GENERATIONAL DIFFERENCES IN SERVANT LEADERSHIP AND JOB SATISFACTION WITHIN RELIGIOUS NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS ALONG THE US/MEXICO BORDER

By

Glenn C. Lafitte, B.S., M.P.H.

DISSERTATION Presented to the Faculty of the Department of Leadership Studies Our Lady of the Lake University, In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements For the Degree of

> Doctor of Philosophy in Leadership Studies

Our Lady of the Lake University San Antonio, Texas

> Barbara Baggerly-Hinojosa, PhD Committee Chair

> > Carol Wheeler, PhD Committee Member

> > Yu Sun, PhD Committee Member

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated above all to my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ – the ultimate Servant Leader. It is also dedicated to my wife Bonnie who encouraged me to pursue this doctorate, sacrificed more than anyone else during all the years I worked on it, and never gave up on me. Of her it can truly be said, "Many waters cannot quench love, neither can the floods drown it" – not even the flood of a Ph. D. program! (Song of Solomon 8:7). I also dedicate it to my son, Jared, our daughter-in-law, Mandy, and our granddaughter, Audrey; and our son, Justin, and our daughter-in-law, Glenna. You have all shown me incredible love and patience during these years of study.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In acknowledging the many people who have helped me in completing this dissertation I have two competing fears: the fear of forgetting someone, and the fear that if I acknowledge everyone who has helped me, this section could be as long as the rest of the entire dissertation! First of all I must acknowledge Dr. Barbara Baggerly-Hinojosa, my dissertation committee chair, and professor for many of my Leadership Studies courses, who patiently guided me through the intricacies of the dissertation process. I also wish to thank Dr. Carol Wheeler and Dr. Yu Sun, the other members of my dissertation committee; and Dr. Esther Gergen and Dr. Meghan Carmody-Bubb who examined me during my pre-public defense. They all provided invaluable insights which have helped me improve this dissertation. I would also like to acknowledge the other professors at Our Lady of the Lake University Rio Grande Valley under whom I had the privilege of studying: Dr. Jared Montoya, Dr. Phyllis Duncan, Dr. Horacio Salinas, Dr. Charles Chapman, Dr. Roy Sheneman, Dr. Chris Townsend, and Dr. John Swiger. Thank you fellow members of OLLU RGV Cohort 5: Dr. David Martínez (my carpool companion during the classroom phase of our program), Dr. Sofia Villarreal, Dr. Mollie Ramón, Dr. Randy Townley, Dr. Dora Vargas-Bustos, and (soon-to-be) Drs. Roland García, Eddie Errisuriz, Lucy Leal, and Esther Rodríguez. You have all modeled servant leadership for me and helped me to persevere.

I wish to thank the board and staff of Inspiracom, the organization with which I serve, including Dr. Abe Limón who encouraged me to look into the Leadership Studies program at Our Lady of the Lake University, and the late Dr. Hernán Meneses who was my friend and mentor for over 35 years and helped me with many of the fine points of the Spanish language as it pertained to this study. I struggle with not mentioning anyone else

by name from Inspiracom, but this relates to the first sentence of these Acknowledgments, as there are over 200 of you! A special thanks to Dr. Larry Windle of Rio Grande Bible Ministries and your organization for all your help. Dr. Jim Laub of the OLA Group was incredibly helpful and generous with any and everything related to the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA).

My mother-in-law Alice Brawand has been a constant source of encouragement, as have Bonnie's and my brothers and their families: David and Christy Brawand, Dr. John and Anna Brawand, and Bruce Lafitte and Daria Jones; and their children, their children's spouses, and their grandchildren. Bonnie's uncle and aunt, Dr. Leon and Professor Mary Long have helped and encouraged me in very specific ways. Thank you also to the rest of the members of our extended family.

Thank you to my "band of brothers", Dr. Steve Havener, Dr. Matt Johnson, and Mario Pérez who have met with me for years every Tuesday morning for prayer, breakfast, and fellowship and have stood by me in friendship. They and their families and so many other friends all over the world are part of that "great cloud of witnesses" (Hebrews 12:1) who constantly cheer me on in life. Finally, thank you to my mission family and my church family who are a constant source of encouragement.

Soli Deo Gloria!

Glenn C. Lafitte March, 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iii
TABLE OF CONTENTSv
LIST OF TABLESix
LIST OF FIGURES
EXECUTIVE SUMMARYxi
Abstractxi
Introduction and Backgroundxii
The Problem xiii
Previous Studiesxiv
Participantsxxiii
Instrumentsxxiv
Methodxxiv
Resultsxxv
References
CHAPTER ONE – INTRODUCTION
Introduction
Background
Generational Cohorts
Servant Leadership
Servant Leadership Models and Instruments
Job Satisfaction

Servant Leadership and Job Satisfaction	10
Statement of the Problem	11
Purpose of the Study	12
Conceptual Definitions	13
Research Questions	17
Leadership Models	18
CHAPTER TWO – LITERATURE REVIEW	20
Introduction	20
Follower's Generational Cohort and Perception of Servant Leadership	20
Generational Cohort and Leadership	22
Age and Servant Leadership	27
Age and Leadership	29
Follower's Language and Perception of Servant Leadership	
Language and Leadership	
Follower's Tenure and Perception of Servant Leadership	40
Tenure and Leadership	42
Follower's Gender and Perception of Servant Leadership	44
Gender and Leadership	45
Follower's Education and Perception of Servant Leadership	51
Education and Leadership	52
Follower's Organizational Level and Perception of Servant Leadership	55
Follower's Generational Cohort and Job Satisfaction	59
Age and Job Satisfaction	61

Follower's Language and Job Satisfaction	65
Follower's Tenure and Job Satisfaction	67
Follower's Gender and Job Satisfaction	70
Follower's Education and Job Satisfaction	72
Follower's Organizational Level and Job Satisfaction	74
Perception of Servant Leadership and Follower's Job Satisfaction	75
Leadership and Job Satisfaction	79
CHAPTER THREE – METHODOLOGY	81
Overview	81
Sampling Plan	81
Research Study Instruments	82
Operational Definitions for Independent and Control Variables	86
Operational Definitions for Dependent Variables	87
Research Design	88
Null Hypotheses	89
Procedure	89
Data Collection and Analysis	91
Ethical Considerations	92
CHAPTER FOUR – RESULTS	94
Overview	94
Data Collected	94
Descriptive Statistics	96
Participants' Demographic Variables	96

Servant Leadership	
Job Satisfaction	
Findings	104
Correlations	104
Null Hypothesis 1	
Null Hypothesis 2	
Null Hypothesis 3	
CHAPTER FIVE – DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	115
Summary	115
Discussion of Findings	116
Implications	
Limitations	119
Recommendations for Future Research	
References	
Appendices	
A. OLLU IRB approval letter	
B. Recruitment message in English and Spanish	134
C. Informed Consent Form in English and Spanish	137
D. Permission letter from World Radio Network	142
E. Permission letter from Rio Grande Bible Ministries	143
F. Demographic Form in English and Spanish	144
G. Permission email from Dr. James Laub to use the OLA	146
H. The OLA in English and Spanish	148

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Study's Cronbach's Alphas	86
Table 2. Participant Language Comparison	96
Table 3. Participant Gender Comparison	98
Table 4. Participant Education	99
Table 5. Participant Organizational Level	100
Table 6. Participant Generational Cohort	101
Table 7. Pearson Correlation Matrix	104
Table 8. ANCOVA of Servant Leadership	106
Table 9. ANCOVA of Job Satisfaction	110
Table 10. Multiple Regression Model Summary – Job Satisfaction	114

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Dimensions of Laub's Servant Leadership Model	
Figure 2. Dimensions of Laub's Job Satisfaction Model	19
Figure 3. Relationship between Servant Leadership and Job Satisfaction	19
Figure 4. Language Comparison of Participants	96
Figure 5. Tenure Distribution of Participants	97
Figure 6. Gender Comparison of Participants	98
Figure 7. Education Comparison of Participants	99
Figure 8. Organizational Level Comparison of Participants	100
Figure 9. Generational Cohort Comparison of Participants	101
Figure 10. Distribution of Servant Leadership Scores	102
Figure 11. Distribution of Job Satisfaction Scores	103
Figure 12. Generational Cohort/Gender Interaction on Servant Leadership	107
Figure 13. Scatterplot of Servant Leadership and Tenure	
Figure 14. Generational Cohort/Gender Interaction on Job Satisfaction	111
Figure 15. Scatterplot of Job Satisfaction and Tenure	112
Figure 16. Scatterplot of Servant Leadership and Job Satisfaction	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Abstract

This study has investigated generational differences among two religious nonprofit organizations along the US/Mexico border on measures of followers' perception of servant leadership and followers' job satisfaction. A convenience sample was recruited by electronic means from the board and staff of World Radio Network, Inc., and the board, staff, and students of Rio Grande Bible Ministries. Participants took the online version of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999). Language was determined by the language the participant selected to take the OLA. A sample of n = 152 completed the demographic survey and the OLA. This was a non-experimental descriptive research design. The respondents' generational cohort as a categorical independent variable was compared with composite scores on the servant leadership scale and the job satisfaction scale of the OLA as dependent variables, controlling for language, tenure, gender, education, and organizational level employing factorial analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) methodology. Separate ANCOVAs were conducted for generational differences on the servant leadership scale of the OLA, and on generational differences on the job satisfaction scale of the OLA. In addition, multiple regression analysis was used to analyze composite scores on the servant leadership scale of the OLA as a predictor of composite scores on the job satisfaction scale of the OLA. The demographic variables of generational cohort, language, tenure, gender, education, and organizational level were entered as control variables into the hierarchical regression analysis.

Introduction and Background

This study has investigated generational differences on measures of followers' perception of servant leadership and followers' job satisfaction among two religious non-profit organizations along the US/Mexico border. The concepts of generational differences and servant leadership have received attention for some time now in the popular and practitioner literature (Gibson, Greenwood, & Murphy, 2009; Parry & Urwin, 2011; Spears, 2005). In recent years, the empirical support for both concepts has increased (Twenge, 2010; Green, Rodríguez, Wheeler, & Baggerly-Hinojosa, 2015). There has been little research to date that has combined the two concepts (Zimmerer, 2013).

Sessa, Kabacoff, Deal, and Brown (2007) state "a generation is a group of people of the same age in a similar social location experiencing similar social events...predisposing them for a certain characteristic mode of thought" (p. 49). They go on to say "these [generational] effects are stable over time, and these life experiences tend to distinguish one cohort from another" (p. 49). Still later they say "empirical research is beginning to suggest that generational cohorts do exist in the United States and can be differentiated from each other....However, at this point, labels and exact years those labels represent are often inconsistent" (p. 49).

This study has focused on generational differences and job satisfaction as applied to the servant leadership model of which Robert Greenleaf is regarded as the founder. In the essay "The servant as leader" (Greenleaf, 2003, pp. 29-74), written in 1970 which forms part 1 of *The Servant-Leader Within*, he articulated his model of the servant leader. Among the elements to be found in the servant leader are that he or she inspires trust, listens with attention, and searches for understanding. He or she raises questions so that others may question their assumptions and be persuaded to make needed changes. The servant leader promotes healing and sees that everyone is heard (Greenleaf, 2003).

Laub (1999) developed both a servant leadership scale and a job satisfaction scale for the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA). He found a strong positive correlation between the servant leadership scale and the job satisfaction scale in his original field research. In his model, servant leaders are defined as those who display authenticity, value people, develop people, build community, provide leadership, and share leadership. Job satisfaction in followers is defined as working at a high level of productivity, feeling good about one's contribution to the organization, feeling that one's job is important to organizational success, enjoying working for the organization, being able to be creative in one's job, and being able to use one's gifts and abilities in the job. Other researchers have found a strong positive correlation between the servant leadership scale of the OLA and other measures of job satisfaction (Thompson, 2002; Cerit, 2009; Jordan, 2015).

The Problem

There has been little research to date on generational attitudes towards work environment, leadership, and job satisfaction as measured by valid and reliable servant leadership and job satisfaction instruments (Zimmerer, 2013). Organizations must adapt to change as the younger generations inevitably assume positions of leadership now held by the older generations (Parry & Urwin, 2011). The organizations in this study are religious non-profits located on the US/Mexico border (World Radio Network, 2016a; Rio Grande Bible Ministries, 2016). They continue to grow in number of donors and income after decades of existence. This growth has occurred in the face of dramatic changes along the US/Mexico border over the past several decades. These organizations must continue to be able to adapt to change as the younger generations assume positions of leadership now held by the older generations. The board and staff members of both World Radio Network, Inc. and Rio Grande Bible Ministries fall into the four categories of generations that serve as the independent variable for this study. Older board and staff members will inevitably leave the organization and be replaced by members of younger generations. Members of younger generations. If the different generations react and respond differently to circumstances in the workplace, it is conceivable they would display varied levels of response to assessments of servant leadership and job satisfaction that measure their attitudes towards work environment and leadership.

Previous Studies

This dissertation has explored generational differences in followers' perception of servant leadership and job satisfaction when controlling for language, tenure, gender, education, and organizational level. A review of the literature did not reveal any metaanalyses of servant leadership. There have been a limited number of meta-analyses of generational cohorts. Where the literature has been limited, this section has been expanded to include followers' age in the case of generational cohort, and perception of leadership in general in the case of servant leadership.

Generational Cohorts and Servant Leadership

There has been only one study to date that has investigated differences between followers' generational cohort and perception of servant leadership. That is the study by Zimmerer (2013). She found no statistical difference between followers' generational cohort and perception of servant leadership.

Researchers found mixed results when reporting followers' generational cohort and perception of leadership. Sessa, Kabacoff, Deal, and Brown (2007) found significant generational differences in attributes perceived to be most important in leaders including credibility, dedication, focus, optimism, farsightedness, and listening. However, they found that some of the differences were only partially supported, and were more due to maturational than to generational cohort effects. Lester, Standifer, Schultz, and Windsor (2012) found some generational differences in followers' perception of leadership values but also found some of the differences to be perceived rather than actual differences in leadership values. Rodriguez, Green, and Ree (2003) found significant differences between Baby Boomers and Generation Xers in preferred leadership behaviors.

Researchers found mixed results when reporting followers' age and perception of servant leadership. The original field research for the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999) found no significant differences among age categories on perception of servant leadership but did find a small but significant positive relationship between followers' increasing age and perception of servant leadership. Subsequent research with the OLA by Horsman (2001) found significant differences among age categories unrelated to increasing age in perception of servant leadership. Rodríguez-Rubio and Kiser (2013) also found significant differences among age categories unrelated to increasing age in perception of servant leadership.

Researchers found mixed results when reporting followers' age and perception of leadership. Shirom, Gilboa, Fried, and Cooper (2008) found that as tenure and age

xv

increased, and as percentage of women and age increased, there was a reduction in the negative correlation between role ambiguity and job performance. Kabacoff and Stoffey (2001) found higher ratings for younger managers in the areas of overall leadership effectiveness than for older managers. O-Campo, Joyner, and Green (2012) in their study of language spoken at home and leadership preferences, did not find age to be a significant covariate. Ng and Feldman (2010) found a positive relationship between followers' increasing age and leader-member exchange (LMX) dyad formation. Kooij, Jansen, Dikkers, and Lange (2010) found employee perceptions of leadership practices of training, rewards, participation, information sharing, and teamwork to be positively correlated with affective commitment and age. Gilbert, Collins, and Brenner (1990) found the effect size between age of a leader, and his or her effectiveness from the point of view of the follower to be small. Lok and Crawford (2003) did not find a significant relationship between the age of participants and scores on the Leader Behavior Descriptive Questionnaire (LBDQ) (Stogdill, 1974). Barbuto, Matkin, and Marx (2007) found differences in followers' perceptions of leadership between age categories unrelated to increasing age. Kearney and Gebert (2009) found transformational leadership to be a significant moderator of the relationship of age on some, but not all, team outcomes.

Servant Leadership and Control Variables

Previous research has not revealed significant differences in perception of servant leadership based on followers' language. Dannhauser and Boshoff (2006) did not find significant differences between Afrikaans and English speakers in perception of servant leadership as measured by the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006). Irving and McIntosh (2007) found similar reliability coefficients between English and Spanish versions of the OLA (Laub, 1999). McIntosh and Irving (2010) found similar reliability coefficients between English and Spanish versions on three of the four dimensions of the Servant Leadership Assessment Instrument (SLAI) (Dennis & Bocarnea, 2005).

In other measures of leadership, followers' language did not reveal differences in perception of leadership. Lok and Crawford (2003) did not find significant mean differences on either LBDQ (Stogdill, 1974) factor between English-speaking Australian and Chinese-speaking Hong Kong managers. O-Campo et al. (2012) found a significant interaction between gender and language in two of the GLOBE (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004) leadership preferences. However, the interactions were within the same language group, not between language groups.

Research has revealed mixed results in the relationship between followers' tenure and perception of servant leadership. The original research for the development of the OLA (Laub, 1999) did not find a significant relationship between tenure and servant leadership. Additional research by Salameh (2011) using the OLA found significant differences based on years of tenure group category, but they were unrelated to increasing tenure and servant leadership.

Research has found mixed results in the relationship between followers' tenure and perception of leadership. Lok and Crawford (2003) found a negative relationship between tenure and consideration and a positive relationship between tenure and initiating structure in research utilizing the LBDQ (Stogdill, 1974). Sin, Nahrgang, and Morgeson (2009) found that the longer the tenure the greater the degree of LMX dyad formation. Kooij et al. (2010) found that tenure had a significantly negative moderating effect between some HR practices and affective commitment and no significant moderating effect between other HR practices and affective commitment.

Research has not revealed a significant difference in followers' perception of servant leadership based on gender. The original research for the OLA (Laub, 1999) and later research by Horsman (2001) using the OLA did not find significant differences between men and women on perception of servant leadership. Research by Dannhauser and Boshoff (2006) using the SLQ (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006) also did not find significant differences between men and women on perception of servant leadership.

Research has found mixed results in followers' perception of leadership based on gender. A meta-analysis by Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, and van Engen (2003) found female leaders were more transformational and engaged in more contingent reward behaviors than male leaders. In the meta-analysis of Paustian-Underdahl, Walker, and Woehr (2014), followers rated women significantly higher than men as leaders, whereas men rated themselves significantly higher as leaders than women did. Shirom et al. (2008) found that as percentage of women and age increased among followers, there was a reduction in the negative correlation between followers' role ambiguity and job performance. Lok and Crawford (2003) did not find a significant mean difference between men and women on either the initiating structure or consideration dimension of the LBDQ (Stogdill, 1974). Barbuto et al. (2007) found some significant differences between men and women followers in their study of the effect of leaders' gender, educational level, and age categories on a leader's use of full range leadership behaviors as rated by followers. The Cuadrado, Morales, and Recio (2008) experimental study of

leadership style and gender regarding women's access to managerial positions did not find statistical differences between men and women followers in perception of leadership. Elsesser and Lever (2011) found the effect size to be small between men and women followers in their study of gender bias against female leaders. O-Campo et al. (2012) discovered a main effect for gender in their study of gender and language spoken at home as applied to the six GLOBE (House et al., 2004) leadership preferences.

Research has indicated mixed results based on followers' level of education and perception of servant leadership. The original field research by Laub (1999) for the development of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) did not discover differences in perception of servant leadership based on educational level. Later research by Horsman (2001) with the OLA revealed increased perception of servant leadership with increasing level of education. Research by Salameh (2011) with the OLA and Dannhauser and Boshoff (2006) with the SLQ (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006) did not find significant differences in perception of servant leadership by followers based on educational level.

Research has indicated significant differences between both leaders' and followers' educational level and followers' perception of leadership. Leaders with advanced degrees were perceived by followers as exhibiting individualized consideration more than those without an advanced degree in the Barbuto et al. (2007) study. The Lok and Crawford (2003) study found significant differences between increasing followers' educational level and their perception of leaders' consideration on the LBDQ (Stogdill, 1974). Kearney and Gebert (2009) found that transformational leadership moderated the effect of followers' education on team performance. When transformational leadership is high the effect of followers' education on team performance is high. In the Rodriguez et al. (2003) assessment of generational differences between followers in preferences for leadership behaviors, there were significant differences especially among Generation Xers in preferences for several leadership behaviors by educational level of the follower.

Research has indicated mixed results in followers' organizational level and perception of servant leadership. The original field research for the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) Laub (1999) found that the higher one's level within the organization the higher the perception of servant leadership. Research by Horsman (2001) and Ledbetter (2003) with the OLA had similar findings as Laub's (1999) original research. Subsequent research with the OLA by Thompson (2002) found no difference in perception of servant leadership among followers' organizational level. Drury (2004) found a significantly higher perception by top leadership than hourly workers of servant leadership within an organization as measured by the OLA.

Generational Cohorts and Job Satisfaction

Research has revealed mixed results between followers' generational cohort and job satisfaction. The Hansen and Leuty study (2012) found significant generational differences for women in the areas of followers' satisfaction with working conditions, advancement, and relationships with coworkers. They found significant generational differences for men in the areas of followers' satisfaction with overall comfort, working conditions, job security, and authority. The Zimmerer (2013) study did not find any differences between generational cohorts and followers' job satisfaction. The Costanza, Badger, Fraser, Severt, and Gade (2012) meta-analysis of generational comparisons revealed that Matures exhibited slightly more job satisfaction than Baby Boomers and Generation X.

Research has revealed mixed results in the relationship of followers' age with job satisfaction. Several studies found a positive relationship between followers' age and job satisfaction (Ng & Feldman, 2010; Laub, 1999; Lok & Crawford, 2003; Dobrow Riza, Ganzach, & Liu, 2014). The Ng, Eby, Sorensen, and Feldman (2005) meta-analysis did not find a correlation between followers' age and career satisfaction. Gittell, Weinberg, Pfefferle, and Bishop (2008) found that followers' age was not a significant predictor of job satisfaction. The Kooij et al. (2010) meta-analysis revealed that employee perceptions of HR practices were positively correlated with job satisfaction and increased with age.

Job Satisfaction and Control Variables

Results have been mixed for differences in followers' job satisfaction by language. The Yousef (2000) and Gittell et al. (2008) studies did not reveal followers' language to be a significant predictor of job satisfaction. The Lok and Crawford (2003) study revealed significant differences in job satisfaction between language groups. Irving and McIntosh (2007) obtained similar reliability coefficients in English and Spanish for the job satisfaction scale of the OLA (Laub, 1999).

Results of research on the relationship between followers' tenure and job satisfaction have been mixed. Both the Ng et al. (2003) and the Gittell et al. (2008) studies found that followers' job tenure was not a significant predictor of job satisfaction. The Ng and Feldman (2010) meta-analysis of age and job attitudes revealed a significant moderating effect of followers' tenure on job satisfaction. As tenure increased job satisfaction increased. The Kooij et al. (2010) meta-analysis found that followers' tenure had a significantly negative moderating effect on the association between the HR practices of training, information sharing, and staffing, and job satisfaction. The Laub (1999) study revealed a positive relationship between tenure and job satisfaction. Both the Lok and Crawford (2003) and the Dobrow Riza et al. (2014) studies revealed a negative relationship between followers' tenure and job satisfaction.

Researchers found mixed results when reporting followers' gender and job satisfaction. Several studies did not find followers' gender to be a significant predictor of job satisfaction (Lok & Crawford, 2003; Ng et al. (2005); Gittell et al., 2008). The Ng and Feldman (2010) meta-analysis of age and job attitudes revealed a significant moderating effect of gender on job satisfaction. The Aydin, Uysal, and Sarier (2012) meta-analysis found a small effect in favor of males on job satisfaction of teachers in Turkey.

Results of research have been mixed on followers' education and job satisfaction. Lok and Crawford (2003) and Ng et al. (2005) found followers' educational level to be a significant predictor of job satisfaction. The Ng and Feldman (2010) meta-analysis of age and job attitudes revealed a significant moderating effect of college education on job satisfaction. Gittell et al. (2008) did not find followers' educational level to be a significant predictor of job satisfaction.

Researchers have found mixed results in followers' level of job satisfaction based on organizational level. Salyadain (1977) and Laub (1999) found that job satisfaction increased with increasing organizational level. Jordan (2015) did not find significant differences in job satisfaction between organizational levels.

Servant Leadership and Job Satisfaction

Studies have indicated a significant relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction. The original research for the development of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999) and subsequent studies (Drury, 2004; Irving, 2004; Anderson, 2005) have indicated a strong positive correlation between the servant leadership and job satisfaction scales of the OLA. Subsequent research has indicated a strong positive correlation between the servant leadership scale of the OLA and other measures of job satisfaction (Thompson, 2002; Cerit, 2009; Jordan, 2015). Other measures of servant leadership besides the OLA have shown a strong positive correlation with measures of job satisfaction (Van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011; Zimmerer, 2013).

Previous studies have indicated a significant relationship between leadership style and followers' job satisfaction (Yousef, 2000; Lok & Crawford, 2003). The Ng et al. (2005) meta-analysis revealed a significant positive correlation between career sponsorship, supervisor support, training and skill development opportunities, and followers' career satisfaction. In the Kooij et al. (2010) meta-analysis, there was a positive correlation between the high commitment HR practices of internal promotion, training, job enrichment, job security, rewards, participation, information sharing, teamwork, work-life policies, flexible work schedules, staffing, and performance management, and followers' job satisfaction.

Participants

A convenience sample was recruited from the board and staff of World Radio Network, Inc. and Rio Grande Bible Ministries (and also from the students of Rio Grande Bible Ministries) by electronic means. After giving informed consent by electronic means, participants provided information by online survey regarding date of birth, tenure with the organization, gender, education, and organizational level. Participants took the online version of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999). Language was determined by the language the participant selected to take the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999). Out of approximately 900 potential participants, 152 completed the demographic survey and the OLA for a response rate of 16.9%.

Instruments

The participants took an online survey in the language of their choice – English or Spanish - that included date of birth, language, tenure, gender, education, and organizational level. They also took the online version in the language of their choice – English or Spanish – of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999). The OLA is a 66-item, 5-point Likert scale format instrument that includes a 60-item servant leadership scale and a 6-item job satisfaction scale.

Method

This was a non-experimental descriptive research design. The respondents' generation as a categorical independent variable was compared with composite scores on the servant leadership scale and the job satisfaction scale of the OLA as dependent variables, controlling for language, tenure, gender, education, and organizational level employing factorial Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) methodology. Separate ANCOVAs were conducted for generational differences on the servant leadership scale of the OLA, and on generational differences on the job satisfaction scale of the OLA. Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) was employed to control for the effect of the continuous variable of tenure on the relationship between the categorical variable of generational cohort and scores on the servant leadership and job satisfaction scales of the OLA, as well as to control for the effect of the variables of language, gender, education, and organizational level on the relationship between the categorical variable of generation cohort and scores on the servant leadership and job satisfaction scales of the OLA. ANCOVAs were analyzed for any main effect of generational cohort or control variables on the dependent variables of servant leadership scores and job satisfaction scores of the OLA, as well as any interactions between generational cohort and the control variables on the dependent variables of servant leadership scores and job satisfaction scores of the OLA. *Pearson's r* correlations, *t*-tests, and ANOVAs were conducted as appropriate.

In addition, multiple regression analysis was used to analyze composite scores on the servant leadership scale of the OLA as a predictor of composite scores on the job satisfaction scale of the OLA. The demographic variables of generational cohort, language, tenure, gender, education, and organizational level were entered as control variables into the hierarchical regression analysis. R^2 , ΔR^2 , β eta weights, and partial correlations were conducted for the regression analysis. *Pearson's r* correlations, *t*-tests, and ANOVAs were conducted as appropriate.

