African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies
VOL.7 (1), August-December, 2022 https://ajemates.org

NEXUS BETWEEN VICE CHANCELLORS' SERVANT LEADERSHIP AND LECTURERS' PROACTIVE PROBLEM SOLVING IN A SOUTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY IN NIGERIA.

Obiajulu A. Ugochukwu Nnedum PhD
Department of Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences,
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria. Phone +234 803 314 6636.
oau.nnedum@unizik.edu.ng; http://orcid.org/0000-0002-8001-5450
&
Bernard Chukwukeluo ChinePhD
Department of Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences,
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria
. Phone+234 64030515, Email: bc.chine@unizik.edu.ng
&
Ntomchukwu Emmanuel Ezechukwu
Department of Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences,
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria

Correspondence can be directed to Obiajulu Anthony. Ugochukwu. Nnedum, Department of Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka Anambra State, Eastern Nigeria. Phone +2348 03314 6636. Email: oau.nnedum@unizik.edu.ng. http://orcid.org/ 0000-0002-8001-5450

ABSTRACT
Servant leadership is gaining increasing attention in leadership studies around the globe. Till date, there is paucity of research on the relationship between servant leadership and proactive problem solving. In addition, the nature of role of underpinnings of servant leadership and proactive problem solving among lecturers has generally remained unexplored. This study aims to examine influence of perceived vice chancellor's servant leadership on lecturer's proactive problem solving from Nigeria University work perspective. Applying Pearson correlation and hierarchical regression on the survey of 648 lecturers (375 male lecturers and 273 male lecturers) randomly selected from Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria; first, we found that the variables of interest were all significantly and positively correlated. Secondly, the result of multiple regression analysis indicated that vice chancellors' servant leadership attributes significantly influenced lecturers' proactive problem-solving behavior after controlling for gender, age, and tenure. Further explication of the result demonstrated that the four -core attributes of vice chancellors' servant leadership including: altruistic calling, persuasive mapping, emotional healing, wisdom, but not organizational stewardship, were positively correlated with proactive problem-solving behavior among lecturers in a university context. Based on

AJEMATES

servant leadership theory, recommendations were made utilization of psychological psychometric tool in the selection of Vice chancellors in Nigerian Universities.

Keywords: Servant leadership underpinnings, altruistic calling, persuasive mapping, emotional healing, wisdom, and Proactive problem-solving.

Introduction

Proactive Problem Solving is self-starting, future oriented responses that aim to prevent the reoccurrence of a problem-such as by addressing its root cause or involve solving it in unusual and nonstandard way of integrated problem prevention (Parker & Collins, 2010; Nnedum, 2016). Proactive problem solving, as a form of proactive work behavior (PWB), is an emerging concept in the organizational management and behavioral research. PWB is defined as employees' self-initiated activities at work that are beyond their call of duty. One distinguished feature of PWB from other form of extra role behavior is that proactive employees play active role, thus, they often apply personal ideas to normal organization work routine to bring about change and improvement in oneself, others and the general university system (Parker & Collins, 2010; Nnedum, 2016). Today, the number of new universities springing up and the network of global academic activities in this modern era, all increase competition among universities across the globe. Consequently, universities need distinctive innovative performance to succeed which lecturers' proactivity ensured. For the individual lecturers, we argue that facing continuous advancement and constant development in the teaching excellence and research excellence frameworks system, academics need to proactively seek for adequate skill to effectively operate. Given this situation, proactive behavior becomes increasingly important for organizations and individuals to adapt to the volatile academic ranking environment, as well as gaining a competitive advantage (Nnedum, 2016).

In the light of the above, scholars by way of empirical studies have identified several PWB consequences for both individual employees and the organization. For the individuals, PWB has been linked with increased job satisfaction, more employees work engagement, more employees' creativity and career success, (Parker & Collins, 2010), and for the organization, employees PWB leads to work innovation, high performance outcome and generally long term work efficiency (Crant, 2000; Griffin, Neal, & Parker, 2007, Parker, 2000) . Probably, due to its benefits, interest on PWB research continues to increase among academic scholars and practicing managers.

