

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SERVANT LEADERSHIP
AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

A Dissertation
Presented to
The Faculty of
Tennessee Temple University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for The Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

By
Woody D. Rimes

April 2011

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SERVANT LEADERSHIP
AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

By

Woody D. Rimes

APPROVED:

COMMITTEE CHAIR: Andrew T. Alexson, Ed.D.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Lori Robertson, Ed.D.

Cary Kimbrell, Ph.D.

DIRECTOR OF PH.D. IN LEADERSHIP PROGRAM:

Andrew T. Alexson, Ed.D.

Copyright 2011
Woody D. Rimes
All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

The results of this study revealed the relationship between the pastor's servant leadership and the staff member's organizational commitment to the church. Data collected was from 37 Southern Baptist churches in the state of Mississippi with a resident membership of 500 or more. Ninety-one participated in the study.

Using the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006), the Three-Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey (Meyer & Allen, 2004), and a demographic survey, the data was collected. Full-time ministerial staff members and administrative assistants participated, rating the servant leadership style of their pastor in addition to providing their organizational commitment. Evidence supported the reliability and validity of both servant leadership and organizational commitment models and the associated instruments.

This study found a statistically significant correlation between the pastor's servant leadership style of leadership and the staff's affective and normative organizational commitment. No statistical significant correlation existed between the pastor's servant leadership style of leadership and the staff's continuance commitment to the organization. Statistical data and implications for the findings were included.

This research presented information that can be used in future studies relating to leadership behavior, as outlined in servant leadership theories and its effect on subordinates in organizations.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to Julie,
who is my beautiful wife,
who is my best friend,
who has encouraged time and time again,
who has prayed for me,
who has stood beside me,
who has been longsuffering with me,
who loves God,
who is a great mother to our children,
who is a wonderful “Lalie” to our grandchildren,
who is a shining light for our Great God.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I would like to thank my chair, Dr. Andrew T. Alexson, for making this such a meaningful process for me. His guidance and encouragement has been invaluable. His time spent coaching me and helping me to formulate the ideas has been priceless. He has offered a critical and keen insight, which has helped in the success of this research project. I would also like to thank Dr. Jerry Hall for the initial motivation and encouragement to start the journey at Tennessee Temple University. I am also very thankful for Dr. Lori Robertson and Dr. Cary Kimbrell for their encouragement and their participation on my committee.

I am grateful to my family for their prayers, understanding, and encouragement during the years of my education. Most of all, I give thanks to my wife, Julie, who has sacrificed the most for me during these recent years of doctoral study.

Ultimately, I give thanks to my Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ. He has been my Strength, Hope, and He is my Redeemer. It is my prayer that this work will bring glory to His Holy name.

Table of Contents

Signatory.....	ii
Abstract.....	iv
Dedication.....	v
Acknowledgements.....	vi
Table of Contents.....	vii
Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study.....	1
Background of the Study	1
Statement of the Problem.....	3
Research Questions.....	4
Significance of the Study	4
Overview of Methodology	5
Definitions.....	6
Organization of Study.....	8
Chapter 2: Review of Literature	9
Leadership.....	9
Types of Leadership.....	12
<i>Trait Approach</i>	12
<i>Style Approach</i>	12
<i>Contingency Theory</i>	14

<i>Situational Approach</i>	15
<i>Path Goal Theory</i>	16
<i>Leader Member Exchange Theory</i>	17
<i>Transactional Leadership Theory</i>	18
<i>Transformational Leadership</i>	18
<i>Servant Leadership</i>	19
Areas of Servant Leadership.....	28
<i>Business</i>	28
<i>Education</i>	29
<i>Christian Ministry</i>	29
Pastor.....	30
Organizational Commitment.....	31
Summary of Literature	38
Chapter 3: Methodology	40
Research Perspective	42
Ethical Consideration.....	43
The Research Participants.....	43
Instruments Used in Data Collection	44
<i>Servant Leadership</i>	44
<i>Organizational Commitment</i>	46

Procedures Used	49
Data Collection	53
Data Analysis	53
Summary of the Methodology	54
Chapter 4: Report of the Findings.....	55
Introduction.....	55
Demographics of Survey Study Participants	55
<i>Gender</i>	56
<i>Age</i>	57
<i>Marital Status</i>	57
<i>Education</i>	58
<i>Tenure with Present Church</i>	59
<i>Position with Present Church</i>	59
Reliability.....	60
<i>Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Scores for SLQ Survey</i>	60
<i>Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Scores for TCM Employee Commitment Survey</i>	62
Descriptive Statistics.....	64
Results of the Correlation Analysis	67
<i>Research Question 1</i>	68
<i>Research Question 2</i>	69

<i>Research Question 3</i>	70
Summary	70
Chapter 5 – Summary, Recommendations and Conclusion.....	72
Purpose.....	72
Implication of the Findings.....	75
<i>Research Findings 1</i>	75
<i>Research Findings 2</i>	76
<i>Research Findings 3</i>	78
Limitations	82
Recommendations for Future Research	83
Conclusion	83
REFERENCES	86
Appendices.....	102
Appendix A.....	102
Appendix B	103
Appendix C	104
Appendix D.....	105
Appendix E	106
Appendix F.....	107
Appendix G.....	108

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

In this chapter, the researcher discussed the correlation between the servant leadership of the pastor and organizational commitment of the staff. A statement of the problem, the research questions and the hypotheses were presented. The researcher also included in the significance of the study, overview of methodology, definitions and the further organization of the study in this chapter.

Background of the Study

Today's world is more turbulent, chaotic, and challenging than ever before (Kanter, 1995). Organizational changes were becoming increasingly a major component of everyday organizational life. The basic principles of ministry were changing fundamentally. One major challenge for the environment was a shortage of skilled, competent, and committed employees. The competitive edge of companies no longer relied on its product, but in its people (Ulrich, 2002). People were the lifeblood of organizations, and they represented the most potent and valuable resources of organizations (Gunnigle, Heraty & Morley, 1971).

The days when leaders controlled, dominated, and manipulated organizations at their pleasure are over (Block, 1993). Bhindi and Duigna (1997) noted that leadership was being redefined. The new leadership focused more on service and stewardship rather than remaining a system of controls and procedures. Sauter (1996) defined healthy workplaces as any organization that "maximizes the integration of worker goals for well-being and company objectives for profitability and productivity". According to this definition, components for a healthy organization included both the organization and the individuals

within the organization. Ulrich (2000) referred to people as intangible resources, which were difficult to imitate. Therefore, the commitment of competent employees was critical to the success of the organization.

The church was one organization that consisted of leaders and employees. In the church's organizational life, God called the pastor to preach and to minister to His people. God bestowed a great honor on a man when He called him to be a pastor (Cothen, 1981). The pastor's call was for the advancement of the kingdom of God. The pastor had the responsibility to lead, not only the church, but also the ministerial staff. It was important for the pastor to understand his impact on other staff members.

While the pastor's role had changed in the church, ministerial staff came to realize the importance of their role of ministering to people in the church. For staff members to minister to the church members, they needed to build relationships with those inside the church. Staff members needed to be willing to be committed to the church they were serving if they desired to build relationships. Effective staff members must be committed to the purpose, vision, and values of the church they are serving (McIntosh, 2000).

It was important for the pastor to have a healthy relationship with his staff members. Some of the greatest challenges faced by a pastor were not with the congregation, but rather with the staff. Conflicts between pastors and staff had the potential to disrupt the overall vision and ministry of the church. Due to their position, pastors were parties to every major church conflict, and paid church staff was frequently involved, as well (Halverstadt, 1991). Pastors should spend time nurturing and leading staff members. In most situations, when the pastor intentionally nurtured the staff, the development of a strong staff would take place (McIntosh, 2000).

Statement of the Problem

Effective leadership was important in the world, in the United States, and in Mississippi. Effective leadership was important in the life of the church. The person who was in a leadership position had the potential to affect positively or negatively the people who worked for him. Various styles and theories of leadership existed. There was not a single universally approved leadership concept that suggested a unique source of leadership success (Walker & Scharf, 2001). While leadership success may have been proposed for many reasons, the desire for leadership should have been to provide an environment to enhance staff growth. A leadership style that was effective, ethical, supportive, and responsible was possible when such an environment existed (Sergiovanni, 1993). The staff of an organization was important to the welfare of the organization. When staff members were not satisfied in their job, their performance, attitudes, staff relations, and commitment to the organization had the potential to suffer.

Writers and researchers frequently addressed the topic of effective leadership in organizations. Leadership was an action performed among and with people. Barna (1997) stated that the American church is dying, due to a lack of strong leadership, and that the church was actually losing influence. When employees were dissatisfied at work, they would be less committed and would become emotionally or mentally withdrawn from the organization (Shirbagi, 2007).

One of the leading forecasters for turnover and intent to leave a job had been organizational commitment. Employees who were more committed to their organizations had less desire to leave than those who had a lesser organizational commitment (Griffeth & Hom, 1995; Igharia & Greenhaus, 1992).

The researcher's purpose for this study was to determine if any relationship existed between servant leadership and organizational commitment.

Research Questions

1. Does the pastor's servant leadership style of leadership have an effect on staff affective commitment to the organization?
2. Does the pastor's servant leadership style of leadership have an effect on staff continuance commitment to the organization?
3. Does the pastor's servant leadership style of leadership have an effect on staff normative commitment to the organization?

Significance of the Study

The researcher noted that this study was significant because it provides additional knowledge relating to the servant leadership style of the pastor and staff organizational commitment. There have been several studies that looked at the relationship between leadership and staff organizational commitment. Nyengane (2007), Drury (2004), and Laka-Mathebula (2004) have done such studies. Pastors, staff, and congregations should not lose sight of the importance of servant leadership. In this study, the researcher focused on the servant leadership of pastors and staff organizational commitment.

In the 21st century, apart from professional skills such as a high level of knowledge and expertise in management, and focus on the organization's purpose, leaders need to know how to care for people and set personal examples for followers (Sharpe, 1995). The servant leader was a servant first, rather than a leader first. The servant leader had the responsibility to be the seeker of the needs, the wants, and the wishes of others who would be served (Greenleaf, 1977).

In this study, the researcher focused on Southern Baptist churches in the state of Mississippi with a resident membership of more than 500 members. Since the pastor's style of leadership can have an impact on the church staff (Barna, 2001), this study could lead to the strengthening of pastor-staff relationships. At the present time, there was a growing awareness of staff and church conflict. This researcher hopes that this study could be helpful by revealing the effect the pastor's leadership style has on the staff's commitment to the organization.

In this study the researcher examined the effects of pastoral leadership, as determined by Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ), (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006), on staff organizational commitment, assessed by the Three-Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey (Allen & Meyer, 2004). The researcher used a demographic survey to obtain specific information from each participant. The information obtained in the survey was the participant's gender, age range, marital status, highest level of education, length of time each participant worked for present employer, and the participant's current position, whether ministerial staff or administrative assistant. The researcher used the two surveys previously mentioned to determine the relationship between servant leadership of the pastor and organizational commitment of the staff.

Overview of Methodology

The researcher used a correlation research design in the attempt to address the problem of this study and to answer the research questions. To determine the variables of this study, the researcher used the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ), the Three-Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey, and a demographic survey. The researcher sent one survey to each participant, consisting of the Servant Leadership

Questionnaire, the Three-Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey, and the demographic survey (Appendix G).

Southern Baptist Churches in Mississippi with over 500 resident members received the survey. The researcher used the Servant Leader Questionnaire (SLQ) to determine the quantified strengths in the pastor's leadership and the Three-Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey to determine a quantified representation of staff commitment to the organization. Only the ministerial staff and administrative assistants completed the survey.

Definitions

Leadership - Leadership referred to the process through which leaders and followers engaged to produce change. Leadership was an intentional change process through which both leaders and followers, joined by a shared purpose, initiate action to pursue a common vision (Laub, 2004).

Servant leadership - Servant leadership, first identified by Greenleaf (1970), focused on the premise that a successful leader must be willing to serve the interests and needs of his or her followers, while assisting the development of these followers to become leaders. The results of the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) defined the pastor's leadership. The Servant Leadership Questionnaire measured leadership characteristics of altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006). According to Reinke (2004), the servant leader was the one who held the organization in trust to the public it served, while remaining intimately aware of the needs and situations of those who worked within the organization.

The servant leader was one who was sincerely committed to empowering others to succeed professionally and personally.

Organizational Commitment – The definition of organizational commitment was a staff member's commitment to an organization according to the TCM Employee Commitment Survey (Allen & Meyer, 2004). According to Allen and Meyer (2004), the TCM Employee Commitment Survey measured affective commitment, normative commitment, and continuance commitment. Affective commitment referred to the employee's emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization and its goals. Continuance commitment was the willingness of the employee to remain in the organization because of the investment that the employee had with "nontransferable" investments. A description of nontransferable investments was one's retirement, relationship with other employees, or things that were unique to the organization (Reichers, 1985). The commitment or obligation a person believed they had to the organization gave basis for normative commitment (Bolon, 1997). The employee's commitment to marriage, family, religion, and employment organizations was a result of the employee's loyalty and devotion (Weiner, 1982).

Ministerial Staff - Staff members were full-time employees of the church, financially compensated by the church, and served along the pastor to accomplish the various ministries of the church.

Administrative Assistants - Administrative assistants were full-time employees of the church and were financially compensated by the church. Administrative Assistants supported the pastor and the ministerial staff. Secretary, receptionist, or office manager were synonyms for administrative assistants.

Organization of Study

The researcher included five chapters in this dissertation. In this chapter, the researcher introduced the background of the research, stated the problem, presented the research questions to investigate and the significance of the research, as well as provided an overview of methodology and definitions. In chapter 2, he provided a detailed review of literature on the definition of leadership, types of leadership, servant leadership, pastor, and organizational commitment. In chapter 2, he also gave a summary of the literature review.

In chapter 3, the researcher included the methodology employed in the investigation of the relationship between servant leadership of the pastor and organizational commitment of the staff, the research questions, the hypotheses, the perspective and a review of the participants in the research. An overview of the surveys used in the research, the procedures used in the research, and a summary, were also in chapter 3.

In chapter 4, the researcher presented the demographic results of the research participant's, the reliability of the surveys that were used, descriptive statistics, results of the correlation analysis, results for each hypothesis, and a summary.

In chapter 5, the researcher reviewed the purpose of the research, presented the results and discussed the implications of the findings, presented the limitations, recommendations for future research, and provided a conclusion.

Chapter 2: Review of Literature

Leadership

“Leadership is inhabited with purpose, opportunities, and relationships” (McCaslin, 2001). Research of the past offered the foundation for the works on leadership that exist today. Leadership was often regarded as the most critical factor in the success or failure of organizations, in the business and industrial sector and in the military arena (Bass, 1990).

Leadership was often difficult to define and evaluate. Leaders have a multitude of roles they fill and many duties that they perform each day. Effective leaders consisted of a myriad of traits and behaviors. While effective leaders did exist, most professionals could not lead, and they did not want to follow (Fisher, 1999).

Bass (1990) noted that there are almost as many different definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the leadership concept. Through the process of academic analysis, over 350 definitions of leadership have been discovered (Bennis & Nanus, 1985). Leadership was a process of persuasion or example through which an individual or team induces others to pursue the objectives of the leader and his followers (Gardner, 1990). Sanders (2007) concluded that leadership was influence, the ability of a person to influence others. True leadership derived authority from a righteous example, not merely from prestige, personality, or position. Leadership was not so much about style, but rather character (MacArthur, 2004). Gerber, Nel, and Van Dyk (1996) defined leadership as an interpersonal process that a leader used to direct the activities of individuals or groups towards given objectives within a certain situation through the

process of communication. Bennis and Goldsmith (1994) defined leadership through the eyes of what a leader does. Their definition consisted of integrity, competence, ability to interpret reality, explain the present, and paint a picture of the future.

Leadership had a distinctiveness surrounding its nature. As a higher order value, leadership set itself apart from human nature by being unchanging, incorruptible and unyielding in principle, while inspiring hope, creativity, and empowerment to unmet human potential (McCaslin, 2001). Leadership was a process in which an individual influenced a group of individuals in order to achieve a common goal. As a process, leadership occurred between the leader and the follower. Leadership involved influence, occurred in groups, and gave attention to goals (Northouse, 2007).

While trying to define leadership, it was important to distinguish between a person's short-term and long-term self-interest; actions that promoted the group also served an individual's long-term welfare. According to Hogan, Curphy, and Hogan (1994), leadership involved persuading other people to set aside for a period of time their individual concerns to pursue the common goals that were important for the responsibilities and welfare of the group. Hogan, Curphy and Hogan (1994) also noted that leadership was persuasion, not domination. People who can require others to do their bidding because of their power were not leaders. Leaders have others following them willingly while the leader adopted the goals of a group as their own goals. According to Janda (1960), when leadership came to depend on relevance within a group, members of the group led as well as followed.

Leadership had a perceived influence in organizations and was an essential component of powerful organizational cultures (Kotter & Heskett, 1992). In institutions,

corporations, and churches, there was a need to develop leaders to meet the current needs, some of which had undergone much change (Leonard, 2003). Leonard (2003) reported that before the mid 1950's, leader characteristics were identified as capacity, achievement, responsibility, participation, and status. However, due to the rapid change of the global economy from an industrial and manufacturing base to a postindustrial and information base, an examination of the models for leadership and leadership development was in order.

