

SERVANT LEADERSHIP AND FAITH-BASED ORGANIZATIONS:
EXPLORING FOLLOWER AND LEADER PERCEPTIONS

A Thesis

by

DAVID P. COYLE

Submitted to the Graduate and Professional School of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Chair of Committee, Jennifer Strong
Committee Members, Kim Dooley
 Larry Dooley

Head of Department, Mathew Baker

May 2022

Major Subject: Agricultural Leadership, Education, and Communications

Copyright 2022 David P. Coyle

ABSTRACT

Effective leadership is vital to the function and success of any organization. This simple reality has prompted copious research into the subject of leadership and its practice in organizational contexts. In 1977, Robert K. Greenleaf stated his opinion that leaders should seek to serve others first, coining the term “servant leadership” (Greenleaf, 1977). Since then, leadership development practitioners have sought to further define servant leadership and understand its use and effectiveness across organizational contexts. Using the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) developed by Liden et al. (2008), this study sought to add to the body of literature on servant leadership by examining its practice in faith-based organizations (FBOs). The researcher sought to examine both leader self-perception and follower perception of servant leadership behaviors in FBOs. The SLQ was delivered to both leaders and followers. Their scores across seven constructs of servant leadership were evaluated and compared to discover any significant differences. Results from the data analysis revealed no significant differences between leader and follower perceptions across the seven servant leadership constructs in FBOs. However, significant differences were found between leader and follower responses on two items of the SLQ. These items concerned the leader’s ability to perceive workplace issues and the amount of freedom followers felt to make important work decisions independent of their leader. Based on these findings, recommendations for further servant leadership education, training, and development practices were offered.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my committee chair, Dr. Jennifer Strong, and my committee members, Dr. Kim Dooley and Dr. Larry Dooley, for their guidance and support throughout the course of this research. Your wisdom and expertise were invaluable, both in conducting this research and in life.

Thanks also go to my friends and colleagues and the department faculty and staff for making my time at Texas A&M University a wonderful experience. College Station has been and will always be my home, largely in part to you.

I would also like to thank the individuals who served as key informants for this study. Your help was instrumental in developing a study of which I can be proud. Thank you also to the many individuals working and serving in faith-based organizations who took the time to participate in this study. I hope this research, only made possible with your help, is an asset to your field for years to come.

Finally, thanks to my mother and father for their never-ending love and support. You have always encouraged my curious mind and my love for knowledge. Your example consistently reminds me of the person I want to become. I truly could have done none of this without you.

CONTRIBUTORS AND FUNDING SOURCES

Contributors

This work was supervised by a thesis committee consisting of Dr. Jennifer Strong, Dr. Kim Dooley, and Dr. Matthew Baker of the Department of Agricultural Leadership, Education, and Communications and Dr. Larry Dooley of the Department of Educational Administration and Human Resource Development.

Funding Sources

This graduate study was supported by a graduate research assistantship from Texas A&M University. This work was made possible in part by the graduate research assistantship under Dr. Jennifer Strong. Its contents are solely the responsibility of the authors.

NOMENCLATURE

SLQ Servant Leadership Questionnaire

FBO Faith-Based Organization

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
CONTRIBUTORS AND FUNDING SOURCES.....	iv
NOMENCLATURE	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	ix
CHAPTER I.....	1
Background and Setting.....	1
Significance	2
Purpose of Study	2
Research Questions.....	3
Operational Definitions.....	3
Scope and Limitations	4
Basic Assumptions.....	4
CHAPTER II	6
Greenleaf’s Servant Leadership.....	6
Christ as a Servant Leader	6
Major Servant Leadership Models.....	8
Conceptual Framework - Methodology	10
Conceptual Framework - Implications	11
Leadership Education, Training, and Development.....	11
Followership.....	12
Servant Leadership in Organizations	13
Faith-Based Organizations.....	14
Servant Leadership in Nonprofits	16
CHAPTER III.....	18
Research Frame.....	18
Design	18
Quantitative Research and Leadership Theory Development	19
Research Questions.....	20

Subject Selection.....	21
Population Identification.....	21
Sample Development.....	22
Sample Characteristics.....	22
Instrumentation.....	27
Data Collection Procedures.....	27
Data Analysis Procedures.....	28
Validity and Reliability.....	30
Nonresponse.....	30
 CHAPTER IV.....	 33
Leader Perception.....	33
Follower Perception.....	34
Comparing Leader and Follower Perceptions.....	35
Emotional Healing.....	35
Creating Value for the Community.....	36
Conceptual Skills.....	37
Empowering.....	38
Helping.....	39
Putting Subordinates First.....	40
Behaving Ethically.....	41
Servant Leadership Total.....	42
 CHAPTER V.....	 43
Research Question 1.....	43
Conclusions.....	43
Recommendations for FBO Leaders.....	44
Recommendations for Leadership Development Practitioners.....	45
Research Question 2.....	46
Conclusions.....	46
Recommendations for Followers in FBOs.....	47
Recommendations for Leadership Development Practitioners.....	48
Research Question 3.....	49
Conclusions.....	49
Recommendations for Leaders and Followers in FBOs.....	51
Recommendations for Leadership Development Practitioners.....	52
 REFERENCES.....	 53
 APPENDIX A.....	 58
 APPENDIX B.....	 60
 APPENDIX C.....	 63

APPENDIX D	66
APPENDIX E	67
APPENDIX F	68
APPENDIX G	70

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1. Descriptive Statistics – Age	27
Table 2. Descriptive Statistics – Years of Experience	28
Table 3. Descriptive Statistics – Leadership Education Experience	29
Table 4. Descriptive Statistics – Leadership Training Experience	29
Table 5. Descriptive Statistics – Leadership Development Experience	30
Table 6. Descriptive Statistics – Selfless Service and Christianity	30
Table 7. Nonresponse Analysis	36
Table 8. Descriptive Statistics of Leader Scores	37
Table 9. Descriptive Statistics of Follower Scores	38
Table 10. Comparing Leader and Follower Means: Emotional Healing	39
Table 11. Comparing Leader and Follower Means: Creating Value for the Community	40
Table 12. Comparing Leader and Follower Means: Conceptual Skills	41
Table 13. Comparing Leader and Follower Means: Empowering	42
Table 14. Comparing Leader and Follower Means: Helping	43
Table 15. Comparing Leader and Follower Means: Putting Subordinates First	44
Table 16. Comparing Leader and Follower Means: Behaving Ethically	45
Table 17. Comparing Leader and Follower Means: Total Scores	46

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background and Setting

When asked to list the greatest leaders in history, most would answer with names of presidents, businessmen, war heroes or the like. These men and women are characterized and exalted for their boldness, their charisma, and their impact. However, in Christian history, a much different type of leader exists. Leaders in the early church were often hated, persecuted, and even killed (*English Standard Version Bible*, 2001, 2 Timothy 3:12; Acts 7:58-60, 12: 1-3). The essence of their leadership was not popularity nor traditional power, because they held little of either. Rather, it was their service to others which made them unique and compelling. According to Robert K. Greenleaf (1977), servant leaders seek to serve above all else. Rather than a desire to lead, their desire to help others is the driving force behind their assumption of responsibility. This sentiment is reflected by Luke in the Bible, who says, “In all things I have shown you that by working hard in this way we must help the weak and remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he himself said, ‘It is more blessed to give than to receive.’” (*English Standard Version Bible*, 2001, Acts 20:35). The correlation between servant leadership and the biblical perception of leadership is undeniable. As such, Christians in positions of authority often drift naturally towards a mindset of service.

In the modern era, practitioners of servant leadership are often those who work with faith-based organizations, or FBOs. Countless FBOs are built upon the idea of service to others; seeking to help those in need. Without competent and compassionate servant leaders at the helm,

these organizations would, most likely, fail in their mission. This study sought to further examine the leadership behaviors of FBO leaders to improve servant leadership training, education, and development.

Significance

Unlike other leadership theories, servant leadership is not built upon a clear and structured model. It is simple in practice which demands leaders serve others above all else. As such, limited empirical research has been conducted on this model in comparison to others. Leadership, in the context of faith-based organizations, has also gone relatively unstudied. Furthermore, the incorporation of servant leadership in the context of FBOs is a unique phenomenon unexamined by leadership scholars. Studying how leaders of FBOs perceive their own leadership behaviors (as it pertains to servant leadership) can shed light on the tendencies, strengths, and weaknesses of these individuals. A servant leadership evaluation of FBO leaders conducted by followers in the organization can prove to be even more informative. By comparing these two evaluations, conducted by both leaders and their followers, even more can be learned and improvements to training can be suggested from the study's findings.

Purpose of Study

This quantitative study sought to discover any significant difference between a leader's self-perception of their servant leadership capacity and their followers' perception of their servant leadership capacity. In any organization, it is vital that the leader have an accurate understanding of both their strengths and weaknesses. In their research on the issue, Mendemu and Manasa (2014) identified that self-awareness is a soft skill essential to the successful execution of leadership. Rubin (2013) discussed this idea in greater detail, claiming awareness of one's

leadership style allows leaders to leverage their strengths and skills more effectively for the accomplishment of organizational goals. Comparing the leaders' Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) scores with those their followers assign for them can reveal significant discrepancies. Based on the findings, suggestions for improving servant leadership training, education, and development among Christian leaders were generated.

Research Questions

The following served as research questions for this study:

RQ1: How do leaders in faith-based organizations perceive their leadership behaviors in accordance with servant leadership?

RQ2: How do followers in faith-based organizations perceive their leader's behaviors in accordance with servant leadership?

RQ3: Do leaders in faith-based organizations perceive themselves as their followers do (is there a significant difference)?

Operational Definitions

Servant leadership: as defined by Robert K. Greenleaf (1977), a servant leader seeks first to serve others.

SLQ: Servant Leadership Questionnaire, developed by Liden et al. (2008)

Faith-based Organization (FBO): an organization created to help others and guided by Christian principles and/or virtues. Identifiable by a consistent focus on mission, based on beliefs, which motivates staff and/or volunteers toward a common goal (Beilefeld & Cleveland, 2013a). For the purpose of this study, this definition excluded churches due to the belief that they are unique and should be examined separately.

Leader (in an FBO): an individual working in a FBO in a position of leadership, has followers.

Follower (in an FBO): an individual working or serving under the leadership of another in a FBO.

Scope and Limitations

As this study was conducted, certain limitations needed to be considered. One such limitation was the need for responses from potential subjects. The subjects of this study were professionals in the fields of ministry, philanthropy, consulting, etc. They live busy lives, and as such, collecting sufficient responses was effortful. Some chose not to participate. The surveys for this study were conducted with two groups: leaders and their followers.

Basic Assumptions

I have been in close proximity to faith-based organizations and their leaders my entire life. As the son of a pastor, I was surrounded by missionaries, philanthropists, and other pastors who all worked together to accomplish their mutual mission: spreading the gospel. As I grew older, I took ownership of my faith in Jesus Christ, and this mission became important to me as well. In the past, I have worked with numerous ministries and Christian non-profits at various levels. I have been a counselor with different camp ministries on multiple occasions. I also spent two summers in El Salvador writing Bible study curriculum, planning outreach events, and leading work projects. I have mentored a group of high schoolers for three years as a youth leader. Admittedly, I care deeply about the welfare of these faith-based organizations, and I care even more about the mission which we share. As such, I wish to see them thrive, and I wish to see their leaders meet their fullest potential.

