

Employee Perceptions of Servant Leadership: Comparisons by Level and with Job  
Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment

Submitted to Regent University

School of Leadership Studies

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy in Organizational Leadership

Sharon Drury

March 2004

School of Leadership Studies

Regent University

This is to certify that the dissertation prepared by:

Sharon Drury

titled

**EMPLOYEE PERCEPTIONS OF SERVANT LEADERSHIP: COMPARISONS  
BY LEVEL AND WITH JOB SATISFACTION AND ORGANIZATIONAL  
COMMITMENT**

Has been approved by her committee as satisfactory completion of the dissertation for the  
degree of Doctor of Philosophy

---

Bruce E. Winston, Ph.D., Committee Chair  
School of Leadership Studies

Date

---

Gail Longbotham, Ph.D., Committee Member  
School of Leadership Studies

Date

---

A. Greg Stone, Ph.D., Committee Member  
School of Leadership Studies

Date

---

Bruce E. Winston, Ph.D., Associate Dean,  
School of Leadership Studies

Date

### Abstract

The amount of empirical research is scarce on the theory of servant leadership, especially as the concept may be related to other organizational constructs. Using multilevel employee ratings from the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) as developed by Laub (1999), this study demonstrated that servant leadership characteristics can be measured in an organization. An ANOVA with scores from top leadership, management, faculty, and hourly workers on their perceptions of servant leadership showed that a statistically significant perception gap exists between levels of employees. Post hoc analysis found hourly workers differed the most from faculty. A Pearson correlation test found a statistically significant, positive, and substantial relationship between the perception of servant leadership and job satisfaction, as measured by the OLA. Using the Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993) commitment scales for organizational commitment, the study found a statistically significant inverse but small relationship between servant leadership and organizational commitment. Statistical data and implications for the findings are included. A nontraditional college was the research site for this quantitative study.

Dedication

To Keith,

who values people with his schedule,  
develops students in and out of the classroom,  
builds community among the faculty,  
displays authenticity with our sons,  
provides leadership with or without position,  
and shares leadership with me.

## Acknowledgements

I wish to express my appreciation to the many people who provided support for me during my pursuit of a doctoral degree. Sincere thanks goes to my advisor, Dr. Bruce Winston, who provided many hours of advice and encouragement even while traveling abroad. I am indebted to many colleagues across Indiana Wesleyan University for their constant encouragement and for IWU's financial assistance. A special thank you to Dr. David Wright and Dr. Mark Smith for the initial motivation to start on this journey, Tommie Barnes for her continual prayer support, and Russ and Cindy for the motivational visits. Much gratitude goes to Dr. Kerry Kind for the denominational aid, Matt Decker for his assistance with SPSS, and Maurie Thompson for her proofreading.

I am most grateful to my family, to my mom and dad who wondered why I quit school to get married so young, to my sons David and John who have been cheering me along during many years of education as an adult, and to my husband Keith who has sacrificed the most for me during these recent years of doctoral study.

May this work bring glory to God, my Strength and my Redeemer through Jesus Christ. I owe my life to Him.

## Table of Contents

<b>Abstract</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>Dedication</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>List of Tables</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>Definition of Terms</b>	<b>x</b>
<b>Chapter 1: Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>Theory and Variables that Apply to the Research Questions</i>	3
<i>Relationship between the Variables</i>	5
<i>Research Hypotheses</i>	7
<i>Scope of the Study</i>	8
<i>Method</i>	9
<i>Analysis of the Data</i>	11
<b>Chapter 2: Literature Review</b>	<b>12</b>
<i>The Importance of Servant Leadership</i>	12
<i>History of the Term Servant Leadership</i>	16
<i>Needs Explicitly Addressed by Servant Leadership</i>	18
<i>Systematic Studies of Servant Leadership</i>	21
<i>Servant Leadership and Job Satisfaction</i>	26
<i>Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment</i>	30
<i>Servant Leadership and Organizational Commitment</i>	35

<i>Summary of the Literature Review Chapter</i>	39
<b>Chapter 3: Method</b>	<b>42</b>
<i>Three Hypotheses</i>	42
<i>Research Design</i>	46
<i>Research Instruments</i>	48
<i>Sample and Population</i>	52
<i>Data Analysis</i>	53
<b>Chapter 4: Data</b>	<b>56</b>
<i>Participants and Perception of Servant Leadership</i>	56
<i>Perceptions of Servant Leadership by Employee Category</i>	57
<i>Relationship of Servant Leadership with Job Satisfaction</i>	60
<i>Relationship of Servant Leadership with Organizational Commitment</i>	62
<i>A Summary of the Major Findings</i>	66
<b>Chapter 5: Discussion</b>	<b>67</b>
<i>Research Finding 1</i>	67
<i>Research Finding 2</i>	70
<i>Research Finding 3</i>	71
<i>Suggestions for Future Research</i>	74
<i>Limitations</i>	75
<b>References</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>Exhibit A</b>	<b>89</b>
<b>Exhibit B</b>	<b>90</b>

<b>Exhibit C</b>	<b>91</b>
<b>Exhibit D</b>	<b>92</b>
<b>Exhibit E</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>Exhibit F</b>	<b>94</b>



## List of Tables

Table 1	Participants in this Study .....	56
Table 2	Overall Perception of Servant Leadership .....	57
Table 3	Perceptions of Servant Leadership by Employee Level .....	58
Table 4	Post Hoc Test of Servant Leadership for Groups of Employees .....	59
Table 5	Servant Leadership and Job Satisfaction .....	60
Table 6	Job Satisfaction by Employee Level.....	61
Table 7	Post Hoc Test of Job Satisfaction for Groups of Employees.....	62
Table 8	Servant Leadership and Organizational Commitment.....	62
Table 9	Organizational Commitment by Employee Level .....	63
Table 10	Post Hos Test of Organizational Commitment for Gropus of Employees .....	64
Table 11	Relationship of Servant Leadership with Affective and with Continuance Commitment .....	65
Table 12	Continuance by Employee Level.....	66

### Definition of Terms

- Job satisfaction – a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job and job experiences (Locke, 1976)
- Leadership – a process whereby an individual influences others to achieve a common goal (Northouse, 2001)
- Organization – a social entity designed as a deliberately structured and coordinated activity system that helps people attain goals (Daft, 1998)
- Organizational commitment – a psychological state that reflects an employee’s relationship to the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990).
- Organizational culture – a pattern of shared assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems (Schein, 1992)
- Servant leadership – an understanding and practice of leadership that places the good of those led over the self-interest of the leader (Laub, 1999)
- Servant leader behavior - values people, develops people, builds community, displays authenticity, provides leadership, and shares leadership (Laub, 1999)
- Servant organization – an organization in which the characteristics of servant leadership are displayed through the organizational culture and are valued and practiced by the leadership and workforce (Laub, 1999)

## Chapter 1: Introduction

Leadership researchers and writers such as Bass (2000), Blanchard (2002), Collins (2001), Covey (2002), DePree (1995), Northouse (2001), and Senge (1990, 1997), have either anecdotally or prophetically referenced the idea that servant leadership should be considered by the leaders of today's organizations. Bass and Buchen (1998), Laub (1999), Senge (as cited in Jaworski, 1996), have specifically recommended servant leadership as a way to counterbalance ego and redirect power in a prosocial manner (Sashkin & Sashkin, 2003), for serving and developing others (Greenleaf, 1970; Stone, Russell, & Patterson, 2003), and for the good of the organization (Beazley, 2002; Melrose, 1995).

Though the literature frequently makes reference to servant leadership, there are few empirical studies to support the concept as a distinct leadership style recognizable by others across the organization. This study demonstrated that servant leadership characteristics can be measured in an organization, and replicated a portion of the Horsman (2001) and Thompson (2003) studies, but with a different kind of organization.

Laub (1999) predicted that the perception of servant leadership would vary by level of employee. Horsman (2001) found a significant difference between the perceptions within top leadership and the perceptions within the workforce. Thompson (2003), however, did not find a significant difference in perceptions by employee level in his sample. Therefore, the first question this study answered was whether perceptions of servant leadership differ by level of employee. The research compared the perceptions of servant leadership in a different kind of organization than has been studied before and did

so from the perspective of employees based on position/role in the organization, e.g., top leadership, management, faculty, and hourly workers.

Though there was a substantial amount of literature on the relationship between various leader behaviors and job satisfaction (e.g., Holdnak, Harsh, & Bushardt, 1993; Pool, 1997; Savery, 1994), their findings were mixed. This study compared job satisfaction and perceptions of servant leadership since Laub (1999) proposed that employees would have higher job satisfaction in a servant organization, and therefore would “be freed to perform at their highest levels of ability, leading to greater success for the organization” (p. 85). Girard (2000) and Thompson (2003) found job satisfaction and servant leadership to be positively correlated; however, these studies did not include hourly workers. As a result, the second research question for the present study is whether there is a relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction across the organization.

Job satisfaction was also positively correlated with organizational commitment in the leadership literature (e.g., Bateman & Strasser, 1984; Brooke, Russell & Price, 1988; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). Furthermore, Brown and Gaylor (2002); Curry, Wakefield, Price, and Mueller (1986); Farkas and Tetrick (1989); Lance (1991); Vandenberg and Lance (1992); Williams and Hazer (1986); and found a causal relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Theoretically, organizational commitment appears to be impacted by servant leadership as well. For example, Agarwal, DeCarlo, and Vyas (1999) found consideration behavior (a strong component of servant leadership) to be positively correlated with organizational commitment. Similarly, Lankau and Chung (1998) found mentoring highly correlated with commitment in

organizations. Numerous studies have found a positive relationship between organizational commitment and overall leadership (Bateman & Strasser, 1984; Chieffo, 1991; Glisson & Durick, 1988; Kacmar, Carlson, & Brymer, 1999; Lok & Crawford, 2001); Loke, 2001; Yousef, 2000). Such attention also highlighted the search for a commitment-performance link, and this was found in studies by Benkhoff (1997) and Siders, George, and Dharwadkar (2001). As a result of the relationship numerous studies have found between job satisfaction and organizational commitment, the third research question was whether there is a relationship between perception of servant leadership and organizational commitment. This study therefore searched for a relationship that has not been attempted in the leadership literature until now.

#### *Theory and Variables that Apply to the Research Questions*

Organizational leaders are seeking ways to increase worker commitment and satisfaction. Theories of job satisfaction and organizational commitment have implications for how leaders relate to followers in an organization. For example, if job satisfaction is a byproduct of meeting different motivational needs within the employee (Holland, 1989), then motivation and power become important aspects of a leadership style. Therefore, leaders who value job satisfaction must consider management's view of the nature of man (Lawler, 1973) and Maslow's (1954) need hierarchy. Holland summarizes these related issues by stating that no one approach motivates all employees; therefore, it is vital that organizations promote a variety of leadership practices. Laub (1999) predicted that servant leadership is a leadership style that is positively related to job satisfaction, which is defined as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job and job experiences (Locke, 1976). This relationship

needed further investigation; thus, servant leadership and job satisfaction were two variables in this study.

Job satisfaction, furthermore, has been positively correlated with organizational commitment (e.g., Bateman & Strasser, 1984; Matheiu & Zajac, 1990; Vandenberg & Lance, 1992). Organizational commitment, the third variable in this study, refers to a psychological state that reflects an employee's relationship to the organization. Allen and Meyer (1990) found that three attitudes conceptualize the construct: affective attachment (*want to stay*), continuance commitment (*need to stay*), and normative obligation (*ought to stay*).

While there is an abundance of literature dealing with the theories of job satisfaction and organizational commitment indicating a positive relationship between the two constructs, the scholarly research is limited on the theory of servant leadership being related to job satisfaction and absent in relating servant leadership and organizational commitment. However, servant leadership and job satisfaction are highly concerned with an employee focus in an organization (Stone et al., 2003), just as job satisfaction and organizational commitment are. Greenleaf (1970) coined the term servant leadership over 30 years ago, and the Bible refers to the servant leader example of Jesus Christ (Matthew 20:25-26; Phil. 2:7). However, over the last decade, the concept has received abundant anecdotal interest. Scholarly research is more rare but has demonstrated that servant leadership can be operationally defined (Laub, 1999), distinguished from transformational leadership (Farling, Stone, & Winston, 1999; Patterson, 2003), identified in studies with top leaders (Livovich, 1999; Russell, 2000; Taylor-Gillham, 1998), and empirically measured as a distinct leadership style in organizations (Beazley,

2001; Horsman, 2001; Thompson, 2003). Perceptions by different levels of employees have not been consistently found, however, because the findings differed in at least two studies that have compared perceptions by level. Therefore, this study attempted to see if perceptions of servant leadership differ between four levels of employees: top leadership, management, faculty, and hourly workers.

Overall, this research studied three variables—servant leadership, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment—to help future leaders consider a servant-minded leadership style for the benefit of the employees (job satisfaction) and the enterprise (organizational commitment). Adding to the body of knowledge on servant leadership was the primary purpose of this study, first, by determining any differences between levels of employees on their perceptions of servant leadership and, second, by seeking to find any relationship the emerging theory of servant leadership has with the more widely accepted theories of job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

#### *Relationship between the Variables*

Since servant leadership was the primary focus of this investigation, servant leadership was considered the independent variable. The research used the operational definition formulated by Laub (1999) that does not mention the term servant leadership in the defining characteristics. In other words, if the characteristics that define servant leadership were perceived as behaviors in the leaders of an organization, this would demonstrate that perceptions of servant leadership existed and were measured in an organization.

The study compared perceptions from four groups of employees: top leadership, management, faculty, and hourly workers. This considered the position/role of the

employee a moderating variable that altered the strength of the independent variable, servant leadership. Laub (1999) predicted that the perception of servant leader behavior would vary by employee level, primarily because of the top leaders' own perceptions of their organizations. Similarly, Kouzes and Posner (1990) reported that self-ratings are typically higher than ratings of the same leaders by their subordinates. However, there have been mixed results in studies that compared employee perception of servant leadership by level. For example, Horsman (2001) found a significant difference between three levels of employees in several small organizations. Thompson (2003), on the other hand, found no significant difference; however, he only surveyed three levels of administrative employees, not hourly ones. Consequently, since this study included hourly workers; plus faculty, management, and top leadership; a difference was expected in the perception of servant leadership in the organization when based on employee rank in the organization.

This study also sought to determine if the extent of perceived level of servant leadership by the employees is related to the extent of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in the members across the organization. Both job satisfaction and organizational commitment were posed as dependent variables because they were expected to be affected by a relational leadership style--servant leadership. In addition, both were used in this study because they have been positively correlated with each other in multiple studies (e.g., Bateman & Strasser, 1984; Matheiu & Zajac 1990; Vandenberg & Lance, 1992). This writer expected the independent and dependent variables to be positively correlated with each other when compared.