Although scholar and managers have empirically identified number of personal and contextual antecedents of PWB (Parker, Bindle, & Strauss, 2010; Wu & Parker, 2017), Crant, (2000) has stressed that research on antecedents of PWB has not been well explored, and of most concern according to these authors, is lack of detail understanding regarding the mechanism and interaction of both contextual and individual factor in the PWB processes. Moreover, PWB study from Nigeria work perspective has been relatively scarce. Given these views, first, there is

AJEMATES

need for more research on antecedent of proactive problem solving (PPS) especially from the perspective Nigeria work context, and secondly, there is also need to explore the underpinning mechanism and interaction of contextual factors and individual differences in respect to full understanding for PPS processes in specific context. In this study, we considered both contextual factor (e.g., Vice chancellor's leadership) that may commonly interplay to influence PPS. Specifically, we examine the association of perceived vice chancellor's servant leadership with lecturers' proactive problem solving behaviour.

Regarding antecedent of PPS, we lay emphasis on servant leadership because it is one important leadership behavior that has been less practiced, and less studied, especially within Nigeria academic work context. Servant leadership is a form of employees'-oriented leadership that holds employees at high esteem, and stresses on their development and well-being at work (Ehrhart, 2004; Smith, Montagno, & Kuzmenko, 2004). Generally, by their positions in the organization, top leaders have the legitimate authority to control and dictate working condition for the subordinates. This implies that leaders have what it takes to influence employees' behavior at work. Meanwhile, as a behavior that is discretional and non-rewarded, but with un-predictable outcome at onset, PPS could be a risky venture for individual, especially when the leadership of the university is not all that supportive. In their study on PWB as taking charge at work, Morrison and Phlep, (2002), and Griifin, Parker, and Masson (2010) emphasized that most times PWB is not always welcome by authoritative leaders; therefore, that standing chances of failure, however, makes PWB a risky adventure for employees. Given this circumstance, it is possible that employees' engagement in PWB may likely be influenced by leaders' approach. In this regard, studies have shown that those leadership approaches that tend to support subordinates need and offer opportunity for subordinate initiatives (autonomy to think out of the box) encourage proactive behavior for employees in the workplace (Yin, Xing, Luo & Zheng, 2018). However, considering its peculiar employees-friendly approach, servant leadership offers such environment that is conducive for employees to be proactively motivated (Liden, Wayne, Liao, & Meuser, 2014). Compared with other forms of leadership which foremost interest lies on the organization (e.g transformational, and authentic leadership), servant leadership see it as a priority to take care of subordinates' need, professional development and well-being first (Greenleaf, 1970; Van-Dierendonck, 2011, Taleghani & Mehr, 2013), this informed by the rationale that once employees are happy and are well developed, they tend to give their best to the organization in return. Regarding the risk of PPS, by providing support and having good relationship with subordinate, servant leadership practice creates an environment that reduces the fear of uncertainty associated with the un-predictive outcome of proactive actions, and fear of being refuted by the leaders, while at the same time increase the confidence to freely initiate and proactively implement proactive ideas and solve problems. Before now, research has extensively been conducted that demonstrated significant positive prediction of some of the similar leadership behaviors such as transformational,

AJEMATES

authentic, and ethical leadership on proactive work behavior (Den-Hartong & Beschak, 2012; Martin, Lioa, Campbell, & Kruse, 2013; Li, Dan, & Kirkman, 2017; Center for ethical leadership, 2014). Unfortunately, servant leadership which combines several of these leadership characteristics (Rafferty & Griffins, 2007) has not been extensively studied. Meanwhile, meta-analytic results have shown that servant leadership explains more variance in key individual outcomes than transformational, ethical, and authentic leadership (Hoch, Bommer, Dulebohn, & Wu, 2018), and therefore requires more adequate research attention.

