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ABSTRACT

Church-related colleges are facing diverse and complex challenges. The campus leadership has found the traditional leadership approaches to be inadequate to meet these new challenges and is seeking solutions. Numerous leadership approaches offer potential solutions, but church-related institutions need an approach fitting the ethos of the institution culture as well as matching the values of the institution and allowing for the use of other leadership practices and styles. Servant leadership has been proposed as a viable leadership model for church-related college leaders.

In light of the absence of scholarly research on servant leadership, this study has provided an objective and quantifiable study of servant leadership and job satisfaction at a church-related college. One hundred sixteen employees of the college were administered a combined survey consisting of Laub's Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) instrument and the short form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). The participants were viewed by both the administrative level (Institutional Leadership, Management, Faculty, and Technical) and the functional area (Academic Affairs and Student Services). The institution in this study was found not to be a servant organization as classified using Laub’s schema. An analysis of variance was performed to see if differences existed between administrative levels and between functional areas. Surprisingly, no statistically significant differences were found to exist between administrative levels. This contradicts earlier findings. However, a statistically significant difference was found to exist between the functional areas of Academic Affairs and Student Services. Further analysis revealed that the subgroup of Student Services Technical scored significantly higher than Academic Affairs Management and the Faculty. In addition, the institutional perception of servant leadership as measured by the OLA was compared to the job
satisfaction score as measured by the MSQ. Confirming Laub’s assertion that the perception of servant leadership positively impacts job satisfaction, a statistically significant, positive correlation was found to exist between the perception of job satisfaction characteristics and job satisfaction.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The demand for effective leadership in higher education has never been more pressing than at the beginning of the twenty-first century, especially for small, church-related colleges. The leaders of these institutions face increased competition for students and faculty, the development of new teaching and learning technologies, the diversification of educational mission, and multiple financial issues. These complex challenges are severely taxing the leadership approaches used by senior administrators of small church-related colleges, motivating many to actively pursue new approaches to leadership.

In the 1970s and 1980s, many educators predicted short futures for small, private, liberal arts colleges. Most agreed that these institutions, including the approximately one hundred church-related colleges that are members of the Council of Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU), would be forced to close by the end of the century because of increased competition, small endowments, and the increasing costs of providing state-of-the-art education. Although slated for demise, many church-related institutions, including a significant number of the CCCU institutions, fought back by providing innovative and responsive programs that created rapid growth in the student bodies and the expansion of both the administration and the physical plant. Nevertheless, the future continues to present significant challenges for the leadership of these institutions.
The CCCU is an organization comprised of institutions that share similar institutional missions and/or relationships with their church affiliations. The member institutions have joined together across denominational lines in order to provide an educational forum and a unified voice in government. Each member institution voluntarily agrees to comply with a set of common values, which includes items such as campus hiring policies, institutional accreditation, and financial responsibility. The church-related institution in this study is a member of the CCCU.

Reisberg (1999) recently stated that enrollments in CCCU colleges “have surged in the last decade, dramatically outpacing the average increase at secular institutions” (p. A42). This influx of new students has placed a burden on material and human resources as institutions race to build and improve facilities and to hire qualified faculty and staff to meet increased demand.

In an attempt to find alternative sources of revenue, many of these institutions have made decisions to diversify by providing distance learning and degree completion programs that cater to a broader population than the traditional, residential based programs. Marketed to working, non-traditional students, the programs serve a populace that is generally unaware of, or perhaps not interested in the integration of the institution’s religious mission with the curriculum. In some instances, these students and programs have significantly challenged the religious identity of church-related institutions. Even though these programs can provide a substantive financial windfall that can create the opportunity to improve and expand facilities and services, the disruption to the institution’s culture may prove harmful to their traditional campuses (Winston, 2000). The diversification of the institution’s services, the educational
delivery system, and the student body can challenge the identity and mission of the institution. According to Winston (2000), some "administrers think of these adult B. A. programs as cash cows. But they are actually more akin to the Trojan horse -- in the guise of bearing gifts, they harbor forces of destruction" (p. 1312).

Rapid growth and diversification of the educational mission have challenged campus leadership to provide adequate facilities including increasing the number of qualified faculty and administrative staff, purchasing, renovating, or building facilities to meet student demands, and sometimes administrating multiple campuses, often in areas a great distance from the main campus. The financial commitment to provide suitable facilities, even at a minimal level, can be a challenge for these tuition-driven institutions.

According to Jim Zook (1995) in an article about the CCCU in the Chronicle of Higher Education:

Coalition [now known as the Council of Christian Colleges and Universities] colleges usually have small endowments and rely heavily on tuition revenue to balance their budgets. They are among the small, private colleges that depend heavily on the "campus-based" federal-aid programs that have been mentioned by both Democrats and Republicans as candidates for elimination. (p. A26)

Jennifer Jovanovich, Executive Assistant to the President, Council for Christian Colleges & Universities (personal communication, February 13, 2001), indicates that the average endowment at a CCCU member institution is $25,001,413.00, a total well below the yearly operating budget of nearly all member institutions. In addition, according to the CCCU's Financial Survey for 2001, which includes responses from over 50 CCCU member institutions, 85% of tuition and fee revenue is comprised of grants, loans, and
work-study (Nelson and Olson, 2002). The high reliance on federal financial aid to generate operating revenue places CCCU institutions in a particularly vulnerable position should federal aid be reduced or eliminated. Finally, institutional leadership realizes that they cannot rely on increasing enrollments to provide long-term operational money, but must develop methods to dramatically increase endowments while providing services, facilities, and instruction in order to remain competitive in today's higher education market.

Leadership Approaches

These complex problems require colleges and universities to learn new ways to adapt to the challenges. Commenting on the leadership in higher education, Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum (1989) note that more and more criticism has been directed at the leadership of our nation's colleges and universities: "The realization that leadership must be practiced in a troubled, complex, and crisis-ridden context has also led to a stream of advice that focuses on the very makeup of the leadership role" (p. 5). At church-related colleges, campus leaders have the added challenges of determining appropriate approaches that effectively address the challenges of the current dynamic environment while maintaining the unique ethos of the institutions.

Many of the leaders of church-related institutions are concerned that the traditional, hierarchical approach to institutional leadership is not able to meet the current challenges facing these schools. The traditional understanding of organizations is that they can or should be rational systems that operate in an efficient manner as possible. While many endorse this as an ideal, it is not easy to accomplish because organizations
are comprised of people. In addition, the traditional approach has focused little on the human aspects of the organization (Morgan, 1997). Leaders of church-related institutions are questioning the traditional, hierarchical approach to organizational leadership and are searching for a leadership model that better fits with the unique ethos of their institutions.

Kingsley (1992) noted that there is a perceived lack of leaders in church-related colleges and states that a change in leadership style is clearly necessary. He goes on to state, “The playing field may be rugged, the obstacles enormous, the opposition formidable, but the game plan has a firm purpose guiding its flexible actions.” He then relates that “this kind of leadership will often be self-sacrificing, the ‘servant leadership’ delineated by Greenleaf in his classic study” (p. 72). James Edwards, President of Anderson University, a member of the CCCU, noted that many Presidents of church-related colleges “aspire” to be servant leaders (October, 1999).

Servant leadership’s focus on relationship proposes to positively impact both employee satisfaction and output while creating an environment where employees are supported and participation is encouraged. Not only is servant leadership beginning to be viewed as an effective approach to address the complex challenges facing church-related colleges, the approach is viewed as fitting the ethos of the church-related institution’s religious mission. As Blanchard (1998) notes, Jesus of Nazareth is often used as an example for servant leadership concepts because Jesus’ teachings and behavior reflect similar servant leadership values.
Statement of the Problem

Church-related colleges are facing diverse and complex challenges. The campus leadership has found the traditional leadership approaches to be inadequate to meet these new challenges and is seeking solutions. Numerous leadership approaches offer potential solutions, but church-related institutions need an approach that fits the ethos of the institution culture as well as matching the values of the institution and allowing for the use of other leadership practices and styles.

Servant leadership has been proposed as a viable leadership model for church-related college leaders. However, little scholarly research has been done on servant leadership in general and in higher education in particular. This has led Sergiovanni (1992) to note, "Virtually missing from the mainstream conversation on leadership is the concept of servant leadership" (p. 124). A major reason for the absence of servant leadership in the current academic literature is the lack of a research base. The focus of the writings concerning servant leadership has centered on anecdotal observations, personal testimonials, and the reflections of the authors. While potentially inspiring to the reader, these works offer little for the academic study of servant leadership.

In light of the absence of scholarly research on servant leadership, this study has provided an objective and quantifiable study of servant leadership and job satisfaction at a church-related, CCCU member college, utilizing Laub's Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) instrument and the short form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). This study functions on two levels, first to contribute to and clarify the concept of servant leadership, and second to explore the extent campus members perceive servant leadership and job satisfaction.
Purpose Statement:

There are church-related colleges and universities that are choosing to adopt servant leadership as the guiding philosophy for the management of their institutions. The purpose of this study was to take one such institution, whose senior leadership has expressed an interest in adapting servant leadership and is in the early stages of adopting servant leadership principles, to investigate the perceived presence of servant leadership characteristics in the management practices of the institution and its relationship to job satisfaction. The study sought to determine the degree to which institutional leadership and the professional members of academic affairs and student services perceive servant leadership characteristics reflected in the leadership and decision-making practices of the college. The study also explored the differences in the perceived presence of servant leadership characteristics and job satisfaction based on administrative level and functional area. Finally, the study sought to determine if there is a relationship between the level of perception of servant leadership characteristics and the participant's level of job satisfaction. The validated job satisfaction instrument, the MSQ, was used to assess the level of job satisfaction and to explore the relationship of reported job satisfaction and the perception of the presence of servant leadership characteristics reported in the OLA.

This information provides quantifiable information reflecting the perception of servant leadership characteristics in the leadership practices of the institutional leadership level, management level, technical level, and faculty, as well as in two major divisions in a church-related institution. In addition, the study provides a benchmark for the institution on any possible future measurement of the impact servant leadership training and interventions.
For the purpose of this study, two instruments were distributed simultaneously to the institutional leadership, the management, faculty, and technical staff of the academic affairs and student services divisions at one institution. The instruments are the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) and the short form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. James Laub (1999) suggests a relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction, and he included a non-validated job satisfaction component in the OLA. The short form of the validated Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) was used to investigate the relationship, if any, between the perception of servant leadership characteristics in the organization and job satisfaction as measured by the MSQ.

Research Questions

1. To what extent do members of the campus community perceive servant leadership characteristics reflected in campus leaders' behavior and institutional decision making processes?

2. Are there differences in the perception of servant leadership characteristics based on university administrative level (institutional leadership, management, faculty, and technical)?

3. Are there differences in the perception of servant leadership characteristics reflected in functional area (academic affairs and student services)?

4. Is there a relationship between participants' perception of servant leadership characteristics and their level of job satisfaction?
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Chapter 2 reviews the literature on servant leadership and related topics. The chapter has four sections: the first section discusses the history of evangelical colleges and universities, the secularization of church-related colleges and the classification of evangelical colleges; the second section discusses the development of leadership theory in the United States during the past century; the third section describes Robert K. Greenleaf and servant leadership; and the fourth section reviews job satisfaction.

History of Evangelical Colleges and Universities

Beginning with the establishment of Harvard College by New England Puritans in 1636, the Protestant Church has played a significant role in the formation and development of higher education in the United States (Guthrie & Noftzger, 1992). Nearly all of the colleges established between the American Revolution and Civil War were organized, supported and controlled by Protestant denominations, many with some assistance of public money. The Protestant Church continued to establish denominational institutions, in the period following the Civil War and ending around World War I, establishing a diverse assortment of denominational affiliations (Guthrie & Noftzger, 1992). Over time, the degree of connectedness of many of the colleges with their founding denominations has changed, ranging from direct control by the establishing
denomination to the total elimination of denominational connection. This has created the
diverse relationship between the historically church-related college and their sponsoring
church seen in the United States today.

Early College Development

Harvard, like nearly all of the colleges founded during the colonial period of the
United States, was established to meet the growing needs of training denominational
ministers, educating the local elite for civic leadership roles, and to a lesser extent
training the American Indians in the English language and culture (Cremin, 1997).
Harvard, along with the majority of the early colleges, was established using the Puritan
model of education modeled after Emmanuel College of Cambridge University, a central
source of Puritan fervor in England. Harvard’s goal for higher education was “to know
God and Jesus Christ which is eternal life (John 17:3), and therefore to lay Christ in the
bottom as the only foundation of all sound knowledge and learning” (Ringenberg, 1984,
p. 38). This view was not unique, but typical of the institutions established during this
time period, especially those founded after the First Great Awakening (1730s and 1740s).
The colleges of this period established by Calvinist-related denominations tended to be
more deliberate in promoting their religious goals than colleges established by the
Anglican-related denominations.

About the time of the American Revolution, the idea of creating strictly state run
colleges began to receive serious consideration. The University of Georgia was the first
such institution to appear in 1785, and by 1849, state governments had founded thirty-six
colleges, twenty-two of which were operational by the Civil War. However, partially due
to the impact of the Second Great Awakening (1800–1835) and the rapid westward expansion of the country. Denominational colleges sprang up rapidly in the frontier states. Records indicate that only 29 permanent colleges existed in the United States prior to 1830, while 133 were established between 1830 and 1860 alone (Ringenberg, 1984). The vast majority of these colleges were denominationally controlled.

**Later College Development**

After the Civil War, forces contributed to change the face of higher education in the United States. One force was the Morrill Land Grant, which created public colleges focused on agriculture and technology. Another force was the introduction of the graduate college model from Germany, which cast the traditional clerical control of colleges in opposition to scholastic openness and progress (Marsden, 1992). An additional force was the economic prosperity brought on by industrial growth in the country. A growing number of newly rich entrepreneurs chose to give large sums of money to transform small colleges into major institutions or to launch new universities. Church-related universities such as Vanderbilt (Central University of Nashville), Duke (Trinity), Emory, Stetson, Baylor, and Wake Forest all received sizable donations that transformed the institution. The Rockefeller family originally intended to found the University of Chicago as a Baptist college, but instead established the institution with a loosely Christian orientation. Stanford University was founded with a similar motivation, but chose to avoid direct religious connection, maintaining belief in "the immortality of the soul, the existence of an all-wise benevolent creator, and the idea that obedience to his laws is the highest duty of man" (Ringenberg, 1984, p. 99). Johns
Hopkins, established by a Quaker merchant, sought to avoid all official ties to any religious influences, though the institution offered a voluntary chapel service.

During this same period, the Midwest and north central states received large numbers of immigrants from Protestant separatist groups such as the Scandinavian Lutherans, Dutch Reformed, German and Russian Mennonites, and German Brethren. These groups, in order to preserve their denominational perspective, chose to establish their own colleges instead of utilizing existing colleges (Ringenberg, 1984).

Secularization of Church-Related Colleges

As the twentieth century progressed, many of the colleges and universities established by a Protestant denomination had either broken or drastically loosened their ties to their founding denomination. The movement away from the influence and control by the founding denomination and gradual secularization of the institutions is the result of complex academic and cultural influences. However, the general process was led by a limited number of elite private institutions in the late nineteenth century, followed by more elite private institutions. Following World War I, most of the colleges established by Protestant denominations began to follow the trend. The institutions that continue to have close ties with their founding denominations tend to come from conservative Protestant denominations, such as the Assembly of God, Churches of Christ, Evangelical Friends, Free Methodist, Lutheran, Mennonite, Nazarene, Wesleyan and in some cases, transdenominational evangelical constituencies (Ringenberg, 1984). Institutions with historical connections to Protestant denominations occupy a wide range of connectiveness to their founding denomination.
Although some institutions have completely severed their relationship with their founding church, there remains close to 800 church-related colleges and universities in the United States (Cunninggim, 1994). Among these colleges are slightly over one hundred evangelical Protestant colleges who have maintained close ties to their founding denomination.