For the second research question, the researcher expected to find a positive relationship between the measure of servant leadership and job satisfaction. Servant leaders have been shown to place emphasis on service to followers that allows freedom for employees to exercise their own abilities (Stone et al., 2003). Additionally, Judge, Bono, Thoresen, and Patton (2001) found a positive relationship between job performance and job satisfaction. A positive relationship between satisfaction and servant leadership was predicted by Laub (1999) and found in the Girard (2000) and Thompson (2003) studies. Therefore, this study attempted to replicate previous findings on the relationship between job satisfaction and servant leadership in a different kind of organization.

For the third research question, the researcher expected to find a positive relationship between servant leadership and organizational commitment since Loke (2001), Kacmar et al. (1999), and Agarwal et al. (1999) found that leader behavior had a positive relationship with commitment. The leadership styles in those studies share many characteristics with servant leadership. However, no link has been found between servant leadership and organizational commitment. Thus, this study contributed to the servant leadership literature a new area—organizational commitment

### *Research Hypotheses*

The first difference suggested in the literature was that perceptions among employees concerning their leader's behavior may vary by levels of employment. The perception of servant leadership characteristics in the organization were projected to be related to the position/role of the employee, especially when hourly employees are included in the research. This study included hourly workers and tested for any difference

between four categories of employees and each level's perception of servant leadership in the organization.

Two relationships were suggested in the literature: a correlation between leadership and two interrelated behaviors desired for employees, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. This study posited servant leadership as the independent variable for each and, therefore, would lay the groundwork for a three-way relationship between the perceptions of servant leadership, the measure of job satisfaction, and the measure of organizational commitment.

In order to study those predictions, this study tested the following null hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1 – There is no difference between position/role of the employee and the perception of servant leadership.

Hypothesis 2 – There is no relationship between the perception of servant leadership and the measure of job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 3 – There is no relationship between the perception of servant leadership and the measure of organizational commitment.

#### *Scope of the Study*

Using an institution-based survey of four levels of employees, the research provided empirical data on the emerging theory of servant leadership. The data included a multi-level rating of servant leader behavior instead of the self-scoring assessment that Russell (2000) used in an earlier quantitative study on servant leadership. The findings concerning servant leadership in this study were based on perceptions of the employees in an organization regarding leadership of that organization.

The study was also an assessment of the total organization to determine what level of servant leadership existed across the organization. To do this, perceptions of servant leader behavior in positional leaders as well as those who may have leadership influence in their work unit were measured. All data were collected without ever mentioning the term servant leadership. Employees were asked to think of their supervisors and/or top leaders in the organization as well as the behaviors of those they work with on a peer level when they evaluated the survey statements.

The study did not address customer perception of servant leadership in the organization nor perceptions from other external stakeholders regarding service from members of the organization. Instead, this was a multirater assessment of the organizational leadership across an organization to determine a possible relationship with satisfaction and commitment of the employees.

### *Method*

In order to test the three hypotheses, a cross-sectional survey design was used with employees of an organization that has espoused the values of servant leadership (NCA Focus Visit, 2003). The target population was a nontraditional college that serves approximately 7,500 adult students. Two instruments were combined and sent to all 225 administrative employees and faculty of the college, a sample that provided respondents in each category of employee.

Laub (1999) developed the 60-item OLA for the expressed purpose of identifying a servant-led organization. By using this instrument, the OLA yielded a score for the organization's level of servant leader characteristics as perceived by the employees. The participants in the present study were classified into four categories: (a) workers, hourly

and technical; (b) faculty, full-time teaching positions; (c) management, exempt (salaried) employees who supervise at least one employee but are not part of the top leadership team; and (d) top leadership, defined as those on the administrative council of the college. These categories were used to test the variables in the first hypothesis, to see if any relationship existed between the position/role of the employees and the perception of servant leadership across the organization.

The OLA also yielded a separate score for job satisfaction in the organization. Six items embedded in the OLA provided a separate job satisfaction scale with a separate score. The scores for job satisfaction were compared with the scores for servant leadership for each participant to see whether or not they correlated.

The Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993) commitment scales were also part of the packet to each employee. This combined organizational commitment scale used 12 Likert-style items to measure organizational commitment. Benkhoff (1996) recommended the Meyer et al. three-dimensional concept after testing their scales against the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) by Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulian (1974). The organizational commitment scores were then compared with the scores for servant leadership from the OLA for each participant.

Dr. James Laub gave permission to use the OLA, as long as the complete instrument was used. This provided the servant leadership and job satisfaction scales. Written permission was also obtained from Dr. John Meyer to use the organizational commitment scales for this research. Approval from the Institutional Review Board of the College to administer the survey was also received.

A questionnaire combining the servant leadership, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment items gathered the position/role data at the beginning of the paper survey. The questionnaire was sent via campus mail using mailing labels provided by the Vice President's office. An outside cover page of instructions and an estimated time frame for taking the survey accompanied the instrument. The researcher's return address was displayed on the back so that each participant could easily fold the stapled pages and anonymously return the questionnaire via campus mail again.

#### *Analysis of the Data*

The researcher summarized the responses from the questionnaires according to position/role in the organization. An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to compare the mean scores from the four categories of employees on their perceptions of servant leadership characteristics and found a significant difference existed between employee levels (Hypothesis 1). Each participant also had a number and a total score entered from the servant leadership scale, the job satisfaction scale, and the organizational commitment scale. The researcher used a Pearson correlation test that showed a statistically significant, positive, and substantial relationship between the first two constructs: servant leadership and job satisfaction (Hypothesis 2). A statistically significant, negative, but small relationship was found between servant leadership and organizational commitment (Hypothesis 3). Implications for the enhancement of servant leadership theory and the related constructs in this study derived from these findings are discussed in Chapter 5.

## Chapter 2: Literature Review

This chapter presents the literature on the concept of servant leadership and related topics. The first section addresses the importance of the theory in contemporary literature. The second section tracks the history of the term. The third reviews how servant leadership has been recommended for specific leadership challenges. The fourth section examines the systematic studies of servant leadership. The fifth section reviews the prediction that a servant-led organization would have higher job satisfaction, the debate about the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance, and some studies that compared servant leadership and job satisfaction. The sixth and seventh sections track the connection between job satisfaction and organizational commitment in the literature and the theoretical connection between servant leadership and organizational commitment. Recommendations for this empirical research are addressed throughout and summarized in the final section.

### *The Importance of Servant Leadership*

Servant leadership is a term referred to by a surprising number of leadership writers and researchers. Peter Senge (as cited in Spears, 1995) emphasized the importance of the concept by stating that he believes the essay by Robert Greenleaf (year), titled *The Servant as Leader*, is the most useful statement on leadership in the last 20 years. This claim by such an influential author begged more empirical study of the emerging theory of servant leadership.

Bernard Bass (2000), most noted for his 1990 exhaustive handbook on leadership research, labeled servant leadership as a movement in his article on learning organizations. He stated that “the strength of the theory and its many links to encouraging

follower learning, growth, and autonomy suggests that the untested theory will play a role in the future leadership of the learning organization" (p. 29). Since most organizations need to keep learning at all levels in order to adapt to their changing environments, servant leadership should be of interest for today's organizational leaders for it enables and empowers people to learn and grow. If this is true, a learning organization such as the one in this study should be a likely study site to find that employees perceive a good measure of servant leadership across the organization.

Peter Senge (1990, 1997) describes learning organizations as open systems where continuous improvement is paramount and customer service is the most important competitive advantage in the marketplace. Senge (1997), the author of the seminal work on learning organizations in 1990, believes leaders who want to help workers be adaptable to change and better prepared for globalism, diversity, and the technological advances in the new economy will choose to serve their workers. Leaders will model learning by regenerating themselves and providing ways for members at every level of the organization to grow personally and professionally. "It is no longer sufficient to have one person learning for the organization; organizations that excel will tap into people's commitment and capacity to learn at all levels in an organization" (Senge, 1990, p. 4). Therefore, this study sought to measure perceptions from the employees at all levels of the organization. Additionally, when change is perpetual, as is characteristic of learning organizations, a leader must develop a supportive role as coach and mentor. These are alternate metaphors for the concept of servant leadership. When employees perceive behavior in their managers, supervisors, and top leaders that is similar to coaches or

mentors, they will also identify the characteristics of servant leadership at various levels in the organization.

Ken Blanchard (2002), a major contributor to both popular and research-based leadership initiatives for over 3 decades, stated that “servant-leadership is the foundation for effective leadership” (p. ix). After studying the life and leadership model of Jesus in the mid-1980s, Blanchard declared Situational Leadership Theory (SLT) to be a servant-leadership model. He also promoted the concept of servant leadership through his Center for FaithWalk Leadership, but the Hersey-Blanchard model does not specifically mention the term servant leadership. The SLT model, developed in 1967 by Hersey and Blanchard at Ohio University, continues to be used in over 400 of the Fortune 500 companies training programs (Hersey & Blanchard, 1993). It proposed that the leader adjusts his or her style to meet the particular situation and needs of the follower. If employees perceived that their leader has tailored his or her leadership style to their personal needs, it is more likely that the leader is focusing on others, a key concept in servant leadership. This was another reason this study looked at measuring the perceptions of employees instead of merely surveying top leaders and using self-reports of servant leadership.

Max DePree (1995), another prolific author of leadership literature, has been a consistent proponent of servant leadership and, like Bass (2000), believed it has the marks of a movement. DePree reminded leaders of their moral purpose versus only employing a skilled response to ratios and policies. He stated that “servant leadership is a deeper and better way to lead, but it is never easy. It sets high standards of being and doing. Building competence in relationships with people...is the best way to produce personal and organizational potential” (p. ix). DePree’s successful career as CEO of



Herman Miller is a confirmation of a servant style of leadership that also produces positive results for the organization. Thus, this study did not only include perceptions of servant leadership, but also included an assessment of commitment to the total organization.

Stephen Covey, a popular management speaker and writer, believed servant leadership requires humility of character and core competency built around new skills. Covey (2002) recommended a servant leader approach that includes four enabling values: modeling, path-finding, alignment, and empowerment. Covey summarized his view of servant leadership by stating that “you don’t just serve, you do it in a way that makes them independent of you, and capable and desirous of serving other people” (p. 31). That was close to the first part of Greenleaf’s (1970) best test of servant leadership that asks, “When served, do they grow as persons?” (p. 7). Therefore, the researcher for this study included employee perceptions of their opportunities for growth in the organization.

Peter Northouse (2001), noted author of the leadership text used in more than 250 colleges and universities, acknowledged servant leadership as a valid philosophy that has significantly influenced management thinkers today. Northouse placed servant leadership in his chapter on leadership ethics because of its altruistic overtones; defined as care of the followers, removing injustice and inequalities in the system, and social responsibility in the life of an organization. He also believed “the leader-follower relationship was central to ethical leadership” (p. 257). Ethical considerations are increasingly on the minds of employees today; therefore, perceptions of integrity and trustworthiness were included in the study.

Jim Collins (2001), author of the national bestseller *Good to Great*, found that his research team was shocked to discover the kind of leadership required to achieve greatness. His research team identified companies that “made the leap from good results to great results” (p. 3) and sustained those results for at least 15 years and compared them with a control group of those that failed to make or sustain the leap. The findings in *Good to Great* covered virtually every area of management strategy and practice including the type of leader that surfaced, though Collins originally wished to downplay leadership as a factor in the study. When the data indicated the leader’s importance in the winning companies, some on the team attempted to describe these good-to-great leaders with terms like “self-less executive and servant leader” (p. 30). Other team members violently objected to these characterizations, saying, “It makes them sound weak or meek.... but [these leaders] would do almost anything to make the company great” (p. 30). Consequently, they decided to describe this trait as “personal humility + professional will” and labeled this style of leadership “Level 5 Leadership” (p. 30). Apparently, servant leadership as a term can be mentioned when the context will accept it more freely but avoided in situations such as the good-to-great study where the surrounding culture was against or unsure of such a term. Therefore, to avoid respondent bias, this study never explicitly used the term “servant” or “servant leadership” in data gathering but simply sought to identify the perceptions of leader behavior in an organization.

#### *History of the Term Servant Leadership*

The modern concept of a leader functioning as a servant was promoted by Robert Greenleaf in a series of essays in the 1960s and 1970s. Writing after he retired from a 38-year managerial career at AT&T, Greenleaf rejected a narrow, short-term profit motive

for business and called institutions to serve society more constructively. Greenleaf (1977) proposed a new business ethic:

the work exists for the person as much as the person exists for the work. Put another way, the business exists as much to provide meaningful work to the person as it exists to provide a product or service to the customer. (p. 142)

His idea was spawned from reading Herman Hesse's mythical story, *Journey to the East* (Spears, 1995). Leo, who performs the most menial of tasks during the journey but also sustains the members with his spirits and song, becomes lost and the group eventually disintegrates. Several years later, Leo is rediscovered by a member of the trek and only then is revealed to be the discrete leader and sponsor of the journey.

The concept of servant leadership did not originate with Greenleaf, however. Ancient Scripture refers to the servant leader example of Jesus Christ. Matthew recorded Jesus' words: "You know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their high officials exercise authority over them. Not so with you. Instead, whoever wants to become great among you must be your servant" (Matthew 20:25-26, New International Version). Nouwen (1989) highlights the foundations of Jesus' leadership style from a study of the Gospels, where "Power is constantly abandoned in favor of love" (p. 63). In the Epistles, the Apostle Paul suggests that anyone who wishes to follow in Jesus' steps would humble himself and take on "the nature of servant" (Phil 2:7). Zohar (1997) connects Greenleaf's value-laden leadership ideas with ancient Eastern religions that tend to be centered on values like compassion, humility, gratitude, and service. Such historical bases of servant leadership were characteristic of the behavior measured in the leadership assessment tool in the current study.

Leadership itself is defined as a process whereby an individual influences others to achieve a common goal (Northouse, 2001). This basic definition of leadership allows for the collaborative nature of servant leadership, and supports this empirical study. It also addresses Greenleaf's (1970) theoretical test, "...do those served...*while being served* [author's emphasis] more likely to become servants?" (p. 7). If servant leadership is practiced in the upper levels of an organization, it should impact the leader, manager, and supervisory behaviors in various work units and have the ability to be replicated across the organization. This study sought to determine if there is any variance of perceived servant leadership in different levels in an organization. Participants were first asked to think of "people in general in this organization" and, in another section of the instrument, "managers/supervisors and top leadership in this organization" (Laub, 1999).

#### *Needs Explicitly Addressed by Servant Leadership*

Servant leadership has been specifically recommended for some challenging areas in the study and practice of leadership. For example, Buchen (1998) and Senge (as cited in Jaworski, 1996) suggest servant leadership will produce a shared leadership that counterbalances ego and power in the positional leader, and Laub (1999) and Stone et al. (2003) believe developing followers for their personal growth first will benefit the total organization. Given these specific areas of emphases that appear repeatedly in the servant leadership literature, this study sought to discover perceptions from all levels of employees—not just reports from top leaders—about the leadership influence in various work units of the organization to see if servant leadership is practiced across the whole organization.