Statement of Problem

Again, to the best knowledge of the researcher, there is no available study that has examined impact of servant leadership on PPS in Sub-Saharan Africa, including Nigeria. Studies conducted in other cultures that include those of North America, Asia, and Europe (have demonstrated that servant leadership practice influences workers' proactive work behavior in western context (Nnedum, 2016). Unfortunately, none of this study has been conducted in academic context. To expand the frontier of research on proactive work behavior, there is need for such studies using Nigeria sample to confirm the findings across culture. Lastly, there is also lack of detail understanding of how different SL dimensions influence PPS. According to literature within the researcher's reach, previous studies have only examined servant leadership dimensions jointly as holistic construct without been able to explore how different dimensions of servant leadership associated with different domains of proactive work behavior. It is also necessary that managers know how the various five core attributes of SL relate to PPS which certainly will be very relevant in program development and interventions in respect to recruitment, training, promotions and other practical relevance. Based on these gaps, the current study set to test the following research questions:

(1) Would there be a significant relationship between servant leadership dimension of altruistic calling and the employees' proactive problem solving?
(2) Would there be a significant relationship between servant leadership dimension of persuasive mapping and the employees' proactive problem solving?
(3) Would there be a significant relationship between servant leadership dimension of emotional healing and the employees' proactive problem solving?
(4) Would there be a significant relationship between servant leadership dimension of wisdom and the employees' proactive problem solving?
(5) Would there be a significant relationship between servant leadership dimension of organizational stewardship and the employees' proactive problem solving?

Hypotheses

Self-determination theory

Deci and Ryan (1985) propounded a self-determination theory (SDT) of motivation theory that links personality, human motivation and optimal performance (Deci & Ryan, 2008). According to SDT, people's behaviors are influenced by three psychological needs; the need for autonomy, the need for competence, and the need for relatedness. Need for autonomy has to do

AJEMATES

with individuals having the opportunity to be involve in taking decisions on issues concerning how they go about they work (autonomy motivation). In order to describe the expected influence of autonomy on PWB, the study addressed one of the several aspects of context; the provision of opportunity for the manifestation of proactive behavior at work. People expand efforts when they are the ones that set up goal for themselves. However, it is expected that providing autonomy for workers to take decision about the work allows employees to make optimal utilization of their initiatives, because such autonomy will give employees greater opportunity to take charge of their work situation, hence, creating an environment for engaging in proactive problem-solving behavior.

Regarding the need for competence, Deci and Ryan (2000) state that employees with sense of competence is intrinsically motivated. Competence gives one sense of mastery and efficacy and answer the question "can I do this" which bothers much on the ability to be proactive (Parker, Bindle, & Strauss, 2010). As proactive work behavior involves making constructive change in the work system, it requires that employees be competent enough to be able to create such change. Competent belief gives employees the confidence to initiate a challenging goal and persist to achieve it. The more one belief to have the competent to do something successfully, the greater risk the person is likely to take to initiate a new work method and create changes in the work system (Seibert, Wang, & Courtright, 2011; Frese & Fay, 2001), thereby increasing proactive problem-solving tendency. Lastly, the need for relatedness emphasizes cooperation among the members of the organization or work teams, or even with the leaders. Relationship among workers especially with the leaders is necessary to build trust on one hand, and confidence of getting leader's support on the other hand, both which certainly will tend to reduce fear, proactive risk, due to uncertainty associated with proactive problem-solving behavior outcome (Morrison & Phelps, 1999).

However, even though one would see Self-determination theory (SDT) as good theoretical orientation underpinning the reason why people should engage in proactive problem-solving behavior considering the necessity for autonomy, competence, and relatedness, these may not actually matters much for workers in Nigeria due to value system. As a matter of fact, these factor (autonomy, competence, and relatedness) may have good meaning for people in Western culture where people have gone far beyond the need for satisfaction of physiological needs (need for food, cloth, shelter etc) because of social security welfare packages, which are priority for most Nigeria workers, who may be so much interested in the expectation for reward for being proactive rather than need for autonomy, competence, and relatedness.

Therefore, we hypothesize as follows:

H1. Servant leadership dimension of altruistic calling is positively related to lecturers' proactive problem solving?

H2. Servant leadership dimension of persuasive mapping is positively related to lecturers' proactive problem solving?

H3. Servant leadership dimension of emotional healing is positively related to lecturers' proactive problem solving?

AJEMATES

H4. Servant leadership dimension of wisdom is positively related to lecturers' proactive problem solving?
H5. Servant leadership dimension of organizational stewardship is positively related to lecturers' proactive problem solving?