Classification of Church-Related Colleges

Because the mission and relationship with their denomination vary greatly, those outside of evangelical Protestant higher education are often confused about the very nature of these institutions and the differences that may exist among them (Marsden, 1992). The purpose of this section is to focus on the identification of institutions of evangelical Protestant higher education, especially as defined by the 122 (91 full members and 31 affiliate members) member Council of Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU) (CCCU on line, 1997), one of which will be used in this study. The CCCU was founded in 1976 with the specific task of “protecting the religious and educational freedom of Christian colleges” (Ringenberg, 1984, p. 204). One of the aims of the CCCU is to provide a unified voice in the nation’s capital for evangelical protestant colleges.

There are four generally recognized approaches used to identify the connectedness a college has with its founding denomination. Patillo and Mackenzie developed the initial taxonomy (1966) in a massive study of over 800 institutions, which resulted in four general categories: Defender of the Faith, Non-affirming, Church-related, and Free Christian Colleges. The study was financed by the American Council on
Education and represented the first comprehensive look at Church-related colleges. This study was followed by Pace's study for the Carnegie Commission in 1972 based on a profile of denominational higher education focusing on 84 colleges. Pace's taxonomy includes the following categories:

- Institutions with Protestant roots that are no longer Protestant in any legal sense.
- Institutions that remain nominally related to Protestantism but are on the verge of disengagement.
- Institutions that were established by major Protestant denominations and retained a connection with the church.
- Institutions those are associated with evangelical, fundamentalist, and interdenominational Christian churches (Cuninggim, 1978; Guthrie & Nofiger, 1992).

Cuninggim (1978), who served as president of a church-related college, a dean of a school of theology, as well as the director of the Danforth Foundation, offered the first inside look at church-related colleges and universities. The Danforth Foundation is a major foundation committed to "old-line" Protestant higher education (Marsden and Longfield, 1992). His study, made in conjunction with the Education Society of the National Council of Churches and the Danforth Foundation was initially made to help church-related colleges clarify their self-understanding. He created his taxonomy in order to rectify what he deemed as the pejorative nature of the earlier classifications. Cuninggim (1978) believed the earlier taxonomies created a definite hierarchy, with institutions with a less obvious connection to a church being rated higher. Cuninggim
developed a continuum consisting of three descriptive groupings, which include the following:

- The consonant college is an ally with its denomination, but speaks infrequently of its church relationship.
- The proclaiming college is a witness to its denominational affiliation, and defines itself first as a college.
- The embodying college is a reflection of its sponsoring church and attempts to integrate faith and values in every facet of the institution (Cuninggim, 1978; Guthrie, 1992).

The most recent attempt to classify church-related colleges and universities was created in 1990 by Sandin as a means of clarifying the effect of religious preference in employment practices in church-related colleges. Sandin is the former provost and a current professor of philosophy in a church-related college. Sandin’s model includes these characteristics:

- Pervasively Religious: characterized by the central Christian convictions, the programs and participants are determined by the ultimate principles of faith and life.
- Religiously supportive: do not aspire to the centralization of religious values in all institutional activities; however, they are largely shaped by their affiliations.
- Nominally church-related: the church-relatedness is an important historical symbol, but not a controlling value in its present mission.
• Independent: were at one time closely tied to a denomination but no longer acknowledge any religious connection (Guthrie & Noltzger, 1992).

Sandin’s Pervasively Religious category includes most, if not all of the CCCU institutions. However, not all Pervasively Religious colleges are members of the CCCU. Even the institutions themselves can reject the classification imposed on them, as demonstrated by the rejection of the Pattillo and MacKenzie taxonomy listing of “defender of the faith” by many CCCU members (Holmes, 1975).

Another way to describe the CCCU schools is by the organizational membership criteria. The membership in the CCCU is voluntary and the members subscribe to the following membership criteria (CCCU on-line, 1996).

1. **Institutional Type and Accreditation**: The institution is a four-year college or university in North America with curriculum rooted in the arts and sciences. In the U.S., institutions must have full non-probationary regional accreditation.

2. **Christ-centered mission**: A public mission based upon the centrality of Jesus Christ and evidence of how faith is integrated with the institution’s academic and student life programs.

3. **Employment policy**: A current hiring policy that requires of each full-time member and administrator a personal faith in Jesus Christ.

4. **Cooperation**: A commitment to advancing the cause of Christian Higher Education through active participation in the programs of the Council, payment of the annual dues and special assessments, and institutional
practices which have been, are now, and will continue to be supportive of
other Council members.

5. **Financial Integrity**: Institutional fund raising activities that are consistent
with the standards of the Evangelical Council for Financial Accountability
and demonstration of responsible financial operations (CCCU Online,
1996)

The self-selection and choice to affiliate with the primarily evangelical protestant
institutions is the clearest way to define the CCCU institutions. It is interesting to note
that Franciscan University of Steubenville, Ohio, though is a Catholic institution is an
affiliate member of the CCCU. The member institutions have joined together across
denominational lines in order to provide an educational forum and a unified voice in
government, at the risk of lessening denominational distinctiveness (Hughes, 1998).

**Leadership Theory**

The question of leadership has interested philosophers and scholars over the ages
and has been a field of study for the past one hundred years. Scholars' theories on
leadership began to take on modern connotations during the 1930s (Rost, 1993). Since
that time, there have been a variety of approaches to the study of leaders and leadership;
all in the quest to better understand an illusive concept. James MacGregor Burns (1978)
wrote, “One of the most universal cravings of our time is a hunger for compelling and
creative leadership” (p. 1). In fact, the interest in leadership has grown dramatically over
the last few decades, expanding during the past decade to include multi-disciplinary
studies of leadership. Referring to the increased interest in leadership, Rost (1993) states;
Leadership is a word that has come to mean all things to all people. Even worse, leadership has increasingly become a very "hot" word since about 1960, with an ability to produce a passionate reaction that draws people to it through an emotional attraction (p. 7).

Even with the recent attraction to the concept of leadership, the interest in leadership as an area of study is a relatively new phenomenon, with its beginnings at the turn of the century, when the idea developed to systematically study leadership (Rost, 1997). Since its beginning in the early 1900s, the research traditions in leadership can be grouped broadly into four major categories, each of which approximately followed each other in popularity. Though the distinctions between the categories are not always clear and concise but are often fluid and inconsistent, the categories can be useful in organizing the large number of leadership studies.

The categories are: 1) trait theories, which attempt to identify specific traits or characteristics that an individual possesses that allows the person to function as a leader; 2) behavioral theories, which focus on the leader's pattern of activity, or what the leader actually does; 3) contingency theories, which focus on the importance of the situational factors, such as nature of the task being performed, the skill level of the followers, and the nature of the external environment; and 4) power and influence theories, which consider leadership in terms of power and the manner in which power is exercised over followers.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, researchers approached leadership by identifying leaders by traits or characteristics that individual leaders possessed. The early studies focused on great military and political leaders and produced what is referred to as
the "great man" theories (Northouse, 1997). This approach posits that certain individuals are gifted with specific traits or characteristics that differentiate them from followers. The traits could include physical attributes, personality characteristics, social background, or general ability.

The assumption is that many of the traits are innate, while others can be developed. Several traits, such as assertiveness, decisiveness, dependability, persistence, self-confidence, and skills such as verbal fluency, creativity, and tact, appear to be characteristic of successful leaders. However, critics of the trait approach note that the possession of the traits does not guarantee success as a leader, nor does the lack of the traits prescribe failure (Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989). While intuitively appealing, the trait approach has produced no definitive list of leadership traits after nearly a century of research and a substantial collection of data. In addition, the trait approach focuses exclusively on the leader, ignoring the situational context or the followers (Northouse, 1997). Due partially to the amount of research data and the tendency to associate leaders with specific characteristics, the trait theory "continues to be influential in the images of effective leadership in higher education, even though it is no longer a major approach to research among organizational theorists" (Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989, p. 35).

During the 1950s, leadership theorists, under the influence of behavioral psychology, and in response to the trait theory's inability to satisfactorily describe leadership, began to look at the behavior of leaders instead of the personality characteristics of leaders (Rost, 1997). The focus became not what traits or characteristics the leader possessed, but what the leader actually did. One of the most
influential studies in the behavioral tradition were part of the Ohio State leadership studies. It identified two essential aspects of leadership behavior: task behaviors (initiating structure) and relationship behaviors (consideration). Task behaviors include activities such as directing, coordinating, planning, and problem solving (Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989). The focus of task behaviors is on goal accomplishment and the achievement of objectives. Relationship behaviors include approachability, openness, friendliness, consideration, and supportive actions. Relationship behaviors help workers feel comfortable with their work environment, their co-workers, and with themselves. Once the workers feel comfortable, they will be more productive (Northouse, 1997).

The behavioral approach has provided insight into leadership studies by acknowledging that the leader's actions toward others occur on a task and relationship level. The studies also indicate that, in order to be effective, and depending on the situation, the leader needs to find a balance between task orientation and relationship orientation. Critics of the behavioral approach note that researchers have not been able to establish a link between task and relationship activities and outcomes, such as job satisfaction, morale, and production. Similar to the trait approach's inability to identify universal leadership traits, the behavioral approach has not been able to identify a definitive set of behaviors that are associated with effective leadership (Northouse, 1997).

This approach was followed by contingency theory, which proposes that the appropriate style of leadership is contingent on the requirements of the particular situational factors, such as the nature of the task performed, the external environment, as well as the group involved. Contingency theory "assumes that different situations require
different patterns of traits and behavior for a leader to be effective” (Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989, p. 14). There is a considerable overlap between the behavioral approach and contingency theories. Both acknowledge that effective leadership behavior depends on the nature of the situation, with contingency theories emphasizing the factors outside the organization and behavioral theories focusing on the internal environment (Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989).

Contingency theories attempt to indicate how a leader’s behavior is shaped and controlled by a wide variety of situational factors and events: including the expectations of followers, institutional regulations and policy, superior’s expectations, the nature of the task, and the stability of the organizational environment.

A well-known leadership theory that fits the contingency model, developed by Hersey and Blanchard (1969), is the situational leadership approach. Situational leadership is based on the idea that different situations require different kinds of leadership. The effective leader evaluates the situation as well as the skills and motivation of the followers and adapts his or her leadership approach to the specific demands of the situation. Situational leadership posits that leadership is composed of a directive and a supportive component, and each must be applied in the appropriate situation (Northouse, 1997).

Contingency theory, especially situational leadership, is one of the most widely recognizable leadership approaches and is used for training leaders within organizations. Contingency theory has broadened the concept of leadership to include the impact of situations on leaders. The ideas behind this approach are easily understood and are easy to apply to organizational settings. In addition, contingency theory stresses the need for
leaders to find out about subordinates' needs and then adapt their style accordingly. This approach acknowledges that employees respond differently doing dissimilar tasks, and calls for leaders to adapt their style based on the task requirements and employees' needs. Critics of contingency theory note the lack of a strong body of research to explain why certain leadership styles are more effective in some situations than others. In addition, the approach does not address how a leader handles a group, individually or as a group (Northouse, 1997).

The final approach concerns the interaction between the leader and the follower, and how effective leaders use power and influence in this interaction. Two themes have emerged, one called the social power approach, which looks at leader's one-way use of power and influence on followers. The social exchange approach emphasizes the two-way, reciprocal relationship between leaders who provide needed services to a group in exchange for the group's approval and compliance with the leader's demands (Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989). The social exchange approach recognizes that a leader builds power through their position and personality, but their authority is limited by the expectations of the followers. The social exchange approach includes the transactional and transformational leadership models, which have received increasing attention since the 1980s.

Transactional leadership focuses on the interaction between the leader and followers that is based on an exchange of things of value, which could be economic, political, or psychological in nature, to advance an agenda that is in the best interest of the leader and the subordinates. In this perspective, leaders and followers take part in a bargaining process, where the effort of followers is exchanged for specific rewards. The
interaction is monitored by honesty, fairness, and commitment. The transactional leader works within the parameters of the organizational culture, with no regard to changing the culture: to accomplish the leader’s desired ends (Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989). When commenting on transactional leadership, Burns (1978) notes:

The bargainers have no enduring purpose that holds them together; hence they may go their separate ways. A leadership act took place, but it was not one that binds the leader and follower together in a mutual and continuing pursuit of a higher purpose. (p. 20)

Transformational leadership differs from transactional leadership by going beyond meeting the basic needs of followers, in a way that both the leader and followers are raised to a higher level of motivation and morality. In this model, the purposes of the leader and followers, which may have started as separate but related, become united in common purpose (Burns, 1978). The transformational leader is associated with charisma, individual consideration, and intellectual stimulation. Charisma is the possession of traits of self-confidence, self-esteem, and self-determination. Individual consideration refers to leaders who provide a supportive climate in which they listen to the individual needs of the followers. This includes participative decision-making, development of subordinates, open communication, delegation of work, and mentoring. Intellectual stimulation is the leader’s ability to encourage creativity and innovation and to change the way followers perceive, conceptualize, and solve problems. According to this theory, the transformational leadership approach produces outcomes beyond expectations by inventing, introducing and advancing new cultural forms (Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989).
Transactional and transformational leadership recognizes that leadership is a process that occurs between leaders and followers. Because the needs of both the leader and follower are met, leadership is no longer the sole responsibility of the leader. Critics of transactional leadership note that the model focuses only on the exchange of rewards for achieved goals. In addition, transactional leaders are not concerned with individual needs or development of subordinates. Critics of transformational leadership note that, while capturing the interest of organizational scholars, it may be possible in only rare instances. Additionally, Burns' original definition of transformational leadership, over time, has come to be synonymous with innovative or motivational leadership, and has lost its original moral component (Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989).

While the approaches described above are presented in a roughly chronological order, the introduction of a new approach did not replace or negate the use of the preceding approach. Each approach has continued to have supporters that utilize one or more approach to understand and explain the concept of leadership. Each approach expands the understanding of leadership by focusing on slightly different aspects of leadership. Reflecting on the leadership theories of the past century, Rost (1993) notes:

The idea that certain people are born to be leaders remains quite prevalent in some of the anthropological, historical, and sociological frameworks of leadership, as well as in many views of leadership that have appeared in the popular press and in the arts since 1930...many management scholars resurrected the basic notion of the great man/woman theory in the 1980s in articulating the excellence theory of leadership. (p. 26)
After analyzing leadership literature during the twentieth century, Rost (1993) proposes that the leadership literature since the 1930s, including serious scholarly works stemming from all the major academic disciplines that address leadership, as well as popular writings that can be classified as "nonsense," share common elements and themes (p. 180). Rost labels this understanding of leadership as the industrial leadership paradigm. The industrial leadership paradigm originates from a structural-functionalist view of organizations, which views management as the preeminent profession. This view focuses individually on the leader who has the objective of goal achievement. In addition, the industrial leadership paradigm comes from a predominantly male model of behavior and power and articulates a utilitarian and materialistic ethical perspective.

Finally, this approach approaches leadership from a rational, quantitative, and linear methodology (Rost, 1997). Rost (1993) proposed that the study of the leadership during the twentieth century could be described as an individual possession of the leader; he defines the industrial leadership paradigm as "leadership as good management" (p. 94).

