

Leading through service, stewardship and suffering

Servant leadership in the life of Hans Nielsen Hauge (1771–1824)

Truls Liland

NLA University College

ABSTRACT

In this article, the leadership of Hans Nielsen Hauge (1771–1824), the founder and main figure of the significant Haugean movement in Norway during the 1800s, will be explored through the lens of servant leadership theory. More specifically, a theoretical framework described and developed by van Dierendonck will be systematically utilized to understand the legacy of Hans Nielsen Hauge better, especially as it relates to his leadership and people development. Thus, three broad questions will be asked: (1) How can Hauge's role as a leader and role model be understood? (2) What are some important characteristics of his leadership thinking and practice, also based on his followers' perceptions? (3) To what extent can servant leadership theory provide a deeper understanding of Hauge's leadership?

Keywords: Servant leadership, Leadership, Calling, Entrepreneurship, Empowerment, Authenticity, Humility, Stewardship, Servanthood.

INTRODUCTION

Hans Nielsen Hauge (1771–1824) was the founder and leader of a movement that significantly influenced areas like business development, entrepreneurship, education, and politics in Norway during the 1800s. Researchers have understood Hauge as a charismatic and transformational leader (Seland, 2017, pp. 109–111), held in high esteem by his followers, and have described him as a strong and bold leader, highly entrepreneurial and risk-taking. However, studying the historical sources, a caring, supportive, and human oriented approach to his leadership also seems to emerge. Thus, servant leadership theory will be applied to seek a deeper understanding of Hauge's leadership.

In this article, we will assess salient aspects of the leadership of Hans Nielsen Hauge, primarily by applying the theoretical framework of servant leadership offered by van Dierendonck (2011). To better understand and contextualize Hauge's leadership, a brief sketch of his life, work, and main contributions will be provided, as well as relevant historical background information about the society he was part of, the Haugean movement he created, and its societal impact in Norway in the 1800s. Thus, even though this influential movement was not what today would be considered a formal organizational entity, it has several similar attributes. The Haugeans' frequent interactions as business partners, their strong relational bonds, both personally and professionally, and their shared core values provide a framework where one could argue that theories of organizational leadership could be applied.

Hauge has previously been described as a charismatic leader (e.g., Seland, 2017, pp. 109–111; Magnus, 2020, p. 127) and an entrepreneur (Kullerud, 1996, p. 256). Obviously, this does explain vital aspects of Hauge's life and leadership, especially his influence and ability as a visionary leader to recruit and convince others to join his many entrepreneurial projects and the Haugean movement at large. However, his strong value-based and religious commitment, his stewardship perspective on both his life and work, and the way he combined his people skills with developing businesses ascribing to a higher purpose seem to fit quite well with more ethically oriented and follower/people-centric leadership theories. Thus, such theories could potentially provide additional and relevant insights in order to gain a broader understanding of Hauge's leadership, both in terms of motivational and behavioral factors. One such theory, servant leadership, appears to be particularly promising and will be applied systematically to understand Hauge's leadership thinking and practice better, with a particular focus on his traveling years, that is, 1797–1804. Thus, the framework developed by van Dierendonck (2011) will primarily provide a broad overview to explore Hauge's leadership in this area, with some references to how this influenced other leaders in the Haugean movement. Hopefully, future studies will go deeper into specific characteristics and dimensions of his leadership to further increase our understanding of Hans Nielsen Hauge and the movement he initiated. Finally, if this article can provide a helpful historical role model, inspiring leaders today to serve their followers, organizations, and local communities better and in ways that benefit society, perhaps even the environment, the research conducted to produce it will be well worth the effort.

HANS NIELSEN HAUGE AND THE HAUGEAN MOVEMENT

Hans Nielsen Hauge was born on April 3rd, 1771, in the former municipality of Rolvsøy, which today is part of Fredrikstad, located in the southeastern part of Norway (Norborg, 1966;

Kullerud, 1996; Gundersen, 2022).¹ The Kingdom of Denmark-Norway was then ruled by the Danish king Christian VII (1749–1808), based on the model of absolute monarchy introduced in 1661. The majority of the population of Norway were peasants living in the rural parts of the country, which was also the case for Hauge (Dalgaard and Supphellen, 2011, p. 51). However, many of Hauge's entrepreneurial endeavors took place during the turbulent times of the early 1800s, which were characterized by periods of both economic growth and increasing unemployment, the latter often due to a lack of available agricultural land (Grytten, 2013, pp. 33–34; Hodne and Grytten, 2000, pp. 9–20). Thus, this period of transition provided several entrepreneurial opportunities but also years of famine and starvation, in part due to catastrophic consequences of the Napoleonic wars in Europe (Hodne and Grytten, 2000, pp. 22–33; Sejersted, 2002, pp. 47–52).

A few days after his 25th birthday, Hauge experienced what later has been categorized as his spiritual breakthrough. As he was working in the fields at the Hauge family farm, singing a traditional Pietistic hymn, *Jesus din søte forening å smake* [Jesus, to taste your sweet communion], he sensed a divine and heavenly presence surrounding him. At the same time, he received a call to share this with others and serve them by leading them into a deeper life through repentance and by turning to God (Kullerud, 1996, pp. 77–79; Grytten and Liland, 2021, pp. 11–13). This radical encounter with the Lord changed the course of Hauge's life and put him on an entirely different trajectory than he, his family and his peers expected. Now, with a deep sense of divine calling, serving a higher purpose, Hauge felt commissioned to spread the message he had received. Thus, he started, almost immediately, preaching to his family, friends, and neighbors, visiting local farms in the vicinity of his hometown as he found opportunities to do so. He later explained that his calling could be summed up by the following words, "My calling is to love God and my neighbor" (Aarflot, 1969, p. 371). Within a year, he started traveling all over the country, mostly on foot, and as people responded to his message, local groups of believers, or societies of friends as they later were called, were formed. During the next few years, this had developed into an expanding network of friends all over Norway. Consequently, from these small and humble beginnings, a national and influential movement began to emerge, with Hauge as the natural and undisputed leader (Sjursen, 1997, p. 17). Thus, many of those who were part of the movement turned to him for advice and direction, and there are several accounts of those who heeded his input in areas like marriage, business-related issues, and religious questions (Kullerud, 1996, p. 249–256; Magnus, 2020, pp. 125–127).

In 1801, partly in response to criticism about neglecting earthly matters and being too concerned with spiritual things, Hauge developed, even though he found some of the criticism unwarranted, the idea of starting businesses (Breistein, 1955, pp. 36–42). Moreover, Hauge wrote a number of books and pamphlets, which were distributed widely and, in fact, made him Norway's most-read author during his lifetime (Haukland, 2014). Thus, he was in constant need of paper, facilities to print and produce his books and pamphlets, and other resources to support this process (Breistein, 1955, p. 120–122). The limited capacity in Norway and Denmark in this area provided several entrepreneurial opportunities for Hauge. In total, Hauge started or restated about 30 entrepreneurial business endeavors and was involved in founding a total of more than 150 business units (Breistein, 1955; Grytten, 2013, p. 38; Ravnåsen, 2015, pp. 48–49; Rødal and Kiplesund, 2009). He even became a merchant in the city of Bergen, on the west coast of Norway, which served as a base to organize many of his trade initiatives (Breistein, 1955, p. 43–50). Recent estimates, though uncertain, stipulate that Hauge and his

¹ Much of the biographical material about Hauge here is based on these sources, but Ording (1953), Breistein (1955), and Kvamen (1974) have also been consulted.

friends were involved in creating between 7,000 and 8,000 jobs between 1801 and 1828 (Breistein, 1955, pp. 120–159; Hodne, 1999, pp. 41–61; Grytten, 2014). Significantly, the total population of Norway was about 900,000 in the early 1800s. Hence, Hauge's accomplishments are quite exceptional, and he is viewed as one of the most influential serial entrepreneurs and entrepreneurial leaders in Norwegian history (Grytten, 2013, pp. 35–41; Liland, 2021, p. 72). This does not mean, however, that all of his business activities succeeded; in fact, some of them failed, and he suffered financial losses as a result (Grytten, 2014, pp. 35–36). As described by Ims, Liland, and Supphellen (2019, p. 324), some indications suggest that Hauge understood his entrepreneurial endeavors as an integral part of responding to his divine calling "to love God and my neighbor" (Aarflot, 1969, p. 370–371). Interestingly, one could thus argue that one of the reasons Hauge started new businesses was based on the understanding that this was an appropriate way to apply his Christian faith and, through that, serve both his neighbor and society, e.g., creating jobs, improving local communities, and increasing literacy skills (Ims, Liland, and Supphellen, 2019, pp. 317–318; Hunnes and Liland, 2021). The Haugeans initiated what eventually became a network of businesses all over Norway, and many of these companies had business models that incorporated both social and financial goals (Liland, 2020). Thus, by following the example of Hauge, they served a higher purpose through their business endeavors (Birkinshaw et al., 2014; Hunnes and Liland, 2021). Also, it is an integral part of modern concepts like social entrepreneurship and corporate social responsibility (Santos, 2012; Liland, 2020). Apparently, this was a major component of what motivated many Haugean entrepreneurial endeavors (Grytten and Minde, 2019; Hunnes and Liland, 2021).