Research Method

Participants used in this study were sampled from three campuses of Nnamdi Azikiwe university, Awka namely; Awka compus, Nnewi compus, and Agulu campus. The study sample was basically focused on the academic staff. Thus, a total number of 648 lecturers comprising 375 male (57.87%) and 273 female (42.13%) lecturers were selected for the study using a simple randomly sampling (accidental random sampling). This implies a situation whereby a questionnaire was administered to participants who were found present and willing to participate. Out of the 648 participants, 456 (70.37%) were drawn from Awka Campus, 162 (25%) were selected from Nnewi Campus, while 30 (4.63%) were from Agulu Campus. The participants' age were ranged from 26 to 68 years, with the mean age of 45.68 years old and standard deviation ([*SD]* = 8.84). In terms of their tenure (that is years of experience), the participants on the average had worked for 10.56 years in the teaching profession (SD = 6.57). All the participants came from Igbo and therefore have similar cultural world view.

Three instruments used to source the data from the participants in the study were all established instruments. They include proactive work behavior scale (PWBS) and servant leadership scale (SLS). Each of these scales is explained below:

The proactive Problem-solving behavior sub-scale (PPS) developed by Parker, Williams and Turner (2006) was used to generate data on proactive problem-solving behavior of the participants in this study. It is a 4-item scale designed in a seven-point Likert response format ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree. The item statements were all positively worded and assess the lectuers' proactive problem-solving behavior. Proactive problem solving (PPS) behavior had four items that were used to measure PPS. Sample items include, "I am always making suggestion to relevant colleagues as to why failed promotion were increasing (PPS). The overall PPS score was derived by summing up scores of the four items. The psychometric property of this scale as reported by Parker, Williams and Turner (2006) indicated a crobanch alpha (α) reliability value of .77 for the overall proactive work behavior construct. Ezechukwu, Nnedum, Eze, Oguegbe, and Joe-Akunne (2001) established the construct validity and reliability of the Parker's et. al., (2006) PWB scale in Southeast cultural area of Nigeria. In the study, the scale showed good reliability with the data as a cronbach's alpha coefficient of .77 for the overall PWB items, and .79 for the PPS dimensions were obtained.

A 23-item scale of servant leadership developed by Barbuto & Wheeler (2006) was used in this study to generate data on servant leadership in its holistic term and also in terms of its five dimensions namely; altruistic calling (measured with 4 items), persuasive mapping (measured with 5 items), emotional healing (assessed with 4 items), wisdom (assessed with 5

items), and organizational stewardship (measured with 5 items). Sample items include, "my leader (HOD/ Dean/ Vice Chancellor) puts staff or my best interest ahead of his / her own (altruistic calling), "my leader (HOD/ Dean/ Vice Chancellor) offers compelling reasons to get lecturers to do things" (persuasive mapping), "my leader (HOD/Dean/Vice chancellor) is one I turn to if I had a personal trauma" (emotional healing), "my leader (HOD/Dean/Vice Chancellor) always seem alert to what is happening around him / her (Wisdom), and "my leader (HOD/ Dean/ Vice Chancellor) believes that the university needs to play a moral role in society (organizational stewardship). However, it is a seven point scale, ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree. The overall SL score was obtained by summing up all scores for the five dimensions. For the psychometric property of the scale, the authors (Bartuto & Wheeler, 2006) assessed the internal reliability for self-version and for raters' version. The self-version of the servant leadership five subscale as reported by Bartuto and Wheeler (2006) demonstrated reliabilities ranging from .68 to .87, and the rater version demonstrated reliabilities ranging from .82 to .92. Ezechukwu, Nnedum, Eze, Oguegbe, and Joe-Akunne (2001) established the construct validity and reliability of the servant leadership scale in Southeast cultural area of Nigeria and obtained a cronbach alpha coefficient of .96 for the main servant leadership construct. For the subscales, the reliabilities ranged from .90 to .94 (altruistic calling =.92, emotional healing = .93, wisdom = .91, persuasive mapping = .90, and organizational stewardship = .94).