Barna believed the American church was dying due to a lack of strong leadership. Rather than the church gaining influence, the church was losing influence, and the primary reason was lack of leadership (Barna, 1997).

Yukl, Gordon, and Taber (2002) commented that a large amount of the empirical research on effective leadership had attempted to identify behavioral types that enhance individual and collective performance. However, due to a lack of agreement on defining relevant and meaningful leadership behavior, a hierarchical taxonomy had emerged to help solve the problem. The taxonomy contained three metacategories: task, relations, and change behavior. Kotter (1988) concluded that leadership produced movement in the long-term best interest of the group. Leadership was an important aspect in any organization. This is because everyday millions of individuals interact with their boss, manager, or supervisor in various capacities, and they will either prosper or fall (Crabtree, 2004).

Types of Leadership

Trait Approach

Bass (1990), Yukl (2002), and Northouse (2007) traced and studied leadership theories. One approach to leadership was the trait approach. In the 1920's, researchers investigated whether leaders had specific traits or characteristics that defined them as leaders. The characteristics identified were intelligence, height, or energy. Such characteristics would distinguish leaders from non-leaders and would contribute to their success (Daft, 2005).

Northouse (2007) listed intelligence, self-confidence, determination, integrity, and sociability as major leadership traits. Some theorists have tried to associate the trait theory with the "big five" model of personality which are neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness (Barrick & Mount, 1991).

The trait approach implied that leadership training would only be beneficial for those who already possessed the desired leadership characteristics (Hersey, Blanchard & Johnson, 1996). While the trait approach was intuitively appealing with a century of research to back it up, trait approach had failed to consider various leadership situations. (Northouse, 2007).

Style Approach

The style approach was different from the trait approach. The style approach emphasized the behavior of the leader (Fleishman & Hunt, 1973). Researchers determined that leadership was composed of two types of behaviors: task and relationship behaviors. The style approach focused on how leaders combined the two types of behaviors. Task behaviors focused on accomplishing goals, while relationship behaviors

focused on the subordinates' feeling of comfort with themselves, with others, and with their situation. The Ohio State and the University of Michigan (Stogdill, 1973) investigated the style approach.

The researchers at Ohio State placed the description of the leader's behavior into general types: initiating structure and consideration (Stogdill, 1973). Initiating structure referred to the leader's behavior. Consideration of the leader referred to the type of leader behavior that described the extent to which a leader was sensitive to subordinates, the leader respected the ideas and feelings of subordinates, and where mutual trust was established (Daft, 1994). Researchers at Ohio State formulated The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) to measure leadership behavior (Hemphill & Coons, 1957).

Researchers who conducted the study at the University of Michigan identified two types of leadership behaviors: employee orientation and production orientation (Northouse, 2007). Employee orientation of the leader focused on the leaders emphasizing the relational aspect of the job. Production orientation of the leader focused on the leader's emphasis on production and technical components (Hersey & Blanchard, 1996).

Blake, Shepherd, and Mouton (1964) developed the Managerial Grid, based on the studies of Ohio State and Michigan. Their model plotted leadership behaviors against two factors on a grid: (1) concern for people and (2) concern for productivity. Blake and Mouton (1964) gave insight to the managerial grid. The concern for the people referred to how the leader managed the people within the organization. The purpose was to build commitment to the organization, trust, promote personal worth of the employee while

maintaining good relations. The concern for productivity focused on the leaders concern with achieving the tasks of the organization. The leader's focus was on policy decisions, product development, product issues, workload, and anything else that the organization had to accomplish to be productive.

The Managerial Grid provided for five different styles of leadership, depending upon the mix of attention to people and productivity: (1) Authority-Obedience Management (2) "Country Club" Management (3) Impoverished Management (4) "Organization Man" Management and (5) Team Management.

Rather than being a refined theory with a neatly organized set of prescriptions, the style approach provided a two-fold, task and relationship, framework for studying leadership behavior. The style approach reminded the leaders that their actions toward others occurred on two different levels: task and relationship (Northouse, 2007).

Contingency Theory

The contingency theory was a leader match theory that explained the match of leaders to situations that were appropriate. Effective leadership was contingent on matching a leader's style to the right setting (Fiedler, 1978). Gerber (1996) concluded that no single leadership style, function, or quality was recommended as the best under all circumstances. Fiedler (1964) developed this theory by studying the styles of leaders who worked in different contexts.

Fiedler's (1964) contingency model of leadership used the leader's LPC (Least Preferred Coworker instrument) score in comparison to three situational variables: (1) leader-member relations, (2) task structure and (3) position power. The authors of the contingency theory suggested that a leader is most effective (low LPC score) when the

three situational variables are present and strong – good leader-member relations, highly structured tasks, and strong position power.

Northouse (2007) noted that the contingency model of leadership was supported by a great deal of empirical research, acknowledges the impact of situations on leaders, was predictive, did not require that people be effective in all situations, and it also provided data on leader's styles that could be useful in the leadership profile development.

The Least Preferred Coworker instrument (LPC) assessed the fit between leader-follower, measuring 16 attributes that reflect the respondent's feelings about another person with whom they work least effectively (Bass, 1990). Bass (1990) also noted that leaders who score high on the scale are relationship motivated and those who score low are task motivated.

Situational Approach

Hersey and Blanchard (1969) developed the situational approach from earlier empirical research. Leaders who were able to adapt their behavior to meet the demands of their unique situation will be successful leaders (Schermerhorn, 1997). Situational leadership focused on task behavior, guidance and direction of the leader, relationship behavior, socioemotional support of the leader, and the readiness of the follower (Northouse, 2007). Northouse also noted that situational leadership consisted of a supportive and directive behavior pattern. The directive behaviors were characterized by the leaders giving guidance, providing goals, and offering methods of evaluation. Northouse (2007) noted that directive behavior uses one-way communication. Supportive behavior was accomplished with two-way communication, giving support, sharing with one another, and offering help to solve problems.

The following categories represented situational leadership: (1) Directing, (2) Coaching, (3) Supporting and (4) Delegating. As the supervisor-subordinate relationship evolved and as the performer's competence and capabilities develop, the leader needed to shift upward through each of the four styles in order to continue to provide the performer with what he or she needed to perform well (Northouse, 2001).

Vroom and Yetton (1973) provided a leadership model that diagnosed when a leader should be directive and when a leader should be participative. The Vroom and Yetton model offered a continuum of six different levels of decision-making that are dependent upon the situation. Vroom and Jago (1974) later added delegation, thus empowering the leader to appoint the subordinate or group of subordinates to accomplish whatever the leader needed accomplished. Vroom and Jago (1974) concluded that leaders should only be directive when they are convinced that subordinates knew their responsibilities.

Path Goal Theory

The Path Goal theory focused on the leader's influences on the subordinate's perception of work, personal goals and paths to attain the goals (House & Mitchell, 1974). The path-goal theory concerned relationships between formally appointed superiors and subordinates in their daily responsibilities. Path Goal theory was a dyadic theory because it focused on subordinates rather than groups or work units (House, 1996). The leader clarified for the followers the paths or behaviors that were best for the situation. The leader was expected to motivate the followers so that the followers would increase in their effectiveness and job satisfaction (House, 1994).

The developers of the Path Goal theory examined four leadership styles: (1) directive (2) supportive (3) participative and (4) achievement oriented (House & Mitchell, 1974, p

24). The choice of the leadership style depended on the task and the individual (House, 1994). Path Goal theory was a contingency approach to leadership because effectiveness depended on the fit between a leader's behavior and the characteristics of the subordinates (House, 1996). While being theoretically complex, providing theories of how leadership styles and subordinate characteristics interact with one another, the Path Goal theory was also pragmatic giving directions to leaders to help subordinates to satisfactorily accomplish their work (Northouse, 2007).

Leader Member Exchange Theory

Most leadership theories and approaches in this section emphasized leadership from the situation or view of the leader, the follower, and the context. Leader Member Exchange Theory (LMX) focused on the interactions between leaders and followers (Northouse, 2007). LMX examined the quality of the relation between the leader and each individual member (Bass, 2000). The first description of the LMX theory was in the works of Dansereau, Graen, and Haga (1975). They focused on the way leaders differed from their subordinates by creating in-groups and out-groups. The in-group consisted of subordinates who got along with the leader and were willing to expand their roles and responsibilities (Danserea, Graen & Hagar, 1975). The in-group members received special opportunities and rewards while out-group members received standard benefits. The in-group members had high characteristics of mutual trust, respect, and obligation (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Bass (2000) contended that the LMX stood up well in 25 years of empirical testing.

Transactional Leadership Theory

According to research, many leaders have turned to a transactional leadership theory, one of the most established methods of leadership (Stone & Patterson, 2005). Bass (1985a) described transactional leadership as the use of contingent rewards and management by exception. Contingent reward was the reward the leader gave to the subordinate once the agreed upon goals had been reached. Bass (1985a) argued that by providing contingent rewards, the leader might inspire the subordinate to attain a certain degree of involvement, loyalty, and commitment. Bass (1985a) also contended that transactional leadership used satisfaction of lower order needs as a primary means of motivation.

Transactional leadership tended to lend itself to short-lived relationships, since the gratification of those relationships was usually marginal and superficial (Fairholm, 1991). The transactional leader engaged in actions that may or may not have been beneficial to the subordinate (Bass, 1990). The purpose for any leader's action was benefiting to the leader (Fairholm, 1991). Transactional leadership failed to consider the whole situation. It failed to take into account the employee or the future of the organization when offering rewards (Crosby, 1996).

Transformational Leadership

Burns' (1978) concept of transforming leadership defined a new paradigm that took leadership research in a new direction. Being a political scientist and historian, Burns did not come from the traditional academic disciplines studying leadership. Burns (1978) contrasted a transactional model of leadership – in which the leader exchanged with a follower a reward for a behavior – with the notion of transforming leadership. Burns

(1978) presented transformational leadership as the manner in which leaders and followers engaged with one another to transcend individual goals and build a shared commitment to larger objectives.

Transformational leadership involved an exceptional form of influence from the leader who moved the follower to accomplish more than was expected of him (Northouse, 2007). Transformational leadership differed substantially from transactional leadership, focusing more on progress and development. Transformational leadership enhanced the effects of transactional leadership on followers (Bass, 1985b, 1990). Transformational leaders were good role models. They were able to create and articulate a clear and concise vision for the organization, empower followers, act in ways that make others want to trust them, and give meaning to organizational life (Bass & Avolio, 1990). Transformational leaders encouraged problem solving in followers rather than consistently providing solutions and directions (Buhler, 1995). Jesus provided a wonderful example of transformational leadership while he employed different leadership styles needed for the disciples' direction and support (Blanchard & Hodges, 2003).

Servant Leadership

Servant leadership seemed to cut across leadership theories while providing a foundational philosophy for those theories that emphasize principles relating to human growth. Servant leadership focused on the character of the individual (McFarland, Senn, & Childress, 1993). According to Laub (2004), servant leadership was not a style of leadership. Rather, it was a paradigm that reshaped our understanding and practice of leadership. Servant leadership held to the premise that only if the general health and development of individuals was initially facilitated, then the goals of the organization

would be achieved long-term (Stone & Patterson, 2005). Laub (2004) summarized the servant leadership and servant leader concept into a servant organizational model.

According to Laub (2004), servant leadership was an understanding and practice of leadership that placed the good of those led over the interest of the leader. Servant leadership promoted the valuing and development of people, the building of community, the practice of authenticity, the providing of leadership for those being led, and the sharing of power and status for the good of everyone (Smith, Montagno, & Kuzmenko, 2004).

The servant leadership model was based on the idea of the servant as the leader (Greenleaf, 1977). According to Spears (1995), Greenleaf coined the term servant leadership after reading *Journey to the East* (Hesse, 1971). Leo, a humble servant, embarked on a mystical journey, and a group of men accompanied him. All went well until Leo disappeared. This created confusion and aimlessness. Lacking the leadership of their servant, the journey had to be abandoned (Sims, 2005). The wayfarers later discovered that Leo was not their servant, but Head of the great Noble Order of a distinguished monastic community. The image of Leo as the servant and leader transformed Greenleaf's understanding of leadership. He determined that a true leader was willing to be a servant to others, and that this aspiration to serve made a leader great.

Greenleaf (1977) noted that the servant-leader was a servant first. The servant-leader was sharply different from the leader-first person. The servant-leader enriched others by his presence, while understanding that the only authority that he possesses is that which is granted by those being led. Servant leadership viewed a leader as a servant of his followers. Servant leadership placed the interest of those being led before the interest of

the leader, emphasized personal development and empowerment of followers (Greenleaf, 1977). Greenleaf (1977) also noted, "The best test (of a servant-leader) and difficult to administer, was: do those served grow as persons? Do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants? Furthermore, what is the effect on the least privileged in society? Will he benefit, or, at least, will he not be further deprived (p. 27)?"

Greenleaf (1977) suggested a *primus inter pares*, first-among-equals approach to leadership. With servant leadership, a leader existed, but the leader was not the chief. Greenleaf characterized a great leader as a servant first. By definition, servants were fully human. Servant-leaders were functionally superior because they were able to hear things, see things, know things, and they had an intuitive insight that was exceptional (p. 56).

Servant leadership approach had many positive qualities. Servant leadership emphasized the following characteristics (Greenleaf, 1977; Spears, 1994; Spears & Lawrence, 2004):

1. Leaders have the attitude of a humble and selfless servant
2. Leaders focus on retention and development of employees
3. Leaders are responsible for creating a safe and positive work environment that fosters innovation and enhances intrinsic motivation
4. Leaders humanize the workplace when they treat subordinates as human beings, worthy of unconditional dignity and respect
5. Leaders earn trust when they place the legitimate needs of their followers above self-interests

6. Leaders earn respect when they place benefits to workers and society above the bottom line
7. Leaders listen to their employees with open-mindedness
8. Leaders develop and maintain good relationships through empathy, kindness, healing and emotional intelligence
9. Leaders gain support and cooperation by valuing team building and involving others in decision-making
10. Leaders seek to achieve organizational goals by developing and unleashing the creative potential of human resources.

Servant leadership did not recently become a style of leadership to be used by leaders. Jesus Christ taught and embraced the attributes of servant leadership (Sendjaya & Sarros, 2002). Servant leadership had been an influential leadership model because Jesus Christ practiced servant leadership. According to the gospels, servant leadership was the type of leadership Jesus practiced throughout His ministry. It was the leadership model that helped to equip and free others to fulfill the purposes of God in the world (Rinehart, 1998). Jesus took on the nature of a servant to redeem and minister to us,

Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God:
But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant,
and was made in the likeness of men: And being found in fashion as a man, he
humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.
(Philippians 2: 6-8 King James Version).

Jesus also taught his disciples how to be a servant leader,

But, so shall it not be among you: but whosoever will be great among you, shall be

your minister: And whosoever of you will be the chiefest, shall be servant of all. For even the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many (Mark 10: 43-45).

Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he was come from God, and went to God; He riseth from supper, and laid aside his garments; and took a towel, and girded himself. After that he poureth water into a bason, and began to wash the disciples' feet, and to wipe them with the towel wherewith he was girded; So after he had washed their feet, and had taken his garments, and was set down again, he said unto them, Know ye what I have done to you? Ye call me Master and Lord: and ye say well; for so I am. If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you. (John 13: 3-5, 12-15).

Russell (1999) provided a comprehensive textual support of servant leadership from a Judeo-Christian perspective. Attempts to link servant leadership to a religious tradition have met resistance in a pluralistic society, assuming there will be a separation between religion and public life (Wallace, 2007). Servant-leaders were not pushovers, for they could and would dismiss workers whose performance and attitude negatively affected others (Kahl & Donelan, 2004).

Laub (2004) noted that servant leadership required a mind shift, a paradigm change that viewed the leader and the followers different from other competing mindsets of leadership. Servant leadership required a different focus on followers. Northouse noted that the servant-leader had a social responsibility to be concerned with the have-not's, recognizing them as equal stakeholders in the organization (Northouse, 2007). The

primary purpose of the servant-leader was to serve others by investing in their development for the benefit of accomplishing tasks and goals for the common good (Page & Wong, 2000). When those being led were the key concern, the leader's desire, organizational interests, and customers were in another category. While acknowledging their power, servant leaders chose to use it to serve the best interests of followers.

Servant leadership was a profound and difficult type of leadership. Servant leadership required a change of attitude and inner transformation, not a set of skills (Wong & Davey, 2007). Principles, values, and beliefs that the leader held were motivating forces of the servant-leader (Greenleaf, 1977).

Since Greenleaf's (1977) initial introduction of servant leadership, several authors have attempted to define and redefine the attributes of servant leadership. Graham (1991) described servant leadership as the most moral form of charismatic leadership and stressed the inspirational and moral dimensions. He noted that servant leadership contained elements of humility, relational power, autonomy, moral development of followers, and emulation of the leader's orientation toward service. Buchen (1998) identified self-identity, capacity for reciprocity, relationship building, and preoccupation with the future as servant leadership themes. Spears (1998) emphasized the elements of listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualism, foresight, stewardship, commitment, and community building. According to Northouse (2007), servant leadership valued everyone's involvement in the community life because it was there that one fully experienced respect, trust, and individual strength.