Results

This study employed factorial analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) to test differences in scores on the servant leadership scale of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999) by generational cohort when controlling for language, tenure, gender, education, and organizational level. While there was not a significant main effect between generational cohort and scores on the servant leadership scale of the OLA, there was a significant interaction between Generational Cohort and Gender: F(3, 89) = 2.802, p = .044. Tenure was also a significant covariate: F(1, 89) = 8.132, p = .005. This suggests that in the presence of both gender and tenure, there are some generational differences in followers' perception of servant leadership. For the oldest and youngest generation, men have a slightly higher perception of servant leadership than women. For the middle two generations, women have a slightly higher perception of servant leadership than men.

Factorial analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was also employed to test differences in scores on the job satisfaction scale of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999) by generational cohort when controlling for language, tenure, gender, education, and organizational level. Again, while there was not a significant main effect between generational cohort and scores on the job satisfaction scale of the OLA, there was a significant interaction between Generational Cohort and Gender: F(3, 89) = 2.710, p = .050. Again, tenure was a significant covariate: F(1, 89) = 6.957, p = .010. This suggests that in the presence of both gender and tenure, there are some generational differences in followers' job satisfaction. For the oldest and youngest generation, men have a slightly higher level of job satisfaction than women. For the middle two generations, women have a slightly higher level of job satisfaction than men. There was a significant main effect for language: F(1, 89) = 7.873, p = .006. The results of a t-test (t(150) = -2.91, p = .004) revealed that English speakers had a lower mean score on the job satisfaction scale of the OLA (M = 4.14) than Spanish speakers (M = 4.50).

To test the relationship between scores on the servant leadership scale and scores on the job satisfaction scale of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) when controlling for generational cohort, language, tenure, gender, education, and organizational level, hierarchical multiple regression was employed to discover which variables were predictors of scores on the job satisfaction scale of the OLA. Language $(R^2 = .045, p = .010)$ was discovered to be a significant predictor of scores on the job satisfaction scale of the OLA. The results of a *t*-test (t(150) = -2.22, p = .004) revealed that English speakers had a lower mean score on the servant leadership scale of the OLA (M = 3.98) than Spanish speakers (M = 4.26). The results of a *t*-test (t(150) = -2.91). p = .004) revealed that English speakers had a lower mean score on the job satisfaction scale of the OLA (M = 4.14) than Spanish speakers (M = 4.50). Followers' scores on the servant leadership scale of the OLA were also a significant predictor of scores on the job satisfaction scale of the OLA. Scores on the servant leadership scale of the OLA accounted for 52.6% of the variance explained, with a standardized $\beta = .734$ and partial correlation of $r_p = .742$, indicating the higher the followers' perception of servant leadership, the higher the followers' job satisfaction (p = .000).

References

- Anderson, K. (2005). A correlational analysis of servant leadership and job satisfaction in a religious educational organization (Doctoral dissertation, University of Phoenix).
- Aydin, A., Uysal, S., & Sarier, Y. (2012). The effect of gender on job satisfaction of teachers: A meta-analysis study. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46(2012), 356-362.
- Barbuto, J. & Wheeler, D. (2006). Scale development and construct clarification of servant leadership. *Group & Organization Management*, 31(3), 300-326.
- Barbuto, J., Fritz, S., Matkin, G., & Marx, D. (2007). Effects of gender, education, and age upon leaders' use of influence tactics and full range leadership behaviors. Sex Roles, 56, 71-83.
- Cerit, Y. (2009). The effects of servant leadership behaviours of school principals on teachers' job satisfaction. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 37(5), 600-623.
- Costanza, D., Badger, J., Fraser, R., Severt, J., & Gade, P. (2012). Generational differences in work-related attitudes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 27(4), 375-394.

Cuadrado, I., Morales, F., & Recio, P. (2008). Women's access to managerial positions: An experimental study of leadership styles and gender. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 11(1), 55-65.

- Dannhauser, Z. & Boshoff, A. (2006). The relationships between trust, team commitment and demographic variables. Servant Leadership Research Roundtable, August, 2006, 1-14.
- Dennis, R. & Bocarnea, M. (2005). Development of the servant leadership assessment instrument. *Leadership & organization development journal*, 26(8), 600-615.
- Dobrow Riza, S., Ganzach, Y., & Liu, Y. (2014, January). Job satisfaction over time: A longitudinal study of the differential roles of age and tenure. Academy of Management Proceedings (pending), 1-22.
- Drury, S. (2004). Servant leadership and organizational commitment: Empirical findings and workplace implications. *Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*, August, 2004, 1-14.
- Eagly, A., Johannesen-Schmidt, M., & van Engen, M. (2003). Transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129(4), 569-591.
- Elsesser, K. & Lever, J. (2011). Does gender bias against female leaders persist?
 Quantitative and qualitative data from a large-scale survey. *Human Relations*, 64(12), 1555-1578.
- Gibson, J., Greenwood, R., & Murphy, E. (2009). Generational differences in the workplace: Personal values, behaviors, and popular beliefs. *Journal of Diversity Management*, 4 (3), 1-8.
- Gilbert, G., Collins, R., & Brenner, R. (1990). Age and leadership effectiveness: From the perceptions of the follower. *Human Resource Management*, 29(2), 187-196.

- Gittell, J., Weinberg, D., Pfefferle, S., & Bishop, C. (2008). Impact of relational coordination on job satisfaction and quality outcomes: A study of nursing homes. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 18(2), 154-170.
- Green, M., Rodríguez, R., Wheeler, C., & Baggerly-Hinojosa, B. (2015). Servant leadership: A quantitative review of instruments and related findings. *Servant Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 2(2), 76-96.
- Greenleaf, R. (2003). *The Servant-leader within: A transformative path*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Hansen, J. & Leuty, M. (2012). Work values across generations. *Journal of Career* Assessment, 20(1), 34-52.
- Horsman, J. (2001). Perspectives of servant-leadership and spirit in organizations.(Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Gonzaga University, Spokane, Washington.
- House, R., Hanges, P., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P., & Gupta, V. (Eds.). (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications.
- Irving, J. (2004). Servant leadership and the effectiveness of teams: Findings and implications. *Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*, August, 2004, 1-12.
- Irving, J. & McIntosh, T. (2007). Evaluating the reliability of the evaluación organizacional de liderazgo among Spanish speaking Latin Americans. *Proceedings of ASBBS*, 14(1), 786-805.
- Jordan, M. (2015). Determining the relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction among U.S. Navy personnel. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Northcentral University, Prescott Valley, Arizona.

- Kabacoff, R. & Stoffey, R. (2001). Age differences in organizational leadership. Management Research Group, 1-33.
- Kearney, E. & Gebert, D. (2009). Managing diversity and enhancing team outcomes: The promise of transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(1), 77-89.
- Kooij, D., Jansen, P., Dikkers, J., & Lange, A. (2010). The influence of age on the associations between HR practices and both affective commitment and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *31*, 1111-1136.
- Laub, J. (1999). Assessing the servant organization: Development of the organizational leadership assessment (SOLA) instrument. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation).
 Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, FL.
- Ledbetter, D. (2003). Law enforcement leaders and servant leadership: A reliability study of the organizational leadership assessment (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Regent University, Virginia Beach, Virginia.
- Lester, S., Standifer, R., Schultz, N., & Windsor, J. (2012). Actual versus perceived generational differences at work: An empirical examination. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 19(3), 341-354.
- Lok, P. & Crawford, J. (2003). The effect of organisational culture and leadership style on job satisfaction and organisational commitment: A cross-national comparison. *Journal of Management Development*, 23(4), 321-388.

- McIntosh, T. & Irving, J. (2010). Evaluating the instrumento de contribución al liderazgo de siervo (ICLS) for reliability in Latin America. *The Journal of Global Leadership*, 1(1), 30-49.
- Ng, T. & Feldman, D. (2010). The relationship of age with job attitudes: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, *63*, 677-718.
- Ng, T., Eby, L., Sorensen, K., & Feldman, D. (2005). Predictors of objective and subjective career success: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 58, 367-408.
- O-Campo, E., Joyner, N., & Green, M. (2012). The impact of the language spoken at home when growing up and Hispanic preferences in leadership. Sam Houston State University, Fourth Annual General Business Conference, *Proceedings*, *Volume III*, 106-119.
- OLAgroup (2016). <u>http://www.olagroup.com/</u>
- Parry, E. & Urwin, P. (2011). Generational differences in work values: A review of theory and evidence. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 13(1), 79-96.
- Paustian-Underdahl, S., Walker, L., & Woehr, D. (2014). Gender and perceptions of leadership effectiveness: A meta-analysis of contextual moderators. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99(6), 1129-1145.
- Rio Grande Bible Ministries (2016). http://www.riogrande.edu/en
- Rodriguez, R., Green, M., & Ree, M. (2003). Leading Generation X: Do the old rules apply? *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 9(4), 67-75.
- Rodríguez-Rubio, A. & Kiser, A. (2013). An examination of servant leadership in the United States and Mexico: Do age and gender make a difference? *The Global Studies Journal*, 5(2), 127-149.

- Salameh, K. (2011). Servant leadership practices among school principals in educational directorates in Jordan. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(22).
- Salyadain, M. (1977). Organization levels and job satisfaction. Vikalpa, 2(1), 29-39.
- Sessa, V., Kabacoff, R., Deal, J., & Brown, H. (2007). Generational differences in leader values and leadership behaviors. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal*, 10(1), 47-74.
- Shirom, A., Gilboa, S., Fried, Y., & Cooper, C. (2008). Gender, age and tenure as moderators of work-related stressors' relationships with job performance: A metaanalysis. *Human Relations*, 61(10), 1371-1398.
- Sin, H-K., Nahrgang, J., & Morgeson, F. (2009). Understanding why they don't see eye to eye: An examination of leader-member exchange (LMX) agreement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(4), 1048-1057.
- Spears, L. (2005). The understanding and practice of servant leadership. *Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*, August, 2005.
- Stogdill, R. (1974). *Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York: Free Press.
- Thompson, R. (2002). The perception of servant leadership characteristics and job satisfaction in a church-related college. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation) Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana.
- Van Dierendonck, D. (2010). Servant leadership: A review and synthesis. Journal of Management. Advance online publication, 1-34. doi: 10.1177/0149206310380462

- Van Dierendonck, D. & Nuitjen, I. (2011). The servant leadership survey: Development and validation of a multidimensional measure. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 26, 249-267. doi 10.1007/s10869-010-9194-1
- World Radio Network, Inc. (2016a). Workers' Manual, Articles of Incorporation, By-Laws.
- Yousef, D. (2000). Organizational commitment: A mediator of the relationships of leadership behavior with job satisfaction and performance in a non-western country. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 15(1), 6-28.
- Zimmerer, T. (2013). *Generational perceptions of servant leadership: A mixed methods study*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Capella University, Minneapolis, MN.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Introduction

This study has investigated generational differences on measures of followers' perception of servant leadership and followers' job satisfaction among two religious non-profit organizations along the US/Mexico border. The concepts of generational differences and servant leadership have received attention for some time now in the popular and practitioner literature (Gibson, Greenwood, & Murphy, 2009; Parry & Urwin, 2011; Spears, 2005). In recent years, the empirical support for both concepts has increased (Twenge, 2010; Green, Rodríguez, Wheeler, & Baggerly-Hinojosa, 2015). There has been little research to date that has combined the two concepts (Zimmerer, 2013).

The first of two organizations included in this study, World Radio Network, Inc., is a Protestant evangelical, interdenominational 501 (c) (3) religious non-profit organization comprised of 14 FM radio stations - nine in Spanish and five in English (<u>http://www.inspiracom.org</u>). In addition, the World Radio Network, Inc. operates several unmanned repeater stations and a Bible correspondence school in Spanish. The World Radio Network, Inc. was incorporated in 1982 under the auspices of World Radio Missionary Fellowship, Inc., and became a separate legal entity from that organization in 2005 (World Radio Network, 2016a).

According to its governing documents, the World Radio Network, Inc. is governed by a board of non-compensated members (World Radio Network, 2016b). The organization is staffed with approximately 200 individuals in three categories: missionaries, who are supported by churches and individuals to serve with the World Radio Network, Inc.; volunteers, who give from two to twenty or more hours a week of their time to the operations of the organization; and employees, many of whom served as volunteers before being employed (Dr. A. Limón, personal communication, December 1, 2015). Many of the staff members have served with the World Radio Network, Inc. for more than twenty years. They serve in 11 locations on the US side of the Mexico border from the Gulf of Mexico to the Arizona/California border. The board members of the World Radio Network, Inc. live in various parts of the United States. The missionary, employee, and volunteer staff members are from the United States, Canada, and Latin America (primarily Mexico) (Dr. A. Limón, personal communication, December 1, 2015).

The other organization included in this study, Rio Grande Bible Ministries, was established in 1946 and is located on a 68-acre campus in Edinburg, Texas, in the Lower Rio Grande Valley (<u>http://www.riogrande.edu/en</u>). It offers a four-year program in Spanish in Biblical Studies and a two-semester Spanish language course for non-Spanish speakers preparing for ministry to Spanish speakers (<u>http://www.riogrande.edu/en</u>). It also operates three radio stations, a bookstore, and a coffee shop. Like World Radio Network, Inc., Rio Grande Bible Ministries is a Protestant evangelical, interdenominational 501 (c) (3) religious non-profit organization (<u>http://www.riogrande.edu/en</u>). The membership of Rio Grande Bible Ministries represents a population of approximately 700 missionaries, employees, volunteers, and students from the United States, Canada, and all over Latin America, as well as board members who live in various parts of the United States and Canada (Dr. L. Windle, personal communication, December 1, 2015). In addition to local volunteers, many of the
volunteers are retired people from the northern United States and Canada who spend the winter months serving with Rio Grande Bible Ministries. They are housed on campus or at a nearby campground owned by the institute (Rio Grande Bible Ministries, 2016).

Background

This study has focused on generational differences and job satisfaction as applied to the servant leadership model of which Robert Greenleaf is regarded as the founder. In the essay "The servant as leader" (Greenleaf, 2003, pp. 29-74), written in 1970 which forms part 1 of *The Servant-Leader Within*, he articulated his model of the servant leader. Among the elements to be found in the servant leader are that he or she inspires trust, listens with attention, and searches for understanding. He or she raises questions so that others may question their assumptions and be persuaded to make needed changes. The servant leader promotes healing and sees that everyone is heard (Greenleaf, 2003). *Generational Cohorts*

Parry and Urwin (2011) discuss the profusion of popular and practitioner literature in reference to the matter of generations in the current workforce that assigns workers to four generations. They note the four generations are assigned different names and range of birth years in the literature, but make these general observations concerning three of the four generations:

Baby Boomers (born 1943-1960) lived to work and respected hierarchy and authority in the workplace, but were resistant to learning new things and to using technology. Generation X (born 1961-1981) responded to instant gratification, worked to live and expected to be rewarded quickly....Generation Y (or Millennials, born 1982 or after) believed in collective action and teamwork, were optimistic, trusted centralized authority, took technology for granted (Parry & Urwin, 2011, p. 87).

Parry and Urwin (2011) do not provide this kind of commentary for Veterans (also known as Traditionalists, Matures, or the Silent Generation, born 1925-1942). They state that "the grouping of individuals within these four generations is motivated by the belief that they each share a different set of values and attitudes, as a result of shared events and experiences" (p. 80). They then go on to discuss how "the practitioner literature suggests that differences in work values influence the requirements for all aspects of people management: recruitment, training and development, career development, rewards and working arrangements, and management style" (p. 80).

Sessa, Kabacoff, Deal, and Brown (2007) state "a generation is a group of people of the same age in a similar social location experiencing similar social events...predisposing them for a certain characteristic mode of thought" (p. 49). They go on to say "these [generational] effects are stable over time, and these life experiences tend to distinguish one cohort from another" (p. 49). Still later they say "empirical research is beginning to suggest that generational cohorts do exist in the United States and can be differentiated from each other....However, at this point, labels and exact years those labels represent are often inconsistent" (p. 49). For their study, they identify the following four generational cohorts by birth year: Mature Generation (1925-1945), Baby Boomers (1946-1963); Generation X (1964-1982) and Millennials (1983-onward) (Sessa, et al., 2011).

Servant Leadership

In the "Introduction: Understanding the growing impact of servant-leadership" (Greenleaf, 2003, pp. 13-27) to *The Servant-Leader Within*, Larry Spears quotes Robert Greenleaf. "The servant-leader is servant first. It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead. The best test is: do those served grow as persons; do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants?" (p. 13). Van Dierendonck (2010), and McClellan (2007) both cite portions of this same quotation. It serves as a conceptual definition of sorts of the thoughts, words, and actions of the kind of person who would have the potential to become a servant leader. It also points to a potential measure of outcomes in those being served. Spears (2005) himself has scrutinized the writings of Greenleaf and has developed a list of characteristics of the servant leader. They are listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community.

Since 1970 when Greenleaf (2003) wrote "The servant as leader" (Greenleaf, 2003, pp. 29-74), which forms Part 1 of *The Servant-Leader Within*, interest in research and application of the theory of servant leadership has expanded. Van Dierendonck (2010) references over 120 books and articles in his review article. He also includes an appendix referencing "Peer-Reviewed Studies on Servant Leadership and Follower Outcomes" (Van Dierendonck, 2010, pp. 28-29) conducted between 2003 and 2009. Williams and Jones (2009) have compared the differences between transformational and servant leadership. They conclude that the main difference is in the focus of the leader.

The transformational leader focuses on a transformation in the values of the follower to support the goals of the organization. The servant leader focuses on serving the followers. Brown and Bryant (2015) in their review article examine servant leadership at the individual, dyadic, and group or organizational level. They compare the "egoistic nature of transformational leadership...with the altruistic nature of servant leadership" (p. 14). At one point they state, "At the foundational level, the most serious issue with the theory of servant leadership is construct clarity" (p. 11).

Parris and Peachey (2013) conducted a review of the literature of servant leadership theory employing a systematic literature review (SLR) methodology. Criteria for inclusion in the study included that the article be peer-reviewed, that it be in English, and that the keywords, "servant leadership" be found in the article. The articles were published between the years 2004 and 2011. The authors found strong evidence in support of the following aspects of servant leadership theory: cross-cultural adaptability, promotes increased leader and organizational trust, fosters organizational citizenship behavior, is associated with procedural justice, increases team effectiveness, increases employee job satisfaction, promotes a positive work environment, enhances employee creativity and helping behaviors, improves follower well-being, lowers employee turnover, and increases job commitment. The aspect of enhancing collaboration was only moderately supported. There was insufficient evidence to support the application of servant leadership theory being associated with workplace spirituality, differences among demographic variables, understanding of servant leadership theory affecting its adoption, or a positive relationship with succession planning.

Servant Leadership Models and Instruments

Green et al. (2015) reviewed six instruments which have demonstrated empirical support in the peer-reviewed literature and which measure constructs related to servant leadership. In the same article they summarize the models of servant leadership associated with those six instruments. The Laub (1999) model includes valuing people, building community, providing leadership, developing people, displaying authenticity, and sharing leadership. The Ehrhart (2004) model includes forming relationships with subordinates, empowering subordinates, helping subordinates grow and succeed, behaving ethically, putting subordinates first, having conceptual skills, and creating value for those outside the organization. The Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) model includes altruistic calling, wisdom, emotional healing, organizational stewardship, and persuasive mapping. The Liden, Wayne, Zhao, and Henderson (2008) model includes emotional healing, creating value for the community, helping subordinates grow and succeed, conceptual skills, putting subordinates first, behaving ethically, and empowering. The Sendjava, Sarros, and Santora (2008) model includes voluntary subordination, authentic self, covenantal relationship, responsible morality, transcendental spirituality, and transforming influence. The Van Dierendonck and Nuijten (2011) model includes empowerment, standing back, authenticity, interpersonal acceptance, accountability, humility, courage, and stewardship.

Green (2013) describes the servant leadership instruments that have been developed in relation to the models discussed in the preceding paragraph. According to Green, the Laub (1999) Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) produced *Cronbach's alpha* scores for its various sub-scales in the .90 to .93 range. The Ehrhart (2004) Servant Leadership Scale was developed and administered along with the LMX-7 (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995) and the MLQ 5X (Bass & Avolio, 1995) and "lent some support that the Servant Leadership Scale seemed to measure something different from Transformational Leadership or Leader Member Relations" (p. 344). In the search for measures of reliability and validity for the Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) Servant Leadership Questionnaire, the subscales "were correlated with the overall LMX-7 score in the range of .55 to .73" and with the overall Transformational score from the MLQ 5X "in the range of .25 to .34" (p. 347). The dimensions of the Liden et al. (2008) Servant Leadership Scale were "correlated strongly with Transformational Leadership (.43 to.79) and the Leader-Member Exchange global scores from the LMX-MDM (.48 to .75) (Liden & Maslyn, 1998)" and "weakly to moderately correlated with the Affective Commitment scale of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (.18 to .45) (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979)" (p. 349). Sendjaya et al. (2008) developed the Servant Leadership Behavior Scale for which the "Cronbach's alpha for each scale ranged from .72 to .93" (p. 351). The Van Dierendonck and Nuitjen (2011) Servant Leadership Survey was developed in several stages that resulted in *Cronbach's alpha* scores in the range of .69 to .91 for the eight dimensions of the survey. "Seven of the eight scales from the Servant Leadership Survey were correlated in the range of .47 to .85 with the seven scales of the Servant Leadership Scale [of Liden et al. (2008)]" (p. 353).

The Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999) was developed as part of Laub's doctoral dissertation. He elaborated a question bank based on his review of the servant leadership literature and enlisted the aid of several servant leadership experts who participated in a three-step Delphi process. This resulted in an 80-item instrument which was field-tested on 828 participants. The instrument was later reduced to 60 items (Green et al., 2015). The Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) evaluates followers' perception of servant leadership at the organizational level as defined by the following constructs: "Displays Authenticity, Values People, Develops People, Builds Community, Provides Leadership [and] Shares Leadership" (Laub, 1999, p. 83).

Job Satisfaction

The literature on job satisfaction as a theoretical construct indicates that individual self-report has often been employed to ascertain job satisfaction (Wanous, Reichers, & Hudy, 1997; Yousef, 2000; Gittell, Weinberg, Pfefferle, & Bishop, 2008; Dobrow Riza, Ganzach, & Liu, 2014). Salyadain, (1977) discusses self-esteem, autonomy, and self-actualization as key elements of job satisfaction. Yousef (2000) and other researchers (Lok & Crawford, 2003; Kooij, Jansen, Dikkers, & Lange, 2010; Costanza, Badger, Fraser, Severt, & Gade, 2012; Zimmerer, 2013) have noted the relationship between job satisfaction and the three-component model of affective, normative and continuance organizational commitment but emphasize that job satisfaction and organizational commitment are different theoretical constructs. Clark (2015) recognizes income, flexible work schedule, opportunities for advancement, job security, interesting work, autonomy, being able to help others, and a sense of usefulness as dimensions of job satisfaction but emphasizes that the relative importance of these dimensions will vary from person to person or even within the same person over time. Aydin, Uysal, and Sarier (2012) discuss various dimensions of job satisfaction including opportunity to use one's gifts, abilities, and talents; flexibility; autonomy; role clarity;

financial rewards; and relationship with peers and superiors. Gittell et al. (2008) include having the necessary resources to perform one's work, and having high quality relationships with co-workers, as important elements of job satisfaction. Dobrow Riza et al. (2014) among many other researchers employ a single-item job satisfaction measure that utilizes a 5-point Likert scale from "1 (*dislike very much*) to...5 (*like very much*)" (p. 8) to assess job satisfaction. Wanous et al. (1997) conducted a meta-analysis of correlations of single-item measures of overall job satisfaction with scale measures and found "a minimum estimated reliability for the single-item measure close to .70" (p. 250). Laub (1999) includes six items in the job satisfaction scale of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) that assess feelings of productivity, contribution, importance, enjoyment, creativity, and use of gifts and abilities.

Servant Leadership and Job Satisfaction

There is strong empirical support for a relationship between leadership practices and job satisfaction in followers. A meta-analysis by Ng, Eby, Sorensen, and Feldman (2005) revealed that leadership practices such as career sponsorship, supervisor support, training and skill development opportunities, and organizational resources are significant predictors of subjective career success defined as career satisfaction. A meta-analysis by Kooij et al. (2010) indicated a strong positive correlation between job satisfaction and leadership practices such as internal promotion, training, job enrichment, rewards, participation, information sharing, and teamwork.

Servant leadership has been demonstrated to have a significant positive correlation with job satisfaction. The Van Dierendonck and Nuijten (2011) Servant Leadership Survey (SLS) measures the dimensions of empowerment, standing back, authenticity, interpersonal acceptance, accountability, humility, courage, and stewardship. In their original field test they found positive correlations ranging from r = .20 to r = .62 for seven of the eight dimensions, and satisfaction in followers with leadership, management, work environment, and co-workers.

Laub (1999) developed both a servant leadership scale and a job satisfaction scale for the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA). He found a strong positive correlation between the servant leadership scale and the job satisfaction scale in his original field research. In his model, servant leaders are defined as those who display authenticity, value people, develop people, build community, provide leadership, and share leadership. Job satisfaction in followers is defined as working at a high level of productivity, feeling good about one's contribution to the organization, feeling that one's job is important to organizational success, enjoying working for the organization, being able to be creative in one's job, and being able to use one's gifts and abilities in the job. Researchers found high positive correlation between the servant leadership scale of the OLA and other job satisfaction measures (Thompson, 2002; Cerit, 2009; Jordan, 2015).

Statement of the Problem

There has been little research to date on generational attitudes towards work environment, leadership, and job satisfaction as measured by valid and reliable servant leadership and job satisfaction instruments (Zimmerer, 2013). Organizations must adapt to change as the younger generations inevitably assume positions of leadership now held by the older generations (Parry & Urwin, 2011). The organizations in this study are religious non-profits located on the US/Mexico border (World Radio Network, 2016a; Rio Grande Bible Ministries, 2016). They continue to grow in number of donors and income after decades of existence. This growth has occurred in the face of dramatic changes along the US/Mexico border over the past several decades. These organizations must continue to be able to adapt to change as the younger generations assume positions of leadership now held by the older generations. The board and staff members of both World Radio Network, Inc. and Rio Grande Bible Ministries fall into the four categories of generations that serve as the independent variable for this study. Older board and staff members will inevitably leave the organization and be replaced by members of younger generations. Members of younger generations. If the different generations react and respond differently to circumstances in the workplace, it is conceivable they would display varied levels of response to assessments of servant leadership and job satisfaction that measure their attitudes towards work environment and leadership.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this research has been to study differences among members of four generations in their composite scores on measures of servant leadership and job satisfaction while controlling for language, tenure, gender, education, and organizational level. A convenience sample has been drawn from the board and staff of the World Radio Network, Inc., and Rio Grande Bible Ministries which represent populations of approximately 200 and 700 individuals respectively. The Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999) was made available to the participants in reliable, validated versions in both English and Spanish which represented the first languages of the membership of both organizations (Irving & McIntosh, 2007). Approval was obtained from the World Radio Network, Inc. president, the Rio Grande Bible Ministries president, the OLAgroup, the principal investigator's dissertation committee, and the Institutional Review Board of Our Lady of the Lake University, after which informed consent was obtained from the participants. All members of the study sample have taken the Laub (1999) Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) online in their language of preference, English or Spanish. The respondents' generation as a categorical independent variable has been compared with composite scores on the servant leadership and job satisfaction scales of the Laub (1999) Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA), as dependent variables while controlling for language, tenure, gender, education, and organizational level. A multiple regression analysis has been conducted on scores of the servant leadership scale of the OLA as a predictor of scores on the job satisfaction scale of the OLA while controlling for language, tenure, gender, education, and organizational level. This study has been important for several reasons. Among the desired outcomes of the study has been to add to the body of knowledge of generational attitudes towards work environment and leadership as measured by a validated and reliable instrument available in both English and Spanish, that contains both a servant leadership scale and a job satisfaction scale, while controlling for language, tenure, gender, education, and organizational level (Laub, 1999; Irving & McIntosh, 2007).