Additionally, I have a particular interest in the servant leadership model. As a Christian and a student of the Bible, I believe Christ was the sole perfecter of servant leadership. 1 Peter 2:21 states, “For to this you have been called, because Christ also suffered for you, leaving you an example, so that you might follow in his steps” (*English Standard Version Bible*, 2001). Being a follower of Christ means I am to model my life after His, to the best of my ability. Ever since my leadership education began, I have sought to learn more about the viability of servant leadership to live as Jesus did. I am also fascinated by critiques of the servant leadership model as well. One such critic asserts that, although the desire to serve is a noble one, the model itself “offers at best not much more than the warm inner glow of a good bed-time story. At worst, it may confuse and deflect us from the development of more useful models” (Bradley, 1999, p. 53). As a leadership scholar, I was eager to study servant leadership further to discover if this sentiment is accurate, or if servant leadership is a more viable model than many believe.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Greenleaf's Servant Leadership

The term “servant leadership” was first coined by Robert K. Greenleaf (1977). Greenleaf (1977) argued that, not only could a leader be a servant to others, but “the great leader is seen as servant first” (p. 21). This new conceptualization of leadership was inspired by a fictional character named Leo in *Journey to the East*, by Hermann Heese (1956). In the story, Leo, a simple servant accompanying a group of adventurers, functions as the heart and soul of this group. One day, he disappears, and the adventurers abandon their mission, knowing they cannot carry on without Leo. Later, Leo is found, and it is discovered that he was actually a great and important leader of a secret order (Heese, 1956).

From the tale of Leo, Greenleaf (1977) extrapolated that perhaps the greatest leaders are those who choose to serve. Central to Greenleaf's (1977) new model was that the servant leader serves *first*, claiming the servant-first would prove very different from the leader-first. The servant leader's desire to serve others is the motivation which propels them towards leadership.

Although this motivation is part of servant leadership's definition, the model has much more to offer. Beyond their motivation, servant leaders also have a particular self-concept (Sedjaya & Sarros, 2002). The innate or learned characteristics of an individual, paired with their practiced behaviors, are what makes a servant leader (Sedjaya & Sarros, 2002).

Christ as a Servant Leader

Greenleaf may have been the first to coin the term “servant leadership,” but examples of his model of leadership far predate Greenleaf himself. For instance, the teachings of Jesus Christ, as

described in the Bible, are heavily based upon the virtue of service. Time after time, he challenged people's expectations of him to be a powerful leader and potential conqueror by preaching love, forgiveness, and selflessness. One such example occurs when his disciples are arguing among themselves over who will achieve the highest honor in heaven. Two of his closest followers, James and John, even asked to sit at Jesus' right and left hand. In response Jesus said

But whoever would be great among you must be your servant, and whoever would be first among you must be slave of all. For even the Son of Man came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many. (*English Standard Version Bible*, 2001, Mark 10:43-45)

In this moment, Jesus revealed his primary motivation, and what should be the primary motivation of his followers: to serve. He later practices this very concept in John Chapter 13, where he washes each of the disciples' feet (*English Standard Version Bible*, 2001). Jesus acted as a servant to his students, and then called them to do the same for one another, saying

You call me Teacher and Lord, and you are right, for so I am. If I then, your Lord and Teacher, have washed your feet, you also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that you also should do just as I have done to you. (*English Standard Version Bible*, 2001, John 13: 13-15)

Jesus was crucified shortly after this moment (*English Standard Version Bible*, 2001, John 19), an event which Christians view as the ultimate act of selfless service. The Apostle Paul would later state "But God shows his love for us in that while we were still sinners, Christ died for us" (*English Standard Version Bible*, 2001, Romans 5:8).

Outside of scripture, researchers have thoroughly analyzed Christ as an example of a servant leader. One scholar asserted servant leadership is unique because it is philosophy based

upon love, just as the life and ministry of Jesus was (Chung, 2011). Others have emphasized all the ways Jesus served others, such as Laurie Beth Jones (1995), who dedicated an entire chapter of her book to discussing Jesus' acts of service. She argues that, while many believe Jesus was sent to the world to serve the Father, the Father really sent him to serve the world (Jones, 1995). Throughout his life, Jesus served others by healing them, feeding them, providing them with wine, encouraging them, and then dying for them (Jones, 1995). The life and teachings of Jesus Christ provide not only an example of servant leadership, but a foundation upon which the theory can stand.

Scripture also promotes ideals and principles similar to those of faith-based philanthropies, echoed in verses such as Hebrews 13:16, which reads, "Do not neglect to do good and share what you have, for such sacrifices are pleasing to God" (*English Standard Version Bible*, 2001). In the book of Acts, the author writes "In all things I have shown you that by working hard in this way we must help the weak and remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he himself said, 'it is more blessed to give than to receive'" (*English Standard Version Bible*, 2001, Acts 20:35). These sentiments are repeated throughout the Bible, and clearly illustrate the role faith-based organizations often fill in the world: helping those in need in the name of Jesus Christ.

Major Servant Leadership Models

Through the years, many academics have attempted to interpret and study the phenomenon of Greenleaf's (1977) servant leadership. Due to the somewhat vague nature of servant leadership's definition, researchers have worked to articulate more specific attributes, models, and evaluations for the subject. One such attempt was made by Farling et. al (1999), who identified five variables of servant leadership: vision, influence, credibility, trust, and service. As a form of

transformational leadership, these five variables are practiced by the leader and then emulated by their followers (Farling et al., 1999). This perspective of servant leadership as a form of transformational leadership, is echoed by many scholars who answered the call of Farling et. al (1999) for further empirical research on the subject. Researchers such as Russell and Stone (2002) expanded upon Farling et al. 's (1999) five variables by listing their own nine functional attributes of servant leadership: vision, honesty, integrity, trust, service, modeling, pioneering, appreciation of others, and empowerment. Later, Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) conducted their own literature review to create a servant leadership scale with five constructs: altruistic calling, emotional healing, persuasive mapping, wisdom, and organizational stewardship. This model provided one of the first methods of measuring servant leadership acuity. Since its creation, scholars have used Barbuto and Wheeler's work (2006) to compare servant leadership with other styles, such as transformational leadership (Hoch et al., 2018; Dierendonck et al., 2014). Other research has examined servant leadership's effect on followers in organizational contexts, such as the mediating effect of regulatory employee focus on the relationship between servant leadership and employee behavior (Neubert et al., 2008).

This study used the research of Liden et al. (2008), who created a 28-item Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ). Drawing on prior research, including that of Barbuto and Wheeler (2006), Liden et al. (2008) declared there are seven constructs of servant leadership:

1. Emotional healing
2. Creating value for the community
3. Conceptual skills
4. Empowering
5. Helping

6. Putting subordinates first
7. Behaving ethically

This study, as well as those which preceded it, offered a variety of perspectives on what it means to be a servant leader, and provided the groundwork for much of my research.

Conceptual Framework - Methodology

The conceptual framework for this study was based on the work of Liden et al. (2008). They created the SLQ, a 28-item survey based upon their seven constructs of servant leadership (2008). The first construct, *emotional healing*, pertains to the servant leader's ability to communicate care for the needs and worries of others (Liden et al., 2008). By *creating a value for the community*, the servant leader instills a passion for helping those in the local area in the organization (Liden et al., 2008). They should also have the *conceptual skills* necessary to lead an organization. As a servant leader, it is their responsibility to know the organization well so they may assist their followers and others in the pursuit of objectives (Liden et al., 2008). The fourth, fifth, and sixth constructs all have to do with the servant leader's responsibility for their followers. *Empowering* is an essential aspect of servant leadership. The leader must empower their followers by providing them with opportunities to succeed. The servant leader also must *help subordinates grow and succeed* by knowing and encouraging their aspirations and providing mentorship. The servant leader must constantly *put subordinates first* by communicating to their followers that their needs and goals at work are a priority (Liden et al., 2008). Finally, a servant leader should *behave ethically*, practicing openness and honesty, and treating others with respect (Liden et al., 2008).

The process of interpreting the resulting data was based upon the work of Northouse (2022), who developed a method for both scoring and interpreting SLQ scores. He revealed that items 1,

8, 15, and 22 correspond with the construct of emotional healing (Northhouse, 2022). Adding the scores on items 1, 8, 15, and 22 would therefore provide a total score for emotional healing (Northhouse, 2022). The same process should be repeated for each of the remaining six objectives. Items 2, 9, 16 and 23 correspond with creating value for the community. Items 3, 10, 17, and 24 correspond with conceptual skills. Items 4, 11, 18, and 25 correspond with empowering. Items 5, 12, 19, and 26 correspond with helping subordinates grow and succeed. Items 6, 13, 20, and 27 correspond with putting subordinates first. Finally, items 7, 14, 21, and 28 correspond with behaving ethically (Northhouse, 2022).

Once scored, the resulting totals for each of the seven servant leadership constructs can be compared to the following key:

High range: A score between 23 and 28 means you strongly exhibit this servant leadership behavior.

Moderate range: A score between 14 and 22 means you tend to exhibit this behavior in an average way.

Low range: A score between 8 and 13 means you exhibit this leadership below the average or expected range.

Extremely low range: A score between 0 and 7 means you are not inclined to exhibit this leadership behavior at all (Northhouse, 2022, pp. 281-282).

Conceptual Framework - Implications

Leadership Education, Training, and Development

The results of this study will provide the groundwork for improvements to the education, training, and development of future FBO leaders. As such, Brungardt's (1996)

framework was the basis for the implications of my research. Brungardt (1996) believed the leadership education process consisted of education, training, and development, drawing a distinction between all three. Leadership education consists of the academic activities and practices intended to develop leadership skills (Brungardt, 1996). Leadership training is the preparation of an individual to assume a specific leadership role (Brungardt, 1996). More broadly, leadership development is the combination of both leadership education and training which takes place over the course of a lifetime (Brungardt, 1996). Brungardt's (1996) unique ideas on the matter have functioned as the framework for countless studies on the education, training, and development of leaders across various contexts. His work has informed research on the development of leadership identity (Komives et al., 2005), the success of managerial leadership programs (Collins & Holton, 2004), the exploration of transformative leadership as a potential model (Caldwell et al., 2012), as well as many other contributions to the study of leadership. The researcher therefore used Brungardt's (1996) framework of leadership education, training, and development to guide the data-based suggestions and implications of this study.

Followership

Followership, or the antecedent of leadership, is an imperative variable to mention. The unique perspective of followers working and serving in faith-based organizations was essential to answering RQ2 and RQ3. Therefore, Kelley's (1988) description of followership was used to analyze and understand data obtained from followers' survey responses. Kelley (1988) acknowledged the negative connotations surrounding the term "follower," but combated this perspective by redefining the roles of leaders and followers in organizations. He argued leaders are not superior to followers, but instead are equal individuals fulfilling different organizational functions (Kelley, 2008). Effective leaders cast organizational vision, generate goals and

strategies, use interpersonal skills to win others over, communicate enthusiastically with others, coordinate organizational endeavors, and desire to lead (Kelley, 1988). Effective followers work effectively in teams, do not desire recognition and praise, and passionately pursue the organization's mission and vision (Kelley, 1988). Kelley (1988) identified four essential qualities of effective followers: self-management, commitment, competence/focus, and courage. Additionally, effective followers practice independent, critical thinking, and are highly active in the organization (Kelley, 1988). Followers with these characteristics serve as allies to their leaders by caring enough to hold them accountable. This clear and positive understanding of followership and its importance was used to guide the recommendations of this study.

