of the staff members and ask them if they'd left anything behind without which they could not live. After



crisscrossing the campus collecting backpacks and photo albums, he headed south to the capital. But Dan Grudda had one more stop to make.

The civil war had interrupted all of the ordinary systems and bureaucracy in the country. With no one able to release the body of the deceased dormitory parent, it had lain in the morgue throughout the ten-day ordeal. On his way out of Bouaké, Mr. Grudda stopped at the morgue and, after a long negotiation, loaded the body into the back of his jeep (with the backpacks and the photo albums) and delivered it safely to his family in Yamoussoukro.

The act had no operational significance. Stopping to retrieve the body made nobody safer and did not increase the likelihood that the school would reopen, but Mr. Grudda was able to put himself into the shoes of the poor wife and kids who never got to say goodbye to their husband and father. By putting people first, he was able to give this family closure to their personal tragedy. But the impact was even more far reaching than Mr. Grudda may have supposed, since three of the interview subjects related this story, even though it had no personal connection to them. This small act of charity did, however, have an impact and they remembered it thirteen years later.

CONCLUSION

The anecdotes clearly show that servant-leadership was practiced leading up to, during, and immediately after the ten-day lockdown and evacuation of ICA. The question of whether



the leadership was effective remains to be analyzed. Some simple facts provide an initial assessment. After the outbreak of the civil war, not a single life was lost or injury recorded amongst the staff or students of ICA. All of the staff and students were safely evacuated to the capital city of Yamoussoukro and then further to Abidjan, whence they returned to the United States or to other countries as they deemed best.

The interview subject who was a student at the time probably gave the best indication of the success of the leadership of ICA. An eighth-grader at the time, he recalls not even once feeling frightened and that the whole episode was “kind of exciting.” Another anecdote from one of the interview subjects gives another indication of just how successful the entire operation was. Upon arriving in Yamoussoukro, the United States Army had established a small base camp to receive American citizens who were being evacuated from around the country. The day before the ICA evacuees arrived at this camp, other missionaries from the Bouaké area had been evacuated. Almost half of the evacuees that day had needed the care of the crisis counselors brought in to treat the emotional needs of evacuees. When the staff and students from ICA arrived, not a single person, the majority of who were children, needed to talk to a crisis counselor. The interview subject laughed as he recounted the tale of dozens of therapists roaming through the crowd trying desperately to get someone to talk to them. But due to the leadership of the crisis committee and Dan Grudda, they were not needed. The



experience had been unpleasant and unfortunate, but not traumatic.

The evidence clearly shows that not only was servant-leadership employed, but the application was remarkably effective. This study does not rule out the fact that other leadership styles could have been employed to equal effect, but the results begin to chip away at the idea that servant-leadership is a “soft” leadership style that is ineffective in a crisis situation. In this instance, not only was servant-leadership employed effectively, but when asked the question directly, all four interview subjects responded definitively and quickly that the success of the evacuation was due to the servant-leadership characteristics of Mr. Grudda.

In addition to the conclusions drawn about servant-leadership itself, this study has also shown the seven pillars of servant-leadership to be a workable model for the practice of servant-leadership. In a real world example, the seven pillars were clearly observable in practice. In theory, a leader in similar circumstances would be able to make a conscious decision to employ these principles in advance and conduct themselves in a manner very similar to Mr. Grudda with similar results.

Finally, I would be remiss in concluding this study without returning to a question posed earlier. When two or more of the pillars come into conflict with one another, how is the servant-leader to resolve the conflict? While it is not a question I set out to answer, I believe we can determine some principles by analyzing the actions of Mr. Grudda and the leadership team at



ICA. Clearly, some pillars take precedence over others. If we divide the seven pillars into those that describe who the leader is (person of character, has foresight, system thinker) and those that describe what a leader does (skilled communicator, compassionate collaborator, puts people first, leads with moral authority), the pillars that describe who the leader is seem to take precedence. In deciding to accept the children of the military leader, Mr. Grudda put his staff and students at greater risk, but he felt that being a person of character came before putting people first. It is doubtful he made this decision consciously; more likely, he found it easier to subordinate what he did to who he was rather than the reverse.