Conceptual Definitions

<u>Generation</u> – "the grouping of individuals within [one of] four generations...motivated by the belief that they each share a different set of values and attitudes, as a result of shared events and experiences" (Parry & Urwin, 2011, p. 80). For the purposes of this study the Sessa et al. (2007) designations and their representative characteristics have been followed which are: Mature Generation (born 1925-1945)

- Practical
- Patient
- Loyal
- Hardworking
- Respectful of Authority
- Rule-followers

Baby Boomers (born 1946-1963)

- Consensus building
- Optimistic
- Ambitious
- Teamwork
- Cooperation
- Workaholic
- Generation X (born 1964-1982)
- Individualistic
- Technically competent
- Comfortable with diversity
- Multitasking
- Balance life and work

Millennials (born 1983-onward)

- Technically "wired"
- Value diversity and change

- Distrustful of institutions
- Value meaningful work
- Value lifelong learning

<u>Servant Leadership</u> – A theoretical construct first described by Greenleaf (2003)

in 1970, and for the purposes of this study measured by the servant leadership scale of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999) which includes the following dimensions and characteristics:

Displays Authenticity through

- trust
- integrity
- accountability
- openness
- willingness to learn from others
- Values People through
- receptive listening
- trusting others
- serving the needs of others first

Develops People through

- providing opportunities to learn
- encouraging and building up others
- modeling appropriate behaviors

Builds Community through

• collaborative effort

- valuing differences within the community
- developing strong relationships

Provides Leadership through

- clarifying goals
- taking the initiative
- giving a vision of the future

Shares Leadership through

- empowering others to make decisions
- according worth and privileges to all
- developing a shared vision

Job Satisfaction - For the purposes of this study job satisfaction was defined by

the dimensions of the job satisfaction scale of the Organizational Leadership Assessment

(OLA) (Laub, 1999) which are the following:

- Works at high level of productivity
- Feels good about contribution to organization
- Job important to organizational success
- Enjoys working for organization
- Able to be creative in job
- Able to use gifts and abilities in job

Language – The language - English or Spanish - in which a participant in the study elected to take the online version of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999)

<u>Tenure</u> - years of service with the organization regardless of multiple categories (volunteer, employee, board member, etc.) or interruptions of service

<u>Gender</u> – male or female

<u>Education</u> – The highest level of education completed of the following four categories: less than high school, high school diploma or equivalent, bachelor's degree, graduate or professional degree

<u>Organizational level</u> – These included the following levels: top leadership, managers/supervisor, workforce

Research Questions

The research questions considered in this study were as follows:

- Are there differences in scores on the servant leadership scale of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999) by generational cohort when controlling for language, tenure, gender, education, and organizational level?
- Are there differences in scores on the job satisfaction scale of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999) by generational cohort when controlling for language, tenure, gender, education, and organizational level?
- 3. Is there a relationship between scores on the servant leadership scale of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999) and scores on the job satisfaction scale of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999) when controlling for generational cohort, language, tenure, gender, education, and organizational level?

Leadership Models

The following illustration demonstrates the dimensions of the Laub (1999) Servant Leadership model.



Figure 1: Dimensions of the Laub (1999) Servant Leadership model

The following illustration demonstrates the dimensions of the Laub (1999) Job Satisfaction model.



Figure 2: Dimensions of the Laub (1999) Job Satisfaction model

The following model illustrates the relationship between servant leadership and

job satisfaction:



Figure 3: Relationship between servant leadership and follower job satisfaction

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This study has explored generational differences in followers' perception of servant leadership and job satisfaction when controlling for language, tenure, gender, education, and organizational level. A review of the literature did not reveal any metaanalyses of servant leadership. There have been a limited number of meta-analyses of generational cohorts. Where the literature has been limited, this review has been expanded to include followers' age in the case of generational cohort, and perception of leadership in general in the case of servant leadership.

Follower's Generational Cohort and Perception of Servant Leadership

In the only study to date investigating generational cohort perception of servant leadership, Zimmerer (2013) investigated generational cohort differences in response to the van Dierendonck and Nuitjen (2011) Servant Leadership Survey (SLS) as a dependent variable. Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intent were also included as dependent variables. A stratified probability sample of 550 working adults in the United States ages 18 to 65 were recruited through an online research organization with a data base of over 1.2 million individuals. Of those recruited, 452 returned usable surveys. The study sample consisted of 150 Baby Boomers (born 1946-1964), 151 GenXers (born 1965-1981), and 151 GenYers (born 1982-2002). The following research questions were investigated:

Research Question 1 (RQ1): Is there a difference in the levels of job satisfaction when exposed to servant leadership among Baby Boomer, GenX and GenY employees? Research Question 2 (RQ2): Is there a difference in the levels of organizational commitment when exposed to servant leadership among Baby Boomer, GenX and GenY employees?

Research Question 3 (RQ3): Is there a difference in the levels of turnover intent when exposed to servant leadership among Baby Boomer, GenX and GenY employees? (Zimmerer, 2013, pp. 92-93)

Followers' perception of servant leadership was measured using the SLS. Followers' job satisfaction was measured using the Abridged Job in General Index (aJIG) (Russell et al., 2004) and the Abridged Job Descriptive Scale (aJDI) (Stanton et al., 2001). Followers' organizational commitment was measured using the Affective Commitment Scale (ACS) (Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993). Turnover intent was assessed as a "composite of all three scales by generation" (pp. 126-127) in the qualitative portion of Zimmerer's (2013) study. A one-way multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted on generational cohort as the independent variable, "servant leadership, affective commitment, job in general, and job descriptive index being the dependent variables" (p. 132). The *Wilks' Lambda* (λ) value was .95, with *F*(3,892) = 2.81, *p* = .004. However, follow up ANOVAs did not reveal any statistical differences between generational cohort for the Servant Leadership Survey (SLS) was *p* = .19.

Summary of Follower's Generational Cohort and Perception of Servant Leadership

There has been only one study to date that has investigated differences between followers' generational cohort and perception of servant leadership. That is the study by

Zimmerer (2013). She found no statistical difference between followers' generational cohort and perception of servant leadership.

Generational Cohort and Leadership

Rodriguez, Green, and Ree (2003) developed a survey "based on Bass and Avolio's [1994] definition of transformational leadership to formulate a leadership preference associated with the five themes" (p. 69) of fulfillment, technology, flexibility, monetary environment, and work environment. The survey was comprised of pairs of statements, one of which was expected to be preferred by each of two generations: Baby Boomers (born 1946-1964) and Generation X (born 1965-1979). The two generations represented a categorical independent variable, and each of the choices on the leadership preference survey represented ten dependent variables. The survey was distributed to 1000 employees of the telecommunications industry from four regions of the United States of which 805 returned valid surveys. Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted. The *Wilks' Lambda* (λ) "was significant at *F*(1,803) = 11.694, *p* < .05" (p. 71). There was a significant difference between Baby Boomers and Generation X on all but one of the ten dependent variables of the leadership

Sessa et al. (2007) tested the following four hypotheses:

1. There are generational differences in today's U. S. managers in terms of attributes perceived to be most important for leaders.

2. There are generational differences in today's U. S. managers in terms of leadership behaviors as perceived by the managers themselves.

3a. There are generational differences in today's U. S. managers in terms of leadership characteristics as perceived by their subordinates.

3b. There are generational differences in today's U. S. managers in terms of leadership characteristics as perceived by their bosses (Sessa et al., pp. 54-55).

To test Hypothesis 1 the authors selected a subset (N = 447) limited to those who were born and working in the United States out of a data base of 4,810 from the Center for Creative Leadership of individuals throughout the world. Members of the study sample were identified as belonging to one of the following generational cohorts: Mature Generation (born 1925-1945), Early Baby Boomers (born 1946-1954), Late Baby Boomers (born 1955-1963), Early Gen-Xers (born 1964-1976), Late Gen-Xers (born 1977-1982) or Millennials (born 1983 or later). The study sample consisted of 34 Matures, 95 Early Baby Boomers, 114 Late Baby Boomers, 138 Early Gen-Xers, 15 Late Gen-Xers and 51 Millennials. Women comprised 55.9% of the sample, and 84.9% identified themselves as being White. The study sample participated in a 20-minute online survey that measured year of birth and answers to the Leadership Descriptives Sort (adapted from Campbell, 2002) to identify attributes they considered most important in a leader. The top twelve rankings of attributes for each generational cohort were determined. The Kruskal-Wallace nonparametric rank test (χ^2) was employed to determine significant differences among the six generational cohorts. Those attributes that were found to be significantly different were subjected to a Mann-Whitley nonparametric rank test (U test) to determine significant differences between cohort pairs. Millennials differed from all the other generations in ranking the attribute of credible as

less important ($\chi^2 = 37.41$, p < .01) and the attribute of dedicated as more important ($\chi^2 = 35.17$, p < .01). Millennials also differed significantly from all other cohorts except Late Gen-Xers in ranking focused ($\chi^2 = 18.39$, p < .01) and optimistic ($\chi^2 = 13.99$, p < .05) as being more important. Millennials differed significantly from Early and Late Boomers and Early Gen-Xers in rating farsighted ($\chi^2 = 18.35$, p < .01) as less important. In the dimension of listens well, Late Boomers rated it as less important than did Early Boomers, Late Gen-Xers and Millennials, and Early Gen-Xers rated it as less important than Early Boomers and Millennials ($\chi^2 = 13.92$, p < .05). Thus Hypothesis 1 was supported.

To test Hypotheses 2, 3a, and 3b above, Sessa et al. (2007) administered the Leadership 360 instrument (Management Research Group, 1992) which measures 22 dimensions of leadership behavior, to 20,640 business professionals from 6000 North American companies representing 23 industries in 48 states. The sample was 54% male and distributed among the following generational cohorts: 2,440 Matures, 6,631 Early Baby Boomers, 7,722 Late Baby Boomers, and 3,847 Gen-Xers combining both Early and Late Gen-Xers. Millennials were not included in this study due to low numbers in the data pool. Scores on the 22 dimensions were subjected to canonical discriminant analysis as predictors against the four generational categories as outcomes. The authors concluded that Hypotheses 2, 3a, and 3b were only partially supported, and that differences in ratings of leadership dimensions were due more to maturational than generational cohort effects.

Lester, Standifer, Schultz, and Windsor (2012) reviewed the literature of generational preferences for leadership practices to develop a Likert-type survey of 15

items. They distributed the survey online to 466 employees of an organization located in the Midwestern United States. They received 263 valid responses. Participants were assigned to three generational cohorts: Baby Boomers (born 1945 to 1964, N = 102), Generation X (born 1965-1981, N = 99), Generation Y or Millennials (born after 1982, N = 62). They tested the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: Actual differences exist regarding the extent to which technology, face-to-face communication, e-mail communication, social media, formal authority, and fun-at-work are valued.

Hypothesis 2: There are more perceived value differences between generations than actual differences (Lester et al., 2013, pp. 344-345).

Participants were asked to rate the extent to which they would personally value each item on the survey from " $1 = No \ extent$ to $6 = Very \ great \ extent$ " (p. 345). They were then "asked to rate the same items based on the extent to which they believed each of the three generations valued the items" (p. 346). Multivariate analysis was conducted with generational cohort, gender, ethnicity, and educational level as fixed factors and the 15 value items as dependent variables.

For the Lester et al. (2012) study, "because the variable measured by the difference (...pairwise comparison of values from each generation) was insensitive to which component score is larger, absolute difference scores were deemed appropriate" (p. 347). For the personal value ratings, Generation Y had a significantly higher mean difference score than Baby Boomers regarding preference for e-mail communication (*Mean Difference* = .71, p < .01). Generation Y indicated a higher preference for social media than Generation X (*Mean Difference* = 1.16, p < .001). Generation Y also

indicated a higher preference for social media than Baby Boomers

(*Mean Difference* = 1.50, p < .001). Generation Y indicated a higher preference for funat-work than Generation X (*Mean Difference* = .69, p < .01). Generation Y also indicated a higher preference for fun-at-work than Baby Boomers (*Mean Difference* = .66, p < .01). Generation Y indicated a higher preference for continuous learning than Baby Boomers (*Mean Difference* = .51, p < .05). Baby Boomers indicated a higher preference for professionalism than Generation X (*Mean Difference* = .38, p < .05). Hypothesis 1 was partially supported as generational cohort differences were found in three of the five items from the 15-item survey which were hypothesized to differ between the generations.

In the Lester et al. (2012) study, Hypothesis 2 involved each generational cohort rating their own and the other two generations on their perception of that generation's rating for each of the 15 items of the survey. This resulted in 45 potential differences in values of which 27 were significant. Hypothesis 2, which involved testing a higher number of perceived rather than real differences, was thus supported.

Summary of Follower's Generational Cohort and Perception of Leadership

Researchers found mixed results when reporting followers' generational cohort and perception of leadership. Sessa et al. (2007) found significant generational differences in attributes perceived to be most important in leaders including credibility, dedication, focus, optimism, farsightedness, and listening. However, they found that some of the differences were only partially supported, and were more due to maturational than to generational cohort effects. Lester et al. (2012) found some generational differences in followers' perception of leadership values but also found some of the differences to be perceived rather than actual differences in leadership values. Rodríguez et al. (2003) found significant differences between Baby Boomers and Generation Xers in preferred leadership behaviors.

Age and Servant Leadership

Laub (1999) developed the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) as part of his doctoral research to assess organizational health. The OLA was established through a Delphi Survey process involving experts in the field of servant leadership. In the course of the 3-part Delphi process the experts arrived at a consensus on the characteristics of the servant organization. The original 80-item instrument (which contained 74 servant leadership items and six job satisfaction items) was field tested among 828 participants from 41 organizations, one of which was in the Netherlands and the rest in the United States, representing religious, secular non-profit and for profit organizations, and public agencies. No significant differences between age categories and perception of servant leadership were discovered. There was a small but significant positive correlation between age and scores on the OLA (r = .076, p < .05).

Horsman (2001) administered the OLA (Laub, 1999) to 608 participants from 34 community service, for profit, educational, religious, government, and health care organizations in the Pacific Northwest of the United States and the Canadian province of Alberta. He conducted a one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on the following age categories: 20-29 years, 30-39 years, 40-49, years, 50+ years. The ANOVA revealed a significant difference among the different age categories, F(3, 534) = 4.021, p = .008. Bonferroni post-hoc analysis revealed that the 30-39 years age group had a significantly

different OLA mean score from the 20-29 years and 50+ years age groups which had similar mean scores.

Rodríguez-Rubio and Kiser (2013) investigated the following research questions: *Research Question 1*: Are cultural values that point towards the acceptance of servant leadership different for men and women in the US and Mexico?

Research Question 2: Are servant leadership oriented values of older and younger generations in the US and Mexico different? (Rodríguez-Rubio & Kiser, 2013, p. 130)

Data were collected from wave 4 (1999-2004) of the World Values Survey (WVS) (World Values Survey, 2012) (<u>http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org</u>) on 2133 men and women from the United States and Mexico. "A total of 32 variables were selected to compare the differences between gender and among age groups" (p. 130). Twenty five of the variables were categorical, and the other nine were continuous. "The variables were selected as proxies of different values and attitudes of the servant leader" (p. 131). For the continuous variables, analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted for the following age categories by country: 15 to 29 years old; 30 to 49 years old; 50 years old and older. Significant differences were found among the different age groups in Mexico for the following variables: importance of work in life, importance of service to others, freedom of choice, and control. Among the different age groups in the US the following variables had significant differences: importance of friends, importance of work, importance of service to others, satisfaction with life, and respect for individual rights. For the categorical variables by age group for Mexico, (*Chi square*) χ^2 analysis revealed significant differences for the following variables: membership in religious organizations, voluntary work with the elderly, voluntary work with religious organizations, voluntary work with women's groups, importance of job to meet one's abilities, and following instructions at work. For the categorical values by age group for the US, χ^2 analysis revealed significant differences for the following variables: membership in religious organizations, voluntary work with the elderly, voluntary work with religious organizations, voluntary work with the elderly, voluntary work with religious organizations, voluntary work with youth groups, voluntary work with women's groups, most people can be trusted, good human relationships, opportunity to use initiative at work, how business and industry should be managed, less emphasis on money and material possessions, greater respect for authority, and more emphasis on family life.

Summary of Age and Servant Leadership

Researchers found mixed results when reporting followers' age and perception of servant leadership. The original field research for the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999) found no significant differences among age categories on perception of servant leadership, but did find a small but significant positive relationship between followers' increasing age and perception of servant leadership. Subsequent research with the OLA by Horsman (2001) found significant differences among age categories unrelated to increasing age in perception of servant leadership. Rodríguez-Rubio and Kiser (2013) also found significant differences among age categories unrelated to increasing age in perception of servant leadership.

Age and Leadership

Shirom, Gilboa, Fried, and Cooper (2008) conducted a meta-analysis of the moderating effect of gender, age, and tenure on role conflict and role ambiguity with job

performance. Mean age had a moderating effect between role ambiguity and job performance. As age increased, the negative correlation between role ambiguity and job performance decreased. Weighted Least Squares (WLS) regression analysis was used to estimate the moderating effect of age with the following results for the direct effect of age on the meta-correlation of role ambiguity with general performance: (N = 7,657, k = 30, $\beta = .47$, p < .05). As tenure and age increased, there was a reduction in the negative correlation between role ambiguity and job performance (N = 7,657, k = 30, $\beta = .48$, $\Delta R^2 = .14$, F = 1.57, p < .05). As percentage of women and age increased, there was a reduction in the negative correlation between role ambiguity and job performance (N = 7,657, k = 30, $\beta = -.44$, $\Delta R^2 = .12$, F = 2.44, p < .05).

Ng and Feldman (2010) conducted a meta-analysis of the relationship between age and 35 job attitudes including work tasks, colleagues, supervisors, and organizations. They included over 800 studies in their meta-analysis. Organizational tenure, race, gender, educational level, and year of study moderated the relationship between age and job attitudes. The relationship of increasing age with employee perceptions of leadership in terms of leader-member exchange dyad formation revealed the following: (N = 5,562, $k = 22, r_c = .06$).

Kooij et al. (2010) conducted a validity general meta-analysis of the effect of age on the association between HR practices and affective commitment and job satisfaction. Correlations were corrected for sampling error yielding mean true score correlations. The researchers applied the 75 percent rule in performing moderator analyses when 25 percent or more of variance remained after accounting for statistical artifacts. They tested the following hypotheses: *Hypothesis 1a:* High commitment HR practices are positively related to affective commitment.

Hypothesis 1b: High commitment HR practices are positively related to job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 2: The associations between high commitment HR practices that relate to the maintenance HR bundle and both affective commitment and job satisfaction will strengthen in older age.

Hypothesis 3: The associations between high commitment HR practices that relate to the development HR bundle and both affective commitment and job satisfaction will weaken in older age. (Kooij et al., 2010, pp. 1113, 1116).

Weighted least squares regression analysis was performed to test the moderating effect of age in Hypotheses 2 and 3. Mean sample age (controlling for tenure) was the independent variable and the correlation coefficient between HR practices, affective commitment, and job satisfaction. The researchers tested for the linear and curvilinear effects of age. Their analysis of 83 studies revealed that employee perceptions of maintenance leadership practices including job security, staffing, rewards, participation, information sharing, flexible work schedules, and teamwork were positively correlated with affective commitment (N = 31,515, k = 50, $\rho = .42$) and strengthened with age.

Gilbert, Collins, and Brenner (1990) studied the relationship between age of a leader and his or her effectiveness from the point of view of the follower. A random sample of employees (N = 1,634) was surveyed in the years 1987, 1988, and 1989 from 17 public and private organizations in the United States and Jamaica including police,

hotel, manufacturing, engineering, hospital, education, retail, and government organizations. Of the respondents, 18% were 30 years or less, 34% were 31 to 40 years of age, 32% were 41 to 50 years of age, and 15% were 51 years or older. A Likert-type instrument developed by one of the authors was administered to measure the performance of the leader on 12 dimensions in the areas of mission accomplishment, empowering behaviors, and relationship behaviors from the perception of the follower. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was employed to determine differences between the age of the leaders and respondents' ratings of the leaders on the 12 dimensions. Eta-squared (η^2) statistics were applied as a post-hoc test of effect size to account for statistical differences due to age rather than sample size. Older leaders were found to be more effective at delegating than younger leaders ($\eta^2 = .13$, F = 8.934, p = .000). Younger leaders had more of a calming influence on followers than older leaders ($n^2 = .07$, F = 2.634, p = .048). Younger leaders received higher ratings than older leaders in the areas of friendship ($\eta^2 = .08$, F = 3.433, p = .016) and enjoyableness ($\eta^2 = .12$, F = 7.992, p = .000). The η^2 values suggest that the influence of leader age on effectiveness is not strong.

Kabacoff and Stoffey (2001) studied age differences in organizational leadership behavior. Matched groups of younger (25-35) and older (45-55) North American midlevel managers (n = 1,280) were evaluated by self, supervisor, peers, and direct reports on 22 leadership behaviors and 3 leadership effectiveness measures (business skills, people skills, and overall leadership effectiveness) using the Leadership Effectiveness Analysis instrument (Management Research Group, 2012). A second study using the same procedures compared younger (25-35) and older North American division heads and vice presidents. In the first study multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA) of supervisor ratings were significant for all three leadership effectiveness variables (*Wilks' Lambda* (λ) = .91, *F* (3, 1276) = 40.01, *p* < .0001). One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted which indicated a significant main effect and with the following effect sizes: supervisors rating younger managers higher than older managers on business skills (*d* = -.34), people skills (*d* = -.30), and overall leadership effectiveness (*d* = -.59). Multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA) of peer ratings was also significant (*Wilks' Lambda* (λ) = .93, *F* (3, 1219) = 32.57, *p* < .0001). Younger managers were rated higher by their peers with effect sizes on business skills of (*d* = -.15) and overall leadership effectiveness of (*d* = -.41). Finally MANOVAs for direct reports were also significant (*Wilks' Lambda* (λ) = .97, *F* (3, 1276) = 14.82, *p* < .0001), with significant main effect of direct reports rating younger managers higher than older managers on business skills (*d* = -.14), people skills (*d* = -.12), and overall leadership effectiveness (*d* = -.32).

The second Kabacoff and Stoffey (2001) study mirrored the results of the first study. Multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA) of supervisor ratings were significant for all three leadership effectiveness variables (*Wilks' Lambda* (λ) = .88, *F* (3, 250) = 11.71, p < .0001). One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted which indicated a significant main effect and with the following effect sizes: supervisors rating younger managers higher than older managers on business skills (*d* = -.26), people skills (*d* = -.25), and overall leadership effectiveness (*d* = -.61). Multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA) of peer ratings was also significant (*Wilks' Lambda* (λ) = .92, *F* (3, 241) = 6.85, *p* < .0002). Younger managers were rated higher by their peers with

effect size on overall leadership effectiveness of (d = -.47). Finally MANOVA for direct reports was also significant (*Wilks' Lambda* (λ) = .89, *F* (3, 250) = 9.92, *p* < .0001), with significant main effect of direct reports rating younger managers higher than older managers on business skills (d = -.26) and overall leadership effectiveness (d = -.51).

Lok and Crawford (2003) studied the effect of organizational culture and leadership style on job satisfaction and organizational commitment on a sample of 337 managers from Hong Kong and Australia. Leadership style was measured by the Leader Behavior Descriptive Questionnaire (LBDQ) (Stogdill, 1974), and job satisfaction was measured by the Warr job satisfaction questionnaire (Warr, Cook, & Wall, 1979). No significant relationship was found between the age of the participants and scores on the LBDQ.

Barbuto, Fritz, Matkin, and Marx (2007) studied the effect of gender, education, and age on influence tactics and full range leadership behaviors. They collected data from the Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-rater version) (Bass, 1985) and Yukl's Influence Behavior Questionnaire (IBQ) (Yukl & Falbe, 1990) for 56 leaders and 234 followers from a variety of industries in rural and urban settings in the United States. Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted on the independent variables of gender, education, and age, and the dependent variables of the MLQ and the IBQ. For the independent variable of age (*Wilks' Lambda* (λ) = .83, *F* = 1.46, *p* = .079 (*sic*). One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted which indicated a significant main effect for the 46+ age group of leaders being rated higher than the 22-35 and 36-45 age groups in transformational leadership, (*F* = 4.24, *p* = .016), idealized influence, (*F* = 5.48, *p* = .017), and individualized consideration, (*F* = 4.84, *p* = .009). Kearney and Gebert (2009) studied transformational leadership as a moderator of the relationship of age, nationality, and educational background on team outcomes among 62 research and development teams within a multinational pharmaceutical company headquartered in Germany. Surveys were sent by e-mail and valid surveys received from 339 members of the 62 teams. Educational and demographic information on the participants was provided by the human resources department of the company. Team leaders rated team performance longitudinally six months after collection of team member data. Transformational leadership was measured by the MLQ-5X Short (Avolio & Bass, 2004). The following hypotheses were tested:

Hypothesis 1: Transformational leadership moderates the relationship of age, nationality, and educational diversity with team performance such that this relationship is positive when levels of transformational leadership are high but negative or nonsignificant when levels of transformational leadership are low.

Hypothesis 2: The elaboration of task-relevant information fully mediates the moderating effect of transformational leadership on the relationship of age, nationality, and educational diversity with team performance. *Hypothesis 3*: Collective team identification partially mediates the moderating effect of transformational leadership on the relationship of age, nationality, and educational diversity with the elaboration of taskrelevant information (Kearney & Gebert, 2009, pp. 80-81).

Hierarchical regression analysis was conducted on the data. The researchers set significance levels at p < .10 for findings involving interactions because of the inherently

low power in field studies for detecting moderators. In support of Hypothesis 1, the multiple squared correlation coefficient indicated a significant change after adding the interaction terms of age, nationality, and education ($\Delta R^2 = .17, p < .01$). The interaction of transformational leadership with age was significant (b = 2.23, p < .05). "When transformation leadership was low, team performance was negatively related to age (b = -2.00, t = -1.72, p < .10)", p. 85), but when transformational leadership was high, the relationship of age to team performance was not significant. In support of Hypothesis 2, the interaction of transformational leadership with age, nationality, and education indicated a significant change in the multiple squared correlation coefficient ($\Delta R^2 = .19$, p < .01). "When transformational leadership was high, the elaboration of task-relevant information was positively related to age (b = 1.67, t = 2.17, p < .05)" pp. 85-86). The indirect or mediated effect of age with transformational leadership via task-relevant information on team performance was significant (b = 0.66, SE = 0.42, p < .05). In support of Hypothesis 3, the interaction of transformational leadership with age, nationality, and education also indicated a significant change in the multiple squared correlation coefficient ($\Delta R^2 = .18, p < .01$). "When transformational leadership was high, collective team identification was positively related to diversity concerning age (b = 1.43, *t* = 2.21, *p* < .05)", p. 86).

O'Campo, Joyner, and Green (2012) studied language spoken at home and leadership preference among employees in Texas of two Fortune 500 companies who were recruited through social networking which provided a link to an on-line survey. Valid surveys were returned from 106 participants. Analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was applied to the categorical independent variables of gender and language spoken at home with the covariate of age. The dependent variables were the six GLOBE (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004) leadership preferences. The ANCOVA did not reveal age to be a significant covariate.

Summary of Age and Leadership

Researchers found mixed results when reporting followers' age and perception of leadership. Shirom et al. (2008) found that as tenure and age increased, and as percentage of women and age increased, there was a reduction in the negative correlation between role ambiguity and job performance. Kabacoff and Stoffey (2001) found higher ratings for younger managers in the areas of overall leadership effectiveness than for older managers. O'Campo et al. (2012) in their study of language spoken at home and leadership preferences did not find age to be a significant covariate. Ng and Feldman (2010) found a positive relationship between followers' increasing age and leadermember exchange (LMX) dyad formation. Kooij et al. (2010) found employee perceptions of leadership practices of training, rewards, participation, information sharing, and teamwork to be positively correlated with affective commitment and age. Gilbert et al. (1990) found the effect size between age of a leader, and his or her effectiveness from the point of view of the follower to be small. Lok and Crawford (2003) did not find a significant relationship between the age of participants and scores on the LBDQ (Stogdill, 1974). Barbuto et al. (2007) found differences in followers' perceptions of leadership between age categories unrelated to increasing age. Kearney and Gebert (2009) found transformational leadership to be a significant moderator of the relationship of age on some, but not all, team outcomes.