Stern (2020) further added to the scholarly understanding of followership in her analysis of the ethics and politics of followership within organizations. Stern (2020) emphasized the need for followers to practice agency. Agency is defined by a follower's ability to disagree with their leader and hold their leader accountable (Stern, 2020). Followers must recognize their leadership responsibilities, lead ethically, and critically decide when it is best to obey and when they must dissent (Stern, 2020). This understanding of the follower's role also proved essential in understanding results obtained from leaders in faith based organizations.

Servant Leadership in Organizations

Since Greenleaf (1977) first coined the term servant leadership, researchers and educators have sought to better define the philosophy and examine its potential. Countless studies have been conducted and published, not only attempting to provide the theoretical structure necessary to make servant leadership a working model, but also to investigate its use in organizations. The latter vein of inquiry has yielded fairly consistent findings, supporting that servant leadership consistently produces various positive institutional outcomes. Dooley et al. (2020) studied

servant leadership with educators in China, specifically investigating its role as a moderator of job-stress and depersonalization. Their research found that perceived servant leadership did indeed share a negative correlation with job-stress and depersonalization among teachers in Chinese high school (Dooley et al., 2020). Another study conducted by Qui et al. (2020) sought to discern if perceived servant leadership and self-efficacy influenced the level of service quality provided by employees in the hospitality industry. They discovered that servant leadership shared a positive relationship with service quality, moderated by employee self-efficacy (Qui et al., 2020). Correlations between servant leadership and innovation have also been explored. Across several companies in northern China, researchers discovered the practice of servant leadership indirectly and positively affected leader innovativeness as a result of an increased sense of accomplishment (Lan et al., 2021). The practice of servant leadership has also been discovered outside of the private sector in bureaucratic organizations. One study revealed servant leadership is not only utilized in government organizations, but actually thrives in formalized environments such as the military (Kim, 2020). These studies, and many others, each provided insight into the potential contributions of servant leadership in various organizational contexts. However, servant leadership being practiced by leaders of FBOs is a phenomenon which remains relatively unexplored.

Faith-Based Organizations

Many organizations founded upon religious principles and ideologies have proven very successful, accomplishing their goals, and achieving financial success. Philanthropies, seminaries, Christian summer camps, and countless other FBOs continue to grow in both size and impact, acting as examples of how these organizations can thrive. It was important,

therefore, to understand the leadership structures and behaviors which have contributed to the success of faith-based organizations.

Before exploring research already conducted in the context of FBOs, a clear definition first needed to be established. For the purpose of this servant leadership study, the work of Beilefeld and Cleveland (2013a) was used to construct an operational definition of this organizational type. Based on their findings, faith-based organizations are those which practice a consistent focus on mission, based upon religious beliefs, which motivated staff and volunteers towards a common goal (Beilefeld & Cleveland, 2013a). This definition was further specified to exclude churches and congregations due to the belief that they are unique enough to comprise their own population and should be studied separately.

Research conducted using the definition created by Beilefeld and Cleveland (2013a) includes studies on how FBOs function in various contexts. For instance, partnerships between FBOs and the government have yielded positive outcomes in the form of providing essential services to communities (Beilefeld & Cleveland, 2013b). Other articles discuss the use of FBOs to conduct health promotion initiatives with communities in need (Tagai et al., 2018). However, currently available literature which studies the practice of leadership in FBOs using Beilefeld and Cleveland's (2013a) definition is limited. Outside of Beilefeld and Cleveland's (2013a) definition, some studies have addressed the practice of Christian evangelical organizations. Burch et al. (2015) conducted research with similarities to this one. They sought to understand how followers' perception of their leaders' servant leadership qualities differed from the leaders' self perception in the administrative office of a Christian university. Using their own servant leadership survey, they asked both leaders and followers to identify strengths and weaknesses of

the leaders based on 21 servant leadership attributes (Burch et al., 2015). Based on their data analysis, Burch et al. (2015) found leaders and followers both perceived proficiency in personal qualities such as passion, commitment, strong values, and optimism. They also discovered followers and leaders disagreed in regard to the leaders' proficiency in mentoring and development, encouragement and motivation, and empowerment (Burch et al., 2015). Their findings were used to inform the data-based conclusions drawn for this study.

Although an abundance of research has been conducted on servant leadership in churches and congregations, outside of the work of Burch et al. (2015), limited literature exists on the study of leadership in non-church FBOs. Given this limitation, additional literature covering the use of servant leadership in organizations of similar structure, such as nonprofits, were studied.

Servant Leadership in Nonprofits

This study did not limit the definition of a faith-based organization to specific business models. By nature, FBOs can be for-profit or nonprofit. However, a large number of those surveyed for this study were nonprofit organizations. Therefore, to properly lay the groundwork for a study on servant leadership in faith-based organizations, understanding how the theory has been studied in the nonprofit sector was essential.

It stands to reason that a philosophy of leadership predicated on service would naturally lend itself toward the function of a nonprofit. Through research, scholars have examined and proven an undeniable relationship between the two. Allen et al. (2018) used survey data to identify the mediating role of structural empowerment between servant leadership and organizational commitment in nonprofits. They concluded servant leaders of nonprofit organizations seeking to increase commitment from their followers should standardize measures for empowering their followers (Allen et al., 2018). A similar study proved the mediating effect

of job satisfaction between servant leadership and volunteer retention in nonprofit organizations (Nghah et al., 2021). Studies such as these revealed the positive, mediating effect of servant leadership using various indicators of organizational success. However, it should be noted not all researchers agree servant leadership is a beneficial leadership philosophy for this type of organization. Pulumbo (2016) argues that the practice of servant leadership may cause several unexpected and negative outcomes. They assert that a service oriented approach to leadership may cause followers to become too dependent upon the leader, rather than taking initiative themselves (Pulumbo, 2016).

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Research Frame

In their own study conducted on servant leadership, Farling et al. (1999) noted the need for more empirical research on the phenomenon. Now, 23 years later, although multiple studies have sought to define and conceptualize servant leadership (Russell & Stone, 2002; Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006; Liden et al., 2008), little research has been conducted on the theory's specific and practical application. The question "what does successfully practiced servant leadership look like?" remains. Furthermore, the use of servant leadership in FBOs has never been examined. This study was designed to add to pre-existing servant leadership literature and hopefully inform the leadership education of those interested in working with faith based organizations.

Design

This quantitative study was conducted to ascertain how leaders in FBOs perceive their leadership behaviors in accordance with servant leadership. It also sought to understand how followers in FBOs perceive their leaders' servant leadership behaviors. Finally, this study sought to discern if there was a significant difference between the way leaders of FBOs perceive their servant leadership behaviors and the way their followers perceive their servant leadership behaviors. The 28-item SLQ, developed by Liden et al. (2008), was delivered to leaders from various FBOs and their followers. Potential responses for each item included options from "Strongly disagree" (1) to "Strongly agree" (7) on a seven-point Likert scale (Liden et al., 2008). Their evaluation was based upon what they claim are the seven most important constructs of servant leadership, including emotional healing, creating value for the community, conceptual

skills, empowering, helping, putting subordinates first, and behaving ethically (Liden et al., 2008). These constructs were discerned by studying the work of Greenleaf (1977) as well as other researchers who had attempted to delineate the most important characteristics of servant leadership. Leaders completed the assessment themselves, and their followers completed the assessment based on their leader. The electronic survey was developed, distributed, and collected using Qualtrics.

Once the data was collected and organized, independent samples t-tests were run to compare the leader data to the aggregate follower data. The mean total scores of both the leaders and followers were interpreted and appraised according to Northouse's (2020) scoring method, and then compared statistically. This process was repeated using the mean scores of the leaders and followers on each of the seven constructs. From the resulting data, conclusions were drawn concerning servant leadership perceptions and correlations between leader and follower perceptions. Future servant leadership training, education, and development for FBO leaders were developed and discussed as additional implications.

In order to conduct this study, the researcher completed the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative for Human Research. The researcher also submitted an IRB Application for this study, which was approved on October 29, 2021, IRB2021-1322M (Appendix A).

Quantitative Research and Leadership Theory Development

Historically, the desire to understand the complexities of leadership has resulted in the development and testing of countless theories and models. Without the use of reputable research methodologies, the furthering of this academic field would not have been possible. Specifically, the use of quantitative research methodologies has been instrumental in leadership theory development (Bass & Bass, 2009). The vast number of peer reviewed publications about

leadership serves as evidence of this. For instance, between 2007 and 2009, the second most common keyword used in submissions to the *Academy of Management Journal* was “leadership” (Morison, 2010). Additionally, Dinh et al. (2014) found 66 separate theories, models, or philosophies of leadership had been identified in peer reviewed journals published between 2000 and 2014. Statistics such as these demonstrate how common the empirical study of leadership is. Furthermore, Palinsky et al. (2021) emphasizes the continued importance of quantitative methods in leadership research, noting the contributions of certain methodologies while also arguing for the increased use of others. Although surveys are a commonly used quantitative research method in the field of leadership education and development, the authors suggested the use of experimental, quasi-experimental, episodic/immersive, and other research methods (Palinsky et al., 2021). The use of quantitative research methodologies such as these must be employed in order to add to the existing literature and improve the education, development, and training of leadership.

Research Questions

The following served as research questions for this study:

RQ1: How do leaders in faith-based organizations perceive their leadership behaviors in accordance with servant leadership?

RQ2: How do followers in faith-based organizations perceive their leader’s behaviors in accordance with servant leadership?

RQ3: Do leaders in faith-based organizations perceive themselves as their followers do (is there a significant difference)?

Subject Selection

Population Identification

Essential to the selection of subjects was defining the population, faith-based organizations, clearly. The researcher defined a faith-based organization as a group or business created to help others or provide a service while being guided by Christian principles and virtues. This definition is based largely on the work of Beilefeld and Cleveland (2013a), who conducted a literature review on FBOs to better understand the phenomenon. They found research conducted on FBOs was largely vague, with different authors creating different definitions (Beilefeld & Cleveland, 2013a). Despite this incongruence, they did discover a consistent focus on mission, based upon religious beliefs, which motivated staff and volunteers towards a common goal (Beilefeld & Cleveland, 2013a).

Understandably, many would first think of a church or congregation as an example which fits this definition. Although churches have the potential to serve countless people, and likely function similarly to other FBOs, for the purpose of this study, the focus was on non-church FBOs. Due to the vast number and diversity of churches located in the United States, the researcher believed they were unique enough to be studied separately from other faith-based organizations.

Additionally, this study was conducted with Christian evangelical FBOs only. This decision was made based upon the literature review, which includes a comparison between the teachings of Jesus Christ and Greenleaf's (1977) servant leadership. One goal of this study was to ascertain whether leaders in Christian FBOs are more competent servant leaders based upon their religious beliefs and practices.