Farling, Stone, and Winston (1999) recommended a model of five factors for servant-leaders composed of vision, influence, credibility, trust, and service. Russell (1999)

included vision, credibility, trust, service, modeling, pioneering, appreciating others, and empowerment as elements of servant leadership. Bennett (2001) believed that Greenleaf's servant leadership model and Spears' ten servant leadership characteristics could inspire trainers in their profession. Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) presented eleven dimensions, adding calling to Spears' model. Russell and Stone (2002) indicated nine functional attributes of servant leadership which include vision, honesty, integrity, trust, service, modeling, pioneering, appreciation of others, and empowerment. They also identified eleven accompanied attributes, which include communication, credibility, competence, stewardship, visibility, influence, persuasion, listening, encouragement, teaching, and delegation.

Wong and Page (2003) described the servant-leader's characteristics by elements of integrity, humility, and servanthood. Page and Wong concluded that servant leadership covered the areas of servanthood (the leader that develops the people), and leadership (building the organization by effectively using people as resources). Their model was the "ring model of servant leadership", because it illustrated servant leadership's effect on the organizational processes. Their process focused on the leader's character, which a servant's heart characterized. The leader's relationship focused on building up others, while the leadership task was to do the work of a leader. The leadership process was improving organizational processes, and the leadership role model was affecting society and culture.

According to Daft (2005), power was not the primary purpose and aim of the leader. Rather, constituents shared the power. The servant-leader's responsibilities were relationships and people. Servant leadership principles included service before self,

listening as a means of affirmation, creating trust and nourishing followers. The servant-leader did not seek to promote his own interests, but promoted followers and encouraged them to grow as persons and become leaders (Daft, 2005). Patterson (2003) presented a servant leadership model beginning with the leader having *agapao* love. This *agapao* love considered the needs, wants, and desires of each person. Patterson's attributes of servant leadership included humility, altruism, vision, trust, empowerment, and service. Service, to Patterson, described the acts of the leader to serve a follower.

Winston (2003) attempted to show the effects of the leader's *agapao* love on the follower's service. Winston noted that a higher level of commitment and self-efficacy resulted in a higher level of the follower's motivation, which led to a higher level of altruistic attitude toward the leader. A higher level of service of the follower to the leader would be the outcome.

The organizational level and the individual level described two measurement areas for servant leadership. While several organizational level measures existed, Laub's (1999) Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) had been the dominant measuring instrument in recent years according to Drury (2004) and Irving (2005)

On the individual level, Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) tested 11 elements derived from Greenleaf (1970). The eleven elements included calling, listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, growth, and community building. Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) produced five dimensions of servant leadership, which included altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship.

Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) offered insight concerning the five dimensions of servant leadership. First, the leader's altruistic calling began with a conscious choice to serve others in a selfless manner. The ultimate goal of the leader was to serve others by putting their interest ahead of his. Altruistic calling described the desire of the leader to make a positive difference in the lives of others. Due to the desire to serve, leaders with high altruistic calling put the interest of others before their own and attempted to meet the needs of the follower.

Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) described emotional healing as the ability to recognize the need and start a healing process for members of the organization. The leader promoted an environment where followers were safe to voice their concerns. Followers who had experienced hardship or trauma would often turn to leaders with high emotional healing.

Wisdom, according to Barbuto and Wheeler (2006), was the ability to see and learn from the environment, being able to see how it would affect each member and the organization. Leaders high in wisdom were observant and able to expect what was ahead.

Persuasive mapping was the ability to envision mental frameworks that mapped issues allowing greater opportunities for the entire organization. Persuasive mapping detailed the leader's ability to use sound reasoning. The leader encouraged others to envision the direction of the organization and encouraged them to take on the responsibility to achieve a particular direction.

Organizational stewardship dimensions of the leader focused on the need to give back to the greater community and society through the organization. Organizational stewardship described the leader's ability to help an organization to make a positive

contribution to society through outreach, programs, and community development (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006).

Areas of Servant Leadership

Business

Numerous corporations and institutions have embraced the servant leadership approach with considerable success. WestJet Airlines Ltd. based in Calgary, Alberta had followed the servant leadership business model and has done very well in a tough market (Davis, 2004). According to Page and Wong (2004), the promotion of servant leadership had been through conferences, courses, publications, and programs. Most of the companies at the top of Fortune Magazine's best companies for which to work had adopted various aspects of servant leadership. The resurgence of servant leadership was due to being part of a larger movement to move away from command and control leadership, and it was recognized as an antidote to corporate scandal, holding management and leadership responsible (Page & Wong, 2003). Servant Leadership became a guiding philosophy in an increasing number of companies. Among these companies were the Toro Company, Synovus Financial Corporation, ServiceMaster Company, the Men's Wearhouse, Southwest Airlines, and TDIndustries (Spears, 2004).

According to Spears (2010), since the time Robert Greenleaf birthed the paradoxical servant leadership term, many thinkers were writing and speaking about servant leadership. Authors such as Max DePree, John Carver, Peter Senge, Margarety Wheatley, and James Kouzes were a few current authors and advocates of servant leadership who viewed servant leadership as an emerging leadership paradigm for the 21st century (Spears, 2010).

Education

Colleges and universities should offer leadership preparation for those who have the potential. Colleges and universities should invest in all classes of people, especially the poor. They teach them how to look for opportunities to help their own communities. Colleges and universities should focus on values. They should teach students how to make the right choices in life. Teaching servant leadership should be a priority in our colleges and universities and greater preparation for servant-leaders should be encouraged (Greenleaf, 1977).

Spears (2004) noted that servant leadership was being used in formal and informal education and training programs. Based on the servant leadership model, colleges and universities were offering leadership and management courses, as well as corporate training programs.

Christian Ministry

The church had taught the importance of serving since the life of Christ, some 2000 years ago. Presumably, servant leadership characterized biblical leadership (Cooper, 2005). The main appeals for servant leadership in the Christian circle were biblically based and modeled after Jesus Christ, while providing vision and purpose for Christian ministry (Page & Wong, 2003). Paul modeled the ministry of Jesus by giving of himself:

But what things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ. Yea doubtless, and I count all things *but* loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord: for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them *but* dung, that I may win Christ (Philippians 2: 7-8); And I will very gladly spend and be spent for you; though the more abundantly I love

you, the less I be loved (2 Corinthians 12: 15).

In servant leadership, leaders empty themselves, their pride, their selfishness and worldly aspirations. Servant leadership required the leader to sacrifice his self-interest and to be willing to die with Christ on the cross (Page & Wong, 2003). The church needed to serve people to achieve her goal and mission. Those inside the church who had the capacity for building would only find joy when they were building. When the church became a place to nurture servant leaders, institution builders would be produced (Greenleaf, 1977).

Pastor

Pastor was the servant leader of the church. In 1 Peter 5:2, Peter used the noun “shepherd” to describe the task of the pastor. The shepherd was responsible to lead, feed, protect, and serve the flock of God under his leadership (Hawkins, 2006). The pastor had many tasks, but he must remember that he was ministering to sheep. Wiersbe (2000) noted that the shepherd had the task of nourishing, protecting, seeking, sacrificing for the sheep, knowing the sheep, modeling integrity, managing, healing, loving, leading and keeping them united.

While the term elder appeared to be the dominant term for the church office dealing with the needs of the local church, both overseer and pastor were synonymous with elder. When the term pastor is used, it suggested feeding, nurturing, and protecting the flock (Newton, 2005).

It was suggested that the pastor must balance being a prophet, shepherd, and a leader. As a prophet, the pastor proclaimed the Word of God. As a shepherd, the pastor nurtured and protected the church. As a leader, the pastor managed and administrated the work of

the church (Eldridge, 1995). The pastor, as a leader, had the responsibility to make decisions. As a decision maker among the staff, he had the discretionary veto power, the buck stopped with him, he made the “go, no go” situations, he was aware of the picture of the church, and he gave the moral, spiritual, managerial, and personal support to the staff (McIntosh, 2000). The underlying call of the pastor was “for the perfecting the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ (Ephesians 4:12, KJV).

While being a prophet, a shepherd, and a leader, pastors faced extreme work pressure because of the personal and personnel problems, along with confrontations in the church. Significant life events of the pastor affected his leadership, character, vocation, and identity (McKenna, Yost & Boyd, 2007). At the turn of the twenty-first century, the emphasis of pastoral work began to focus on hands-on care for the people, executive leadership, vision casting, and needs-oriented teaching (Vines & Shaddix, 1999). While the spiritual responsibilities of pastors had not reduced, administrative responsibilities had doubled or even tripled (Irwin & Roller, 2000).

The expectation of pastors was to manage the daily operations, develop leaders, establish the vision, and be responsible for the organizational development of the church (Carter, 2009). The church, being an organism and an organization, faced spiritual and administrative challenges. Pastors served in both spiritual and administrative roles, which made the pastor a very important part of the life of the church (Irwin & Roller, 2000).

Organizational Commitment

Allen and Meyer (1996) defined organizational commitment as a “psychological link between the employee and his or her organization that made it less likely that the employee would voluntarily leave the organization (p.252). Kanter (1968) viewed

organizational commitment as the willingness of workers to devote their energy and loyalty to an organization. Meyer and Hersovitch (2001) listed several definitions of organizational commitment by various colleagues: “the relative strength of an individual's identification with, and involvement in a particular organization.” (Mowday, Porter & Steers, 1979, p.226); “the totality of normative pressures to act in a way that meets organizational goals and interests.” (Wiener, 1982, p.421); “the psychological attachment felt by the person for the organization; it will reflect how much the individual internalizes or adopts characteristics or perspectives of the organization.” (O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986, p.493); “a psychological state that binds the individual to the organization (i.e., makes turnovers less likely).” (Allen & Meyer, 1990, p.14); and “a bond or linking of the individual to the organization.” (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990, p.171).

According to Baruch (1998), organizational commitment was a concept that was well established in both management and behavioral sciences. Due to the processes and new developments in the way organizations treated their employees, doubts were raised concerning management and employee relations (Baruch, 1998). Baruch (1998) also noted that while organizations were complex systems operating toward a common goal, organizational commitment could help the organization achieve the common goal.

Bateman and Strasser (1984) stated that the reasons for studying organizational commitment related to employee behaviors and performance effectiveness, attitudinal, affective, and cognitive constructs.

Success on the job was no guarantee that someone would remain in a position. Strong performance could have been a motivation for departure unless there were countervailing influences that made a position or organization valuable to the employee. When an

employee was able to develop a set of skills that were easily transferable between occupations, he or she may have found it easier to move between jobs (Kirshenbaum & Mano-Negrin, 1999). The degree of employee commitment to the organization had implications for the organization and the employee (Mowday, Porter & Steers, 1982). Organizations were not the factories, trade, transportation, money, or other financial and physical resources. People who work together, form structures, and were guided by leadership made up organizations (Megginson, Mosely, Pietri, 1992). Research had revealed that there was an inverse relationship between commitment and turnover retention (Porter, Steers, Mowday & Boulian, 1974).

Individual and organizational goals, coupled with the willingness to remain and exert considerable effort within an organization, characterized organizational commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1997). The component of commitment represented how much an individual wanted to stay with an organization (Myer & Allen, 1991).

Three types of commitment identified organizational commitment: affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Employees with strong affective commitment remained with the organization because they wanted to, those with strong continuance commitment remained because they needed to, and those with strong normative commitment remained because they felt they ought to remain (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

Affective commitment referred to the employee's emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization and its goals. Employees remained in the organization because of a desire to stay. Individual and organizational value congruency induced affective commitment. The individuals emotional attachment

to and enjoyment of the organization was a result (March & Simon, 1958; O'Reily & Chatman, 1986; Meyer & Allen, 1984). A person who was effectively committed to the organization or emotionally attached to the organization, believed in the goals and values of the organization, worked hard for the organization, and intended to stay with the organization (Mowday, 1982). Getting and keeping the right employee had an effect on the customer. Committed employees were valuable to the organization because they were willing to take the time to build relationships with customers, they could increase the organizations efficiency, and they saved their employees money by not having to continually train and recruit new employees (Reichheld, 1996). Mowday (1982) noted that personal characteristics, structural characteristics, job-related characteristics, and work experiences identified affective commitment.

Meyer and others (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001), suggested three categories for the variables: personal characteristics, organizational characteristics, and work experiences. Elements of personal characteristics were employee age (Kaldneberg, Becker, & Zvonkovic, 1995); gender (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990); and organizational tenure (Mathieu and Zajac, 1990). Concerning organizational characteristics, according to Meyer and Allen (1991), employees who perceived a high level of support from the organization were more likely to feel an obligation to repay the organization in terms of affective commitment. Organizational characteristics may have included structure, culture, and organizational policies. Work experience variables had the strongest correlation with affective commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Continuance commitment was the willingness of the employee to remain in the organization because of the investment that the employee had with “nontransferable” investments. One’s retirement, relationship with other employees, or things that were unique to the organization described nontransferable investment (Reichers, 1985). Reichers also noted the years of employment or benefits the employee received from the particular organization described continuance commitment. Meyer and Allen (1991) suggested that investments referred to any actions that would result in loss should the individual decide to leave the organization.

Investments could come in the form of time devoted to a particular career track, development of certain work groups, or friendships. Organizations could easily get employees to think that they had made major investments in the organization. Some factors could have been promotions, performance bonuses, accrual of vacation and sick leave, family-friendly policies, and other benefits (Romzek, 1990).

Kanter (1968) described continuance commitment as that which occurred when there was a profit associated with continued participation and a cost associated with leaving. Continuance commitment developed because of the number of investments individuals made in their current organization and their perceived lack of alternatives. The fewer alternatives employees believed were available, the stronger would be the employee's continuance commitment to the current organization (Meyer & Allen, 1990). In order for continuance commitment to be present between the employee and the organization, the employee had to be able to identify the alternatives (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Anything that increased the cost that was associated with leaving an organization had the potential to create or increase continuance commitment. Employees who thought they had viable

alternatives would have weaker continuance commitment than those who thought their alternatives were fewer (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Meyer and Allen (1997) also suggested that previous job search attempts, the present organization's ability to recruit employees, and family factor limits of relocation could have influenced one's perception of alternatives. Other factors that may have affected the alternatives were age and tenure. During the time in which an employee recognized the costs of leaving the organization, continuance commitment was produced (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

Normative commitment was the more recently defined type of commitment. The basis for normative commitment was the commitment or obligation a person believed they had to the organization (Bolton, 1997). Meyer and Allen (1990) expanded their set of organizational commitment dimensions to include normative commitment. They noted that normative commitment might have been developed based on the psychological contract between an employee and the organization. Because of loyalty and devotion, commitments to marriage, family, religion and employment, organizations described normative commitment. Normative commitment viewed individual commitment as a behavior that was moral and right (Wiener, 1982). The extent to which a person believed he, or she should be loyal to their organization and make personal sacrifices to help it and not criticize it measured a person's moral obligation (Weiner & Verdi, 1980).

Meyer and Allen (1997) indicated that socialization might have a possible role in the development of normative commitment. They also indicated that socialization could carry various sorts of messages about what is appropriate in the area of attitudes and behaviors within an organization. Normative commitment developed because of a

particular kind of gift or investment from the organization that the employee could not reciprocate. If the organization gave to the employee in such a way that the employee could not return, the employee may have developed feelings of obligation to the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Over the years, organizational commitment had been studied using two different approaches (Meyer & Allen, 1991). The two approaches used to study organizational commitment were commitment-related attitudes and commitment related-behaviors . According to Meyer and Allen (1991), the distinction between the two was well established in organizational commitment literature. The commitment-related attitude approach viewed organizational commitment as a partisan, affective attachment to the goals and values, and to the organization for its own sake, apart from its purely instrumental worth (Buchanan, 1974). Mowday, Steers, and Porter, (1979) recognized attitudinal commitment as a state in which an individual identified with a specific organization, along with its goals, wishing to maintain membership with the organization to help reach its goals.

The commitment-related behavior approach focused on a behavioral pattern. Internalized normative pressures to act in a way that met organizational goals and interest (Wiener, 1982) guided the behavioral pattern. According to Wiener and Gechman (1977), behavior resulting from commitment reflected personal sacrifices made for the sake of the organization, showed persistence, and showed a personal preoccupation with the organization. Kanter (1968) noted that the behavioral approach emphasized the view that employee investments in the organization bound the employee to be loyal to his organization. The behavioral approach profited by being associated with continued

participation within the organization and acknowledging the cost associated with leaving the organization.

According to Meyer and Allen (1991), an employee may have experienced affective, continuance, and normative commitment in varying degrees. Meyer and Allen (1991) also argued that organizational commitment was a mind-set, a psychological state that reflected a desire, a need, or an obligation to maintain membership within an organization.

Organizational commitment was a subject of extensive study. The extensive study was due to its relationship to job performance because of its potential influence on high productivity and low turnover cost (Lease, 1998). Organizational commitment was a key factor in the financial success and competitive advantage of organizations (Mowday, 1998).