Follower's Language and Perception of Servant Leadership

Dannhauser and Boshoff (2006) studied the relationship between followers' perception of servant leadership, trust, team commitment, and demographic variables. They administered the Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ), the Workplace Trust Survey (WTS) (Ferres & Travaglione, 2003) and the Team Commitment Survey (TCS) (personal communication between H. F. Bennett and A. B. Boshoff, June, 1997) to 417 sales people from the automobile industry in South Africa. Demographic information was obtained on the participants' age, tenure, religious affiliation, ethnicity, educational level, language, and gender. Participants were recruited electronically. Analysis of the data was conducted as appropriate by Pearson Product-Moment correlation, multiple regression, *t*-test, and analysis of variance (ANOVA). Analysis of participants' language differences as Afrikaans or English speakers did not reveal a significant difference in means by *t*-test in perception of servant leadership as measured by the SLQ.

Irving and McIntosh (2007) evaluated the reliability of the Spanish version of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999). They administered the Spanish version of the OLA to a convenience sample of 78 leaders in Lima, Peru of which 60 provided usable data for the servant leadership scale of the OLA, and 78 provided usable data for the job satisfaction scale of the OLA. Their research revealed a *Cronbach's alpha* of .9862 (N = 60) for the Spanish version of the servant leadership scale of the OLA. Laub's (1999) original field research for the OLA revealed a *Cronbach's alpha* of .98 for the English version of the servant leadership scale.
McIntosh and Irving (2010) administered a Spanish translation of the Dennis and Bocarnea (2005) Servant Leadership Assessment Instrument (SLAI) to a convenience sample of 78 students and professors from an evangelical Christian seminary in Lima, Peru. The original English version of the SLAI had the following reliability coefficients for the four dimensions of the SLAI: Love (*Cronbach's alpha* = .94); Empowerment (*Cronbach's alpha* = .83); Vision (*Cronbach's alpha* = .89); Humility (*Cronbach's alpha* = .92). The Spanish translation of the SLAI had the following

reliability coefficients for the four dimensions of the SLAI:

Love (*Cronbach's alpha* = .84); Empowerment (*Cronbach's alpha* = .92);

Vision (*Cronbach's alpha* = .90); Humility (*Cronbach's alpha* = .50).

Summary of Follower's Language and Perception of Servant Leadership

Previous research has not revealed significant differences in perception of servant leadership based on followers' language. Dannhauser and Boshoff (2006) did not find significant differences between Afrikaans and English speakers in perception of servant leadership as measured by the SLQ (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006). Irving and McIntosh (2007) found similar reliability coefficients between English and Spanish versions of the OLA (Laub, 1999). McIntosh and Irving (2010) found similar reliability coefficients between English and Spanish versions on three of the four dimensions of the SLAI (Dennis & Bocarnea, 2005).

Language and Leadership

In the Lok and Crawford (2003) study the LBDQ (Stogdill, 1974) was administered to 337 managers from a wide variety of industries in Australia (N = 129) and Hong Kong (N = 208). A *t*-test was conducted as appropriate on mean factor scores of the LBDQ for consideration and initiating structure for Australian and Hong Kong managers. There was no significant mean difference on either LBDQ factor between English-speaking Australian and Chinese-speaking Hong Kong managers.

In the O-Campo et al. (2012) study, three-way analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) did not reveal a significant main effect for language differences between English and Spanish speakers in GLOBE (House et al., 2004) leadership preferences. There was a significant interaction between gender and language in two of the GLOBE leadership preferences. However, the interactions were within the same language group - not between language groups (interaction between gender and language for Participative Leadership for English speakers, and interaction between gender and language for Humane-Oriented Leadership for Spanish speakers.

Summary of Follower's Language and Perception of Leadership

In other measures of leadership, followers' language did not reveal differences in perception of leadership. Lok and Crawford (2003) did not find significant mean differences on either LBDQ (Stogdill, 1974) factor between English-speaking Australian and Chinese-speaking Hong Kong managers. O-Campo et al. (2012) found a significant interaction between gender and language in two of the GLOBE (House et. al) leadership preferences. However, the interactions were within the same language group, not between language groups.

Follower's Tenure and Perception of Servant Leadership

In the Laub (1999) study for the original field test for the development of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA), tenure categories were investigated for differences with scores on the servant leadership scale of the OLA. The categories were as follows: less than one year of service, 1-3 years, 4-6 years, 7-10 years, 10-15 years, more than 15 years. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) did not reveal significant differences between tenure categories (F(5,810) = .606, p > .05).

Salameh (2011) investigated teachers' perception of servant leadership practices among school principals in the country of Jordan. The Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999) was administered to a random sample of 432 Jordanian teachers. Demographic data was collected on gender, experience (tenure), and academic qualification (educational level). The researcher conducted an analysis of all six dimensions of the OLA servant leadership scale as continuous dependent variables with gender, tenure, and educational level as categorical independent variables. Multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA) was employed to investigate followers' perception of servant leadership among school principals based on the teachers' gender, tenure category, and educational level. The result of the MANOVA indicated there were significant differences in teachers' perception of servant leadership practices of their principals based on the teachers' gender and tenure category (*Wilks' Lambda* (λ) = .49, F(12) = 28.33, p = .000). Analysis of variance (ANOVA) indicated significant differences among tenure categories on the servant leadership dimensions of Builds Community (F(2,430) = 125.56, p = .000) and Develops People (F(2,430) = 113.35, p = .000)p = .000). Scheffé post-hoc analysis found that those with less than 5 years tenure (M = 3.62) scored higher than those with 5 to 9 years of tenure (M = 3.29), or those with 10 or more years of tenure (M = 3.32) on the dimension of Develops Others. On the dimension of Builds Community those with 5 to 9 years of tenure (M = 4.02) scored

higher than those with less than 5 years tenure (M = 3.48) or those with 10 or more years of tenure (M = 3.77).

Summary of Follower's Tenure and Perception of Servant Leadership

Research has revealed mixed results in the relationship between followers' tenure and perception of servant leadership. The original research for the development of the OLA (Laub, 1999) did not find a significant relationship between tenure and servant leadership. Additional research by Salameh (2011) using the OLA found significant differences based of years of tenure group category, but they were unrelated to increasing tenure and servant leadership.

Tenure and Leadership

In the Shirom et al. (2008) meta-analysis, there was no moderating effect of tenure on the relationship of role ambiguity and role conflict with job performance except when tenure interacts with age. As age and tenure increased, the meta-correlation of role ambiguity with general performance decreased. Weighted Least Squares (WLS) regression analysis was used to estimate the moderating effect of tenure with the following results for the interaction of tenure with age on the meta-correlation of role ambiguity with general performance: (N = 7,657, k = 30, $\beta = .48$, $\Delta R^2 = .14$, F = 2.44, p < .05).

Sin, Nahrgang, and Morgeson (2009) combined meta-analytic methods and primary data collection to study leader-member exchange (LMX) dyads. Their metaanalytic sample included 63 studies representing 64 independent participant samples. Their study revealed that the longer the relationship tenure and intensity of the relationship, the greater the degree of LMX dyad formation (N = 10,844, k = 64, $\rho = .37$). Kooij et al. (2010) controlled for the moderating effect of tenure on age in their meta-analysis of the effect of age on the association between HR practices and both affective commitment and job satisfaction. Weighted least squares (WLS) multiple regression analysis revealed that tenure had a significantly negative moderating effect between some HR practices and affective commitment: training ($\beta = -.74$, p < .001) and teamwork ($\beta = -.78$, p < .05). There was no significant moderating effect of tenure between other HR practices such as promotion, rewards, participation, information sharing, and affective commitment.

In the Lok and Crawford (2003) study, the LBDQ (Stogdill, 1974) was administered to 337 managers in a variety of industries in Australia and Hong Kong. There was a negative correlation between tenure and consideration (r = -.13, p < .05). There was a positive correlation between tenure and initiating structure (r = .21, p < .01).

Summary of Tenure and Leadership

Research has found mixed results in the relationship between followers' tenure and perception of leadership. Lok and Crawford (2003) found a negative relationship between tenure and consideration and a positive relationship between tenure and initiating structure in research utilizing the LBDQ (Stogdill, 1974). Sin et al. (2009) found that the longer the tenure the greater the degree of LMX dyad formation. Kooij et al. (2010) found that tenure had a significantly negative moderating effect between some HR practices and affective commitment and no significant moderating effect between other HR practices and affective commitment.

Follower's Gender and Perception of Servant Leadership

In the original research for the development of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA), Laub (1999) conducted an analysis of variance (ANOVA) on six categorical demographic variables and participants' composite scores on the servant leadership scale of the OLA. Among the categorical variables submitted to ANOVA was gender. There was no significant mean difference in scores on the servant leadership scale of the OLA between men and women (F(1,789) = .998, p > .05).

In the Horsman (2001) study, analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted on categorical demographic variables and composite scores on the servant leadership scale of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999). A one-way ANOVA was conducted for gender and composite servant leadership scores on the OLA. There was no significant difference in servant leadership scores between male and female participants: (F(1,538) = 3.572, p = .059).

In the Dannhauser and Boshoff (2006) study a *t*-test was conducted on composite scores on the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006) to determine if the mean scores differed significantly between males and females. The results were not significant, t(162) = -1.027, p = .306. The means for males and females were not statistically different.

Summary of Follower's Gender and Perception of Servant Leadership

Research has not revealed a significant difference in followers' perception of servant leadership based on gender. The original research for the OLA (Laub, 1999) and later research by Horsman (2001) using the OLA did not find significant differences between men and women on perception of servant leadership. Research by Dannhauser and Boshoff (2006) using the SLQ (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006) also did not find significant differences between men and women on perception of servant leadership.

Gender and Leadership

Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, and van Engen (2003) conducted a meta-analysis of 45 studies in which they compared men and women on transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles as defined by the MLQ-5X (Bass & Avolio, 1995). Weighted mean effect sizes (*d*) were calculated with a negative effect meaning that women had higher scores than men. They found that female leaders were more transformational (k = 44, d = -.10) and engaged in more contingent reward behaviors (k = 21, d = -.13) than male leaders.

Shirom et al. (2008) conducted a meta-analysis of the moderating effect of gender, age, and tenure on role conflict and role ambiguity with job performance. Weighted least squares (WLS) regression analysis did not reveal gender to have a significant moderating effect between role ambiguity and job performance or between role conflict and job performance. As percentage of women and age increased, there was a reduction in the negative correlation between role ambiguity and job performance $(N = 7,657, k = 30, \beta = -.44, \Delta R^2 = .12, F = 1.57, p < .05).$

Paustian-Underdahl, Walker, and Woehr (2014) conducted a meta-analysis of gender and leadership effectiveness. They included 99 independent samples from 95 studies in their meta-analysis. When all leadership contexts were taken into consideration, there was no difference between women and men in perceptions of their effectiveness as leaders. However, when leadership effectiveness was rated by their followers, women were rated significantly more effective than men (N = 96,893, k = 78,

d = -.120). In self-ratings, men rated themselves significantly more effective as leaders than women did of themselves (N = 4711, k = 19, d = .206).

Lok and Crawford (2003) measured the effect of organizational culture and leadership style on job satisfaction and organizational commitment among 377 managers in various industries in Australia and Hong Kong. Perception of leadership style was measured by the LBDQ (Stogdill, 1974). There was no significant mean difference between men and women on either the initiating structure or consideration dimension of the LBDQ.

Barbuto et al. (2007) studied the effect of leaders' gender, educational level, and age categories on a leader's use of full range leadership behaviors as rated by followers using the MLQ (Bass, 1985), and influence behaviors as rated by followers using the IBQ (Yukl & Falbe, 1990) in a variety of settings in the United States. Multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to analyze the effect of the categorical independent variables of gender, educational level, and age categories on the continuous dependent variables of the dimensions of the MLQ and IBQ. There was no significant main effect of leaders' gender on followers' perception of leadership as measured by the MLQ, nor was there a significant interaction between leaders' age and gender on followers' perception of leadership as measured by the MLQ. There was a significant interaction between leaders' gender and educational level at the high school level on followers' perception of almost all full range leadership behaviors with the following Weighted Least Squares (WLS) means: Management by Exception Active (M (men) = 0.67, M (women) = 1.88, p < .05); Contingent Reward (M (men) = 3.52, M (women) = 2.53, p < .05);

Transformational (M (men) = 3.55, M (women) = 2.52, p < .05); Inspirational Motivation

(M (men) = 3.68, M (women) = 2.75, p < .05); Idealized Influence (M (men) = 3.59, p < .05); Idealized Influence (M (men) = 3.59, p < .05); Idealized Influence (M (men) = 3.59, p < .05); Idealized Influence (M (men) = 3.59, p < .05); Idealized Influence (M (men) = 3.59, p < .05); Idealized Influence (M (men) = 3.59, p < .05); Idealized Influence (M (men) = 3.59, p < .05); Idealized Influence (M (men) = 3.59, p < .05); Idealized Influence (M (men) = 3.59, p < .05); Idealized Influence (M (men) = 3.59, p < .05); Idealized Influence (M (men) = 3.59, p < .05); Idealized Influence (M (men) = 3.59, p < .05); Idealized Influence (M (men) = 3.59, p < .05); Idealized Influence (M (men) = 3.59, p < .05); Idealized Influence (M (men) = 3.59, p < .05); Idealized Influence (M (men) = 3.59, p < .05); Idealized Influence (M (men) = 3.59, p < .05); Idealized Influence (M (men) = 3.59, p < .05); Idealized Influence (M (men) = 3.59, p < .05); Idealized Influence (M (men) = 3.59, p < .05); Idealized Influence (M (men) = 3.59, p < .05); Idealized Influence (M (men) = 3.59, p < .05); Idealized Influence (M (men) = 3.59, p < .05); Idealized Influence (M (men) = 3.59, p < .05); Idealized Influence (M (men) = 3.59, p < .05); Idealized Influence (M (men) = 3.59, p < .05); Idealized Influence (M (men) = 3.59, p < .05); Idealized Influence (M (men) = 3.59, p < .05); Idealized Influence (M (men) = 3.59, p < .05); Idealized Influence (M (men) = 3.59, p < .05); Idealized Influence (M (men) = 3.59, p < .05); Idealized Influence (M (men) = 3.59, p < .05); Idealized Influence (M (men) = 3.59, p < .05); Idealized Influence (M (men) = 3.59, p < .05); Idealized Influence (M (men) = 3.59, p < .05); Idealized Influence (M (men) = 3.59); Idealized Influence (M (men) = 3.59); Idealized Influence (M (men) = 3.59); Ide

M (women) = 2.58, p < .05); Intellectual Stimulation (M (men) = 3.52,

M (women) = 2.38, p < .05); Individualized Consideration (M (men) = 3.36,

M (women) = 2.32, p < .05). There was a significant interaction between leaders' gender and educational level at the graduate level on followers' perception of Individualized Consideration with the following Weighted Least Squares (WLS) means:

(M (men) = 3.41, M (women) = 3.13, p < .05). Male leaders at the high school level of education were rated higher by their followers in all transformational dimensions than women leaders at the high school level of education. Male leaders at the graduate level of education were rated higher by their followers on the transformational dimension of Individualized Consideration than women leaders at the high school level of education.

Cuadrado, Morales, and Recio (2008) conducted experimental research on leadership style and gender regarding women's access to managerial positions. Their study sample consisted of 136 psychology students at a university in Spain who were randomly assigned to one of four groups of equal size (34 in each group) which were each assigned a different experimental scenario. The study sample was 53% female and 47% male. They tested the following four hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: Female leaders will receive less favorable evaluations than male leaders when they adopt stereotypically masculine leadership styles (autocratic and task-oriented).

Hypothesis 2: Male leaders will not receive less favorable evaluations than female leaders when they adopt stereotypically feminine leadership behaviors (democratic, relationship-oriented, individualized consideration).

Hypothesis 3: Female leaders will receive worse evaluations from male evaluators than from female evaluators.

Hypothesis 4: Male leaders will receive similar evaluations from male and female evaluators (Cuadrado et al., 2008, p. 58).

The study participants by experimental group were presented with one of four different narratives that varied by the leader's gender (male or female) and leadership style (stereotypically masculine or feminine). The participants then rated each leader on three 7-point Likert-type scale evaluations of leadership qualities (adjective list), leadership capacity, and leadership effectiveness. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to test the hypotheses. There was no significant main effect between the leader's gender and the three evaluations of the leader by the participants. Thus Hypothesis 1 was not supported. The lack of a significant main effect between the leader's gender and the three evaluations of the leader by the participants supported Hypothesis 2 in that there was no difference between male and female leaders in their evaluations by the participants. There was no significant main effect based on the participants' gender in evaluations of female leaders on the three evaluations of the leader by the participants. Thus Hypothesis 3 was not supported. There was no significant main effect based on the participants' gender in evaluations of male leaders on the three evaluations of the leader by the participants. Thus Hypothesis 4 was supported.

Elsesser and Lever (2011) conducted a large-scale study of gender bias against female leaders. Data was obtained from a national survey based in the United States. The

researchers participated in the development of a 37-item survey which was posted on the msnbc.com website in 2007 for a period of 10 days. Valid surveys were returned by 60,740 participants from a broad spectrum of employment environments. The participants were asked to respond to questions regarding their current supervisor as to relationship quality, competence, and sensitivity. Participants were also asked to respond to questions regarding the gender with whom they compete most frequently at work and their preference for a male or female supervisor. Demographic information was obtained as to the respondents' gender, age, marital status, educational level, salary, and gender of supervisor. To analyze the data the researchers utilized *t*-tests, χ^2 (Chi-square) analysis, and factorial analysis of variance (ANOVA) as appropriate. Effect sizes were determined applying *Cohen's d* calculations. Male participants rated female supervisors higher on competence than female participants rated female supervisors, t(29692) = 2.90, p < .004, d = .06. Female participants rated male supervisors higher on competence than female supervisors, t(30744) = -5.69, p < .001, d = .08. Female participants reported having better relationships with male supervisors than female supervisors, t(30744) = 13.75, p < .001, d = .15. There was no significant difference in the rating of relationships of male participants with male or female supervisors, t(29692) = -1.06, p < .29, d = .01. Where the *t*-test indicated a significant difference, the effect size was small.

O-Campo et al. (2012) studied gender and language spoken at home with the covariate of age as applied to the six GLOBE (House et al., 2004) leadership preferences. Analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) revealed a significant main effect for gender. Female Spanish speaking followers (M = 5.71) felt that being a participative leader contributed to outstanding leadership more than did Male Spanish speaking followers (M = 5.29), p = .05.

Summary of Gender and Leadership

Research results have been mixed in followers' perception of leadership based on gender. A meta-analysis by Eagly et al. (2003) found female leaders were more transformational and engaged in more contingent reward behaviors than male leaders. In the meta-analysis of Paustian-Underdahl et al. (2014), followers rated women significantly higher than men as leaders, whereas men rated themselves significantly higher as leaders than women did. Shirom et al. (2008) found that as percentage of women and age increased among followers, there was a reduction in the negative correlation between followers' role ambiguity and job performance. Lok and Crawford (2003) did not find a significant mean difference between men and women on either the initiating tructure or consideration dimension of the LBDQ (Stogdill, 1974). Barbuto et al. (2007) found some significant differences between men and women followers' in their study of the effect of leaders' gender, educational level, and age categories on a leader's use of full range leadership behaviors as rated by followers. The Cuadrado et al. (2008) experimental study of leadership style and gender regarding women's access to managerial positions did not find statistical differences between men and women followers in perception of leadership. Elsesser and Lever (2011) found the effect size to be small between men and women followers in their study of gender bias against female leaders. O-Campo et al. (2012) discovered a main effect for gender in their study of gender and language spoken at home as applied to the six GLOBE (House et al., 1974) leadership preferences.

Follower's Education and Perception of Servant Leadership

In the original research for the development of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA), Laub (1999) conducted an analysis of variance (ANOVA) on six categorical demographic variables and participants' composite scores on the servant leadership scale of the OLA. Among the categorical variables submitted to ANOVA was educational level. There was no significant mean difference in scores on the servant leadership scale of the OLA between educational levels (F(5,807) = 2.699, p > .05).

In the Horsman (2001) study, analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted on categorical demographic variables and composite scores on the servant leadership scale of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999). A one-way ANOVA was conducted for educational level and composite servant leadership scores on the OLA, F(2,538) = 15.076, p = .000. Bonferonni post-hoc analysis indicated significant differences in perception of servant leadership between those with no undergraduate degree and those with undergraduate or graduate degrees. Increasing mean scores from those with no undergraduate degree to those with graduate degrees suggested "that on average as the educational level of respondents increased, the higher the OLA score" (p. 129).

In the Dannhauser and Boshoff (2006) study, followers' perception of servant leadership was measured by the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006). Two levels of education – secondary and post-secondary – were analyzed by *t*-test to measure differences in followers' perception of servant leadership by educational level. The results of the *t*-test were not significant, t(386) = .250, p = .803. In the Salameh (2011) study, teachers' perception of servant leadership among high school principals in the country of Jordan was measured using the servant leadership scale of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999). Differences of perception of servant leadership by teachers related to the gender, tenure, and educational level of their principals were assessed by multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). The results of the MANOVA were not significant for educational level. Therefore additional analysis of variance (ANOVA) and post-hoc analysis were not indicated.

Summary of Follower's Education and Perception of Servant Leadership

Research has indicated mixed results based on followers' level of education and perception of servant leadership. The original field research by Laub (1999) for the development of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) did not discover differences in perception of servant leadership based on educational level. Later research by Horsman (2001) with the OLA revealed increased perception of servant leadership with increasing level of education. Research by Salameh (2011) with the OLA and Dannhauser and Boshoff (2006) with the SLQ (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006) did not find significant differences in perception of servant leadership by followers based on educational level.

Education and Leadership

Lok and Crawford (2003) studied the effect of organizational culture and leadership style on job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Leadership style was measured by the Leader Behavior Descriptive Questionnaire (LBDQ) (Stogdill, 1974). Demographic information was obtained on the participants for the variables of national culture, gender, age, tenure, and educational level. A significant positive correlation was found between increasing years of education and the dimension of consideration on the LBDQ, r = .13, p < .05.

Rodriguez et al. (2003) assessed generational differences between followers in preferences for leadership behaviors. Demographic information was obtained on participants' ethnicity and educational level in addition to generational cohort. Multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted on the data. The Wilks' Lamba multivariate test for the independent variable of educational level was significant, F(1,803) = 5.016, p < .05. For Generation Xers, significant mean differences were found in preferred leadership style for several dependent variables by educational level. For fulfillment (challenging tasks), F(1,803) = 7.757, p = .005, those with greater than 12 years of education (M = 2.95) scored higher than those with 12 years of education (M = 2.66). For technology use, F(1,803) = 11.869, p = .001, those with greater than 12 years of education (M = 2.48) scored higher than those with 12 years of education (M = 2.08). For work flexibility, F(1.803) = 8.892, p = .003, those with greater than 12 years of education (M = 3.35) scored higher than those with 12 years of education (M = 3.03). For work environment, F(1,803) = 4.963, p = .026, those with greater than 12 years of education (M = 2.33) scored higher than those with 12 years of education (M = 2.00). For Baby Boomers a significant mean difference was found in preferred leadership style for the dependent variable of monetary benefits by educational level, F(1,803) = 39.757, p = .000. Those with greater than 12 years of education (M = 3.06) scored lower than those with 12 years of education (M = 3.95).

Barbuto et al. (2007) studied the relationship of gender, age, and education on leadership style and influence tactics. They examined 56 leaders and 234 followers using the MLQ (rater version) (Bass, 1985) and Yukl's Influence Behavior Questionnaire (IBQ) (Yukl & Falbe, 1990). Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted on the independent variables of gender, education, and age, and the dependent variables of the MLQ and the IBQ. "MANOVA results revealed that leader's gender and education explained significant differences in followers' ratings of leadership behaviors" (p. 77). One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted which indicated a significant main effect for education, F = 4.58, p = .011. Leaders with advanced degrees were perceived by followers as exhibiting individualized consideration more than those without an advanced degree.

Kearney and Gebert (2009) studied transformational leadership as measured by the MLQ Short (Avolio & Bass, 2004) as a moderator of the relationship of age, nationality, and educational background on team outcomes. Hierarchical regression analysis was conducted on the data. The researchers set significance levels at p < .10 for findings involving interactions because of the inherently low power in field studies for detecting moderators. The multiple squared correlation coefficient indicated a significant change after adding the interaction terms of age, nationality, and education ($\Delta R^2 = .17$, p < .01). The interaction of transformational leadership with education was significant, b = 1.04, p < .05. Transformational leadership moderated the effect of education on team performance. When transformational leadership was high, the effect of education on team

Summary of Education and Leadership

Research has indicated significant differences between both leaders' and followers' educational level and followers' perception of leadership. Leaders with

advanced degrees were perceived by followers as exhibiting individualized consideration more than those without an advanced degree in the Barbuto et al. (2007) study. The Lok and Crawford (2003) study found significant differences between increasing followers' educational level and their perception of leaders' consideration on the LBDQ (Stogdill, 1974). Kearney and Gebert (2009) found that transformational leadership moderated the effect of followers' education on team performance. When transformational leadership was high, the effect of followers' education on team performance was high. In the Rodriguez et al. (2003) assessment of generational differences between followers in preferences for leadership behaviors, there were significant differences especially among Generation Xers in preferences for several leadership behaviors by educational level of the follower.

Follower's Organizational Level and Perception of Servant Leadership

In the original research for the development of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA), Laub (1999) conducted an analysis of variance (ANOVA) on six categorical demographic variables and participants' composite scores on the servant leadership scale of the OLA. Among the categorical variables submitted to ANOVA was organizational level. There was a significant difference in scores on the servant leadership scale of the OLA (F(2,807) = 9.611, p < .05) between top leadership (M = 297.98), and both management/supervision (M = 278.59), and workforce (M = 274.88). The higher one's position in the organization, the higher the scores on the servant leadership scale of the OLA.

In the Horsman (2001) study, analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted on categorical demographic variables and composite scores on the servant leadership scale

of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999). A one-way ANOVA was conducted for organizational level and composite servant leadership scores on the OLA. There was a significant difference in servant leadership scores between organizational levels of the participants: (F(2,538) = 4.686, p = .010). Bonferonni posthoc analysis indicated a significant difference between top leadership (M = 230.90) and workforce (M = 210.75), indicating the higher one's level in the organization, the higher the perception of servant leadership.

Thompson (2002) studied the perception of servant leadership and job satisfaction at a church-related college in the United States. He administered the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999) and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967) to 170 employees of the college. Demographic information was obtained on the participants' gender, educational level, tenure, and organizational level. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted for organizational level and composite servant leadership scores on the OLA. There was no significant difference in perception of servant leadership among followers by organizational level, F(3,112) = 2.322, p = .079.

Ledbetter (2003) conducted a test-retest reliability study on perception of servant leadership as measured by the servant leadership scale of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999) among law enforcement officers in the United States. Participants were recruited from an association of chiefs of police. Demographic information was obtained on participants' age, gender, race/ethnicity, tenure, educational level, type of organization, and organizational level. A total of 1584 surveys were distributed to a sample of 792 individuals from 12 agencies who were asked to complete and return two identical surveys at an interval of two weeks. A total of 466 surveys were returned by 263 respondents representing 260 surveys for OLA test 1 and 206 surveys for OLA retest. A total of 138 surveys from the test and 138 from the retest were paired from the same respondents to analyze correlation and reliability between the test and retest. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) indicated mean differences between organizational levels on the test: top leadership (M = 230.00); management (M = 184.86) and workforce (M = 200.62); and on the retest: top leadership (M = 225.50); management (M = 212.63) and workforce (M = 222.50).