Hauge was seen as a threat to the established order, including the Lutheran state church, and was arrested in 1804. He was not released until 1814 when Norway gained independence from Denmark. His health had deteriorated severely during his imprisonment, and he was no longer able to travel like before, but he continued to lead the movement and launch entrepreneurial projects until he died in 1824. Then, the Haugeans continued to influence areas like business, education, and politics for several decades (Grytten and Minde, 2019). Consequently, the foundation was laid for what became the first people movement in Norway, contributing to the development of inclusive institutions and, eventually, a more democratically governed society (Sejersted, 2002, pp. 66–67).

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES ON LEADERSHIP AND SERVANT LEADERSHIP

Even though leadership scholars so far have been unsuccessful in reaching a clear consensus in defining leadership, Yukl and Gardner (2020) will serve here as representatives of what can be identified as a quite broad and mainstream process-oriented approach. They provide the following definition, "Leadership is the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how to do it, and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish shared objectives" (Yukl and Gardner, 2020, p. 26). The primary meaning of keywords like influence, process, collective efforts, and shared objectives in the definition can be found in several other contributions in the quest to describe the concept of leadership clearly. Moreover, transformational leadership was first introduced by Burns (1978), who defined it as occurring "when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers help each other to advance to higher levels of motivation and morality" (Burns, 1978, p. 20). Further developed by Bass (1985), it has been a highly influential

and popular theory among leadership researchers during the last few decades. Aspects of charismatic leadership are often understood as based on charisma (Weber (1922 [1978]), which "entices people to follow, as it is perceived as a magnetism, which attracts attention and fascination" (Fragouli, 2018, p. 298). They can be found particularly in one of the four dimensions of transformational leadership that is, idealized influence (Bass, 1985, p. 6). These dimensions (the other three being inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration) were identified by Bass (1985, pp. 6–7) as core elements in this leadership theory. However, the more traditional approach to leadership has been the object of criticism for its alleged lack of ethical considerations (Hornett and Fredricks, 2005). Thus, one could argue that the potential of destructive leadership, e.g., can be found in narcissistic and manipulative behavior, is not sufficiently addressed to be prevented in traditional leadership theories, perhaps also charismatic and transformational leadership. Some attempts have been made to resolve this, e.g., by distinguishing between authentic transformational leadership and pseudo-transformational leadership (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999). However, research has also been conducted to identify leadership theories that, to a greater extent, seek to integrate ethics and leadership in a more holistic way (Hoch et al., 2018). Importantly, recent corporate scandals, like Enron, Fannie Mae and Volkswagen, have raised the awareness of leadership scholars and practitioners to include ethical aspects and considerations more explicitly in both leadership theory and behavior (Parris and Peachey, 2013). Several more follower-centric and people-oriented leadership theories, like authentic leadership (Avolio and Gardner, 2005) and ethical leadership (Lawton and Páez, 2015), have thus been presented as new perspectives in the leadership literature, thus seeking to integrate ethics and leadership. However, the most promising theory among these so far is servant leadership (Hoch et al., 2018)

In his essay "The Servant as Leader" in 1970, Robert K. Greenleaf (1904–1990) launched and explained the concept of servant leadership, where he describes a leader who is, first and foremost, dedicated to serving others (Greenleaf, 1970, p. 13). Both Herman Hesse's novel *Journey to the East* and Greenleaf's own Quaker background, emphasizing the example of Jesus of Nazareth as a servant leader, are mentioned as sources of inspiration for this new approach to leadership (Greenleaf, 1970). Primarily described as a leadership philosophy and not sharply defined in academic terms, his approach to leadership did not initially gain much traction from researchers (Parris and Peachey, 2013, p. 378). This approach to leadership also initially seemed to overlap with other leadership theories (Hoch et al., 2018). However, many business leaders embraced the idea and implemented versions of servant leadership as a leadership philosophy in their organizations (Langhof and Guldenberg, 2020, p. 34). Without a clear definition of servant leadership, however, the way this theory was applied could deviate somewhat from its original intent. During the last few years, however, there has also been an increased interest in this leadership theory from researchers, and clearer definitions and measurements have been developed (Eva et al. 2019, pp. 1–2). Originally, according to Greenleaf (1970, p. 13), "The servant-leader is servant first. It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead". To illustrate the development of the field, one could compare this more conceptual approach to the following definition of servant leadership by Eva et al. (2018) as a point of reference:

"Servant leadership is an (1) other-oriented approach to leadership (2) manifested through one-on-one prioritizing of follower individual needs and interests, (3) and outward reorienting of their concern for self towards concern for others within the organization and the larger community" (Eva et al., 2018, p. 4).

Currently, servant leadership by many leadership researchers and practitioners is often understood and described as a holistic approach to leadership (Reddy, 2019; Eva et al., 2018, p. 1). Also, this understanding is, at least to a certain extent, built on the notion, which also

was central to Greenleaf, that all organizations have an extended role or responsibility in society (Greenleaf, 1977, pp. 49–55). More specifically, Greenleaf argued that all organizations should serve society in some way or another, even though this would obviously look different for institutions in the private, public, and non-profit sectors (Greenleaf, 1977). Significantly, this role goes beyond realizing one's own goals, that is, to develop people who can contribute to a better society (Parris and Peachey, 2012, p. 378). Consequently, a servant leader is concerned with the growth and development of their followers, as well as being involved in building healthy and strong organizations that serve both their many different stakeholders and society as a whole (Greenleaf, 1977).

Interestingly, several studies have shown that servant leadership contributes positively to organizational goals like increased intrinsic motivation and job performance (Bande et al., 2016; Rieke et al., 2008), organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) (Graham, 1995; Ng et al., 2008), and team effectiveness (Burke et al., 2006). Moreover, an increasing number of studies are indicating a positive correlation between servant leadership and both innovation and creativity (Yoshida et al., 2014), more specifically, employee innovative behavior (Wang et al., 2019), creativity (Williams et al., 2017), and even management innovation (Karatepe et al., 2020). However, as researchers have identified a dark side of leadership in general (Mackey et al., 2021), studies regarding servant leadership have shown similar results, though it is premature to conclude whether these results are ubiquitous (Camm, 2019; Zheng et al., 2023). Nevertheless, some studies indicate that the other orientation of servant leaders can lead to emotional exhaustion (Zheng et al., 2023) and, in fact, though often impacting followers' wellbeing positively, can be harmful to the wellbeing of the leader (Panaccio et al., 2015).

According to Spears (2010), there are certain characteristics of serving leaders, identified as listening, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of others, and community building. Subsequently, several studies have been provided to construct clearer measurement models for servant leadership. Thus, according to Eva et al. (2018), the three most promising and commonly used servant leadership measurement models are the "Servant Leadership Scale" (SL-7), developed by Liden et al. (2008), the "Servant Leadership Behavior Scale" (SLBS-6) by Sendjaya, Sarros, and Santona (2008), and the "Servant Leadership Survey" (SLS) scale made by van Dierendonck and Nuijten (2011), see Table 1 below. However, these measurement models are primarily applied through more quantitative-oriented methods.