Summary of Literature

In this chapter, the researcher included several resources that defined and overviewed leadership, servant leadership, pastor and organizational commitment. Drury (2004) identified that servant leadership inversely correlated to organizational commitment. However, in another study Liden, Wayne, Zhao, and Henderson (2008) reported that servant leadership had a positive effect on organizational commitment. Studies showed that servant leadership was a model of shared leadership and emphasized the development of people within an organization.

Organizational commitment had been viewed and discussed from different approaches. Based on the different components of commitment, organizational commitment was a multidimensional concept. Classifications of organizational

commitment were affective commitment (emotional attachment), continuance commitment (the costs of leaving the organization) and normative commitment (moral obligation to remain with the organization) (Meyer & Allen, 1990).

The literature indicated that an organization, specifically a church, was a setting for the measurement of servant leadership and organizational commitment. However, review of existing scholarly literature relevant to the topic of servant leadership and organizational commitment showed a lack of empirical research regarding servant leadership and organizational commitment in a church setting. Since servant leadership and organizational commitment had assessment tools that accomplished the measurement, this study focused on the relationship of servant leadership and organizational commitment in Southern Baptist churches in Mississippi with a resident membership of more than 500.

In chapter 3, the researcher included a review of the methodology used to address the research questions. The researcher also include a research perspective, ethical considerations, a review of the research participants, instruments used in the data collection process, procedures used in the data collection process, an analysis of the data, and a summary of the methodology.

Chapter 3: Methodology

In this chapter, the researcher described the research methodology used in this study to test the hypotheses and the rationale behind it. Sellitz, Johoda, Deutsch, and Cook (1966) suggested that for any research to be purposeful, it should discover answers to the research questions. The researcher used this chapter to explain the methodology of the study. Detailed information was provided to explain the context of the study, the participants, the instruments, and the methods used in gathering the data. The chapter ended with an explanation of the analysis of the data.

The researcher's purpose of this study was to discover if any relationship existed between servant leadership and organizational commitment. To investigate the problem, the following research questions and null hypotheses were analyzed:

1. Does the pastor's servant leadership style of leadership have an effect on staff affective commitment to the organization?

Hypothesis 1a: There will be no significant correlation between the pastor's altruistic calling and staff affective commitment to the organization.

Hypothesis 1b: There will be no significant correlation between the pastor's emotional healing and staff affective commitment to the organization.

Hypothesis 1c: There will be no significant correlation between the pastor's wisdom and staff affective commitment to the organization.

Hypothesis 1d: There will be no significant correlation between the pastor's persuasive mapping and staff affective commitment to the organization.

Hypothesis 1e: There will be no significant correlation between the pastor's organizational leadership and staff affective commitment to the organization.

2. Does the pastor's servant leadership style of leadership have an effect on staff continuance commitment to the organization?

Hypothesis 2a: There will be no significant correlation between the pastor's altruistic calling and staff continuance commitment to the organization.

Hypothesis 2b: There will be no significant correlation between the pastor's emotional healing and staff continuance commitment to the organization.

Hypothesis 2c: There will be no significant correlation between the pastor's wisdom and staff continuance commitment to the organization.

Hypothesis 2d: There will be no significant correlation between the pastor's persuasive mapping and staff continuance commitment to the organization.

Hypothesis 2e: There will be no significant correlation between the pastor's organizational stewardship and staff continuance commitment to the organization.

3. Does the pastor's servant leadership style of leadership have an effect on staff normative commitment to the organization?

Hypothesis 3a: There will be no significant correlation between the pastor's altruistic calling and staff normative commitment to the organization.

Hypothesis 3b: There will be no significant correlation between the pastor's emotional healing and staff normative commitment to the organization.

Hypothesis 3c: There will be no significant correlation between the pastor's wisdom and staff normative commitment to the organization.

Hypothesis 3d: There will be no significant correlation between the pastor's persuasive mapping and staff normative commitment to the organization.

Hypothesis 3e: There will be no significant correlation between the pastor's organizational stewardship and staff normative commitment to the organization.

Research Perspective

The research was quantitative and used a correlation research design. The research correlated the results of two surveys to attempt to answer the research questions by evaluating the hypotheses. The research employed the Servant Leadership Questionnaire, (SLQ), (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006), which contained five categories. The five categories included altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship. The research also employed the Three Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey, (Meyer & Allen, 2004) which contained three categories. The three categories included affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. The researcher obtained permission to use both survey instruments. (Appendix B & C). The researcher also used a demographic survey to obtain the following information from each participant: gender, age range, marital status, highest level of education, length of time each participant worked for present employer and the participant's current position, ministerial staff or administrative assistant

The researcher calculated correlation coefficients for the relationships of the two surveys as well as for the relationships of each of the categories. The method used consisted of: selection of research method; population and sampling; survey selection; data collection; data capturing; data statistical analysis.

Ethical Consideration

Ethical considerations of confidentiality and privacy were addressed and stressed in the customized instructions in both pastor and participant letters. Each respondent received assurance that the research report would not reveal any of their personal information. The researcher linked pastors and staff members with their particular church. Beyond that linkage, pastors and staff remained anonymous.

The Research Participants

The targeted population for this study was Southern Baptist Churches in Mississippi. The researcher used the process of purposeful sampling, selecting subjects who could provide the best information to address the purpose of the research (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). The sample consisted of Southern Baptist Churches in Mississippi with a resident membership of 500 or more. Churches with 500 or more resident members could provide needed information for the present study. A total of 218 churches fit within the above limitations.

As the pastor of one of the 218 churches, the researcher used his church as a pilot for the research survey. The researcher then obtained the following information from the other 217 Southern Baptist Churches: pastor status and Internet capability. Because the survey included the servant leadership of the pastor, the church had to have a full-time pastor. Next, to participate, each church needed to have Internet capabilities. The Internet capability was necessary for each pastor to receive the researcher's e-mail. Also, each participant needed Internet capability to complete the survey.

Instruments Used in Data Collection

The researcher used two surveys to obtain required information on servant leadership and organizational commitment. The two surveys were Barbuto and Wheeler's Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) (2006) rater version and Meyer and Allen's Three Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey (2004). Along with these two surveys, a demographic survey was included. The demographic survey sought to obtain the following information: gender, age, marital status, highest educational qualifications, time/tenure with present church, and current position (Appendix G).

Servant Leadership

Servant leadership was measured using Barbuto and Wheeler's (2006) 23-item servant leadership rater version instrument. The scale measured five factors of potential servant leadership characteristics: (a) altruistic calling, (b) emotional healing, (c) wisdom, (c) persuasive mapping, and (e) organizational stewardship.

According to Barbuto and Wheeler (2006), altruistic calling described a leader's deep-rooted desire to make a positive difference in the lives of others. A leader who was high in altruistic calling would put the interests of others ahead of their own and try to meet the needs of the followers.

Emotional healing described the commitment to and skill of the leader in fostering spiritual recovery due to a hardship or trauma. The leader who was high in emotional healing was highly empathetic, a great listener, therefore able to facilitate the healing process. This leader would create a safe environment for the employee to share personal and professional issues, therefore encouraging the follower to turn to the leader for help in emotional healing.

Wisdom was the ideal of perfect and practical, a combination of being aware of one's surrounding and anticipating the consequences. A leader high in wisdom was able to pick up cues from the environment and was able to understand the implications of the cues. Such leaders were characteristically observant and anticipatory.

Persuasive mapping was the ability to use sound reasoning and mental frameworks. Leaders high in persuasive mapping had the ability to map issues, cast visions of larger possibilities and were compelling in the process. Such leaders encouraged others to visualize the organization's future and were able to compel others to get things done.

The last factor was organizational stewardship. A leader whom was high in organizational stewardship prepared an organization to make a positive contribution to society through community development, programs, and outreach. Such a leader assumed the responsibility for the well-being of the community and was willing to devise strategies and make decisions to leave things in the community better than when he found them. The leader with a high organizational stewardship promoted a spirit of community in the workplace for leaving a positive legacy.

The Servant Leadership Questionnaire consisted of 23 questions with a 5-point Likert scale: (1) never, (2) rarely, (3) sometimes (4) often and (5) always.

The Servant Leadership Questionnaire consisted of two versions known as the "rater version" and the "self-rater version". The researcher used the "rater version" in this study.

In this study, the pastors were not required to complete any survey. However, both ministerial staff and administrative assistants were required to complete the rater version of the servant leadership of their pastor. To determine the internal reliability of the scale,

Barbuto and Wheeler used the Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) scale internal reliability (alpha) functions. The reliabilities of the sub-scales ranged from .82 to .92 (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006).

For the rater version of the Servant Leadership Questionnaire categories, mean item score ranged from 2.58 to 3.24. The standard deviations of the scores were consistent for the rater version across the five categories, ranging from 0.73 to 0.97.

Due to the factor structures and good performance in all validity criteria of the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ), the instrument offered value for future research. The researcher used the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) due to its ability to assess the servant leadership behavior of individuals as opposed to measuring servant leadership of the organization (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006).

Organizational Commitment

Meyer and Allen's 18-item Three-Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey (2004) was the survey used to measure organizational commitment. The scale measured three forms of organizational commitment of an employee: affective commitment, normative commitment, and continuance commitment. Affective commitment measured an employee's emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization. The employee accepted the values of the organization and wanted to stay as a part of the organization. Normative commitment reflected pressures on an employee to remain with an organization resulting from organizational socialization. The commitment kept the employee with the organization due to his strong ties. Continuance commitment referred to commitment associated with the costs the employees perceived are related to leaving the organization. The employees thought that

if they left the job, they would have had fewer choices. In order to describe commitment to an occupation or profession by substituting the profession name in place of organization in the items, the same measurements were used (Coleman, Irving, & Cooper, 1999; Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993). Employees with a strong affective commitment remained on the job because they wanted to, those with strong continuance commitment remained on the job because they needed to, and those with strong normative commitment remained on the job because they thought that they ought to (Meyer & Allen, 1990).

Meyer and Allen (1990) examined the relationship between the constructs of affective, continuance and normative commitment. The results revealed that continuance commitment was independent from affective commitment ($p < .001$, $r = .06$) and normative commitment ($p < .001$, $r = 0.14$). The relationship between affective commitment and normative commitment was significant ($p < .001$, $r = .51$).

Meyer and Allen (1997) shortened the original eight item measures to six items for each type of commitment. The items for both the original and revised measures were: Coefficient alpha values ranged from .77 to .88 for affective commitment (ACS), from .65 to .86 for normative commitment (NCS), and from .69 to .84 for continuance commitment (CCS) (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Cohen, 1996, 1999; Cohen & Kirchmeyer, 1995; Hackett, Bycio, & Hausdorf, 1994; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Meyer, Irving, & Allen, 1998; Somers, 1995; Somers & Birnbaum, 1998). For the validity, in multi-sample confirmatory factor analysis, Hackett, Bycio, & Hausdorf (1994) and Dunham, Grube, & Castaneda (1994) found support for the three-component model with affective, normative, and continuance commitment each composing a separate dimension.

Cohen (1999) used confirmatory analysis to show discriminate validity among affective organizational commitment, career commitment, and continuance organizational commitment. Confirmatory factor analysis had also shown that the three Allen and Meyer scales were empirically distinct from job involvement, career commitment, work involvement, and Protestant work ethic (Cohen, 1996).

Somers (1995) found that affective and normative commitment both correlated positively with employee turnover, while continuance commitment correlated negatively with employee turnover. In addition, the low alternatives subscale of continuance commitment correlated negatively with career commitment. The personal sacrifices subscale of continuance commitment correlated positively with career commitment. Allen and Meyer (1990) found that affective commitment correlated positively with six different types of organizational socialization programs and negatively with having an innovative role orientation within the first six months of entering an organization.

The Three-Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey consisted of 18 questions with a 7-point Likert scale: (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) slightly disagree, (4) undecided, (5) slightly agree, (6) agree and (7) strongly agree.

There were two versions of the Three Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey, the original and the revised. Based on the length issues and the additional interpretation that may have been required, this researcher chose to use the revised version of the Three Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey. In the original version of the survey, there were eight items for each of the three commitment scales: Affective commitment scale (ACS), normative commitment scale (NCS) and the continuance commitment scale (CCS). In the revised survey, there were

six items for each scale. The greatest difference between the original and the revised survey of the affective commitment scale (ACS) and the continuance commitment scale (CCS) was the length desired for the survey. The greatest difference in the normative commitment scale (NCS), which measures the employees feeling of obligation to remain with the organization, focused on the difference between the basis and feelings of obligation to stay with the organization. The original version tended to include information about the basis of the employees commitment, whereas the revised version focused more on the feeling of obligation without focusing on the basis. The basic focus in the original version might have required interpretation of one or more of the subsets (Meyer & Allen, 2004). Strong agreement actually reflected a lower level of commitment on some of the commitment scale items. Those are termed “reverse-keyed” items identified by “R” after the statement on the scoring guide (Meyer & Allen, 2004). Items 26, 30, 33, and 36 were reversed. The reversed scale had the numbers as follows: (1)strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) slightly agree, (4) undecided, (5) slightly disagree, (6) disagree and (7) strongly disagree.

After the scoring process, the affective commitment scale (ACS), the continuance commitment scale (CCS) and the normative commitment scale (NCS), each had individual scores. The scores ranged in value from 1 to 7 with higher scores showing strong commitment.

Procedures Used

The researcher requested a list of Southern Baptist Churches, with a minimum of 500 resident members from the Mississippi Baptist Convention. A total of 218 churches fit within the prescribed parameters. The researcher started the process of finding the e-mail

address of each pastor of the other 217 churches after receiving the list of church names from the Mississippi Baptist Convention. The first step in finding the e-mail address for each pastor was searching on the Internet for the web page for each church. The next step was to call the churches and ask for the e-mail address. Once the pastor's e-mail address was obtained, the researcher wrote the name of the pastor and his e-mail address on the master church list. The researcher used the church's e-mail address if the pastor did not have a designated e-mail address.

The list of churches within the specified limitation was 218. On September 30, 2010, the researcher used his own church as a pilot to test the survey for the research project. After researching the churches, nineteen did not have a full-time pastor and seventeen did not have Internet access. The total number of churches to participate in the survey decreased from the original 218 to a total of 181.

The researcher used www.speedsurvey.com as the on-line survey tool for this project. The researcher listed the twenty-three items for the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006) with a 5-point Likert scale. For clarification, the researcher added, "In this section, "This person" refers to the pastor of the church where you are currently employed" before each of the twenty-three items. The researcher listed the eighteen items for the Three-Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey (Meyer & Allen, 2004) with a 7-point Likert scale. For clarification, the researcher added, "In this section, your employer/organization refers to the church where you are currently employed" before each of the eighteen items. The researcher also included six additional questions that concerned demographics (Appendix G).

Once the researcher had completed the list of survey questions, the researcher set up a parameter on the survey tool that required each participant to have a password. The researcher listed passwords for each participating church. The password used by the researcher was the resident membership number listed on the information sheet given to the researcher by the Mississippi Baptist Convention. Several churches had the same resident membership number. For churches having the same resident membership number, the researcher listed the number representing the resident membership for the first church on the list. If another church had the same number for its resident membership, the researcher added the letter “a” after the membership number. If there was another church with the same membership number, the researcher added the letter “b” after the resident membership number.

The researcher also set up a parameter to identify the password of each participant. This information allowed the researcher to identify how many individual churches participated in the survey and informed the researcher of the number of participants from each church. The website address for the survey was www.orgcommitment.com.

The researcher sent a letter to each of the 181 church pastors by email, starting October 6, 2010 and finishing October 7, 2010. The researcher personalized each letter by addressing the pastor's name. The letter to the pastor consisted of the following: identification of the project; purpose of the research; procedures for the survey; permission sought from the pastor to allow his staff, both ministerial staff and administrative assistants to participate in the survey; information concerning the amount of time needed to take the survey; instructions for the pastor; qualifications required for each participant; a note informing the participants of the confidentiality of the survey; a

note describing voluntary participation in the survey; and contact information if the pastor had a question. The letter also contained a “thank you” to the pastor and to all the anticipated participants (Appendix D).

A letter sent to the pastor, contained a letter for each participant (Appendix E). The pastor was directed to forward the attached letter to each participant, which contained the following information: a request for their participation; identification of the project; purpose of the research; procedures and instructions; confidentiality information; a note describing voluntary participation; contact information if the participant had a question; a link to the survey, the deadline date for the survey to be completed, and a password to enter the site.

After the initial email was sent, the researcher periodically checked www.speedsurvey.com, the survey website, to keep up-to-date on the number of churches participating. On Monday, October 22, 2010, the researcher attempted to contact the pastor of the churches that had not yet participated in the survey. The researcher sent a follow-up email letter reminding the pastor of the initial email letter that was sent to him (Appendix F). On Thursday, October 25, 2010, the researcher attempted to make a telephone contact with the pastor of each church that had not yet participated in the survey. If the pastor agreed for his staff to participate, the researcher encouraged the pastor to remind his ministerial staff and administrative assistants to complete the survey.

Participants had completed a total of 91 surveys by November 11, 2010. This number represented 37 Southern Baptist Churches in Mississippi with a resident membership of 500 or more. The sample total participation of 37 churches represented a 20 %

participation. Of the 91 surveys completed, 59 of the respondents were full-time ministerial staff and 32 were full-time administrative assistants.