Drury (2004) studied the relationship between servant leadership and organizational commitment. Hourly workers and faculty differed in their perceptions of servant leadership and organizational commitment. Her research revealed a significantly higher perception by top leadership than hourly workers of servant leadership within the organizations studied. Perceptions of servant leadership and job satisfaction were measured with the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999). She tested the following three null hypotheses: "(a) There is no difference in categories of employees in their perception of servant leadership, (b) There is no correlation between servant leadership and job satisfaction, and (c) There is no correlation between servant leadership and organizational commitment" (p. 2) In her first null hypothesis she was looking at the relationship between organizational level and servant leadership. Her study population was drawn from a non-traditional college in the United States and included top leadership, salaried management, full time faculty, and hourly workers (N = 170). For perception of servant leadership the ANOVA results were F(3,164) = 3.085, p = .029. Bonferroni post-hoc analysis revealed that hourly workers differed most from full time

faculty. There was a significantly higher perception by top leadership than hourly workers of servant leadership within the organization.

Black (2010) conducted a correlational analysis of perception of servant leadership with perception of school climate. The Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999) and the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire-Revised (OCDQ-RE) (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991) were administered to a random sample of 231 teachers and 15 principals in Roman Catholic elementary schools in the province of Ontario, Canada. Canonical correlation analysis revealed a significant relationship between the OLA construct of Values People and the OCDQ-RE dimension of Supportive of 0.66; between the OLA construct of Develops People and the OCDQ-RE dimension of Collegial of 0.54; and between the OLA construct of Displays Authenticity and the OCDQ-RE dimension of Intimate of 0.36. Principals reported higher levels of perception of servant leadership than teachers did on the following dimensions of the OLA: Values People: Principals (M = 39.88), Teachers (M = 38.12); Develops People: Principals (M = 36.77), Teachers (M = 33.39); Builds Community: Principals (M = 43.05), Teachers (M = 38.60); Displays Authenticity: Principals (M = 49.61), Teachers (M = 43.88); Provides Leadership: Principals (M = 38.05), Teachers (M = 33.63); and Shares Leadership: Principals (M = 41.83), Teachers (M = 36.58).

Summary of Follower's Organizational Level and Perception of Servant Leadership

Research has indicated mixed results in followers' organizational level and perception of servant leadership. The original field research for the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) Laub (1999) found that the higher one's level within the organization the higher the perception of servant leadership. Research by Horsman (2001) and Ledbetter (2003) with the OLA had similar findings as Laub's (1999) original research. Subsequent research with the OLA by Thompson (2002) found no difference in perception of servant leadership among followers' organizational level. Drury (2004) found a significantly higher perception by top leadership than hourly workers of servant leadership within a non-traditional college as measured by the OLA. Black (2010) found a higher perception by principals than teachers of servant leadership within Roman Catholic elementary schools in Canada as measured by the OLA.

Follower's Generational Cohort and Job Satisfaction

Costanza et al. (2012) conducted a meta-analysis of 20 studies containing 18 pairs of generational comparisons (Traditionals, Baby Boomers, Generation Xers, and Millennials) (N = 19,961) on the criteria of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intent to turnover. The authors identified 329 studies of which 20 met their criteria that the study tested hypotheses on generational differences in an empirical and quantitative manner; investigated at least one of the dimensions of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, or intent to turnover; and were capable of meta-analysis. The studies included in the meta-analysis were conducted between 1995 and 2009 all within the United States except one each from Canada and Europe, and two from New Zealand. Meta-analysis with corrected d levels revealed that Traditionals experienced slightly more job satisfaction than Boomers (N = 2182, k = 2, d = .18) and Generation Xers (N = 1398, k = 2, d = .25). The authors, however, concluded that their meta-analysis did not support significant differences among the generations, as the majority of comparisons had d levels of "less than one-quarter of a standard deviation when corrected for unreliability" (p. 387).

Hansen and Leuty (2012) studied work values across generations. Clients of a vocational assessment clinic in the United States represented 1689 participants from three generations: Silent Generation (born 1925 to 1945, N = 371); Baby Boomers (born 1946 to 1964, N = 1179; and Generation X (born 1965 to 1980, N = 139). Job satisfaction was assessed by the Minnesota Importance Questionnaire (MIQ) (Gay, Weiss, Hendel, Dawis, & Lofquist, 1971) which assesses a range of work values including achievement, comfort, status, autonomy, working conditions, security, relationships with coworkers, and compensation. Participants gave their permission for data from the MIQ that had been collected to be used in the study. Analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) by generational cohort and gender was employed to control for the covariate of age because of significant differences in age between each generational group at the time they took the MIQ. Age was a significant covariate, F(2,1689) = 341.89, p < .001. For women, significant generational differences were found for working conditions, (F(2,757) = 5.89), p < .01); advancement, (F(2,757) = 4.74, p < .01); and relationships with coworkers, (F(2,757) = 5.48, p < .01). For men, significant generational differences were found for overall comfort, (F(2,932) = 4.85, p < .01); working conditions, (F(2,932) = 10.27, p < .01); working c p < .001; job security (F(2,932) = 4.67, p < .01); and authority, (F(2,932) = 5.62, p < .01).

Zimmerer (2013) studied generational differences in followers' job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intent when exposed to servant leadership. Followers' job satisfaction was measured using the Abridged Job in General Index (aJIG) (Russell et al., 2004) and the Abridged Job Descriptive Scale (aJDI) (Stanton et al., 2001). Followers' perception of servant leadership was measured using the Servant Leadership Survey (SLS) (Van Dierendonck & Nuitjen, 2011). Multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted on the categorical independent variable of generational cohort and the dependent variables of followers' perception of servant leadership, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intent. The *Wilks' Lambda* value was .95, with F(3,892) = 2.81, p = .004. However, follow up analysis of variance (ANOVA) did not reveal any statistical differences between generational cohorts and job satisfaction for either the Abridged Job in General Index (aJIG), F(3,449) = .25, p = .78, or the Abridged Job Descriptive Scale (aJDI), F(3,449) = .89, p = .42.

Summary of Follower's Generational Cohort and Job Satisfaction

Research has revealed mixed results between followers' generational cohort and job satisfaction. The Hansen and Leuty study (2012) found significant generational differences for women in the areas of followers' satisfaction with working conditions, advancement, and relationships with coworkers. They found significant generational differences for men in the areas of followers' satisfaction with overall comfort, working conditions, job security, and authority. The Zimmerer (2013) study did not find any differences between generational cohorts and followers' job satisfaction. The Costanza et al. (2012) meta-analysis of generational comparisons revealed that Matures exhibited slightly more job satisfaction than Baby Boomers and Generation X.

Age and Job Satisfaction

Ng et al. (2005) conducted a meta-analysis on predictors of objective and subjective career success. Predictors included organizational sponsorship as defined by career sponsorship, supervisor support, training and skill development opportunities, and organizational resources; human capital; socio-demographics, and stable individual differences. Subjective career success was defined as career satisfaction. Demographic information was obtained for gender, race (White or non-White), marital status (married or unmarried), and age. There was not a significant correlation between age and career satisfaction (N = 11,913, k = 26, $r_c = .00$).

Ng and Feldman (2010) conducted a meta-analysis of the relationship of age with job attitudes. The researchers controlled for the effect of tenure as age and tenure are likely to be significantly correlated. They found that there was a weakly positive correlation between age and overall job satisfaction ($N = 151, 105, k = 388, r_c = .18$).

Kooij et al. (2010) conducted a meta-analysis of the effect of age on the association between HR practices and affective commitment and job satisfaction. The researchers controlled for the effect of tenure. Weighted least squares (WLS) regression analysis was performed to test for the moderating effect of age on the relationship between HR practices and job satisfaction. Their analysis revealed that employee perceptions of the HR practices of teamwork, flexible work schedules, performance management, rewards, and information sharing were positively correlated with job satisfaction (N = 37,261, k = 56, $\rho = .34$) and increased with age.

In the original field test for Laub's (1999) development of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) a six-item job satisfaction scale was developed. A *Pearson's r* correlation was calculated for the relationship of followers' age and scores on the job satisfaction scale of the OLA. There was a significant positive relationship between age and job satisfaction (r = .177, p < .05).

Lok and Crawford (2003) studied the effect of organizational culture and leadership style on job satisfaction and organizational commitment on a sample of managers from Hong Kong and Australia. Leadership style was measured by the Leader Behavior Descriptive Questionnaire (LBDQ) (Stogdill, 1974), and job satisfaction was measured by the Warr job satisfaction questionnaire (Warr et al., 1979). Their research indicated a positive correlation between age and job satisfaction, r = .16, p < .01.

Gittell et al. (2008) studied the effect of relational coordination on nursing aide job satisfaction and quality of life outcomes for nursing home residents. A cross-sectional study was conducted in 15 nursing home facilities in the United States. A 38-item Likerttype questionnaire was administered in face-to-face interviews to 105 nursing home residents, and an 82-item Likert-type questionnaire was administered in face-to-face interviews to 252 nursing aides. The nursing aide questionnaire was available in English, Spanish, and Haitian Creole according to the language preference of the nursing aide. Demographic information was obtained on nursing home residents' age, length of stay, and gender. For nursing aides, demographic information was obtained on their age, tenure, language, gender, and educational level. Relational coordination for nursing aides assessed problem solving communication, shared goals, shared knowledge, and mutual respect. A 1-item job satisfaction Likert-type question scored from 1- very dissatisfied to 5 - very satisfied asked, "Overall, how satisfied are you with your job?" (p. 159). Resident quality of life assessed "privacy, spiritual well-being, meaningful activity, enjoyment of food, individuality, and global quality of life" (p. 159). Random effects linear regression was used to analyze the relationship between relational coordination and nursing aide job satisfaction with nursing aide (N = 231) as the unit of analysis, and

nursing home facility (N = 15) as the random effect. The control variables were nursing aide age, tenure, gender, language, and education. Nursing aide age was not a significant predictor of nursing aide job satisfaction.

Dobrow Riza et al. (2014) studied the effect of age and tenure on job satisfaction. Their study included 21,670 participants in 34 waves of data collection over a 40-year period from two nationally representative samples in the United States. The first sample (N = 12,686) consisted of Americans born between 1957 and 1964 as part of the 1979 cohort of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY79, US Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics). The second sample (N = 8,984) consisted of Americans born between 1980 and 1984 as part of the 1997 cohort of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY97, US Department of Labor Statistics). Job satisfaction was measured by a single-item Likert-type question from 1 - *dislike very much* to 4 - *like very much* in the NLSY79 and 1 - *dislike very much* to 5 - *like very much* in the NLSY97. They tested the following three hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: Holding all else constant (and in particular controlling for tenure), job satisfaction increases as people age.

Hypothesis 2: Holding all else constant (and in particular controlling for age), job satisfaction decreases as organizational tenure increases. *Hypothesis 3:* Pay mediates the relationship between both (a) age and (b) tenure with job satisfaction, such that age and tenure both have a positive relationship with pay, which in turn has a positive relationship with job satisfaction (Dobrow Riza et al., 2014, p. 6).

In their analysis they were interested in individuals' job satisfaction over time across career paths. They used multilevel modeling techniques, and a three-level nested structure at the within-organization (for tenure), between organization (for age), and between-person levels to account for differences between persons and organizations within both the NLSY79 and the NLSY97. Correlations between age and job satisfaction were positive for both the NLSY79 (r = .14, p < .01) and the NLSY97 (r = .11, p < .01). The results indicate that job satisfaction increased with age.

Summary of Age and Job Satisfaction

Research has revealed mixed results in the relationship of followers' age with job satisfaction. Several studies found a positive relationship between followers' age and job satisfaction (Ng & Feldman, 2010; Laub, 1999; Lok & Crawford, 2003; Dobrow Riza et al., 2014). The Ng et al. (2005) meta-analysis did not find a correlation between followers' age and career satisfaction. Gittell et al. (2008) found that followers' age was not a significant predictor of job satisfaction. The Kooij et al. (2010) meta-analysis revealed that employee perceptions of HR practices were positively correlated with job satisfaction and increased with age.

Follower's Language and Job Satisfaction

Yousef (2000) studied the mediator role of organizational commitment between leadership behavior and job satisfaction and performance in the United Arab Emirates (UAE). Leadership behavior of superiors as perceived by respondents was measured by the Likert (1967) leadership questionnaire. Job satisfaction was measured by a single question on a 7-point Likert scale that inquired about a participant's overall job satisfaction. A random sample of 600 employees from 30 organizations received the survey instrument of which 430 returned usable surveys. The study sample consisted of 47% UAE nationals (Arabic-speaking), 45% Arabic-speaking expatriates, and 8% Asian nationals. Regression analysis did not reveal language (national culture) to be a significant predictor of job satisfaction.

Lok and Crawford (2003) studied the effect of organizational culture and leadership style on job satisfaction and organizational commitment on a sample of managers from Hong Kong and Australia. Leadership style was measured by the Leader Behavior Descriptive Questionnaire (LBDQ) (Stogdill, 1974), and job satisfaction was measured by the Warr job satisfaction questionnaire (Warr et al, 1979). There was a significant mean difference between managers from Australia (English-speaking, M = .23, SD = .95) and managers from Hong Kong (Chinese-speaking, M = .14, SD = .98) in job satisfaction, t(335) = 3.37, p < .01.

Irving and McIntosh (2007) evaluated the Spanish version of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999). Their research revealed a *Cronbach's alpha* of .8715 (N = 78) for the job satisfaction scale of the OLA. The original field research for the OLA revealed a *Cronbach's alpha* of .81 (N = 828) for the job satisfaction scale of the OLA (Laub, 1999).

Gittell et al. (2008) studied the effect of relational coordination on nursing aide job satisfaction and quality-of-life outcomes for nursing home residents. An 82-item Likert-type questionnaire was administered in face-to-face interviews to 252 nursing aides. The nursing aide questionnaire was available in English, Spanish, and Haitian Creole according to the language preference of the nursing aide. Random effects linear regression was used to analyze the relationship between relational coordination and nursing aide job satisfaction with nursing aide (N = 231) as the unit of analysis and nursing home facility (N = 15) as the random effect. The control variables were nursing aide age, tenure, gender, language, and education. Nursing aide language was not a significant predictor of nursing aide job satisfaction.

Summary of Follower's Language and Job Satisfaction

Results have been mixed for differences in followers' job satisfaction by language. The Yousef (2000) and Gittell et al. (2008) studies did not reveal followers' language to be a significant predictor of job satisfaction. The Lok and Crawford (2003) study revealed significant differences in job satisfaction between language groups. Irving and McIntosh (2007) obtained similar reliability coefficients for the job satisfaction scale of the OLA (Laub, 1999).

Follower's Tenure and Job Satisfaction

Ng et al. (2005) conducted a meta-analysis on predictors of objective and subjective career success. Predictors included organizational sponsorship as defined by career sponsorship, supervisor support, training and skill development opportunities, and organizational resources; human capital; socio-demographics, and stable individual differences. Subjective career success was defined as career satisfaction. Demographic information was obtained for gender, race (White or non-White), marital status (married or unmarried), and age. Information was also obtained for tenure. Job tenure was not a significant predictor of career satisfaction.

Kooij et al. (2010) conducted a meta-analysis of the effect of age on the association between HR practices and affective commitment and job satisfaction. The researchers controlled for the effect of tenure. Weighted least squares (WLS) regression analysis was performed to test for the moderating effect of age on the relationship between HR practices and job satisfaction. Tenure had a significantly negative moderating effect on the association between the HR practices of training, information sharing, and staffing, and job satisfaction.

Ng and Feldman (2010) conducted a meta-analysis of the relationship between age and 35 job attitudes including work tasks, colleagues, supervisors, and organizations. They included over 800 studies in their meta-analysis. Organizational tenure, race, gender, education level, and year of study moderated the relationship between age and job attitudes. There was a significant moderating effect of job tenure on job satisfaction (tenure < 7 years, N = 2,149, k = 11, $r_c = .16$; tenure > 7 years, N = 12,029, k = 11, $r_c = .24$).

In the original field test for Laub's (1999) development of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) a six-item job satisfaction scale was included. A *Pearson's r* correlation was calculated for the relationship of followers' tenure and scores on the job satisfaction scale of the OLA. There was a significant positive correlation between participants' tenure and scores on the job satisfaction scale of the OLA, r = .118, p < .05.

Lok and Crawford (2003) studied the effect of organizational culture and leadership style on job satisfaction and organizational commitment on a sample of managers from Hong Kong and Australia. Leadership style was measured by the Leader Behavior Descriptive Questionnaire (LBDQ) (Stogdill, 1974), and job satisfaction was measured by the Warr job satisfaction questionnaire (Warr et al, 1979). There was a significant negative correlation between participants' tenure and participants' job satisfaction (r = -.15, p < .01).

Gittell et al. (2008) studied the effect of relational coordination on nursing aide job satisfaction and quality of life outcomes for nursing home residents. An 82-item Likert-type questionnaire was administered in face-to-face interviews to 252 nursing aides. The nursing aide questionnaire was available in English, Spanish, and Haitian Creole according to the language preference of the nursing aide. Random effects linear regression was used to analyze the relationship between relational coordination and nursing aide job satisfaction with nursing aide (N = 231) as the unit of analysis, and nursing home facility (N = 15) as the random effect. The control variables were nursing aide age, tenure, gender, language, and education. Nursing aide tenure was not a significant predictor of nursing aide job satisfaction.

Dobrow Riza et al. (2014) studied the effect of age and tenure on job satisfaction. Their study included 21,670 participants in 34 waves of data collection over a 40-year period from two nationally representative samples in the United States. The first sample (N = 12,686) consisted of Americans born between 1957 and 1964 as part of the 1979 cohort of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY79). The second sample (N = 8,984) consisted of Americans born between 1980 and 1984 as part of the 1997 cohort of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY97). Correlations between tenure and job satisfaction were negative for both the NLSY79 (r = -.07, p < .01) and the NLSY97 (r = -.13, p < .01).

Summary of Follower's Tenure and Job Satisfaction

Results of research on the relationship between followers' tenure and job satisfaction have been mixed. Both the Ng et al. (2003) and the Gittell et al. (2008) studies found that followers' job tenure was not a significant predictor of job satisfaction. The Ng and Feldman (2010) meta-analysis of age and job attitudes revealed a significant moderating effect of followers' tenure on job satisfaction. As tenure increased, job satisfaction increased. The Kooij et al. (2010) meta-analysis found that followers' tenure had a significantly negative moderating effect on the association between the HR practices of training, information sharing, and staffing and job satisfaction. The Laub (1999) study revealed a positive relationship between tenure and job satisfaction. Both the Lok and Crawford (2003) and the Dobrow Riza et al. (2014) studies revealed a negative relationship between followers' tenure and job satisfaction.

Follower's Gender and Job Satisfaction

Ng et al. (2005) conducted a meta-analysis on predictors of objective and subjective career success. Predictors included organizational sponsorship as defined by career sponsorship, supervisor support, training and skill development opportunities, and organizational resources; human capital; socio-demographics, and stable individual differences. Subjective career success was defined as career satisfaction. Demographic information was obtained for gender, race (White or non-White), marital status (married or unmarried), and age. Gender was not a significant predictor of career satisfaction.

Ng and Feldman (2010) conducted a meta-analysis of the relationship between age and 35 job attitudes including work tasks, colleagues, supervisors, and organizations. They included over 800 studies in their meta-analysis. Organizational tenure, race, gender, education level, and year of study moderated the relationship between age and job attitudes. There was a significant moderating effect of gender on job satisfaction (women < 50%, N = 7,886, k = 17, $r_c = .13$; women > 50%, N = 3,862, k = 17, $r_c = -.05$).

Aydin et al. (2012) conducted a meta-analysis of the effect of gender on job satisfaction of teachers in Turkey. They included ten studies in their meta-analysis (k = 10) representing a sample of 2,775 participants (N = 2775) all from within the country of Turkey. Meta-analytic procedures were used to calculate a standardized effect size (*Cohen's d*). A mean effect size of d = -.02 was calculated indicating a small effect of job satisfaction in favor of males.

Lok and Crawford (2003) studied the effect of organizational culture and leadership style on job satisfaction and organizational commitment on a sample of managers from Hong Kong and Australia. Leadership style was measured by the Leader Behavior Descriptive Questionnaire (LBDQ) (Stogdill, 1974), and job satisfaction was measured by the Warr job satisfaction questionnaire (Warr et al, 1979). Hierarchical regression analysis did not reveal gender to be a significant predictor of job satisfaction.

Gittell et al. (2008) studied the effect of relational coordination on nursing aide job satisfaction and quality of life outcomes for nursing home residents. An 82-item Likert-type questionnaire was administered in face-to-face interviews to 252 nursing aides. The nursing aide questionnaire was available in English, Spanish, and Haitian Creole according to the language preference of the nursing aide. Random effects linear regression was used to analyze the relationship between relational coordination and nursing aide job satisfaction with nursing aide (N = 231) as the unit of analysis, and nursing home facility (N = 15) as the random effect. The control variables were nursing aide age, tenure, gender, language, and education. Nursing aide gender was not a significant predictor of nursing aide job satisfaction.

Summary of Follower's Gender and Job Satisfaction

Researchers found mixed results when reporting followers' gender and job satisfaction. Several studies did not find followers' gender to be a significant predictor of job satisfaction (Lok & Crawford, 2003; Ng et al., 2005; Gittell et al., 2008). The Ng and Feldman (2010) meta-analysis of age and job attitudes revealed a significant moderating effect of gender on job satisfaction. The Aydin et al. (2012) meta-analysis found a small effect in favor of males on job satisfaction of teachers in Turkey.

Follower's Education and Job Satisfaction

Ng et al. (2005) conducted a meta-analysis on predictors of objective and subjective career success. Predictors included organizational sponsorship as defined by career sponsorship, supervisor support, training and skill development opportunities, and organizational resources; human capital; socio-demographics, and stable individual differences. Subjective career success was defined as career satisfaction. Demographic information was obtained for gender, race (White or non-White), marital status (married or unmarried), and age. Educational level was a significant predictor of career satisfaction ($N = 11,890, k = 24, r_c = .03, p < .05$).

Ng and Feldman (2010) conducted a meta-analysis of the relationship between age and 35 job attitudes including work tasks, colleagues, supervisors, and organizations. They included over 800 studies in their meta-analysis. Organizational tenure, race, gender, educational level, and year of study moderated the relationship between age and job attitudes. The study revealed a significant moderating effect of college education on job satisfaction (college education < 70%, N = 20,351, k = 51, $r_c = .27$; college education > 70%, N = 13,963, k = 56, $r_c = .16$).

Lok and Crawford (2003) studied the effect of organizational culture and leadership style on job satisfaction and organizational commitment on a sample of managers from Hong Kong and Australia. Leadership style was measured by the Leader Behavior Descriptive Questionnaire (LBDQ) (Stogdill, 1974), and job satisfaction was measured by the Warr job satisfaction questionnaire (Warr et al, 1979). Hierarchical regression analysis revealed that level of education was a significant predictor of job satisfaction, (β = -.16, p < .01), indicating participants with higher levels of education had lower levels of job satisfaction.

Gittell et al. (2008) studied the effect of relational coordination on nursing aide job satisfaction and quality of life outcomes for nursing home residents. An 82-item Likert-type questionnaire was administered in face-to-face interviews to 252 nursing aides. The nursing aide questionnaire was available in English, Spanish, and Haitian Creole according to the language preference of the nursing aide. Random effects linear regression was used to analyze the relationship between relational coordination and nursing aide job satisfaction with nursing aide (N = 231) as the unit of analysis, and nursing home facility (N = 15) as the random effect. The control variables were nursing aide age, tenure, gender, language, and education. Nursing aide level of education was not a significant predictor of nursing aide job satisfaction.

Summary of Follower's Education and Job Satisfaction

Results of research have been mixed on followers' education and job satisfaction. Lok and Crawford (2003) and Ng et al. (2005) found followers' educational level to be a significant predictor of job satisfaction. The Ng and Feldman (2010) meta-analysis of age and job attitudes revealed a significant moderating effect of college education on job satisfaction. Gittell et al. (2008) did not find followers' educational level to be a significant predictor of job satisfaction.

Follower's Organizational Level and Job Satisfaction

Salvadain (1977) studied the effect of organizational level on job satisfaction among 84 employees from four organizational levels within a research and teaching organization in India. The lowest level was Class Four Employees (CFEs) followed in increasing organizational level by Lower Division Clerks (LDCs), Upper Division Clerks (UPCs), and Stenographers (STGs). Job satisfaction was measured by the 13-item Porter Need Satisfaction Questionnaire (PNSQ) (Porter, 1961) which measures a Maslow-type needs hierarchy of security, social needs, esteem, autonomy, and self-actualization. The Job Satisfaction Index (JSI) (Brayfield & Rothe, 1951) was also administered to the participants. The correlation between the PNSQ and the JSI was r = .80, p < .05. Oneway analysis of variance (ANOVA) revealed significant mean differences between organizational levels for esteem (F(3,80) = 3.52, p < .05), autonomy (F(3,80) = 4.78, p < .01), and self-actualization (F(3,80) = 6.54, p < .01). A comparison of means on these segments of the PNSQ between organizational levels indicated a general trend of the higher the organizational level the higher the level of job satisfaction as measured by the PNSQ.

In the original field test for Laub's (1999) development of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) a six-item job satisfaction scale was included. "A significant (p < .01) negative relationship of -.234 existed between position and job
satisfaction" (p. 74). The positions were listed from highest to lowest indicating the higher the position, the higher the job satisfaction level.

Jordan (2015) studied the relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction. He administered the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999) and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) (Weiss et al., 1967) to 140 active duty and reserve members of a U. S. Navy Reserve organization. Demographic information was obtained on the participants' gender, tenure, and rank. Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted to control for rank. Rank was a significant covariate, F(3,136) = 7.545, p = .000. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) and Bonferroni post-hoc analysis did not reveal a significant difference between ranks on job satisfaction.

Summary of Follower's Organizational Level and Job Satisfaction

Researchers have found mixed results in followers' level of job satisfaction based on organizational level. Salyadain (1977) and Laub (1999) found that job satisfaction increased with increasing organizational level. Jordan (2015) did not find significant differences in job satisfaction between organizational levels.

Perception of Servant Leadership and Follower's Job Satisfaction

Laub (1999) developed the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) for his doctoral dissertation. It contains a servant leadership scale and a job satisfaction scale. The OLA was field tested among 828 participants from 40 organizations in the United States and one organization in the Netherlands. His research indicated a correlation of r = .634, p < .01 between the servant leadership scale and the job satisfaction scale of the OLA.

Thompson (2002) administered the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999) and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) (Weiss et al., 1967) to a sample of 116 staff members from the Academic Affairs and Student Services department of a church-related college in the United States. The results of a Pearson correlation between the servant leadership scale of the OLA and the MSQ were as follows: r = .704, p < .01, two-tailed.

Drury (2004) studied the relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction at a non-traditional college in the U. S. The servant leadership scale and the job satisfaction scale of the Organization Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999) were administered to 170 staff members. There was a strong positive correlation between servant leadership and job satisfaction (r = .631, p = .000, two-tailed).

Irving (2004) studied the relationship between servant leadership and the effectiveness of teams within churches, non-profits, and businesses in the U. S. He administered the servant leadership scale and the job satisfaction scale of the Organization Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999) to 202 participants. He found a strong positive correlation between servant leadership and job satisfaction (r = .625, p = .000).