In the Dephi study that yielded an operational definition of servant leadership, Laub (1999) found consensus on shared leadership because “servant leaders will use their position and power to empower those whom they lead and will work alongside them as partners... as community” (p. 31). Sashkin and Sashkin (2003) called this phenomenon pro-social power, using what power and authority one has for the good of others and the whole organization, versus personalized power where one primarily uses power for personal benefit, special status, or perks that accompany the leadership position. Today’s employees generally reject this latter kind of behavior in their leaders. Leaders who have positional power become most powerful when they share power or give their power away to others. Laub labeled this “one of the paradoxes of servant leadership” (p. 20). If shared leadership, collaboration, and empowerment are functioning with employees in an organization, these should be perceived by the participants in a survey and, therefore, identified as behaviors within the construct of servant leadership across the organization. Sharing power is also necessary for community building; this enables employees to think beyond themselves or an individual job and toward the whole organization. Therefore, this study sought to learn the attitudes of individual employees toward their own role as well as perceptions about the whole organization.

Peter Senge, in Jaworski's 1996 book *Synchronicity*, addressed the power struggle that challenges many leaders by saying, "Only [author's emphasis] when the choice to serve undergirds the moral formation of leadership does the hierarchical power that separates leader and those led not corrupt" (p. 1). This moral motivation from within the leader cares for the individuals in the workplace by developing an other-centeredness that is an antidote to ego gratification. Servant leaders provide workers with what they need to

get their work accomplished and do so because they intend to help others develop into fulfilled human beings. Likewise, Farling et al. (1999) believe that “merely serving is not the means by which to get results, but the behavior of serving is the result” (p. 3). In a similar finding, Stone et al. (2003) found that the choice to focus on others is the distinguishing feature between servant leadership and transformational leadership.

Organizational outcomes were secondary. That is why this study first attempted to see to what extent the employees perceive servant leadership behaviors across the organization.

Ego and power struggles were also mentioned in journal articles by Bass (2000) and Buchen (1998). They specifically recommended servant leadership to address leadership needs in education and inherent governance structures that inhibited effective leadership. Bass suggested a connection between colleges and servant leadership by stating that “servant leadership offers future faculty and administration the opportunity to transform higher education” (p. 30). Buchen was more explicit when he recommended servant leadership for redirecting ego and image in universities. He believed that ego is often displayed in newly hired faculty who have recently earned their terminal degrees but do not know how to teach. Thus, they are encouraged to keep doing what they already know how to do—research. This is especially evident when they are hired by tenure-track institutions that stress research over teaching in order to maintain the image and reputation of the university. Buchen proposed that the collegial system of governance in higher education would lend itself to a servant approach to leadership. Such collegiality, collaborative research with students and other faculty, is consistent with Greenleaf's (1977) concept of *primus inter pares* that he borrowed from early Roman writers, meaning first among equals. If leaders in other organizations were to use the first-among-

equals model, it would look like empowerment—a critical component of servant leadership. If the claims by Bass and Buchen are valid, then a study in a college or university seemed to be favorable.

Though organizational objectives were found to be secondary outcomes for the servant leaders (Stone et al., 2003), several financially successful corporations; such as Herman Miller, TD Industries, and The Toro Company; have been noted as servant-led organizations. DePree (1995) proposed that servant leadership principles provide enlightened momentum for the leader and the people to reach for both personal and organizational potential. If this is true and a study found a good level of servant leadership behavior, then such research should also find a similar level of commitment among employees who seek to reach for organizational goals.

The Toro Company story is an example of a successful CEO who led by serving; Covey (1995) called their CEO, Ken Melrose, a model of “the new post-heroic leadership” (p. x). After Toro had experienced serious reversals, Melrose learned to practice leadership based on serving the organization. He created an environment that fostered the growth of both the individual and the enterprise by utilizing slow-but-sure growth strategies and principled-centered leadership. Using this context as a basis, the study sought to measure servant leadership in a financially successful and growing organization which espoused values similar to Toro’s, i.e., employees are valued and performance goals are clear and well supported.

#### *Systematic Studies of Servant Leadership*

Though servant leadership was illustrated in biblical literature over 2000 years ago and noted by a multitude of contemporary authors, the concept largely remains an

intuition-based theory. Greenleaf (1977) originated the term servant leader, but he did not encourage a systematic study of the concept. In fact, Frick (1998) stated it should not be studied or quantified in an objective manner. However, Hatfield and Rapson (1993) believe even romantic love can be quantified and its richness can be understood, appreciated, and encouraged more broadly. This study attempted to do the same for servant leadership and thereby extend the emerging research efforts on the concept in recent years.

A few studies have surveyed preselected leaders to determine more about servant leader characteristics. Taylor-Gillham (1998) found all ten characteristics of servant leaders identified by Spears (1995) in a qualitative study of educational administrators. Livovich (1999) surveyed public school superintendents on the same ten characteristics and found greater measure of servant leadership in those superintendents who had a doctoral degree, had long-term employment, and worked in larger schools. Both of these studies indicate that servant leadership characteristics are evident in a working environment. The current study was also conducted in a working environment, among the administrative offices of a college.

Russell (2000) designed a quantitative study to determine if servant leaders differ from nonservant leaders in the five dimensions of Kouzes and Posner's (1990) *Leadership Practices Inventory* (LPI). Kouzes and Posner classified 167 leaders as either servant or nonservant leaders as measured by the *Hall-Tonna Inventory of Values* (HTIV; 1998). Russell found strong evidence that vision and pioneering are functional attributes of servant leadership and noted that modeling and appreciation of others are important attributes. However, the variable of empowerment was inconclusive. Russell's study was



well conducted and analyzed, however, it used self-reports from preselected leaders. The attached research did not examine designated leaders or even chosen servant leaders; it measured perceptions of leaders and followers in an organization.

Laub (1999) realized the need for a way to assess the level at which workers and leaders perceive the presence of servant leadership characteristics within their organizations. He formulated an operational definition from an agreed-upon list of the characteristics of servant leadership, refined from a panel of experts using the reiterative Delphi method (Sackman, 1975). Laub's definition stated that,

Servant leadership is an understanding and practice of leadership that places the good of those led over the self-interest of the leader. Servant leadership promotes the valuing and development of people, the building of community, the practice of authenticity, the providing of leadership for the good of those led, and the sharing of power and status for the common good of each individual, the total organization, and those served by the organization. (p. 83)

Laub then developed the items for an assessment tool, the OLA, that measures perceptions of servant leadership without ever using the term servant or servant leadership. In his field test of the instrument, Laub found that perceptions of servant leadership vary by level of employee and correlate with job satisfaction. The current study used the OLA and tested for the reliability of Laub's results using a different kind of organization.

Since several studies of servant leadership only examined preselected leaders, four recent empirical studies were reviewed because they surveyed employees by using all or a portion of the Laub (1999) instrument for their servant leadership research.

Horsman (2001) surveyed six different kinds of organizations in the Northwest and demonstrated generally consistent results between his OLA survey results and Laub's (1999) field-testing. Horsman also found that perceived characteristics of servant leadership and personal dimensions of spirit had a significant positive relationship, i.e., greater levels of servant leadership reflected high levels of spirit and vice versa. His findings reflect a comparison of the scores from all but the job satisfaction items on the OLA with scores on the Dimensions of Spirit instrument (McMahon & Wilson, 1999). Workforce-level employees comprised 69% of the respondents (n=608); subjects employed with smaller organizations assessed the whole company while those employed with larger organizations assessed servant leadership within their work unit. Therefore, since Horsman was able to demonstrate that a large percentage of workforce employees can perceive servant leader characteristics across the organization, this study surveyed everyone in an organization to help overcome some of the problems inherent in self-assessments of leadership.

D. A. Beazley (2002) studied TDIndustries in Dallas, TX. It is purported to be a servant-led company, as noted by the Greenleaf Center in Indianapolis, IN (Beazley). Headed by Jack Lowe, TDIndustries is a \$208 million a year construction and service company that has used servant leadership principles in their management training for many years. H. Beazley (1998) found a near one-to-one correlation between spirituality, as measured by the Spirituality Assessment Scale, and servant leadership, as measured on the leadership portion of the Laub's (1999) OLA. She also found that perceptions of leader behavior by employees who had very little servant leadership training were not significantly different than those employees who had been trained in the concepts of

servant leadership for long periods of time. Therefore, the current study did not need to survey only those employees who have had training in servant leadership principles; it surveyed the whole organization. Accordingly, the terms servant and servant leadership were not used in the instrument or instructions during data gathering to avoid respondent bias and invalidate the sample (Patton, 2002). Instead, the participants were informed that they were part of a research project focused on assessment of the organization.

Ledbetter (2003) used the complete OLA instrument for his research, as opposed to the two previous studies that used portions of the OLA. His participants were law enforcement officers from 12 agencies who were given the same survey at 2-week intervals. Ledbetter found that there was a perception gap between the top leadership and the workforce, and an even larger gap between top leadership and management, in their perceptions of servant leader behavior among the leaders of the agencies. The current study tested that finding by comparing the scores on the OLA between employee levels in the organization.

Thompson (2003) also used the complete OLA instrument and assessed the leadership of the residential college of the same university in the current study. The two colleges operate very independently. His study compared perceptions of servant leadership that existed between administrative levels and two functional areas. A significant difference was found between the two functional areas Student Services and Academic Affairs with the latter area scoring lower on the OLA. However, no significant difference was found between the administrative levels. This differs from Laub's (1999) field test and from Ledbetter's (2003) findings. Thompson did not have any hourly employees in his sample; he included only salaried administrators who were in

supervisory, management, or top leadership positions. In order to test the mixed findings between the Thompson, Ledbetter, and Horsman studies, the current research compared perceptions of servant leader characteristics among four main levels in the organization: hourly workers, full-time faculty, management/supervisory workers, and the top leadership team.

### *Servant Leadership and Job Satisfaction*

In developing the OLA, Laub (1999) proposed that “managers and workers would have higher job satisfaction in a servant organization and as a result would be freed up to perform at their highest levels of ability, leading to greater success for the organization” (p. 85). Satisfying the needs of workers to enhance job performance is an aspect of leadership that has been studied since the Hawthorne experiments (Ivancevich & Matteson, 1999). These were conducted between 1924 and 1932 with 20,000 Western Electric employees. Work groups were examined for the effect of lighting on their output. The researchers found that production increased whether lighting increased, decreased, or remained the same. People began to believe that economic rewards did not totally explain worker behavior and that employee attitudes were linked to performance. This launched the human relations movement (Judge et al., 2001). Valuing employees, indicative of a human relations emphasis, is a key component of servant leadership; and, therefore, perceptions of leader behaviors related to valuing people were measured in the current study.

Significant attention has been focused on studies of the leader’s behavior and job satisfaction, but the findings have been mixed. For example, Holdnak et al. (1993) found two correlations between leadership behavior and job satisfaction. Holdnak et al. labeled

leadership behavior as one of the two styles found in the Ohio State studies, either consideration (relational) or initiating structure (task). Then, they compared leadership style with job satisfaction and found two correlations: a positive relationship between consideration behavior and satisfaction and an inverse relationship between initiating structure and job satisfaction. Pool (1997) later confirmed the Holdnak et al. (1993) findings and added worker motivation as the most powerful predictor of job satisfaction. Pool's study also found Kerr and Jermier's (1978) model of leadership substitutes to have significant influence. Since servant leader characteristics include leadership that places the good of those led over the self-interests of the leader, the current study tested for a relationship between servant leader behavior and job satisfaction.

In a historical overview of the concept of job satisfaction, Holland (1989) suggested that satisfaction with one's particular job is a by-product of meeting different motivational needs within the employee, a significant finding in the Pool (1997) study. She concluded that the way an organization relates to workers is based on management's view of the nature of man that Lawler (1973) described in four categories: rational-economic man, social man, self-actualizing man, and complex man. The rational-economic man is motivated by economic incentives. Authority structures that control man's irrational feelings are necessary in organizations with this view. The social man is motivated by being liked by their supervisor and other workers. In this view, management functions as a mediator between top leaders and the workers. The self-actualizing man is ultimately motivated by reaching his or her full potential. Based on Maslow's (1954) need hierarchy, workers begin with seeking survival needs (e.g., job security), then ego satisfaction, and autonomy, in the end seeking to satisfy the higher

need for self-actualization. Organizations holding this view are committed to making jobs fulfilling, and power is generally more broadly distributed. Lawler's complex man theory views man as capable of learning new motives that generally interact well. Therefore, Holland concluded that no one approach motivates all employees and open communication and promoting a variety of leadership possibilities are vital.

About the same time as Holland's (1989) overview of job satisfaction, Adair (1984) reported on a meta-analysis of 86 different studies believed to involve the use of control groups to counteract the Hawthorne effect, and concluded that there is no such effect whatsoever. Similarly, Iaffaldano and Muchinski (1985) called the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance "intuitively logical" but "illusory" (p. 270) since no relationship was found in their meta-analysis. More recently, however, Judge et al. (2001) reexamined the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance. Because of limitations in prior analyses and misinterpretations, their meta-analysis was conducted on 312 samples, N=54,417. The mean true correlation between overall job satisfaction and job performance was estimated to be moderate (.30). Their findings were influenced by Organ's (1988) argument that when performance is conceptualized more broadly to include both task performance and organizational citizenship behaviors, its correlation with job satisfaction will increase. Likewise, the emphasis of servant leadership on building community (a relational emphasis) and clarifying goals (a task emphasis) encourage more breadth in defining job performance and, therefore, should increase the measure of job satisfaction across the organization.

One major influence on job satisfaction and motivation at work has been material affluence in America. This has shifted people's orientation toward work from a means to

an end, to a more sacred view where work dignifies the individual (Hesselbein, 1999). People seek intrinsic benefits in their work (Yankelovich, 1981). Workers today do not want to just work for a company, they want to be part of the company and consulted on decisions that affect them. Therefore, managers and leaders must find ways to get employee input; otherwise, the company's problems will not feel like their problems. Since it is no longer sufficient to offer only extrinsic rewards to motivate workers and as leaders are able to believe in the potential of their followers, the new relational paradigm for leadership is needed. Similarly, Stone et al. (2003) reported that servant leadership, when compared to transformational leadership, is predominantly a relations-oriented leadership in that it has the worker as its primary focus; organizational outcomes are secondary. If the employees feel dignified in their jobs and gain intrinsic benefits from their work, it should impact their level of job satisfaction and correlate with the practice of servant leadership that includes similar values.

As a result of the research on various styles of leadership and job satisfaction, Laub (1999) included six job satisfaction questions in the OLA. In order to test the reliability of the job satisfaction items in the OLA, Thompson (2003) administered an additional validated instrument, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ; Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967) to the same participants who took the entire OLA (n=138). Thompson found a statistically significant positive correlation ( $p < .01$ ) between participants' perception of servant leadership characteristics as measured by the OLA and their level of job satisfaction as measured by the MSQ. In a study of servant leadership characteristics in superintendents and job satisfaction of principals in 12 Illinois school districts, Girard (2000) found a significant correlation as well. The Judge et al. (2001)

study also found that a higher job satisfaction-job performance correlation existed between high complexity jobs versus jobs with lower complexity. Therefore, the current study extended the Laub, Girard, and Thompson claims concerning servant leadership and job satisfaction.