Of course, even the division of the pillars into these two categories can be debated. Furthermore, we have a very small number of scenarios by which to measure the alleged precedence, if one exists. It is clear, however, that occasionally the pillars will come into conflict and it behooves servant-leaders to determine, in advance, how they will deal with those situations when they occur.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This case study started as an analysis of an event, the evacuation of ICA, but quickly turned into a profile of ICA's director, Dan Grudda. The interview subjects unanimously credit his leadership with the safe and effective evacuation of the ICA community. Further research into his life and leadership career both before and after ICA would fill out the portrait of this remarkable servant-leader. A sample population



of four is generally considered low for purposes of reliability, but given the unanimity of responses it seems unlikely that a larger sample would produce a significantly different result. With more than 100 staff and students evacuated from ICA, however, the opportunity for a much more robust case study exists. Additionally, further research into the role of servant-leadership in crisis management needs to be conducted. The author's research, while not exhaustive, could not produce a single study dedicated to researching the effectiveness of servant-leadership during a period of crisis.

The seven pillars themselves also deserve further research. A leadership scenario can surely be designed to test the seven pillars versus a control group and even other articulations of servant-leadership. Further case studies in which the seven pillars were intentionally employed as a leadership model would give us a greater measure of their effectiveness. Finally, the existence of a hierarchy or some other consistent method for resolving conflicts between the pillars needs to either be discovered or proposed.

References

- Creswell, J. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Boston: Pearson.
- Dallaire, R. (2003). *Shaking hands with the devil: The failure of humanity in Rwanda*. Toronto: Random House Canada.
- Farina, G. (2014). Some reflections on the phenomenological method. *Dialogues in Philosophy, Mental and Neuro Sciences*, 7(2), 50-62.



- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York, NY: Paulist Press.
- Husserl, E. (1962). *Ideas: General introduction to pure phenomenology*. London: Collier, Macmillan.
- Keith, K. M. (2008). *The case for servant leadership*. Westfield, IN: Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership.
- Mundt, R. (1997). Côte d'Ivoire: Continuity and change in a semi-democracy. In J. Clark & D. Gardinier (Eds.), *Political reform in francophone Africa* (pp. 182-203). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Nayab, N. (2011, May 25). *Servant leadership theory – strengths and weaknesses*. Retrieved from <http://www.brighthub.com/office/home/articles/73511.aspx>
- Northouse, P.G. (1997). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Résultats Définitifs du 4ème Recensement Général de la Population et de l'Habitat (RGPH) 2014 de Côte d'Ivoire. (2014). In *Institut National de la Statistique*. Retrieved February 8, 2015, from <http://www.ins.ci/n/>
- Rolls, L. and Relf, M. (2006). Bracketing interviews: Addressing methodological challenges in qualitative interviewing in bereavement and palliative care. *Mortality*, 11(3), 286–305.
- Russell, R. T., & Stone, A. G. (2002). A review of servant leadership attributes: The development of a practical model. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal*, 23, 145-157.
- Sipe, J. W., & Frick, D. M. (2009). *Seven pillars of servant leadership: Practicing the wisdom of leading by serving*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Spears, L. (2010). Character and servant leadership: Ten characteristics of effective, caring leaders. *The Journal of Virtues and Leadership*, 1, 25-30.
- Tufford, L., & Newman, P. (2012). Bracketing in qualitative research. *Qualitative Social Work*, 11(1), 80-96.

Michael F. James is the Administrator at Mountain Lake Christian School in Mountain Lake, Minnesota. He earned his



doctorate in interdisciplinary leadership from Creighton University and also holds degrees from the University of Maryland and the United States Naval Academy. He has extensive international experience having lived in Germany, Japan, and Senegal. His research interests include educational leadership, higher education finance, and international leadership.