Data Collection

Once the deadline had approached, the researcher collected the scores in a Microsoft EXCEL spreadsheet from the completed surveys at www.speedsurvey.com. The researcher compiled the scores for analysis with respect to Rater Servant Leadership of the pastor, Organizational Commitment and Demographic variables of full-time ministerial staff and administrative assistants.

Data Analysis

The researcher obtained the data and because the study is quantitative in nature, the researcher used statistical techniques to analyze the information. Using the Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS), the two-tailed Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (Pearson r) correlation was conducted to test each hypothesis. The correlation analysis helped to determine the relationship between the pastor's servant leadership and the staff member's commitment to the church. Scores from Barbuto and Wheeler's (2006) SLQ provided values on 23 items for servant leadership. Scores from Allen and Meyer's (2004) TCM Employee Commitment Survey scale provided values on 18 items for organizational commitment.

The researcher tabulated the response data on servant leadership characteristics from the results of the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) portion of the instrument and organizational commitment characteristics from the results of the TCM Employee Commitment Survey portion of the instrument. The mean and standard deviations were calculated.

Summary of the Methodology

This chapter presented the methodology of the research and the process of data collection and analysis. The researcher presented the hypotheses of the research along with the research tools. Both of the instruments used in this research were discussed in detail. The researcher presented information about the sample size and the number of participating churches and individuals. Next, the researcher presented an overview of the data collection and the statistical analysis of the hypothesis.

The previous chapters presented the theoretical background of the research topic and this chapter presents the research process and methods of obtaining the relevant information and the results. The intended results of this study are to contribute research in servant leadership. By researching evidence of correlation between servant leadership and organizational commitment, this study contributed to future research that may use these variables as well. The following chapter presented the results from the correlation analysis conducted in an attempt to test the research hypotheses.

Chapter 4: Report of the Findings

Introduction

The previous chapters have detailed the background and literature review of this doctoral study, reviewed the relevant literature, and detailed the methodology of the study. In chapter 4, the researcher portrayed the data as obtained through following the methodology outlined in chapter 3.

The purpose of this study was to answer the question, “Is there a relationship between the servant leadership style of the pastor and staff organizational commitment?”

Therefore, the researcher used this study to discover any significant correlation that existed between the servant leadership of the pastor and the organizational commitment of the staff. The research questions for this study were as follows:

1. Does the pastor’s servant leadership style of leadership have an effect on staff affective commitment to the organization?
2. Does the pastor’s servant leadership style of leadership have an effect on staff continuance commitment to the organization?
3. Does the pastor’s servant leadership style of leadership have an effect on staff normative commitment to the organization?

Demographics of Survey Study Participants

The researcher e-mailed a letter to 181 pastors of Southern Baptist churches in Mississippi with a resident membership of 500 or more. On October 6th & 7th, 2010, the researcher sent the letters to the pastors, and the last survey to be completed was November 11, 2010. Participants completed a total of 91 surveys representing 37

Southern Baptist Churches in Mississippi. The 37 churches that responded yielded a 20% participation rate.

The researcher did not ask the pastor of the participating churches to complete a survey. Instead, the ministerial staff and administrative assistants completed a survey consisting of the following: (1) a rater version of the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006), (2) an organizational commitment survey, the Three-Commitment Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey (Meyer & Allen, 2004) and (3) a demographic survey. The Servant Leadership Rater version (SLQ) consisted of twenty-three items rating the pastor's servant leadership. The Three Commitment Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey consisted of eighteen items rating the staff's commitment to the church, and the demographic survey consisted of six items.

The researcher requested that each participant report the following demographic information: gender, age, marital status, education, years worked with present church and position with the church.

Gender

A summarization of the distribution of gender for the research is in table 4.1.

	Frequency	Percent
Female	35	38.5
Male	56	61.5
Total	91	100.0

Table 4.1. Gender Distribution of Participants

Age

The significant age range was between 30-49 and 50-64 years old. The number of participants in the age range of 18-29 and 65 and older was much smaller. Table 4.2 summarizes the participants age.

	Frequency	Percent
18-29 years old	5	5.5
30-49 years old	40	44.0
50-64 years old	42	46.2
65 years and over	4	4.4
Total	91	100.0

Table 4.2. Age Distribution of Participant

Marital Status

The category with the highest number was the “now married”. Eighty-six participants representing 94.5% of the participants are in the “now married” category. “Divorce” and “widowed” shared the lowest category and “never married” was very close. Table 4.3 summarizes the participant’s marital status.

	Frequency	Percent
Divorced	1	1.1
Never Married	3	3.3
Now Married	86	94.5
Widowed	1	1.1
Total	91	100.0

Table 4.3. Marital Status Distribution of Participants.

Education

Participants represented a varied range of education levels. The category with the highest level of education was the “Master’s Degree” with a total of 36 individuals. “Bachelor’s Degree” was next with a total of 22 individuals. The next category was “1 or more years of college, no degree” with a total of 10 individuals. “Some college credit, but less than one year” had a total of 8, “Doctorate degree” totaled 5, “High School graduate” totaled 4 and “Professional degree” totaled 3. Table 4.4 summarizes the participant’s educational level providing percentage rating for each category.

	Frequency	Percent
High School Graduate	4	4.4
Some College credit, but less than 1 year	8	8.8
1 or more years of college No degree	10	11.0
Associate Degree	3	3.3
Bachelor’s Degree	22	24.2
Master’s Degree	36	39.6
Professional Degree	3	3.3
Doctorate Degree	5	5.5
Total	91	100.0

Table 4.4. Education Distribution of Participants

Tenure with Present Church

The category with the highest numbers was 1-5 years. Thirty-four participants had been with their present church five years or less, representing 37.4% of the study participants. Seventeen participants had been with their present church 6-10 years, representing 18.7%, and 17 participants had been with their present church 21-30 years, representing another 18.7%. Table 4.5 summarizes the participant’s tenure with present church.

	Frequency	Percent
Less than 1 year	6	6.6
1-5 years	34	37.4
6-10 years	17	18.7
11-15 years	8	8.8
16-20 years	9	9.9
21-30 years	17	18.7
Total	91	100.

Table 4.5. Tenure Distribution of Participants

Position with Present Church

The survey participants were either ministerial staff or administrative assistants. Thirty-two of the participants were administrative assistants, representing 35.2%, and 59 of the participants were ministerial staff, representing 64.8% of the total. Table 4.6 summarizes the participant’s position in the church.

	Frequency	Percent
Ministerial Staff	59	64.8
Administrative Assistant	32	35.2
Total	91	100.0

Table 4.6. Position Distribution of Participants

Reliability

To determine the quality and consistency of both survey instruments, reliability scores were calculated. Cronbach’s alpha determined an agreement of answers on questions targeted toward a specific trait, and Cronbach’s coefficient should be provided for total and subscale scores used as a variable (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). When using Cronbach’s reliability coefficient, reliabilities less than 0.6 were considered poor, reliabilities within 0.7 ranges were considered acceptable, and those reliabilities over 0.8 were considered good (Sekaran, 2000). To estimate the reliability of the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) and the Three-Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey, Cronbach’s alpha coefficients were calculated. Scale reliabilities were acceptable for all subscales, according to Nunnally’s (1978) conclusion that minimum reliability (Cronbach’s alpha) measures should be at .70.

Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Scores for SLQ Survey

To estimate the reliability of the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) instrument for the research, Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficients were calculated. The instrument measured the servant leader’s altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship. Table 4.7 provided the results for Cronbach’s

Alpha reliability coefficients for Servant Leadership Questionnaires' (SLQ) five subscales.

SLQ Subscales	N=4	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correction	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted	Cronbach's Alpha
Altruistic Calling	Q1	11.5495	6.628	.849	.932	.943
	Q2	11.4286	6.403	.846	.932	
	Q3	11.7253	5.868	.907	.912	
	Q4	11.7143	5.673	.873	.926	
N=4						
Emotional Healing	Q5	10.6264	11.059	.808	.943	.943
	Q6	11.1099	9.699	.896	.916	
	Q7	11.1648	9.739	.920	.908	
	Q8	10.9451	10.653	.841	.933	
N=5						
Wisdom	Q9	16.1429	9.279	.896	.933	.951
	Q10	16.1319	9.494	.840	.944	
	Q11	16.0659	9.707	.921	.929	
	Q12	16.0769	9.716	.907	.932	
	Q13	16.3297	10.535	.767	.955	
N=5						
Persuasive Mapping	Q14	15.3407	13.583	.747	.921	.926
	Q15	15.2308	13.157	.755	.921	
	Q16	15.2088	13.989	.762	.918	
	Q17	15.2527	13.080	.884	.895	
	Q18	15.4066	12.488	.899	.891	
N=5						
Organizational Stewardship	Q19	17.352	7.317	.505	.880	.868
	Q20	17.9121	6.392	.713	.836	
	Q21	17.8901	6.099	.843	.806	
	Q22	18.1758	5.569	.680	.851	
	Q23	17.9890	5.789	.769	.820	

Table 4.7. Servant Leadership Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficients

This research used the rater version of the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ), and the reliability statistics proved to be strong. This researcher compared Barbuto and Wheeler's (2006) reliability findings with findings of this research: Barbuto and Wheeler's (2006) measurement for altruistic calling was .82 compared to present

research of .943; Barbuto and Wheeler's (2006) emotional healing was .91 compared to present research of .943; Barbuto and Wheeler's (2006) findings for wisdom was .92 compared to present research findings of .951; Barbuto and Wheeler's (2006) findings for persuasive mapping was .83 compared to present research of .926; and Barbuto and Wheeler's (2006) findings for organizational stewardship was .83 compared to present research of .868. The results revealed that all five subscales of the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) had a high reliability for this research.

Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Scores for TCM Employee Commitment Survey

To estimate the reliability of the Three-Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey instrument, Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients were calculated. The instrument measured affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. Table 4.8 provided the results for Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficients for the Three-Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey three constructs.

TCM Constructs		Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted	Cronbach's Alpha
Affective Commitment	Q24	28.0000	27.911	.581	.706	.759
	Q27	28.8901	32.721	.141	.823	
	RQ30	28.0110	26.122	.653	.683	
	RQ33	28.0549	25.630	.650	.682	
	RQ36	28.1429	26.568	.524	.718	
	Q39	27.8022	28.627	.559	.713	
N=6						
Continuance Commitment	Q25	18.7802	28.173	.561	.604	.694
	Q28	17.7253	36.468	.217	.714	
	Q31	18.6593	32.627	.345	.681	
	Q34	19.9451	29.053	.580	.600	
	Q37	20.3736	35.770	.300	.689	
	Q40	19.6264	29.214	.552	.609	
N=6						
Normative Commitment	Q26	25.8681	31.205	.527	.772	.796
	Q29	26.3297	29.623	.653	.738	
	Q32	26.5824	32.335	.491	.780	
	Q35	25.2967	34.833	.507	.775	
	Q38	26.0440	33.642	.514	.773	
	Q41	25.6484	32.542	.632	.748	

Table 4.8. Organizational Commitment Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficients

The results revealed that affective and normative commitment were above the .70 and that continuance commitment was just below the .70 mark of a good reliability score. Meyer, Stanley, Hersovitch and Topolnytsky's (2002) research revealed reliability scores for affective commitment of .82, continuance commitment of .73, and normative commitment of .76. Continuance commitment had a lower reliability score than affective or normative commitment, but the results were similar to other studies. As noted in chapter 3, continuance commitment scale ranged from .69 to .86. In Scuderi's (2010) research, the reliability findings for the Three-Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey constructs were as follows: affective commitment score was .80, continuance commitment score was .45, and normative commitment score was .62. The

information provided from this study, along with other studies using the Three-Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey, revealed that the Three-Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment instrument was reliable to conduct this research.

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics summarize quantitative data, enabling patterns and relationships to be discerned which were not readily apparent in raw data (Hussy & Hussey, 1997). Appendix A contains the descriptive statistics for each item of each subscale of the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) and the Three-Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey. The Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) scores ranged from 1 to 5, and the scores for the Three-Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey ranged from 1 to 7.

Table 4.9 contains descriptive data for the five servant leadership subscales and the organizational commitment constructs. The servant leadership subscales are (1) altruistic calling, (2) emotional healing, (3) wisdom, (4) persuasive mapping, and (5) organizational stewardship. The organizational commitment constructs are (1) affective commitment, (2) continuance commitment, and (3) normative commitment.

	Frequency	Mean	Standard Deviation
Altruistic Calling	91	3.87	.818
Emotional Healing	91	3.65	1.06
Wisdom	91	4.04	.78
Persuasive Mapping	91	3.82	.90
Organizational Stewardship	91	4.49	.61
Affective Commitment	91	5.63	1.03
Continuance Commitment	91	3.84	1.10
Normative Commitment	91	5.19	1.12

Table 4.9. Descriptive Statistics of Survey Tools

Table 4.10 contained statistics of the group giving the number of ministerial staff and administrative assistants, the mean score, and the standard deviation of each subscale and construct.

	Type	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Altruistic Calling	Min. Staff	59	3.80	.102
	Admin Assist	32	4.00	.154
Emotional Healing	Min. Staff	59	3.59	.130
	Admin Assist	32	3.77	.206
Wisdom	Min. Staff	59	3.99	.100
	Admin Assist	32	4.19	.136
Persuasive Mapping	Min. Staff	59	3.77	.110
	Admin Assist	32	3.91	.179
Organizational Stewardship	Min. Staff	59	4.46	.079
	Admin Assist	32	4.55	.112
Affective Commitment	Min. Staff	59	5.53	.141
	Admin Assist	32	5.82	.162
Continuance Commitment	Min. Staff	59	3.70	.155
	Admin Assist	32	4.10	.151
Normative Commitment	Min. Staff	59	5.11	.147
	Admin Assist	32	5.34	.194

Table 4.10 Group Statistics

The mean is the arithmetic average of all the scores. The mean is typically a stable measure of the central tendency and is the most widely used (Springhall, 1994). When a distribution contains extreme high or low scores, a weakness is noticeable. Barbuto and Wheeler’s (2006) mean scores for the five subscales of the SLQ were as follows, altruistic calling = 2.76, emotional healing = 2.71, wisdom = 3.24, persuasive mapping = 2.58, and organizational stewardship = 3.12.

The present research mean score for the subscales of altruistic calling was 3.87, emotional healing was 3.65, wisdom was 4.04, persuasive mapping was 3.82, and organization stewardship was 4.49. From the information provided, mean scores were well above mid-point (2.5) of the scale. The highest mean score was the organizational stewardship scoring 4.49, while the lowest was 3.65 for emotional healing. When compared to the mean scores of Barbuto and Wheeler (2006), the means scores of this research were higher.

Meyer and Allen (1997) did not provide expected, desired, average or means for the Three Commitment Model (TCM) Organizational Employee Commitment constructs. Meyer and Allen (1990) provided a mean score on the 8-item construct. The affective commitment means score was 4.63; continuance commitment means score was 4.51, and normative commitment means score was 3.77. Nyengane's (2007) research provided a mean score for TCM Organizational Commitment questionnaire as follows: affective commitment = 2.43, continuance commitment = 2.17 and normative commitment = 1.77.

Table 4.9 shows that continuance commitment had a lower mean score than affective commitment. Continuance commitment scored 3.84, and affective commitment scored 5.63. Continuance commitment was also lower than normative commitment, which scored 5.19. The highest mean scores were above the mid-point (3.5) of the scale. Although Meyer and Allen (1997) gave no guidance concerning the expected or desired organizational commitment constructs for affective, continuance, and normative constructs, (Meyer & Allen, 1996; Dunham, Grube, & Castaneda, 1994) they set out to determine the relationship between the different types of organizational commitment, measuring the constructs and identifying the patterns. They discovered that the desired

pattern is for affective commitment to have the highest score, followed by normative commitment, and lastly continuance commitment. Table 4.9 indicated that normative commitment mean scores were marginally higher than affective commitment, and affective commitment mean scores were marginally higher than continuance commitment scores.

Results of the Correlation Analysis

As already mentioned, the hypotheses of this study were concerned with determining the relationship between the pastor's servant leadership style of leadership and organizational commitment of the staff. Using the two-tailed Pearson analysis, the researcher investigated the relationship between servant leadership of the pastor and organizational commitment. The Pearson product-moment coefficient was represented by r . The correlation could range from -1.00 to 1.00. A high positive value represents a high positive relationship, and a negative value represents a negative relationship (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). Servant leadership was determined measuring categories, and organization commitment was determined by measuring the different constructs. This researcher used Barbuto & Wheeler's (2006) scales, measuring 5 categories of servant leadership: altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship. The researcher also used Meyer & Allen's (2004) scales measuring three constructs of commitment: affective, continuance, and normative. This study also included a demographic gathering section.

Research Question 1

Does the pastor’s servant leadership style of leadership have an effect on staff affective commitment to the organization?