Bearing in mind this understanding of FBOs, subjects who met the criteria were considered. The chosen organizations could be for-profit or nonprofit and have any mission, so long as they seek the welfare of others and are founded on Christian principles and traditions. Potential participating organizations were identified with the help of a number of key informants who all had numerous connections in the world of faith-based organizations.

Sample Development

This study sought to discover if leaders in faith-based organizations perceive themselves as their followers do (as it pertains to servant leadership behavior). To discover a statistical correlation between follower-perception and leader-self-perception, separate samples of both leaders and followers in FBOs were required.

Snowball sampling was used preliminarily to build a larger list of FBOs to contact (Goodman, 1961). A preliminary group of individuals with many connections were identified as key informants. These key informants helped the researcher develop a larger list of potential leaders in faith-based organizations to contact about the study. Leaders identified by the key informants were contacted, and their participation was requested. Those who participated in the study were asked to provide the names and email addresses of two followers in their organization. These followers were also contacted, and their participation was requested. Additionally, leaders who took the survey were asked to provide the names and email addresses of other leaders whom they know who would also be willing to participate in the study. These leaders were contacted in the same way as those identified by the key informants.

Sample Characteristics

Included in both surveys were a series of participant characteristics questions. These questions were created to provide greater context to the data obtained by the Servant Leadership

Questionnaire. Both leaders and followers were asked to share their age by selecting one of the provided age ranges. The data revealed that a majority of the leaders (53.13%) and followers (42.42%) surveyed were between the ages of 40 and 59.

Table 1.

Descriptive Statistics - Age

Age (years old)	Leaders		Followers	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Less than 20	0	0	1	3.0
20-39	6	18.8	11	33.3
40-59	17	53.1	14	42.4
More than 60	9	28.1	7	21.2

A second characteristic question posed to both leaders and followers asked how many years they had worked in their current field. A majority of the leaders (21.81%) had worked in their field for 10-19 years, and a majority of the followers (48.48%) had worked in their field for less than 10 years.

Table 2.

Descriptive Statistics - Years of Experience

Age (years old)	Leaders		Followers	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Less than 10	8	25	16	48.5
10-19	7	21.9	2	6.1
20-29	8	25	8	24.2
30-39	6	18.8	4	12.1
More than 40	3	9.4	2	6.1

Note. One participant did not answer this question.

Participants were also asked to indicate if they had any specific experience with leadership education. A majority of the leaders (56.25%) said they had no such experience, while a majority of the followers (60.61%) said they had some experience with leadership education.

Table 3.

Descriptive Statistics - Leadership Education Experience

Experience Level	Leaders		Followers	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Has experience	18	56.3	20	60.6
Does not have experience	14	43.8	13	39.4

Participants were prompted to indicate their experience with leadership training as well. A majority of the leaders (81.25%) and followers (78.79%) both indicated they had been involved in some level of leadership training.

Table 4.

Descriptive Statistics - Leadership Training Experience

Experience Level	Leaders		Followers	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Has experience	26	81.3	26	78.8
Does not have experience	6	18.8	7	21.2

Participants were also surveyed for their leadership development experience. The same percentage of both leaders and followers (81.25%, 78.79%) who stated they had experience with leadership training also indicated they had experience with leadership development.

Table 5.

Descriptive Statistics - Leadership Development Experience

Experience Level	Leaders		Followers	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Has experience	26	81.3	26	78.8
Does not have experience	6	18.8	7	21.2

Leaders and followers were asked to share whether or not they believed selfless service was an essential part of being a Christian. A large majority of both leaders (93.75%) and followers (93.94%) declared selfless service is an essential part of being a Christian.

Table 6.

Descriptive Statistics - Selfless Service and Christianity

Is selfless service an essential part of being a Christian?	Leaders		Followers	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Yes	30	93.8	31	93.9
No	2	6.3	2	6.1

Instrumentation

The instrument used in this study is a 28-item survey style assessment. The assessment, titled the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) was developed by Liden et al. (2008) as an instrument for measuring one's servant leadership acuity on seven constructs. These constructs are

1. Emotional healing
2. Creating value for the community
3. Conceptual skills
4. Empowering
5. Helping
6. Putting subordinates first
7. Behaving ethically (Liden et al., 2008)

Each construct was equally represented by four items in the questionnaire. The items were presented as multiple-choice questions on a seven-point Likert scale from "Strongly disagree" (1) to "Strongly agree" (7). The data obtained from this survey was analyzed for statistical significance.

The researcher also developed six additional questions included at the end of the survey for the collection of personal characteristics data. The questions and the distribution of resulting responses are included above.

Data Collection Procedures

The SLQ was designed to measure the servant leadership competency of an individual. The original tool was designed to be taken by followers in an organization, who then answer each question about their leader. However, this study included the leader's self-perception as

well. To discover both the followers' perception of their leader and the leaders' self-perception, the survey was delivered to both the leaders (Appendix B) and followers (Appendix C) in each organization. As such, the wording of the survey delivered to the leaders was altered accordingly.

The researcher contacted leaders of identified FBOs via email (Appendix D) to request their participation in the study. Those who accepted took the leader version of the questionnaire. The leader was asked to provide contact information, specifically email addresses, of their followers. The researcher then contacted each follower via email (Appendix E) with their consent form and link to the Qualtrics survey. Both versions of the survey included an informed consent form (Appendix F and Appendix G).

The design of the Qualtrics survey followed Dillman et al.'s (2014) criteria for the construction of web surveys. The design was respondent-friendly, interfaced with various computer operating systems, and included questions phrased as one might find on a traditional, physical survey (Dillman et al., 2014).

Data Analysis Procedures

Once responses were collected, they were used to answer each of the three research questions. To do so, the raw numerical data must first be used to calculate scores. This process was based upon the work of Northouse (2022), who developed a method for both scoring and interpreting SLQ scores. He revealed that items 1, 8, 15, and 22 correspond with the construct of emotional healing (Northouse, 2022). Adding the scores on items 1, 8, 15, and 22 would therefore provide a total score for emotional healing (Northouse, 2022). The same process should be repeated for each of the remaining six objectives. Items 2, 9, 16 and 23 correspond with creating value for the community. Items 3, 10, 17, and 24 correspond with conceptual skills.

Items 4, 11, 18, and 25 correspond with empowering. Items 5, 12, 19, and 26 correspond with helping subordinates grow and succeed. Items 6, 13, 20, and 27 correspond with putting subordinates first. Finally, items 7, 14, 21, and 28 correspond with behaving ethically (Northhouse, 2022).

Once scored, the resulting totals for each of the seven servant leadership constructs can be compared to the following scale:

High range: A score between 23 and 28 means you strongly exhibit this servant leadership behavior.

Moderate range: A score between 14 and 22 means you tend to exhibit this behavior in an average way.

Low range: A score between 8 and 13 means you exhibit this leadership below the average or expected range.

Extremely low range: A score between 0 and 7 means you are not inclined to exhibit this leadership behavior at all (Northhouse, 2022, pp. 281-282).

The scores obtained by leaders on each of the seven constructs were evaluated using this scale.

The same was done with scores obtained from followers. Once their scores were evaluated, they were analyzed for statistically significant differences.

The data was used to derive the mean scores obtained from both leaders and followers. A total mean score as well as a construct-specific mean score was calculated for each group. The mean scores were used to run eight independent sample t-tests in SPSS version 25. An independent sample t-test is a method of statistical analysis used to compare mean values obtained from separate groups whose means are independent (Gerald, 2018). In this study, independent samples t-tests were used to discern whether the mean scores (construct and total)

obtained from both leaders and followers were significantly different. The mean total scores of both the leaders and followers were interpreted and appraised according to Northouse's (2020) scoring method, and then tested for statistically significant differences. This process was repeated using the mean scores of the leaders and followers on each of the seven constructs. Significance was determined at an alpha level of .05. From the resulting data, conclusions were drawn concerning servant leadership perceptions and correlations between leader and follower perceptions. Recommendations for the future servant leadership training, education, and development of FBO leaders were offered and discussed as additional implications.

Validity and Reliability

An unreliable instrument would have been of no use in this study. Therefore, it was important to first identify the validity and reliability of the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) before delivering it to participants. Liden et al. (2008) conducted an exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) in order to bear out the construct validity of the seven constructs they identified as factors in servant leadership. A Cronbach's alpha score was generated for each construct as follows: conceptual skills ($\alpha = .81$), empowerment ($\alpha = .80$), helping ($\alpha = .82$), putting subordinates first ($\alpha = .86$), behaving ethically ($\alpha = .83$), emotional healing ($\alpha = .76$), and creating value for the community ($\alpha = .83$) (Liden et al., 2008). Based on these results, the researchers deemed that their instrument was both reliable and valid (Liden et al., 2008). Additionally, face validity was established by two leadership education experts, who also identify as Christians.

Nonresponse

In their review of how nonresponse historically has been handled in the context of social science research, Linder et al. (2001), pointed out the importance of not ignoring nonresponse

and analyzing data and reporting findings. Based upon their research, they suggested three methods for accounting for nonresponse in social science research: comparing early to late respondents, using the number of “days to respond” as a regression variable, or comparing respondents with nonrespondents (Linder et al., 2001). In this study, the researcher used the first method, comparing early to late respondents. Using this method, late respondents were used to represent nonrespondents due to their similarities (Linder et al., 2001). By comparing data obtained from those who responded early (after a preliminary wave of communication) with those who responded late (after the final wave of communication), the researcher was able to extrapolate the potential effect of nonresponse on the data (Linder et al., 2001). Linder et al. (2001) suggested that researchers should not generalize their findings to their target population if there is a statistically significant difference between early and late respondents.

In this study, early respondents were classified as those who took the survey after receiving only one email. Late respondents were classified as participants who took the survey, but only after being emailed multiple times. 30 early respondents and 35 late respondents were identified. An independent samples t-test was used to compare the mean total scores obtained from both early respondents and late respondents who took the SLQ. The difference between early respondents' ($M = 173.63$, $SD = 13.19$) and late respondents' ($M = 170.91$, $SD = 19.42$) mean total scores was not found to be statistically significant. Based on these findings, the research determined that non-response error had no significant effect on the results and conclusions of this study.

Table 7.*Nonresponse Analysis*

	Levene's Test		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval	
	F	Sig.	t	df	p	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
SLQ Mean Total Scores	0.91	0.34	0.65	63	0.52	2.72	4.19	-5.65	11.09

Note. Equal variances assumed.

CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

Leader Perception

After completing data collection, the researcher analyzed the data for significant findings. Research question one asked how leaders in FBOs perceive their own servant leadership behaviors. The collected data from the leaders provided an average score for each construct. Leaders obtained the highest mean score in Behaving Ethically ($M = 26.69$, $SD = 1.45$), and the lowest mean score in Empowering ($M = 23.44$, $SD = 2.63$). According to Northouse's (2022) scale for evaluating SLQ scores, scores which fall between 23 and 28 are considered high. The mean scores for each construct obtained by the leaders are therefore all high. The mean for their total servant leadership scores was $M = 174$ and $SD = 11.23$.