Rost (1993) has called for a change in the approach to leadership needed to operate successfully in this dynamic time, and notes that the industrial leadership paradigm is increasingly ill suited to meet the needs of a rapidly transforming world. Rost believes that there is an increasing amount of evidence supporting the conclusion that the industrial leadership paradigm is losing its hold on the Western societies and perhaps all societies, and a new paradigm will dominate these societies in the near future.

Building on the concept of leadership as relationship, originally presented by McGregor Burns in the late 1970s, Rost (1997) proposes a new approach that he labeled the postindustrial paradigm of leadership, whose defining characteristic is leadership as a
relationship. The key to Rost's approach is that leadership is not what one individual, labeled as a leader does, but what leaders and collaborators (not followers – follower reflects passivity) do together.

Servant Leadership

Robert K. Greenleaf was born in 1904 in Terre Haute, Indiana. After completing his bachelor's degree in the mid-1920s, Greenleaf purposely chose to work for a big organization in order to be a force for change. Greenleaf (1977) noted that it was a prosperous time, and he was able to go to work for American Telephone and Telegraph (AT&T), where he held a variety of positions, finishing his career as Director of Management Research. While serving for AT&T, Greenleaf also held the position of visiting lecturer for the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Sloan School of Management as well as the Harvard Business School. He also held teaching positions at Dartmouth College and the University of Virginia (Spears, 1998). Greenleaf retired from AT&T in 1964, ending a thirty-eight year professional career and beginning a second career as an author and consultant to universities, businesses, foundations, and churches.

In 1964, Greenleaf founded the Center for Applied Ethics, Inc., which was renamed the Robert K. Greenleaf Center in 1985. The center's mission "is to improve the caring and quality of all institutions through a new approach to leadership, structure, and decision-making. This new concept – called servant leadership – emphasizes increased service to others, a wholistic approach to work, promoting a sense of community, and the sharing of power in decision-making" (Greenleaf, 1977, p. 337).
It was in the years as a consultant that Greenleaf began to formulate his concept of what would be known as servant leadership. Drawing from his Quaker background and his observations during his career as a professional and consultant, the idea of servant leadership came together after Greenleaf read Herman Hesse's 1956 work, *Journey to the East* (Greenleaf, 1977). Hesse's novel tells the story of a band of travelers that included an able and humble servant named Leo. Leo maintains the group by doing their menial chores and sustains them through his spirit and song. All is well until Leo disappears; shortly thereafter, the travelers fell into conflict and the journey is abandoned. After several years, the narrator, who was one of the travelers, finds Leo and is taken into the Order that had sponsored the original journey. It was then that the narrator discovers that Leo, who he had known as a humble servant, was actually the great and noble leader of the Order. This was a significant realization to Greenleaf (1977) as he discovered that Leo was the actual "leader all of the time, but he was servant first because that was who he was "deep down inside" (p. 7). Greenleaf (1977) concluded that the story, "clearly says that the great leader is seen as a servant first, and that simple fact is the key to his greatness" (p. 7).

Greenleaf, at the age of 66, articulated his concept of servant leadership in the first of four major essays, *The Servant as a Leader*, in 1970. Greenleaf continued promoting his view of leadership until his death in 1990, applying his thoughts concerning servant leadership to various organizations and roles, including education, foundations, churches and business.
Sources of Servant Leadership

Greenleaf did not originate the idea of servant leadership. The concept of servanthood and the leader as a servant is rooted in Judeo-Christian tradition. Greenleaf (1996) observed that the word servant (along with serve and service) appears over thirteen hundred times in the Bible. Yet the concept does not belong to Judeo-Christian heritage alone. "Advocates of the [servant leadership] movement quote Jewish mystics, Buddhist masters, Hebrew prophets, Jesus, and Albert Einstein" (Wicker, 1998, p. 247). Bottum and Lenz (1998) noted in about the sixth century B.C., Lao Tzu and Buddha were commenting on servant leadership. They also include Confucius as a supporter of the servant leadership concept. Lad and Luechauer (1998) include this quote from the Dalai Lama in the introduction to their essay on servant leadership: "If you seek enlightenment for yourself simply to enhance yourself and your position, you miss the purpose; if you seek enlightenment for yourself to enable you to serve others, you are with purpose" (p. 54).

Current Writings on Servant Leadership

Servant leadership clearly fits into Rost's idea of the postindustrial leader by rejecting the idea of leadership as an individualistic endeavor with the focus resting on the leader. Instead, the focus is placed on the relationship between the leader and those being led. Page and Wong (2000), state, "Servant-leadership takes into account the fact that traditional forms of leadership are inadequate for motivating today's people to follow" (p. 71). Max DePree (1995) noted that servant leadership relies primarily on building competence and relationships with the people who work with the leader to
produce the required results. Rost (1997) identifies servant leadership as a possible alternative to the industrial leadership paradigm, but points out that the scholarly leadership literature has not been influenced by the recent renewed interest in servant leadership. While servant leadership has not received a great amount of scholarly review to this point, the approach does provide a different manner of viewing leadership.

Jaworski (1996) states that:

Greenleaf takes a fundamental stand and sets forth a new framework through which we can understand the underlying dynamics of leadership. The essence of leadership...is the desire to serve one another and to serve something beyond ourselves, a higher purpose. (p.59)

Greenleaf’s observations concerning servant leadership were based on his extensive experience, but not on research. Greenleaf (1977) stated in his original writing on servant leadership:

I give you much of a view of my adult life so that you will have some perspective on where the content of this book comes from, because it comes largely out of my own experience, plus watching and talking to able practitioners, and not from scholarship. (p. 3)

His experiences and observations led him to desire a future where, “leaders will bend their efforts to serve with skill, understanding, and spirit, and that followers will be responsive only to able servants who would lead them” (Greenleaf, 1977, p. 4).

Greenleaf called the servant leader to be a servant first and a leader second. The servant leader’s motivation is to “make sure that other people’s highest priority needs are being served” (Greenleaf, 1977, p. 13). Page and Wong (2000) expand on this concept by
noting. "Servant-leadership should not be equated with self-serving motives to please people or to satisfy one's need for acceptance and approval" (p. 71). Neuschel adds to this thought, and encourages leaders to "first serve that they may lead better" (1998, forward).

While Greenleaf wrote and spoke extensively about servant leadership, he did not provide a clear definition of servant leadership. Greenleaf, based on his informal observations, did identify several characteristics of servant leaders, foremost of which was the leader's motivation for leading. Greenleaf (1977) noted, "The servant leader is servant first... It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first" (p. 13). Greenleaf goes on to describe a way to identify a servant leader.

The best test, and difficult to administer, is: Do those served grow as persons? Do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants? And, what is the effect on the least privileged in society; will they benefit, or, at least, not be further deprived? (1977, p. 13-14)

Many authors have drawn from and expanded on Greenleaf's ideas, most notably Larry Spears, the Director for the Greenleaf Center for Servant-Leadership. Spears (1995), drawing from Greenleaf's writings, identified ten characteristics of a servant leader. These characteristics are: 1) listening, 2) empathy, 3) healing, 4) awareness, 5) persuasion, 6) conceptualization, 7) foresight, 8) stewardship, 9) commitment to the growth of people, and 10) building community. While contributing significantly to the literature on servant leadership, Spear's work is not scholarly in its approach, and therefore, has not advanced the concept in the scholarly discussion of leadership.
In addition, a large number of popular writers have contributed to the growing literature on servant leadership. Peter Senge (1995) highlights how Greenleaf’s writings on servant leadership acknowledge the interrelatedness of leadership, and the how Greenleaf’s idea that the leader should listen first, then talk, are in stark contrast to the predominate leadership approaches. Steven Covey (1998) says this in regard to servant leadership: “That is what the whole future is going to be. It’s interdependency, it’s connection, and it’s the sharing of power in decision making” (p. xv). Ken Blanchard (1996), Peter Block (1998), James Kouzes (1998), and Margaret Wheatley (1998) have acclaimed the servant leadership concept as a relevant approach to meeting the complex leadership challenges now facing organizations, including colleges and universities. Blanchard (1998, 1999), Page and Wong (2000), and Sergiovanni (Brandt, 1992) have applied the concept of servant leadership to organizations.

Servant Leadership in Organizations

When servant leadership is practiced at the organizational level, an emphasis is placed on developing, empowering, and including employees. As Greenleaf (1977) stated when assessing the servant leader:

Do those being served grow as persons? Do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servant leaders? And, what is the effect on the least privileged in society; will they benefit, or at least, not be further deprived? (pp. 13 – 14)
Page and Wong (2000) note that, "Servant-leadership incorporates the ideals of empowerment, total quality, team building, and participatory management, and the service ethic into a leadership philosophy" (p. 69).

Tom Sergiovanni noted regarding the concept of servant-leadership and organizational structure, "I think we've had it upside down. Traditionally we've served our leaders. I'm suggesting that in an idea-based organization ... the person with the moral authority is cast in the role of serving the enterprise" (Brandt, 1992, p. 46).

Blanchard (1996), as well as Page and Wong (2000) have applied the servant leader concept to the organization. The typical organization is structured in a pyramid, with the leader at the top point of the pyramid and the employees at the bottom. Decisions are made at the top of the pyramid and passed down through the organization to the employees to implement. In this example, the leader is responsible for the outcomes and the employees are responsive to the leader. The focus of the organization is on the leader, and according to Blanchard (1996), the employees "spend all their time looking over their shoulder trying to figure out what their boss wants rather than focusing on the needs of the customer" (p. 24). This organizational framework is reflective of the industrial model of leadership described by Rost (1993, 1997).

The servant leadership organization addresses this dilemma by viewing the traditional pyramid model as a fluid structure that functions similar to sand in an egg timer that flows both directions (Page and Wong, 2000). The traditional pyramid with the leader at the top functions to provide the vision, mission, goals and values for the organization, while an inverted pyramid with the leader at the bottom serving the followers by enabling them to reach their full potential for accomplishing the mission of
the organization. The "sand" flows back and forth between the establishment of vision and mission and the implementation of the vision. As Blanchard (1996) noted, "When you turn the pyramid upside down ... the people become responsible and the job of management is to be responsive to them" (p. 25).

The job of the servant leader within the servant organization is to help the employees accomplish their goals. The leader then functions in different roles depending on how the pyramid is situated. The leader determines when the pyramid needs to be reversed. When the organization is functioning at its optimum, the leader becomes one of many partners in a circle of partners who are all equally committed to the organization successful in accomplishing its goals and mission (Page and Wong, 2000). Bensimon, Neumann and Birnbaum (1989) state that "leaders are more servants of the group than masters, and they are expected to listen, to persuade, to leave themselves open to influence, and to share the burden of decision making" (p. 55). Bilezikian (1997) notes, "The motivation should not be the desire to rule, control, or command, but to support and assist others, just as a servant does" (p. 131).

Servant leadership is an attitude toward the responsibilities of leadership. What the leader does and how the leader accomplishes their tasks are shaped by their personal identity. Servant leadership to Greenleaf, began "with an enlargement of identity, followed by behaviors" (Frick, 1998). The difficulty in operationalizing the qualities related to the internal motivations of the servant leader, such as humility, integrity, and a servant's attitude, has possibly led to the absence of attempts to measure servant leadership. Perhaps many interested in servant leadership do not do so because of the
“fear of operationalizing of servant-leadership runs the risk of reductionism and trivialization of the concept” (Page and Wong, 2009, p. 85).

Page and Wong (2000) argue for servant leadership theorists to develop a reliable and valid instrument for the measurement of servant leadership. They then created an instrument, which is still in development, based on their experiences and the literature on servant leadership. Limited testing of the instrument, the Self-Assessment of Servant-Leadership, has been encouraging. The resulting model has twelve categories of servant leadership characteristics, which are grouped into four orientations, each representing four common domains of leadership: personality, relationship, tasks, and process.

Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA)

Laub (1999) was among the first to systematically examine servant leadership, utilizing an extensive Delphi Study to the topic. Laub invited experts in the field of servant leadership to identify the characteristics of servant leadership. Using the results of the Delphi Study, Laub defines servant leadership as 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. The focus of servant leadership becomes the relationship between the leader and those being served.
Related Studies on Servant Leadership

An increasing number of researchers are looking at servant leadership in both business and educational settings. This section will review pertinent qualitative and quantitative research on the topic of servant leadership.

Walker (1997) used a case study approach to examine Crowder College, an institution that openly embraces the concept of servant leadership. This same school has served as a higher education example of servant leadership principals for other case studies, including Smith and Farnsworth (2202). Drawing from Greenleaf’s writings on servant leadership, Walker examined the college against four themes: 1) increased service to others, 2) a holistic approach to work, 3) a sense of community, and 4) a shared decision making process. In order to operationalize the philosophy of servant leadership, the college purposefully redesigned their mission statement, curriculum, institutional goals, and organizational structure to support the new approach.

Taylor-Gillham (1998) studied a single school district recommended by the Greenleaf Center utilizing ten characteristics of servant leadership identified from Greenleaf’s writings by Spears (1995). Taylor-Gillham used a case study approach and semistructured interviews to examine how these ten characteristics impacted the professional and personal aspects of the lives of the educators. The researcher then triangulated the ten characteristics with the implicit findings from the educators and explicit responses of an expert servant leadership panel. Superintendents were found to have a large degree of influence in the degree in which servant leadership was practiced in the school district.
Wheaton (1999) used quantitative methodology and the ten characteristics of servant leadership identified by Spears to investigate the relationship between qualities that staff in public school systems associated with effective school superintendents. Selected school staff from six school districts in the state of Washington was asked to identify the characteristics they would look for in the hiring of a superintendent. The findings were then examined using Spear's ten servant leadership characteristics. Wheaton noted that there appeared to be a consensus that the school staff valued six of the ten characteristics of superintendents. These were listening, empathy, foresight, awareness, conceptualization, and teamwork.

Lubin (2001) utilized a descriptive study to identify the behaviors of visionary leaders in small public school districts and examine their congruency with Spear's ten servant leadership characteristics. Lubin found a high degree of congruency of visionary leader's behaviors and nine of the ten servant leadership characteristics.

Foster (2000) took a slightly different approach, by examining the organizational barriers that impede servant leadership effectiveness within an organization. Foster interviewed twenty participants within a large corporation who were recognized as servant leaders to identify barriers to the day-to-day practice of servant leaders. Foster identified nine significant barriers to the practice of servant leadership, including: 1) lack of trust, 2) paternalism, 3) conflicting leadership styles, 4) misunderstanding of servant leadership, 5) lack of empowerment, 6) self-serving personal agendas, 7) limited communication, 8) lack of development, and 9) inadequate listening (p. iv). Foster noted that in order to be effective, the organizational culture must support the practice of servant leadership.
Livovich (1999) investigated the extent to which Spear's ten characteristics of servant leadership were perceived in the responding 229 public school superintendents in the state of Indiana. Livovich developed a questionnaire that operationalized the ten servant leadership characteristics. Livovich found that superintendents who had an earned doctorate, six to ten years of experience, and who represented school districts with a large student population made responses that correlated closest with the ten servant leadership characteristics.

Horsman (2001) examined the extent leaders today exhibit the six characteristics of servant—leadership, as described by Laub (1999) and whether a significant relationship existed between servant—leadership and personal dimensions of spirit, and whether their was congruity between personal aspects of spirit and one's work life. Horsman used a questionnaire composed of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) and the Dimensions of Spirit (DS) instrument. This combined instrument was used to survey 608 participants in 34 different organizations of a variety of types. Horsman found that significant differences existed in the demographic variables of age, education level, years employed, and position/role within the organization.