Table 1: *Three servant leadership measurement models: SL-7, SLBS-6, and SLS.*

Servant Leadership Scale (SL-7), Liden et al. (2008)	Servant Leadership Behavior Scale (SLBS-6), Sendjaya et al. (2008)	Servant Leadership Survey (SLS), van Dierendonck and Nuijten (2011)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emotional healing • Creating value for the community • Conceptual skills • Empowering • Helping subordinates grow and succeed • Putting subordinates first • Behaving ethically 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Voluntary subordination • Authentic self • Covenantal relationship • Responsible morality • Transcendental spirituality • Transforming influence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Empowerment • Accountability • Standing back • Humility • Authenticity • Courage • Interpersonal acceptance • Stewardship

Although there are differences among these measurement models, considerable overlap and similar characteristics like stewardship, humility, empowerment, and serving/developing others can also be identified. Thus, concepts like serving something greater than oneself, being motivated by the growth and development of followers, and actually empowering others seem to indicate core components of servant leadership, both in these models and in much of the relevant research literature. However, as described in more detail below, the analysis used in this article will be based on van Dierendonck (2011).

METHODICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The theoretical framework offered by van Dierendonck (2011) will be applied in the analysis of Hans Nielsen Hauge's leadership below, based on relevant and available historical material. Significantly, van Dierendonck (2011) distinguishes between antecedents, behavior, mediating processes, and outcomes, and the six key characteristics of servant leader behavior. The latter is described as empowering and developing others, humility, authenticity, interpersonal acceptance, providing direction, and stewardship. Thus, these six characteristics will be applied to understand Hauge's leadership philosophy and behavior better in order to gain deeper insights into their underlying drivers and mechanisms. Also, the characteristics provided by van Dierendonck can and will be understood as key concepts that provide some overlap with other similar terms in the leadership and organizational theory literature. Hopefully, this will provide richer and broader perspectives in analyzing the subject matters at hand, seeking to clarify Hauge's approach to leadership. Other relevant studies and literature regarding these characteristics will be supplied in the analysis when seen as relevant to anchor this in a broader field of leadership research to understand Hauge's leadership better.

In dealing with the sources regarding Hauge and the Haugean movement, primary sources like Ording (1953) and Kvamen (1974), which contain the writings and letters of Hauge, were first consulted, together with research-based articles and publications pertaining to the relevant topics covered in the analysis below, like Breistein (1955). Also, material from biographies about Hauge and other non-scientific sources have been utilized as they shed light and provide help to understand the relevant topics better. Here, Hauge's saying about leadership, stories that convey leadership behavior, descriptions of how business-related issues were dealt with, teaching about theological topics related to the role and character of leadership, as well as practical issues regarding leaders and followers, etc., will be reviewed in light of the characteristics of servant leader behavior as identified by van Dierendonck (2011). However, it should be noted that the analysis has been conducted to identify patterns and the general tendency in Hauge's leadership regarding the above-mentioned characteristics. Thus, all known relevant sources and findings have been applied in this effort, not just those that support or correspond positively to the six characteristics identified by van Dierendonck; see Table 2 below for a short description of these sources and their contributions.

Table 2: *Categories of sources utilized in analyzing Hans Nielsen Hauge's (servant) leadership.*

Type	Sources (examples)	Relevance for analysis
Primary sources	Ording (1947–1953): Books and writings by Hauge	Quotes by Hauge like "The greatest is the servant of all" and his teaching regarding a biblical understanding of topics like stewardship, servanthood, and leadership.
	Kvamen (1974): Letters from Hauge and other Haugeans	Communication within the Haugean movement regarding practical issues, business matters, and ethical behavior. Hauge exhorts his followers to lead by example, serve others, and live according to their values/faith. Demonstrates characteristics like humility, listening to others, and empowerment.
Research-based sources	Breistein (1955): Doctoral thesis about Hauge as a merchant	Provides useful information about Hauge's thinking and practice regarding business, entrepreneurship and leadership.
	Aarflot (1969): Doctoral thesis about Hauge's theology	A thorough analysis of Hauge's understanding of theology and biblical topics like stewardship, work, and social engagement.
	Grytten (2013 and 2014), Hunnes & Liland (2021), Grytten & Minde (2019), Dalgaard & Supphellen (2011), Seland (2017), Haukland (2014), Grytten & Liland (2021), etc.	Research regarding Hauge's life and leadership, entrepreneurship, authorship, societal influence, and the Haugean movement; their political involvement, business development, engagement in areas like education and civic society, etc.
Other sources	Kullerud (1996), Magnus (2020), Sejersted (2002), Hodne (1999), Riiser Gundersen (2022), etc.	Biographical information about Hauge, the history of Norway during the 1800s, and relevant background information about the Haugeans.
	Ravnåsen (2015), Liland (2020), etc.	Information regarding Haugean companies, business philosophy, etc.

Consequently, the results are not unambiguous. For a characteristic like humility, the analysis identifies only a partial resemblance with Hauge's leadership, and for another, providing direction, more information is needed to explore all its relevant aspects adequately.

Obviously, the above-mentioned approach does not imply that this study seeks to document that Hans Nielsen Hauge deliberately practiced servant leadership as we know this theory today, nor that he had any knowledge about this. Neither does the article exhaustively cover every aspect of Hauge's understanding and practice of leadership nor that servant leadership theory is necessarily sufficient to explain this. What it does imply, though, is that by applying servant leadership theory to salient areas of Hauge's leadership thinking and behavior, we can

gain a better, and hopefully deeper, understanding of his life and work. In particular, this would be applicable to his leadership, although not comprehensively or completely.

For each of the six characteristics, two or three key terms, primarily based on definitions and explanations provided by van Dierendonck (2011) and van Dierendonck and Nuijten (2011), but also based on how these concepts are used in the leadership literature, are applied to Hauge's leadership. To be true to the original model, all of the characteristics of servant leader behavior, including the two or three concepts associated with each of them, will be covered. However, a thorough analysis of all six characteristics of servant leader behavior and two or three concepts included in each of them would require a more comprehensive treatment than what would fit the parameters of this article. Thus, the analysis below will deal with all of these to provide an overview and test the assumption that important aspects of Hauge's leadership can be understood in the light of servant leadership theory. Still, three of these characteristics, that is, empowering and developing people, interpersonal acceptance, and stewardship, do appear to be particularly relevant to Hauge's understanding of leadership and also closely related to topics that have been covered in prior research about Hauge, and can thus perhaps offer a somewhat natural and helpful extension of the relevant body of literature in this area.

Moreover, at this stage in the process of discovery regarding the main drivers of Hauge's leadership, they can be understood as representing important, fruitful, and promising topics in developing our understanding. Thus, these characteristics will be covered in greater detail in the analysis below, whereas the other characteristics, that is, humility, authenticity, and providing direction, will be dealt with more briefly for now. Nevertheless, as mentioned in the final section, these characteristics should certainly be explored further and in more depth as part of future research projects and studies.

HANS NIELSEN HAUGE AS A LEADER

Even though Hans Nielsen Hauge did not hold an official leadership position, he was recognized as the initiator and the father figure of the highly influential Haugean movement in Norway in the 1800s. Based on Weber's (1930) framework, he can thus be identified as a charismatic leader, and several authors have described him as such (Kullerud, 1996, pp. 249–256; Seland, 2017, pp. 109–111, and Magnus, 2020, pp. 126–127). Stibbe (2007, pp. 59–61) even argues that this can be seen in light of Hauge's prophetic role. Also, based on his and his followers' extensive entrepreneurial endeavors, Hauge can be understood as the leader and role model of an influential entrepreneurial movement and, thus, an entrepreneurial leader (Leitch and Volery, 2017).

There are certainly valid arguments supporting this approach, especially the fact that Hauge was acting as a role model and the way he strongly influenced others as the leader of the Haugean movement. However, as we seek to understand his approach to leadership more holistically, which also includes his thinking regarding and approach to leadership, other leadership models and theories should, at least, be considered. Interestingly, Hauge made specific statements like, "I am just a steward of the gifts God has entrusted me" (Kvamen, 1974, Book 3, p. 414, translation), "The greatest is the servant of all" (Ording, 1947, Book 5, p. 186, translation), and that we are to "Serve all with love" (Ording, 1947, Book 5, p. 199, translation). In fact, the notion of serving (others) is frequently mentioned by Hauge, both in relation to God and fellow human beings (Ording, 1947). According to Liland (2021), this suggests that he at least was familiar with the concept of leadership as service. Given Hauge's faith and dedication

to following Biblical principles in his life, which also included his approach to and understanding of leadership, this would make sense since service as a salient component of leadership is a central idea expressed in *The New Testament*, as described by Jesus in Matt. 20:20–28 (Wilson, 2011; Liland, 2021).