Table 8.

Descriptive Statistics of Leader Scores

Servant Leadership Construct	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Emotional Healing	32	25.22	2.03
Creating Value for the Community	32	23.47	3.77
Conceptual Skills	32	25.56	2.27
Empowering	32	23.44	2.63
Helping	32	24.84	2.83
Putting Subordinates First	32	24.78	1.50
Behaving Ethically	32	26.69	1.45

Servant Leadership Construct	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Total Score	32	174.00	11.23

Follower Perception

The second research question asked how followers perceive the servant leadership behaviors of their leaders. Followers scored their leaders highest in the construct of Behaving Ethically ($M = 26.82$, $SD = 2.20$), and lowest in Empowering ($M = 22.78$, $SD = 4.63$). Using Northouse's (2022) scale for evaluating servant leadership scores, followers gave their leaders high scores for each construct except Empowering, which still received a high score (between 14 and 22). The mean of the total servant leadership scores followers gave their leaders was $M = 170.39$ and $SD = 20.78$.

Table 9.

Descriptive Statistics of Follower Scores

Servant Leadership Construct	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Emotional Healing	33	24.64	2.89
Creating Value for the Community	33	23.73	3.79
Conceptual Skills	33	25.06	3.71
Empowering	33	22.78	4.63
Helping	33	23.15	4.76
Putting Subordinates First	33	24.21	3.80
Behaving Ethically	33	26.82	2.20
Total Score	33	170.39	20.78

Comparing Leader and Follower Perceptions

Emotional Healing

An independent samples t-test was used to discern a statistically significant difference between the mean scores obtained from leaders and followers on each of the seven servant leadership constructs. The 32 leaders who took the survey ($M = 25.22$, $SD = 2.03$) compared to the 33 followers who took the survey ($M = 24.64$, $SD = 2.89$) revealed no significant difference between their mean scores on the construct of emotional healing, with $p = 0.35$.

Table 10.

Comparing Leader and Follower Means: Emotional Healing

Servant Leadership Construct	Levene's Test		t-test for Equality of Means				95% Confidence Interval		
	F	Sig.	t	df	p	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Question 1	1.20	0.28	0.52	63	0.61	0.13	0.25	-0.37	0.63
Question 8	3.92	0.05	0.95	63	0.34	0.12	0.12	-0.13	0.36
Question 15	0.14	0.71	-0.1	63	0.92	-0.02	0.21	-0.44	0.39
Question 22	0.08	0.77	1.22	63	0.23	0.36	0.3	-0.23	0.95
Construct Total	3.16	0.08	0.94	63	0.35	0.58	0.62	-0.66	1.82

Note. Equal variances assumed.

Creating Value for the Community

A second independent samples t-test was run to compare the mean scores of leaders ($M = 23.47$, $SD = 3.77$) and followers ($M = 23.73$, $SD = 3.79$) on the servant leadership construct of creating value for the community. There was no significant difference between the mean scores on this construct, with $p = 0.78$.

Table 11.

Comparing Leader and Follower Means: Creating Value for the Community

Servant Leadership Construct	Levene's Test		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval	
	F	Sig.	t	df	p	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Question 2	1.40	0.24	1.69	63	0.10	0.47	0.28	-0.09	1.02
Question 9	0.25	0.62	-1.15	63	0.26	-0.27	0.24	-0.74	0.20
Question 16	1.31	0.26	-1.60	63	0.12	-0.53	0.33	-1.20	0.13
Question 23	1.71	0.20	0.24	63	0.81	0.08	0.33	-0.58	0.73
Construct Total	0.29	0.60	-0.28	63	0.78	-0.26	0.94	-2.13	1.62

Note. Equal variances assumed.

Conceptual Skills

A third independent samples t-test was run to compare the mean scores of leaders ($M = 25.56$, $SD = 2.27$) and followers ($M = 25.06$, $SD = 3.71$) on the servant leadership construct of conceptual skills. There was no significant difference between the mean scores on this construct, with $p = 0.51$. However, on Question 3 (*I/My leader can tell if something work related is going wrong*) an alpha level of 0.04 was obtained. At a significance level of 0.05, the mean scores on this question between leaders and followers was found to be significantly different.

Table 12.
Comparing Leader and Follower Means: Conceptual Skills

Servant Leadership Construct	Levene's Test		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval	
	F	Sig.	t	df	<i>p</i>	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Question 3	1.29	0.26	2.11	63	0.04	0.46	0.22	0.02	0.90
Question 10	0.00	0.10	-0.57	63	0.57	-0.15	0.26	-0.66	0.37
Question 17	4.92	0.03	1.13	44.84	0.26	0.18	0.16	-0.14	0.49
Question 24	1.84	0.18	0.02	63	0.98	0.01	0.27	-0.54	0.56
Construct Total	2.40	0.13	0.66	63	0.51	0.50	0.77	-1.03	2.03

Note. Equal variances assumed on Q3, Q10, and Q24. Equal variances not assumed on Q17.

Empowering

A fourth independent samples t-test was run to compare the mean scores of leaders ($M = 23.44$, $SD = 2.63$) and followers ($M = 22.78$, $SD = 4.63$) on the servant leadership construct of empowering. There was no significant difference between the mean scores on this construct, with $p = 0.49$. However, a significant difference was found between results obtained from leaders and followers on Question 25 (*If others need to make important decisions at work, they do not need to consult me/my leader*), with $p = 0.02$.

Table 13.
Comparing Leader and Follower Means: Empowering

Servant Leadership Construct	Levene's Test		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval	
	F	Sig.	t	df	p	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Question 4	1.44	0.23	0.59	63	0.56	0.13	0.23	-0.32	0.59
Question 11	0.14	0.71	-0.70	63	0.49	-0.23	0.32	-0.87	0.42
Question 18	0.70	0.41	-0.36	63	0.72	-0.10	0.27	-0.63	0.44
Question 25	16.79	<.01	2.35	44.55	0.02	0.84	0.36	0.12	1.56
Construct Total	5.80	0.02	0.69	63	0.49	0.65	0.94	-1.22	2.52

Note. Equal variances assumed on Q4, Q11, and Q8. Equal variances not assumed on Q25.

Helping

A fifth independent samples t-test was run to compare the means obtained from leaders ($M = 24.84, SD = 2.83$) and followers ($M = 23.15, SD = 4.76$) on the servant leadership construct of helping. No significant difference was found between the mean scores of leaders and followers on this construct, with $p = 0.09$.

Table 14.
Comparing Leader and Follower Means: Helping

Servant Leadership Construct	Levene's Test		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval	
	F	Sig.	t	df	p	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Question 5	9.19	<0.01	1.89	52.18	0.06	0.55	0.29	-0.03	1.14
Question 12	5.11	0.03	1.15	54.88	0.25	0.31	0.26	-0.22	0.84
Question 19	1.06	0.31	1.79	63	0.08	0.43	0.24	-0.05	0.92
Question 26	1.25	0.27	1.46	63	0.15	0.40	0.27	-0.15	0.94
Construct Total	4.50	0.04	1.73	63	0.09	1.69	0.98	-0.26	3.64

Note. Equal variances assumed on Q19 and Q26. Equal variances not assumed on Q5 and Q12.

Putting Subordinates First

A sixth independent samples t-test was run to compare the means obtained from leaders ($M = 24.78, SD = 1.50$) and followers ($M = 24.21, SD = 3.80$) on the servant leadership construct of helping. No significant difference was found between the mean scores of leaders and followers on this construct, with $p = 0.43$.

Table 15.

Comparing Leader and Follower Means: Putting Subordinates First

Servant Leadership Construct	Levene's Test		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval	
	F	Sig.	t	df	<i>p</i>	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Question 6	1.22	0.27	0.61	63	0.55	0.16	0.36	-0.36	0.68
Question 13	2.31	0.13	-0.13	63	0.90	-0.03	0.19	-0.41	0.36
Question 20	6.23	0.02	0.52	42.42	0.60	0.12	0.24	-0.35	0.60
Question 27	0.21	0.65	1.46	63	0.15	0.31	0.21	-0.12	0.74
Construct Total	5.74	0.02	0.79	63	0.43	0.58	0.72	-0.87	2.01

Note. Equal variances assumed.

Behaving Ethically

A seventh independent samples t-test was run to compare the means obtained from leaders ($M = 26.69$, $SD = 1.45$) and followers ($M = 26.82$ $SD = 2.20$) on the servant leadership construct of helping. No significant difference was found between the mean scores of leaders and followers on this construct, with $p = 0.78$.

Table 16.

Comparing Leader and Follower Means: Behaving Ethically

Servant Leadership Construct	Levene's Test		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval	
	F	Sig.	t	df	p	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Question 7	5.23	0.03	1.11	56.06	0.27	0.12	0.11	-0.09	0.33
Question 14	0.47	0.49	-1.90	63	0.06	-0.36	0.19	-0.73	0.02
Question 21	<0.01	0.96	-0.05	63	0.96	-0.01	0.11	-0.22	0.21
Question 28	1.55	0.22	0.59	63	0.56	0.11	0.19	-0.27	0.50
Construct Total	0.02	0.89	-0.28	63	0.78	-0.13	0.46	-0.06	0.80

Note. Equal variances assumed on Q 14, Q21, and Q28. Equal variances not assumed on Q7.

Servant Leadership Total

Finally, an independent samples t-test was conducted to compare the aggregate means scores of leaders and followers on the SLQ as a whole. The mean total scores of leaders ($M = 174.00$, $SD = 11.30$) and followers ($M = 170.39$, $SD = 20.78$) were not found to be significantly different ($p = 0.39$).

Table 17.

Comparing Leader and Follower Means: Total Scores

	Levene's Test		t-test for Equality of Means				95% Confidence Interval		
	F	Sig.	t	df	<i>p</i>	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
SLQ Mean Total Scores	4.70	0.03	0.87	49.73	0.39	3.61	4.13	-4.69	11.91

Note. Equal variances not assumed.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS and RECOMMENDATIONS

Results from the data analysis were used to answer the three research questions developed for this study. For each research question, the data was used to draw conclusions and provide specific recommendations, both to leaders of FBOs and leadership development practitioners.

Research Question 1

Conclusions

The first question answered by this study was “How do leaders in faith-based organizations perceive their leadership behaviors in accordance with servant leadership?”

Results from the data analysis indicated leaders perceive they effectively practice servant leadership behaviors. The 32 leaders of FBOs, included in this sample, obtained a mean score of 26.69 in the servant leadership construct of behaving ethically, a 25.56 in conceptual skills, a 25.22 in emotional healing, a 24.84 in helping, a 24.78 in putting subordinates first, a 23.47 in creating value for the community, and a 23.44 in empowering. On Northhouse’s (2022) scale, each of the leaders’ construct scores landed in the high range (between 23 and 28). Based on these findings, the researcher concludes the leaders of FBOs from this sample view themselves as competent and effective practitioners of servant leadership.