Anderson (2005) studied the relationship between perception of servant leadership and job satisfaction among employees of the Church Educational System of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. She administered the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999) to 145 administrators and 285 teachers. The OLA contains both a servant leadership scale and a job satisfaction scale. Rather than employ a single composite score for the servant leadership scale, she chose to conduct Pearson correlations between the six highly correlated subscales of the servant leadership scale of the OLA with the job satisfaction scale. This resulted in correlations between perception of servant leadership and job satisfaction for administrators ranging from r = .521 to r = .616 for the various servant leadership subscales of the OLA, and between r = .634 to r = .718 for teachers at the p < .01 level.

Cerit (2009) examined the effect of servant leadership behaviors of 29 primary school principals on the level of job satisfaction of 595 teachers in Turkey. The Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999) was used to measure servant leadership, and the job satisfaction scale of A. Mohrman, Cooke, S. Mohrman, Duncan, and Zaltman (1977) was used to measure job satisfaction. Regression analysis indicated that servant leadership behavior of primary school principals was a significant predictor of job satisfaction among teachers accounting for 58.3% of the variance (R = .764; $R^2 = .583$; F(593) = 829.446; p < .01).

Van Dierendonck & Nuijten (2011) developed the Servant Leadership Survey (SLS) through analysis of a sample of 1571 participants from the Netherlands and the UK. As part of their exploration of the criterion-related validity of the SLS, they conducted a study of a sample of 362 participants of the correlation between the SLS and job satisfaction, as measured by questions adapted from the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, & Klesh, 1979) related to global job satisfaction, and satisfaction with leadership, management in general, work environment, and coworkers. Significant correlations between seven of the eight dimensions of the SLS and job satisfaction ranged from r = .20 (p < .01) for the dimension of forgiveness to r = .62 (p < .05) for the dimension of empowerment.

Zimmerer (2013) studied the relationship between levels of servant leadership perception among three generational cohorts and their levels of job satisfaction. She administered the Servant Leadership Survey (SLS) (van Dierendonck & Nuitjen, 2011), the Abridged Job in General Index (aJIG) (Russell et al., 2004), and the Abridged Job Descriptive Scale (aJDI) (Stanton et al., 2001) to 150 Baby Boomers, 151 GenXers, and 151 GenYers. For Baby Boomers, the correlation between scores on the SLS and the aJDI was (r = .62, p < .01, two-tailed) and between the SLS and the aJIG was (r = .49, p < .01, two-tailed). For GenExers, the correlation between scores on the SLS and the aJDI was (r = .56, p < .01, two-tailed) and between the SLS and the aJIG was (r = .30, p < .01, two-tailed). For GenYers, the correlation between scores on the SLS and the aJDI was (r = .56, p < .01, two-tailed) and between the SLS and the aJIG was (r = .30, p < .01, two-tailed). For GenYers, the correlation between scores on the SLS and the aJDI was (r = .66, p < .01, two-tailed) and between the SLS and the aJIG was (r = .30, p < .01, two-tailed). For GenYers, the correlation between scores on the SLS and the aJDI was (r = .66, p < .01, two-tailed) and between the SLS and the aJIG was (r = .61, p < .01, two-tailed). For GenYers, the correlation between scores on the SLS and the

Jordan (2015) studied the relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction among U. S. Navy personnel. The Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999) and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) (Weiss et al., 1967) were administered to 140 active duty and reserve members of a U. S. Navy Reserve organization. There was a strong positive correlation between servant leadership and overall job satisfaction (r = .725, p < .0005, two-tailed).

Summary of Perception of Servant Leadership and Follower's Job Satisfaction

Studies have indicated a significant relationship between Servant Leadership and Job Satisfaction. The original research for the development of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999) and subsequent studies (Drury, 2004; Irving, 2004; Anderson, 2005) have indicated a strong positive correlation between the servant leadership and job satisfaction scales of the OLA. Subsequent research has indicated a strong positive correlation between the servant leadership scale of the OLA and other measures of job satisfaction (Thompson, 2002; Cerit, 2009; Jordan, 2015). Other measures of servant leadership besides the OLA have shown a strong positive correlation with measures of job satisfaction (Van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011; Zimmerer, 2013).

Leadership and Job Satisfaction

Ng et al. (2005) conducted a meta-analysis on predictors of objective and subjective career success. Predictors included organizational sponsorship as defined by career sponsorship, supervisor support, training and skill development opportunities, and organizational resources. Subjective career success was defined as career satisfaction. Their analysis revealed a significant positive correlation between career sponsorship and career satisfaction (N = 6,255, k = 18, $r_c = .44$); between supervisor support and career satisfaction (N = 1,653, k = 6, $r_c = .46$); and between training and skill development opportunities and career satisfaction (N = 5,048, k = 18, $r_c = .38$).

Kooij et al. (2010) conducted a meta-analysis of 83 studies on the influence of age on the association between high commitment HR practices and affective commitment and job satisfaction. High commitment HR practices included internal promotion, training, job enrichment, job security, rewards, participation, information sharing, teamwork, work-life policies, flexible work schedules, staffing, and performance management. There was a positive correlation between all HR practices and job satisfaction $(N = 37,261, k = 56, r_c = .34).$

Yousef (2000) studied the mediator role of organizational commitment between leadership behavior and job satisfaction and performance in the United Arab Emirates. Leadership behavior of superiors as perceived by respondents was measured by the Likert (1967) leadership questionnaire. Job satisfaction was measured by a single question on a 7-point Likert scale that inquired about a participant's overall job satisfaction. A random sample of 600 employees from 30 organizations received the survey instrument of which 430 returned usable surveys. There was a significant positive correlation between leadership behavior and job satisfaction (r = .40, p < .01).

Lok and Crawford (2003) studied the effect of organizational culture and leadership style on job satisfaction and organizational commitment on a sample of 337 managers from Hong Kong and Australia. Leadership style was measured by the Leader Behavior Descriptive Questionnaire (LBDQ) (Stogdill, 1974), and job satisfaction was measured by the Warr job satisfaction questionnaire (Warr et al., 1979). There was a positive correlation between consideration and job satisfaction (r = .50, p < .01) and a negative correlation between initiating structure and job satisfaction (r = .35, p < .01).

Summary of Leadership and Job Satisfaction

Previous studies have indicated a significant relationship between leadership style and followers' job satisfaction (Yousef, 2000; Lok & Crawford, 2003). The Ng et al. (2005) meta-analysis revealed a significant positive correlation between career sponsorship, supervisor support, training and skill development opportunities, and followers' career satisfaction. In the Kooij et al. (2010) meta-analysis, there was a positive correlation between the high commitment HR practices of internal promotion, training, job enrichment, job security, rewards, participation, information sharing, teamwork, work-life policies, flexible work schedules, staffing, and performance management, and followers' job satisfaction.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

Overview

The purpose of this research has been to study differences among members of four generations in their composite scores on the servant leadership scale, and their composite scores on the job satisfaction scale of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999) when controlling for language, tenure, gender, education, and organizational level. This study also looked at the relationship between scores on the servant leadership scale and scores on the job satisfaction scale of the OLA when controlling for generational cohort, language, tenure, gender, education, and organizational level. This chapter provides details of the sampling plan, instruments used to measure the variables, operational definitions, research design, null hypotheses, procedures, data collection and analysis, and ethical considerations.

Sampling Plan

A convenience sample was recruited from the board and staff of World Radio Network, Inc. and Rio Grande Bible Ministries (and also from the students of Rio Grande Bible Ministries) by electronic means. After giving informed consent by electronic means, participants provided information by online survey regarding date of birth, tenure with the organization, gender, education, and organizational level. Participants took the online version of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999). Language was determined by the language the participant selected to take the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999).

Research Study Instruments

<u>Demographic Survey</u> – The demographic survey asked for the following information:

- 1. Year of birth _____
- Years with organization (regardless of category, organizational level, or interruption of service)
- 3. Gender: Male ____ Female ____
- 4. Level of education
 - a. Less than High School_____
 - b. High School Diploma or Equivalent_____
 - c. Bachelor's Degree_____
 - d. Graduate or Professional Degree_____

Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA)

The Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999) is a 66-item, 5-point Likert scale format instrument that includes a 60-item servant leadership scale and a 6-item job satisfaction scale. Dr. James Laub developed the OLA as part of his doctoral research to assess organizational health. This in turn "produced a comprehensive model of servant leadership applied to organizational life" (OLAgroup, 2017, OLA section, Development subsection, para.1).

The Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) was established through a Delphi Survey process involving experts in the field of servant leadership. In the course of the 3-part Delphi process the experts arrived at a consensus on the characteristics of the servant organization. The process identified the following dimensions and characteristics:

Displays Authenticity through

- trust
- integrity
- accountability
- openness
- willingness to learn from others

Values People through

- receptive listening
- trusting others
- serving the needs of others first

Develops People through

- providing opportunities to learn
- encouraging and building up others
- modeling appropriate behaviors

Builds Community through

- collaborative effort
- valuing differences within the community
- developing strong relationships

Provides Leadership through

- clarifying goals
- taking the initiative
- giving a vision of the future

Shares Leadership through

- empowering others to make decisions
- according worth and privileges to all

• developing a shared vision (Laub, 1999; OLAGroup, 2017)

The above dimensions and characteristics were used to write the 60 items that make up the servant leadership scale of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999). The OLA was designed to be taken by all organizational levels within an institution to include Top Leadership, Managers/Administrator, and Workforce (OLAgroup, 2017).

The OLA was field tested with 41 organizations representing 828 participants. The research revealed that these six dimensions listed above were highly correlated with each other. Only the composite score for the 60-item servant leadership scale and composite score for the 6-item job satisfaction scale of the OLA should be used for research purposes (Laub, 1999; OLAgroup, 2017).

The original field test of the OLA revealed a reliability score of .9802 using the *Cronbach's alpha* coefficient. In the same original field test, the lowest item-to-item correlation was .41 and the highest was .77, indicating that all of the items have a strong correlation with the entire instrument. Horsman (2001) determined a *Cronbach's alpha* coefficient of .9870 for the OLA. Ledbetter's study (2003) also closely approximated the original research in that the *Cronbach's alpha* coefficient was .9814 for the overall instrument, and the lowest item-to-item correlation was .44 and the highest was .78. The job satisfaction scale of the OLA revealed a *Cronbach's alpha* of .81 in the original field test (Laub, 1999).

Ledbetter (2003) investigated test-retest reliability of the OLA in which means and standard deviations between the Test and the Retest remained consistent when administered two weeks apart. For this portion of his study, 138 participants from 12 police agencies in 7 states of the US took part in the study. The group mean for the first test out of a total possible score of 300 was M = 210.52, SD = 39.16. For the retest the group mean was M = 214.80, SD = 36.76 (Ledbetter, 2003).

Irving and McIntosh (2007) evaluated the Spanish version of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999). A *Cronbach's alpha* of .9862 (N = 60) was obtained for the servant leadership scale of the Spanish language OLA. A *Cronbach's alpha* of .8715 (N = 78) was obtained for the job satisfaction scale of the Spanish language OLA. These reliability coefficients were comparable to the original field test of the OLA which resulted in a *Cronbach's alpha* of .9802 for the servant leadership scale and a *Cronbach's alpha* of .81 for the job satisfaction scale (Laub, 1999).

Construct validity was established in the development phase of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) for Laub's (1999) original research through a three-stage Delphi process involving a panel of experts in the field of servant leadership. This determined the characteristics of servant leadership that became the 60 items of the servant leadership scale. Face validity was determined in the development phase involving over 100 adult graduate students as to the accuracy of the descriptors of the six dimensions of servant leadership in the Laub (1999) model. There was consistency of perception of accuracy across full-page descriptions of all six dimensions of the model (Laub, 1999; OLAGroup, 2017).

Thompson (2002) conducted a *Pearson's r* correlation between the job satisfaction scale of the OLA and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) (Weiss et al., 1967). There was a significant positive correlation between the two instruments (r(114) = .721, p < .01, two-tailed). This is indicative of strong concurrent validity between the two measures of job satisfaction (Thompson, 2002).

The present study obtained the following *Cronbach's alpha* reliability statistics found in Table 1 below:

Table 1

Present study's reliability st	atistics for Organizatio	nal Leadership Asse	ssment (OLA)
Servant Leadership Scale	Cronbach's alpha	N of Items	
	.987	60	
Job Satisfaction Scale	Cronbach's alpha	N of Items	
	.865	6	

Operational Definitions for Independent Variables

<u>Generation</u> - self report and assignment by birth year to one of the following generations (Sessa, Kabacoff, Deal, & Brown, 2007):

- a. Mature Generation (born 1925-1945)
- b. Baby Boomers (born 1946-1963)
- c. Generation X (born 1964-1982)
- d. Millennials (born 1983-onward)

Operational Definitions for Control Variables

- 1. <u>Language</u> English or Spanish in which the respondent chooses to take the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999)
- <u>Tenure</u> years with the organization regardless of multiple categories (volunteer, employee, board member, etc.) or interruptions of service
- 3. Gender male or female
- 4. Education Level of education completed
 - a. Less than High School Diploma
 - b. High School Diploma or Equivalent
 - c. Bachelor's Degree
 - d. Graduate or Professional Degree
- 5. Organizational Level (Laub, 1999)
 - a. Top Leadership (top level of leadership)
 - b. Management (supervisor, manager)
 - c. Workforce (staff member, worker)

Operational Definitions for Dependent Variables

- <u>Servant Leadership</u> composite score on the servant leadership scale of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999)
- Job Satisfaction composite score on the job satisfaction scale of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999)

Research Design

This was a non-experimental descriptive research design. The respondents' generation as a categorical independent variable was compared with composite scores on the servant leadership scale and the job satisfaction scale of the OLA as dependent variables, controlling for language, tenure, gender, education, and organizational level employing factorial analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) methodology. Separate ANCOVAs were conducted for generational differences on the servant leadership scale of the OLA, and on generational differences on the job satisfaction scale of the OLA. Analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was employed to control for the effect of the continuous variable of tenure on the relationship between the categorical variable of generational cohort and scores on the servant leadership and job satisfaction scales of the OLA, as well as to control for effect of the variables of language, gender, education, and organizational level on the relationship between the categorical variable of generational cohort and scores on the servant leadership and job satisfaction scales of the OLA. ANCOVAs were analyzed for any main effect of generational cohort or control variables on the dependent variables of servant leadership scores and job satisfaction scores of the OLA, as well as any interactions between generational cohort and the control variables on the dependent variables of servant leadership scores and job satisfaction scores of the OLA. *Pearson's r* correlations, *t*-tests, and analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were conducted as appropriate.

In addition, multiple regression analysis was used to analyze composite scores on the servant leadership scale of the OLA as a predictor of composite scores on the job satisfaction scale of the OLA. The demographic variables of generational cohort, language, tenure, gender, education, and organizational level were entered as control variables into the hierarchical regression analysis. R^2 , ΔR^2 , β eta weights, and partial correlations were conducted for the regression analysis. *Pearson's r* correlations, *t*-tests, and ANOVAs were conducted as appropriate.

Null Hypotheses

 H_01 : There are no differences in scores on the servant leadership scale of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999) by generational cohort when controlling for language, tenure, gender, education, and organizational level.

H₀2: There are no differences in scores on the job satisfaction scale of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999) by generational cohort when controlling for language, tenure, gender, education, and organizational level.

 H_03 : There is no relationship between scores on the servant leadership scale of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999) and scores on the job satisfaction scale of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999) when controlling for generational cohort, language, tenure, gender, education, and organizational level.

Procedure

The study sample was drawn from the board and staff of the World Radio Network, Inc., and Rio Grande Bible Ministries which represented populations of approximately 200 and 700 individuals respectively. The presidents of both organizations had given permission to conduct the study within their respective organizations and had given access to staff contact information. Permission was obtained from the OLAGroup to use the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999) for this research. After appropriate approvals were received from the principal researcher's dissertation committee and the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of Our Lady of the Lake University, recruitment of the study populations was conducted by electronic means.

A convenience sample was recruited by electronic means from both the World Radio Network, Inc., and Rio Grande Bible Ministries through access to staff contact information, and the electronic and print resources of both organizations. All the participants took the demographic survey and Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999) online after having been recruited electronically by the principal investigator. They were provided an electronic version of the recruitment/informed consent message which served as their copy. Once they had read those, they were allowed to proceed to the OLA website to take the survey. At that point they indicated that they had given informed consent before proceeding to take the demographic survey and the OLA as described in the Sampling Plan above. Data were collected during the months of April, May, June, and July of 2016.

Participants age 18 or over took part in this study. After they read the informed consent form attached to the electronic recruitment message, and decided to participate in this study, they were asked to go to the following website: http://www.olagroup.com. They typed in the username and pin that pertained to their organization. They selected "Take the OLA" at the upper right of the screen. They chose the "Standard Version." They selected the language - English or Spanish - with which they were most comfortable. They found (a) a demographic survey that asked if they had read the informed consent document and were in agreement; their year of birth (for assignment to the appropriate generational cohort); their number of years with the organization

(regardless of staff category, organizational level, or interruption of service); their gender; and their level of education (b) instructions for taking the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999) which included asking for their organizational level - top leadership/board member; supervisor/manager; or staff/member/worker/student/volunteer. It took the participants about 30 minutes to read the informed consent form, take the demographic survey, and the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999).

Data Collection and Analysis

The administration of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999) was coordinated with Dr. James Laub of OLA group to set up each of the organizations being studied on the www.olagroup.com site. Access codes and directions for taking the OLA were provided to those participating in the study. Dr. Laub provided access to the site to the principal investigator in order to monitor the progress of each organization taking the OLA. Once all assessments were completed by the research participants, Dr. Laub provided:

1) an OLA report for each organization in pdf. format, as well as

2) a copy of the raw data in MicroSoft Excel format. These were transferred from the Excel file into SPSS for data analysis.

Descriptive statistics were determined from the raw data derived from the demographic survey and the servant leadership and job satisfaction scales of the Organizational Leadership Assessment OLA from the respondents. Those statistics included the following: distribution of respondents by generational cohort; by tenure; by language of response (English or Spanish); by gender; by educational level; and by organizational level. Distribution of composite scores for the servant leadership and job satisfaction scales of the OLA were calculated. The categorical variables of generational cohort, language, gender, educational level, and organizational level were dummy-coded. Range, mean, standard deviation, and skewness for the continuous variable of tenure, and for the servant leadership and job satisfaction scales of the OLA were calculated.

Pearson's r correlations of the continuous variable of tenure with the composite servant leadership scale scores and with the job satisfaction scale scores of the OLA were calculated. A *Pearson's r* correlation of the composite servant leadership scale scores with the job satisfaction scale scores of the OLA was also calculated. A *t-test* was calculated for response by language to composite scores of the servant leadership and job satisfaction scales of the OLA. A confidence level of $p \le .05$ was established for all inferential statistical calculations.

Ethical Considerations

Approval was obtained from the World Radio Network, Inc. president, and the Rio Grande Bible Ministries president to recruit participants from their respective organizations. Dr. James Laub of the OLAgroup gave permission to use the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999) for research purposes. The principal investigator's dissertation committee and the Institutional Review Board of Our Lady of the Lake University gave permission to conduct the research. Informed consent was obtained from the participants. In order to preserve anonymity, all participants from each organization used the same organizational code and pin for their respective organization to take the demographic survey and the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999). Only the principal investigator and the co-investigators – Dr. Baggerly-Hinojosa, Dr. Wheeler, and Dr. Sun - had access to the data. The data was downloaded onto the researcher's and/or the co-investigators' computer for analysis. The data was deleted by the researcher after the analysis was complete. Reasonable precautions were taken to preserve the anonymity of the study data. The participants were identified only by number. The raw data from the demographic survey and the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) were kept in locked premises, and only the researcher and co-investigators had access to the data.

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

Overview

The purpose of this research was to study differences among members of four generations in their composite scores on the servant leadership scale, and their composite scores on the job satisfaction scale of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999) when controlling for language, tenure, gender, education, and organizational level. The researcher also looked at scores on the servant leadership scale as a predictor of scores on the job satisfaction scale of the OLA when controlling for generational cohort, language, tenure, gender, education, and organizational level. This chapter provides an analysis of the data, statistical analysis of the demographic, predictor and criterion variables, and covariate; the null hypotheses, and results of the analyses.

Data Collected

Participants were recruited from two religious non-profit organizations along the US/Mexico border. The first group of participants was from the board and staff (comprised of missionaries, employees, and volunteers) of World Radio Network, Inc. representing approximately 200 individuals (Personal communication, Dr. A. Limon, December 1, 2015). The second group of participants was from the board and staff (comprised of missionaries, employees, and volunteers) of Rio Grande Bible Ministries, and also from the students of Rio Grande Bible Ministries, representing approximately 700 individuals (Personal communication, Dr. L. Windle, December 1, 2015). A convenience sample was recruited by mass email to the respective organizations. Participants were given a description of the study in detail, an electronic informed consent form, and a link to the online survey. The researcher had been informed by both

organizations that due to many volunteer staff members it was not possible to know if all volunteer staff members had access to email or if each email address represented one or more volunteer staff members in cases where one or more members of a family volunteered. Thus, estimates of response rates for each organization are approximate. From World Radio Network, Inc., the response rate was 87 participants out of approximately 200 potential participants or 43.5%. From Rio Grande Bible Ministries the response rate was 65 participants out of approximately 700 potential participants or 9.3%. The combined response rate was 152 participants out of approximately 900 potential participants or 16.9%.

Descriptive Statistics

Participants' Demographic Variables

Table 2

Language Comparison

	N	Percent
English	114	75.0
Spanish	38	25.0
Total	152	100.0

Figure 4 illustrates the language comparison of English speaking and Spanish speaking participants. The language distribution resulted in 75% (n = 114) English speakers, and 25% (n = 38) Spanish speakers.



Figure 4. Language comparison of participants

Figure 5 demonstrates the tenure distribution of participants. Participants' tenure ranged from one year or less to 46 years (M = 14.85, SD = 11.745). Due to skewness in the data, the distribution shows a floor effect.



Figure 5. Tenure distribution of participants

Gender Comparison

	N	Percent
Male	74	49.0
Female	77	51.0
Total	151	100.0

Figure 6 illustrates the gender comparison of male and female participants. The language distribution resulted in 49% (n = 74) male, and 51% (n = 77) female.



Figure 6. Gender comparison of participants

Participants' Education

	Ν	Percent
High School	40	26.3
Bachelors	57	37.5
Graduate/ Professional	55	36.2
Total	152	100.0

Figure 7 illustrates the education of participants. The education distribution resulted in 26.3% (n = 40) with high school diploma or equivalent, 37.5% (n = 57) with bachelors degree, and 36.2% (n = 55) with graduate or professional degree.



Figure 7. Education of participants

Participants' Organizational Level

	Ν	Percent
Top Leadership	20	13.2
Management	26	17.1
Workforce	106	69.7
Total	152	100.0

Figure 8 illustrates the organizational level of participants. The organizational level distribution resulted in 13.2% (n = 20) in top leadership, 17.1% (n = 26) in management, and 69.7% (n = 106) in the workforce.



Organizational Level

Figure 8. Organizational level of participants

Participants' Generational Cohort

	Ν	Percent
Mature Generation	34	22.5
Baby Boomers	57	37.7
Generation X	39	25.8
Millennials	21	13.9
Total	151	100.0

Figure 9 illustrates the generational cohort of participants. The generational cohort distribution resulted in 22.5% (n = 34) in the Mature Generation, 37.7% (n = 57) Baby Boomers, 25.8% (n = 39) Generation X, and 13.9% (n = 21) Millennials.



Figure 9. Generational cohort of participants

Figure 10 demonstrates the distribution of participants' scores on the servant leadership scale of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999). The mean and standard deviation for servant leadership scores were (M = 4.05, SD = .69).



Figure 10. Distribution of participants' scores on the servant leadership scale of the OLA

Figure 11 demonstrates the distribution of participants' scores on the job satisfaction scale of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999). The mean and standard deviation for job satisfaction scores were (M = 4.23, SD = .662).



Figure 11. Distribution of participants' scores on the job satisfaction scale of the OLA

Findings

Correlations

Pearson's r correlations were calculated for the continuous variables of participants' tenure, and for scores on the servant leadership scale and the job satisfaction scale of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999). There was a significant negative relationship between participant tenure and scores on both the servant leadership scale of the OLA (r = -.219, p < .01) and the job satisfaction scale of the OLA (r = -.195, p < .01). There was a significant positive relationship between participant scores on the servant leadership scale of the OLA (r = -.195, p < .01). There was a significant positive relationship between participant scores on the servant leadership scale of the OLA and participant scores on the job satisfaction scale of the OLA (r = .749, p < .01). Table 7 illustrates the significant relationships between tenure, and scores on servant leadership and the job satisfaction scale of scales of the OLA. Probability level for the *Pearson's r* correlations was set at the .05 level.

Table 7

Pearson Correlation Matrix

	Job Satisfaction	Tenure	Servant Leadership
Job Satisfaction			
Tenure	195**		
Servant Leadership	.749**	219**	

Note: Correlation Matrix for Tenure, Job Satisfaction, and Servant Leadership, **p < .01.

Null Hypothesis One: Generational Cohorts and Servant Leadership

 H_01 : There are no differences in scores on the servant leadership scale of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) by generational cohort when controlling for language, tenure, gender, education, and organizational level.

Factorial analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was employed to control for the effect of the continuous variable of tenure on the relationship between the categorical variable of generational cohort and scores on the servant leadership scale of the OLA, as well as to control for effect of the variables of language, gender, education, and organizational level on the relationship between the categorical variable of generational cohort and scores on the servant leadership scale of generational cohort and scores on the servant leadership scale of the OLA. (See Table 8). The results showed no significant main effect for Generational Cohort, F(3, 89) = 2.411, p = .072. As a result there was a failure to reject H₀1. A significant interaction was found between Generational Cohort and Gender, F(3, 89) = 2.802, p = .044. (See Figure 12). Additionally the covariate of tenure was significant, F(1, 89) = 8.132, p = .005. *Pearson r* correlation analysis revealed a significant negative relationship between participant tenure and scores on the servant leadership scale of the OLA (r = -.219, p < .01). (See Figure 13).

Si	<i>x</i> -	Wa	ay A	Anal	ysis	of	C	0-	V	aria	nce	on	Se	rvan	t	Lead	leı	rsł	ιi	p
----	------------	----	------	------	------	----	---	----	---	------	-----	----	----	------	---	------	-----	-----	----	---

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	Sig.
Tenure (T)	3.472	1	3.472	8.132*	0.005
Generational Cohort (GC)	3.089	3	1.03	2.411	0.072
Language (L)	1.544	1	1.544	3.617	.060
Gender (G)	.618	1	.618	1.447	.232
Education E)	.225	2	.112	.263	.769
Organizational Level (OL)	.219	2	.110	.257	.774
GC * L	.833	2	.417	.976	.381
GC * G	3.589	3	1.196	2.802*	.044
GC * E	2.336	6	.389	.912	.490
GC * OL	1.472	4	.368	.862	.490
L * G	.685	1	.685	1.605	.208
L * E	1.046	2	.523	1.225	.299
L * OL	.379	2	.189	.443	.643
G * E	1.332	2	.666	1.560	.216
G * OL	.109	3	.054	.127	.881
E * OL	.444	2	.148	.347	.792
GC * L * E	.452	3	.226	.529	.591
GC * G * E	3.087	2	1.029	2.410	.072
GC * E * OL	1.764	0	.882	2.066	.133
GC * L * G * E * OL	.000				
Error	37.999	89	.427		
Total	2469.122	146			
Corrected Total	68.143	145			



Figure 12: Interaction of Generational Cohort and Gender on Servant Leadership Scores



Figure 13: Scatterplot for Servant Leadership Scores and Tenure

Null Hypothesis Two: Generational Cohorts and Job Satisfaction

H₀2: There are no differences in scores on the job satisfaction scale of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) by generational cohort when controlling for language, tenure, gender, education, and organizational level.