	Affective Commitment	
Altruistic Calling	Pearson Correlation	.430**
	Sig. (2-Tailed)	.000
	N	91
Emotional Healing	Pearson Correlation	.423**
	Sig. (2-Tailed)	.000
	N	91
Wisdom	Pearson Correlation	.412**
	Sig. (2-Tailed)	.000
	N	91
Persuasive Mapping	Pearson Correlation	.553**
	Sig. (2-Tailed)	.000
	N	91
Organizational Stewardship	Pearson Correlation	.414**
	Sig. (2-Tailed)	.000
	N	91

Table 4.11. Summary of Hypotheses for Research Question 1

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The data provided in Table 4.11 shows that there is a positive relationship between the servant leadership of the pastor and the affective commitment of the staff. The researcher rejected the null hypothesis of hypotheses 1a, b, c, d, and e. The researcher concluded that there was sufficient evidence at the 1% level of significance to show a positive relationship between all five subscales of servant leadership and affective commitment. Servant leadership had a positive correlation with affective commitment.

Research Question 2

Does the pastor’s servant leader style of leadership have an effect on staff continuance commitment to the organization?

	Continuance Commitment	
Altruistic Calling	Pearson Correlation	-.189
	Sig. (2-Tailed)	.072
	N	91
Emotional Healing	Pearson Correlation	-.137
	Sig. (2-Tailed)	.196
	N	91
Wisdom	Pearson Correlation	-.056
	Sig. (2-Tailed)	.595
	N	91
Persuasive Mapping	Pearson Correlation	-.005
	Sig. (2-Tailed)	.963
	N	91
Organizational Stewardship	Pearson Correlation	-.005
	Sig. (2-Tailed)	.959
	N	91

Table 4.12. Summary of Hypotheses for Research Question 2

Table 4.12 contains a mixed response between the servant leadership of the pastor and the continuance commitment of the staff. Altruistic calling is the strongest negative ($r = -.189$) followed by emotional healing ($r = -.137$). Persuasive mapping and organizational stewardship were the same ($r = -.005$). Those four subscales had a negative relationship with the continuance commitment of the staff members. The wisdom subscale ($r = .056$) was the only subscale with a positive relationship. The researcher therefore accepted the null hypotheses, accepting the evidence that there was no significant correlation between altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship of the pastor and the staff continuance commitment.

Research Question 3

Does the pastor’s servant leadership style of leadership have an effect on staff normative commitment to the organization?

	Normative Commitment	
Altruistic Calling	Pearson Correlation	.327**
	Sig. (2-Tailed)	.002
	N	91
Emotional Healing	Pearson Correlation	.294**
	Sig. (2-Tailed)	.005
	N	91
Wisdom	Pearson Correlation	.398**
	Sig. (2-Tailed)	.000
	N	91
Persuasive Mapping	Pearson Correlation	.454**
	Sig. (2-Tailed)	.000
	N	91
Organizational Stewardship	Pearson Correlation	.464**
	Sig. (2-Tailed)	.000
	N	91

Table 4.13. Summary of Hypotheses for Research Question 3

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

From table 4.13, it is clear that there is a positive relationship between the servant leadership of the pastor and the normative commitment of the staff. The researcher rejected the null hypothesis of hypotheses 1a, b, c, d, and e. The researcher concluded that there was sufficient evidence to show, at the 1% level of significance, a positive relationship between normative commitment and all five subscales of servant leadership. Servant leadership correlated positively with normative commitment.

Summary

As part of this dissertation study, the preceding chapter presented the data derived from full-time ministerial staff and full-time administrative assistants of Southern Baptist

churches located in Mississippi with a resident membership of 500 or more. Along with descriptive statistics and reliability analysis, empirical results of the research were presented. The researcher presents the following significant results:

1. Servant leadership of the pastor does have an effect on staff affective commitment to the organization.
2. Servant leadership of the pastor does not have an effect on staff continuance commitment.
3. Servant leadership of the pastor does have an effect on staff normative commitment to the organization.

In chapter 5, the researcher will present the purpose, implications of the findings, limitations, recommendations for future research, and the conclusion.

Chapter 5 – Summary, Recommendations, and Conclusion

In chapter 5, the researcher includes the purpose, implications of the findings, limitations, recommendations for future research, and the conclusion.

Purpose

The purpose of this dissertation was to examine the relationship between the servant leadership of the pastor and staff organizational commitment. The researcher sought to discover the following: The relationship between pastoral leadership and staff organizational commitment. The following research questions and hypotheses are presented once again to properly evaluate the problem:

1. Does the pastor's servant leadership style of leadership have an effect on staff affective commitment to the organization?

Hypothesis 1a: There will be no significant correlation between the pastor's altruistic calling and staff affective commitment to the organization.

Hypothesis 1b: There will be no significant correlation between the pastor's emotional healing and staff affective commitment to the organization.

Hypothesis 1c: There will be no significant correlation between the pastor's wisdom and staff affective commitment to the organization.

Hypothesis 1d: There will be no significant correlation between the pastor's persuasive mapping and staff affective commitment to the organization.

Hypothesis 1e: There will be no significant correlation between the pastor's organizational stewardship and staff affective commitment to the organization.

2. Does the pastor's servant leadership style of leadership have an effect on staff continuance commitment to the organization?

Hypothesis 2a: There will be no significant correlation between the pastor's altruistic calling and staff continuance commitment to the organization.

Hypothesis 2b: There will be no significant correlation between the pastor's emotional healing and staff continuance commitment to the organization.

Hypothesis 2c: There will be no significant correlation between the pastor's wisdom and staff continuance commitment to the organization.

Hypothesis 2d: There will be no significant correlation between the pastor's persuasive mapping and staff continuance commitment to the organization.

Hypothesis 2e: There will be no significant correlation between the pastor's organizational stewardship and staff continuance commitment to the organization.

3. Does the pastor's servant leadership style of leadership have an effect on staff normative commitment to the organization?

Hypothesis 3a: There will be no significant correlation between the pastor's altruistic calling and staff normative commitment to the organization.

Hypothesis 3b: There will be no significant correlation between the pastor's emotional healing and staff normative commitment to the organization.

Hypothesis 3c: There will be no significant correlation between pastor's wisdom and staff normative commitment to the organization.

Hypothesis 3d: There will be no significant correlation between the pastor's persuasive mapping and staff normative commitment to the organization.

Hypothesis 3e: There will be no significant correlation between the pastor's organizational stewardship and staff normative commitment to the organization.

The findings of the study provide an important addition to the field of leadership studies and address the limited research of servant leadership and organizational commitment in a church setting.

The sample population consisted of Southern Baptist Churches in Mississippi with a resident membership of 500 or more. The researcher sent the survey by e-mail to 181 pastors asking permission for their staff to participate. A total of 37 churches responded, representing 20% participation. Ninety-one participants completed surveys. The 91 participants rated their pastor with the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006) and completed the Three-Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey (Meyer & Allen, 2004) measuring their commitment to the organization.

The researcher obtained the data and used correlations to analyze the data. The researcher then calculated the correlation coefficients for the sub-score for each survey as well as each category of each survey compared with each category of the other using Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (Pearson r). The Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) had five subscales: (a) altruistic calling, (b) emotional healing, (c) wisdom, (d) persuasive mapping, and (e) organizational stewardship. The Three-Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey had three constructs: (a) affective commitment, (b) continuance commitment, and (c) normative commitment.

The present research mean score for the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) categories of altruistic calling were 3.87, emotional healing were 3.65, wisdom were 4.04, persuasive mapping were 3.82 and organization stewardship were 4.49. When compared to the mean scores of Barbuto and Wheeler (2006), the mean scores of this research were higher.

The Three-Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey constructs mean scores for this research were as follows: affective commitment 5.63, continuance commitment 3.84 and normative commitment 5.19. When compared to Meyer and Allen's (1990) mean score of 4.63 for affective commitment, 4.51 for continuance commitment and 3.77 for normative commitment, the mean scores for this study, except for continuance commitment, were higher. When compared to Nyengane's (2007) scores of 2.43 for affective commitment, 2.17 for continuance commitment and 1.77 for normative commitment, the mean scores for this research were all higher.

Implications of the Findings

Research Findings 1

Does the pastor's servant leadership style of leadership have an effect on staff affective commitment to the organization? The researcher's results showed there was a relationship between servant leadership and affective commitment in all five areas of servant leadership: altruistic calling ($r = .430$), emotional healing ($r = .423$), wisdom ($r = .412$), persuasive mapping ($r = .553$), and organizational stewardship ($r = .414$). For hypotheses 1a-e, the data provided showed that there was a positive correlation between the pastor's servant leadership and the staff affective commitment to the organization. According to the data provided, the hypotheses were not accepted.

The leader affected the affective commitment of the staff, their emotional attachment and identification with the organization. According to research, studies have shown that a person who is affectively committed to the organization has an emotional attachment to the organization. The person who believes in the goals and values of the organization, works hard for the organization and intends to stay with the organization (Mowday, Porter & Steers, 1982). The results of this study indicated that affective commitment exists in churches as well as in other organizations.

The pastor's leadership style did have an effect on a staff member's goals, values, work ethics, and tenure with the church. The pastor's leadership had the ability to reach farther than his own person. The staff member was motivated to live out his affective commitment when the pastor led as a servant-leader. By living out their affective commitment, employees have an effect on those whom they serve (Reichheld, 1996). The results of the study revealed that staff members could positively affect church members, as well as others, when led by a pastor with a servant leadership style of leadership.

Research Findings 2

Does the pastor's servant leadership style of leadership have an effect on staff continuance commitment to the organization? As noted in chapter two, continuance commitment focuses on the investments of the staff member that are nontransferable. Continuance commitment could include tenure, retirement benefits, bonuses, and other benefits.

The results for hypothesis 2a reveal a negative correlation between altruistic calling and continuance commitment to the church ($r = -.189$). The altruistic calling of the pastor emphasizes the pastor's desire to make a difference in the lives of others, while putting

the other person's interest before his own. The Sig (2-tailed) value of .072 is greater than 0.01, concluding that there was no statistically significant correlation between the pastor's altruistic calling and the staff member's continuance commitment to the church. The findings showed hypothesis 2a to be accepted.

The results for hypothesis 2b reveal a negative correlation between emotional healing and continuance commitment to the church, ($r = -.137$). Emotional healing is the attribute of servant leadership in which the leader promotes healing and provides a place where staff members are able to voice their concerns. The Sig (2-tailed) value of .196 is greater than 0.01, concluding that there was no statistically significant correlation between the pastor's emotional healing and the staff member's continuance commitment to the church. The findings showed hypothesis 2b to be accepted.

The results for hypothesis 2c reveals a positive correlation between the pastor's wisdom and staff continuance commitment to the church, ($r = .056$). The pastor's wisdom is his ability to anticipate what lies ahead and his ability to learn from the environment. The Sig (2-tailed) value of .595 is greater than 0.01, concluding that there was no statistically significant correlation between the pastor's wisdom and the staff member's continuance commitment to the church. The findings showed hypothesis 2c to be accepted.

The results for hypothesis 2d revealed a negative correlation between the pastor's persuasive mapping and the staff member's continuance commitment to the church, ($r = -.005$). The pastor's persuasive mapping encourages the staff member to look forward and make decisions that will positively affect the entire organization. The Sig (2-tailed) value of .963 is greater than 0.01, concluding that there was no statistically significant

correlation between the pastor's persuasive mapping and the staff member's continuance commitment to the church. The findings showed hypothesis 2d to be accepted.

The results for hypothesis 2e revealed a negative correlation between the pastor's organizational stewardship and the staff members continuance commitment to the church ($r = -.005$). The pastor's organizational stewardship has the ability to affect the community through the church. The Sig (2-tailed) value of .959 is greater than 0.01 concluding that there was no statistically significant correlation between the pastor's organizational stewardship and the staff member's continuance commitment to the church. The findings showed hypothesis 2e to be accepted .

Research Findings 3

Does the pastor's servant leadership style of leadership have an effect on staff normative commitment to the organization? The findings showed that there was a positive correlation between the normative commitment of the staff and the servant leadership of the pastor: altruistic calling ($r = .327$), emotional healing ($r = .294$), wisdom ($r = .398$), persuasive mapping ($r = .454$), and organizational stewardship ($r = .464$). Since there was a relationship between normative commitment of the staff and servant leadership of the pastor, hypotheses 3a-e was not accepted.

Normative commitment is a commitment based on an obligation one feels toward the organization. Normative commitment is based on moral and right behavior (Wiener, 1982) measured by one's sacrifice and loyalty to the organization (Weiner & Verdi, 1980). The results of this research question should not have been surprising. In this study, the researcher focused on the ministerial staff and administrative assistants of Southern Baptist churches in Mississippi. Staff member of churches are expected to be Christians.

Christians agree to live with moral values based on the Word of God. The Bible instructed Christians to serve others and to sacrifice themselves for the sake of others.

The findings in the study offer several implications for pastors, ministerial staff, and administrative assistants. The results of the present research suggest the servant leadership of the pastor has an influence on the affective commitment of ministerial staff and administrative assistants. As a servant-leader, the pastor influences the ministerial staff and administrative assistants in their attachment, identification, involvement and desire to remain with the church. The present research also suggests that the pastor has an influence on the normative commitment of the ministerial and administrative staff. The commitment of the ministerial staff and administrative assistants is directly proportional to the pastor's servant leadership. The staff member who experienced normative commitment is a staff member who is loyal to the church and its ministry and is willing to make sacrifices, as needed, to further the church (Weiner & Verdi, 1980). The pastor's servant leadership has the capacity to influence the church staff. If the church wishes to keep committed and loyal staff, the church should be willing to pray for a servant-leader pastor.

The results from continuance commitment revealed that there was no significant correlation between the pastor's servant leadership and the continuance commitment of the staff. The result revealed that staff members were willing to stay with the church, keep their retirement, maintain their relationship with other employees, or enjoy other benefits that existed, regardless of the pastor. The group statistics reminded us that there were 59 ministerial staff and 32 administrative assistants who participated in the survey. For the continuance commitment, the ministerial staff mean score was 3.69 out of 7 and

the administrative assistant's mean score was 4.10 out of 7. The administrative assistant's score showed the researcher that they were more likely to experience continuance commitment than ministerial staff.

Table 4.9 in chapter 4 showed that continuance commitment had a lower mean score, which is 3.8370, than affective commitment, scoring 5.6300, or normative commitment scoring 5.1923. Meyer and Allen (1997) gave no guidance about the expected or desired organizational commitment constructs: affective, continuance, and normative commitment. However, Meyer and Allen (Meyer & Allen, 1996; Dunham, Grube, & Castaneda, 1994) set out to determine the relationship between the different types of organizational commitment measuring the constructs and identifying the patterns. They discovered that the desired pattern was for affective commitment to have the highest score, followed by normative commitment, and lastly continuance commitment. Table 4.9 indicated that normative commitment mean scores were marginally higher than affective commitment, and affective commitment mean scores were marginally higher than continuance commitment scores.

This research focused on pastors, ministerial staff, and administrative assistants of Southern Baptist Churches in Mississippi. Pastors, ministerial staff, and administrative assistants were expected to be Christians. God called Christians to love God, put their trust in God, and to pattern their life after Jesus Christ. Christians believe that the Bible is the Word of God, and they should pattern their lives after the truths and precepts of the Bible. The Bible instructs its readers to love one another and to value one another. Christians are to pray and to trust God to use them where He wants them in His kingdom. The lack of a correlation between the servant leadership of the pastor and continuance

commitment of the ministerial staff and administrative assistants could have been because the staff felt led to serve where they are, enjoying the benefits that they have, knowing that God has placed them in their present ministry. Regardless of what the pastor does or how he treats the staff, the staff chooses to trust God. As Christians, the staff believes the Bible is God's Word and they choose to live by His Word. Rather than doubting God's plan, they live by (Romans 8:28), "For we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose."

When a person understands grace, the correlation between normative commitment of the staff and the pastor's servant leadership makes sense. Grace is a gift of God, expressing mercy, loving-kindness, and salvation to people. Grace is God's activity of confronting human beings' indifference and rebellion with forgiveness and blessings (Elwell & Comfort, 2001). As a receiver of grace, a Christian desires to live in grace. A Christian not only desires to be the receiver of the blessing of grace, but also the giver. When the pastor behaves as a servant-leader, the characteristics of the ministerial staff and administrative assistants in normative commitment will be evident.

In regards to pastoral leadership, pastors should seek to practice servant leadership. Research has proven that servant leadership yield significant effects on the church staff, both ministerial and administrative. Pastors who desire for the staff to stay with the church, who desire to have a climate of trust, organizational health, loyalty and a pursuit of goals, should consider further development of servant leadership behaviors.

Limitations

The findings of this study have certain limitations. One limitation could be the sample. The sample included only Southern Baptist Churches in the state of Mississippi with a resident membership of 500 or more.

The sample size for this study was adequate ($n = 91$), although a larger sample of the population of Southern Baptist Churches in Mississippi could have enhanced the results. McMillan and Schumacher (2010) suggest a minimum of 30 subjects for correlation studies.

Another limitation could be that only full-time ministerial staff and administrative assistants received an invitation to participate in the survey. This approach seemed to be the most effective method of obtaining a sample of followers who could address the questions about the pastor's leadership style and their commitment to the church.

The instrumentation choice of questionnaires for this study could be a limitation. The data gathering process was a single on-line survey. The researcher chose the two instruments due to the detail of their available measures that have shown reliability and validity in previous research. However, the instruments were not specifically designed for religious organizations. In the survey, the researcher gave clarification so that the one taking the survey would clearly understand the meaning of the items.