These findings are supported by the assertions of Chung (2011) and Jones (1995), who identified key comparisons between the life and teachings of Christ and the heart of servant leadership. The high scores obtained by leaders on the SLQ reveal a high servant leadership capacity, which may be rooted in their deeply held evangelical beliefs and values. Additionally, the scores derived from leaders align with other servant leadership research. Allen et al. (2018)

and Qiu et al. (2022), drew connections between Liden's (2008) seven servant leadership constructs and indicators of organizational success. Qiu et al. (2020) described several of the servant leadership constructs from the SLQ in the development of their hypotheses. They found the presence and practice of servant leadership in the Chinese hospitality industry positively influenced employee service quality, moderated by employee self-efficacy (Qui et al., 2020). Allen et al. (2018) closely examined the role of servant leadership in increasing organizational commitment in nonprofit organizations. They specifically focused on the servant leadership construct of empowerment in their research (Allen et al., 2018). Findings from their study revealed leaders who practice servant leadership and prioritize the empowerment of their followers will witness an increase in organizational commitment (Allen et al., 2018). These studies confirm not only the presence of servant leadership in two vastly different organizational contexts, but its contribution to the achievement of desirable organizational outcomes. Results from their research confirm the findings of this study. Not only is servant leadership highly prevalent in faith-based organizations, but leaders of FBOs exhibit servant leadership behaviors of a high caliber across all seven of Liden et al. (2008) constructs.

Recommendations for FBO Leaders

Based on these conclusions, the researcher would offer the following recommendations to leaders of faith-based organizations in the United States. Although their mean scores on each construct fell in Northouse's (2022) high range, leaders scored themselves noticeably lower in the construct of empowering (23.44). Based on this discovery, the researcher recommends that leaders of FBOs view this construct of servant leadership as an area for improvement. Liden et al. (2008) defined empowering as allowing and equipping followers to independently identify and solve problems at work. By seeking opportunities to empower their followers in this way,

leaders of FBOs will increase the effectiveness of their servant leadership. Additionally, the leaders surveyed in this study scored themselves lower in the construct of putting subordinates first (23.47). This construct should be viewed by leaders of FBOs as another area for potential growth. Liden et al. (2008) define putting subordinates first as emphasizing, both through words and actions, that the needs of followers are of the utmost importance to the leader. The researcher recommends leaders of FBOs take more opportunities to assure followers of their care, awareness, and commitment to their immediate needs. In doing so, leaders will further increase their servant leadership competency.

Recommendations for Leadership Development Practitioners

Leadership development practitioners constantly seek new and innovative ways to improve the development of tomorrow's leaders, both through education and training. The findings from this study provide keen insight into the prevalence of servant leadership among faith-based organizations. The FBO leaders surveyed in this study scored high in each of Liden et al. (2008) servant leadership constructs. Therefore, leaders of FBOs should be regarded as standard bearers for the practice of servant leadership. It should also be noted that 56.3% of the leaders surveyed in this study indicated that they had some level of leadership education experience, and 81.3% indicated they had both leadership training and development experience. The researcher recommends further research be conducted on the leadership education, training, and development of these individuals. By gaining a deeper understanding of what practices and experiences contributed to their servant leadership development, leadership scholars and educators can more strategically create and employ pedagogies for the development of servant leadership.

Research Question 2

Conclusions

The second research question of this study was “How do followers in faith-based organizations perceive their leader’s behaviors in accordance with servant leadership?” Results from the data analysis revealed followers also perceive their leaders’ servant leadership in high regard. The 33 followers in FBOs, included in this sample, provided their leaders with a mean score of 26.82 in the construct of behaving ethically, a 25.06 in conceptual skills, a 24.64 in emotional healing, a 24.21 in putting subordinates first, 23.73 in creating value for the community, a 23.15 in helping, and 22.78 in empowering. Using Northhouse’s (2022) scale, each of these scores fall within the high range (between 23 and 28). Based on these findings, the researcher concludes followers in faith-based organizations from this sample perceive their leaders as competent and effective practitioners of servant leadership.

These findings are supported by the conclusions of prior servant leadership and followership literature. Numerous studies have identified similarities between the life and teachings of Jesus and Greenleaf’s (1977) philosophy of servant leadership (Chung, 2011; Jones, 1995). Scores on the SLQ obtained by both leaders and followers support the idea that evangelical Christianity lends itself to servant leadership behaviors. In addition, Qui et al. (2020) and Allen et al. (2018) discovered high servant leadership capacity among leaders across various organizational contexts. In this study, followers in faith-based organizations identifying their superiors as competent servant leaders similarly confirms the prevalence of servant leadership. Prior followership literature also supports results obtained in the answering of RQ2. Kelley (1988) claimed an essential part of effective followership is the ability to think critically. A high capacity for critical thinking is required for leaders to accurately evaluate their leaders’

behaviors. Commitment to the organization, or activity, is also essential to effective followership (Kelley, 1988). Followers who were willing to take time out of their day to take a survey which could help their organization and field demonstrated high activity and commitment. Other scholars who have added their voices to the growing conversation over followership have asserted the importance of followers' agency. Stern (2020) emphasized the need for effective followers to have agency, or the ability to disagree with their leader. Such agency requires a high level of critical thinking (Kelley, 1988) and knowledge of the leader themselves. The 33 followers who participated in this study exhibited a high level of agency in their willingness to provide an informed evaluation of their superiors' leadership behaviors. These followers also demonstrated a high level of agency in their roles. Stern (2020) asserted followers must recognize their leadership responsibilities, lead ethically, and know when to obey and when to dissent. By providing honest evaluations of their leaders, the 33 followers from the sampled FBOs demonstrated their agency.

Recommendations for Followers in FBOs

Although the 33 followers from the sample gave their leaders high mean scores in each of the seven servant leadership constructs, they generated the lowest mean scores in the constructs of helping and empowering. Based on these findings, the researcher recommends followers in faith-based organizations clearly communicate their desire for both help and empowerment. Helping is defined as leaders actively demonstrating care for their followers' personal development and career growth (Liden et al., 2008). Followers in faith-based organizations should clearly and honestly communicate their desire for increased help from their leader in the form of support and mentoring. Liden et al. (2008) defined empowering as allowing and equipping followers to independently identify and solve problems at work. In the context of faith-based organizations,

followers should also clearly communicate to their leader their desire for more responsibility and independence in the completion of their work. By honestly identifying these desires, followers can provide their leaders with more opportunities to practice and improve their servant leadership.

Recommendations for Leadership Development Practitioners

Kelley (1988) defined effective followers as those who practice both critical thinking and are active in the organization. Followers who know their leader well enough to honestly evaluate their leadership behaviors demonstrate a high level of critical thinking. Additionally, followers can prove their level of activity and commitment by participating in opportunities which may benefit their organization or others like it. By merely participating in this study, the 33 followers from the sample demonstrated their high level of activity and commitment to their organization. The data obtained from their responses denote a deep knowledge of their leader and a high level of critical thinking. Kelley's (1988) description of effective followership was instrumental in understanding and analyzing the data obtained from followers in this study. The researcher recommends leadership scholars further investigate the relationship between Kelley's (1988) followership and Greenleaf's (1977) servant leadership. Many researchers have previously attempted to create a servant leadership model based upon Greenleaf's (1977) original philosophy. By exploring the role of followers in the organizational practice of servant leadership, a model of servant leadership which elaborates on the role and function of effective followers could potentially be developed.

Research Question 3

Conclusions

The third research question of this study asked, “Do leaders in faith-based organizations perceive themselves as their followers do (is there a significant difference)?” Independent samples t-tests were conducted to discover any statistically significant differences between the means construct and total scores obtained from both leaders and followers in FBOs. Using an alpha level of 0.05 for significance, the resulting data revealed no significant difference between the aggregate mean scores of leaders and followers on the SLQ. There was also no significant difference found between leaders’ and followers’ mean scores on any of the seven servant leadership constructs.

However, a statistically significant difference was discovered between the average answers of leaders and followers on Question 3 of the SLQ ($p = 0.04$). Question 3, included in the construct of conceptual skills, reads, “I/My leader can tell if something work related is going wrong.” Participants were prompted to rate their leader on a seven-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 7 (Strongly agree). In the construct of conceptual skills, leaders gave themselves a mean score of 25.56, while followers gave their leaders a mean score of 25.06. Upon further examination of the results from Question 3, the 32 leaders provided a higher mean response of 6.28 compared to the 33 followers, who provided a mean response of 5.82.

A second statistically significant difference between leader and follower responses was found on Question 25 ($p = 0.02$). Question 25 falls under the construct of empowering, and reads, “If others need to make important decisions at work, they do not need to consult me/my leader.” A closer examination of Question 25 revealed that leaders provided an average response of 5.62, while flowers provided an average response of 4.79. This indicates that leaders perceive they

often allow their followers to make important work decisions without permission, while followers perceive they have less freedom to do so.

Based on these findings, the research concludes there is no significant difference between the ways followers and leaders in FBOs surveyed in this study perceive the leaders' servant leadership behavior. Largely, both followers and leaders hold the leaders' servant leadership competency in high regard. However, there was a significant and consistent discrepancy between how followers and leaders answered Question 3 and Question 25 of the SLQ. Leaders believe they are aware of workplace issues and allow followers to make important decisions independently. Meanwhile, followers believe their leaders are less aware of workplace issues and provide less freedom for them to make important decisions without permission.

A similar study conducted by Burch et al. (2015), examined differences between leader and follower perceptions of administrator' servant leadership at a Christian university. Although they used a different instrument, many of the servant leadership qualities used in the creation of their survey align with Liden et al. 's (2008) seven constructs. In addition, using this study's operational definition of FBOs, Christian universities fall within the parameters of a faith-based organization. Burch et al.'s (2015) findings confirm those obtained from the data in this study. They discovered significant differences between leaders and followers' perceptions of mentoring and development, encouragement and motivation, and empowerment (Burch et al., 2015). In this study, the two questions which revealed statistically significant differences fell under Liden et al.'s (2008) constructs of conceptual skills and empowerment. Conceptual skills are defined as the leader's knowledge of organizational tasks and functions which allow them to support and assist their followers (Liden et al., 2008). This construct is similar to the servant leadership quality of mentoring and development highlighted in Burch et al.'s (2015) study. The construct

of empowerment and defined as equipping followers to solve problems and complete essential tasks (Liden et al., 2008). The same quality is also highlighted in the work of Burch et al. (2015). Both studies reveal a discrepancy between the leaders' and followers' perceptions of how these specific behaviors are practiced by the leaders.

Recommendations for Leaders and Followers in FBOs

Based on the data obtained from leaders' and followers' responses to the SLQ, the researcher confidently concluded there is no significant difference between follower and leader perceptions of servant leadership in faith-based organizations. However, the statistically significant differences in responses to Question 3 and Question 25 reveal very specific areas in which FBO leaders can grow. According to the data, leaders included in the sample overestimate their ability to notice work related issues. With this information, leaders of FBOs can practice greater self-awareness and grow in their ability to perceive work related conflicts. The researcher also recommends that followers in FBOs communicate more frequently and clearly with their leaders about work related issues. In doing so, followers can be active participants in their leaders' servant leadership development.

The data also revealed leaders from the sample overestimate the freedom they provide their followers to make independent decisions at work. This revelation should also be used to further increase leader self-awareness. Leaders in FBOs should more actively seek opportunities to equip and empower their followers to make important work-related decisions. This practice would likely contribute to the development of followers into effective leaders and increase the completion of organizational goals. Followers should also vocalize their desire for more responsibility in the workplace, clearly communicating their desire to grow to their superiors.