First and Foremost, the researcher sought for information on the total population of academic staff of the study university. This was achieved by writing a letter to directorate of academic planning and personnel units through the Head of Psychology Department. The total population of the academic staff then was 3726, and based on the record, the sample size of 856 was determined using Taro Yamane formula (1967) for determining sample size. A systematic simple random sampling was applied to select the faculties. Using this method, the entire Faculties were listed, and the ones chosen were selected on every count of 3. In all, 9 faculties were selected. After this, a consent letter was written to all the Deans of Faculties selected for their approval for lecturers from the faculties to participate. The Deans gave their approval. However, with the list of lecturers collected from the Directorate of academic planning and Personal Units, it was then easy to know the number of the staff from each department down to faculty. Based on this information, the sample frame was drawn. After this, the researcher printed 1000 copies of questionnaire for distribution. During administration of questionnaire, non-probability accidental random sampling was applied. This method reflects a situation whereby questionnaire was given to any lecturer from the selected faculties who was found present and also declare willingness to participate. Luckily, during the period of the field survey, there was a workshop organized by the school for all the academic staff in the university, which was done batch by batch, and faculty by faculty. This gave the researcher an ample opportunity to easily reach the participants. Whenever it is turn of the Faculties selected for the study, the research went there to distribute questionnaire to them, normally during break time. The research consults the organizers

AJEMATES

who helped to create a ground to address the lecturers. At this point, the research debriefed the lecturers on purpose of the study, shown them consent letter from the deans and assured of confidentiality of any information released. However, little interactions and instructions were carried out for clarifications. Thereafter, the questionnaire was distributed to the participants (lecturers) during the workshop. Three faculties formed each batch and the training lasted for four days for each batch. Participants were pleaded with to fill and return the questionnaire within the four days that the workshop for each batch was meant to last. The entire field survey lasted for 38 working days which was about 1 month and 2 weeks. In all, a total of 702 copies of questionnaire (structured questionnaire) were administered. Out of the 702, 658 copies were returned, giving a return rate of 93.73%. Further, a cross-examination of the returned copies of the filled questionnaire revealed that 10 copies were invalid; they were either improperly or not completely filled and were discarded. The remaining 648 copies which gives a response rate of 92.31% were finally adopted as relevant data in the analysis. The first analysis has to do with descriptive statistic which produced the mean, the standard deviation and percentage scores of the data distribution; the second which is Pearson Moment Correlation Statistic was used to produce the zero-order correlations of all the variables; the third was a simple regression linear analysis that tested the direct relationships between the predictors and the outcome variables, while controlling for gender, age and tenure; and lastly, the Hierarchical Multiple Regression statistic that tested the hypotheses.

Presentation of Results

Table 1: Mean, Standard Deviation, Cronbach Alpha Reliability, and Inter-correlation Results

Variables:	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1.Gender	1.42	.49	-												
2.Age	45.68	8.85	.07	-											
3.Tenure	10.56	6.57	.03	.63**	-										
4.SL	4.62	1.15	-.01	-.07	-.05	(.96)									
5.AC	4.24	1.51	.01	-.05	-.02	.84**	(.92)								
6.E.H	3.77	1.62	-.05	-.05	-.02	.77**	.68**	(.93)							
7.Wisdo	4.78	1.28	.01	.09*	-.03	.83**	.59**	.50**	(.91)						

AJEMATES

8.PM	4.87	1.28	-.02	-.02	-.09*	.87**	.62**	.55**	.68**	(.90)				
9.OS	5.22	1.32	-.03	-.08*	.03	.85**	.62**	.47**	.67**	.74**	(.94)			
10-PPS	4.57	1.28	-.08*	.07	.09*	.15**	.22**	.20**	.09*	.11**	.03	.87**	.32**	(.79)

*ote: N = 648, * = .05, ** = .01, servant leadership (SL), altruistic calling (AC), emotional healing (EH), persuasive mapping (PM), organizational stewardship (OS), proactive problem solving (PPS),*