Another limitation to this research was the construct of continuance commitment. The reliability of the continuance commitment scale was low (.694) in comparison to affective (.759) and normative (.796). The researcher concluded that these findings suggested a need for additional study of the Meyer and Allen's TCM Employee Commitment Survey.

Recommendations for Future Research

Replication of and possible enlargement of the sample of this study in other regions would be highly desirable. A person could study the correlation of the servant-leader behavior of the pastor and its effect on the organizational commitment of the staff in other states. To help all levels of church staff adopt a servant leadership behavior, leadership could promote training in servant leadership principles. The pastor, ministerial staff, and administrative associates could learn the behavior of servant leadership and teach paid and volunteer staff to lead as servants.

In this study, ministerial staff and administrative assistants rated individual pastors. Further research could rate the pastors as in this study, but individualize the ministerial staff and administrative assistants. Further research could also employ interviews with ministerial staff and administrative assistants to determine why they answered the questions as they did.

In this study, staff positions, ministerial staff, and administrative assistants were the demographic control variables. Future studies might consider measuring how servant leadership of the pastor might affect other variables such as age, gender, tenure and education.

Conclusion

The main objective of the study was to investigate the relationship between the pastor's servant leadership style of leadership and organizational commitment of the ministerial staff and administrative assistants to Southern Baptist churches in Mississippi. Evidence supported the reliability and validity of both servant leadership and organizational commitment measurement instruments.

The results of the study revealed that the pastor's servant leadership style of leadership had a positive correlation with affective and normative commitment. This means that leadership behaviors which involve meeting the needs of others, initiating processes of healing, being observant, promoting encouragement, and focusing on the good of society has an effect on how ministerial staff and administrative assistants feel about staying with the church.

The ministerial staff and administrative assistant's affective commitment, their emotional attachment to the church, identification, and involvement with the church was positively correlated with the pastor's servant leadership. The outcome of such a relationship between the pastor and staff will be belief in goals of the church, hard work, and long tenure with the organization (Mowday, Porter & Steers, 1982).

The ministerial staff and administrative assistant's normative commitment, the loyalty of the staff to the church, had a positive correlation with the pastor's servant leadership. The staff's loyalty and devotion, the sacrifices that they make on behalf of the church, is evidence of such a relationship (Weiner & Verdi, 1980).

The results of the study revealed a weak negative correlation between the pastor's servant leadership and continuance commitment of the church staff based on the *r*-values. The *p*-values were not below 0.01, therefore the researcher accepted the hypothesis. This means that the pastor's leadership behaviors which involve meeting the needs of others, initiating processes of healing, being observant, promoting encouragement, and focusing on the good of society had no effect on the continuance commitment of the staff.

This present study provides another view of the importance of leadership in the local church. Hopefully, this study provides instruction and encouragement for the future

development of leaders, reminding them of the impact they have on others, in both church and organizational settings.

REFERENCES

- Allen, N.J., & Meyer, J.P. (1996). "Affective Continuance and Normative Commitment to the Organization: An Examination of Construct Validity." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 49, 252-76.
- Barbuto, J.E., & Wheeler, D. (2006). "Scale Development and Construct Clarification of Servant Leadership." *Group & Organization Management* (3), 300-326.
- Barna, George (1997). "Nothing is More Important Than Leadership" in *Leaders on Leadership*, ed. George Barna. Ventura: Regal.
- Barna, George (2001). "The Power of Team Leadership". Colorado Springs: Waterbrook Press.
- Barrick, M.R., & Mount, M.K. (1991). "The Big Five Personality Dimensions and Job Performance: A Meta-Analysis." *Personnel Psychology* (44), 1-26.
- Baruch, Y. (1998). "The Rise and Fall of Organizational Commitment." *Human Systems Management* 17, (2), 135-44.
- Bass, B.M. (1985a). "Leadership: Good, Better, Best". *Organizational Dynamics* 3, (3), 26-40.
- Bass, B.M. (1985b). *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*. New York: The Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership*. New York: The Free Press.
- Bass, B.M. (2000). "The Future of Leadership in Learning Organizations". *Journal of Leadership Studies* 7, (3),18-41.

- Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.J. (1990). "Developing Transformational Leadership, 1992 and Beyond." *Journal of European Industrial Training* 14, (5), 21-27.
- Bateman, T., & Strasser, S. (1984). "A Longitudinal Analysis of the Antecedents of Organizational Commitment." *Academy of Management Journal* (21), 95-112.
- Bennett, J.L. (2001). "Trainers as Leaders of Learning." *Training & Development* 55, (3), 42-5.
- Bennis, W., & Goldsmith, J. (1994). *Learning to Lead: A Workbook on Becoming a Leader*. Reading: Addison Wesley.
- Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The Strategies for Taking Charge*. New York: Harper & Row Publisher.
- Bhindi, N., & Duignan, P. (1997). *Leadership for the New Century: Authenticity, Intentionality, Spirituality, and Sensibility*. London: Sage.
- Blake, R.R., & Mouton, J.S. (1964). *The Managerial Grid*. Houston: Gulf Publishing Company.
- Blake, R. R., Shepherd, H.A., & Mouton, J.S. (1964). *Managing Intergroup Conflict in Industry*. Houston: Gulf Publishing.
- Blanchard, Ken and Hodges, P. (2003). *The Servant Leader*. Nashville: J Countryman.
- Block, P. (1993). *Stewardship: Choosing Service over Self-Interest*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Bolon, D.S. (1997). "Organizational Citizenship Behavior Among Hospital Employees: A Multidimensional Analysis Involving Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment." *Hospital & Health Services Administration* 42, (2), 221-41.

- Buchanan, B. II. (1974). "Building Organizational Commitment: The Socialization of Managers in Work Organizations." *Administrative Science Quarterly* (22), 533-46.
- Buchen, I.H. (1998). "Servant Leadership: A Model for Future Faculty and Future Institutions." *The Journal of Leadership Studies* (5), 125.
- Buhler, P. (1995). "Leaders vs. Managers." *Supervision* (56), 24.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Carter, J. C. (2009). "Transformational Leadership and Pastoral Leader Effectiveness". *Pastoral Psychology* (58), 261-71.
- Cohen, A. (1996). "On the Discriminant Validity of the Meyer and Allen Measure of Organizational Commitment: How Does it Fit with the Work Commitment Construct?" *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 56, (3), 494-503.
- Cohen, A. (1999). "Relationships Among Five Forms of Commitment: An Empirical Assessment." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* (20), 285-308.
- Cohen, Aaron & Kirchmeyer, C. (1995). "A Multidimensional Approach to the Relation Between Organizational Commitment and nonwork Participation." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 46, (2), 189-202.
- Coleman, D. F., Irving, G.P., & Cooper, C.L. (1999). "Another Look at the Locus of Control-Organizational Commitment Relationship: It Depends on the Form of Commitment." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* (20), 995-1001.
- Cooper, M. (2005). "The Transformational Leadership of the Apostle Paul: A Contextual and Biblical Leadership for Contemporary Ministry." *Christian Education Journal* 2, (1), 48-61.

- Cothen, Joe H. (1981). *Equipped for Good Work*. Gretna: Pelican Publishing Company.
- Crabtree, S. (2004). "Getting Personal in the Workplace: Are Negative Relationships Squelching Productivity in Your Company?" *The Gallup Management Journal*, June. <http://gmj.gallup.com> (accessed January 2, 2011).
- Crosby, P.B. (1996). *The Absolutes of Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Daft, R.L. (1994). *Management*. Fort Worth: The Dryden Press.
- Daft, R.L. (2005). *The Leadership Experience (3rd ed.)*. Mason, OH: Thomson.
- Dansereau, F., Graen, G., & Haga, W.J. (1975). "A Vertical Dyad Linkage Approach to Leadership within Formal Organizations." *Organizational Behavior & Human Performance* (13), 46-78.
- Davis, A. (2004). "Sky High – How WestJet Got There – and How You Can, Too." *Profit*, March, 20-26.
- Drury, Sharon L. (2004). "Servant Leadership and Organizational Commitment". *Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*, 1-14.
- Dunham, Randall B., Grube, J.A., & Castaneda, M.B.(1994). "Organizational Commitment: The Utility of an Integrative Definition." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 79, (3), 370-80.
- Eldridge, D. (1995). *The Teaching Ministry of the Church*. Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers.
- Elwell, W.A., & Comfort, P.W. (2001). *Tyndale Bible Dictionary*. Wheaton: Tyndale House Publishers.
- Fairholm, G.W. (1991). *Values Leadership: Toward a New Philosophy of Leadership*. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Farling, M.L., Stone, A.G., & Winston, B.E. (1999). "Servant Leadership: Setting the Stage for Empirical Research." *The Journal of Leadership Studies* (6), 49-72.

Fiedler, F.E. (1964). "A Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness." In *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, by L. Berkowitz (Ed), 149-90. New York: Academic Press.

Fiedler, F.E. (1978). "The Contingency Model and the Dynamics of the Leadership Process." In *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, by L. Berkowitz (Ed), 59-112. New York: Academic Press.

Fisher, Jr., J.R. (1999). "What Will it Take to Transform Your Organization in the 21st Century?" *Journal for Quality & Participation* 22, (6), 7-14.

Fleishman, E.A. & Hunt, G. (1973). *Current Developments in the Study of Leadership*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Gardner, J. (1990). *On Leadership*. New York: The Free Press.

Gerber, P.D., Nel, P.S. & Van Dyk, P.S. (1996). *Human Resource Management*. Johannesburg: International Thompson Publishing.

Getz, Gene A. (2003). *Elders and Leaders*. Chicago: Moody Publishers.

Graen, George & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). "Relationship-based Approach to Leadership: Development of Leader-member Exchange (LMX) Theory of Leadership Over 25 Years: Applying a Multi-Level Multi-Domain Perspective". *The Leadership Quarterly* 6, (2), 219-47.

Graham, J. W. (1991). "Servant Leadership in Organizations: Inspirational and Moral." *Leadership Quarterly* (2), 105-19.

Greenleaf, Robert K. (1970). *The Servant as Leader*. Indianapolis: Greenleaf Center.

- Greenleaf, Robert K. (1977). *Servant Leadership*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Griffeth, R.W. & Hom, P.W. (1995). "The Employee Turnover Process". *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management* (13),245-9.
- Gunnigle, P., Heraty, P. & Morley, M. (1971). *Personal and Human Resource Management: Theory and Practice in Ireland*. Ireland: MacMillan Press Ltd.
- Hackett, Rick D., Bycio, P. and Hausdorf, P.A. (1994). "Further Assessments of Meyer and Allen's (1991) Three-Component Model of Organizational Commitment". *Journal of Applied Psychology* 79, (1), 15-23.
- Halverstadt, Hugh F. (1991). *Managing Church Conflict*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press.
- Hawkins, O.S. (2006). *The Pastor's Primer*. Guidestone.
- Hemphill, J. K., & A.E. Coons (1957). Development of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. In *Leader behavior: Its Description and Measurement* by R. M. Stogdill & A. E. Coons (Eds.), Columbus: Ohio State University.
- Hersey, P., and K. H. Blanchard (1969). Life Cycle Theory of Leadership. *Training and Development Journal* (23), 26-34.
- Hersey, P., Blanchard, K.H., and D.E. Johnson (1996). *Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hesse, H. (1971). *Journey to the East*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.
- Hogan, R., G.J. Curphy, and Hogan, J. (1994). "What We Know About Leadership: Effectiveness and Personality." *American Psychologist* (June), 1-33.
- House, R.J. (1994). *Global Perspectives for Local Action*. Washington, DC: National Academic Press.

- House, R.J. (1996). "Path-Goal Theory of Leadership: Lessons, Legacy, and a Reformulated Theory." *Leadership Quarterly* 7, (3), 317-22.
- House, R.J., & Mitchell, T.R. (1974). "Path-goal Theory of Leadership." In *Decision Making: An Organizational Behavior Approach* by J.M. Pennings, 23-34. Markus Wiener Publishing Inc.
- Hussey, J., & Hussey, R. (1997). *Business Research: A Practical Guide for Undergraduate and Postgraduate Students*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Igharia, M., & Greenhaus, J.H. (1992). "Determinants of MIS Employees' Turnover Intentions: A Structural Equation Model." *Association for Computing Machinery Communications of the ACM* 35, (2), 34-45.
- Irving, Justin A. (2005). "Utilizing the Organizational Leadership Assessment as a Strategic Tool for Increasing the Effectiveness of Teams within Organizations." *Journal of Management and Marketing Research*, 111-24.
- Irwin, Craig E., & Roller, R.H. (2000). "Pastoral Preparation for Church Management." *Journal of Ministry Marketing & Management* 6, (1), 53-67.
- Kahl, J., & Donelan, T. (2004). *Leading from the Heart: Choosing to Be a Servant Leader*. Westlake: Kahl & Associates.
- Kaldneberg, D. O., B.W. Becker & Zvonkovic, A. (1995). "Work and Commitment Among Young Professionals: A Study of Male and Female Dentists." *Human Relations* 48, (11), 1355-77.
- Kanter, R.M. (1968). "Commitment and Social Organization: A Study of Commitment Mechanisms in Utopian Communities." *American Sociological Review* (33), 499-517.

- Kanter, R.M. (1995). *Mastering Change. Learning Organizations: Developing Cultures For Tomorrow's Workplace*. Portland: Productivity Press.
- Kirshenbaum, A, and Mano-Negrin, R. (1999). "Underlying Labor Market Dimensions of Opportunities." *Human Relations* 52, (10), 1233-55.
- Kotter, J.P. (1988). *The Leadership Factor*. New York: The Free Press.
- Kotter, J.P. and Heskett, J. (1992). *Corporate Culture and Performance*. New York: Free Press.
- Laka-Mathebula, M. (2004, January). *Modeling the Relationship Between Organizational Commitment, Leadership Style, Human Resources Management Practices and Organizational Trust*. Dissertation, University of Pretoria.
- Laub, J.A. (2004, August). "Defining Servant Leadership: A Recommended Typology for Servant Leadership Studies." *Servant Leadership Research Roundtable Proceedings*, Regent University, School of Leadership Studies. Virginia Beach.
- Lease, S. H. (1998). "Annual review, 1993-1997: Work Attitudes and Outcomes." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* (53), 154-83.
- Leonard, H.S. (2003). "Leadership Development of the Postindustrial, Postmodern Information Age." *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research* (55), 3-14.
- Liden, Robert C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, Hao, & Henderson, D. (2008, April). "Servant Leadership: Development of a Multidimensional Measure and Multi-Level Assessment." *Leadership Quarterly* 19, (2), 161-77.
- MacArthur, J. (2004). *The Book on Leadership*. Nelson Books.
- March, James G., & Simon, H. A. (1958). *Organizations*, New York: Wiley Publishing Company.

- Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). "A Review and Meta-Analysis of the Antecedents, Correlates, and Consequences of Organizational Commitment." *Psychological Bulletin* (108), 171-94.
- McCaslin, M. (2001). "The Landscape of Leadership Building Relationships". *Journal of Leadership Studies* (8), 21.
- McFarland, L.J., Senn, L.E., & Childress, J.R. (1993). *21st Century Leadership: Dialogues with 100 Top Leaders*. New York: Leadership Press.
- McIntosh, Gary L. (2000). *Staff Your Church For Growth*. Grand Rapids: Baker.
- McKenna, Robert B., Yost, P.R., & Boyd, T.N. (2007). "Leadership Development and Clergy: Understanding the Events and Lessons that Shape Pastoral Leaders". *Journal of Psychology and Theology* 35, (3), 179-89.
- McMillan, James H., & Schumacher, S. (2010). *Research in Education*. New York: Pearson.
- Megginson, Leon C., Mosley, D. C., & Pietri, P.H., Jr. (1992). *Management*. Harper Collins Publishers: New York.
- Meyer, J.P., & Allen, N.J. (1984). "Testing the Aside-Bet Theory of Organizational Commitment: Some Methodological considerations." *Journal of Applied Psychology* (69), 372-78.
- Meyer, J.P., & Allen, N.J. (1990). "The Measurement and Antecedents of Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment to the Organization." *Journal of Occupational Psychology* (63), 1-18.
- Meyer, J.P., & Allen, N.J. (1991). "A Three-Component Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment." *Human Resource Management Review* (1), 61-98.

- Meyer, J.P., & Allen, N.J. (1997). *Commitment in the Workplace*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Meyer, J.P., & Allen, N.J. (2004). *TCM Employee Commitment Survey Academic Users Guide 2004*. Department of Psychology: University of Western Ontario.
- Meyer, J.P., Allen, N.J., & Smith, C.A. (1993, August). "Commitment to Organizations and Occupations: Extensions and Test of a Three-Component Conceptualization." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 78, (4), 538-51.
- Meyer, J.P., & Hersovitch, L. (2001). "Commitment in the Workplace: Toward a General Model". *Human Resources Management Review*, (11), 299-326.
- Meyer, J.P., Irving, G., & Allen, N.J. (1998). "Examination of the Combined Effects of Work Values and Early Work Experiences on Organizational Commitment." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* (19), 29-52.
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D.J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). "Affective Continuance and Normative Commitment to the Organization. A Meta-Analysis of Antecedents, Correlates and Consequences." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 61, (1), 20-52.
- Mowday, R. T. (1998). "Reflections on the Study and Relevance of Organizational Commitment." *Human Resource Management Review* (8), 387-401.
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L.W., & Steers, R.M. (1979, April). "The Measure of Organizational Commitment." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 14, (2), 224-47.
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L.W., & Steers, R.M. (1982). *Employee-organization linkages: The Psychology of Commitment, Absenteeism, and Turnover*. New York: Academic Press.