Recommendations for Leadership Development Practitioners

Aside from the statistical discrepancies evident in the responses to Question 3 and Question 25, the perception of servant leadership behaviors among the sampled leaders and followers were largely similar. In addition, both leaders and followers from the surveyed organizations held their leaders' servant leadership capacity in high regard across each of Liden et al. 's (2008) servant leadership constructs. These conclusions led the researcher to offer the following recommendations to leadership development practitioners. The high servant leadership capacity of leaders from the sampled FBOs should be recognized and further studied by scholars seeking to improve their leadership development curriculum. By better understanding the leadership education, training, and development experiences which contributed to the attainment of such high scores on the SLQ, leadership educators can enhance their servant leadership programming. However, the significant discrepancies found on Question 3 and Question 25 should also be used to inform future servant leadership education and training. In their curriculum, leadership development practitioners should specifically emphasize the importance of perceiving issues in the workplace and equipping followers to make important decisions on their own. By considering the results of this study in the creation of further servant leadership programming, leadership educators can better prepare and train individuals for positions of leadership in faith-based organizations.

REFERENCES

- Allen, S., Winston, B. E., Tatone, G. R., & Crowson, H. M. (2018). Exploring a model of servant leadership, empowerment, and commitment in nonprofit organizations. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 29(1), 123–140. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.21311>
- Barbuto, J. E., & Wheeler, D. W. (2006). Scale development and construct clarification of servant leadership. *Group & Organizational Management*, 31(3), 300–326. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601106287091>
- Bass, B. M., & Bass, R. (2009). *The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (4th ed.). Simon and Schuster.
- Bielefeld, W., & Cleveland, W. S. (2013a). Defining faith-based organizations and understanding them through research. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 42(3), 442–467. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764013484090>
- Bielefeld, W., & Cleveland, W. S. (2013b). Faith-based organizations as service providers and their relationship to government. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 42(3), 468–494. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764013485160>
- Bradley, Y. (1999). Servant leadership: A critique of Robert Greenleaf’s concept of leadership. *Journal of Christian Education*, 42(2), 43–54. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00219657990-4200207>
- Brungardt, C. (1996). The making of leaders: A review of the research in leadership development and education. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 3(3), 81–95. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107179199700300309>
- Burch, M. J., Swails, P., & Mills, R. (2015). Perceptions of administrators’ servant leadership qualities at a christian university: A descriptive study. *Education*, 135(4), 399–404.

- Chung, Y. S. (2011). Why servant leadership? Its uniqueness and principles in the life of Jesus. *Journal of Asia Adventist Seminary, 14*(2), 159–170.
- Collins, D. B., & Holton, E. F. (2004). The effectiveness of managerial leadership development programs: A meta-analysis of studies from 1982 to 2001. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 15*(2), 217–248. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.1099>
- Dierendonck, V. D., Stam, D., Boersma P., Windt, N. D., & Alkema J. (2014). Same difference? Exploring differential mechanisms linking servant leadership and transformational leadership to follower outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly, 25*(3), 544–562. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.014>
- Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2014). *Internet, phone, mail, and mixed-mode surveys : the tailored design method*. (4th ed.). Wiley.
- Dinh, J. E., Lord, R. G, Gardner, W. L., Meuser, J. D., Liden, R.C., & Hu, J. (2014). Leadership theory and research in the new millennium: Current theoretical trends and changing perspectives. *The Leadership Quarterly, 25*(1), 36–62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.005>
- Dooley, L. M., Alizadeh, A., Qiu, S., & Wu, H. (2020). Does servant leadership moderate the relationship between job stress and physical health? *Sustainability, 12*(16), 6591. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12166591>
- English Standard Version Bible*. (2001). ESV Online. <https://esv.literalword.com/>
- Farling, M. L., Stone, A. G., & Winston, B. E. (1999). Servant leadership: Setting the stage for empirical research. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 6*(1-2), 49–72. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F107179199900600104>

- Gerald, B. (2018). A brief review of independent, dependent, and one sample t-test. *International Journal of Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics*, 4(2), 50–54.
<http://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijamtp.20180402.13>
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power & greatness*. Paulist Press.
- Goodman, L. A. (1961). Snowball sampling. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 32(1), 148–170. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2237615>
- Hassan, Z. A., & Raheemah, S. H. (2021). Servant leadership and its impact on the effectiveness of teamwork. *Journal of Economics & Administrative Sciences*, 27(129), 69–84.
- Hoch, J. E., Bommer, W. H., Dulebohn, J. H., & Wu, D. (2018). Do ethical, authentic, and servant leadership explain variance above and beyond transformational leadership? A meta-analysis. *Journal of Management*, 44(2), 501–529.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316665461>
- Jones, L. B. (1995). *Jesus, ceo: Using ancient wisdom for visionary leadership*. Hyperion.
- Kelley, R. E. (1988). In praise of followers. *Harvard Business Review*, 66(6), 142–148.
- Kim, J. (2020). The emergence of servant leadership and its effectiveness in bureaucratic organizations. *International Journal of Manpower*, 41(8), 1235–1249.
<http://doi.org/10.1108/IJM-05-2019-0263>
- Komives, S. R., Owen, J. E., Longersbeam, S. D., Mainella, F. C., & Osteen, L. (2005). Developing a leadership identity: A grounded theory. *Journal of College Student Development*, 46(6), 593–611. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2005.0061>
- Lan, Y., Xia, Y., & Yang, L. (2021). Effects of servant leadership on the leader's innovative behavior. *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal*, 49(10), 1–13.

- Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: Development of multidimensional measure and multi-level system. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19(2), 161–177. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.01.006>
- Lindner, J.R., Murphy, T. & Briers, G. (2001). Handling nonresponse in social science research. *Journal of Agriculture*, 42(4), 43–53. <https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2001.04043>
- Morrison, E. (2010, January 1). OB in AMJ: What is hot and what is not? *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(5), 932–936.
- Ngah, N. S., Abdullah, N. L., & Mohd Suki, N. (2021). Servant leadership, volunteer retention, and organizational citizenship behavior in nonprofit organizations: Examining the mediating role of job satisfaction. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1177/089976402111057409>
- Northhouse, P. G. (2022) *Leadership: Theory and practice* (9th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Neubert, M. J., Kacmar, K. M., Carlson, D. S., Chonko, L. B., & Roberts, J. A. (2008). Regulatory focus as a mediator of the influence of initiating structure and servant leadership on employee behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(6), 1220–1233. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012695>
- Palanski, M., Newman, A., Leroy, H., Moore, C., Hannah, S., & Den Hartog, D. (2021). Quantitative research on leadership and business ethics: Examining the state of the field and an agenda for future research. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 168(1), 109–119. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-019-04267-9>
- Qiu, S., Dooley, L. M., & Xie, L. (2020). How servant leadership and self-efficacy interact to affect service quality in the hospitality industry: A polynomial regression with response

- surface analysis. *Tourism Management*, 78.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2019.104051>
- Rubin, E. N. (2013). Assessing your leadership style to achieve organizational objectives. *Global Business and Organizational Excellence*, 32(6), 55. <https://doi.org/10.1002/joe.21515>
- Russell, R. F., & Stone, A. G. (2002). A review of servant leadership attributes: Developing a practical model. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 22(3), 145–157.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/01437730210424>
- Sendjaya, S., & Sarros J. C. (2002). Servant leadership: Its origin, development and application in organizations. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 9(2), 57–64.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/107179190200900205>
- Showry, M., & Manasa, K. V. L. (2014). Self-awareness - key to effective leadership. *IUP Journal of Soft Skills*, 8(1), 15–26.
- Stern, J. (2021). Do you follow? Understanding followership before leadership. *Management in Education*, 35(1), 58–61. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0892020620942504>
- Tagai, E. K., Scheirer, M. A., Santos, S. L. Z., Haider, M., Bowie, J., Slade, J., Whitehead, T. L., Wang, M. Q., & Holt, C. L. (2018). Assessing capacity of faith-based organizations for health promotion activities. *Health Promotion Practice*, 19(5), 714–723.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1524839917737510>
- Wang, Z., Yu, K., Xi, R., & Zhang, X. (2019). Servant leadership and career success: the effects of career skills and proactive personality. *Career Development International*, 24(7), 717-730. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/CDI-03-2019-0088>

APPENDIX A

IRB APPROVAL

DIVISION OF RESEARCH



Exemption Determination (Common Rule – Effective January 2018)

November 01, 2021

Title: Servant Leadership and Faith-Based Organizations: Exploring Follower & Leadership Perceptions
Investigator: Jennifer Strong
IRB: IRB2021-1322M
Submission Type: Submission Response for Initial Review Submission Form
Funding: N/A
Reference Number: 131440

Dear Jennifer Strong:

The HRPP determined on November 01, 2021 that this research meets the criteria for Exemption in accordance with 45 CFR 46.104.

This determination applies only to the activities described in this IRB submission and does not apply should any changes be made. Please use the reviewed, stamped study documents (available in iRIS and outlined below in the Appendix) for applicable study procedures (e.g. recruitment, consent, data collection, etc...). If changes are needed to stamped study documents or study procedures, you must immediately contact the IRB. You may be required to submit a new request to the IRB.

Your exemption is good for three (3) years from the Approval Start Date (.). Thirty days prior to that time, you will be sent an Administrative Check-In Notice to provide an update on the status of your study.

If you have any questions, please contact the IRB Administrative Office at 1-979-458-4067, toll free at 1-855-795-8636.

Sincerely,

IRB Administration

Appendix: Reviewed Study Documents. Of note, all "forward-facing documents" that will be viewed or completed by participants should be

"stamped" in iRIS. The stamped version should be downloaded from iRIS and used during the study. If a document was not stamped correctly, please communicate with your HRPP Liaison to resolve the issue.

Type	Document Name	Version
Submission Response by Board:		
TAMU IRB	Review Response Form - IRB	Version 2.0
TAMU IRB	Review Response Form - IRB	Version 1.0
Submission Form:		
Submission Form	Initial Review Submission Form	Version 1.1
Submission Form	Initial Review Submission Form	Version 1.0
Submission Attachments:		
Application	IRB Application (Human Research)	Version 1.0
Consent (English)	Informed Consent (Follower Version)	Version 2.0
Consent (English)	Informed Consent (Leader Version)	Version 1.0
Consent (English)	Informed Consent (Follower Version)	Version 2.0
Consent (English)	Informed Consent (Leader Version)	Version 2.0
Document - Questionnaire	Servant Leadership Questionnaire - Follower Version	Version 2.0
Document - Questionnaire	Servant Leadership Questionnaire - Leader Version	Version 1.0
Document - Other Recruiting Materials	Solicitation to Follower	Version 1.0
Document - Other Recruiting Materials	Leader Solicitation to Follower	Version 1.0
Document - Other Recruiting Materials	Solicitation to Leader	Version 1.0

APPENDIX B

SERVANT LEADERSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE - LEADER VERSION

Part I

Instructions: Answer the following questions about yourself as a leader/manager in your organization. Please answer each to the best of your ability.