A central element in servant leadership theory, as mentioned above, is the servant leader's priority to develop followers and meet their needs even before their own needs (Greenleaf, 1977). Also, this includes the idea of leaders serving society at large and seeing the organizations they lead as serving a useful purpose or cause in society. Hauge and the Haugean movement saw business development as a way of creating a better society, and they are thus known for their parallel pursuit of both financial and social goals (Liland, 2020). The latter can be exemplified by their commitment to causes like alleviating poverty and improving literacy (Haukland, 2014; Hunnes and Liland, 2021). The idea of serving others, including society as a whole, was thus something Hauge and his followers valued highly and embraced as an important part of their work ethic, so to speak (Ravnåsen, 2015, pp. 81–84). A common feature in Hauge's leadership was that he saw potential in others who were part of the movement, provided relevant training for them, and then gave them responsibilities that were aligned with their potential. One example of this is Ole Torjussen Helling, a young man from a farm in Ål in Hallingdal, who became a follower after responding to the preaching of Hans Nielsen Hauge. When Hauge purchased the Svanøy estate, he challenged the young Ole Torjussen to sell his family farm and invest in the property at Svanøy to lead the development of several businesses located there (Breistein, 1955, pp. 149–156). The young man was successful in his endeavors and later changed his name to Ole Svanøe. The estate became a center for the Haugean movement on the west coast of Norway, and Ole Svanøe also became a respected politician, being part of the national parliament, Stortinget (Breistein, 1955, pp. 155–156; Magnus, 2020, pp. 120–121). Also, the young Haugeans Christopher Grøndahl and Peter Møller have been mentioned in prior research describing Hauge's ability to see potential in others and provide sufficient training. Grøndahl received financial support and training provided by Hauge and other Haugeans in producing and publishing books and founded the company Grøndahl og sønn and Møller received similar support to become a chemist and pharmacist, eventually developing the famous Norwegian product Møllers tran, which is a form of cod-liver oil (Supphellen and Liland, 2017; Liland, 2021). Below, the six characteristics, each followed and specified by two or three key terms provided by van Dierendonck (2011), are applied to Hauge.

Empowering and Developing People

In gaining a better understanding of empowerment, several things need to be considered. Many modern leadership theories support the importance of empowerment as a vital ingredient in effective leadership (see e.g. Northouse, 2018), often referred to as empowering leadership, that is, "a process of sharing power, and allocating autonomy and responsibilities to followers, teams, or collectives through a specific set of leader behaviors for employees to enhance internal motivation and achieve work success" (Cheong et al., 2018, see also Ahearne, Mathieu, & Rapp, 2005). Moreover, a number of studies document positive outcomes of empowering leadership, both enhancing employee wellbeing and boosting performance (Cheong et al., 2018). Here, we will focus on three important aspects of empowerment, based on van Dierendonck (2011): 1) Coaching and training, 2) believing in people's abilities and seeing their potential, and 3) encouraging others and information sharing.

Coaching and training: As mentioned above, Hans Nielsen Hauge was often involved in the initial stages of establishing a business before moving on to other projects by handing over the primary leadership responsibility to others. However, many of those chosen for such tasks were initially without the proper background and experience to run and further develop these endeavours (Dalgaard and Supphellen, 2021). One could thus question whether they had received sufficient training and were prepared to tackle the challenge they were given. On the other hand, some sources indicate that the Haugean businesses often trained young people in doing business and provided the employees with relevant skills in areas like bookkeeping and business development (Grytten and Liland, 2021). If so, specific skills in certain trades or crafts were learned by working alongside a person who was more experienced in their field of work. Thus, Hauge empowered others and gave them the responsibility to develop further businesses he had founded, for instance, as can be seen in the comprehensive letter correspondence with his friends (Kvamen, 1974).

Believing in people's abilities and seeing their potential: Several authors describe Hauge's ability to see potential in others (e.g., Breistein, 1955; Kullerud, 1996; Magnus, 2020). By giving what was often young and quite inexperienced followers the responsibility of running many of the new businesses he founded, Hauge demonstrated that he saw their potential and believed in their abilities to develop these businesses to become profitable and successful. For instance, he invited the young man Ole Eyelsen to become the leader of a brick factory the Haugeans had purchased in Eeg, close to the city of Kristiansand. Eyelsen sold his farm and changed his name to Ole Eyelsen Eeg as he settled at the farm adjacent to the brick factory, where he managed, unlike the former owners, to make the company profitable (Breistein, 1955, pp. 134–137; Dalgaard and Supphellen, 2011).

Encouraging others and information sharing: Hauge wrote hundreds of letters to his friends about a range of different topics and concerns, both regarding spiritual and practical, work-related issues (e.g., Kullerud, 1996, as documented by Kvamen (1974)). In these letters, he often encouraged the respondents to deal with the issues they were facing. As pointed out and emphasized in research regarding Hauge, he was known as a man characterized by humility and meekness (see, e.g., Seland, 2017, p. 109), which also emerges in some of the letters he wrote, as he encourages his friends and seeks their advice. However, there were also instances where he addressed problems, and he could thus be rather blunt and straightforward in conveying his perspective and what he thought were the appropriate actions his readers needed to take.

Inspired by Hauge, the Haugeans followed suit, and the information sharing among them, through all the letters they wrote, was extensive and surprisingly open. Also, the early morning meetings at many of the Haugean companies (Supphellen and Liland, 2017) and the way Hauge shared information in some of his writings, both regarding spiritual and practical matters, can be seen as additional examples. Thus, this indicates that the Hauge used multiple channels for information sharing and thus created a movement that made extensive use of this in communicating with each other, both regarding religious matters and relevant business-related topics.

Humility

In a growing number of leadership studies, humility is seen as an important factor (Krumrei-Mancuso and Rowatt, 2021). As applied here, it can be expressed through 1) listening to the advice of others, 2) admitting mistakes, and 3) knowing one's limitations (van Dierendonck, 2011; van Dierendonck and Nuijten, 2011).

Listening to others: Hauge was known to be a strong leader, exhibiting at times strong-willed behavior and, as mentioned above, exhibiting humility as he listened to and received advice from others (Norborg, 1966, pp. 180–185; Seland, 2017, p. 109). Even if he asked for the input of others, he sometimes did not listen to his friend's advice, as when he purchased the ship *Christane Margaretha* and suffered a financial loss (Supphellen and Liland, 2017, p. 136).

Admitting mistakes: Considering the fact that humility includes admitting mistakes, we do find examples of this in Hauge's life, e.g., in some of the letters, Hauge admitted mistakes he had made, both in specific practical matters, but also on a more conceptual level. For instance, he changed his mind regarding private property rights versus a model where the community had everything in common (Aarflot, 1969, pp. 364–365; Breistein, 1955, pp. 184–186). He initially thought the latter was the ideal model, based on the Biblical account of the first Christian believers in Jerusalem having everything in common as described in *The Book of Acts* in *The New Testament*. Later, he admitted this was incorrect as he became convinced that a model based on individual ownership was preferable, especially since this would promote individual diligence and hard work better than the above-mentioned radical communal approach (Breistein, 1955, p. 186; Kullerud, 1996, pp. 247–249). However, Hauge could also come across as assertive and not easily swayed, especially in his dealings with authority figures (Kullerud, 1996). Even though he was arrested for lacking the proper travel documentation, he would still argue his case and, at least in the eyes of those arresting him, could have been seen as someone not admitting to his mistakes.

Knowing limitations: This area is perhaps one of the most difficult to assess in Hauge's leadership. On the one hand, he invited others to be part of his business ventures, and even gave over the leadership, and sometimes the ownership, of many of the businesses to others to run them after they were founded (Dalgaard and Supphellen, 2021). However, Hauge was a man of many talents, which sometimes can make it difficult to see one's limitations. According to Kullerud (1996, pp. 238–239), Hauge had perhaps overinvested and was close to bankruptcy in 1804 when he was arrested. This could imply that he had invested excessively and did not realize his limitations in the expansion of his business endeavors. However, even though we know that Hauge made several major investments in 1804 (Rødal and Kiplesund, 2009; Grytten, 2014), it is difficult to assess accurately whether this would, in fact, have resulted in bankruptcy.

Authenticity

During the last few years, the leadership literature has made frequent references to the topic of authenticity, especially in ethically oriented leadership theories like authentic leadership (Fusco et al., 2015). Authenticity, as a concept, has roots all the way back to Greek philosophy and the ideal to "know thyself" (Rahimnia and Sharifirad, 2015) and be true to oneself; "To thine own self be true" (Avolio and Gardner, 2005). Integrity is a closely related term, which, according to Russell and Stone (2002), has to do with "adherence to an overall moral code" (Russell and Stone, 2002, p. 148). According to van Dierendonck (2011), authenticity applied to servant leaders can be expressed through 1) doing what is promised, 2) honesty/integrity, and 3) seeing each employee as a person, not just as filling a professional role (van Dierendonck, 2011, p. 1233; van Dierendonck and Nuijten, 2011, p. 252).