Factorial analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was employed to control for the effect of the continuous variable of tenure on the relationship between the categorical variable of generational cohort and scores on the job satisfaction scale of the OLA, as well as to control for the effect of the variables of language, gender, education, and organizational level on the relationship between the categorical variable of generational cohort and scores on the servant leadership scale of the OLA. (See Table 9). The results showed no significant main effect for Generational Cohort, F(3, 89) = 2.067, p = .110. As a result there was a failure to reject H_02 . There was a significant main effect for Language, F(1, 89) = 7.873, p = .006. Results of a *t*-test were as follows for mean difference between English speakers and Spanish speakers on the job satisfaction scale of the OLA: t(150) = -2.91, p = .004 (two-tailed), M (English) = 4.14, SD = .71 and M (Spanish) = 4.50, SD = .41. A significant interaction was found between Generational Cohort and Gender, F(3, 89) = 2.710, p = .050. (See Figure 14). Additionally the covariate of tenure was significant, F(1, 89) = 6.957, p = .010. Pearson r correlation analysis revealed a significant negative relationship between participant tenure and scores on the job satisfaction scale of the OLA (r = -195, p < .01). (See also Figure 15).

Six-Way	Analysis	of Co	-Variance	on J	lob	Satisfa	ction

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	Sig.
Tenure (T)	2.595	1	2.595	6.957*	0.01
Generational Cohort (GC)	2.313	3	2.067	2.067	0.11
Language (L)	2.937	1	2.937	7.873*	.006
Gender (G)	.039	1	.039	.104	.748
Education E)	.025	2	.012	.033	.967
Organizational Level (OL)	.721	2	.361	.967	.384
GC * L	1.636	2	.818	2.193	.118
GC * G	3.033	3	1.011	2.710*	.050
GC * E	1.167	6	.195	.522	.791
GC * OL	1.200	4	.300	.804	.526
L * G	.000	1	.000	.000	.985
L * E	.048	2	.024	.064	.938
L * OL	.608	2	.304	.815	.446
G * E	.161	2	.081	.216	.806
G * OL	.213	2	.106	.285	.753
E * OL	1.233	3	.411	1.102	.353
GC * L * E	.439	2	.219	.588	.558
GC * G * E	3.842	3	1.281	3.433	.020
GC * E * OL	2.127	2	1.064	2.851	.063
GC * L * G * E * OL	.000				
Error	33.199	89	.373		
Total	2691.972	146			
Corrected Total	60.511	145			


Figure 14: Interaction of Generational Cohort and Gender on Job Satisfaction Scores



Figure 15: Scatterplot for Job Satisfaction Scores and Tenure

 H_03 : There is no relationship between scores on the servant leadership scale and scores on the job satisfaction scale of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) when controlling for generational cohort, language, tenure, gender, education, and organizational level.

Multiple regression analysis was used to predict the relationship between participants' scores on the servant leadership scale of the OLA and participants' scores on the job satisfaction scale of the OLA beyond the impact of generational cohort, language, tenure, gender, education, and organizational level. Model 1 of the model summary table (Table 10) shows that Language was the only demographic variable to predict job satisfaction scores on the OLA ($R^2 = .045$, p = .010). Results of a *t*-test for language and job satisfaction scores were as follows: t(150) = -2.91, p = .004 (twotailed), M (English) = 4.14, SD = .71 and M (Spanish) = 4.50, SD = .41; and for language and servant leadership scores on the OLA as follows: t(150) = -2.22, p = .028 (twotailed), M (English) = 3.98, SD = .73 and M (Spanish) = 4.26, SD = .49. Model 2 demonstrates that servant leadership scores on the OLA are a predictor of job satisfaction scores on the OLA and account for an additional 52.6% of the variance ($\Delta R^2 = .526$, $\beta = .734, r_p = .742, p = .000$). (See also Figure 16). As language and servant leadership scores on the OLA have been shown to be significant predictors of job satisfaction scores on the OLA, H_03 was rejected.

Model	R	R Square	R Square Change	F Change	βeta	<i>r</i> _p	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.212 ^a	.045		6.838			1	146	.010
2	.755 ^b	.570	.526	177.318	.734	.742	1	145	.000

Table 10: Model summary of Multiple Regression – Job Satisfaction

Note: (a) Language, (b) Servant Leadership



Figure 16: Scatterplot for Servant Leadership and Job Satisfaction Scores

CHAPTER FIVE – DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Summary

This chapter will discuss findings of the ratings by generational cohort of board and staff members of two religious non-profit organizations along the US/Mexico border of his or her servant organizational leadership as well as his or her job satisfaction. Only the Zimmerer (2013) study so far has looked at generational differences in followers' perception of servant leadership. Other studies have looked at generational differences in job satisfaction with mixed results (Costanza et al., 2012; Hansen & Leuty, 2012; Zimmerer, 2013). Although Zimmerer (2013) employed different instruments to measure perception of servant leadership and job satisfaction, as in the case of this study, she did not find significant differences between the generations in perception of servant leadership or job satisfaction. For differences or relationships of the demographic variables of language, tenure, gender, education, and organizational level with followers perception of servant leadership and job satisfaction, the results have been mixed with the exception of language and gender and followers' perception of servant leadership. Previous studies have not revealed differences in followers' perception of servant leadership by language or gender. This study found significant differences in followers' perception of servant leadership by language and a significant interaction between generational cohort and gender in the presence of the significant covariate of tenure in followers' perception of servant leadership. Several studies have reported a significant positive correlation between followers' perception of servant leadership and job satisfaction (Laub, 1999; Thompson, 2002; Drury, 2004; Irving, 2004; Anderson, 2005; Cerit, 2009; Van Dierendonck & Nuitjen, 2011; Zimmerer, 2013; Jordan, 2015). The

literature review did not reveal previous studies that had controlled for demographic variables in the relationship between followers' perception of servant leadership and job satisfaction. Thus, this study has employed multiple regression analysis in looking at the relationship between followers' perception of servant leadership and job satisfaction while controlling for generational cohort, language, tenure, gender, education, and organizational level. The following sections discuss the findings of this study as well as its implications, limitations, and recommendations for future research.

Discussion of Findings

This study employed factorial analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) to test differences in scores on the servant leadership scale of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999) by generational cohort when controlling for language, tenure, gender, education, and organizational level (H₀1). While there was not a significant main effect between generational cohort and scores on the servant leadership scale of the OLA, there was a significant interaction between generational cohort and gender: F(3, 89) = 2.802, p = .044. Tenure was also a significant covariate: F(1, 89) = 8.132, p = .005. This suggests that in the presence of both gender and tenure, there are some generational differences in followers' perception of servant leadership. For the oldest and youngest generation, men have a slightly higher perception of servant leadership than women. For the middle two generations, women have a slightly higher perception of servant leadership than men. (See Figure 12, p. 107).

Factorial analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was also employed to test differences in scores on the job satisfaction scale of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999) by generational cohort when controlling for language, tenure, gender, education, and organizational level (H₀2). Again, while there was not a significant main effect between generational cohort and scores on the job satisfaction scale of the OLA, there was a significant interaction between generational cohort and gender: F(3, 89) = 2.710, p = .050. Again, tenure was a significant covariate: F(1, 89) = 6.957, p = .010. This suggests that in the presence of both gender and tenure, there are some generational differences in followers' job satisfaction. For the oldest and youngest generation, men have a slightly higher level of job satisfaction than women. For the middle two generations, women have a slightly higher level of job satisfaction than men. (See Figure 14, p. 111.) There was a significant main effect for Language: F(1, 89) = 7.873, p = .006. The results of a *t*-test (t(150) = -2.91, p = .004) revealed that English speakers had a lower mean score on the job satisfaction scale of the OLA (M = 4.14) than Spanish speakers (M = 4.50).

To test the relationship between scores on the servant leadership scale and scores on the job satisfaction scale of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) when controlling for generational cohort, language, tenure, gender, education, and organizational level, hierarchical multiple regression was employed to discover which variables were predictors of scores on the job satisfaction scale of the OLA. Language $(R^2 = .045, p = .010)$ was discovered to be a significant predictor of scores on the job satisfaction scale of the OLA. The results of a *t*-test (t(150) = -2.22, p = .004) revealed that English speakers had a lower mean score on the servant leadership scale of the OLA (M = 3.98) than Spanish speakers (M = 4.26). The results of a *t*-test (t(150) = -2.91, p = .004) revealed that English speakers had a lower mean score on the job satisfaction scale of the OLA (M = 4.14) than Spanish speakers (M = 4.50). Followers' scores on the servant leadership scale of the OLA were also a significant predictor of scores on the job satisfaction scale of the OLA. Scores on the servant leadership scale of the OLA accounted for 52.6% of the variance explained, with a standardized $\beta = .734$ and partial correlation of $r_p = .742$, indicating the higher the followers' perception of servant leadership, the higher the followers' job satisfaction (p = .000).

Implications

This study revealed differences by followers' language in perceptions of servant leadership not previously described in the literature. Spanish speakers indicated a higher perception of servant leadership and job satisfaction than English speakers. Language differences in perception of servant leadership and job satisfaction could suggest the need for differences in training based on language. This study also revealed an interaction of followers' generational cohort with gender in perceptions of servant leadership not previously described in the literature. Interaction between generational cohort and gender could suggest the need for differences in training based on generational cohort by gender. Finally, this study revealed a negative relationship between follower's tenure and perception of servant leadership not previously described in the literature. Both follower's perception of servant leadership and follower's level of job satisfaction decreased with increasing tenure. Although follower performance was not measured in this study, negative correlations between tenure and perception of servant leadership and job satisfaction could suggest the need for increased awareness of job evaluation and performance review with increasing tenure.

Limitations

This study failed to find a significant difference between followers' generational cohort and followers' perception of servant leadership or job satisfaction, although it did find a significant interaction in the presence of a significant covariate of tenure between followers' generational cohort and gender for both followers' perception of servant leadership and job satisfaction. Gender, education, and organizational level did not have a significant main effect in the presence of the significant covariate of tenure on either scores on the servant leadership scale or the job satisfaction scale of the OLA. While tenure was a significant covariate for both generational differences in followers' perception of servant leadership and job satisfaction, it was not a significant predictor of job satisfaction in the multiple regression. Language was a significant predictor of job satisfaction and had a significant main effect in the presence of the significant covariate of tenure on scores on the job satisfaction scale of the OLA. However, language did not have a significant main effect in the presence of the significant covariate of tenure on scores on the servant leadership scale of the OLA. With the exception of followers' language and gender, and perception of servant leadership, several previous studies have discovered significant differences or relationships between followers' language, tenure, gender, education, and organizational level and perception of servant leadership. A possible explanation for the failure to find significant differences or relationships for several of the demographic variables could be the small sample size of this study (N = 152) potentially limiting statistical power. The small sample size might have been due in part to the study being limited to two religious non-profits on the US/Mexico border. The larger of the two organizations is primarily an educational institution. The

resident population drops to about ten percent from mid-May to mid-August compared to the rest of the year. Due to unavoidable delays, recruitment for the study did not begin until the end of April and ended in early July of 2016.

Another limitation of this study was the skewness of the continuous variables of servant leadership scores, job satisfaction scores, and especially tenure, which had a floor effect. Due to range restriction, the correlations between the continuous variables could have been underestimated. The fact that the servant leadership and job satisfaction scales were obtained from the same instrument is a limitation. This study and previous studies have found a strong positive correlation between the two scales. There could be a concern that they measure the same rather than different constructs. Finally, the results of this study can only be generalized to the population from which the sample was taken.

Recommendations for Future Research

Future research into generational differences in followers' perception of servant leadership and job satisfaction would benefit from a larger study sample. This researcher had an interest in religious non-profits with high numbers of both English and Spanish speakers. It would perhaps be possible to recruit a larger sample by electronic means through one of the accrediting agencies to which many religious non-profits belong. Other measures of servant leadership and job satisfaction besides the OLA (Laub, 1999) could be employed to investigate followers' generational differences. In this study, tenure was a significant covariate in the analysis of followers' generational differences in perception of servant leadership and job satisfaction. Future studies could investigate generational differences for those who all have the same tenure. Significant differences or relationships were found in this study by language and tenure in both the perception of servant leadership and job satisfaction. Future research could investigate other factors that might explain language and tenure differences in perception of servant leadership and job satisfaction.

References

- Anderson, K. (2005). A correlational analysis of servant leadership and job satisfaction in a religious educational organization (Doctoral dissertation, University of Phoenix).
- Avolio, B. & Bass, B. (2004). *MLQ: Multifactor leadership questionnaire*. Menlo Park, CA: Mind Garden.
- Aydin, A., Uysal, S., & Sarier, Y. (2012). The effect of gender on job satisfaction of teachers: A meta-analysis study. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46(2012), 356-362.
- Barbuto, J. & Wheeler, D. (2006). Scale development and construct clarification of servant leadership. *Group & Organization Management*, 31(3), 300-326.
- Barbuto, J., Fritz, S., Matkin, G., & Marx, D. (2007). Effects of gender, education, and age upon leaders' use of influence tactics and full range leadership behaviors. Sex Roles, 56, 71-83.
- Bass, B. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. & Avolio, B. (1994). Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bass, B. & Avolio, B. (1995). Multifactor leadership questionnaire: Manual leader form, rater, and scoring key for MLQ (Form 5x-Short). Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.
- Black, G. (2010). Correlational analysis of servant leadership and school climate. *Journal of Catholic Education*, *13*(4).

- Brayfield, A. & Rothe, E. (1951). An index of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 35, 307-311.
- Brown, S. & Bryant, P. (2015). Getting to know the elephant: A call to advance servant leadership through construct consensus, empirical evidence, and multilevel theoretical development. *Servant Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 2(1), 10-35.
- Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, D., & Klesh, J. (1979). The Michigan organizational assessment questionnaire. *Unpublished manuscript, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor*.
- Campbell, D. (2002). *Campbell Leadership Descriptor Facilitator's Guide*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Cerit, Y. (2009). The effects of servant leadership behaviours of school principals on teachers' job satisfaction. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 37(5), 600-623.
- Clark, A. (2015). What makes a good job? Job quality and job satisfaction. *IZA World of Labor*, ISSN 2054-9571, Iss. 215, http://dx.doi.org/10.15185/izawol.215
- Costanza, D., Badger, J., Fraser, R., Severt, J., & Gade, P. (2012). Generational differences in work-related attitudes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 27(4), 375-394.
- Cuadrado, I., Morales, F., & Recio, P. (2008). Women's Access to managerial positions: an experimental study of leadership styles and gender. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 11(1), 55-65.

- Dannhauser, Z. & Boshoff, A. (2006). The relationships between trust, team commitment and demographic variables. Servant Leadership Research Roundtable, August, 2006, 1-14.
- Dennis, R. & Bocarnea, M. (2005). Development of the servant leadership assessment instrument. *Leadership & organization development journal*, 26(8), 600-615.
- Dobrow Riza, S., Ganzach, Y., & Liu, Y. (2014, January). Job satisfaction over time: A longitudinal study of the differential roles of age and tenure. Academy of Management Proceedings (pending), 1-22.
- Drury, S. (2004). Servant leadership and organizational commitment: Empirical findings and workplace implications. *Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*, August, 2004, 1-14.
- Eagly, A., Johannesen-Schmidt, M., & van Engen, M. (2003). Transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129(4), 569-591.
- Ehrhart, M. (2004). Leadership and procedural justice climate as antecedants of unit-level organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, *57*, 61-94.
- Elsesser, K. & Lever, J. (2011). Does gender bias against female leaders persist?
 Quantitative and qualitative data from a large-scale survey. *Human Relations*, 64(12), 1555-1578.
- Ferres, N. & Travaglione, T., 2003). The development and validation of the workplace trust survey (WTS): Combining qualitative and quantitative methodologies. Mexico: APROS.

- Gay, E., Weiss, D., Hendel, D., Dawis, R., & Lofquist, L. (1971). Manual for the Minnesota Importance Questionnaire. *Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation*, 28.
- Gibson, J., Greenwood, R., & Murphy, E. (2009). Generational differences in the workplace: Personal values, behaviors, and popular beliefs. *Journal of Diversity Management*, 4 (3), 1-8.
- Gilbert, G., Collins, R., & Brenner, R. (1990). Age and leadership effectiveness: From the perceptions of the follower. *Human Resource Management*, 29(2), 187-196.
- Gittell, J., Weinberg, D., Pfefferle, S., & Bishop, C. (2008). Impact of relational coordination on job satisfaction and quality outcomes: A study of nursing homes. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 18(2), 154-170.
- Graen, G. & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership:
 Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25
 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *The leadership quarterly*, 6(2), 219-247.
- Green, M. (2013). *Graduate leadership: A review of the science of leadership*. N. Charleston, SC: CreateSpace and Leadership Studies.
- Green, M., Rodríguez, R., Wheeler, C., & Baggerly-Hinojosa, B. (2015). Servant leadership: A quantitative review of instruments and related findings. *Servant Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 2(2), 76-96.
- Greenleaf, R. (2003). *The Servant-leader within: A transformative path*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.

- Hansen, J. & Leuty, M. (2012). Work values across generations. *Journal of Career* Assessment, 20(1), 34-52.
- Horsman, J. (2001). *Perspectives of servant-leadership and spirit in organizations*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Gonzaga University, Spokane, Washington.
- House, R., Hanges, P., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P., & Gupta, V. (Eds.). (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications.
- Hoy, W., Tarter, C., & Kottkamp, R. (1991). Open schools, healthy schools: Measuring organizational climate. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Irving, J. (2004). Servant leadership and the effectiveness of teams: Findings and implications. *Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*, August, 2004, 1-12.
- Irving, J. & McIntosh, T. (2007). Evaluating the reliability of the evaluación organizacional de liderazgo among Spanish speaking Latin Americans. *Proceedings of ASBBS*, 14(1), 786-805.
- Jordan, M. (2015). Determining the relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction among U.S. Navy personnel. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Northcentral University, Prescott Valley, Arizona.
- Kabacoff, R. & Stoffey, R. (2001). Age differences in organizational leadership. Management Research Group, 1-33.
- Kearney, E. & Gebert, D. (2009). Managing diversity and enhancing team outcomes: The promise of transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(1), 77-89.

- Kooij, D., Jansen, P., Dikkers, J., & Lange, A. (2010). The influence of age on the associations between HR practices and both affective commitment and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31, 1111-1136.
- Laub, J. (1999). Assessing the servant organization: Development of the organizational leadership assessment (SOLA) instrument. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation).
 Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, FL.
- Ledbetter, D. (2003). Law enforcement leaders and servant leadership: A reliability study of the organizational leadership assessment (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Regent University, Virginia Beach, Virginia.
- Lester, S., Standifer, R., Schultz, N., & Windsor, J. (2012). Actual versus perceived generational differences at work: An empirical examination. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 19(3), 341-354.
- Liden, R. & Maslyn, J. (1998). Multidimensionality of leader-member exchange: An empirical assessment through scale development. *Journal of management*, 24(1), 43-72.
- Liden, R., Wayne, S., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership:Development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *19*, 161-177.
- Likert, R. (1967). *The Human Organization: Its Management and Values*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Lok, P. & Crawford, J. (2003). The effect of organisational culture and leadership style on job satisfaction and organisational commitment: A cross-national comparison. *Journal of Management Development*, 23(4), 321-388.
- Management Research Group, (1992). Leadership effectiveness analysis. Portland, ME: Author.
- McClellan, J. (2007). The advisor as servant: The theoretical and philosophical relevance of servant-leadership to academic training. *NACADA Journal*, 27(2), 41-49.
- McIntosh, T. & Irving, J. (2010). Evaluating the instrumento de contribucion al liderazgo de siervo (ICLS) for reliability in Latin America. *The Journal of Global Leadership*, *1*(1), 30-49.
- Meyer, J., Allen, N., & Smith, C. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of applied psychology*, 78(4), 538-551.
- Mohrman, A., Cooke, R., Mohrman, S., Duncan R., & Zaltman, G. (1977). An Assessment of a Structural Task Approach to Organizational Development of a School System. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.
- Mowday, R., Steers, R., & Porter, L. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of vocational behavior*, *14*(2), 224-247.
- Ng, T. & Feldman, D. (2010). The relationship of age with job attitudes: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, *63*, 677-718.
- Ng, T., Eby, L., Sorensen, K., & Feldman, D. (2005). Predictors of objective and subjective career success: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, *58*, 367-408.

O-Campo, E., Joyner, N., & Green, M. (2012). The impact of the language spoken at home when growing up and Hispanic preferences in leadership. Sam Houston State University, Fourth Annual General Business Conference, *Proceedings*, *Volume III*, 106-119.

OLAgroup (2016). http://www.olagroup.com/

- Parris, D. & Peachey, J. (2013). A systematic literature review of servant leadership theory in organizational contexts. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 113(3), 377-393.
- Parry, E. & Urwin, P. (2011). Generational differences in work values: A review of theory and evidence. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 13(1), 79-96.
- Paustian-Underdahl, S., Walker, L., & Woehr, D. (2014). Gender and perceptions of leadership effectiveness: A meta-analysis of contextual moderators. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99(6), 1129-1145.
- Porter, L. (1961). A study of perceived need satisfaction in bottom and middle management jobs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *46*, 1-10.

Rio Grande Bible Ministries (2016). http://www.riogrande.edu/en

- Rodriguez, R., Green, M., & Ree, M. (2003). Leading Generation X: Do the old rules apply? *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 9(4), 67-75.
- Rodríguez-Rubio, A. & Kiser, A. (2013). An examination of servant leadership in the United States and Mexico: Do age and gender make a difference? *The Global Studies Journal*, *5*(2), 127-149.
- Russell, S., Lin, L., Spitzmueller, C., Stanton, J., Smith, P., & Ironson, G. (2004). Shorter can also be better: The abridged job in general scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 64(5), 878-893.

- Salameh, K. M. (2011). Servant leadership practices among school principals in educational directorates in Jordan. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(22).
- Salyadain, M. (1977). Organization levels and job satisfaction. Vikalpa, 2(1), 29-39.
- Sendjaya, S., Sarros, J., & Santora, J. (2008). Defining and measuring servant leadership behavior in organizations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 45(2), 402-424.
- Sessa, V., Kabacoff, R., Deal, J., & Brown, H. (2007). Generational differences in leader values and leadership behaviors. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal*, 10(1), 47-74.
- Shirom, A., Gilboa, S., Fried, Y., & Cooper, C. (2008). Gender, age and tenure as moderators of work-related stressors' relationships with job performance: A metaanalysis. *Human Relations*, 61(10), 1371-1398.
- Sin, H-K., Nahrgang, J., & Morgeson, F. (2009). Understanding why they don't see eye to eye: An examination of leader-member exchange (LMX) agreement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(4), 1048-1057.
- Spears, L. (2005). The understanding and practice of servant leadership. *Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*, August, 2005.
- Stanton, J., Sinar, E., Balzer, W., Julian, A., Thoresen, P., & Aziz, S. (2001). Development of a compact measure of job satisfaction: The abridged job descriptive index. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 61(6), 1104-1122.
- Stogdill, R. (1974). *Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York: Free Press.

- Thompson, R. (2002). The perception of servant leadership characteristics and job satisfaction in a church-related college. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation)
 Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana.
- Twenge, J. (2010). A review of the empirical evidence on generational differences in work attitudes. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 25, 201-210.
- Van Dierendonck, D. (2010). Servant leadership: A review and synthesis. Journal of Management. Advance online publication, 1-34. doi: 10.1177/0149206310380462
- Van Dierendonck, D. & Nuitjen, I. (2011). The servant leadership survey: Development and validation of a multidimensional measure. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 26, 249-267. doi 10.1007/s10869-010-9194-1
- Wanous, J., Reichers, A., & Hudy, M. (1997). Overall job satisfaction: How good are single-item measures? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 242-252.
- Warr, P., Cook, J. & Wall, T. (1979). Scales for the measure of some work attitude and aspects of psychological well-being. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*,52, 129-148.
- Weiss, D., Dawis, R., England, G., & Lofquist, L. (1967). *Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota
- Williams, S. & Jones, F. (2009). Transformational leadership and servant leadership: Is there a difference? *Connexions Module: m27080*, 1-5.

World Radio Network, Inc. (2016a). Workers' Manual.

- World Radio Network, Inc. (2016b). Board of trustees: Agenda books, minutes, motions and action points, 1996-2016.
- World Values Survey, 2012. http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org.

- Yousef, D. (2000). Organizational commitment: A mediator of the relationships of leadership behavior with job satisfaction and performance in a non-western country. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 15(1), 6-28.
- Yukl, G. & Falbe, C. (1990). Influence tactics and objectives in upward, downward, and lateral influence attempts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 132-140.
- Zimmerer, T. (2013). *Generational perceptions of servant leadership: A mixed methods study*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Capella University, Minneapolis, MN.

APPENDIX A

OUR LADY OF THE LAKE UNIVERSITY

NOTICE OF APPROVAL TO BEGIN RESEARCH

EXEMPT STATUS

Approval Date: April 4, 2016

PI Name: Glenn C. Lafitte

Faculty Advisor: Dr. Barbara Baggerly-Hinojosa

Title of Study: Generational Differences in Servant Leadership and Job Satisfaction within Religious Non-Profit Organizations along the US/Mexico Border

The application you submitted for IRB review has been reviewed and determined to be Exempt from further review. Your study qualifies for exemption based on federal guidelines and no follow up with the IRB is required. You may begin data collection.

CHANGES – The PI must receive approval from the IRB before initiating any changes, including those required by the sponsor, which would affect human subjects. Such changes include changes in methods or procedures, numbers or kinds of human subjects, or revisions to the informed consent document or process. In addition, co-investigators must also receive approval from the IRB.

UNANTICIPATED RISK OR HARM- The PI will immediately inform the IRB of any unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects or others, of any serious harm to subjects.

Note: Your IRB training certificate needs to be renewed for another three years.

CC: IRB

le.

IRB Chair

APPENDIX B

Our Lady of the Lake University

Institutional Review Board

Recruitment message/Texto de hoja de reclutamiento (received electronically by potential participants)

(English) "Greetings board members, administrators, staff members, students, missionaries, employees and volunteers of Rio Grande Bible Ministries and World Radio Network, Inc.:

(Spanish) "Saludos miembros de la mesa directiva, administradores, colaboradores, estudiantes, misioneros, empleados y voluntarios del Ministerios Bíblicos del Rio Grande y de World Radio Network, Inc./Inspiracom:

(English) Hello. My name is Glenn Lafitte. I have been a missionary since 1981 with HCJB/Reach Beyond, and have been part of World Radio Network, Inc/Inspiracom since 1989. I studied Spanish at Rio Grande Bible Institute in 1981-1982 before going to Ecuador for missionary service. Since 2012 I have been working on a Ph. D. in Leadership Studies at the Rio Grande Valley campus of Our Lady of the Lake University. I have been approved by the university to begin the research for my dissertation. Dr. Larry Windle, president of Rio Grande Bible Ministries; and Dr. Abe Limón, president of World Radio Network, Inc., have given approval for me to conduct research within their respective organizations. I would like to invite you to participate in my research.

(Spanish) Hola. Mi nombre es Glenn Lafitte. He sido misionero desde 1981 con HCJB/Reach Beyond y miembro de World Radio Network, Inc./Inspiracom desde 1989. Fui alumno en el programa de español en el Seminario Bíblico del Rio Grande en 1981-1982 antes de ir al Ecuador como misionero. Desde el 2012 he tomado estudios de doctorado en liderazgo en Our Lady of the Lake University en La Feria. Estoy aprobado por la universidad para comenzar mis investigaciones para mi disertación. El Dr. Larry Windle, presidente de Ministerios Bíblicos del Rio Grande; y el Dr. Abelardo Limón, presidente de Inspiracom me han aprobado para iniciar investigaciones dentro de sus respectivas organizaciones. Por medio de la presente quisiera invitarle a usted también a ser parte en mis investigaciones.