Key: 1 = Strongly disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Somewhat disagree 4 = Undecided
5 = Somewhat agree 6 = Agree 7 = Strongly agree

- | | |
|---|---------------|
| 1. Others would seek help from me if they had a personal problem. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 2. I emphasize the importance of giving back to the community. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 3. I can tell if something work related is going wrong. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 4. I give others the responsibility to make important decisions about their own jobs. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 5. I make others' career development a priority. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 6. I care more about others' success than my own. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 7. I hold high ethical standards. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 8. I care about others' personal well-being. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 9. I am always interested in helping people in the community. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 10. I am able to think through complex problems. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 11. I encourage others to handle important work decisions on their own. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 12. I am interested in making sure others reach their career goals. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 13. I put others' best interests above his/her own. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 14. I am always honest. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 15. I take time to talk to others on a personal level. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 16. I am involved in community activities. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 17. I have a thorough understanding of the | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |

organization and its goals.	
18. I give others the freedom to handle difficult situations in the way they feel is best.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
19. I provide others with work experiences that enable them to develop new skills.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
20. I sacrifice my own interests to meet others' needs.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
21. I would not compromise ethical principles in order to meet success.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
22. I can recognize when others are feeling down without asking them.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
23. I encourage others to volunteer in the community.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
24. I can solve work problems with new or creative ideas.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
25. If others need to make important decisions at work, they do not need to consult me.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
26. I want to know about others' career goals.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
27. I do what I can to make others' jobs easier.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
28. I value honesty more than profits.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Part II

Instructions: Please select the answer that best describes you.

1. What is your current age?
 - a. Less than 20 years old
 - b. 20-39 years old
 - c. 40-59 years old
 - d. More than 60 years old
2. Have you ever studied leadership before? If so, briefly explain in what capacity.
 - a. Yes
 - b. No

Briefly explain if you chose "yes" :

3. How long have you worked in your current field?
 - a. Less than 10 years
 - b. 10-19 years
 - c. 20-29 years
 - d. 30-39 years
 - e. More than 40 years
4. Is selfless service an essential part of being a Christian?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No

SOURCE. Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: Development of multidimensional measure and multi-level system. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19(2), 161-177. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.01.006>

APPENDIX C

SERVANT LEADERSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE - FOLLOWER VERSION

Part I

Instructions: The following questions are about the leader/manager of your organization. Please answer each of the following questions to the best of your ability.

Key: 1 = Strongly disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Somewhat disagree 4 = Undecided
5 = Somewhat agree 6 = Agree 7 = Strongly agree

- | | |
|--|---------------|
| 1. Others would seek help from my leader if they had a personal problem. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 2. My leader emphasizes the importance of giving back to the community. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 3. My leader can tell if something work related is going wrong. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 4. My leader gives others the responsibility to make important decisions about their own jobs. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 5. My leader makes others' career development a priority. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 6. My leader cares more about others' success than their own. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 7. My leader holds high ethical standards. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 8. My leader cares about others' personal well-being. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 9. My leader is always interested in helping people in the community. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 10. My leader is able to think through complex problems. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 11. My leader encourages others to handle important work decisions on their own. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 12. My leader is interested in making sure others reach their career goals. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 13. My leader puts others' best interests above their own. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 14. My leader is always honest. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |

- | | |
|---|---------------|
| 15. My leader takes time to talk to others on a personal level. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 16. My leader is involved in community activities. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 17. My leader has a thorough understanding of the organization and its goals. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 18. My leader gives others the freedom to handle difficult situations in the way they feel is best. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 19. My leader provides others with work experiences that enable them to develop new skills. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 20. My leader sacrifices their own interests to meet others' needs. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 21. My leader would not compromise ethical principles in order to meet success. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 22. My leader can recognize when others are feeling down without asking them. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 23. My leader encourages others to volunteer in the community. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 24. My leader can solve work problems with new or creative ideas. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 25. If others need to make important decisions at work, they do not need to consult my leader. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 26. My leader wants to know about others' career goals. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 27. My leader does what they can to make others' jobs easier. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 28. My leader values honesty more than profits. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |

Part II

Instructions: Please select the answer that best describes you.

1. What is your current age?
 - c. Less than 20 years old
 - d. 20-39 years old
 - e. 40-59 years old

- f. More than 60 years old
- 2. Have you ever studied leadership before? If so, briefly explain in what capacity.
 - g. Yes
 - h. No

Briefly explain if you chose “yes” :

- 3. How long have you worked in your current field?
 - i. Less than 10 years
 - j. 10-19 years
 - k. 20-29 years
 - l. 30-39 years
 - m. More than 40 years
- 4. Is selfless service an essential part of being a Christian?
 - n. Yes
 - o. No

SOURCE. Liden, R.C., Wayne, S.J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: Development of multidimensional measure and multi-level system. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19(2), 161-177. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.01.006>

APPENDIX D

SOLICITATION TO LEADER

Howdy (insert name),

My name is David Coyle, and I am a master's student at Texas A&M University in the Department of Agricultural Leadership, Education, & Communications. I am currently conducting a study on leaders of Faith Based Organizations, and I was wondering if you would be willing to participate. Your participation would include taking a survey about your leadership behaviors. Additionally, you would identify two members of your organization who work under you and know you well to take a similar survey. My hope is the data collected from this study will inform how to best educate, train, and develop those who wish to lead and serve in Faith Based Organizations.

If you are interested in participating, please let me know, and I will promptly send you more detailed instructions. Please know that your participation is completely voluntary, and you may choose to decline at any time. If you have any questions, feel free to ask! My email is dpcoyale2021@tamu.edu.

Thank you so much for your time!

David Coyle | Graduate Assistant

Agricultural Leadership, Education & Communications | Texas A&M University

dpcoyale2021@tamu.edu

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY

APPENDIX E

SOLICITATION TO FOLLOWER

Howdy (Insert name),

My name is David Coyle, and I am a master's student at Texas A&M University in the Department of Agricultural Leadership, Education, & Communications. I am currently conducting a study on leaders of Faith Based Organizations, and I asked (insert leader's name) from your organization if they would be willing to participate. They agreed and informed me you were also willing to take a short survey. Thank you so much for your willingness and cooperation! Please know that your participation is completely voluntary, and you may choose to decline at any time.

Here is a link to a survey and consent form. It should not take longer than 15 minutes of your time.

(Insert link)

Again, thank you for your participation in this study! If you have any questions, feel free to email me at dpcoyale2021@tamu.edu.

Sincerely,

David Coyle | Graduate Assistant

Agricultural Leadership, Education & Communications | Texas A&M University

dpcoyale2021@tamu.edu

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY

APPENDIX F

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF INFORMED CONSENT - LEADER VERSION

INFORMED CONSENT

Title of Research Study: Servant Leadership and Faith-Based Organizations: Exploring Follower & Leader Perceptions

Investigator: David Coyle

Why am I being asked to take part in this research study?

You are invited to participate in this study because we are trying to learn more about the leadership behaviors of leaders in faith-based organizations.

You were selected as a possible participant in this study because you are a leader of a faith-based organization. You must be 18 years of age or older to participate.

Why is this research being done?

The survey is designed to evaluate your behaviors as a leader in terms of service.

How long will the research last?

It will take about 15-20 minutes to complete.

What happens if I say “Yes, I want to be in this research”?

If you decide to participate, please proceed to the next page of this survey and follow the included instructions.

What happens if I do not want to be in this research?

Your participation in this study is voluntary. You can decide not to participate in this research and it will not be held against you. You can leave the study at any time.

Is there any way being in this study could harm me?

There are no sensitive questions in this survey that should cause discomfort. However, you can skip any question you do not wish to answer, or exit the survey at any point.

What happens to the information collected for the research?

You may view the survey host’s confidentiality policy at: <https://www.qualtrics.com/privacy-statement/>

Your name and email address will be stored separately from your survey data, and is only being collected for the researcher, should they need to contact you. All identifiable information will be

kept on a password protected computer and is only accessible by the research team. Compliance offices at Texas A&M may be given access to the study files upon request.

Your information will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by law. The results of the research study may be published but your identity will remain confidential.

Who can I talk to?

Please feel free to ask questions regarding this study. You may contact me later if you have additional questions or concerns at dpcoyle2021@tamu.edu.

You may also contact the Human Research Protection Program at Texas A&M University (which is a group of people who review the research to protect your rights) by phone at 1-979-458-4067, toll free at 1-855-795-8636, or by email at irb@tamu.edu for:

- additional help with any questions about the research
- voicing concerns or complaints about the research
- obtaining answers to questions about your rights as a research participant
- concerns in the event the research staff could not be reached
- the desire to talk to someone other than the research staff

If you want a copy of this consent for your records, you can print it from the screen.

Ø If you wish to participate, please click the **“I Agree”** button and you will be taken to the survey.

Ø If you do not wish to participate in this study, please select **“I Disagree”** or select **X** in the corner of your browser

APPENDIX G

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF INFORMED CONSENT - FOLLOWER VERSION

INFORMED CONSENT

Title of Research Study: Servant Leadership and Faith-Based Organizations: Exploring Follower & Leader Perceptions

Investigator: David Coyle

Why am I being asked to take part in this research study?

You are invited to participate in this study because we are trying to learn more about the leadership behaviors of leaders in faith-based organizations.

You were selected as a possible participant in this study because the leader of your organization identified you as someone who knows them well and can describe their leadership tendencies accurately. You must be 18 years of age or older to participate.

Why is this research being done?

The survey is designed to evaluate the behaviors of your leader in terms of service.

How long will the research last?

It will take about 15-20 minutes to complete.

What happens if I say “Yes, I want to be in this research”?

If you decide to participate, please proceed to the next page of this survey and follow the included instructions.

What happens if I do not want to be in this research?

Your participation in this study is voluntary. You can decide not to participate in this research and it will not be held against you. You can leave the study at any time.

Is there any way being in this study could harm me?

There are no sensitive questions in this survey that should cause discomfort. However, you can skip any question you do not wish to answer, or exit the survey at any point.

What happens to the information collected for the research?

You may view the survey host’s confidentiality policy at: <https://www.qualtrics.com/privacy-statement/>

Your name and email address will be stored separately from your survey data, and is only being collected for the researcher, should they need to contact you. All identifiable information will be kept on a password protected computer and is only accessible by the research team. Compliance offices at Texas A&M may be given access to the study files upon request.

Your information will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by law. The results of the research study may be published but your identity will remain confidential.

Who can I talk to?

Please feel free to ask questions regarding this study. You may contact me later if you have additional questions or concerns at dpcoyale2021@tamu.edu.

You may also contact the Human Research Protection Program at Texas A&M University (which is a group of people who review the research to protect your rights) by phone at 1-979-458-4067, toll free at 1-855-795-8636, or by email at irb@tamu.edu for:

- additional help with any questions about the research
- voicing concerns or complaints about the research
- obtaining answers to questions about your rights as a research participant
- concerns in the event the research staff could not be reached
- the desire to talk to someone other than the research staff

If you want a copy of this consent for your records, you can print it from the screen.

Ø If you wish to participate, please click the **“I Agree”** button and you will be taken to the survey.

Ø If you do not wish to participate in this study, please select **“I Disagree”** or select **X** in the corner of your browser