Girard (2000) developed three parallel surveys, one for each category of superintendent, school board president, and principal. The instrument measured superintendent behavior as related to servant leadership qualities, job satisfaction, and identifying characteristics of the population. The population of the study included all the superintendents of K—12 school districts who had served in their current position for more than three years. Girard chose to use nine of Spear's ten characteristics of a servant leader. These included: 1) listening, 2) empathy, 3) healing, 4) foresight, 5) awareness,
6) persuasion, 7) conceptualization and communication, 8) commitment to the growth of others, and 9) building community. Girard did not use Spear’s servant leadership characteristic of stewardship. Girard found a significant correlation between principal’s job satisfaction and all nine servant leadership characteristics. In addition, Girard found a high correlation between the nine servant leadership characteristics and school district working relationships. Girard also found that school board presidents tended to rate the perception of servant leadership characteristics in the superintendents higher than the principals.

*Job Satisfaction*

Job satisfaction has been a topic of great interest for organizations and employees and has received significant attention in the literature related to higher education. This interest could be related to the underlying idea that job satisfaction and job productivity are related. Researchers have investigated a number of factors that may impact job satisfaction, including the gender and race of employees as well as the organizational location and employment level of the employee.

Implicit in the development of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) questionnaire is the idea that the perception of the practice of servant leadership behaviors by an organization’s leadership will have a favorable impact on employee’s job satisfaction. Laub (1999) suggests that “the more strongly respondents perceived that servant leadership exists in their organization the higher their job satisfaction level” (p. 85). Girard’s (2000) findings support this notion, reporting a significant correlation
between the perception of servant leadership characteristics in superintendents and job satisfaction of principals in twelve school districts in Illinois.

Laub (1999) subscribes to the idea that a high job satisfaction positively impacts individual productivity and contribution. Laub (1999) proposes 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).

Interest in job satisfaction, especially in relationship to job performance and productivity has existed since the 1930s and the human relations movement that followed. The Hawthorne studies have been credited with emphasizing the linkage between employee attitudes and performance (Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton, 2001). For many years, organizational theorists promoted the idea that a happy worker is a productive worker. However, when the relationship was studied, satisfaction and performance were found to be only slightly related, and certainly not to the level that the theory has been promoted in organizational literature. Iaffaldano and Muchinsky (1985), in their influential meta-analysis of job satisfaction and performance, called the relationship an “illusory correlation, a perceived relation between two variables that we logically or intuitively think should interrelate, but in fact do not” (p. 270). Judge, Thoresen, Bono, and Patton (2001) reexamined the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance, citing the new developments that have given rise to renewed discussion on the topic. Their study, a more recent meta-analysis of the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance, found a stronger correlation between the two factors than suggested in earlier studies, especially when looking at overall job
satisfaction and overall job performance (p. 383). In addition, their study indicated that a stronger satisfaction-performance correlation exists in high-complexity jobs than in low-complexity jobs, suggesting a possible connection between position level, job performance and job satisfaction. Judge, Thoresen, Bono, and Patton (2004) conclude that global job satisfaction correlates more highly with job performance than recognized earlier.

In addition to examining the relationship between job satisfaction and performance, researchers have looked at factors contributing to job satisfaction, and found that job factors such as achievement, recognition, responsibility, possibility of advancement, and salary have a relationship with job satisfaction. Therefore, “when a worker feels a high level of achievement, is intensely involved, and is appropriately compensated by recognition, responsibility, and salary, job satisfaction is enhanced and job dissatisfaction is decreased” (Hagedorn, 2000, p. 8).

In addition to the approaches listed above, gender is another frequently examined factor of job satisfaction. In fact, gender is among the most researched job satisfaction demographic, which has produced mixed results with respect to job satisfaction. Laub (1999) reported that he found no correlation between gender and job satisfaction in his study, additional research could reveal a relationship.

While the literature has reported mixed results concerning the relationship between job satisfaction and gender, researchers agree that some differences do exist. “There is considerable agreement that males are more satisfied with their salary and benefits and that family factors play a larger role for women” (Hagedorn, 2000, p. 8). In higher education, Blackhurst (2000) reported that women in student services represent a
disproportionately small number in senior administrative levels and are less likely to be satisfied with their current jobs and also have a higher attrition than men. In addition, Blackhurst (2000) reports that inequity in pay and limited opportunity for advancement could significantly contribute to job dissatisfaction for women. Anderson, Guido-DiBrito, and Morrell (2000) found that female academic administrators with advanced degrees reported higher job satisfaction than women with only a bachelor’s degree. In fact, they found that female administrators with Ph.D.'s have the highest job satisfaction of all employees, followed by men with Ph.D.'s, men without Ph.D.'s, and females without Ph.D.'s. This supports the notion that increased education, experience and job complexity contribute to greater job satisfaction, regardless of the gender of the employee. Laub (1999) reports a similar high correlation between employment rank and job satisfaction that could be explained at least in part by the correlation between position and the servant leadership score on the OLA.

Job Satisfaction in Student Services

Student Services is comprised of the professionals who provide the services needed by college students, such as housing, health center, campus security, and testing, as well as providing student activities, personal and career counseling, intramurals, residence life, mentoring, and the chapel program. Although job satisfaction is an important and frequently investigated topic, and student services are a central component of the university, most research in higher education has been focused on faculty (Tarver, Canada, Lim, 1999).
Anderson, Guido-DiBrito, and Morrell (2000) suggest that Student Services professionals may be less satisfied than the general population, perhaps due to the general low status ascribed to student services as a profession in some university administrative hierarchies. However, Ellis (2002) found a high level of satisfaction in student services management in church-related college. Ellis found that ideological fit, which is comprised of the correlation of the institution's and individual's personal mission, philosophy of education and religious beliefs, was the best predictor of job satisfaction.

Much of the research on job satisfaction in Student Services has focused on finding differences based on demographic variables, such as age, education level, experience, and gender. These studies suggest that increased education and experience produce greater job satisfaction. In addition, Upper-level administrators in private institutions tend to be very satisfied with most areas of their jobs. Senior level administrators in these same institutions reported higher levels of job satisfaction than mid-level administrators. It has also been suggested that entry-level professionals in student affairs are the least satisfied with their positions (Anderson, Guido-DiBrito, and Morrell, 2000). When private institutions are compared to public institutions, student services professionals in the public sector report a higher job satisfaction.

*Job Satisfaction in Academic Affairs*

The Academic Affairs is comprised of both faculty and the administrative personnel and support for the area directly responsible for the delivery and support of the academic mission of the institution. This includes the faculty and administrative structure supporting the full-time teaching faculty, including Department Chairs,
administrative faculty such as Librarians, Life Calling and Leadership Director, Director of Records and Director of Institutional Research. In addition, various academic administrators such as athletic coaches, various administrative library employees, and the life coaches also report in the academic area. Most of the research on job satisfaction in academic affairs focuses on the faculty.

Anderson, Guido-DiBrito, and Morrell (2000) report that academic administrators perceive dissatisfaction from the nature of the work they are required to perform, yet report only slightly lower levels of job satisfaction than the normative data for administrators with similar educational levels. Again, female administrators report significantly lower levels of job satisfaction than male administrators in comparable positions (Anderson, Guido-DiBrito, and Morrell, 2000).

Nyquist, Hitchcock, and Tehrani (2000) suggest three categories of faculty satisfaction: 1) organizational factors, 2) job-related factors, and 3) personal factors. The organizational factors relate to the institutional environments in which the faculty operate. These factors include the availability of resources, perceived opportunities for advancement, the quality of mentoring for junior faculty, gender-based obstacles to success, appreciation or respect by colleagues, faculty role in decision-making, and commitment to the organization (pp. 37 -- 38). The researchers also note that there is a clear gender difference in the perception of organizational factors. In addition, they report that female medical school faculty reports a lower satisfaction in respect to institutional environment.

Job-related factors include relate to the specific elements of the faculty’s job, including autonomy, stimulation from work, gratification from teaching, availability of
time and funds for research, workload, and income and job security. Nyquist, Hitchcock, and Teherani (2000) found that teaching was the most satisfying activity for faculty. The elements of this category all contribute to job satisfaction when positive, and can be a source of dissatisfaction when negative.

Personal factors connect the faculty member to their life outside of the institution. This includes family and other external activities, as well as how these elements interact. When a perception that work interferes with home life or that home life interferes with work, job satisfaction can be negatively impacted (Nyquist, Hitchcock, and Teherani, 2000).

Little research exists to support the idea that leadership style, especially servant leadership, has direct impact on the job satisfaction of employees. However, the research has shown a connection between employee’s job satisfaction and achievement, recognition, responsibility. These are all areas that could be directly or indirectly influenced by a servant leadership approach.
CHAPTER 3

METHOD

Chapter 3 outlines the methodology for the study. The chapter consists of seven sections: research design, description of the sample, instrumentation, collection procedures, data analysis, limitations of the study, and ethical considerations.

Research Design

A cross-sectional survey design was used to assess the perception of servant leadership characteristics and job satisfaction held among the members of one midwestern church related institution. In order to gain a comprehensive view, participants were selected from two divisions central to the institution’s educational mission: Academic Affairs and Student Services. These two divisions, or functional areas, were then separated into the three administrative levels of control within the university: technical, management, and institutional (Thompson, 1967; Birnbaum, 1988).

The choice of Academic Affairs and Student Services for the study was based on the central role these two divisions play in fulfilling the mission and operation of the institution. A recent report issued jointly by the American Association for Higher Education, the American College Personnel Association, and the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (1998), acknowledged the central role these two areas play in student learning: the primary objective of a baccalaureate institution.
The choice of the two divisions does not mean that other divisions within the university are not important or that the study could not be expanded to include the remaining divisions. However, it is in the particular interest of the researcher to focus on the functional areas of academic affairs and student services because the role of each is important to the primary mission of the institution.

Thompson (1967) indicated that there are three distinct levels of responsibility and control within an organization: the technical, management, and institutional. The primary focus of the technical sublevel is the effective accomplishment of the task. Birnbaum (1988) notes the "Understanding the technical subsystem is important because it describes the characteristic ways in which the colleges and universities transform their inputs into outputs" (p. 42). In this study, those applying the technology of the institution differ greatly in their preparation and skills. The majority of faculty has advanced graduate degrees and holds a special role within the institution's governance, holding a large influence in the development of the curriculum and how it is delivered to the students. Therefore, the faculty were considered separately for research questions one and two.

The management level services the technical level by mediating between the technical level and those who use its products by obtaining the resources necessary for the accomplishment of a task. The management level administers the technical suborganization by deciding such things as the scope of operations, employment, and purchasing policy. According to Birnbaum (1988), the key administrative task is to provide management structures and behaviors that will most effectively support the technical system given the unique demands of the environment. The management level is
comprised of mid-level administrators who make decisions that impact the division but have little influence outside of their area.

The institutional leadership level was comprised of the suborganization that included both the technical and management suborganizations and is a part of a larger organizational system. The institutional level gives the organization direction and meaning, as well as high-level support that make the implementation of the organizational goals possible. Decisions at this level impact the entire organization.

The administrative level was determined by the institutional position rankings, provided by the University Human Resources Office, and membership in the academic affairs or student services functional area determined by vice presidential reporting unit. A random sample of 70 of the 101 full-time teaching faculty was used to determine the participants for the faculty subgroup. Figure 1 describes the population and a complete list of positions surveyed is contained in Appendix A.

The study did not include employees who work in divisions outside of academic affairs or student services. In addition, the study did not include hourly staff, part-time employees, or adjunct faculty. Permission for this study was obtained from the President of the institution prior to the distribution of the combined instrument.

Description of the Institution

The institution underwent a major transition between 1985 and 2000. This is evidenced by the three strategic measurements, enrollment growth, fundraising success, and enhanced educational image, which can be used to indicate if the institution has successfully transformed (Taylor, Meyerson, and Massey, 1993).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President, Vice President, Cabinet, College Deans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. The figure depicts the population of this study. The left-hand column represents the student services area and the right-hand column represents academic affairs. The top area represents the Institutional Level.

A theologically conservative denominational school established in 1920, the institution remained a tuition-driven small college for the majority of its history. According to Cramer (2002), the institution in this study “had been moderately successful and much of its constituency, if not happy, was content with the ‘status quo’” (p. 74). The institution was never in a strong financial position, and due to flat enrollment and revenues, combined with uncontrolled expenditures, the institution fell into financial crisis by 1986. Long deferred maintenance had left facilities in dire need of attention, and the institution was forced to mortgage a building in order to meet payroll. All internal funds were depleted and significant internal and external borrowing had occurred (Cramer, 2002). The institution was in a state of financial exigency, and the situation demanded immediate and radical action.
The transformation began with the Board of Trustee’s hiring of a new president with a vision for change and a passion for maintaining the institution’s mission. The President immediately began addressing four critical areas simultaneously: the financial situation, increasing student enrollment, the enhancement of facilities, and improving the quality of academic programs (Cramer, 2002).

The institution’s financial situation was greatly enhanced by the addition of adult degree programs, which provided financial stability and the platform that allowed the President to successfully address the critical areas. The resources and exposure provided by the rapidly expanding adult degree programs provided the capital for investment in the physical plant of the main campus, including addressing deferred maintenance and entering into what can only be described as an aggressive building campaign. The vastly improved main campus and expanded adult program led to a steadily increasing student population with the overall growth in enrollment increasing 50% over a ten year period (Cramer, 2002).

The expansion of enrollment and facilities was accomplished by a greater emphasis being placed on academic rigor and the recruitment of Ph. D. trained faculty. The faculty increased from 64 full-time traditional faculty to 104 in a ten year period. In addition, faculty salaries increased over 50% and are among the highest for this type of institution in the region (Cramer, 2002). During the same time period, the institution’s student body increased in average composite SAT scores from 805 to 1083 and average composite ACT scores from 20 to 24. The institution introduced an Honor’s College and Honor’s Program, and began recruiting National Merit Scholars for the first time.

Campus Life Magazine, a magazine published by Christianity Today, has recently ranked
the institution as number one in spiritual atmosphere, number four in campus facilities, and number nine in faculty reputation.

During this same period, through increased fund raising efforts, the institution's endowment grew from just over $1,900,000 to over $16,500,000. Through the expansion of the donor base and capital campaigns, annual giving to the institution rose from just over one million dollars a year in 1988 to a high of $16 million in 2001. This increase in donations, as well as a five year total of $35 million in grants, helped fund the construction of over $100,000,000 dollars in building construction and renovation (University source). In addition, the institution's operating budget rose from $8.2 million per year in 1987 to over $81 million in 2002.

Utilizing the three strategic measurements of enrollment growth, fundraising success, and enhanced educational image, the institution in this study has been transformed from a financially struggling institution to a financially healthy institution with a growing reputation. The positive growth on these measures led one researcher to conclude that the institution had truly been transformed under the leadership of the current President, stating that the institution is, "in all reality, a different institution than the one that existed in 1987" (Cramer, 2002, p. 136).

-Description of the Sample

A total of 170 employees of the Institutional Leadership and the divisions of Student Services and Academic Affairs were invited to participate in the survey. Three employees had left their positions during the survey process and therefore were unable to participate. Each employee of the Institutional Leadership, Management, and Technical
Level were given the opportunity to respond. Of the 167 invited to participate, 116 completed and returned the survey for an overall response rate of 70%.