Doing what is promised. Both in the writings of Hauge and as seen in the way he conducted his life, diligence is emphasized as a highly valued virtue. Quotes like "Be diligent in doing good works" (Kvamen, 1974, Vol. 1, p. 41, translation) and "Being diligent and attentive in our service" (Ording, 1949, Book 3, p. 593, translation) illustrate this. The extreme

productivity displayed by Hauge in the many roles he filled, e.g., as an entrepreneur, author, investor, revivalist, religious leader, and business owner, demonstrates that this was a virtue that represented a primary characteristic of his life and conduct. Also, as described below, Hauge and his followers were considered trustworthy and people who kept their word (Ravnåsen, 2015). This combination earned them the trust of others as they followed through on what they had promised.

Honesty/integrity. Hauge saw honesty and integrity as salient values (Supphellen et al., 2021, p. 201). Even though Hauge received severe criticism before and during his long imprisonment until 1814, especially from local priests and other authority figures, he and his followers later gained respect for their hard work and integrity both nationally and in the local communities they belonged to all over the country (Sødal and Dørum, 2017, p. 18). They were known for keeping their word and being trustworthy. Through many of his writings, Hauge confronted local priests for what he deemed as hypocritical conduct, finding a lack of correspondence between their words and actions. This criticism was an important reason why Hauge was arrested, and thus, something he had to suffer severely for. In many ways, this indicates how important integrity, especially in this area, was to him, and his persistence in holding to these convictions, even in the face of extreme hardship and suffering, is also a testament to his integrity and consistency of character. Finally, Hauge frequently reminded his readers about the necessity of maintaining the "sincerity of heart" (e.g., Ording, 1949, Book 3, p. 593, translation), being sincere in one's faith (e.g., Ording, 1949, Book 2, p. 200), and having a sincere love for God and others (e.g., Ording, 1949, Book 1, pp. 98 and 114). He refers to the "founding father" of his church, Martin Luther, as an example and perhaps even a role model in being a sincere believer and follower of Christ (Ording, 1949, Book 8, p. 143).

Seeing each employee as a person. According to several accounts of people who met Hauge, he is described as one who saw and regarded them as individuals (Norborg, 1966, pp. 180–185). For many, these encounters represented life-changing experiences. Some of these were employees, especially young people Hauge recruited to be part of the different Haugean businesses he founded. Hauge held the conviction that all people are equally valuable in the sight of God, and thus also for him, and this caused him to develop an egalitarian approach to both life and business (Supphellen and Liland, 2017). In his business practices, this was demonstrated by leaders who were close to and cared for their employees, recruiting practices that included hiring people with disabilities, and also by appointing female leaders, which was quite uncommon in Norway in the 1800s (Ravnåsen, 2015; Kullerud, 1996).

Interpersonal Acceptance

The characteristic described as interpersonal acceptance has to do with understanding others and is related to relational concepts and traits like empathy, compassion, and forgiveness, especially as they manifest in job-related contexts (van Dierendonck, 2011). Moreover, it can be linked to theoretical interpersonal constructs like psychological safety (Edmondson and Lei, 2014) and trust (Mayer et al., 1995). As explained by van Dierendonck (2011, p. 1234), "For servant leaders, it is important to create an atmosphere of trust where people feel accepted, are free to make mistakes, and know that they will not be rejected" (Ferch, 2005). Thus, the areas covered below are 1) empathy, 2) forgiveness, and 3) an atmosphere of trust.

Empathy. Even though Hauge displayed traits like being strong-willed and demanding at times, he is also described as a man who cared for and valued people, as mentioned above. Based on the accounts recorded by people who met him, they often left deeply moved. Many authors claim that he had an extraordinary ability to find common ground and communicate

with all kinds of people (Kullerud, 1996; Ravnåsen, 2015). His writings and preaching also touched people and had a lasting impact on their lives. However, his harsh criticism and attack on priests and other authority figures he found lacking in moral judgment, and character could perhaps be argued as not being in concert with this picture of Hauge as empathetic and caring.

On the other hand, his critique was primarily directed towards authority figures, not the common person, and can thus be seen as an example of the strength of his feelings about social injustice. So, here the results seem to be mixed. In general, Hauge accepted people on a personal level but could appear to be harsh in his judgment of others, especially priests and other authority figures. Also, he criticized friends who were too concerned with material wealth or business more than spiritual matters (Dalgaard and Supphellen, 2021, p. 110–111). Significantly, the fact that Hauge criticized others does not necessarily indicate that he lacked empathy, but some could perhaps experience him as strict and uncompromising when it came to what he regarded as hypocrisy and discrimination.

Forgiveness. There are several examples of people in the Haugean movement who were given a second chance, which for Hauge would be closely connected to a Biblical understanding of grace in the sense of receiving God's forgiveness. Hauge had experienced this himself in his divine encounter in 1796, where he sensed an overwhelming sense of God's compassionate love and grace. He saw this clearly as something he could not earn by his efforts but as a gift freely given. According to Aarflot (1969), Hauge had a clear theological understanding of grace, which also implies receiving forgiveness and being given a second chance. Thus, this is a central aspect of Hauge's Christian faith, even though some theologians would argue that Hauge, and thus the Haugean movement, had a weak understanding of grace and tended towards works of righteousness in their understanding of salvation, as hinted by Welle (1948) and Sivertsen (1946). Against this, Aarflot concludes in his extensive analysis of Hauge's theological understanding that Hauge is not advocating works of righteousness but one based on grace (1969, p. 291). The disputes Hauge experienced with other prominent Haugean entrepreneurs like Ole P. Moe and Arent Solem regarding issues of private wealth and lifestyle could serve as examples of forgiveness. Hauge criticized them and felt their actions were not always compatible with those of the Haugean movement, where reinvesting profits in their business or donating it to people experiencing poverty was the norm (see Dalgaard and Supphellen, 2021, p. 110–111). However, they were still regarded as friends and were given a second chance, so to speak, as they continued to work together for the common cause that united them (Breistein, 1955; Dalgaard and Supphellen, 2021).

The atmosphere of trust. Hauge saw the Haugean movement grow to become a national network of believers, and based on their common ethical values, they knew and trusted each other (Kullerud, 1996, p. 249–256). By sharing a common faith and core values like honesty, equality, and care, they knew that their friends would not let them down or in any way take advantage of them, either in private matters or in business affairs. Hauge was often able to recruit and develop talented employees from within the Haugean networks of friends. Since both leaders and workers shared many of the same ethical values, developed relevant business skills in their different business endeavors, and sought to live lives characterized by Christian love, the three main sources of trust identified by Mayer et al. (1995) that is, competence, integrity, and benevolence, appeared to be present. Thus, it seems clear that the Haugean movement, inspired by the example of Hauge, promoted an atmosphere of trust among themselves.

Providing Direction

The characteristic called providing direction is more practical and specific in that it is particularly oriented towards how work is done, that is, making sure that people know what is expected of them (van Dierendonck, 2011). Moreover, it is about providing direction for employees based on their abilities and needs, among other things, which implies adequate levels of responsibility and even "creating new ways or new approaches to old problems, with a strong reliance on values and convictions that govern one's actions" (Russell & Stone, 2002; van Dierendonck, 2011). Consequently, the following will be described in more detail: 1) tailor-made job descriptions and responsibilities, and 2) innovation based on values.

Tailormade job descriptions and responsibilities. As mentioned above, Hauge saw potential in others and challenged people to take on different roles, like Ole Svanøy. Hauge was very explicit and clear regarding the overall direction and value-based approach of the Haugean business endeavors (Hunnes and Liland, 2021). These businesses were to benefit society, but at the same time, it seems like employees were given autonomy and freedom in terms of how they carried out their tasks, at least to a certain extent. If so, micro-management did not seem to be an issue, but regarding the level of specific job descriptions, there is not much available information in the literature. However, the morning meetings and the fact that leaders were involved in the operation indicate that a certain level of direction was given. Based on what we know from the historical sources, especially regarding Hauge's ability to spot talent and appoint leaders who were successful in their new roles and the training provided by him and other Haugean entrepreneurs, it seems probable that the employees were given a certain level of tailor-made job descriptions and responsibilities.