### *Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment*

Another construct that was repeatedly related to job satisfaction in the research literature was organizational commitment. For example, in a meta-analysis of organizational commitment, Mathieu and Zajac (1990) found two significantly consistent correlates for commitment: intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction. Other findings, however, were mixed in studies concerning the satisfaction-commitment relationships; therefore, the current study sought to compare the job satisfaction and organizational commitment constructs along with their relationship to servant leadership.

Because of the large body of literature relating the two concepts, Brooke et al. (1988) sought to test for the discriminant validity for the measures of job satisfaction and organizational commitment to make sure they were not testing the same subjective attitudes. A confirmatory factor analysis determined that job satisfaction and organizational commitment are indeed distinct constructs. Most studies operationalized the definitions of job satisfaction and organizational commitment by using the distinction that Porter et al. (1974) made between organizational commitment, represented by a more global attitude toward the organization as a whole, and job satisfaction, characterized by the specific task environment where an employee performs his or her duties. Their longitudinal evidence supported the view that organizational commitment was more stable over time than job satisfaction, given the more immediate reactions to specific and



tangible aspects of the work environment in the latter versus the more global aspects of the former.

Four frequently-referenced yet competing satisfaction-commitment models were examined by Vandenberg and Lance (1992). Model 1 (job satisfaction being antecedent to organizational commitment) was the most widely accepted belief. Williams and Hazer's (1986) study found support for this belief and explained that through a process of evaluating personal and organizational characteristics for satisfaction, the resulting affective state became associated with the organization or, in other words, satisfaction indirectly influenced organizational commitment.

Vandenberg et al.'s (1992) model 2 held that organizational commitment is causally antecedent to job satisfaction. Bateman and Strasser's (1984) longitudinal study found that commitment was causally antecedent to satisfaction and explained that a process of rationalization helps the employee to make sense of their current situation by developing attitudes consistent with their commitment to work there. A decade later, Brown and Gaylor (2002) surveyed 106 faculty and staff members in a historically black college and found support for organizational commitment being antecedent to job satisfaction. They also found that staff employees reported higher levels of affective commitment than their faculty counterparts. In light of this, the current study sought to identify faculty as a separate demographic category and compare findings with these previous results.

Model 3 said that job satisfaction and organizational commitment are reciprocally related. Farkas and Tetrick (1989) conducted a study of longitudinal data on the causal ordering of job satisfaction and organizational commitment and found limited support for

causal order. Yet, these researchers reiterated the strong relationship between the two constructs and suggested a cyclical or reciprocal relationship with increased tenure in an organization. Lance (1991) found support for this model; however, he noted that job satisfaction has a stronger effect on organizational commitment than the reverse, suggesting an asymmetrical relationship.

Model 4 holds that job satisfaction and organizational commitment are not causally related. In an attempt to replicate the findings by Bateman and Strasser (1984), Curry et al. (1986) found no support for hypothesized causal linkage between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Curry et al. surveyed a similar population as Bateman and Strasser; however, they used the shorter version of the OCQ and a global measure of satisfaction.

Vandenberg and Lance concluded in 1992 that there were variables relevant to job satisfaction and organizational commitment that had been unmeasured, specifically value congruence for job satisfaction and bonus equity for organizational commitment. They proceeded to survey 100 multinational Management Information Systems professionals with demographic characteristics that did not differ from the total population. After a 5-month test-retest interval, they found that correlations between job satisfaction and organizational commitment were relatively high (.45 and .52) and, when controlling for their two added variables, found overall support for model 2, that organizational commitment is causally antecedent to job satisfaction. If this is true, further research would find a stronger relationship with job satisfaction than with organizational commitment. The current study included a measure of value-related items but not bonus equity items in the servant leadership scale. Nevertheless, a substantial amount of

research supports the positive association between job satisfaction and commitment and set the stage for the comparison of servant leadership with each construct, even if the overall body of evidence on the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment does not consistently find causation or a reciprocal relationship. Therefore, the current study attempted to find a relationship rather than causality between servant leadership and each of these distinct but consistently-related job satisfaction and organizational commitment constructs and build on the emerging evidence that often correlates servant leadership with job satisfaction.

An additional reason organizational commitment was included in the current study relates to another variable that has often appeared in the satisfaction-commitment literature--productivity or organizational performance. In existing literature, organizational commitment is more often associated with performance outcomes than job satisfaction is. For example, Benkhoff (1997) found that employee commitment is significantly related to organizational performance, that include such targets as sales, private savings, and operating profit. Her approach was to extend the Mathieu and Zajac (1990) study; though this study found a significant positive correlation with job satisfaction, it was not conclusive in finding direct influence of organizational commitment on performance. An additional Benkhoff finding identified supervisory commitment to the organization as a strong influence on the measures of performance. Benkhoff collected surveys from 182 employees from 37 branches of a bank in Germany using the OCQ (Porter et al., 1974) and a specifically designed commitment scale in order to get a better behavioral picture of a committed employee. This latter scale was designed to measure what employees do, rather than what they report, about their

opinions and feelings and was measured by staff self-reports and staff members describing the branch manager. Combined results emerged that employee commitment is significantly related to the financial success of bank branches. Therefore, the current research included organizational commitment as a variable because finding a commitment-performance link with servant leadership would enhance interest in servant leadership.

Siders et al. (2001) extended the Benkhoff (1997) research by using objective measures at the individual level. They compared data from 389 surveys of sales executives to performance measures (sales volume, growth, and market share) and demonstrated that “commitment to the organization is indeed a critical determinant to sales volume” (p. 14). This study supported the commitment-performance relationship by contributing findings on attitudinal commitment to the organization that includes affective commitment, value commitment, identification with the organization, and value congruence. Benkhoff had emphasized behavioral commitment; yet, the results of both studies on the relationship between commitment and performance were consistent. Therefore, the current study sought to measure an overall conception of organizational commitment that includes affective and continuance dimensions of commitment.

The findings on the positive relationship between organizational commitment and performance give additional rationale for including commitment measures in the study. Job satisfaction alone may only reemphasize the relational side of leadership; organizational commitment emphasizes the task side of leadership that is sometimes ignored in job satisfaction and servant leadership research.

*Servant Leadership and Organizational Commitment*

No studies were found on the relationship between servant leadership and organizational commitment; however, the relationship between leadership in general and organizational commitment has received a great deal of attention, likely because of the belief that “employees who are highly committed to their top management deliver dramatically higher returns to shareholders” (HRFocus, year, p. 9). For example, Bateman and Strasser (1984) were among the first to report on the positive relationship between leadership style and commitment as well as the positive association between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Mathieu and Zajac’s (1990) meta-analysis of the commitment literature found that participative leadership was a consistently significant antecedent for commitment. Lok and Crawford’s (2001) study of 251 nurses in seven large hospitals extended that finding, finding that leadership that promoted innovative subcultures has the strongest positive effects on commitment. Glisson and Durick (1988) found that leadership and the company’s age, which they classified as organizational characteristics, are the best predictors of organizational commitment. The literature shows that organizational commitment has intrigued practitioners and students of leadership for many years.

Overall, however, studies comparing leader behavior with organizational commitment and job satisfaction have mixed findings. In a study of 16 community colleges in New Mexico, Chieffo (1991) surveyed 97 presidents and leadership team members to find a relationship between leader behavior and the satisfaction-commitment constructs. The overall mean for job satisfaction was 3.76 on a 5-point scale of items from Taylor and Bowers (1972) General Satisfaction Scale; the overall mean for

organizational commitment was 3.72 on the 1970 version of the OCQ (Porter & Smith, as cited in Cook, Hepworth, Wall, & Warr, 1981). Chieffo found a somewhat higher correlation between the five leader behaviors (vision, influence orientation, people orientation, motivational orientation, and values orientation) and organizational commitment (.60 to .70) than for the five leader behaviors and job satisfaction (.44 to .56). The current study, however, surveyed more than just the top leadership team but in a somewhat similar type of branch-campus organization in higher education.

A similar relationship was found in a study of leadership behavior and organizational commitment in a nonwestern country, Yousef (2000) found a significant positive and slightly stronger relationship between leadership behavior and organizational commitment (.54) than leadership with job satisfaction (.40). Yousef surveyed 430 employees of 30 organizations in United Arab Emirates who perceived the most prevalent leadership behavior as consultative as measured by the Likert (1967) leadership questionnaire. Organizational commitment was measured by Mowday, Steers, and Porter's (1979) scale, and job satisfaction was determined by a simple question, "Overall, are you satisfied with your present job?" The Yousef study supported the Chieffo (year) findings of the relationship between leadership behavior and organizational commitment over leadership and job satisfaction. However, a comprehensive study by Loke (2001) measured a style of leadership that gets closer to the current study and found that organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and productivity were significantly correlated with Kouzes and Posner's (year) leader behavior styles. This replication study was conducted with 97 nurses and 20 managers in Singapore and used the LPI (Kouzes & Posner, 1990) self/observer assessment for leader behavior; the 15-item scale by Porter et

al. (1974); and the Jobs-in-General scale developed by Smith, Ironson, and Brannick (1989) to measure overall job satisfaction. Regression analysis indicated that 29% of job satisfaction and 22% of organizational commitment were explained by the use of leadership behaviors as measured by the LPI. In the current study, job satisfaction was found to be more strongly related to the scores on the measure of servant leadership as well; many of the servant leadership characteristics coincide with the LPI categories (challenging the process, inspiring a shared vision, enabling others to act, modeling the way, and encouraging the heart). Self and observer assessments of leadership were combined in the current study.

Kacmar et al. (1999) reviewed several studies that examined Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) and organizational commitment. Despite the use of a wide range of measurement tools for organizational commitment and LMX, these researchers reported a statistically significant and positive relationship between LMX and commitment. Since LMX emphasizes the quality of the relationship between the supervisor and subordinate, the current study compared organizational commitment and servant leadership, a leadership style that also focuses on quality relationships with employees, to seek a relationship similar to the constructs in the Kacmar et al. research.

A study by Argawal, DeCarlo, and Vyas (1999) that examined a similar leadership behavior found it to be positively correlated with organizational commitment. American and Indian salespersons were found to exhibit very similar responses toward leadership behaviors pertaining to consideration leader behavior but different responses toward initiation of structure leader behaviors. Consideration behavior was defined as the degree to which managers develop a work climate that promotes subordinates' trust and

respect for subordinates' ideas and feeling. Laub (1999) identified trust and communication as two key components of increasing the perception of servant leadership characteristics within an organization; thus, questions on the servant leadership scale included similar items to the Argawal et al. study.

Another concept that has been compared with commitment and is related to servant leadership is mentoring. In a study of 457 hotel workers, Lankau and Chung (1998) found that front-line hotel “employees who were involved in a mentoring relationship reported a significantly higher overall level of commitment than did employees who did not have mentors... which translates to retention, sustained service quality, and bottom-line cost savings” (p. 16). A mentor was defined as someone helping a less-experienced employee to navigate his or her role in the organization. While having a mentor did not appear to affect the level of job satisfaction; formal, informal, and peer-mentoring relationships were equally effective in the protégés' increased level of commitment; defined in this study as identification with the organization, level of effort that the individuals put forth for the organization, the pride they feel about working for the hotel, the level of inspiration for job performance, their emotions about working for the hotel, congruence of personal and organizational values, and concern about the future of the hotel. Most mentoring studies have used interviews with executive or managerial employees, and these emphasized that everyone who succeeds has had a mentor or mentors. Mentoring is at the heart of the servant leadership definition used for the present study which is “leadership that places the good of those led over the self-interest of the leader” (Laub, 1999, p. ?). Therefore, the current study referred to similar behaviors in the assessment items.



Defining organizational commitment was the focus of a study by Singh and Vinnicombe (1998). Motivated by the belief that 21st century employees have a different motivation for working than in previous decades, these researchers found that the meaning behind commitment in organizations appears to be shifting from a “desire to remain in, and identify with, the organization... towards a highly proactive, innovative, and challenging approach to work, as a mutually beneficial psychological contract between organization and individual” (p. 228). These researchers interviewed 37 senior engineers from three major Swedish and UK firms; their combined answers indicated a new opportunity for more creative and innovative leadership. Kacmar et al. (1999) concur; stressing that LMX, life satisfaction, and job involvement are more predictive of the new meanings behind organizational commitment than are turnover intentions and identification with the organization. These latter ideas are the basis of the OCQ (Porter et al., 1974) that has been the “market leader” in organizational commitment scales (Benkhoff, 1996, p. 114). In searching for new employee meanings behind commitment, a *WorkUSA 2000 Survey* found that “today’s mobile workers look for an employer of choice—one they can be proud to work for and whose leadership they trust. This sense of trust in senior leadership is really a key factor in commitment” (HRFocus, 2000, p. 9). Therefore, the current study included characteristics of servant leadership that identify trust, leader flexibility, and quality leader-member communication as key factors.

#### *Summary of the Literature Review Chapter*

The emerging theory of servant leadership needed to be measured in a variety of organizations as well as compared with other more empirically tested constructs in organizations. Thus far, the literature has demonstrated that servant leadership can be

measured in a working environment, assessed through self-reports of top leaders, perceived by employees who have not been trained in servant leadership, recommended for a learning organization, and perceived by empowered employees with trustworthy leaders. Yet, there appear to be mixed findings on a perception gap between employee rank in the organization and the perception of servant leadership. Therefore, this study first tested to see if perceptions of the characteristics of servant leadership differed by level across the organization by surveying everyone in an organization and comparing the scores by four employee ranks: workers (hourly support staff), faculty, management/supervisors, and the top leadership team.

Because of the research that links employee motivation and performance, several studies have been conducted on job satisfaction and various leadership styles including servant leadership. Findings are mixed, indicating that some leadership styles correlate with measures of job satisfaction more than others. Two studies indicated support for a predicted positive relationship between job satisfaction and servant leadership; however, only one study surveyed hourly employees. Therefore, the second purpose of this study was to see if a relationship exists between the perception of servant leadership and the measure of job satisfaction by surveying all of the employees in an organization.

A substantial amount of literature has supported a strong relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The leadership literature also indicates support for certain leadership styles that are similar to servant leadership, indicating a positive relationship with organizational commitment. Findings are mixed in these studies as to whether these leadership styles correlate better with job satisfaction or with organizational commitment. However, no studies have been found that compare servant

leadership with organizational commitment. Given the limited support for the predicted relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction, and the strong correlation between job satisfaction and organizational commitment, the third variable in the current study was organizational commitment. Thus, the current study sought to extend or prove the implications in the literature by testing the following null hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1 - There is no difference between employee rank and the perception of servant leadership in an organization.

Hypothesis 2 - There is no relationship between the perception of servant leadership and the measure of job satisfaction in this kind of organization.

Hypothesis 3 - There is no relationship between the perception of servant leadership and the measure of organizational commitment in an organization.

### Chapter 3: Method

This chapter outlines the research method for the study and includes the following sections: hypotheses, data needed to test each hypothesis, overall research design, description of the instruments, sample and population, and planned analysis.