The response rate by administrative level ranged from 92% for the Institutional Leadership to 54% for the faculty. The management and technical levels had similar response rates of 79% and 85% respectively. When viewing the response rate by functional area, student services had a 95% return rate while academic affairs, including the faculty, had a return rate of 61%. Table 1 provides a detailed summary of the response rates.

Table 1

Respondents by administrative level and functional area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Distributed</th>
<th>Returned</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Level</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>84.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Area</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>69.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The gender distribution of the 116 respondents shows that approximately 52% were male. While the overall response was equitable, the administrative levels within the study varied greatly. The institutional leadership level was almost totally male, with 92% of the respondents being male. The management level was comprised of a slight majority of males at 56%, while the respondents in the technical level were 77% female. The faculty respondents were 66% male. When viewed by functional area, student services
had a slight majority of females at 58%, while academic affairs, including the faculty, had an exactly even division of females and males.

In addition to the variation in administrative level, the gender distribution of the subgroups within the sample also showed considerable variation. As stated earlier, Institutional Leadership was overwhelmingly male at 92%, while the respondents in the technical level of Academic Affairs were 93% female. The management level personnel in Student Services and Faculty had similar distributions of approximately two-thirds male, while the technical level employees of Student Services report the opposite, with two-thirds female. The respondent in the management level of Academic Affairs were an equal 50% female and male. Table 2 depicts the gender distribution for the six subgroups: Institutional Leadership, Management level in Student Services, Management Level in Academic Affairs, Technical level in Student Services, Technical level in Academic Affairs, and Faculty.

Similarly, variety in subgroups was seen in the years of education of the respondents. As one would expect, the participants were fairly well educated, with the mean number of years of education for the respondents at 18.16 years, or slightly more than an earned master’s degree. Interestingly, over 40% of the respondents reported 20 or more years of schooling. Not surprisingly, the Faculty has the highest mean with approximately 19.6 years of education, with the Institutional Leadership slightly lower at 19.4. As one would expect, the employees of the technical subgroups in Student Services and Academic Affairs (not including the Faculty) reported the lowest means reporting 16.4 and 14.9 years of education respectively. The respondents in the Academic Affairs Management
subgroup and Student Services subgroup reported similar mean scores of 18.9 and 18.4 respectively.

Table 2

Gender of OLA-MSQ respondents by subgroup

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Leadership</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>92.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instrumentation

Two instruments were used in the study, the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) and the Short Form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). The two instruments were administered at the same time and included three demographic questions: gender, number of years of education, number of years of employment at the institution. The OLA is described first, followed by the MSQ.
**Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA)**

Laub (1999) developed the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) “to provide organizations and teams with a tool with which to assess the perceived presence of servant leadership characteristics within the group” (p. 36). Laub (1999) states that the “OLA is applicable for use by individuals, teams, work units, company divisions or departments, or with entire organizations (p. 50). In addition, Laub (1999) suggests that the OLA could be used for the purpose of prediction and diagnosis within an organization. According to Laub (1999), “An organization that wishes to be more servant oriented could assess itself to find weaknesses and strengths to be addressed” (p. 88).

The OLA design assumes that leadership is shared, thus it is applicable across all levels of an organization. The instrument was designed to assess and compare groups within an organization, portions of an organization, or the entire organization (Laub, 1999). The OLA has a 1998 copyright, and Laub has granted permission to use the instrument (Appendix B). This study utilized the full, 66-item OLA as it was intended, without any additions or changes.

**Development of the OLA**

Because servant leadership was not a well defined theoretically, Laub was faced with the task of operationalizing the concept of servant leadership. To accomplish this, Laub invited a panel of experts to identify the principle components of servant leadership using a Delphi process. The Delphi process is a method of developing consensus among people who share a common interest or expertise. The panel of experts, through the
Delphi process, identified six definitional constructs: Values People, Develops People, Builds Community, Displays Authenticity, Provides Leadership, and Shares Leadership.

Then, Laub constructed the items for the instrument based on the six definitional constructs, using characteristics that the Delphi panel identified as necessary or essential. The six subscale items were each written from three different perspectives, producing three different sections of the instrument: assessing the entire organization, assessing the leadership of the organization, and assessing both from the perspective of the respondent’s personal experience (p. 51).

Laub next developed a 74-question version of the OLA, based on the six definitional constructs to which he added six questions related to job satisfaction. This version was then field tested with 828 participants from 41 different organizations, representing four different categories: religious non-profit organizations, secular non-profit organizations, for profit organizations, and public agencies. Laub used individuals as units of measurement for his study. After the field test, Laub reduced the OLA instrument to 60 items, and retained the six job satisfaction questions, in order to decrease the time it takes to complete the instrument. The questions that were removed had lower item-to-test correlations and their removal did not affect the instrument validity (p. 78). The OLA is scored on a five point Likert-style scale, beginning with “strongly disagree” (a response of 1) and ranging to “strongly agree” (a response of 5).

Reliability and Validity of the OLA

The OLA has been demonstrated to be reliable for measuring the defined definitional constructs of the servant leader in an organizational context. However, it
should be noted that the high correlation between scales rules out the possibility of using the individual definitional constructs for research purposes (Laub, 1999).

Laub (1999) reported that the reliability score for revised 66-item OLA instrument, using the Cronbach-Alphas coefficient, was .9802 (p. 66). A reliability coefficient of .80 or higher is considered acceptable in most Social Science applications (http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/spss/faq, October 29, 2001). Laub (1999) reported that each of the six sub-scores had a Cronbach-Alphas coefficient of .90 or above (p. 67). Table 3 reports the Cronbach-Alphas coefficients for each of the six OLA constructs. Horsman (2001) verified the reliability of the OLA instrument and each of the six sub-scores (p. 55).

Table 3

Cronbach-Alphas coefficients of the OLA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OLA Instrument</th>
<th>OLA (Alpha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Six OLA Constructs</td>
<td>.9802 (Field Test)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values People</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develops People</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds Community</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displays Authenticity</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Leadership</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shares Leadership</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Construct scores are rounded to the second decimal.

Laub (1999) indicated that the validity of the underlying constructs is strong based on the Delphi process and participation of the panel of experts, but suggests that
ongoing process of validation was necessary to show consistency with the construct (p. 87).

Interpreting the OLA

In order to differentiate between and give meaning to scores provided by the OLA, Laub (2002) developed an evaluation process to use with individual organizations. Laub adopted the three categories of leadership described by Millard (2000) on his servant leadership paradigm. Laub divided each category into two subsets, which resulted in the six organizational categories of his schema. The organization is placed in one of six organizational categories based on the organization’s mean OLA score. Figure 2 depicts the six organizational categories. A detailed explanation of Laub’s six organizational categories is listed in Appendix C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Category</th>
<th>OLA Score Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Org(^1) Absence of servant leadership characteristics</td>
<td>60.0 – 119.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org(^2) Autocratic organization</td>
<td>119.5 – 179.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org(^3) Negatively paternalistic organization</td>
<td>179.5 – 209.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org(^4) Positively paternalistic organization</td>
<td>209.5 – 239.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org(^5) Servant-oriented organization</td>
<td>239.5 – 269.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org(^6) Servant-minded organization</td>
<td>269.5 – 300.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Laub’s six organizational categories and OLA score ranges

Laub (2002) used exponents to identify each category because he believed that the energy and effort to change from one category to the next was exponential in nature rather than arithmetic. According to Laub, an Org\(^1\) represents a total absence of servant
leadership characteristics perceived by the participants, while the $\text{Org}^6$ represents the
perception of a total integration of servant leadership characteristics by the organization's
leadership. Organizational categories $\text{Org}^2$ through $\text{Org}^5$ represent a progressive
integration of the six servant leadership characteristics described by Laub (1999, 2002).

The first two categories are generally characterized by the leadership focusing on
their own needs and desires. Power is yielded to force compliance and the leader expects
the employees to serve the leader (Millard, 2000). According to Laub (2002), an $\text{Org}^1$
Category, where there is no perception of servant leadership characteristics in practice, is
characterized by the devaluation of employees by the leadership. All decisions are made
by the leadership and power is utilized for benefit of the leadership. Employees have no
power and goals are unclear. An $\text{Org}^2$ Category, which Laub describes as an Autocratic
Organization, is characterized by the leadership forcing compliance among the
employees. Employees often feel used and a very low level of trust exists within the
organization. The organization is very individualistic and competitive, with little or no
collaboration.

Laub (2002) identifies the next two categories as Paternalistic, with the $\text{Org}^3$
Category described as a Negatively Paternalistic Organization and the $\text{Org}^4$ Category a
Positively Paternalistic Organization. These categories are characterized by leaders who
often assume their focus is on the employees but exhibit behaviors that reflect autocratic
leaders (Millard, 2000). An $\text{Org}^3$ is characterized by a focus on the top levels of the
organization. In this category, employees are given the authority to make some
decisions, but important decisions remain at the top levels of the institution. Employees
sense they are valued more for their contribution than for who they are as people. An
Org^4 Category is characterized by a greater level of shared power, yet important decisions are still perceived to come from the top leadership. Many employees sense they are valued as people and as producers. Employees perceive a moderate level of trust from leadership, but fear they can lose it easily.

The last two categories Laub (2002) identifies as servant-oriented and servant-minded. In these categories, the leadership is focused on those being led. The leaders at this level are perceived to trust and empower employees while seeking no personal recognition (Millard, 2000). An Org^5 Category is characterized by the authenticity of all levels of employees. It is a “people first” environment, where people are trusted and feel value throughout the organization. The top leaders share power and leadership and employees are empowered to make important decisions. An Org^6 is characterized by a high level of community where people work in teams and collaborate effectively. Employees perceive dynamic and effective leadership at all levels of the organization (Laub, 2002).

In addition to the organizational category of the OLA score for the entire institution, Laub (2002) also includes what he calls the Readiness for Change (RFC). Laub (2002) posits that the RFC indicates the level of change necessary for the organization to develop into a servant leadership organization. The RFC compares the OLA scores of the institutional leadership and technical levels for each of the six OLA subscales. This determines how close the perception of the presence and strength of servant leadership characteristics in the organization is viewed by the institutional leadership and technical level employees. A low score would indicate a wide gap in perception held by the institutional leadership and technical level employees. Laub then
assigns the organization to one of six levels of RFC scores: Almost no RFC; Limited RFC; Some RFC; Moderate RFC; Good RFC; and Excellent RFC.

_Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire – Short Form (MSQ)_

**Instrumentation**

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) is designed to measure an employee’s satisfaction with his or her job. There are three forms: two long forms, each with twenty-one scales, one developed in 1977 and one developed in 1967, and a three scale short form. This study utilized the short form of the MSQ. The short form of the MSQ measures satisfaction with several specific aspects of work and work environments and can be scored on the three scales of: intrinsic satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction, and general satisfaction (Weiss, Dawis, et al., 1967). Permission was obtained to administer the MSQ (Appendix D).

**Development of the MSQ**

The MSQ was developed from a continuing series of research studies known as the Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation or the Work Adjustment Project. The studies, began in 1957, have two objectives: “the development of diagnostic tools for assessing the work adjustment ‘potential’ of applicants for vocational rehabilitation, and the evaluation of work adjustment outcomes” (Weiss, Dawis, et. al., 1967, p. v). The conceptual framework for the research is entitled the Theory of Work Adjustment, and uses the correspondence between the work personality and the work environment as the principle reason for observed satisfaction. The researchers (1967) go on to state, “Work
adjustment is predicted by matching an individual’s work personality with work environments. In other words, work adjustment depends on how well an individual’s abilities correspond to the ability requirements in work and how well his needs correspond to the reinforcers available in the work environment” (p. v).

The short form of the MSQ was developed using twenty representative items, one from each scale of the long form. The items chosen corresponded highest with their respective scales. The resulting short form was then administered to 1,460 employed men and the resulting data were factor-analyzed. Two factors resulted, intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction. In addition, all twenty items were scored as one scale. Therefore, the short form can be scored for intrinsic satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction, and general satisfaction.

The short form of the MSQ takes only five minutes to complete. In order to reduce the time to complete the combined OLA and MSQ instruments, the short form was used.

Reliability and Validity of the MSQ

The short form of the MSQ has been demonstrated to be reliable for measuring the three scales of intrinsic satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction, and general satisfaction. The Hoyt reliability coefficient scores are shown in Table 4. The stability of the short form is currently under study. However, the stability of the General Satisfaction Scale may be inferred from the data on the stability of the long-form MSQ since both scales use the same 20 items (Weiss, Dawis, et. al., 1967). The authors report a test-retest correlation of the General Satisfaction scale of the long-form MSQ of
.89 over a one-week period and .70 over a one-year interval (Weiss, Dawis, et al., 1967, p. 24).

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Form of the MSQ</th>
<th>MSQ (Alpha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Satisfaction Scale</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Satisfaction Scale</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Satisfaction Scale</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Alpha score is for the median reliability coefficients for 1,460 participants employed in one of six occupational groups.

The validity of the short form MSQ can be inferred from the validity of the long-form. There is good evidence for construct validity, which indicates that the MSQ is performing according to theoretical expectations. Indirect evidence supporting construct validity can be derived from studies of the Minnesota Importance Questionnaire, which is based on the same theory of work adjustment. The analysis of the data from these studies yielded evidence for seven of the sixteen scales studied. Further analysis produced evidence of construct validity for three other scales. Evidence supporting the validity of the MSQ as a measure of general job satisfaction comes from other construct validation studies based on the theory of work adjustment. The results of these studies indicated that the MSQ measured satisfaction in accordance with the expectations from the theory of work adjustment (Weiss, Dawis, et al., 1967, pp. 17, 18).

Evidence also exists for the concurrent validity of the MSQ. A large body of research indicates that occupational differences exist in job satisfaction. A one-way
analysis of variance and Bartlett’s test of homogeneity of variance were performed on 25 occupational groups to see if the MSQ can differentiate between occupational groups. The results were comparable with those reported in the research literature (Weiss, Dawis, et. al., 1967, p. 19). The short form of the MSQ has shown to reflect the differences in occupational group job satisfaction in all three scales.

Collection Procedures

The researcher made personal contact with the President (see Appendix A) to obtain permission to administer the instruments as well as provide employee names and administrative rank. The campus leadership acknowledged the confidential nature of the research and expressed commitment to maintaining the confidentiality of individual responses.

The combined survey consisted of the OLA and the short form of the MSQ. The OLA assesses the perception of servant leadership characteristics in the leadership and in the organization. The short form of the MSQ is a validated instrument that assesses the job satisfaction level of the respondents. The OLA also contains a job satisfaction measurement and Laub (1999) implies that a relationship exists between job satisfaction and servant leadership. However, the job satisfaction component has not been validated and this study used the short form of the MSQ to assess the job satisfaction of the participants.

The OLA and short form of the MSQ instruments included an instruction page (Appendix E), which included three personal demographic variables regarding gender,
educational level, and length of employment as well as instructions for the completion of the survey.

Due to the large number of faculty, a random sample of faculty was used to determine who was given the opportunity to respond to the OLA/MSQ instrument. All other employees of Academic Affairs and Student Services were given the opportunity to respond. Three employees had left their positions during the survey process and were unable to participate.

Dillman’s (1978) Total Design Method (TDM) approach was followed. A packet of material containing the OLA – MSQ survey instrument was distributed to participants by hand and through the United States Postal Service. Each sealed packet was addressed to a specific employee and contained a cover letter (Appendix F) inviting participation and explaining the purpose of the study as well as discussing important issues such as confidentiality and the planned use of the study. The packet also included a pre-addressed and stamped return envelope to return the completed surveys to the researcher’s home address using the United States Postal Service.