Innovation based on values. Hauge started businesses in various industries, like printing, paper mills, brick production, farming, etc. (Grytten, 2014). As he was traveling across the country, he learned from others, and he even went to Denmark, where he e.g., learned how to develop businesses based on paper mill production and new farming techniques (Breistein, 1955; Supphellen and Liland, 2017). This kind of learning is a common approach in innovation, where what one learns in one context can be adopted, modified, and applied in other markets or industries. Also, Hauge tested different approaches and methods, and by experimenting with business models that combined financial and social goals, he was even involved in what today is called social entrepreneurship (Liland, 2021). Hauge's radical inclusion policies, demonstrated by hiring people who would normally not be offered employment by others, like older people or those with disabilities, appointing female leaders, and offering benefits and educational opportunities not common among contemporary companies, could serve as a case in point. Also, the fact that he and his brother, Mikkel, were working on a pension and insurance system for the employees at their model business, the Eker Paper Mill, is yet another example of the value-based innovation approach among the Haugean companies (Ravnåsen 2015).

Stewardship

Stewardship is based on the idea that the leader has an overall responsibility and that this implies seeing the bigger picture and an obligation to the common good (van Dierendonck and Nuijten, 2011). Stewardship theory has been presented as an alternative to agency theory, focusing on collaboration between actors like agents and principals and the long-term goals of the organization (Davis et al., 1997, 2007; Donaldson and Davis, 1991). This has also been applied to leadership (Waters, 2013). According to Hauge, this was one of the primary reasons

why he, and those he inspired to do the same, were involved in business in the first place, serving God and one's neighbor and thus improving society by working towards the common good. The concept of stewardship and, in particular, the idea of serving the common good and benefitting all of society were key leadership principles and convictions for Hauge. Thus, the areas covered below are 1) taking responsibility for the larger institution and 2) a sense of obligation to the common good beyond self-interest.

Taking responsibility for the larger institution: As mentioned above, the Haugean companies were working towards realizing both social and financial goals (Hunnes and Liland, 2021). A primary source for their motivation was to impact society positively, which can be illustrated through their commitment to creating jobs, alleviating poverty, and improving literacy (Liland, 2021). As mentioned above, Hauge saw starting businesses as part of his responsibility as a Christian and a way of responding to the calling he believed he received as part of his divine encounter in 1796. He certainly took it upon himself to lead the movement he initiated, not just to be involved in individual businesses or projects. This sense of responsibility for the larger institution, or in this case, the movement, was a characteristic of Hauge's leadership and something he carried until he died in 1824.

A sense of obligation to the common good beyond self-interest: The primary purpose, and thus overarching goal, of the businesses Hauge and his friends developed was not financial gain or success. As seen in the description above, they wanted to benefit society and positively impact local communities through their entrepreneurial projects (Liland, 2021). The dual pursuit of social and financial goals, so fundamental to Hauge's approach to business, seems to be in line with a perspective that implied a sense of obligation to the common good beyond self-interest.

Significantly, Aarflot (1969), in his doctoral dissertation about Hauge's understanding of Christian theology and practice, identifies biblical stewardship as one of the reoccurring larger themes Hauge emphasized in describing his motivation for starting businesses and being involved in entrepreneurial endeavors. Some authors, like Flatø (1963) and Norborg (1966), have argued that Hauge's motivation to develop businesses and lead his growing movement of entrepreneurs was not associated with his religious beliefs, including his commitment to being a good steward of everything God had entrusted him. However, Hauge frequently refers to his understanding of Biblical stewardship with typical statements like, "I am just a steward of the gifts God has entrusted me" (Kvamen, 1974, Book 3, p. 414, translation). Thus, for Hauge, stewardship, business development and leadership were connected; see Aarflot (1969, p. 364–377) and Liland (2020, p. 333–335).

For Hauge, stewardship implied the idea of being responsible for something greater than oneself and working towards creating a better society, which included, among other things, creating jobs, alleviating poverty and improving literacy in Norway in the 1800s (Hunnes and Liland, 2021). Thus, the legacy of the Haugean movement, certainly inspired by Hauge's example as a social agent for change by providing valuable and significant contributions to developing a more democratic, egalitarian, and just society, demonstrated a clear stewardship-oriented perspective. The movement's sense of obligation to the common good was, in fact, an important part of their intrinsic motivation as stewards of God's creation and everything He had entrusted to them. This sacred duty also applied to Hauge's understanding of leadership and the way he functioned as a role model in being a wise steward of his time and finances and in utilizing and developing the gifts he was endowed with.

Table 3: *The characteristics and key terms of servant leadership (van Dierendonck, 2011) applied to the leadership of Hans Nielsen Hauge*

Characteristics	Key terms	Findings
Empowering and developing people	Coaching and training	Hauge provided relevant training for at least some young leaders and employees
	See the potential in people	Young people were given important roles based on the potential Hauge saw in them
	Encouraging others and information sharing	Extensive information sharing and encouraging others to persevere through hardships
Humility	Listening to others	Hauge asked for advice from his friends but also failed to listen at times
	Admitting mistakes	There are examples of Hauge admitting mistakes and weaknesses, but his opponents probably found him quite assertive
	Knowing limitations	Even though others provided complementary skills, this could be seen as a weak spot for Hauge
Authenticity	Doing what is promised	Hauge emphasized diligence and sought to find ways to deliver on what he had promised
	Honesty and integrity	The Haugeans valued honesty and integrity highly and kept their word
	Seeing the person	Hauge described as seeing individuals
Interpersonal acceptance	Empathy	Hauge was known for caring and listening but also offered sharp criticism of leaders
	Forgiveness	Forgiveness was important to Hauge, and employees were given a second chance
	Atmosphere of trust	Hauge and the Haugeans operated with a high level of trust based on common ethical values
Providing direction	Tailormade job descriptions and responsibilities	People were given specific roles and responsibilities, even without prior experience. Lack of information about job descriptions
	Innovation based on values	New problems were often approached with optimism, thinking they could be solved
Stewardship	Taking overall responsibility	Hauge saw his role as leader of the Haugean movement, not just individual businesses
	Sense of obligation for the common good	Hauge and the Haugeans were motivated by love and being a positive force in society

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

In this article, servant leadership theory, primarily based on the theoretical framework provided by van Dierendonck (2011), has been applied to the leadership of Hans Nielsen Hauge and the inspiration he provided to the Haugean movement. The six characteristics of empowering and developing others, humility, authenticity, interpersonal acceptance, providing direction, and stewardship, thus provide a lens to see and seek an understanding of Hauge's motivation for and thinking regarding leadership in the light of specific behaviors and conduct. Thus, through the overview provided by the analysis above, elements of servant leadership,

based on these six characteristics, especially related to empowering and developing others, interpersonal acceptance, and stewardship, can be identified. Also, the overall approach to business and leadership, modeled by Hauge, seems to fit with Greenleaf's understanding of organizations as serving institutions in society based on the overview provided in this study. In particular, Hauge's leadership is characterized by empowerment of others and trust, based on his understanding of being a steward, serving God, others, and society. However, it needs to be reiterated that the analysis here seeks to establish the overall match between servant leadership theory and, in particular, the model developed by van Dierendonck (2011) and the leadership of Hans Nielsen Hauge. Thus, more research will be needed to answer better the question of whether this leadership theory can offer a more complete and sufficient description of Hauge's leadership than what has been provided by previous studies.

Additional studies regarding Hauge's leadership will be necessary to complement our understanding of his thinking and practice in this area. Even though a few studies have explored certain aspects of this by applying theories like charismatic and entrepreneurial leadership, more research is needed here. However, at least certain aspects of servant leadership theory seem to fit Hauge's life and leadership, as described in this and a few other articles. Related concepts like his understanding of stewardship, calling, and entrepreneurship, also need to be considered as integral in these studies. Obviously, applying servant leadership measurement models in studies of Hauge's life and leadership could add new and relevant insights, as would other aspects of servant leadership theory, where both behavioral and psychological factors are considered. Finally, other leadership theories, and perhaps in particular more ethically oriented follower-centric theories like authentic leadership, ethical leadership, and spiritual leadership, can be applied to increase our knowledge of Haugean leadership. Finally, the relevance of Haugean leadership in addressing some of the major challenges facing both business and society today, like climate change, growing inequality, and increased polarization, should be explored in greater depth than what has so far been done.