A review of the literature found that perception of leadership varies by employee rank; however, findings by employee rank on the perception of servant leadership were mixed. Furthermore, the amount of empirical research is limited on the emerging theory of servant leadership, especially as the concept may be related to other organizational constructs. A few studies have indicated support for the predicted relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction. In contrast, a substantial number of studies found significant correlation between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. This study, therefore, needed data on three variables: servant leadership, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. In order to add to the servant leadership research and to test for a possible three-way relationship between these variables, the research questions of this study were tested against the following null hypotheses.

#### *Three Hypotheses*

Hypothesis 1 - There is no difference between employee rank and the perception of servant leadership in an organization. Since the perception of leader behavior has been found to vary by position and role in an organization (Kouzes & Posner, 1990), this study measured the perceptions of servant leadership characteristics from the employees at all levels of the organization. Firstly, all employees were asked to identify themselves in one of four categories: (a) top leadership, meaning those employees on the administrative

council of the college; (b) management, meaning salaried employees such as department directors, assistant directors, managers, and/or anyone who supervises one or more employees; (c) faculty or those who fill full-time teaching positions; and (d) workers, meaning hourly employees such as support staff, specialists, coordinators, and technical workers in the organization.

Laub (1999) recommended three ranks of employees for data gathering on servant leadership in an organizational assessment; however, for this study, four categories were used because of the kind of organization where the data will be gathered—a college. Laub's third level, workforce, was divided into two separate categories: hourly employees and faculty. According to Birnbaum (1988), faculty are part of the technical subsystem that he described as the characteristic way a college or university transforms their inputs into outputs. This coincides with Laub's category of workforce, but these two were considered separately since the study is to be conducted in a university setting.

Workers are part of what Thompson (1967) called a technical subsystem in an organization whose primary focus is to effectively accomplish tasks. Management provides the necessary resources for the workers to accomplish their tasks and to provide products for those outside the organization. Management, for the purposes of this study, included those mid-level administrators who supervise others and make decisions that impact their work unit, but have little influence outside their area of responsibility. Conversely, those in top leadership make decisions that affect the entire organization. Top leadership teams provide strategic direction and support for the organization to reach its overall goals. The categorical data from the four mutually exclusive groups (Williams & Monge, 2001) were the basis for testing the first hypothesis.

Secondly, after indicating their employment level in the organization, each employee was asked to rate their feelings toward statements that describe the behavior of leaders and managers in their organization. These behaviors defined the characteristics of servant leadership that were found in Laub's (1999) study; however, the term servant or servant leadership was not used in the data gathering so not to introduce bias in the sample (Patton, 2002). The data measured fell into six main areas that encompass the characteristics of servant leader behavior: values people, develops people, builds community, displays authenticity, provides leadership, and shares leadership. These six areas could become subscores in future research related to this study.

To test this hypothesis, the data from each employee were combined for a mean score. Mean scores for servant leadership were compared by position/role or category of participants. When a significant difference between any category of scores (top leadership, management, faculty, and hourly workers.) showed on their perceived level of servant leadership in the organization, a perception gap existed in terms of employee estimation of servant leadership in the organization, and the null hypothesis 1 did not hold.

An additional theory-building measure resulted from data collection by employee rank. Since Greenleaf (1970) predicted servant leadership would be replicated at various levels of the organization, the researcher collected data on employee servant leader behavior with one another across the organization in addition to the perception of positional servant leader behavior in management and top leadership. This overall score provided a measure of Laub's (1999) criteria for a servant organization.

Hypothesis 2 - There is no relationship between the perception of servant leadership and the measure of job satisfaction in this kind of an organization. The findings have been mixed in studies that have compared job satisfaction and servant leader behavior; thus, any relationship found previously between the two constructs needed to be replicated. Therefore, the data needed to test the null hypothesis concerning the relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction included both the individual employee's scores of perceived servant leadership in an organization and the measure of the same employee's satisfaction with his or her particular job in the organization. Each employee already scored the characteristics that define servant leadership. The researcher also gathered data on job satisfaction through responses to statements about themselves personally in the organization. The data focused on the appraisal of their particular jobs and job experiences (Locke, 1976).

The researcher tested data for each construct—total scores for servant leadership and job satisfaction on each employee—for a correlative relationship between the two constructs. Since a relationship was found to exist between the measures for each, the null hypothesis 2 was disproved.

Hypothesis 3 - There is no relationship between the perception of servant leadership and the measure of organizational commitment in an organization. No studies were found that compare servant leadership and organizational commitment; thus, any predicted relationship between the two constructs emerged from studies that compared organizational commitment with leader behaviors determined to be most similar to servant leadership. The data for the measure of servant leadership were based on employee perceptions described for the other hypotheses. The data for organizational

commitment were measured by self-reports of the employee's attitude toward the organization or what Meyer et al. (1993) call attitudinal attachment to their workplace. Employees indicated their degree of agreement or disagreement with statements that described how they believe it applied to them personally in the organization, providing scores on the level of organizational commitment for each employee.

Data from the employee's perceived servant leadership in the organization and data from the employee's level of organizational commitment were then tested for a correlative relationship. Since a relationship was found, the null hypothesis 3 was disproved, adding new knowledge to the theory of servant leadership with regard to a construct—organizational commitment—never before tested in the servant leadership literature.

### *Research Design*

A cross-sectional survey design by means of a questionnaire was used for this study. This provided a quantitative or numeric description through the data collection process of asking questions of people at one point in time (Creswell, 1994). The study employed standardized instruments, Laub's (1999) OLA and the organizational commitment scales of Meyer et al. (1993). Permission was obtained to use their copyrighted material. Permission was also obtained from the Vice President's office to use campus mail to distribute the survey.

The confidential nature of the research was stressed in the customized instructions in the cover letter for the combined instrument, the closing instructions for returning the survey (folding the questionnaire in half so that the return address appeared and their answers were covered), as well as the handling of the questionnaires via Campus Mail.



The researcher also gained commitment from the college leadership to maintain confidentiality about the survey. All data collected and recorded by the researcher were stored in a secure location.

In order to make the survey as anonymous as possible, the only demographic items asked on the questionnaire were the four options for the self-reported employee rank. Demographics such as gender, age, and educational level were not essential for the data needed to test the hypotheses. Thus, the researcher did not ask other potential identifiers such as department or campus location of the employees, and the questionnaires were not coded. Since there was no way to know who had responded, email reminders were sent to everyone at 1 and 2 week intervals, similar to Dillman's (1978) recommended follow-up sequence.

According to Babbie (1998), the survey method's purpose is to generalize from a sample to a population so that inferences can be made about some characteristics, attitude, or behavior of this population. Since only one organization was surveyed, the researcher's place of employment, generalizability from this convenience sample to employees outside of the target population is not recommended because of the lack of statistical random sampling in various organizations (Creswell, 1994).

All employees had an equal opportunity to participate. Furthermore, using Campus Mail, attaching a note from the Vice President, providing anonymity, and offering the \$100 drawing entry form insured that the questionnaire provided enough quantifiable values for statistical comparison to generalize from the sample to the organization.

The results of this exploratory, nonexperimental study were intended for the purpose of contributing research in the field of servant leadership. By finding evidence of correlates for servant leadership with job satisfaction and organizational commitment, this study contributed to future research that may use these variables as well.

### *Research Instruments*

Two instruments were utilized for this study, and provided the data needed to test the three hypotheses in this research. Permission to use each instrument was obtained from the author(s), as well as the approval to combine the instruments for this study, provided adequate instructions appeared at the beginning of each scale (the combined instrument is Exhibit F).

*OLA.* No single instrument claims to measure all of the attributes of servant leadership; however, several studies used a list of characteristics to formulate a definition for the purposes of studying preselected leaders (Livovich, 1999; Russell, 2000; Taylor-Gillham, 1998). Laub (1999) explicitly created the OLA, however, to establish a testable definition of servant leadership in a variety of organizations. Laub designed an extensive three-phase Delphi study (Sackman, 1975) for building consensus on servant leadership characteristics with 14 authorities from the field of servant leadership. The geographically distributed panel was asked to name and rate the characteristics of the servant leader. A significant ( $p < .05$ ) decrease was found in the interquartile range between round two and round three, indicating a move toward consensus. The resulting definition of servant leadership provided six constructs as a basis for the prediction and diagnosis of servant leadership: values people, develops people, builds community, displays authenticity, provides leadership, shares leadership. The first 21 items on the

OLA are concerned with perceptions of servant leader characteristics across the entire organization. The next 33 items apply to the managers/supervisors and top leadership of the organization. The last 6 items deal with the respondent's own role in the organization (job satisfaction), for a total of 60 Likert-style items in the questionnaire.

After the OLA was successfully field tested, the 66-item questionnaire provided a reliable tool for measuring servant leadership behavior in organizations from the perspective of the workforce, managers/supervisors, and top leaders. Laub's (1999) research has been helpful in adding to the literature on servant leadership. It not only provided an operational definition for the behavior; it also produced an instrument, without mentioning the term servant leadership, to quantitatively assess the leadership in an organization from three levels of employees. If statements on the instrument mentioned the servant leader concept, and if employees were familiar with the term, such verbiage could bias the respondent and predetermine conclusions (Patton, 2002).

Laub (1999) reports strong reliability for the OLA, with an alpha coefficient of .98. Reliability deals with the consistency of the measures. After the field test with 41 different organizations, Laub (1999) reports that the instrument had alpha reliability coefficients of the six subscores all .90 or above. Additionally, Laub indicated that the validity of the instrument is strong based on the Delphi process. Validity is concerned with measuring what the constructs are intended to measure. The validation process is ongoing, however, and the findings in this study added to that research. Permission was obtained from Dr. James Laub to use the OLA instrument as long as the research was conducted using all of the items. He included the right to change the initial instructions so

that the researcher could be more specific for the organization surveyed as well as include verbiage to ensure confidentiality and encourage the response rate.

Job satisfaction was measured by the 6 items included near the end of the OLA. This scale was tested for reliability and external validity in the Thompson (2003) study when that researcher used the OLA and the MSQ short form with the same participants. The MSQ has been validated via Bartlett's test of homogeneity (Weiss et al., 1967) and has been demonstrated to be reliable for measuring three areas of satisfaction: intrinsic satisfaction with .86 alpha, extrinsic satisfaction with .80 alpha, and general satisfaction with .90 alpha. The Thompson results indicated a positive significant relationship between the OLA job satisfaction score and the MSQ results at the  $p < .01$  level as well as a statistically significant correlation score,  $r(114) = +.721$ ,  $P < .01$  in the Pearson correlation test on scores from the two scales.

Each OLA response item for servant leadership was stated positively (e.g., [people in this organization] trust each other; [manager/supervisors and top leadership] are receptive listeners). Likewise, the items for job satisfaction were stated positively (e.g., I am able to be creative in my job). Therefore, a positive correlation was sought in the analysis for the current study.

*Organizational Commitment Scales.* According to Benkhoff (1996), the market leader for measuring commitment in organizations has been the OCQ (Porter et al., 1974), noting that it was used for 103 of 174 samples of results that Mathieu and Zajac used in their 1990 meta-analysis. However, Benkhoff conducted a confirmatory factor analysis (LISREL) specifically because Porter et al.'s definition implied that commitment was related to lack of turnover, yet no evidence of this was consistently found between

the two. After finding that the OCQ's 15 items did not represent the same underlying concept, Benkhoff recommended using Allen and Meyer's (1990) model for research.

Allen and Meyer (1990) conceptualized commitment into three categories: (a) emotional or affective attachment, (b) perceived costs of leaving the organization or continuance, and (c) obligation or normative commitment. They developed three separate 8-item scales to test for each general theme. The coefficient alpha reliability for each scale was found to be .87 for ACS—affective, .75 for CCS—continuance, and .79 for NCS—normative (Allen & Meyer). Confirmatory factor analysis found the scales to measure relatively distinct constructs (Benkhoff, 1996; Meyer, Allen, & Gellatly, 1990; Shore & Tetrick, 1991). Allen and Meyer noted, however, that the affective and normative scales had a significant relationship and suggested that “feelings of obligation to maintain membership in the organization, although not identical to feeling of desire, may be meaningfully linked” (p. 8). Ko, Price, and Mueller (1997) also found that the ACS and NCS lacked discriminant validity. Therefore, this study did not use the normative scale and only used the affective and continuance scales. Both will be used because of the confirmatory analysis that showed they measure relatively distinct constructs within organizational commitment, affective and continuance commitment.

Meyer et al. (1993) tested the generalizability of their earlier research on commitment scales and decided to shorten their scales to 6 items each. Permission to use either iteration of these commitment scales was obtained by personal correspondence from Dr. John Meyer. Thus, the present study utilized the affective and continuance scales for a total of 12 items. The items were stated positively, except for 3 which were

noted internally as reversed scored items. Therefore, a positive correlation was sought for organizational commitment and servant leadership.

### *Sample and Population*

The study site for this research was a mid-west nontraditional college of approximately 225 employees. All employees were invited to participate in the survey; each employee in this target population had an equal opportunity of being a participant. Since the study was conducted within the researcher's organization, this was a convenience sample that needed many steps to establish trust and minimize the costs for responding. Providing for anonymity and providing an opportunity to win in a drawing for \$100 increased the amount of participant response so that it was considerably higher than the normal rate for the mail survey method.

The sample represented the target population of employees that work in an organization in which the participants can be grouped into hierarchical levels—top leadership, management, faculty, and workers. The mailing did not include temporary workers or adjunct faculty; however, it did include permanent part-time employees. All employees were surveyed in their working environment.

Empirical studies on leadership of nontraditional colleges are rare (Beaudoin, 2002). The researcher is a long-term employee in a university with a nontraditional college, and that division of the university was appropriate for a study of servant leadership for several reasons. The study site is a nontraditional college of 7,500 adult students that operates separately from its parent university. It has approximately 175 employees working in the central administration building of this college, while another 50 work at distributed campuses in three states. Two years ago, the parent university was

surveyed for its level of servant leadership; the nontraditional college, the largest operation of the university, was not included in that research (Thompson, 2003). Therefore, this study replicated a portion of the Thompson study on servant leadership in an organization that is reported to have a more socially integrated, supportive, and openly communicative culture (Hoffman, 2002) than the residential campus that was sampled in the Thompson study and, potentially, more servant leader behavior. Additionally, the study site had many of the characteristics of a learning organization, one that is "continually expanding its capacity to create its future" (Senge, 1990, p. 14). As an organization that comes up with responsive strategies in an ever-changing higher education environment, this part of the university has had a 70% increase in the last 5 years (Tweedell, 2003). Furthermore, learning organizations are believed to run best when led in a relational leadership paradigm (Beaudoin; McFarland, Senn, & Childress, 1993), and servant leadership was specifically recommended by Bass (2000) for such organizations. Thus, this convenience sample provided good participant response with enough data to determine the relationship between the variables and the ability to generalize to this population.