Dillman (1978) suggests that a carefully designed follow-up sequence is imperative in order to increase response rates. Dillman’s three-part follow-up procedure involves sending a reminder postcard (Appendix G) to all participants one week after distributing the survey. According to Dillman, a letter appealing for the return of the completed instrument and a replacement survey should be sent to non-respondents at the end of three weeks. However, due to the 70% return rate after the first two steps of the collection procedure, the third step was not conducted.
Each questionnaire was assigned an identifying code number prior to distribution for tracking purposes. In order to protect the confidentiality and the anonymity of the respondents, all participants had the opportunity to send the completed questionnaires through the U.S. mail system to the researcher’s home address. All data collected and recorded by the researcher were stored in a secure location.

Data Analysis

The study is an exploratory, non-experimental study of the perception of servant leadership characteristics and job satisfaction in one mid-western, Council of Christian College and University, church-related college. The study collected quantifiable survey data, which was used to answer four research questions.

In question one, descriptive statistics were used to analyze the extent that members of the campus community perceive servant leadership characteristics reflected in the campus leadership and decision making processes.

In question two, a One-way ANOVA was used to determine if there were differences in the perception of servant leadership characteristics based on university administrative level: institutional leadership, management, faculty, and technical.

In question three, a One-way ANOVA was used to determine if there were differences in the perception of servant leadership characteristics based on functional area: academic affairs and student services.

In question four, a Pearson Correlation was used to determine if there was a relationship between the participants’ perception of servant leadership characteristics and their level of job satisfaction.
Limitations of the Study

A possible limitation to this study is that only two divisions of the institution were chosen to receive the combined OLA – MSQ survey. While these two divisions are central to fulfilling the institution’s mission, a large portion of the university’s employees, those working in other divisions, were not given the opportunity to participate in the study. Another possible limitation is that the combined survey was given to salaried personnel only. Hourly employees within Student Services and Academic Affairs were not given the opportunity to participate in the study. A third possible limitation is participant unwillingness to respond honestly to the instrument because of concerns that their responses would not be kept confidential.

Ethical Considerations

Participants were informed in the cover letter of the purpose of the study and that participation in the study is completely voluntary. All participants and their responses were kept completely confidential. Babbie (1998) notes that, “social research should never injure the people being studied, regardless of whether they volunteer for the study” (p. 439). To ensure anonymity, only codes, not names were placed on individual questionnaires and the codebook was kept in a secure location. In addition, precautions were taken to ensure that only generalized findings and not individual responses are presented to the institution’s leadership.
CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS

The findings of this study are presented in Chapter 4. The first section includes findings related to research question one: the extent that the members of the campus community perceive servant leadership characteristics reflected in campus leaders’ behavior and institutional decision making processes. The second section includes findings related to research question two: are there differences in the perception of servant leadership characteristics based on university administrative level (institutional leadership, management, faculty, and technical). The third section includes findings related to research question three: are there differences in the perception of servant leadership characteristics reflected in functional area (academic affairs and student services). The final section presents the findings for the final research question: is there a relationship between participants’ perception of servant leadership characteristics and their level of job satisfaction?

*Research Question One:*

To what extent do members of the campus community perceive servant leadership characteristics reflected in campus leaders’ behavior and institutional decision making processes?
The overall OLA mean score for all respondents is 213.73 out of a possible total score of 300 and the standard deviation is 35.1. The mean is a general measure of the extent that servant leadership was perceived to exist in the entire organization. Laub (2002) says a mean score in this range indicates the employees of the institution perceive some servant leadership characteristics in practice. When the institutional mean is placed into Laub’s Organizational Category schema (see Figure 3), the institution is considered in the Org⁴ Category, or a Positive Paternalistic Organization. Laub (2002) has found that an institutional score in an Org⁴ Category is typical of the organizations he has studied. As stated earlier, an Org⁴ Category is characterized by a greater level of shared power, yet important decisions are still perceived to come from the top leadership. Many employees sense they are valued as people and as producers. Employees perceive a moderate level of trust from leadership, but fear they can lose the trust easily. Laub would classify the institution in this study as a non-servant leadership organization.

Laub includes six subscales for the OLA. The subscales will not be used for further analysis in this study because the high correlation between scales rules out the possibility of using the individual definitional constructs for research purposes (Laub, 1999). It is interesting to look at the scores from the subscales in this study, which range from Displays Authenticity with a mean score of 42 to Shares Leadership with a mean score of 31. This seems to indicate the respondents believe the leadership to be authentic, but unwilling to share leadership with the employees. Table 5 depicts the means and standard deviations for each of the six subscales for the OLA.
Table 5

The means and standard deviations of the six OLA subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OLA Subscales</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Values People</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36.91</td>
<td>6.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develops People</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31.17</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds Community</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32.25</td>
<td>5.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displays Authenticity</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>41.77</td>
<td>8.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Leadership</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33.88</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shares Leadership</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30.83</td>
<td>6.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Returning to the total OLA means and standard deviations of the institution’s various administrative levels, there is little variation in the mean scores, with a range of 20 points. Table 6 shows the means and standard deviations of the administrative levels. Faculty had the mean at 205, while the participants in the technical level had the highest mean score of 225.

Table 6

A comparison of OLA means and standard deviations for the institutional administrative levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational level</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Leadership</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>215.37</td>
<td>35.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>209.11</td>
<td>35.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical (without Faculty)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>224.87</td>
<td>30.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>205.07</td>
<td>37.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>213.73</td>
<td>35.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When viewed by functional area, there is a slightly wider difference than when viewed by administrative level. Table 7 depicts the means and standard deviations for the two functional areas in this study, Academic Affairs and Student Services. The Faculty responses are included in the Academic Affairs division. Institutional Leadership is not
included in either Academic Affairs or Student Services. The mean for the Student Services division is 230 and Academic Affairs is 205.

Table 7

A comparison of OLA means and standard deviations for academic affairs and student services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Division</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>205.11</td>
<td>32.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>229.47</td>
<td>34.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When analyzed by administrative levels within the functional area, there is greater variety. Table 8 depicts the OLA means and standard deviations for each subgroup. For example, participants in academic affairs management perceive the least amount of servant leadership characteristics in the institutional leadership with a mean score of 195, while participants in student services management and student services technical perceive the most servant leadership characteristics with mean scores of 230.

Table 8

A comparison of OLA means and standard deviations by subgroup

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational position</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Leadership</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>215.37</td>
<td>35.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs Management</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>194.62</td>
<td>25.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services Management</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>230.18</td>
<td>37.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs Technical</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>217.21</td>
<td>24.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services Technical</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>229.16</td>
<td>33.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>205.07</td>
<td>37.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question Two:

Are there differences in the perception of servant leadership characteristics based on university administrative level (institutional leadership, management, faculty, and technical)?

A One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted with the university administrative level as the independent variable and the OLA scores as the dependent variable. The analysis of variance showed no significant difference in mean OLA scores. \( F(3,112) = 2.322, p < .05 \), existed between the various university administrative levels in this study. Table 9 depicts the ANOVA results.

Table 9

One-Way ANOVA results for OLA – university administrative level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University position level</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Leadership</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>215.37</td>
<td>35.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>209.11</td>
<td>35.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>224.87</td>
<td>30.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>205.07</td>
<td>37.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-Way ANOVA Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean of Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>8296.79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2765.60</td>
<td>2.322</td>
<td>0.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>133375.79</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1190.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>141672.58</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

Research Question Three:

Are there differences in the perception of servant leadership characteristics reflected in functional area (academic affairs and student services)?
A One-Way ANOVA was conducted with functional area as the independent variable and total OLA score as the dependent variable.

The analysis of variance showed a significant interaction between Academic Affairs and Student Services on the OLA scores. $F(1, 102) = 12.55$, $p < .05$ ($\omega^2 = .10$). The result of the analysis of variance is depicted in Table 10.

Probing further in order to find where the significant difference exists, an additional ANOVA was conducted using administrative level within functional area as independent variables and the total OLA score as the dependent variable. The independent variable included five of six subgroups, with institutional leadership excluded because the respondents in that subgroup are not in either functional area.

Table 10

One-Way ANOVA results for OLA by functional area – means and standard deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Area</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>205.11</td>
<td>32.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>229.47</td>
<td>34.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>213.54</td>
<td>35.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-Way ANOVA Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>13968.72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13968.72</td>
<td>12.55*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>113490.1</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1112.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127458.80</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

The ANOVA showed a significant interaction between the subgroups of student services management, student services technical, academic affairs management, academic affairs technical, faculty and the OLA scores, $F(4, 99) = 4.01$, $p < .05$ ($\omega^2 = .10$). The result of the analysis of variance is depicted in Table 11.
A post-hoc test using the Tukey's honestly significant difference (HSD) analysis was conducted in order to determine where differences exist in the ANOVA. The Tukey HSD analysis revealed a significant difference at the .05 level between Student Services Technical group and the Academic Affairs Management group and the Student Services Technical group and the Faculty group. No additional differences between groups were found to be significant.

Table 11

One-Way ANOVA results for OLA professional level within academic affairs and student services – means and standard deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional focus</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Services Management</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>230.18</td>
<td>37.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services Technical</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>229.16</td>
<td>33.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs Management</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>194.62</td>
<td>25.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs Technical</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>217.21</td>
<td>24.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>205.07</td>
<td>37.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>213.54</td>
<td>35.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-Way ANOVA Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>17787.83</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4446.96</td>
<td>4.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>109671.00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1107.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127458.80</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

Research Question Four:

Is there a relationship between participants' perception of servant leadership characteristics and their level of job satisfaction?

The total institutional MSQ mean score of 79.88 is above the 74.85 total group mean for the MSQ instrument. This would indicate that the respondents are relatively
satisfied. The means and standard deviations of the MSQ scores by functional area and administrative level are depicted in Table 12. In viewing the data by functional area, student services had a higher mean average than academic affairs, indicating a higher job satisfaction. When the MSQ means are viewed by administrative level, there is virtually no difference between the scores, with each level scoring 80.

Table 12

Means and standard deviations of the MSQ by functional area and administrative level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Position</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>MSQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Functional Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>78.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>83.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Leadership</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>79.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>79.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Probing further, each of the six subgroups in the study scored above the national norm, with the faculty scoring the lowest at 78 and the respondents in the student services technical subgroup scoring 83.43. The scores indicate that the respondents are satisfied and those in student services are the most satisfied. See table 13 for further breakdown.

A two-tailed Pearson Correlation was conducted in order to assess the relationship between the perception of servant leadership characteristics and job satisfaction. The Pearson correlation revealed that the total OLA scores and the MSQ score were significantly related, $r (114) = +.704$, $p < .01$, two tails.
Table 13

Means and standard deviations of the MSQ by subgroup

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Position</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>MSQ</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Leadership</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80.58</td>
<td>11.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs Management</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>78.07</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services Management</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>82.09</td>
<td>14.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs Technical</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>78.64</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services Technical</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>83.43</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>77.91</td>
<td>10.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Institution</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>79.88</td>
<td>10.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicated that a positive significant relationship, at the p < .01 level, existed between the OLA score and the MSQ results. The coefficient of determination ($r^2$) for the correlations for OLA and the MSQ is .50, indicating that 50% of the variability can be attributed to the relationship.

An auxiliary finding was a statistically significant correlation between the OLA Job Satisfaction score and the MSQ score, $r (114) = .721$, p < .01, two tails. The data for this correlation is in Appendix H.

Summary of Findings

This section presents a summary of the four major findings of this study.

1. The institution in this study was found not to be a servant organization. The overall average score for the institution was 213.73 out of a possible 300, indicating that the members of the organization perceive some elements of servant leadership. The mean score places the institution as a Positive Paternalistic Organization. The study indicated the members of various subgroups vary on how they perceive the organization, with OLA averages ranging from 230.18, or positive paternalistic organization for student services management to 194.62, a negative paternalistic organization for academic affairs management.
2. This study found no statistically significant difference (p < .05) in the perception of servant leadership characteristics based on administrative level of the employee.

3. This study found a statistically significant difference in the perception of servant leadership characteristics based on professional focus of the respondents. The student services division was found to have a significantly higher mean score than academic affairs (p < .05). Further analysis of subgroups revealed a significant difference (p < .05) existed between student services technical and both the academic affairs management and the faculty.

4. A statistically significant positive correlation (p < .01) was found to exist between participants' perception of servant leadership characteristics and their level of job satisfaction as measured by the MSQ.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The leadership of church-related colleges and universities are facing an unprecedented array of issues and problems, including insufficient and inadequate funding, unprecedented growth and expansion, and the diversification and expansion of degree delivery systems. All of these issues must be met while maintaining the unique ethos of the church-related college. Many within church-related higher education have concluded that the traditional approaches to leadership are not sufficient to meet the complex issues facing institutional leadership today. There are an increasing number of authors, including Greenleaf, Blanchard, Spears, who propose servant leadership as a viable approach to meet the issues facing the leadership of church-related colleges.

This study was about one such institution, where members of the senior leadership have expressed an interest in adapting servant leadership and have begun the early stages of adopting servant leadership principles. The study investigated the perceived presence of servant leadership characteristics in the management practices of the institution as well as how different groups within the institution perceive servant leadership characteristics. In addition, the study examined the implied positive relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction.

This chapter summarizes the answers to the research questions in light of the purpose and outcomes of the research and findings of this study. The chapter has three
sections: the first section includes a discussion of each of the research questions; the
second section addresses the implications of the research: and the final section addresses
suggestions for future research.

Discussion

Servant Leadership Practice on Campus

The data collected for question one revealed the perceived level of servant
leadership characteristics in the institution studied. According to Laub’s Organizational
Category schema, the institutional mean of 214 indicates the institution is an Org\(^4\)
Category, or a Positive Paternalistic Organization. Laub would classify the institution in
this study as a non-servant leadership organization.

Although the institution as a whole had a mean of 214, there was a wide variety in
the perception of servant leadership characteristics reflected by the various subgroups
within the study. The functional areas of Student Services and Academic Affairs are
separated by approximately one organizational category in Laub’s (2002) schema, with
Student Services scoring a mean of nearly 230, which is a relatively high score within
Laub’s (2002) Org\(^4\) Category and Academic Affairs scoring a mean of 205, which falls in
the upper level of Laub’s Org\(^3\) Category. Within the various subgroups, Student Services
Management and Student Services Technical had solid Org\(^4\) Category mean scores of 230
and 229 respectively. Surprisingly, the subgroup of Institutional Leadership only had a
mean score of 215, with an unusually large range in their responses. This score was
similar to Academic Affairs Technical mean score of 217. Both of these subgroups
scored in the lower half of Laub’s Org\(^4\) Category. The subgroups of Faculty and
Academic Affairs Management both scored in the Org$^3$ Category, with mean scores of 205 and 195 respectively.

*Higher Education's Unique Organizational Structure*

The data collected for question two addressed the possibility of differences in the perception of servant leadership characteristic based on the administrative level. Previous studies by Laub (1999) and Horsman (2001), drawing from samples taken from a variety of organizations, indicated that differences were likely to exist. However, the failure to find statistically significant differences between administrative levels in this study contradicts the previous research. Laub (1999) found significant differences existed between the institutional leadership and management levels as well as between institutional leadership and technical levels. Horsman (2001) found a significant difference between institutional leadership and employees at the technical level.