REFERENCES

- Aarflot, A. (1969). *Tro og lydigbet. Hans Nielsen Hauges kristendomsforståelse*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Ahearne, M., Mathieu, J., & Rapp, A. (2005). To Empower or Not to Empower Your Sales Force? An Empirical Examination of the Influence of Leadership Empowerment Behavior on Customer Satisfaction and Performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(5), pp. 945–955.
- Avolio, B. J. & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, pp. 315–338.
- Bande, B., Fernández-Ferrín, P., Varela-Neira, C. & Otero-Neira, C. (2016). Exploring the relationship among servant leadership, intrinsic motivation and performance in an industrial sales setting. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing* 31(2), pp. 219–231.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership: Good, Better, Best. *Organizational Dynamics*, 13(3), pp. 26–40.
- Bass, B. M., & Steidlmeier, P. 1999. Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10, pp. 181–217.
- Birkinshaw, J., Foss, N. J. & Lindenberg, S. (2014). Combining purpose with profits. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 55(3), pp. 49–56.
- Breistein, D. (1955). *Hans Nielsen Hauge. Kjøbmand i Bergen*. Bergen: John Griegs Forlag.

- Burke, C. S., Stagl, K. C., Klein, C., Goodwin, G. F., Salas, E., & Halpin, S. M. (2006). What type of leadership behaviors are functional in teams? A meta-analysis. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17, pp. 288–307.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Camm, T. W. (2019). The Dark Side of Servant Leadership. *The International Journal of Servant Leadership*, 13(1), pp. 107–132.
- Cheong, M., Yammarino, F. J., Dionne, S. D., Spain, S. M., & Tsai, C. Y. (2018). A Review of the Effectiveness of Empowering Leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 30, pp. 34–38.
- Dalgaard, B. R. & Supphellen, M. (2021). Interpreting Haugean Entrepreneurial Motivation from the Perspective of Economic and Management Theories. In Grytten, O. H. & Liland, T. (eds). *In the Legacy of Hans Nielsen Hauge. Entrepreneurship in Economics, Management, Education, and Politics*, pp. 95–118. Bergen, Norway: Bodoni forlag.
- Dalgaard, B. R., & Supphellen, M. (2011). Entrepreneurship in Norway's economic and religious nineteenth-century transformation. *Scandinavian Economic History Review*, 59(1), pp. 48–66.
- Davis, J., Frankforter, S., Vollrath, D., & Hill, V. (2007). An Empirical Test of Stewardship Theory. *Journal of Business and Leadership: Research, Practice, and Teaching*, 3(1), pp. 40–50.
- Davis, J., Schoorman, F., & Donaldson, L. (1997). Toward a Stewardship Theory of Management. *Academy of Management Review*, 22(1), pp. 20–47.
- Donaldson, L. & Davis, J.H. (1991). Stewardship theory or agency theory: CEO governance and shareholder returns, *Australian Journal of Management*, 16, 1, June, 49–64.
- Edmondson, A. C. & Lei, Z. (2014). Psychological safety: The history, renaissance, and future of an interpersonal construct. *The Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1, pp. 23–43.
- 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*, 30, pp. 111–132.
- Ferch, S. (2005). Servant-leadership, forgiveness, and social justice. *International Journal of Servant-Leadership*, 1: 97–113.
- Flatø, L. (1963). Hans Nielsen Hauge om ervervslivet. *Tidsskrift for Teologi og Kirke*, pp. 11–24.
- Fragouli, E. (2018). The Dark Side of Charisma and Charismatic Leadership. *Business and Management Review*, 9(4), pp. 298–307.
- Fusco, T., O'Riordan, S., & Palmer, S. (2015). An existential approach to authentic leadership development: A review of the existential coaching literature and its' relationship to authentic leadership. *Coaching Psychologist*, 11, pp. 61–71.
- Graham, J. W. (1995). Leadership, moral development, and citizenship behavior. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 5: pp. 43–54.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1970). *The servant as leader*. Indianapolis: Robert K. Greenleaf Center.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant-leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Grytten, O. H. (2013). The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism: Entrepreneurship of the Norwegian Puritan Leader Hans Nielsen Hauge. *Review of European Studies*, 5(1).
- Grytten, O. H. (2014). Haugianere som næringslivsaktører. In Bjørg Seland (red.). *Gud og mammon. Religion og næringsliv*, pp. 47–67. Oslo: Cappelen Damm Akademisk.
- Grytten, O. H. & Liland, T. (eds). (2021). *In the Legacy of Hans Nielsen Hauge. Entrepreneurship in Economics, Management, Education, and Politics*. Bergen, Norway: Bodoni forlag.
- Grytten, O. H. & Minde, K. B. (2019). Generational Links Between Entrepreneurship, Management and Puritanism. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 17(1), pp. 244–256.
- Grytten, Ola H. (2010). «Protestantisk etikk og entreprenørskapens ånd». *Minerva*. <https://www.minervanett.no/protestantisk-etikk-og-entreprenørskapens-and/>

- Gundersen, Trygve Riiser. (2022). *Haugianerne. Enevelde og undergrunn*. Oslo: Cappelen Damm.
- Haukland, L. (2014). Hans Nielsen Hauge. A catalyst of literacy in Norway. *Scandinavian Journal of History* 39(5), pp. 539–559.
- Hoch, J. E., Bommer, W. H., Dulebohn, J. H., Wu, D. (2018). Do Ethical, Authentic, and Servant Leadership Explain Variance Above and Beyond Transformational Leadership? A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Management*. 44(2), pp. 501–529.
- Hodne, F. (1999). Verdiskapingen i manufaktur og industri i Norge 1817–1829. In Grytten, O. H. (ed.), *Nordic Historical National Accounts*, pp. 41–61. Bergen, Norway: Fagbokforlaget.
- Hodne, F., & Grytten, O. H. (2000). *Norsk økonomi i det 19. århundre*. Bergen, Norway: Fagbokforlaget.
- Hornett, A., & Fredericks, S. (2005). An Empirical and Theoretical Exploration of Disconnections between Leadership and Ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 59, pp. 233–246.
- Hunnes, J. A. & Liland, T. (2021). On the Purpose of the Firm. The Case of Hans Nielsen Hauge. In Grytten, O. H. & Liland, T. (eds). In Grytten, O. H. & Liland, T. (eds). *In the Legacy of Hans Nielsen Hauge. Entrepreneurship in Economics, Management, Education, and Politics*. Bergen, Norway: Bodoni forlag.
- Ims, K., Liland, T., & Supphellen M. (2019). The Importance of Calling in Realization of Life Projects: The Case of Maverick and Serial-entrepreneur Hans Nielsen Hauge with Implications for Business Education. Bouckaert L., van den Heuvel S. (eds). *Servant Leadership, Social Entrepreneurship and the Will to Serve*, pp. 309–333. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Karatepe, O. M., Aboramadan, M. & Dahleez, K. A. (2020). Does climate for creativity mediate the impact of servant leadership on management innovation and innovative behavior in the hotel industry? *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 32(8), pp. 2497–2517.
- Krumrei-Mancuso, E. J. & Rowatt, W. C. (2021): Humility in novice leaders: links to servant leadership and followers' satisfaction with leadership, *The Journal of Positive Psychology*. DOI:10.1080/17439760.2021.1952647
- Kullerud, D. (1996). *Hans Nielsen Hauge – Mannen som vekket Norge*. Oslo: Forlaget Forum
- Kvamen, I. (1974). *Brev fra Hans Nielsen Hauge*. Bind 1–3. Oslo: Luther Forlag.
- Lawton, A., & Páez, I. (2015). Developing a framework for ethical leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 130, pp. 639–649.
- Leitch, C.M. & Volery, T. (2017). Entrepreneurial leadership: Insights and directions. *International Small Business Journal*, Vol. 35 No. 2, pp. 147–156.
- 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, pp. 161–177.
- Liland, T. (2020). Den gode husholder som modell for bedrifters samfunnsansvar: Haugiansk samfunnsengasjement for vår tid. I Hagesæther, G., Innerdal, G. & Kvam, B. (Red.), *NLA Høgskolen. Fagutvikling og sjølvforståing på kristen grunn*, pp. 326–351. Oslo: Cappelen Damm Akademisk.
- Liland, T. (2021). The Greatest Is the Servant of All. Servant Leadership, Biblical Perspectives, and Hans Nielsen Hauge. In Grytten, O. H. & Liland, T. (eds). *In the Legacy of Hans Nielsen Hauge. Entrepreneurship in Economics, Management, Education, and Politics*, pp. 57–78. Bergen, Norway: Bodoni forlag.
- Mackey, J. D., Ellen, B. P. III, McAllister, C. P., & Alexander, K. C. (2021). The dark side of leadership: a systematic literature review and meta-analysis of destructive leadership research. *Journal of Business Research*, 132, pp. 705–718.
- Magnus, A. (2020). *Hans Nielsen Hauge: Mannen som forandret Norge*. Ottestad: Proklamedia.

- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), pp. 709–734.
- Ng, K.Y., Koh, C., S.K., & Goh, H.C. (2008). The heart of the servant leader. Leader's motivation-to-serve and its impact on LMX and subordinates' extra-role behavior. In G. B. Graen & J. A. Graen (Eds.), *Knowledge-driven corporation-complex creative destruction*, 125–144. Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Norborg, S. (1966). *Hans Nielsen Hauge – Biografi*. Volume I & II. Oslo: Cappelen Forlag.
- Northouse, P. G. (2018). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (8th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ording, N. H. (1947–1953). *Hans Nielsen Hauges Skrifter*. Oslo: H. Aschehoug, Vol. 1–9.
- Panaccio, A., Donia, M., Saint-Michel, S., & Liden, R. C. (2015). Servant leadership and well-being. In R. J. Burke, C. L. Cooper, & K. M. Page (Eds.), *Flourishing in life, work, and careers: New horizons in management*, pp. 334–358. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Parris, D. L., & Peachey, J. W. (2013). A Systematic Literature Review of Servant Leadership Theory in Organizational Contexts. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 113(3), 377–393.
- Rahimnia, F. & Sharifirad, M. (2015). Authentic leadership and employee wellbeing: The mediating role of attachment insecurity. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 132, pp. 363–377.
- Ravnåsen, S. (2015). *Ånd og hånd, Hans Nielsen Hauges etikk for ledelse og næringsliv*. Oslo: Luther forlag.
- Reddy, A. V. (2019). Servant leadership and spirituality at workplace: A critical review. *International Journal on Leadership*, 7(1), pp. 8–12.
- Rieke, M., Hammermeister, J., & Chase, M. (2008). Servant Leadership in Sport: A New Paradigm for Effective Coach Behavior. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 3(2), pp. 227–239.
- Rødal, V. T. & Kiplesund, A. (2009). *Hans Nielsen Hauge: Entrepreneur, Banker and Industrialist*. Master thesis. Bergen: Norwegian School of Economics (NHH).
- Santos, F. M. (2012). A positive theory of social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 111(3), pp. 335–351.
- Sejersted, F. (2002). *Demokratisk kapitalisme*. Revidert utvalg. Oslo: Pax Forlag.
- Seland, B. (2017). I "Fællesskab og Samfund" - Haugebevegelsens organisasjon. In Dørum, K. og Kringlebotn Sødal, H. (red.). *Hans Nielsen Hauge. Fra samfunnsfiende til ikon*. Oslo: Cappelen Damm Akademisk, pp. 104–132.
- Sendjaya, S., Sarros, J. C., & Santora, J. C. (2008). Defining and measuring servant leadership behaviour in organizations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 45, pp. 402–424.
- Sivertsen, N. (1946). *Hans Nielsen Hauge og venesamfunnet*. Oslo: Land og kirke.
- Sjursen, F. W. (1997). *Den haugianske periode (III): 1796 – ca. 1850*. Vol. 3. Bergen, Norway: NLA-forlaget.
- Spears, L. C. (2010). Character and servant leadership: Ten Characteristics of Effective, Caring Leaders. *The Journal of Virtues & Leadership*, 1, pp. 25–30.
- Stibbe, A. H. (2007). *Hans Nielsen Hauge and The Prophetic Imagination*. Doctoral Thesis in Philosophy. London: University of London.
- Supphellen, M. & Liland, T. (2017). «Kallsorientert seriegründer. Hans Nielsen Hauge i møte med dagens næringsliv». Nils Ivar Agøy, Knut Edvard Larsen og Chr. Anton Smedshaug (red.). *Trådene i samfunnsveven. Hva har reformasjonen betydd for Norge?*, pp. 125–140. Oslo, Norway: Verbum.
- Supphellen, M., Liland, T., & Norheim, B. E. H. (2021). Arbeids-og næringslivet som misjonær arena: Momenter til en tverrfaglig forskningsagenda–inspirert av arven etter Hans Nielsen Hauge. *Norsk Tidsskrift for Misjonsvitenskap* 75(1–2), pp. 191–210.
- Sødal, H. K. & Dørum, K. (2017). *Hans Nielsen Hauge. Fra Samfunnsfiende til ikon*. Oslo: Cappelen Damm Akademisk.

- van Dierendonck, D. (2011). Servant leadership: A review and synthesis. *Journal of Management*, 37, pp. 1228–1261.
- van Dierendonck, D., & Nuijten, I. (2011). The Servant Leadership Survey: Development and Validation of a Multidimensional Measure. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 26(3), 249–267.
- Wang, Z., Meng, L., & Cai, S. (2019). Servant leadership and innovative behavior: A moderated mediation. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 34(8), pp. 505–518.
- Waters, R. D. (2013). The role of stewardship in leadership: Applying the contingency theory of leadership to relationship cultivation practices of public relations practitioners. *Journal of Communication Management*, 17(4), pp. 324–340.
- Weber M (1922 [1978]) *Economy and Society*, 2 vols (ed. G Roth & C Wittich). Berkeley, CA; London; Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Weber, M. (1930). *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons (reprint 1958).
- Welle, I. (1948). *Kirkens historie*. III. Oslo: Lutherstiftelsens forlag.
- Williams Jr. W.A., Brandon, R.S., Hayek, M., Haden, S.P., & Atinc, G. (2017). Servant leadership and followership creativity: The influence of workplace spirituality and political skill. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 38, pp. 178–193.
- Wilson, J. H. (2011). The Serving Organization: Jesus vs. Hierarchy in Matthew 20:20–28. *Journal of Biblical Perspective in Leadership*, 3(2), pp. 91–98.
- Yoshida, D.T., Sendjaya, S., Hirst, G., & Cooper, B. (2014). Does servant leadership foster creativity and innovation? A multi-level mediation study of identification and prototypicality. *Journal of Business Research*, 67, pp. 1395–1404.
- Yukl, G. & Gardner III, W. L. (2020). *Leadership in organizations* (9th ed.). Essex: Pearson.
- Zheng, G. G., Zhou, Y., & Wu, W. (2023). Followers matter: Understanding the emotional exhaustion of servant leadership. *Applied Psychology: An International Review* 1, pp. 1–25.

Truls Liland, 1972, is a doctoral student at the Norwegian School of Economics in Bergen and lecturer at the Hauge School of Management (HSM), NLA University College in Oslo. He is the former head of department at HSM and has held several different management positions in business in industries such as telecoms, banking and finance. His teaching and research are primarily related to subject areas such as leadership, entrepreneurship, innovation, Haugian enterprises, and corporate social responsibility. Liland also holds several board positions, is involved in local church leadership, and has an educational background in economics, leadership, and theology. truls.liland@nla.no

- Grytten, O. H. & Liland, T. (eds). (2021). *In the Legacy of Hans Nielsen Hauge. Entrepreneurship in Economics, Management, Education, and Politics*. Bodoni forlag: Bergen, Norway.
- Liland, T. (2021). Hans Nielsen Hauge as a Social Entrepreneur and Innovator. In Grytten, O. H. & Liland, T. (eds). *In the Legacy of Hans Nielsen Hauge. Entrepreneurship in Economics, Management, Education, and Politics*. Bodoni forlag: Bergen, Norway.

- Liland, T. (2021). The Greatest Is the Servant of All. In Grytten, O. H. & Liland, T. (eds). *In the Legacy of Hans Nielsen Hauge. Entrepreneurship in Economics, Management, Education, and Politics*. Bodoni forlag: Bergen, Norway.
- Ims, K., Liland T. & Supphellen, M. (2019). The Importance of Calling in Realization of Life Projects: The Case of Maverick and Serial-entrepreneur Hans Nielsen Hauge with Implications for Business Education. In: Bouckaert L., van den Heuvel S. (eds) *Servant Leadership, Social Entrepreneurship and the Will to Serve*. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-29936-1_15