#### *Data Analysis*

The researcher conducted a cross-sectional analysis of the scores that were received on the employee questionnaires. Scores from Laub's (1999) OLA provided values on 60 items for servant leadership and 6 items for job satisfaction. The scores from the Meyer et al. (1993) commitment scales provided values on 12 items for organizational commitment. Thus, this study measured different phenomena at the same time. The researcher entered the data on the combined instrument from each participant

into the Software Program for the social Sciences (SPSS) and the appropriate tests were run for differences by category and for any relationship between the independent and dependent variables.

Response data on the perceptions of servant leadership characteristics were tabulated from results of the OLA portion of the instrument and compared with the categorical data. All employees ranked themselves according to position/role in the organization, providing the categorical data for comparing the measure of servant leadership across the organization. Mean scores and standard deviations were calculated according to the four categories (top leadership, management, faculty, and workers) and then compared by category. A one-way ANOVA was used to analyze any differences in the responses based on four categories of participants to determine if a perception gap existed. The ANOVA also revealed whether the four categories represent the same population in terms of their means (Williams & Monge, 2001). The researcher included a post hoc test to show the specific relationships between the individual means since the *F*-test was significant (Kerlinger & Lee, 2000).

For Hypothesis 2, the data from the OLA on servant leadership items and the job satisfaction items was compared, using a mean score for each one who completed the questionnaire. A Pearson correlation test was run to identify the relationship between the mean scores on the two variables to test the second null hypothesis.

Data on servant leadership and organizational commitment were similarly analyzed for testing Hypothesis 3, using the mean scores from the OLA servant leadership items and the organizational commitment results from each employee. A



Pearson correlation test was run to identify the relationship between the mean scores on the two variables.

## Chapter 4: Data

This chapter presents the findings resulting from an analysis of the data collected for this study. The first section describes the participants in this study and their overall perception of servant leadership. The second section presents the findings related to the first hypothesis. The third section includes the findings related to the second hypothesis. The fourth second section includes the findings related to the third hypothesis. The final section contains a summary of the major findings in this study.

### *Participants and Perception of Servant Leadership*

The researcher surveyed all 225 employees of a mid-west college. Within 15 days, the researcher received 170 questionnaires, yielding a 75.5% response rate. The demographic data consisted of a self-reported level of employment in which 10 were from top leadership, 62 were from management, 22 were from faculty, and 76 were hourly workers, for a total of 170 respondents. Table 1 summarizes the categorical variables in this study.

Table 1

### *Participants in this Study*

Organizational Level	n	Percent	Cum. Percent
Top Leadership	10	5.9	5.9
Management/Salaried	62	36.9	42.9
Faculty	22	12.9	55.3
Hourly Workers	76	44.7	100.0

The mean score for all participants was 224.65 out of a possible 300 points for the overall perception of servant leadership in this study. This was very near the 223.79 out of 300 for Laub's (1999) testing of his 60-item OLA design. Horsman (2001) found an overall average of 214.74 out of 300 in his study of six different kinds of organizations in the Northwest. In 12 law enforcement agencies, Ledbetter (2003) found a test/retest average of 212.66 out of 300 in OLA results. Thompson (2003) found 213.73 out of 300 in the residential part of the university; however, hourly employees were not used in his study. Table 2 summarizes the overall scores for servant leadership in studies using the 60-item OLA.

Table 2

*Overall Perception of Servant Leadership*

Studies using the OLA	n	Mean	Std.
Laub (1999)	828	223.79	41.08
Horsman (2001)	540	214.74	48.57
Thompson (2003)	116	213.73	35.10
Ledbetter (2003) test	138	210.52	39.16
Ledbetter (2003) retest	138	214.80	36.76
Drury (2004)	170	224.65	34.18

*Perceptions of Servant Leadership by Employee Category*

In order to test if there was no difference between employee rank and the perceptions of servant leadership in an organization, the researcher ran an ANOVA of the OLA servant leadership mean scores. The scores used were a total mean and the mean for each category out of a 300 possible score for the 60 servant leadership items. This

omitted the 6 job satisfaction items in the last section of the OLA since they were not intended to measure servant leadership.

Table 3 shows the overall perception of servant leadership score and the breakdown by category of employee. The top leadership mean was 241.30; however, the mean was 223.52 from management. The faculty mean was 239.55, differing the least with the responses from top leadership. The mean score from hourly workers was 219.03. With  $p < .05$ , the ANOVA analysis demonstrated a significant difference in mean scores between levels of employees in their perception of servant leadership,  $F(3, 164) = 3.085$ ,  $p = .029$ .

Table 3

*Perceptions of Servant Leadership by Employee Level*

	Top Leaders	Mgmt/ Salaried	FT Faculty	Hourly Workers	All Participants
Means	241.30	223.52	239.55	219.03	224.65
Std.	29.97	33.50	39.88	32.05	34.18
ANOVA Summary					
	Sum of Sq	df	Mean Sq	F-statistic	Sig.
Between groups	10423.99	3	3474.66	3.085	.029
Within groups	184739.79	164	1126.46		
Total	195163.79	164			

Results from the Bonferroni post hoc test in Table 4 shows that hourly employees differed the most with faculty (.067 sig.), thus, the influence on the  $p = .029$  significance in the ANOVA. Therefore, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis because of the

between-groups analysis and concluded that there was a significant difference in employee perceptions of servant leadership in this organization.

Table 4

*Post Hoc Test of Servant Leadership for Groups of Employees*

		Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.
Top leaders	Mgmt	14.55	11.46	1.000
	Faculty	1.74	12.80	1.000
	Hourly	22.57	11.29	.283
Mgmt	Top leaders	-14.55	11.46	1.000
	Faculty	-12.81	8.36	.765
	Hourly	8.02	5.79	1.000
Faculty	Top leaders	-1.74	12.80	1.000
	Mgmt	12.81	8.36	.765
	Hourly	20.84	8.12	.067
Hourly	Top leaders	-22.57	11.29	.283
	Mgmt	-8.02	5.79	1.000
	Faculty	-20.84	8.12	.067

*Relationship of Servant Leadership with Job Satisfaction*

In order to test for the interrelationship between employee perceptions of servant leadership and their level of job satisfaction, the researcher ran a Pearson correlation test of the overall mean score for job satisfaction and the overall mean score for servant leadership. The means were calculated from responses to the 6 job satisfaction items in the OLA (56, 58, 60, 62, 64, 66) and the 60 servant leader items (the rest of the OLA; Exhibit F). Table 5 shows a positive correlation between these two variables in this study,  $r(168) = +.631$ ,  $p = .000$ , two tailed. Therefore, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis and concluded that there is a statistically significant, positive, and substantial relationship between the overall perception of servant leadership and the measure of job satisfaction in this organization.

Table 5

*Servant Leadership and Job Satisfaction*

	SL	JS
Pearson correlation	1	.631
Sig. (2 tailed)		.000
N	168	168

Further analysis of the job satisfaction means is shown in Table 6. An ANOVA test did not find statistical significance in the overall score for job satisfaction when analyzed by employee levels,  $r(166) = 2.571$ ,  $p = .056$ , two tailed.

Table 6

*Job Satisfaction by Employee Level*

	Top Leaders	Mgmt/ Salaried	FT Faculty	Hourly Workers	All Participants
Means					
Std.					
ANOVA Summary	Sum of Sq	df	Mean Sq	F-statistic	Sig.
Between groups	111.513	3	37.171	2.571	.056
Within groups	2356.291	163	14.456		
Total	2467.904	166			

Table 7 shows the Bonferroni post hoc results for the above ANOVA, for further evidence that even the hourly workers were not statistically different in their scores for job satisfaction.

Table 7

*Post Hoc Test of Job Satisfaction for Groups of Employees*

		Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.
Top leaders	Mgmt	1.0333	1.29868	1.000
	Faculty	-.5364	1.45009	1.000
	Hourly	1.8333	1.28000	.924
Mgmt	Top leaders	-1.0333	1.29868	1.000
	Faculty	-1.5697	.94765	.597
	Hourly	.8000	.65855	1.000
Faculty	Top leaders	.5364	1.45009	1.000
	Mgmt	1.5697	.94765	.597
	Hourly	2.3697	.92188	.066
Hourly	Top leaders	-1.8333	1.28000	.924
	Mgmt	-.8000	.65855	1.000
	Faculty	-2.3697	.92188	.066

*Relationship of Servant Leadership with Organizational Commitment*

In order to test for a relationship between employee perceptions of servant leadership and for organizational commitment, the researcher ran a Pearson correlation test of the overall mean score for servant leadership from Sections 2-4 (Exhibit F) and the aggregate score for organizational commitment from Section 5 (Exhibit F). Table 8 shows a statistically significant and negative correlation between these two variables in this study,  $r(168) = -.223$ ,  $p < .004$ , two tailed.

Table 8

*Servant Leadership and Organizational Commitment*



	SL	OC
Pearson correlation	1	-.223
Sig. (2 tailed)		.004
N	168	168

Since the negative correlation in these two variables is contrary to what the literature indicated, the researcher also ran an ANOVA on the overall commitment score using the four employment categories. Table 9 shows there is a statistically significant difference between groups in the commitment scores,  $F(3, 167) = 5.427, p = .001$ .

Table 9

*Organizational Commitment by Employee Level*

	Top Leaders	Mgmt/Salaried	FT Faculty	Hourly Workers	All Participants
Means	44.20	44.63	43.82	49.30	46.61
Std.	6.25	8.69	8.96	7.00	8.18
ANOVA Summary	Sum of Sq	df	Mean Sq	F-statistic	Sig.
Between groups	1009.634	3	336.545	5.427	.001
Within groups	10170.438	164	62.015		
Total	1180.071	167			

Table 10 shows the Bonferroni post hoc results, indicating the differences are between hourly workers and faculty (.028 sig.) and between hourly workers and management (.005 sig.).

Table 10

*Post Hoc Test of Organizational Commitment for Groups of Employees*

		Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.
Top leaders	Mgmt	-.4333	2.68981	1.000
	Faculty	.3818	3.00339	1.000
	Hourly	-5.0895	2.64905	.339
Mgmt	Top leaders	.4333	2.68981	1.000
	Faculty	.8152	1.96276	1.000
	Hourly	-4.6561	1.34999	.005
Faculty	Top leaders	-.3818	3.00339	1.000
	Mgmt	0.8152	1.96276	1.000
	Hourly	-5.4713	1.90653	.028
Hourly	Top leaders	5.0895	2.64905	.339
	Mgmt	4.6561	1.35999	.005
	Faculty	5.4713	1.90653	.028

Since organizational commitment is best understood by measuring the different constructs within organizational commitment, and this study used the Meyer et al. (1993) scales which differentiate these constructs, the researcher ran a correlation analysis between the two subdivisions of commitment measure (affective and continuance

commitment) and servant leadership. The study did not use the normative subdivision of commitment because the literature showed that the normative results generally matched the affective measures. Table 11 shows there was a statistically significant and inverse correlation between both affective commitment;  $r(168) = -.183$ ,  $p = .018$ , two tailed; and continuance commitment;  $r(168) = -.174$ ,  $p = .024$ , two tailed; in this organization. Both coefficients show a small relationship between the constructs, according to Guilford (as cited in Williams & Monge, 2001).

Table 11

*Relationship of Servant Leadership with Affective and with Continuance Commitment*

	SL	Affective Commitment
Pearson correlation	1	-.183
Sig. (2 tailed)		.018
N	168	168

	SL	Continuance Commitment
Pearson correlation	1	-.174
Sig. (2 tailed)		.024
N	168	168

Continuance commitment had a significant difference (.000) between groups when analyzed by employee level, whereas affective commitment did not (.494). Table 12 shows the ANOVA summary of continuance commitment by employee level.

Table 12

*Continuance Commitment by Employee Level*

ANOVA Summary	Sum of Sq	df	Mean Sq	F-statistic	Sig.
Between groups	1156.810	3	385.603	8.290	.000
Within groups	7581.993	163	46.515		
Total	8738.802	166			

As a result of several statistical tests (Tables 8-12), the researcher rejected the null hypothesis and concluded that there was a statistically significant, inverse, and small relationship between servant leadership and organizational commitment in this organization.

*A Summary of the Major Findings*

The major findings that resulted from an analysis of the data gathered for this study are:

1. There was a statistically significant difference in the perception of servant leadership by position/role in the organization studied.
2. The perception of servant leadership overall is positively correlated in a substantial relationship to the overall measure of job satisfaction.
3. The overall measure of servant leadership is inversely correlated in a small relationship with organizational commitment.

The researcher will discuss the reasons for the expected and unexpected results of this study in Chapter 5.

## Chapter 5: Discussion

The purpose of this dissertation was to examine employee perceptions of servant leadership by position/role in an organization and to test for any relationship between the overall perception of servant leadership with job satisfaction and with organizational commitment. The following discussion examines the results presented in Chapter 4, draws conclusions for how these findings contribute to the literature, offers suggestions for leadership of organizations, and recommends future research that builds on this study.

The significance of this study was furthering the research stream on the theory of servant leadership and in finding its relationship with two other organizational constructs: job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The high response rate (75.5%) for this survey provided empirical support for generalizing the findings to the study site on servant leadership, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. The overall assessment of leadership in this organization demonstrated a respectable level of servant leadership with which to draw further conclusions about the theory as well.

### *Research Finding 1*

The results on the measure of servant leadership showed a significant difference ( $p = .029$ ) between categories of employees in their perception of servant leadership in this organization, meaning that different categories of employees are experiencing the organization differently. This finding supported the research of Horsman (2001), Laub (1999), and Ledbetter (2003), and the overall prediction by Kouzes and Posner (1997) that self-ratings of leadership are typically higher than ratings of the same leaders by their subordinates. However, since post hoc analyses showed the greatest difference was between hourly workers and faculty perceptions and also that leadership, management,

and faculty are statistically similar in their perceptions of servant leadership, the hourly-faculty difference is the focus of the discussion on the first research finding.

Hourly workers appear to perceive the organization very differently from faculty, likely because hourly workers are the most removed from the end “product” in this organization, i.e., the students. This is especially so in a nontraditional college, with students in regional campuses across three states as well as around the world in online programs. Hourly workers may have emailed or talked with students on the phone, but they have seldom seen many students except when assisting with commencement ceremonies. Hourly workers also may not feel as valued for their technical or secretarial expertise or included in important decisions as much as the other three levels of employees, especially faculty. Likewise, hourly workers probably recognize the daily emphasis on academic accomplishment in this kind of organization. In spite of this, it is important to note that hourly employees perceived a higher level of servant leadership (219.03) than the overall mean scores for the Horsman (2001), Ledbetter (2003), Thompson (2003) studies. Therefore, the hourly worker’s responses reveal a significant difference from faculty in their perception of servant leadership, but both categories of employees held a perception of servant leadership that was higher than other organizations studied. Yet, the difference between hourly workers and faculty, though expected according to the literature, was significant enough to suggest that leaders of this organization need to practice servant leader behavior with all levels of employees.

The relatively high mean score for faculty’s perception of servant leadership may demonstrate how this category of employees participates in the governance structure of the college. Faculty are often included in the decision-making process for program

growth and development, likely receive more funding for professional development than hourly staff do, and may feel more valued and equal than the hourly workers feel in an academic community that relies on advanced degrees. Feeling valued and developed and sharing in the leadership are key components of a servant led organization.