One possible explanation for the unexpected lack of a statistically significant difference between administrative levels, especially between the institutional leadership and technical level, could be that this study focused on an institution of higher education. The unique structure of higher education institutions, especially when compared to the business world, is well documented (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Morgan, 1997; Birnbaum, 1988). While colleges and universities are typically more geographically concentrated than organizations in the business world, higher education's organizational structure is flatter in nature; considerably more decentralized, and has less distance existing between administrative levels. In addition, there is a high level of expectation, especially held by the faculty, of sharing in the governance of the institution (Bolman & Deal, 1997).
Another factor could be that institutional leadership may be defined at a broader level in this study than in Laub's (1999) or Horsman's (2001) studies. For this study, institutional leadership was defined as the President, Vice Presidents, and the Deans of the three institutional colleges, and their responses were included in the leadership category. The inclusion of the Vice Presidents and Deans could have a leveling effect on institutional leadership score which might not have been reflective of the other studies. Laub (1999) and Horsman (2001) allowed participants to self-select their employment category. Participants may have selected the management level if they were not the organization president or chief executive officer. The self-selection could create a greater difference between the mean scores of the institutional leadership and management levels.

This study did find slight variance in the mean scores of the various administrative levels. Surprisingly, the technical level had the highest mean score of 225, differing from both the Laub (1999) and Horsman (2001) studies which found that the institutional leadership had the highest mean score. The institutional leadership mean score of 215 was higher than both management (209) and faculty (205).

*The Dual Structure of Higher Education*

While no statistically significant differences were found between administrative levels, this study did find statistically significant differences in the perception of servant leadership characteristics reflected in the professional focus of the respondents. Respondents in student services had a mean score of 229.5, which was statistically significantly higher than the respondents in academic affairs mean score of 205. Placed
in Laub’s Organizational Category schema, the respondents in Student Services view the institution and their functional area as an Org⁴, or a Positively Paternal Organization, while the respondents in Academic Affairs view the institution and their functional area as an Org⁵, or a Negatively Paternal Organization.

The different view of the organization expressed by the two functional areas is not surprising. Morgan (1997) noted, “In any organization there may be different and competing value systems that create a mosaic of organizational realities rather than a uniform corporate culture” (p. 137). Morgan adds that different professional groups can have different views of their roles and the overall nature of the organization’s business.

While the functional areas of Academic Affairs and Student Services are central to fulfilling the mission and operation of the institution, the two functional areas reflect a dualism of organizational structure. Birnbaum (1988) notes that, when compared to the business world, higher education looks vastly different. According to Birnbaum, institutions of higher education are comprised of two structures that exist in parallel: a traditional administrative hierarchy which is predominate in Student Services, and a professional structure which is rooted in the faculty’s traditional collegiality and institutional governance role.

In the traditional administrative hierarchy, the goals and objectives are carried out according to organizational position. Authority comes from the position in the organization and is used by superiors to control and coordinate desired activities. When questions involving specific issues or knowledge arise, the final decision is made with deference to the organizational structure.
In the professional structure, expertise and knowledge are valued. The faculty exercises a large amount of autonomy in curricular and academic issues and holds a shared role in the governance of the institution. Administrative structures within the academic area exist to support the professional structure and are typically filled from within the faculty. The professional structure is considerably different than the hierarchical structure found in student services and the business world in general.

The findings of this study suggest that the two functional areas do perceive the organization differently and, in essence, operate as different subcultures within the institution. According to Morgan (1997), organizations can have a corporate culture, while groups within the organization can have their own mini-culture or subculture. The culture is the “social or normative glue that holds an organization together. According to Birnbaum (1988), culture of the organization expresses the values or social ideals as well as the beliefs that members come to share (p. 72). While both Academic Affairs and Student Services are part of the culture of the church-related college, each professional area has its own distinctive subculture that includes the way the area is structurally organized, either professionally or administratively.

The expectations, based on the unique subculture of the two functional areas could contribute to the differences found in this study. Due to the collaborative and collegial nature of academic affairs culture, expectations for participation in the institutional decision making process would be high. If these expectations are not matched by the perceptions of the participants, the overall perception of the practice of servant leadership in the institution would be lower. In addition, since the subculture of
Academic Affairs values knowledge and expertise more than administrative position. The OLA instrument may not accurately assess the participant's responses.

Laub (1999) states, "if means of respondents from certain types of organizations score significantly higher, or lower, on the instrument, these organizations should be studied in an attempt to determine the different variables that support servant leadership characteristics in the organization" (p. 84). The significantly higher scores of the Student Services division suggest that something different is occurring within Student Services.

The findings in this study suggest that the significant difference between academic affairs and student development are due to the perception of a higher percentage of servant leadership characteristics in the leadership of student services. One possible explanation for the difference in perception between Academic Affairs and Student Services rests in the expectations of the two areas for participation in the institution's governance. Student Services is more bureaucratic in nature, with a clear chain of command and formal procedures for decision making. This structure differs significantly from the culture of faculty and academic administrators, such as department chairs and deans, in higher education. Faculty and administrators who have come from faculty positions have high expectations for meaningful involvement in the decision making processes in the institution. Edelstein (1997) states, "The tendency among faculty members to believe that whatever authority they may have is only a shadow of the authority they should have is one of the things that makes governance such an inexhaustible topic of debate on many campuses" (p. 60).

Laub (2002) identifies trust and communication as two key components of increasing the perception of servant leadership characteristics within an organization.
Edelstein (1997) mirrors this idea by proposing that keeping the faculty as a whole informed through communication and including faculty senate leaders in various dean’s meetings as well as other administrative forums decreases the effects of misinformation and rumor while building trust between the faculty and administrative leadership.

*The Relationship Between the Perception of Servant Leadership and Job Satisfaction*

The final research question examined whether a relationship existed between participants’ perception of servant leadership characteristics and their level of job satisfaction. This study looked at the relationship between the institutional OLA score and the MSQ job satisfaction score.

Laub (1999) posits in his study that “the more strongly respondents perceive that servant leadership exists in their organization (higher scores on the [OLA]) the higher is their job satisfaction level” (p. 85). To support this assertion that job satisfaction is connected to servant leadership, Laub included six job satisfaction questions in his instrument. The findings of this study supported Laub’s assertion.

The statistically significant, positive relationship between the OLA and the MSQ provided an association of 50%. This is regarded as a strong association. The positive, statistically significant association supports Laub’s idea that the perception of servant leadership in an organization impacts the employee’s job satisfaction. However, the interaction of ideological fit and job satisfaction found in Ellis’ (2202) study must be investigated further. Organizations interested in increasing employee job satisfaction could impact employee’s job satisfaction with the application of servant leadership principles in the organization as defined by Laub (1999).
Implications

Implications for this study can be viewed from two levels: 1) the implication for the institution studied; 2) the implication for higher education in general. The institution in this study, using Laub’s (2002) schema, was not considered a servant organization at any level. The overall institution, and some subgroups, scored in an Org⁴ Category, or Positive Paternal Organization, while the faculty and Academic Affairs Management subgroup scored in an Org³ Category, or Negative Paternal Organization. If the senior administration is committed to having servant leadership permeate the organization, intervention must occur.

As noted earlier, this institution underwent a major transformation, including dramatic increases in enrollment, unprecedented growth in institutional fundraising and endowment, and significantly enhanced institutional image. However, the findings of this study suggest that the institution has a ways to go in its professed desire to be transformed as a servant organization. This gap is very apparent in the OLA scores of the Institutional Leadership group. Unlike previous studies, the Institutional Leadership subgroup in this study did not have the highest OLA mean score and, further, had the largest range of scores. The Institutional Leadership subgroup’s lower mean score suggests that the senior leaders are not as invested in the concept of the servant leadership as are other subgroups within the university and, further, are not in agreement about the importance of becoming a servant organization. Any effort to transform the university into a servant organization will depend on this group’s ability to build a consensus on the importance of the university becoming a servant organization.
To maintain an aggressive change agenda on the campus, the individual members of the leadership subgroup would be advised to adopt a more servant approach to leading and managing. The leaders' more paternalistic leadership style successfully galvanized the campus community in the massive change process that lifted the institution out of the earlier financial crisis. The campus community's shared a sense of impending doom both provided the sense of urgency vital for successful change processes (Kotter, 1996) and justified a more top-down, controlled leadership approach. However, the dramatic financial turn around of the institution may reduce a sense of urgency among campus constituencies and undermine the effectiveness of a more paternalistic leadership approach. Doctoral-prepared faculty and administrators are less likely to tolerate approaches that violate the collegial values of academic governance in the absence of an apparent crisis.

As senior leadership looks to continue the transformation process within the institution, changing the institution from a Positive Paternal Organization to a Servant Organization, the leadership must help the employees develop the capacity to share in the institutional leadership. However, the scores of the senior leadership, however, suggest that they do not have the capacity to begin the process. Consequently, senior leaders and the institution as a whole face what Hefetz (1997) calls an adaptive challenge.

Colleges face many types of problems, some they can clearly define and have the techniques and resources to solve. On the other hand, they increasingly face problem that are difficult to define and for which there is no precedent to following to resolve them. These adaptive challenges require new learning, strategies, and technologies to solve. Developing a servant approach to management and leadership will be adaptive challenges
for campus leaders as well as for the people in their units. Leaders will need opportunity and support to develop their capacity for servant leadership. Simultaneously, they will need to work with the members of their units and teams to assume responsibility for and to solve the challenges they face. The goal of the leadership is not control the outcome but to mobilize employees to confront the tough decisions they face in the change process. Heifetz argues that the goal of the leader should be to reduce employee dependency on the leadership while encouraging the capacity for employees to exhibit leadership in addressing challenges in the work place.

For higher education in general, senior administration at other institutions interested in adapting a servant leadership approach in their college or university must be fully unified and committed to the task. This study would indicate that it may be easier to establish servant leadership in various areas, such as Student Services, than it is in other areas. The caring and student centered nature of Student Services lends itself to the principles of servant leadership, but barriers could exist within the institution. In addition, a strong change program must be implemented.

The findings from this study provide empirical data about the perception of servant leadership characteristics as defined by Laub (1999) in a church-related college. The study helps fill a void of scholarly research on servant leadership and joins a growing number of systematic explorations of servant leadership, which will help legitimize and promote the concept of servant leadership in the academic study of leadership.

The study did find strong, positive correlation between the OLA and the MSQ, indicating a relationship between the perception of servant leadership characteristics and job satisfaction. This supports Laub's (1999) assertion that the perception of servant
leadership characteristics in practice within an organization will increase the job satisfaction of the employees.

*Future Research*

Because of the exploratory nature of this study, the results highlight the need for further research on servant leadership using the Organizational Leadership Assessment instrument. There is a need to study other institutional divisions within colleges and universities. While Academic Affairs and Student Services are central to the accomplishment of the university’s mission, the other divisions may provide additional insight into the institutional perception of servant leadership characteristics in the leadership. This study focused on one church-related CCCU college. Additional studies on similar institutions, as well as secular public and private institutions, could add greatly to the knowledge of servant leadership in the higher education setting. Hourly staff was excluded in this study. Future researchers may want to include hourly staff to investigate the impact of non-professional employees on the perception of servant leadership. No statistically significant differences between administrative levels were found in this study. This differs from earlier studies and may represent a difference in higher education. Additional research is needed to examine this finding. In addition, further research should examine why the Institutional Leadership level did not have the highest mean score on the OLA. The functional area of Student Services was found to have a significantly higher perception of servant leadership characteristics within the institution than Academic Affairs. More research is needed to understand why this difference exists. In addition, further research should explore why Academic Affairs Management
and Faculty perceive the institution more negatively. Finally, since one aspect of this study was to gather data to serve as a baseline measurement of the perception of servant leadership for the college in order to measure yet-to-be-determined future implementations of servant leadership practices. A replication of this study in the future could provide the effectiveness of servant leadership implementation strategies.
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APPENDIX A

Positions Included in Institutional Subgroups
Positions Included in Institutional Subgroups

Institutional Level

President, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Vice President for Adult and Graduate Programs, Vice President for Enrollment Management, Vice President for Financial Affairs, Vice President for Information Technology, Vice President for Operations, Vice President for Student Development, Vice President for University Advancement, Dean of Adult and Professional Studies, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, Acting Dean of Graduate College

Management Level: Student Services

Assistant Vice President for Student Development, Dean of Mentoring and Accountability, Director of Residence Life, Director of Student Support Services, Director of Upward Bound, Assistant Director of Student Support Services, Director of Health Center, University Chaplain, Assistant Director of Upward Bound

Management Level: Academic Affairs

Assistant Vice President for Academic Sciences, Chair Division of Religion & Philosophy, Chair Division of Education, Chair Division of Language & Literature, Chair Music, Chair Undergraduate Nursing, Athletic Director, Chair of Behavioral Sciences, Director of Life Calling and Leadership, University Registrar, Associate Director Life Calling and Leadership, Director of Library Services, Media Center Director, Technical Services Librarian, Director of Records, Interlibrary Loan/Reference Librarian, Head Reference Librarian, Director of Academic Enrichment, Assistant Director of Records, Circulation Manager

Technical Level: Student Services

Assistant to the Chaplain, International Student Advisor, Counselor, Director of Intramural Sports, Director of Student Activities, Resident Director (11), STEP Counselor, Technical Director, Career Counselor, Director Conference Services, Performing Arts Center Manager, Nurse Practitioner, Administrative Assistant to Vice President, Office Manager Health Center, Administrative Assistant Student Support Services, Registered Nurse (2).
Technical Level: Academic Affairs

Life Coach (2), Media Center Technical Assistant, Coordinator of Registration, Technical Support Nursing Computer Lab, Laboratory Manager, Coordinator of Records Information Systems, Assistant Lab Manager, Assistant Men's Basketball Coach, Assistant Director Academic Enrichment, Assistant Catalog Librarian, Public Service Assistant (2), Media Center Supervisor, Catalog Technician, Acquisitions Coordinator, Transcript Specialist, Registration Specialist (2), Faculty: Instructors, Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, Full Professors.
APPENDIX B

Approval to use the Organizational Leadership Assessment
This is to grant my permission, as the author of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA), to Rob Thompson to make all copies necessary of the complete OLA instrument for the purposes of his doctoral research project.
APPENDIX C

Larb’s Six Organizational Categories
Description

Toxic Organizational Health

This organization is now operating with Toxic Organizational Health in terms of its workers, leadership and organizational culture and it exhibits these characteristics throughout all levels of operation.

The Workers: Motivation, morale, attitude & commitment, listening, relationships vs. tasks

Workers are devalued here. They are not believed in and in turn do not believe in one another. Workers are used and even abused in this work setting. There is no opportunity for personal development. Workers are not listened to. Their ideas are never sought or considered. All decisions are made at the top levels of the organization. Relationships are dysfunctional and people are only valued for conformity to the dominant culture. Diversity is seen as a threat and differences are cause for suspicion.

The Leadership: Power, decision making, goals & direction

True leadership is missing at all levels of the organization. Power is used by leaders in ways that are harmful to workers and to the organization's mission. Workers do not have the power to act to initiate change. Goals are unclear and people do not know where the organization is going.

The Team: Community, collaboration and team learning

People are out for themselves and a highly political climate exists. People are manipulated and pitted against each other in order to motivate performance. Focus is placed on punishing non-performers.

The Culture: Authenticity, integrity, accountability, creativity, trust, service, communication

This is an environment characterized by dishonesty and a deep lack of integrity among its workers, supervisors and senior leaders. It is an environment where failure is punished, creativity is stifled and risks are never taken. People are suspicious of each other and feel manipulated and used. There is almost no trust level and an extremely high level of fear because people, especially leadership, are seen as untrustworthy. At all levels of the organization, people serve their own self-interest before the interest of others. This is an environment that is characterized by totally closed communication.