Table 1 above presents the result of the zero-order correlations of all the variables. As indicated, gender had a significant negative relationship with PPS (r = -08, p < .05). Age had a significant positive correlation with leader's wisdom (r = .09*, p < .05), and negatively correlated with leader's OS trait (r = -.08, p < .05). Tenure was significantly associated positively with leader's persuasive mapping trait (r = .09, p < .05), and also correlates positively with employees' PPS (r = .09, p < .05).. However, none of the three demographic variables relate significantly with SL variable. Moreover, correlations among the three main variables of interest in this study were all significant and positive: SL had a significant positive relationship with PPS (r = .15, p < .01) However, of the five forms of SL; altruistic calling (AC) correlates positively with with PPS (r = .22 p < .01). Emotional healing (EH) associates positively with PPS aspect (r = .20, p < .01). Perceived leader's wisdom has a significant positive relationship with employees' performance of PPS (r = .09, p < .05). Persuasive mapping (PM) has a positive links with PPS (r = .11, p < .01) in positive direction. Leader's organizational stewardship (OS) did not relate significantly with the PPS variable. Given these results, and couple with evidence of the previous research that gender, age, and tenure were relatively important in influencing certain employees' work outcomes, we decided to enter them as control variable in the test of the main hypotheses.

Test of Hypotheses

H1: Altruistic calling (AC) will have a significant positive influence on lecturers' PPS behavior.

H2: Persuasive mapping (PM) will have a significant positive influence on lecturers' PPS behavior.

H3: Emotional healing will have a significant positive influence on lecturers' PPS behavior

H4: Wisdom will have a significant positive influence on lecturers' PPS behavior

H5: Organizational stewardship will have a significant positive influence on lecturers' PPS behaviour

African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies
VOL.7 (1), August-December, 2022 https://ajemates.org

Table 2: Summary Results of the Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for the Joint and Independent Relationship between the Five SL dimensions, and the Proactive Problem-Solving variable

Var:	PPS					
	M1			M2		
	β	P-val	R^2	β	P-val	R^2
SL:	.15***	.000	.023	.16***	.000	.040
AC:	.22***	.000	.049	.22**	.000	.065
PM:	.11**	.006	.012	12**	.003	.028
EH:	.20***	.000	.039	.20***	.000	.053
Wis:	.09*	.028	.007	.09*	.018	.024
OS:	.03	.505	.001	.03	.415	.016

*N = 648, * = p< .05, ** = p < .01, R^2 = R-square, SL = Var. = Variables, , PPS = Proactive problem solving, servant leadership, AC = altruistic calling, PM = persuasive mapping, Wis – Wisdom, EH = emotional healing, OS = organizational stewardship.*

Note: The model includes controlling for gender, age and tenure.

As shown in table 2, overall hypothesis indicated that for the five dimensions of SL to jointly predict the results demonstrate that the five SL dimensions jointly predicted PPS even before (β = .15, < .001) as in model 1and after (β = 15, p < .05) controlling for gender, age and tenure as in model 2, all in positive direction. SL dimensions jointly will significantly predict PPS was confirmed. In terms of predicting power, model 1with SL alone accounted for 2.3% (R^2 = .023) of the variance in PPS, while model 2 with inclusion of the three control variables explained an increasing 4.0% (R^2 = .040) of the variance in PPS outcome.

Testing for independent prediction of each of the five SL dimensions on PPS outcome was significantly influenced by all the dimensions of SL except OS as follow: AC (M1 β = .22, p < .001, M2 β = .22), PM (M1: β = ,11, : β = .12, p < .01), EH (M1: β = .20, M2: β = .20, p < .001), and wisdom (M1: β = .09, M2: β = .09, p < .05). Looking at their predicting power on PPS outcomes; AC has the greatest influence on this outcome (M1: R^2 = .049 or 4.90%, M2 R^2 = .065 or 6.50%), followed by EH (M1 R^2 = .039, M2 R^2 = .053), followed by PM (M1 R^2 = .0.12 or 1.20%; M2 R^2 = .028 or 2.80%) and then Wisdom (R^2 = .007 or 0.70%;, R^2 = .024 or 2,40%) in that order. Given these results, subordinate hypotheses – H1 (AC will have a significant positive influence on PPS), H2 (PM will have a significant influence on PII), **H3** (PM will have a significant positive influence on PPS), **H4** (EH will have a significant positive influence on PPS), **H5** (leader's wisdom will have a significant positive influence on PPS), were all accepted, whereas subordinated hypotheses – **H6** (OS will have significant influence on PPS) were rejected.