Faculty members in this study were also more likely to recognize servant leader behavior in their managers and leaders because of the servant leadership concepts in the curriculum in this college. The top leaders may have been similarly influenced by the servant leadership literature, though the small sample in the top leadership category did not show statistical significance when compared to the much larger sample in the hourly category. Rationale for being influenced by an understanding of servant leadership is supported by Beazley's (2002) finding that "managers were affected by the number of years of studying servant leadership principles, whereas employees were not" (p. ?) and did not show a greater criticism or acceptance of their manager's servant leader behavior with such training. Beazley, however, used only the Managers/Leaders section (items 22-54) of the OLA.

It should also be noted that the largest standard deviation in the perception of servant leadership for all categories was within the faculty category, indicating a greater difference of opinion in the group that customarily prides itself with independent thinking. This means that there was strong agreement and strong disagreement among the faculty about servant leader behavior in this organization. This could mean that faculty members are more discerning about perceiving leader behavior, and/or they may feel the principles of servant leadership need more clarification.

### *Research Finding 2*

Perceptions of servant leadership overall were positively correlated in a substantial relationship with job satisfaction in this study. Laub (1999) predicted that a servant-led organization would have higher job satisfaction, and this study supported the internal validity of Laub's OLA in measuring job satisfaction as well as servant leadership in an organization. This finding also validated the work of Girard (2000) and Thompson (2003) who found a positive correlation between servant leadership and job satisfaction among the leaders and salaried levels in their respective organizational samplings. However, this study extends their research to include data from hourly workers, thereby demonstrating that job satisfaction is a correlate of servant leadership for all levels of workers in an organization.

The researcher assumes that job satisfaction is likely widespread across the organization given the extent of servant leader behavior perceived in the organization, combined with the significance of the positive correlation between job satisfaction and servant leadership. Furthermore, no significant differences in the overall score for job satisfaction by employee levels were found in this organization. Job satisfaction has been linked with job performance especially in high complexity jobs (Judge et al., 2001) and, therefore, is important to the leaders and managers who are also concerned with output. Servant leaders, according to Stone et al. (2003), have the employees as their primary focus; that appears to be supported in this study. Employees liked their jobs and immediate surroundings to the same extent statistically that they perceived servant leader behavior in the organization.



### *Research Finding 3*

Since servant leadership and job satisfaction were found to be correlates in this study, and a substantial amount of literature supports a positive relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment, the research finding that servant leadership was negatively correlated with organizational commitment was unexpected.

Organizational commitment showed a small, inverse relationship to the perception of servant leadership (-.223), meaning that a change in perception of servant leadership showed a change in the opposite direction for organizational commitment. This negative correlation between servant leadership and organizational commitment is not a simple rejection of one construct over the other, nor a cause and effect relationship, but is more complex. Therefore, the relationship between the two needs further explanation and study.

One explanation for the negative correlation found between servant leadership and organizational commitment may relate to length of employment for the participants in this study. Colbert and Kwon (2000), Curry et al. (1986), and Mathieu and Zajac (1990) found that tenure had a statistically significant positive relationship with organizational commitment. In the college surveyed for the present study, 40 of the 225 employees were added in the last year; therefore, these and any who replaced workers who left were new to the culture and values of the organization. Furthermore, in higher education, tenure is a highly desired status for faculty; however, the institution surveyed does not have tenured faculty positions. Thus, the negative correlation may have been influenced by the large number of employees who are new and are therefore experiencing very different levels of commitment to the organization.

Another influence on the negative correlation between servant leadership and organizational commitment may be the changes that are happening within the organization. Probst (2003) found that organizational characteristics such as restructuring are significantly and negatively related to organizational commitment. The organization in the current study experienced a 70% increase in enrollment in 5 years (Tweedell, 2003), went through a broad academic restructuring into three colleges 3 years ago, moved into new office space 2 years ago, and is currently dealing with a massive information systems software conversion. Such organizational changes may have resulted in negatively influencing individual commitment to the organization.

Besides the influence of organizational restructuring and the effect of low tenure on commitment, position/role in the organization also appeared to influence organizational commitment in this study. The findings revealed a significant difference between management and hourly workers ( $p = .005$ ) and faculty and hourly workers ( $p = .028$ ) in their commitment to the organization. The ANOVA tests run on the subscores for affective commitment and continuance commitment showed that continuance commitment was significantly different between employee groups in this study (see Table 12), but affective commitment did not differ between groups. Therefore, continuance commitment, or the need to stay in the organization, had the greater influence of the two constructs for the difference between hourly workers and management or faculty in the overall measure of organizational commitment. This may mean that faculty and management have more job options because of their education and are more open to leaving the organization for other jobs that offer greater opportunities. Conversely, hourly workers would have fewer options because they typically have less

education than the masters and doctorate required in the many management and all faculty and top leadership positions in the college that was surveyed.

Both constructs, affective and continuance commitment, are negatively correlated with servant leadership in this organization (see Table 11). Though the relationship is small, the study demonstrated that the employees varied in the same direction in their perception of servant leadership and job satisfaction overall, but in the opposite direction in their emotional attachment with the organization (affective commitment) and their need to stay with the organization (continuance commitment). Other factors besides servant leadership such as restructuring in the organization, tenure, and personal life situations may have influenced the responses regarding organization commitment. However, it is possible that the large number of new employees perceived, and were more influenced by, the difference in behavior of servant leaders from their last jobs and had not yet gained a sense of “family” in the organization because they were so new. It is also possible that those who typically would have been with the organization longer, a factor which correlates with a higher level of organizational commitment in the literature, may perceive less servant leader behavior because they know the faults of the leaders better.

Regarding the concept of servant leadership and its possible impact on commitment, this study’s inverse correlation may indicate that servant leaders create a climate of growth in the individual that leads to self-efficacy beliefs such as, “I am pretty good at this work and have developed so much that I’m now capable of brokering my abilities elsewhere.” If so, employees in servant-led organizations may become more committed to their individual job but less so to the organization.

Finally, it should be noted that syntax accuracy was double-checked in the data entry with SPSS, especially for the three reversed scored items in the section measuring affective commitment. However, the different style of wording in those items near the end of a lengthy questionnaire could have confused the participants.

#### *Suggestions for Future Research*

This research demonstrated empirical support for an extensive measure of servant leadership by employees in an organization and that perceptions of servant behavior differ by position/role across the organization. For the further development of the theory of servant leadership, more study is needed that includes a larger data set for top leadership along with other levels of employees including hourly workers from a variety of organizations. Training in servant leadership principles could be initiated so that all levels of employees could adopt a servant mindset for influence within their unit during cross-training procedures as well as voluntary assistance on a day-to-day basis. Longitudinal studies that incorporated pre- and posttesting could assess the influence of servant leader training. Furthermore, studies that compare less complex organizations with multilevel industries would be helpful to knowing the extent of servant leadership applications to organizational structure.

This study found a significant correlation with job satisfaction and adds hourly employees to the literature on this relationship. Since there were no significant differences in the overall score for job satisfaction by employee levels, but there was a difference for servant leadership by employee levels, additional studies could examine the reasons for this disparity.

Most importantly, this research established the need to further examine the relationship between servant leadership and organizational commitment and test the implication of this study that servant leaders may be good for the individual but not the best approach for the organization. Do servant leaders develop people and then lose them to someone else? Since the study found an inverse relationship between servant leadership and organizational commitment, a replication study could test this finding by using different instruments. For example, one could use Mowday et al.'s (1979) OCQ with the Laub (1999) OLA to provide additional research on the overall commitment relationship with servant leadership. Or a study could be conducted which used all three Meyer et al. (1993) commitment scales and a shorter servant leadership scale. Such studies would add to the research stream on servant leadership and enhance the organizational leadership literature.

### *Limitations*

The present study was limited by the fact that all of the data was gathered from a single questionnaire at a single institution. Several participants commented on the length of the survey and response fatigue was likely a negative influence on the organizational commitment score. The organizational commitment items were near the end of the six-page document.

The study did not have enough demographic data to draw more specific conclusions; however, this likely increased anonymity and a willingness to participate. The convenience sample was a strength for the response rate and furthered the research that is lacking with leadership in nontraditional higher education. However, it is also a limitation of the study because the results can only be generalized to this organization.

However, findings in such an academic setting may well apply to other professional organizations if the four position/role categories of employees are similar and may stimulate further research and application concerning servant leadership, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment.

## References

- Adair, J. G. (1984). The Hawthorne effect: A reconsideration of the methodological artifact. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 69*, 334-349.
- Agarwal, S., DeCarlo, T. E., & Vyas, S. B. (1999). Leadership behavior and organizational commitment: A comparative study of American and Indian salespersons. *Journal of International Business Studies, 30*(4), 727.
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 63*, 1-18.
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1996). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 49*, 252-276.
- Babbie, E. (1998). *The practice of social research* (8th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Bass, B. M. (2000). The future of leadership in learning organizations. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 7*(3), 18.
- Bateman, T. S., & Strasser, S. (1984). A longitudinal analysis of the antecedents of organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Journal, 27*, 95-112.
- Beaudoin, M. F. (2002). Distance education leadership: An essential role for the new century (post-secondary education research). *Journal of Leadership Studies, 8*(3), 131-145.
- Beazley, D. A. (2002). *Spiritual orientation of a leader and perceived servant leader behavior: A correlational study*. Dissertation No. 3049889, Walden University, City, ST.

- Beazley, H. (1998). *Meaning and measurement of spirituality in organizational settings: Development of a spirituality assessment scale*. Dissertation, UMI No. 9820619, George Washington University, Washington, D. C.
- Benkhoff, B. (1996). Disentangling organizational commitment: The dangers of the OCQ for research and policy. *Personnel Review*, 26, 114-131.
- Benkhoff, B. (1997). Ignoring commitment is costly: New approaches establish the missing link between commitment and performance. *Human Relations*, 50(6), 701-726.
- Birnbaum, R. (1988). *How colleges work*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Blanchard, K. (2002). Foreword: The heart of servant-leadership. In L. C. Spears & M. Lawrence (Eds.), *Focus on leadership: Servant leadership for the twenty-first century* (ix-xii). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Brooke, P. P., Jr., Russell, D. W., & Price, J. L. (1988). Discriminant validation of measures of job satisfaction, job involvement, and organizational commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73(2), 139-146.
- Brown, U. J., & Gaylor, K. P. (2002). *Organizational commitment in higher education*. Unpublished Manuscript, Jackson State University, Jackson, MS.
- Buchen, I. H. (1998). Servant leadership: A model for future faculty and future institutions. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 5(1), 125.
- Chieffo, A. N. (1991). Factors contributing to job satisfaction and organizational commitment of community college leadership teams. *Community College Review*, 19(2), 15-25.



- Colbert, A. E., & Kwon, E. G. (2000). Factors related to the organizational commitment of college and university auditors. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 12(4), 484-495.
- Collins, J. C. (2001). *Good to great: Why some companies make the leap... and others don't*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Cook, J. D., Hepworth, S. J., Wall, T. D., & Warr, P. B. (1981). *The experience of work: A compendium and review of 249 measures and their use*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Covey, S. R. (1995). Foreword. In K. Melrose (Ed.), *Making the grass greener on your side: A CEO's journey to leading by serving* (ix-xi). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Covey, S. R. (2002). Servant-leadership and community leadership in the twenty-first century. In L. C. Spears & M. Lawrence (Eds.), *Focus on leadership: servant-leadership for the 21st century* (27-33). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Curry, J. P., Wakefield, D. S., Price, J. L., & Mueller, C. W. (1986). On the causal ordering of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 29(4), 847-858.
- Daft, R. L. (1998). *Organization theory and design* (6th ed.). Cincinnati, OH: South-Western College Publishing.
- DePree, M. (1995). Foreword. In L. C. Spears (Ed.), *Reflections on leadership: how Robert K. Greenleaf's theory of servant-leadership influenced today's top management thinkers* (pp. ?-?). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

- Dillman, D. A. (1978). *Mail and telephone surveys: The total design method*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Farkas, A. J., & Tetrick, L. E. (1989). A three-wave longitudinal analysis of the causal ordering of satisfaction and commitment on turnover decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*(6), 855-969.
- Farling, M. L., Stone, A. G., & Winston, B. E. (1999). Servant leadership: Setting the state for empirical research. *Journal of Leadership Studies, Winter-Spring, 49*.
- Frick, D. M. (1998). Understanding Robert K. Greenleaf and servant-leadership. In L. C. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant-leadership* (pp. ?-?). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Girard, S. H. (2000). *Servant leadership qualities exhibited by Illinois public school district superintendents*. Dissertation, UMI No. 9973347, University, City, ST.
- Glisson, C., & Durick, M. (1988). Predictors of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in human service organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 33*(1), 61-82.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1970). *The servant as leader*. Indianapolis, ST: The Robert K. Greenleaf Center.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Hall, B. P., & Tonna, B. (1998). *Hall-Tonna inventory of values*. Santa Cruz, CA: Values Technology.
- Hatfield, E., & Rapson, R. L. (1993). *Love, sex, and intimacy*. New York: HarperCollins.

- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1993). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources* (6th ed). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hesselbein, F. (1999). Managing in a world that is round. In F. Hesselbein & P. M. Cohen (Eds.), *Leader to leader: Enduring insights on leadership from the Drucker Foundation's award-winning journal* (pp. ?-?). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hoffman, R. (2002). *Employee Survey*. Marion, IN: Indiana Wesleyan University.
- Holdnak, B. J., Harsh, J., & Bushardt, S. C. (1993). An examination of leadership style and its relevance to shift work in an organizational setting. *Health Care Management Review, 18*, 21-23.
- Holland, B. K. (1989). Motivation and job satisfaction. *Journal of Property Management, 54*(5), 32-37.
- HR Focus News Briefs, (April 2000). What drives employee commitment (and the higher productivity that follows)? *HR Focus, 77* (4), 9.
- Horsman, J. H. (2001). *Perspectives of servant-leadership and spirit in organizations*. Unpublished dissertation, Gonzaga University, Spokane, WA.
- Iaffaldano, M. T., & Muchinski, P. M. (1985). Job satisfaction and job performance. *Psychological Bulletin, 97*, 251-273.
- Ivancevich, J. M., & Matteson, M. T. (1999). *Organizational behavior and management*. Boston: Irwin McGraw-Hill.
- Jaworski, J. (1996). *Synchronicity*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

- Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Thoresen, C. J., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction--job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin, 127*(3), 376.
- Kacmar, K. M., Carlson, D. S., & Brymer, R. A. (1999). Antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment: A comparison of two scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 59*(6), 976-995.
- Kerr, S., & Jermier, J. (1978). Substitutes for leadership: Their meaning and measurement. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 22*, 374-403.
- Kerlinger, F. N., & Lee, H. B. (2000). *Foundations of behavioral research* (4th ed.). Orlando, FL: Harcourt.
- Ko, J. W., Price, J. L., & Mueller, C. W. (1997). Assessment of Meyer and Allen's three-component model of organizational commitment in South Korea. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*(6), 961-974.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1990). *The leadership challenge: How to get extraordinary things done in organizations* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1997). *Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI)*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lance, C. E. (1991). Evaluation of a structural model relating job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and precursors to voluntary turnover. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 26*, 137-162.
- Lankau, M. J., & Chung, B. G. (1998). Mentoring for line-level employees. *Cornell Hotel & Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 39*(6), 14-20.