- Newton, Phil A. (2005). *Elders in Congregational Life*. Grand Rapids: Kregel.
- Northouse, Peter G. (2007). *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Nunnally, J.C. (1978). *Psychometric Theory*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Nyengane, Mongezi H. (2007). *The Relationship Between Leadership Style and Employee Commitment: An Exploratory Study in an Electrical Utility of South Africa.* Thesis: Rhodes University.
- O'Reily, C. A., & Chatman, J. (1986). "Organizational Commitment and Psychological Attachment: The Effects of Compliance, Identification and Internalization on Prosocial Behavior." *Journal of Applied Psychology* (71), 361-78
- Page, D., & Wong, T.P. (2000). A Conceptual Framework for Measuring Servant Leadership. In "*The Servant-Leadership Role of Selected Catholic High School Principals.*" Dissertation by Nsiah, Joseph K. University of Saskatchewan, 2009.
- Page, D., & Wong, T.P. (2003, October). "Servant Leadership: An Opponent-Process Model and the Revised Servant Leadership Profile." *Servant Leadership Roundtable*, 1-13. <http://www.meaning.ca/archives/archive/pdfs/WongServantLeadership.pdf>. (Accessed August 30, 2010).
- Patterson, K.A. (2003). "Servant Leadership: A Theoretical Model." *Dissertation Abstracts International-A*. 64, no.2 (UMI No. 3082719): 570.
- Porter, L.W., Steers, R.M., Mowday, R.T., & Boulian, P.V. (1974). "Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction and Turnover Among Psychiatric Technicians." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 59, (5), 603-09.

- Reichers, A. (1985). "A Review and Reconceptualization of Organizational Commitment." *The Academy of Management Review* 10, (3), 465-76.
- Reichheld, Frederick F. (1996). *The Loyalty Effect*. Harvard Business School Press: Boston.
- Reinke, S.K. (2004). "Service Before Self: Towards a Theory of Servant Leadership". *Global Virtue Ethics Review* (5), 30-58.
- Rinehart, S.T. (1998). *Upside Down: The Paradox of Servant Leadership*. Colorado Springs: NavPress.
- Romzek, Barbara S. (1990, May-June). "Employee Investment and Commitment: The Ties that Bind." *Public Administration Review* 50, (3), 374-82.
- Russell, R.F. (1999). "The Role of Values in Servant Leadership." *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal* 22, (2), 76-83.
- Russell, R.F., & Stone, A.G. (2002). "A Review of Servant Leadership Attributes: Developing a Practical Model." *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal* 23, (3), 145-57.
- Sanders, J. O. (2007). *Spiritual Leadership*. Chicago: Moody Publishers.
- Sauter, S., Lim, S., & Murphy, L. (1996). "Organizational Health: A New Paradigm for Occupational Stress Research at NIOSH." *Japanese Journal of Occupational Mental Health* (4), 248-54. In "The Path to A Healthy Workplace." By Matthew J. Grawitch, Melanie Gottschalk and David C. Munz in *The Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 58, no. 3 (2006): 129-47. (Accessed February 19, 2011).

- Schermerhorn, John, Jr. (1997, Fall). "Situational Leadership: Conversations with Paul Hersey." *Mid American Journal of Business* 12, (2), 5-11.
- Sekaran, U. (2000). *Research Methods for Business: A Skill Building Approach*. 3rd Edition, New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Sellitz, C., Jehoda, M., Deutsch, M., & Cook, S.W. (1966). *Research Methods in Social Relations*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- 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.
- Sergiovanni, T.J. (1993). "Frames of Leadership." *International Journal of Educational Reform*. 2, (1), 19-26.
- Sharpe, F.G. (1995). "Educational Leadership for the Twenty-First Century." *The Practicing Administrator* (2), 16-20.
- Shirbagi, Naser (June, 2007). "Exploring Organizational Commitment and Leadership Frames within Indian and Iranian Higher Education Institutions." *Bulletin of Education Research* 29, (1), 17-32.
- Sims, B.J. (2005). *Servanthood: Leadership for the Third Millennium*. New York: Wipf & Stock.
- Smith, Brien N., Montagno, R.V., & Kuzmenko, T.N.(2004). "Transformational and Servant Leadership: Content and Contextual Comparisons." *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies* 10, (4), 80-91. <http://ezproxy.mc.edu:2054/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=5&hid=113&sid=fc2511a4-1f95-4c64-9c3e-a5da26df03f2%40sessionmgr114>. (accessed August 24, 2010).

- Somers, Mark J. (1995). "Organizational Commitment, Turnover and Absenteeism: An Examination of Direct and Interaction Effects." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* (16), 49-58.
- Somers, Mark J., & Birnbaum, D. (1998). "Work-related Commitment and Job Performance: It's also the Nature of the Performance that Counts." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* (19), 621-34.
- Spears, L.C. (1994). "Servant Leadership: Quest for Caring Leadership." *Inner Quest* (2), 1-4.
- Spears, L.C. (1995). *Reflections on Leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's Theory of Servant Leadership Influenced Today's Top Management Thinkers*. New York: John Wiley.
- Spears, L.C. (1998). *Insights on Leadership: Service, Stewardship, Spirit, and Servant Leadership*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Spears, L.C. (2004, Fall). "Practicing Servant Leadership." *Leader to Leader* (34), 7-11.
- Spears, L.C., & Lawrence, M. (Eds.). (2004). *Practicing Servant-Leadership: Succeeding Through Trust, Bravery, and Forgiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Spears, Larry C. (2010). "Character and Servant Leadership: Ten Characteristics of Effective, Caring Leaders." *The Journal of Virtues & Leadership*, 1, (1), 25-30.
- Springhall, Richard C. (1994). *Statistical Analysis*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Stogdill, R.M. (1973). *Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research*. New York: Free Press.
- Stone, A.G., & Patterson, K.A. (2005, August). The History of Leadership Focus. *Servant Leadership Research Roundtable Proceedings*.

- Ulrich, D. (2000). "A New Mandate for Human Resources." *Harvard Business Review*, 124-34.
- Ulrich, D. (2002, April). "Human Resources Has to Create Real Business Value." *Management Today*, 12-8.
- Vines, Jerry, & Shaddix, J. (1999). *Power in the Pulpit*. Chicago: Moody Press.
- Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A.G. (1974). "Decision Making as a Social Process: Normative and Descriptive Models of Leader Behavior." *Decision Science* (5),743-69.
- Vroom, V.H., & Yetton, P.W. (1973). *Leadership and Decision Making*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Walker, K., & Scharf, M. (2001). *Servant-Leadership Review*. Saskatoon: SELU, University of Saskatchewan.
- Wallace, J. Randall. (2007). "Servant Leadership: A World Perspective." *International Journal of Leadership Studies* 2, (2), 114-32.
- Weiner, Y. (1982). "Commitment in Organization: A Normative View." *Academy of Management Review* (7), 418-28.
- Weiner, Y., & Gechman, A.G. (1977). "Commitment: A Behavioral Approach to Job Involvement." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* (10), 47-52.
- Weiner, Y., & Verdi, Y. (1980). "Relationships Between Job, Organization, and Career Commitments and Work Outcomes-An Integrative Approach." *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* (26), 81-96.
- Wiersbe, David W. (2000). *The Dynamics of Pastoral Care*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books.

- Winston, B.E. (2003, October). "Extending Patterson's Servant Leadership Model: Coming Full Circle." *Proceedings of the Servant Leadership Research Roundtable*. School of Leadership Studies. Regent University, Virginia Beach.
- Wong, P., & Davey, D. (2007, July). "Best Practices in Servant Leadership." *Servant Leadership Round Table*. School of Global Leadership & Entrepreneurship, Regent University.
- Wong, P., & Page, D. (2003, October). "Servant Leadership: An Opponent-Process Model and the Revised Servant Leadership Profile." *Servant Leadership Roundtable*. Trinity Western University.
- Yukl, G. (2002). *Leadership in Organizations*. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.
- Yukl, G., Gordon, A. & Taber, T. (2002). "A Hierarchical Taxonomy of Leadership Behavior: Integrating a Half Century of Behavior Research." *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 9, (1), 15-32.

Appendices

Appendix A

Descriptive Statistics of Servant Leader Categories and
Organizational Commitment Subscales

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
Affective Commitment	91	2.67	7.00	5.63	1.032
Continuance Commitment	91	1.33	6.67	3.84	1.096
Normative Commitment	91	2.33	7.00	5.19	1.115
Altruistic Calling	91	1.00	5.00	3.87	.818
Emotional Healing	91	1.00	5.00	3.65	1.060
Wisdom	91	1.80	5.00	4.04	.776
Persuasive Mapping	91	1.40	5.00	3.82	.902
Organizational Stewardship	91	2.60	5.00	4.49	.614

Appendix B

Permission to Use the Servant Leadership Questionnaire

9/14/10

Dear Dr. Barbuto,

I am a student of Tennessee Temple University in Chatanooga, TN., and I am working on my PhD in Organizational Leadership. I am also the pastor of FBC McComb, MS. I would like to use the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) survey in my dissertation. The purpose of the study is to determine the relationship between servant leadership of pastors and organizational commitment of staff. The staff will consist of ministerial and administrative staff.

My plan is to have the staff of 219 Southern Baptist churches in the state of Mississippi to participate in this study. I am hoping that you can direct me in how to purchase the survey for use in my study or give me permission to use it at no cost.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Dear Pastor Rimes,

The questions from the servant leadership questionnaire are available to use for your dissertation at no cost. we ask that you keep us updated with results from your study and if possible, that you share your raw data with us so we can continue to revise and improve the measure. Thank you and good luck with your research.

Jay Barbuto

John E. Barbuto, Jr., Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Leadership
Coordinator, Leadership Studies Doctoral Specialization
University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Appendix C

Permission to Use the Organization Commitment Survey

9/9/10

Dear Dr. Meyer,

I am a student of Tennessee Temple University in Chatanooga, TN., working on my PhD in Organizational Leadership. I am also the pastor of FBC McComb, MS. I am planning on using your organizational commitment survey in my dissertation. The purpose of the study is to determine the relationship between servant leadership of pastors and organizational commitment of staff. The staff will consist of ministerial and administrative staff.

My plan is to have the staff of 219 Southern Baptist churches in the state of Mississippi to participate in this study. I am hoping that you can direct me in how to purchase the surveys for use in my study or give me permission to use them at no cost.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Woody D. Rimes

9/10/10

Dear Woody,

Thank you for your interest in our work. You are welcome to use the commitment measures in your research. There is not cost of academic use. I have attached a copy of the user's guide that contains the measures and instructions. I hope all goes well with your research.

Best regards,
John Meyer

9/10/10

Dr Meyer,

Thank you for your permission to use the commitment measures and your quick reply.
Blessings,
Woody

Appendix D

Letters to Pastors

Dear Pastor ,

As part of the requirements to complete my PhD at Tennessee Temple University, I am performing research for the dissertation component of my degree program. The participation of your ministerial staff and administrative assistants in this study is requested. **Ministerial staff** refers specifically to full time, financially compensated ministers who serve alongside the pastor to perform the ministry of the church.

Administrative assistant refers specifically to full time, financially compensated employees of the church who support the ministerial staff.

Below is information and instructions concerning the project.

Identification of Project

The Relationship between Pastoral Leadership and Staff Organizational Commitment

Purpose of the Research

This study is a research project with the purpose of examining the possible relationships between the servant leadership of the pastor and the organizational commitment of the staff. Participation in this survey will take approximately 10 minutes to complete.

Procedures

Each ministerial staff and administrative assistant will complete assessments consisting of 41 Likert-type questions and 6 demographic-type questions.

Confidentiality

The records of this study will be kept private. In any sort of report we might publish, we will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a subject or a specific church. Research records will be stored securely and only researchers will have access to the records.

Voluntary Participation

Participation in this study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with Tennessee Temple University or the researcher.

Contacts and Questions

The researcher conducting this study is Woody D. Rimes. If you have questions regarding this study, you are encouraged to contact him at First Baptist Church, McComb, xxx-xxx-xxxx.

If you will permit your ministerial staff and administrative assistants to participate, would you please forward the attached letter to each participant?

Thanks in advance for your support.

Sincerely

Woody D. Rimes, Pastor

First Baptist Church

1700 Delaware Ave. McComb, MS 39648

Appendix E

Letter to Participants

Dear Participant,

As part of the requirements to complete my PhD at Tennessee Temple University, I am performing research for the dissertation component of my degree program. Your participation in this study is requested.

Below is information and instructions concerning the project.

Identification of Project

The Relationship between Pastoral Leadership and Staff Organizational Commitment

Purpose of the Research

This study is a research project with the purpose of examining the possible relationships between the servant leadership of the pastor and the organizational commitment of the staff. Participation in this survey will take approximately 10 minutes to complete.

Procedures

Each ministerial staff and administrative assistant will complete assessments consisting of 41 Likert-type questions and 6 demographic-type questions. (One survey per participant).

Confidentiality

The records of this study will be kept private. In any sort of report we might publish, we will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a subject or a specific church. Research records will be stored securely and only researchers will have access to the records.

Voluntary Participation

Participation in this study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with Tennessee Temple University or the researcher.

Contacts and Questions

The researcher conducting this study is Woody D. Rimes. If you have questions regarding this study, you are encouraged to contact him at First Baptist Church, McComb, xxx-xxx-xxxx

If you are willing to participate in this survey, would you please go to xxxxxxxxxx and complete the survey? The survey site will remain open until 12:00 am, Thursday, October 28th.

Your password is _____

Thanks in advance for your support.

Sincerely

Woody D. Rimes, Pastor

First Baptist Church

1700 Delaware Ave.

McComb, MS 39648

Appendix F

Pastor Follow-Up Letter

October 22, 2010

Dear Pastor,

Approximately two weeks ago, I sent a request for your help, concerning my PhD studies. In my letter, I asked for your permission to allow your full time Ministerial Staff and Administrative Assistants to participate in an on-line survey.

If you have given them permission, please remind them that Thursday, October 28 is the final day to participate.

Your permission and the participation of your staff are greatly appreciated and will be a great help in the fulfillment of my PhD research.

Thank You,

Woody D. Rimes

Sent to all pastors whose staff had not responded on Oct 22

Appendix G

On-line Survey Questions

In this section, “this person” refers to the pastor of the church where you are currently employed. (The optional answer for the questions in this section were “never, rarely, sometimes, often, or always”).

1. This person puts my best interests ahead of his/her own.
2. This person does everything he/she can to serve me.
3. This person sacrifices his/her own interests to meet my needs.
4. This person goes above and beyond the call of duty to meet my needs.
5. This person is one I would turn to if I had a personal trauma.
6. This person is good at helping me with my emotional issues.
7. This person is talented at helping me to heal emotionally.
8. This person is one that could help me mend my hard feelings.
9. This person always seems to be alert to what’s happening around him/her.
10. This person is good at anticipating the consequences of decisions.
11. This person has awareness of what’s going on around him/her.
12. This person seems very in touch with what is happening around him/her.
13. This person seems to know what’s going on around him/her.
14. This person offers compelling reasons to get me to do things.
15. This person encourages me to dream “big dreams” about the organization.
16. This person is very persuasive.
17. This person is good at convincing me to do things.
18. This person is gifted when it comes to persuading me.
19. This person believes that the organization needs to play a moral role in society.
20. This person believes that our organization needs to function as a community.
21. This person sees the organization for its potential to contribute to society.
22. This person encourages me to have a community spirit in the workplace.
23. This person is preparing the organization to make a positive difference in the future.

In this section, your employer/organization refers to the church where you are currently employed. (The optional answer for the questions in this section were “strongly disagree, disagree, slightly disagree, undecided, slightly agree, agree, or strongly agree”).

24. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.
25. Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.

Please continue on next page

26. I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer.
27. I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.
28. It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.
29. Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now.
30. I do not feel a strong sense of "belonging" to my organization.
31. Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now.
32. I would feel guilty if I left my organization now.
33. I do not feel "emotionally attached" to this organization.
34. I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.
35. This organization deserves my loyalty.
36. I do not feel like "part of the family" at my organization.
37. If I had not already put so much of myself into this organization, I might consider working elsewhere.
38. I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.
39. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.
40. One of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.
41. I owe a great deal to my organization.

1. Gender

- Male
- Female

2. What is your age?

- 18-29 years old
- 30-49 years old
- 50-64 years old
- 65 years and over

3. What is your marital status?

- Now married
- Widowed
- Divorced
- Separated
- Never married

Please continue on next page

4. Education - What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed?

- High school graduate -
- Some college credit, but less than 1 year
- 1 or more years of college, no degree
- Associate degree
- Bachelor's degree
- Master's degree
- Professional degree
- Doctorate degree

5. How long have you been with your present employer/church?

- less than 1 year
- 1-5 years
- 6-10 years
- 11-15 years
- 16-20 years
- 21-30 years

6. Your position

- Ministerial staff
- Administrative assistant