(English) The purpose of this study is to determine if there are differences in attitudes towards servant leadership and job satisfaction among the different generations of members of Rio Grande Bible Ministries and World Radio Network, Inc. Both organizations are experiencing younger generations assuming positions of leadership now held by the older generations. There is little research to date on generational attitudes towards work environment, leadership, and job satisfaction as measured by valid and reliable servant leadership and job satisfaction instruments. (Spanish) El propósito de esta investigación es determinar si hay diferencias en actitudes sobre el liderazgo de siervo y satisfacción de trabajo dentro de las distintas generaciones de los colaboradores de Ministerios Bíblicos del Rio Grande y de Inspiracom. Ambas organizaciones enfrentan la realidad de las nuevas generaciones tomando los lugares de liderazgo ocupados por las generaciones anteriores. Hasta el momento hay muy poca investigación sobre actitudes de ambiente de trabajo, liderazgo, y satisfacción de trabajo medida por encuestas válidas y confiables de liderazgo de siervo y satisfacción de trabajo.

(English) "You must be age 18 or over to participate in this study. After you have read the informed consent form attached to this electronic message, and decide to participate in this study, you are asked to go to the following website: http://www.olagroup.com. You will type in the username and pin that pertains to your organization. You will select "Take the OLA" at the upper right of the screen. You will choose the "Standard Version". You will select the language - English or Spanish - with which you are most comfortable. You will find 1) a demographic survey that asks if you have read the informed consent document and are in agreement; your year of birth (for assignment to your appropriate generational cohort); your number of years with the organization (regardless of staff category, organizational level, or interruption of service); your gender; and your level of education 2) instructions for taking the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) which will include asking for your organizational level - top leadership/board member; supervisor/manager; or staff/member/worker/student/volunteer. It will take you about 30 minutes to read the informed consent form, take the survey, and the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA)."

Thank you again for taking time out of your busy work day to respond."

(Spanish) Es necesario tener 18 anos de edad o mas para participar en esta investigación. Una vez que ha leído usted el Formulario de Consentimiento Informado adjunto a este mensaje electrónico, y ha tomado la decisión de participar en esta investigación, favor de abrir el siguiente sitio del internet: <u>http://www.olagroup.com</u>. Una vez en este sitio en el internet favor de incluir el nombre del usuario y la clave de su organización de Ministerios Bíblicos del Rio Grande o World Radio Network, Inc/Inspiracom. Favor de seleccionar "Take the OLA" en la parte arriba y a la derecha en la pantalla. Favor de seleccionar "Standard Version". Favor de seleccionar el idioma – inglés o español – que le sirva mejor. Debe llenar una breve encuesta que afirma que ha leído y está de acuerdo con el Formulario de Consentimiento Informado; su año de nacimiento (para asignarle a su generación apropiada); sus años como colaborador en la respectiva organización (a pesar de su categoría como miembro, nivel de trabajo o lapsos en colaboración); su género; y su nivel educacional. Después usted va a leer las instrucciones para la *Evaluacion Organizacional de Liderazgo* y va a indicar su nivel organizacional –Alto ejecutivo/miembro de la mesa directiva (alto nivel de liderazgo), Gerencia (supervisor, gerente, coordinador de unidad), o Fuerza de trabajo (personal, miembro, trabajador, estudiante, voluntario). Requiere más o menos unos 30 minutos para tomar la encuesta y la *Evaluacion Organizacional de Liderazgo*.

Gracias otra vez por tomar tiempo dentro de su día ocupada para responder."

APPENDIX C

Adult Electronic Informed Consent Form

1. Título de la Investigación

(English) Title of Research Study

Generational Differences in Servant Leadership and Job Satisfaction within Religious Non-Profit Organizations along the US/Mexico Border

(Spanish) Diferencias generacionales dentro de organizaciones religiosas sin fines de lucro en medidas de liderazgo de siervo y satisfacción de trabajo en la frontera de Estados Unidos y México

2. Invitación

(English) Invitation

Hello. My name is Glenn Lafitte. I have been a missionary since 1981 with HCJB/Reach Beyond, and have been part of World Radio Network, Inc./Inspiracom since 1989. I studied Spanish at Rio Grande Bible Institute in 1981-1982 before going to Ecuador for missionary service. Since 2012 I have been working on a Ph. D. in Leadership Studies at the Rio Grande Valley campus of Our Lady of the Lake University. I have been approved by the university to begin the research for my dissertation. Dr. Larry Windle, president of Rio Grande Bible Ministries; and Dr. Abe Limon, president of World Radio Network, Inc., have given their approval for me to conduct research within their respective organizations. I would like to invite you to participate in my research. This form is meant to help you decide whether or not you would like to participate. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to get in touch with me through the contact information I will provide below.

(Español) Hola. Mi nombre es Glenn Lafitte. He sido misionero desde 1981 con HCJB/Reach Beyond y miembro de World Radio Network, Inc./Inspiracom desde 1989. Fui alumno en el programa de español en el Seminario Bíblico del Rio Grande en 1981-1982 antes de ir al Ecuador como misionero. Desde el 2012 he tomado estudios de doctorado en liderazgo en Our Lady of the Lake University en La Feria. Estoy aprobado por la universidad para comenzar mis investigaciones para mi disertación. El Dr. Larry Windle, presidente de Ministerios Bíblicos del Rio Grande; y el Dr. Abelardo Limón, presidente de Inspiracom me han aprobado para iniciar investigaciones dentro de sus respectivas organizaciones. Por medio de la presente quisiera invitarle a usted también a ser parte en mis investigaciones necesarias en cuanto a su participación en mis investigaciones. Si tiene alguna pregunta con toda confianza por favor póngase en contacto conmigo en unas de las maneras indicadas abajo.

3. ¿Cuál es el propósito de esta investigación?

(English) What is the reason for doing this research study?

The purpose of this study is to determine if there are differences in attitudes towards servant leadership and job satisfaction among the different generations of members of Rio Grande Bible Ministries, Inc. and World Radio Network, Inc. Both organizations are experiencing younger generations assuming positions of leadership now held by the older generations. There is little research to date on generational attitudes towards work environment, leadership, and job satisfaction as measured by valid and reliable servant leadership and job satisfaction instruments.

(Spanish) El propósito de esta investigación es determinar si hay diferencias en actitudes sobre el liderazgo de siervo y satisfacción de trabajo dentro de las distintas generaciones de los colaboradores de Ministerios Bíblicos del Rio Grande y de Inspiracom. Ambas organizaciones enfrentan la realidad de las nuevas generaciones tomando los lugares de liderazgo ocupados por las generaciones anteriores. Hasta el momento hay muy poca investigación sobre actitudes de ambiente de trabajo, liderazgo, y satisfacción de trabajo medida por encuestas válidas y confiables de liderazgo de siervo y satisfacción de trabajo.

4. ¿Qué se hará durante la investigación?

(English) What will be done during this research study?

You must be age 18 or over to participate in this study. After you have read this informed consent form and decide to participate in this study you are asked to go to the following website: http://www.olagroup.com. You will type in the username and pin that pertains to your organization. You will select "Take the OLA" at the upper right of the screen. You will choose the "Standard Version". You will select the language – English or Spanish - with which you are most comfortable. You will find 1) a demographic survey that asks if you have read the informed consent document and are in agreement; your year of birth (for assignment to your appropriate generational cohort); your number of years with the organization (regardless of staff category, organizational level, or interruption of service); your gender; and your level of education 2) instructions for taking the *Organizational Leadership Assessment* (OLA) which will include asking for your organizational level – top leadership/board member; supervisor/manager; or

staff/member/worker/student/volunteer. It will take you about 20 minutes to take the survey and the *Organizational Leadership Assessment* (OLA).

(Spanish) Es necesario tener 18 años de edad o más para participar en esta investigación. Una vez que ha leído usted el Formulario de Consentimiento Informado y ha tomado la decisión de participar esta investigación, favor de abrir el siguiente sitio del internet: <u>http://www.olagroup.com</u>. Una vez en este sitio en el internet favor de incluir el nombre del usuario y la clave de su organización de Ministerios Bíblicos del Rio Grande o World Radio Network, Inc/Inspiracom. Favor de seleccionar "Take the OLA" en la parte arriba y a la derecha en la pantalla. Favor de seleccionar "Standard Version". Favor de seleccionar el idioma – inglés o español – que le sirva mejor. Debe llenar una breve encuesta que afirma que ha leído y está de acuerdo con el Formulario de Consentimiento Informado; su año de nacimiento (para asignarle a su generación apropiada); sus años como colaborador en la respectiva organización (a pesar de su categoría como miembro, nivel de trabajo o lapsos en colaboración); su género; y su nivel educacional. Después usted va a leer las instrucciones para la Evaluación Organizacional de Liderazgo y va a indicar su nivel organizacional -Alto ejecutivo/miembro de la mesa directiva (alto nivel de liderazgo), Gerencia (supervisor, gerente, coordinador de unidad), o Fuerza de trabajo (personal, miembro, trabajador, estudiante, voluntario). Requiere más o menos unos 20 minutos para tomar la encuesta y la Evaluación Organizacional de Liderazgo.

5. ¿Cuáles son los posibles riesgos asociados con su participación en la investigación?

(English) What are the possible risks of being in this research study?

There are no known risks to you from being in this research study.

(Spanish) No hay ningún riesgo identificado en cuanto a su participación en esta investigación.

6. ¿Cuáles son los posibles beneficios para usted?

(English) What are the possible benefits to you?

You are not expected to get any direct benefit from being in this research study.

(Spanish) No hay ningún beneficio directo en cuanto a su participación en esta investigación.

7. ¿Cuáles son los posibles beneficios para otras personas?

(English) What are the possible benefits to other people?

This research will contribute in general to the field of Leadership Studies, and in particular to the understanding of the relationship between a person's generation and his or her attitude towards servant leadership and job satisfaction. There is not a lot of valid and reliable information so far about generational differences and servant leadership.

(Spanish) Esta investigación representa una contribución a los estudios en liderazgo en general y en lo particular a la relación entre la generación de un grupo de colaboradores y las actitudes de aquella generación hacia liderazgo de siervo y satisfacción de trabajo. No hay mucha información válida y confiable hoy en día sobre las distintas generaciones y liderazgo de siervo.

8. ¿Qué le costará su participación en esta investigación?

(English) What will participation in this research study cost you?

There is no cost to you to be in this research study.

No hay ningún costo para usted por su participación en esta investigación.

9. ¿Cómo se protegerá su información?

(English) How will information about you be protected?

All data collected in this study is anonymous. This means that no names or identifying information will be recorded during the study. There is no way to connect your identity with any of your responses.

(Spanish) Todos los datos recaudados en esta investigación son anónimos. Esta implica que no hay uso de nombres ni información tomada que se pueda usar para identificarle a usted durante esta investigación. No hay manera de conectar su identidad con sus respuestas a la encuesta o a la *Evaluación Organizacional de Liderazgo*.

10. ¿Qué sucederá si usted decide no participar o negar su colaboración en la investigación?

(English) What will happen if you decide not to be in this study or if you decide to stop participation during the study?

Participation in this study is completely voluntary. If you choose to participate, you may stop participation at any time without penalty and without losing any benefits that are a part of this study.

(Spanish) Participación en esta investigación es completamente voluntaria. Si usted decide participar, tiene la libertad de dejar de hacerlo en cualquier momento sin ningún perjuicio o pérdida de beneficios que sean parte de esta investigación.

11. ¿Qué se debe hacer si hay preguntas o dudas sobre esta investigación?

(English) What should you do if you have questions or concerns about this research study?

If you have any questions or concerns during or after this study, you may contact me:

Glenn Lafitte 1703 Terrace Drive Mission, Texas 78572 956-451-1324 (cell or text) glafitte@reachbeyond.org

or my dissertation chair:

Dr. Barbara Baggerly-Hinojosa Our Lady of the Lake University-RGV 505 N. Villarreal/P.O. Box 420 La Feria, Texas 78559 956-277-0146 <u>bahinojosa4041@lake.ollusa.edu</u>

12. ¿A quién puede usted contactar si tiene preguntas sobre sus derechos como participante?

(English) Who can you contact if you have questions about your rights as a participant?

You can contact me or my dissertation chair above or you can contact the Our Lady of the Lake Institutional Review Board Chair:

Puede contactar al investigador o al Consejo de Revisión Institucional de la Universidad

Dr. Chris Carmichael Our Lady of the Lake University 411 SW 24th Street San Antonio, Texas 78207 210-434-6711, ext. 2402 <u>ccarmichael@ollusa.edu</u>

APPENDIX D

P.O. Box 3765 * McAllen, Texas 78502 * 956-787-9788 * Fax 956-787-9783

www.WorldRadioNetwork.org

December 8, 2015

Institutional Review Board Our Lady of the Lake University

To Whom It May Concern:

I authorize Glenn Lafitte to conduct research related to his Ph. D. within World Radio Network, Inc., including but not limited to the following parameters:

- Recruitment of the participants conducted in a variety of ways including e-mail, social media, written communications, in person
- Pre-existing data sources (e. g., employment or other records)
- Existing records (such as a list of our organization's members)
- Access to contact information for the World Radio Network, Inc board and staff in order to recruit them for the study
- It is my understanding that the research will be conducted online and that all the participants will use the same access code and password to preserve anonymity

Yours sincerely, 1 -Abelarde Limon President and Chairman of the Board



APPENDIX E



PREPARING CHRIST-CENTERED LEADERS WITH A BIBLICAL WORLDVIEW FOR THE GLOBAL CHURCH

> Самриз: 4300 S. US Hwy 281 EDINBURG, ТХ 78539-9650 (956) 380-8100

CANADA: 103-2005 ST MARY'S RD. WINNIPEG, MANITOBA R2N 4P1

Fax: (956) 380-8256

December 7, 2015

Glenn Lafitte Director of Corporate Affairs Inspiracom/World Radio Network, Inc. P. O. Box 3765 McAllen, TX 78502

To whom it may concern

I, Lawrence B. Windle, President of Rio Grande Bible Ministries (RGBM), do hereby authorize Glenn Lafitte, Director of Corporate Affairs for Inspiracom/World Radio Network, Inc. to solicit participation of RGBM staff, students, and constituency in a PHD research project. Said authorization includes access and use for research of the following:

- approval to access and use any pre-existing data that RGBM may supply;

-approval to access to personnel and student lists with contact information that RGBM may supply, and to solicit participation from said lists;

-approval to incorporate information and data gleaned from surveys and interviews that Glenn may conduct

It is also understood that any names or other confidential personal information from any of the aforementioned sources will be kept confidential unless the individual authorizes its use for the project.



SPANISH BIBLE INSTITUTE * LANGUAGE SCHOOL * RADIO * VIDEO COURSES * BIBLEVILLE

APPENDIX F

Online Demographic Survey

- 1. I have read and agree with the Informed Consent Document Yes____ No ____
- 2. Year of birth (for generational cohort assignment)
- 3. Years with organization (regardless of category, organizational level or interruption of service)
- 4. Gender: Male ____ Female ____
- 5. Level of education

Less than High School_____

High School Diploma or Equivalent_____

Some Post High School_____

Bachelor's Degree_____

Graduate or Professional Degree_____

(Spanish Version of Online Demographic Survey)

Encuesta Demográfica por internet

- 1. He leído y estoy de acuerdo con el Formulario de Consentimiento Informado Sí ____ No ____
- 2. Año de nacimiento (para asignarle a su generación apropiada) _____
- 3. Años como colaborador con la organización (a pesar de su categoría como miembro, nivel de trabajo o lapsos en colaboración) _____

4. Género: Masculino _____ Femenino _____

5. Nivel educacional

Menos de escuela secundaria _____

Diploma de escuela secundaria o equivalente _____

Algunos estudios post-secundarios_____

Bachillerato _____

Post-bachillerato o estudios profesionales_____

APPENDIX G

From: JIM LAUB Sent: Tuesday, October 13, 2015 3:09 PM To: Glenn Lafitte Subject: Glenn Lafitte - OLA for research

Glenn – I like your plan and I see it adding to the body of research around the OLA and servant leadership. I would be glad for you to use the OLA for your study. I have attached a document that lists the information I will need to set up your organizations for the OLA.

Let me know when you are ready to move forward.

Jim Laub, Ed.D. Professor of Leadership The MacArthur School of Leadership Palm Beach Atlantic University 901 South Flagler Drive West Palm Beach, FL 33416-4708

From: Glenn Lafitte
Sent: Wednesday, October 07, 2015 3:38 PM
To: JIM LAUB
Cc: Lafitte, Glenn C.
Subject: Inquiry about Using the OLA for Academic Research Purposes

October 7, 2015

Glenn Lafitte Ph. D. Candidate Our Lady of the Lake University Rio Grande Valley Campus

Jim Laub, Ed.D. President, OLAgroup

Dear Dr. Laub,

I may be premature in writing to you at this point. I have completed three years of study in the Ph. D. program in Leadership Studies at the Rio Grande Valley Campus of Our Lady of the Lake University. I have recently completed my written and oral comprehensive exams, have been appointed my dissertation chair and committee, and am a Ph. D. candidate. I have been working on a tentative research proposal and my PDLR for some time now. My next step will be to receive research concept approval from my dissertation committee which will then be followed by my research proposal defense.

I have been aware of your work for some time now and would very much like to use the OLA in my dissertation research. I have copied the information below from the OLA website and have read through the other parts of the site and feel that the OLA would be an excellent instrument for the research I hope to conduct. I have attached a summary of my research plan as you have
indicated. My dissertation committee must approve my research concept followed by a more rigorous research proposal defense and approval by the Institutional Review Board of the University before I can begin my research. My dissertation chair encouraged me to get in touch with you at this point even before my committee has approved my research concept.

Thank you for your consideration of my request, and please let me know any questions or comments you have for me at this point.

Yours sincerely,

Glenn Lafitte

APPENDIX H

(reproduced through the kind permission of Dr. James Laub)



Organizational Leadership Assessment

General Instructions

The purpose of this instrument is to allow organizations to discover how their leadership practices and beliefs impact the different ways people function within the organization. This instrument is designed to be taken by people at all levels of the organization including workers, managers and top leadership. As you respond to the different statements, please answer as to what you believe is generally true about your organization or 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 (from 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 we seek is the one that most closely represents your feelings or beliefs about the statement that is being considered. There are <u>three different sections</u> to this instrument. Carefully read the brief instructions that are given prior to each section. Your involvement in this assessment is anonymous and confidential.

Before completing the assessment it is important to fill in the name of the organization or organizational unit being assessed. If you are assessing an organizational unit (department, team or work unit) rather than the entire organization you will respond to all of the statements in light of that work unit.

	IMPORTANT please complete the following
Write i	n the name of the organization or organizational unit (department, team or work unit) you are assessing with this instrument.
Or	ganization (or Organizational Unit) Name:
I	ndicate your present role/position in the organization or work unit. Please circle one.
	1 = Top Leadership (top level of leadership)
	2 = Management (supervisor, manager)
	3 = Workforce (staff, member, worker)

Please provide your response to each statement by placing an \mathbf{X} in <u>one</u> of the five boxes

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree

Section 1

In this section, please respond to each statement as you believe it applies to <u>the</u> <u>entire organization</u> (or organizational unit) including workers, managers/supervisors and top leadership.

Г

In general,	people within	this organization
-------------	---------------	-------------------

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

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree

Section 2

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

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

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agre	ee	Strongly Agree]
Ma	nagers/Superviso	ors and Top Lea	dership in this	organization	1	2	3	4	5
46	Build people up	through encourag	ement and affir	mation					
47	Encourage workers to work <i>together</i> rather than competing against each other								
48	Are humble – the	ey do not promote	e themselves						
49	Communicate cle	ear plans & goals	for the organiza	tion					
50	Provide mentor relationships in order to help people grow professionally								
51	Are accountable & responsible to others								
52	Are receptive listeners								
53	Do not seek after	r special status or	the "perks" of le	eadership					
54	Put the needs of the workers ahead of their own								

Section 3

In this next section, please respond to each statement as you believe it is true about <u>you personally</u> and <u>your role</u> in the organization (or organizational unit).

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

(Spanish version of the Organizational Leadership Assessment)



• •	ola co	oncepts \ partn	ers \ res	earch 🔪 traini	ng cont	lact us
• •	introduction use the ola o	mine demo) instrume	nt report us	es development p	sychometrics	random
ola introduction use the ola	Favor de dar su respue	sta a cada enuncia	ido con una	X en <u>uno de los</u>	cinco cuadro	<u>as</u>
online demo		2	3	4	5	3.04
instrument random sample	Muy en desacuerdo	En desacuerdo	Indeciso	De acuerdo	Muy de acuerdo	,
development report uses	Sección 1 En esta organiz supervis	sección responda ación (o unidad de ores y altos ejecut	a cada enun trabajo) inc vos.	ciado según cre luyendo trabajac	a que apliqu lores, gerent	e a toda la les o
log-in	En general, personas de esta	organización .			1 7	2345
	1 Confian el uno en el otro.				e c	0000
	2 Tienen claros los objetivos clave	s de la organizació	in.		00	0000
	3 No son prejuiciosos y mantiener	n una mente abiert	9.		C C	5000
	4 Se respetan.				O C	0000
	5 Saben a donde se dirige la orga	nización.			C C	0000
	6 Mantienen firmes normas éticas				CC	5666
	7 Trabajan bien en equipo.				C (0000
	8 Valoran las diferencias de cultur	a, raza y grupo étr	ico.		CC	0000
	9 Son atentos y compasivos hacia	a los demás.			C C	$0 \circ 0 \circ 0$
	10 Demuestran gran integridad y ho	onestidad.			ĊE	0000
	11 Son confiables.				00	0000
	12 Se relacionan bien.				Θ¢	0000
	13 Tratan de trabajar con otros más	que con ellos mis	mos.		0 0	0000
	14 Se consideran responsables pa	ra alcanzar los obj	etivos de tra	bajo.	C	0000
	15 Están consientes de las necesi	dades de los dema	is.		0	0000
	16 Tienen en cuenta la individualida	ad de estilo y expr	esión.		e.	0000
	17 Los supervisores fomentan la pa importantes.	articipación de otro	s en la toma	a de decisiones	C	0000
	18 Se esfuerzan en mantener una	relación de trabajo	positiva.		C	0000
	19 Aceptan a las personas como s	on.			0	6600
	20 Ven el conflicto como una oport	unidad para aprend	der y crecer.		C	000
	21 Saben convivir con la gente.				C ·	0000

	ALL READY		Look .	No.
••	Aaroup	10/10/10/10/0	a with my accourt	1 12
•	nla concents partners re	search training	Contactus	
• •	introduction use the clait online demo instrument report u	ses development i payo	nomence (mindure	200
ola introduction use the ola	Favor de dar su respuesta a cada enunciado con una	a X en uno de los cin	co cuadros.	
instrument	1 2 3	4	5	
random sample	Muy en En desacuerdo Indeciso	De acuerdo	Muy de acuerdo	
development report	SECCIÓN 2 En esta sección responda a cada enu liderazgo de la organización (o unida	inciado según crea q id de trabajo).	ue aplique al	
log-in	Los Gerentes, Supervisores y Altos ejecutivos de est	ta organización	1234	5
	22 Comunican una visión clara del futuro de la organización.		0000	$) \in$
	23 Están abiertos a aprender de los que están debajo de ellos er	n la organización.	0000	0
	24 Permiten que los trabajadores ayuden a determinar la direcció organización.	ón que lleva la	0000	0
	25 Trabajan juntos con los trabajadores en vez de separarse de e	ellos.	0000) (C)
	26 Usan la persuasión para influir en otros en vez de la fuerza.		0000	0
	27 No dudan en proporcionar el liderazgo necesario.		0000	0
	28 Promueven la comunicación abierta y comparten información		0000	0
	29 Le dan a los trabajadores la facultad de tomar decisiones imp	ortantes.	0000	0
	30 Proporcionan el apoyo y los recursos necesarios para ayudar cumplir sus objetivos.	0000	0	
	31 Crean un ambiente que promueve el aprendizaje.		0000	C
	32 Están abiertos a recibir críticas y retos de los demás.		0000	C
	33 Enuncian claramente lo que quieren.		0000	0
	34 Animan a la gente a ejercitar el liderazgo.		0000	Ó
	35 Admiten sus limitaciones personales y los errores.		6 6 6 6	0.0
	36 Fomentan a la gente a tomar riesgos incluso si pudiesen frac	asar.	0000	0.0
	37 Practican el mismo comportamiento que esperan de los dem	ás.	000	00
	38 Facilitan la creación de un sentido de comunidad y de trabajo	en equipo.	0000	0 0
	39 No exigen reconocimiento especial por su liderazgo.		0000	0.0
	40 Son ejemplo de liderazgo al comportarse de manera apropiad	a.	0000	0.0
	41 Buscan influir en los demás a partir de una relación positiva y su puesto.	no de la autoridad o	10 0 0 0 0	00
	42 Dan oportunidades para que todos los trabajadores desarrolle	n toda su potencial.	000	0 0
	43 Se evalúan honestamente antes de buscar la evaluación de lo	s demás.	0000	0 0
	44 Usan su facultad y autoridad para beneficiar a los trabajadores	S.	0000	0.0
	45 Toman las medidas correctas cuando sea necesario.		0000	0.0
	46 Mediante el apoyo y la reafirmación, ayudan a que la gente se	e desarrolle.	0000	0 0
	47 Estimulan el trabajo conjunto en vez de la competencia entre	el personal.	0000	0

48 Son humildes: no se jactan de sí mismos.	C	C	O	C	Ø
49 Comunican claramente los planes y objetivos de la organización.	O	O	O	0	C
50 Sirven como tutores a los trabajadores a fin de que se desarrollen profesionalmente.	E	0	Ċ	C	e,
51 Son confiables y responsables para con los demás.	C	0	ē	C	C
52 Escuchan de manera receptiva.	e	0	C	O	6
53 No buscan el estatus o privilegios especiales del liderazgo.	C	6	C	C	6
54 Ponen las necesidades del personal antes que sus propias necesidades.	C	O	0	C	0

Seccion 3 >

Take the cin my account

•	de oduction juse th	
ola introduction use the ola online demo	Favor de dar su r	espue
Instrument random sample	Muy en desecuerdo	1
development report	sección 3 🛱	i esta ersona
uses log-in	Al revisar mi propio pap	el

and the second se	and the second se	and the second second	and the state of the	Route Contractor
Muy en desecuerdo	En desacuerdo	Indeciso	De acuerdo	Muy de acuerde

Sección 3 En esta sección responda a cada enunciado según crea que aplique <u>a su</u> persona y a su papel dentro de la organización (o unidad de trabajo).

Al revisar mi propio papel	1	2	3	4	5
55 Siento que mi supervisor me aprecia por lo que aporto.	O	0	C	0	$^{\circ}$
56 Estoy trabajando a un alto nivel de productividad.	Ø	¢	C	C	0
57 Mis superiores me escuchan.	Ó	C	O	Ó	O
58 Me siento bien con lo que aporto a la organización.	C	0	C	C	C
59 Recibo apoyo y reafirmación de parte de mis superiores.	C	C	Ô	C	C
60 Mi trabajo es importante para el éxito de esta organización.	C	Ċ,	$^{\circ}$	\mathbf{C}	Û
61 Confio en el liderazgo de esta organización.	Ċ	0	Ċ	O	0
62 Me gusta trabajar en esta organización.	C	C	C	0	C
63 Mis superiores me respetan.	C	0	Ø	0	0
64 Me permiten ser creativo en mi trabajo.	C	C	0	C	C
65 En esta organización, se valora el trabajo de la persona más que su puesto.	¢	C	0	Ċ	O
66 Puedo utilizar mis dones y capacidades en mi trabajo.	O	0	C:	C	0

Acabado >