The Outlook: Type of workers attracted, action needed

This is an organization in name only that will find it impossible to find, develop and maintain healthy productive workers who can navigate the changes necessary to improve. The outlook for this organization is doubtful. Extreme measures must be instituted in order for this organization to establish the necessary health to survive.

Poor Organizational Health

This organization is now operating with Poor Organizational Health in terms of its workers, leadership and organizational culture and it exhibits these characteristics throughout most levels of operation.

The Workers: Motivation, morale, attitude & commitment, listening, relationships vs. tasks

Most workers do not feel valued or believed in here. They often feel used and do not feel that they have the opportunity of being developed either personally or professionally. Workers are rarely listened to and only when they speak in line with the values and priorities of the leaders. Their ideas are rarely sought and almost never used. Most all decisions are made at the top levels of the organization. Relationships are not encouraged and the tasks of the organization come before people. Diversity is not valued or appreciated.

The Leadership: Power, decision making, goals & direction

Leadership is autocratic in style and is imposed from the top levels of the organization. Power is held at the highest positions only and is used to force compliance with the leader’s wishes. Workers do not feel empowered to create change. Goals are often unclear and the overall direction of the organization is confused.

The Team: Community, collaboration and team learning

This is a highly individualistic and competitive environment. Almost no collaboration exists. Teams are sometimes utilized but often are put in competition with each other in order to motivate performance.

The Culture: Authenticity, integrity, accountability, creativity, trust, service, communication

This is an environment often characterized by lack of honesty and integrity among its workers, supervisors and senior leaders. It is an environment where risks are seldom taken, failure is often punished and creativity is discouraged. There is a very low level of trust and trustworthiness along with a high level of uncertainty and fear. Leaders do not trust the workers and the workers view the leaders as untrustworthy. People lack motivation to serve the organization because they do not feel that it is their organization or their goals. This is an environment that is characterized by closed communication.

The Outlook: Type of workers attracted, action needed

This is an autocratic organization, which will find it very difficult to find, develop and maintain healthy productive workers. Change is needed but very difficult to achieve. The outlook is not positive for this organization. Serious measures must be instituted in order for this organization to establish the necessary improvements to move towards positive organizational health.

Limited Organizational Health

This organization is now operating with limited Organizational Health in terms of its workers, leadership and organizational culture, and it exhibits these characteristics throughout most levels of operation.

The Workers: Motivation, morale, attitude & commitment, listening, relationships vs. tasks

Most workers sense they are valued more for what they can contribute than for who they are. When they receive training in this organization it is primarily to increase their performance and their value to the company not to develop personally. Workers are sometimes listened to but only when they speak in line with the values and priorities of the leaders. Their ideas are sometimes sought but seldom used, while the important decisions remain at the top levels of the organization. Relationships tend to be functional and the organizational tasks almost always come first. Conformity is expected while individual expression is discouraged.

The Leadership: Power, decision-making, goals & direction

Leadership is negatively paternalistic in style and is focused at the top levels of the organization. Power is delegated for specific tasks and for specific positions within the organization. Workers provide some decision-making when it is appropriate to their position. Goals are sometimes unclear and the overall direction of the organization is often confused.

The Team: Community, collaboration and team learning

This is mostly an individualistic environment. Some level of cooperative work exists, but little true collaboration. Teams are utilized but often are characterized by an unproductive competitive spirit.

The Culture: Authenticity, integrity, accountability, creativity, trust, service, communication

Workers are unsure of where they stand and how open they can be with one another, and especially with those in leadership over them. This is an environment where limited risks are taken, failure is not allowed and creativity is encouraged only when it fits within the organization's existing guidelines. There is a minimal to moderate level of trust and trustworthiness along with an underlying uncertainty and fear. People feel that they must prove themselves and that they are only as good as their last performance. People are sometimes motivated to serve the organization but are not sure that the organization is committed to them. This is an environment that is characterized by a guarded, cautious openness.

The Outlook: Type of workers attracted, action needed

This is a negatively paternalistic organization. The compliant worker will find this a safe place to settle in. The best and most creative workers will look elsewhere. Change here is long-term and incremental and improvement is desired but difficult to achieve. The outlook for this organization is uncertain. Decisions need to be made to move toward more healthy organizational life. In times of organizational stress there will be tendency to move backwards towards a more autocratic organizational environment.

Description

Moderate Organizational Health

This organization is now operating with Moderate Organizational Health in terms of its workers, leadership and organizational culture and it exhibits these characteristics throughout most levels of operation.

The Workers: Motivation, morale, attitude & commitment, listening, relationships vs. tasks

Many workers sense they are valued while others are uncertain. People receive training in this organization in order to equip them to fulfill company goals. Workers are listened to but usually it is when they speak in line with the values and priorities of the leaders. Their ideas are often sought and sometimes used, but the important decisions remain at the top levels of the organization. Relationships are valued as they benefit company goals but organizational tasks often come first. There is a tension between the expectation of conformity and encouragement of diversity.

The Leadership: Power, decision making, goals & direction

Leadership is positively paternalistic in style and mostly comes from the top levels of the organization. Power is delegated for specific tasks and for specific positions within the organization. Workers are encouraged to share ideas for improving the organization. Goals are mostly clear though the overall direction of the organization is sometimes confused.

The Team: Community, collaboration and team learning

Some level of cooperative work exists, and some true collaboration. Teams are utilized but often compete against one another for scarce resources.

The Culture: Authenticity, integrity, accountability, creativity, trust, service, communication

Workers are sometimes unsure of where they stand and now open they can be with one another and especially with those in leadership over them. This is an environment where some risks can be taken but failure is sometimes feared. Creativity is encouraged as long as it doesn’t move the organization too much beyond the status quo. There is a moderate level of trust and trustworthiness along with occasional uncertainty and fear. People feel trusted but know that that trust can be lost very easily. People are motivated to serve the organization because it is their job to do so and they are committed to doing good work. This is an environment characterized by openness between select groups of people.

The Outlook: Type of workers attracted, action needed

This is a positively paternalistic organization, that will attract good motivated workers but may find that the “best and brightest!” will seek professional challenges elsewhere. Change here is ongoing but often forced by outside circumstances. Improvement is desired but difficult to maintain over time. The outlook for this organization is positive. Decisions need to be made to move toward more healthy organizational life. This organization is in a good position to move towards optimal health in the future.

Description

Excellent Organizational Health

This organization is now operating with Excellent Organizational Health in terms of its workers, leadership and organizational culture and it exhibits these characteristics throughout most levels of operation.

The Workers: Motivation, morale, attitude & commitment, listening, relationships vs. tasks

Most workers are valued here, for what they are as well as for what they contribute to the organization. They are believed in and are encouraged to develop to their full potential as workers and as individuals. Most leaders and workers listen receptively to one another and are involved together in some of the important decisions of the organization. Most relationships are strong and healthy and diversity is valued and celebrated.

The Leadership: Power, decision making, goals & direction

People are encouraged to provide leadership at all levels of the organization. Power and leadership are shared so that most workers are empowered to contribute to important decisions, including the direction that the organization is taking. Appropriate action is taken, goals are clear and vision is shared throughout most of the organization.

The Team: Community, collaboration and team learning

A high level of community characterizes this positive work environment. People work together well in teams and prefer collaborative work over competition against one another.

The Culture: Authenticity, integrity, accountability, creativity, trust, service, communication

This is an environment mostly characterized by the authenticity of its workers, supervisors and senior leaders. People are open and accountable to others. They operate with honesty and integrity. This is a “people first” environment where risks are encouraged, failure can be learned from and creativity is encouraged and rewarded. People are trusted and are trustworthy throughout the organization. Fear is not used as a motivation. People are motivated to serve the interests of each other before their own self-interest and are open to learning from each other. This is an environment that is characterized by open and effective communication.

The Outlook: Type of workers attracted, action needed

This is a servant-oriented organization, which will continue to attract some of the best and most motivated workers who can welcome positive change and continuous improvement. It is a place where energy and motivation are continually renewed to provide for the challenges of the future. The outlook is very positive. Ongoing attention should be given to building on existing strengths and continuing to learn and develop towards an optimally healthy organization.

Description

Optimal Organizational Health

This organization is now operating with Optimal Organizational Health in terms of its workers, leadership and organizational culture and it exhibits these characteristics to a very high level throughout all levels of operation.

The Workers: Motivation, morale, attitude & commitment, listening, relationships vs. tasks

All workers are valued here, for who they are as well as for what they contribute to the organization. They are believed in and are encouraged to develop to their full potential as workers and as individuals. All leaders and workers listen receptively to one another and are involved together in many of the important decisions of the organization. Relationships are strong and healthy and diversity is valued and celebrated.

The Leadership: Power, decision making, goals & direction

People provide dynamic and effective leadership at all levels of the organization. Power and leadership are shared so that all workers are empowered to contribute to important decisions, including the direction that the organization is taking. Appropriate action is taken, goals are clear and vision is shared throughout the entire organization.

The Team: Community, collaboration and team learning

An extremely high level of community characterizes this positive work environment. People work together well in teams and choose collaborative work over competition against one another.

The Culture: Authenticity, integrity, accountability, creativity, trust, service, communication

This is an environment characterized by the authenticity of its workers, supervisors and executive leaders. People are very open and accountable to others. They operate with complete honesty and integrity. This is a “people first” environment where risks are taken, failure is learned from and creativity is encouraged and rewarded. People throughout the entire organization are highly trusted and are highly trustworthy. Fear does not exist as a motivation. People are highly motivated to serve the interests of each other before their own self-interest and are open to learning from each other. This is an environment that is characterized by open and effective communication throughout the organization.

The Outlook: Type of workers attracted, action needed

This is a servant-minded organization throughout, which will continue to attract the very best and most motivated workers who can welcome positive change and continuous improvement. It is a place where energy and motivation are continually renewed to provide for the challenges of the future. The outlook is extremely positive. Ongoing attention should be given to building new strengths and continuing to maintain and develop as an optimally healthy organization.

APPENDIX D

Approval to use the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire – Short Form
March 15, 2002

Rob Thompson
Assistant Vice Pres. For Student Dev
Indiana Wesleyan University
4201 S. Washington Street
Marion, IN 46953

Dear Rob Thompson...

We are pleased to grant you permission to use 170 of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire 1977 long modified form as you requested.

Please note that each copy that you make must include the following copyright statement:

Copyright 1977, Vocational Psychology Research
University of Minnesota. Reproduced by permission.

Vocational Psychology Research is currently in the process of revising the MSQ manual and it is very important that we receive copies of your research study results in order to construct new norm tables. Therefore, we would appreciate receiving a copy of your results including 1) Demographic data of respondents, including age, education level, occupation and job tenure; and 2) response statistics including, scale means, standard deviations, reliability coefficients, and standard errors of measurement.

Your providing this information will be an important and valuable contribution to the new MSQ manual. If you have any questions concerning this request, please feel free to call us at 612-625-1367.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dr. David J. Weiss, Director
Vocational Psychology Research
APPENDIX E

Survey Instruction and Demographic page
Organizational Leadership Assessment
and
Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

General Instructions

The purpose of the combined questionnaire is to allow organizations to discover how their leadership practices and beliefs impact the different ways people function within the organization, as well as the job satisfaction levels of the personnel. People at all levels of the organization including workers, managers and top leadership will take this questionnaire. The questionnaire presents two surveys. Please respond to all questions on both instruments as well as the demographic question on the bottom of this page.

Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA)

As you respond to the different statements, please answer as to what you believe is generally true about Indiana Wesleyan University or your work unit. Please respond with your own personal feelings and beliefs and not those of others, or those that others would want you to have. Respond as to how things are... not as they could be, or should be.

Feel free to use the full spectrum of answers (Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree). You will find that some of the statements will be easy to respond to while others may require more thought. If you are uncertain, you may want to answer with your first, intuitive response. Please be honest and candid. The response sought is the one that most closely represents your feelings or beliefs about the statement that is being considered. There are three different sections to the OLA. Carefully read the brief instructions that are given prior to each section. Your involvement in this assessment is anonymous and confidential.

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ)

The purpose of the MSQ is to allow you to tell how you feel about your present job, what things you are satisfied with and what things you are not satisfied with. You will find statements concerning your current job. Read each statement carefully; decide how satisfied you feel about the aspect of your job described by the statement. Remember: keep the statement in mind when deciding how satisfied you feel about that aspect of your job. Do this for all of the statements. Please answer every item.

Be frank and honest. Give a true picture of your feelings about your present job.

Demographic Information

Please check one: Female  Male

Circle the number of years of schooling you completed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Graduate or Professional School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 10 11 12  13 14 15 16</td>
<td>17 18 19 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Circle the number which best describes the of years you have worked at IWU:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 12 13 14 15</td>
<td>16 17 18 19 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 22 23 24 25</td>
<td>26+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

Survey Cover Letter
April 11, 2002

Dear Colleague,

I am writing to invite you to participate in a study of the perceptions of leadership beliefs and practices and job satisfaction at Indiana Wesleyan University. There are no direct benefits to your participation, however, the research will provide important information about the changing nature of leadership on college campuses in general and at Indiana Wesleyan University in particular. The study is being conducted as part of my dissertation and under the auspices of the Department of Educational Leadership, Administration, and Foundations at Indiana State University.

I am interested in understanding how individuals at all organizational levels view leadership on the campus and specifically in the Divisions of Academic Affairs and of Student Development. As a full-time member of one of these divisions, I am very interested in your views. Your participation is essential for gaining a more complete picture of leadership at IWU. The enclosed questionnaires will take you approximately 25 to 30 minutes. By returning the completed questionnaire, you are giving your consent to participate in this study.

There are little or no foreseeable risks in participating in the survey. You may be assured of complete confidentiality when responding to the survey. Do not place your name on the questionnaire and return the completed survey to me in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope. Your participation is strictly voluntary and your refusal to participate will not result in penalty or loss of benefits. All surveys will be destroyed once the information has been recorded. A copy of the completed study will be placed on closed reserve in the library at Indiana Wesleyan University.

Dr. Joanne Burrows, my advisor, or I will be happy to answer any questions you might have regarding the study. Dr. Burrows can be reached at (812) 257-2902 or by email at jburrows@indstate.edu. My campus extension is 2202 and email address is rthompson@indwes.edu.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Robert S. Thompson
Doctoral Candidate
Indiana State University

Joanne M. Burrows, Ph.D.
Chair and Assistant Professor
Indiana State University
APPENDIX G

Survey Follow-Up Post Card
There is still time to complete and return your OLA—MSQ Survey.

Thank you for your response!

Questions? Contact Rob Thompson at
Phone: 785-677-2202
Fax: 785-677-2631
Email: rthompson@indwes.edu

Reminder

Thank you for your response!
Rob Thompson
3701 S. Nebraska Street
Marion, IN 46953
APPENDIX H

OLA Job Satisfaction Correlation with the MSQ Short Form
APPENDIX H

A Pearson Correlation was conducted to determine if there is a relationship between the measurement of job satisfaction as indicated by the OLA and the MSQ. The correlation of OLA job satisfaction and the MSQ score was found to be significantly related, $r (114) = .721$, $p < .01$, two tails. The finding indicated that a positive significant relationship, at the $p < .01$ level, existed between the OLA job satisfaction score and the MSQ results. The $r^2$ for the correlation between the OLA job satisfaction and the MSQ is .52, indicating that 52% of the variation can be determined by the relationship. The significant correlation of the OLA's job satisfaction questions with the validated MSQ support the use of the OLA for job satisfaction purposes.