- Laub, J. A. (1999). *Assessing the servant organization: Development of the organizational leadership assessment (OLA) instrument*. Unpublished Dissertation, Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton.
- Lawler, E. E. (1973). *Motivation in work organizations*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Pub. Co.
- Ledbetter, D. S. (2003). *Law enforcement leaders and servant leadership: A reliability study of the organizational leadership assessment*. Unpublished Dissertation, Regent University, City, ST.
- Likert, R. (1967). *The human organization: Its management and values*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Livovich, M. P., Jr. (1999). *An investigation of servant-leaders in public school superintendents in the state of Indiana*. Unpublished Dissertation, Indiana State University, Terre Haute.
- Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *The handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297-1349). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Lok, P., & Crawford, J. (2001). Antecedents of organizational commitment and the mediating role of job satisfaction. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 16(8), 594-613.
- Loke, J. C. F. (2001). Leadership behaviours: Effects on job satisfaction, productivity and organizational commitment. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 9(4), 191-205.
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper.

- Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin, 108*(2), 171-124.
- McFarland, L. J., Senn, L. E., & Childress, J. R. (1993). *21st century leadership: Dialogues with 100 top leaders*. New York: Leadership Press.
- McMahon, C., & Wilson, S. (1999). *Dimensions of Spirit Inventory*. Paper presented at Developing the Leader Within Workshops, Spokane, WA.
- Melrose, K. (1995). *Making the grass greener on your side: A CEO's journey to leading by serving*. San Fransisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Gellatly, I. R. (1990). Affective and continuance commitment to the organization: Evaluation of measures and analysis of concurrent and time-lagged relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*(6), 710-721.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 538-551.
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14*(2), 224-247.
- NCA Focus Visit Report (2003). Marion, IN: Indiana Wesleyan University.
- Northouse, P. G. (2001). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Nouwen, H. J. M. (1989). *In the name of Jesus: Reflections on Christian leadership*. New York: Crossroads.

- Organ, D. W. (1988). A restatement of the satisfaction-performance hypothesis. *Journal of Management, 14*(4), 547-558.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pool, S. W. (1997). The relationship of job satisfaction with substitutes of leadership, leadership behavior, and work motivation. *The Journal of Psychology, 131*(3), 271-284.
- Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 59*(5), 603-609.
- Probst, T. M. (2003). Exploring employee outcomes or organizational restructuring. *Group & Organization Management, 28*(3), 416-439.
- Russell, R. F. (2000). *Exploring the values and attributes of servant Leaders*. Dissertation, UMI No. 9999498, Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA.
- Sackman, H. (1975). *Delphi critique: Expert opinion, forecasting, and group process*. Lexington: Lexington Press.
- Sashkin, M., & Sashkin, M.G. (2003). *Leadership that matters: The critical factors for making a difference in people lives and organizations' success*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Savery, L. K. (1994). Attitudes at work: The influence of perceived style of leadership on a group of workers. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal, 15*(4), 12-18.

- Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday.
- Senge, P. M. (1997). Creating learning communities. *Executive Excellence*, 14(3), 17-18
- Shore, L. M., & Tetrick, L. E. (1991). A construct validity study of the survey of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(5), 637-644.
- Siders, M. A., George, G., & Dharwadkar, R. (2001). The relationship of internal and external commitment foci to objective job performance measures. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(5), 570-580.
- Singh, V., & Vinnicombe, S. (1998). What does "commitment" really mean? Views of UK and Swedish engineering managers. *Personnel Review*, 29(2), 228-258.
- Smith, P., Ironson, G. H., & Brannick, M. T. (1989). Construction of a job in general scale: A comparison of global, composite and specific measures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 1-8.
- Spears, L. C. (1995). *Reflections on leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's theory of servant-leadership influenced today's top management thinkers*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Stone, A. G., Russell, R. F., & Patterson, K. (2003). *Transformational versus servant leadership - A difference in leader focus*. Unpublished manuscript, Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA.



- Taylor, J. C., & Bowers, D. G. (1972). *Survey of organizations: A machine-scored standardized questionnaire instrument*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan, Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge.
- Taylor-Gillham, D. J. (1998). *Images of servant leadership in education*. Unpublished Dissertation, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, AZ.
- Thompson, J. D. (1967). *Organizations in action: Social science bases of administrative theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Thompson, R. S. (2003). *The perception of servant leadership characteristics and job satisfaction in a church-related college*. Unpublished dissertation, Indiana State University, Terre Haute, IN.
- Tweedell, C. B. (2003). *Adult & Graduate Studies Enrollment Statistics*. Marion, IN: Indiana Wesleyan University.
- Vandenberg, R. J., & Lance, C. E. (1992). Examining the causal order of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Journal of Management*, 18(1), 153-168.
- Weiss, M. J., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. (1967). *Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- Williams, F., & Monge, P. (2001). *Reasoning with statistics: How to read quantitative research*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt.
- Williams, L. J., & Hazer, J. T. (1986). Antecedents and consequences of satisfaction and commitment in turnover models: A reanalysis using latent variable structural equation methods. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(2), 219-232.
- Yankelovich, D. (1981). *New rules: Searching for self-fulfillment in a world turned upside down*. New York: Random House.

Yousef, D. A. (2000). Organizational commitment: A mediator of the relationships of leadership behavior with job satisfaction and performance in a non-western country. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 15(1), 6-29.

Zohar, D. (1997). *Rewiring the corporate brain: Using the new science to rethink how we structure and lead organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

## Exhibit A


From: Laub, Jim

Sent: Tue 9/30/2003 8:55 AM

To: Drury, Sharon

Cc:

Subject: RE: Instructions for the OLA

Attachments:  Attachments may contain viruses that are harmful to your computer.

Attachments may not display correctly.

 [OLA Instrument.doc\(170KB\)](#)  [OLA items by catagories.doc\(54KB\)](#)

[View As Web Page](#)

Here's my quick response – I would be glad to get together with you next week to fill in the spaces. Give me a call and we can work out a time.

Jim Laub, Ed.D.

Center for Life Calling and Leadership

Indiana Wesleyan University

4201 South Washington Street

Marion, IN 46953-4974

## Exhibit B


From: John Meyer [meyer@uwo.ca]

Sent: Wed 9/17/2003 7:45 AM



To: Drury, Sharon

Cc:

Subject: Re: Permission to use the OC instrument

Attachments:  Attachments may contain viruses that are harmful to your computer.

Attachments may not display correctly.

 [8-item commitment scales.doc\(35KB\)](#)  [6-item commitment scales.doc\(32KB\)](#)

Dear Sharon,

You are welcome to use our commitment scales in your dissertation research. There is no charge as long as they are being used for research purposed only. The items included in the book are from the original and revised versions of the scales published in earlier articles. I have attached copies of both sets of items so you can track their original source (there is a typographical error in the book).

Good luck with your research.

Best regards,

John Meyer

"Drury, Sharon" wrote:

- > Part 1.1 Type: Plain Text (text/plain)
- > Encoding: quoted-printable

--

John Meyer

Department of Psychology

University of Western Ontario

London, ON, Canada N6A 5C2

Phone: (519) 661-3679

Fax: (519) 661-3961

Email: meyer@uwo.ca

## Exhibit C

*Dear AGS Team,*

*Please fill out this survey for Sharon Drury before January 16<sup>th</sup>.*

*Thanks,*

*Mark A. Smith*

*Vice President*

## Exhibit D

Dear Fellow Employees,

Will you do me a favor by completing the attached survey, please?

Your involvement will be completely anonymous. Your answers will provide data for my Ph. D. dissertation research and also help AGS as an organization.

I need the questionnaire returned by Friday, January 16, 2004.

Thanks so much!

*Sharon Drury*

## Exhibit E

**\$100 Reward**—a drawing

There will be a drawing for \$100 cash reward for those who indicate they've filled out the survey on time by returning this card. Drawing will occur the week after the due date.

I completed the survey and mailed it by the deadline January 16, 2004—enter me in the drawing for \$100 reward.

---

Printed name

---

Phone Ext.

➔ Return this card (separate from survey) via campus mail (self-addressed on reverse)

## Exhibit F

## AN ORGANIZATIONAL ASSESSMENT

This questionnaire is designed to be taken by employees at all levels of the AGS organization. As you respond to the different statements, please answer as to what you believe is generally true about the Adult & Graduate Studies organization. Please respond...

- with your own personal feelings and beliefs.
- not with the beliefs of others, or those that others would want you to have.
- to how things *are* ... not as they could be, or should be.

There are five (5) different sections in this questionnaire.

- **Note that each section has different instructions.**
- Feel free to use the full spectrum of answers (from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree).
- If you are uncertain, answer with your first, intuitive response.
- It takes about 20 minutes to complete all 78 items.
- **By completing all 5 sections, your questionnaire can be used in determining the results.**

**Your involvement in this assessment is completely anonymous.** Return the survey by folding the questionnaire in half so the back page shows the return address. Tape or staple it, and send via IWU Campus Mail. Thank you!

Sharon Drury

**Please return by January 16, 2004**

### Section 1

Please place an **X** on **ONE** of the lines below to indicate **your** position/role in the organization:

\_\_\_ Top leadership (VP administrative council)

\_\_\_ Management (directors, assistant directors, managers, and supervisors of one or more persons)

\_\_\_ Faculty (full-time teaching position)

\_\_\_ Workforce (hourly employees, e.g., coordinators, specialists, support staff, technical workers)



**Section 2**

In this next section, please respond to each statement as you believe it applies to the **entire organization**, including workforce, faculty, managers, and top leadership.

Please provide your response to each statement by placing an **X** in one of the boxes after each statement.

	1	2	3	4	5
<b>In general, people within this organization ....</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
1 Trust each other					
2 Are clear on the key goals of the organization					
3 Are non-judgmental – they keep an open mind					
4 Respect each other					
5 Know where this organization is headed in the future					
6 Maintain high ethical standards					
7 Work well together in teams					
8 Value differences in culture, race & ethnicity					
9 Are caring & compassionate towards each other					
10 Demonstrate high integrity & honesty					
11 Are trustworthy					
12 Relate well to each other					
13 Attempt to work with others more than working on their own					
14 Are held accountable for reaching work goals					
15 Are aware of the needs of others					
16 Allow for individuality of style and expression					
17 Are encouraged by supervisors to share in making <i>important</i>					
18 Work to maintain positive working relationships					
19 Accept people as they are					
20 View conflict as an opportunity to learn & grow					
21 Know how to get along with people					

**Section 3**

In this next section, please respond to each statement as you believe it applies to the **leadership** of the organization, including **managers/supervisors and top leadership**.

Please provide your response to each statement by placing an X in one of the boxes after each statement.

	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Managers/Supervisors and Top Leadership in this Organization...</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Undecided</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
22 Communicate a clear vision of the future of the organization					
23 Are open to learning from those who are <i>below</i> them in the organization					
24 Allow workers to help determine where this organization is headed					
25 Work alongside the workers instead of separate from them					
26 Use persuasion to influence others instead of coercion or force					
27 Don't hesitate to provide the leadership that is needed					
28 Promote open communication and sharing of information					
29 Give workers the power to make <i>important</i> decisions					
30 Provide support and resources needed to help workers meet their goals					
31 Create an environment that encourages learning					
32 Are open to receiving criticism & challenge from others					
33 Say what they mean, and mean what they say					
34 Encourage each person to exercise leadership					
35 Admit personal limitations & mistakes					
36 Encourage people to take risks even if they may fail					
37 Practice the same behavior they expect from others					
38 Facilitate the building of community & team					
39 Do not demand special recognition for being leaders					
40 Lead by example by modeling appropriate behavior					
41 Seek to influence others from a positive relationship rather than <u>from the authority of their position</u>					
42 Provide opportunities for all workers to develop to their full potential					
43 Honestly evaluate themselves before seeking to evaluate others					
44 Use their power and authority to benefit the workers					
45 Take appropriate action when it is needed					

**Section 3, continued**

	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Provide your response to each statement by placing an X in one of</i>					
<b>Managers/Supervisors and Top Leadership in this Organization...</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Undecided</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
46 Build people up through encouragement and affirmation					
47 Encourage workers to work <i>together</i> rather than competing against each other					
48 Are humble – they do not promote themselves					
49 Communicate clear plans & goals for the organization					
50 Provide mentor relationships in order to help people grow					
51 Are accountable & responsible to others					
52 Are receptive listeners					
53 Do not seek after special status or the “perks” of leadership					
54 Put the needs of the workers ahead of their own					

**Section 4**

In this next section, please respond to each statement as you believe it is true about **you personally and your role** in the organization.

<b>In viewing my own role...</b>	1	2	3	4	5
55 I feel appreciated by my supervisor for what I contribute					
56 I am working at a high level of productivity					
57 I am listened to by those <i>above</i> me in the organization					
58 I feel good about my contribution to the organization					
59 I receive encouragement and affirmation from those <i>above</i> me					
60 My job is important to the success of this organization					
61 I trust the leadership of this organization					
62 I enjoy working in this organization					
63 I am respected by those <i>above</i> me in the organization					
64 I am able to be creative in my job					
65 In this organization, a person’s <i>work</i> is valued more than their					
66 I am able to use my best gifts and abilities in my job					

### **Section 5**

This section is different because it has a 7-point scale. *Please place an X in one of the seven boxes after each statement as you believe it applies to **you personally in this organization.***

<i>Read each statement carefully.</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>For me <u>personally</u> in this organization...</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Slightly Disagree</b>	<b>and Disagree</b>	<b>Slightly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
67 I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.							
68 Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.							
69 I feel as if this organization's problems are my own.							
70 It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.							
71 I do not feel a strong sense of "belonging" to my organization.							
72 Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now.							
73 One of the few negatives consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.							
74 I do not feel "emotionally attached" to this organization.							
75 I feel I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.							
76 I do not feel like "part of the family" at my organization.							
77 If I had not already put so much of myself into this organization, I might consider working elsewhere.							
78 This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.							

**Return this survey anonymously** by folding the questionnaire in half so the back page shows the return address. Tape or staple it, and send via IWU Campus Mail. Thank you!

Sections 2-4 is The *Organizational Leadership Assessment*, with permission from Laub, J. A. (1998), Marion, IN: Center for Life Calling and Leadership, Indiana Wesleyan University. Section 5 is reprinted with permission from Meyer, J.P., Allen, N.J., & Smith, .A.(1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 538-551.

IWU CAMPUS MAIL

TO: Sharon Drury  
College of Adult & Professional  
Studies  
Business & Management Division  
Marion, IN