AJEMATES

Implication of the Findings

The study has both theoretical and practical implications. For its theoretical implications, the study expanded the frontier of knowledge on the relationship between SL and PPS from Nigeria university work context. However, with the consistent research evidence confirming the relationship between SL and PPS, the need for understanding the nature of the relationship was felt more vigorously.

Practically, the present study has numerous implications to organizational managers on intervention policies pertaining training, recruitment and promotion. First, in terms of training, the study proved the need for organization to periodically organize training or workshop for their university staff/ management on servant leadership skills. This study empirically revealed that employees who have low competence or low self-belief can be shape and motivated to exhibit PPS behavior under a servant vice chancellor as a leader; proving that by training university staff/ leaders on SL skills, organizations can increase proactive problem-solving behavior activities of their employees at work. Finally, the study showed to be practically relevant to university organization when it comes to promotion policies. Basically, workers track record that show servant leadership quality should be used as yardstick for selection of vice chancellors interview protocol, including appointment and promotion of workers to leadership position since the study evidenced that vice chancellors' servant leadership is crucial in promoting proactive problem-solving behaviour.

Recommendations

The following recommendation are made base on the findings:

1. We recommended that choosing who occupy leadership position in the university (e.g., Vice-Chancellor, Deans of faculty, and head of departments) should strictly base on their track records on Psychological attributes such as servant leadership quality.
2. We also recommended that university and other academic organization operating in Nigeria work culture should occasionally organizes leadership training or workshop for university leaders with focus on increasing servant leadership skills among leaders

Conclusion

Based on the findings, we concluded that:

1. SL tend to have a significant impact in influencing employees' proactive problem-solving behavior at work.
2. On specific dimensions, leader's AC, PM, EH, and wisdom has ability to influence lecturers' PPS.

Funding

We would like to acknowledge the financial support provided by TetFund Institutional Based Research (IBR) grant referenced (TETF/DR&D/CE/UNI/AWKA/RG/2022/VOL.1) of (NAU/TETFC/IBR/2022/VOL.1V/020) to the lead researcher Obiajulu Anthony Ugochukwu Nnedum for the preparation of this research report

AJEMATES

Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge the contributions of all the college students who volunteered to participate in the study by responding to the questionnaires distributed to them that are returned havening honestly responded to its items. We acknowledge Late Chief Mrs Jospine Obiageliaku Nnedum (Ezinne electric) for her care and encouragement during the field research camp.

REFERENCES

Burbuto, J.E. & Wheeler, D. W. (2006). Scale development and construct clarification of servant leadership. Group organizational Management, 31; 300-326

Center for Ethical Leadership (2014). Who We Are; Concept and Philosophies. ethical leadership.org/concepts-and-philosophies.html. Accessed January, 2015.

Crant, J.M. (2000). Proactive behavior in organization. *Journal of management, 26*, 435-462.

Deci, E.L. & Ryan R.M. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychology* 55, 68-78

Deci, E.L. and Ryan, R.M. (2008), "Self-determination theory: a macrotheory of human motivation, development, and health", *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie Canadienne, 49 (3)*, pp. 182-185

Deci, E.L. & Ryan, R.M. (1985). The support of autonomy and the control of behavior. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *53*(6): 1024.

Den-Hartog, D.N., & Beschalk, F.D. (2012). When does transformational leadership enhance employees proactive behavior?. The role of autonomy and the role breadth self-efficacy. *Journal of Applied Psychology; 97*(1), 194-202. doi:10.1037/a0024903

Ehrhart, M. G. (2004). Leadership and procedural justice climate as antecedents of unitlevel organizational citizenship behaviour . Personnel Psychology , 57, 6

Ezechukwu, Nnedum, Eze, Oguegbe, & Joe-Akunne (2001). Relationship servant leadership and proactive work behavior among academic staff: core self-evaluation as moderator: *National Scientific and Annual Meeting,* Nigeria Association of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Owerri, Nigeria.

Frese, M., & Fay, D. (2001). Personal initiative: An active performance concept for work in the 21st century. *Research in the organizational behavior 23*, 133 – 187.

Grant, A. M., & Ashford, S.J. (2008). The dynamics of proactivity at work. Research in organizational behavior; *Elsevier LTD, 28*, 3-34. doi:10.1016/j.riob.2008.04.002.

Greenleaf, R.K. (1970). The servant as a leader. Indianapolis, In: Greenleaf Center.

Griffin, M.A., Neal, A., & Parker, S.K. (2007). A new model of work role performance:

AJEMATES

Positive behavior in uncertain and interdependence context. *Academy of Management journal; 50*(2), 327 -347.

Griifin, M.A., Parker, S.K., & Masson, C.M. (2010). Leader Vision and the development of adaptive and proactive performance: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Applied Psychology,95*(17) 182. doi:10.1037/a0017263.

Hoch, J. E., Bommer, W. H., Dulebohn, W. H., & Wu, D. (2018). Do ethical, authentic, and servant leadership explain variance above and beyond transformational leadership? A meta- analysis. *Journal of Management*, 44, 501–529.

Liden, R., Wayne, S., Liao, C., & Meuser, J. (2014). Servant leadership and serving culture: Influence on individual and unit performance. Academy of Management Journal, 57, 1434-1452.

Luo, J. & Zheng, J. (2018), "The impact of servant leadership on proactive behaviors: a study based on cognitive evaluation theory", *Psychology*, 09 (5), pp. 1228-1244.

Martin, S. L., Liao, H., & Campbell, E.M. (2013). Directive versus empowering leadership: A field experiment comparing impacts on task proficiency and proactivity. *Academy of Management Journal, 56*(5), 1372–1395.

Morrison, E.W., & Phelps, C.C. (1999). Taking charge at work. Extra-role efforts to initiative workplace change. *Academy of management journal, 42*: 403–419.

Nnedum, O.A.U. (2016). Impact of University shared leadership on lecturer's university extra-role behavior. *Unpublished PhD dissertation*, Ebonyi State University, Abakiliki, Ebonyi State.

Parker, S.K., Bindle, K.S & Strauss, K (2010). Making things happen: a model of proactive motivation. *Journal of management, 36*, 827 – 856

Parker. S.K.,& Collins, C.G. (2010). Taking stock: Intergrating and differentiating multiple proactive behaviors. *Journal of management; 36*(3). 633–662.

Parker, S.K., Williams, & Turner (2006). Modeling the antecedents of proactive behavior t work. *Journal of Applied Psychology; 91*(3), 636 – 652.

Rafferty, A.E., & Graffin, M.A. (2007). Refining individualized consideration: Distinguishing developmental leadership and supportive leadership. *Journal of Occupational and organizational Psychology; 79*; 37–61

Seibert, S.E., Wang, G. and Courtright, S.H. (2011), "Antecedents and consequences of psychological team empowerment in organizations: a meta-analytic review", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96 (5), pp. 981-1003.

Smith, B. N., Montagno, R. V., & Kuzmenko, T. N. (2004). Transformational and servant leadership: Content and contextual comparisons . 10 (4), 80-91.

Taleghani, M. & Mehr, R.R. (2013). The relationship between servant leadership and

organizational citizenship behavior in executive organizations of Guilan Province. *Journal of basic and applied scientific research; 3*(1), 910-917

AJEMATES

Tischler, L. Giambastista, R., McKeage, R, & McCornic, D. (2016). Servant leadership and its relationship with core self-evaluation and job satisfaction. *The journal of valued-based leadership; 9*(1),8.

Van-Derendonck, D (2011). Servant leadership: A review and synthesis. Journal of management, doi:1177/0149206310380462

Wu, C., & Parker, S.K. (2017). The role of leaders support in facilitating proactive work behavior: A perspective from attachment theory. Journal of management, 43, 1025-1-49

Yin, K., Xing L., Li, C.,& Guo. Y. (2017). Are empowered employees more proactive?. The contingency of how they evaluate their leader. Frontier in Psychology. 8:1802. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01802.

AJEMATES