SERVANT-LEADERSHIP AS A PREDICTOR OF JOB SATISFACTION AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT WITH THE MODERATING EFFECTS OF ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT AND ROLE CLARITY AMONG FILIPINO ENGINEERING, MANUFACTURING, AND TECHNOLOGY WORKERS

—G.R. BUD WEST
  REGENT UNIVERSITY

—MIHAI BOCÂRNEA
  REGENT UNIVERSITY

—DIOSCORO MARAÑON
  WEST NEGROS UNIVERSITY

Over the past decade, some popular press writers in the Philippines have pointed out the lack of transparency and stability in both public and private sectors throughout their country. Some have further offered that certain high-profile people in positions of authority have demonstrated relatively unmitigated ambition and lust for power, which has reportedly caused some members of their society to question the integrity and commitment of these organizational authorities in regard to their fellow citizens, as well as to question their collective ability to provide effective leadership (Fernandez, 2003; Limon, 2003). Still others have suggested that a *crisis* of leadership exists in the Philippines and have cited the need for better leadership in related political, socio-cultural, and economic concerns as a key for achieving peace and development in their country (Cagogo, 2006; Lugo, 2003). Some members of the government, as well as others in the business and religious communities, have suggested that developing and then applying servant-leadership could provide an effective answer to these concerns. At

129

the 2005 Catholic Bishops Conference of the Philippines, Archbishop Angel Lagdameo stated, "Authentic servant-leadership is what is proposed to transform our people's mistrust and despair into trust and confidence in leaders once again" (as cited in Pilapil, 2005, ¶ 5). Similarly, in a 2003 article in *Business World*, Reverend Father Antonio Pascual was cited suggesting that "servant leadership should start in the family" (¶ 1), thereby implicitly indicating his perceived need or desire to instill into the Filipino culture a paradigm of servant-leadership. Others have further surmised that urgent and desperate needs exist in the Philippines for servant-leadership (Cruz, 2006; Limon, 2003).

In apparent response to these calls, organizations such as the Ayala Group, the Financial Executives Institute of the Philippines, and the Center for Servant-Leadership Philippines have sponsored workshops and seminars to further Filipino citizens' general understanding of the concept of servant-leadership. For several years, on an annual basis, senior managers of the Ayala Group have interviewed nominees from colleges and universities across the Philippines and have selected student leaders who show exceptional promise to attend Ayala Young Leaders' Congress (AYLC). The stated goal of the AYLC organizers includes developing quality leaders, in what they term "the spirit of servant leadership" (Cagogo, 2006, ¶ 3). Similarly, the Financial Executives Institute of the Philippines has conducted workshops throughout the Philippines to assist its members in understanding the concepts of servant-leadership. Additionally, in conjunction with the Center for Servant-Leadership Philippines and the International Movement of Development Managers, they conducted a forum during the last presidential election cycle, inviting four national leaders to standardize the criteria for servant-leadership among national public officials (Limon, 2003). These efforts and others appear to have resulted in the perceptions of some success. Libre (2003) reported that a group interview he conducted with a small group of lawyers and reporters led him to believe that in the Philippines, the concept of servant-leadership has "found its way to the psyche of individuals who manage other people" (¶ 9).

Several years after the observed need for an investment in servant-leadership throughout the Philippines was recognized and articulated by both public and private sector members, statements in the press are unclear as to whether Filipinos generally appreciate servant-leadership constructs as presented in the scholarly literature; and if they do, how their appreciation for servant-leadership relates to organizational outcomes. In his article regarding the AYLC, Cagogo (2006) quoted Senator Manuel Roxas and others who discussed both governance and leadership as concepts. In his analysis of that discussion, Cagogo appeared to imply that the participants generally held that constructs of governance overlap with constructs of leadership and work toward the same outcomes. This may or may not represent truth, but without specific research to verify the notion, the implied relationship appears to add confusion rather than clarity. Likewise, Cruz (2006) suggested that no differences exist between the concepts of moral leadership, steward leadership, and servant-leadership, and that they amount to one type of leadership, albeit one that Filipinos need. Others suggested that servant-leadership includes the constructs of leaders maintaining and sharing their visions, while instilling commitment and teamwork (Abesamis, 2002; Suleik, 2003). Lugo (2003) additionally suggested that servant-leadership consists of emphasizing service as a component of leadership, while Suleik observed that Filipino servant-leadership adds humility and spirituality to the list of dimensions originally presented by Greenleaf (1977).

Several theorists have purported that servant-leadership, as introduced in the modern era by Robert Greenleaf (1977) and developed by several others (Autry, 2004; Spears & Lawrence, 2004), provides answers, in many ways, to some ethical and moral concerns, challenges, and dilemmas faced by members of organizations. In that regard, Spears identified two primary reasons for the rise in the importance of servant-leadership. He suggested that there exists a general level of dissatisfaction among members of today's organizations with the level of caring and encouraging behaviors they experience at work; in response to which he further suggested that

servant-leadership provides a different, more successful approach to answering contemporary expectations, than do other, more traditional leadership models (Tey, 2006). Conversely, other researchers have argued these points, as some have suggested that few substantive differences exist between servant-leadership and other modes such as transformational leadership (Beazley & Beggs, 2002; Stone, Russell, & Patterson, 2004; Patterson, 2003). Stone, Russell, and Patterson explained that both servant- and transformational leadership theories include the constructs of "influence, vision, trust, respect or credibility, risk-sharing or delegation, integrity, and modeling" (p. 354). Of the few substantive differences between these two leadership theories, it appears that servant-leadership might provide a closer alignment of motives between leaders and followers, which primarily results from greater levels of trust in followers (Bass, 2000; Stone, Russell, & Patterson, 2003). Additionally, Smith, Montagno, and Kuzmenko (2004) suggested that transformational leadership uniquely includes an accounting for intellectual stimulation, while servant-leadership uniquely stresses employees' emotional well-being. In a personal conversation in 2008, Bruce Winston, of Regent University, further suggested that a unique construct of servant-leadership exists in the requirement for the servant-leader to provide only for the desires and not necessarily the needs of the followers. He further described how, if a servant-leader perceives a need a follower has, rather than addressing the need for the follower or instructing the follower to address the need, the leader should develop the desire on the part of the follower to address the need.

In several studies, researchers have shown a positive relationship between transformational leadership and organizational commitment as well as job satisfaction (Leach, 2002; Walumbwa, Lawler, Avolio, Wang, & Shi, 2005; Walumbwa, Orwa, Wang, & Lawler, 2005; Walumbwa, Wang, Lawler, & Shi, 2004; Viator, 2001). All of these studies provided examples from a broad range of occupations, including responses from respondents in the banking, nursing, financial services, and accounting pro-

fessions. Reported outcomes of these studies suggest the existence of similar significant positive relationships between the evaluated constructs.

Because of the limited number of studies that have reported empirical results between servant-leadership and the organizational outcomes of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, the cited similarities between transformational leadership and servant-leadership help to establish the theoretical foundations necessary to investigate these relationships appropriately. Additionally, the few studies available that did consider servant-leadership in these regards reported mixed results. For example, Drury (2004) reported the existence of a significant, positive relationship between servant-leadership and job satisfaction, but a significant, inverse relationship between servant-leadership and organizational commitment. Ehrhart (2004) reported the existence of a significant, positive relationship between servant-leadership and organizational commitment, but no significant relationship between servant-leadership and job satisfaction. West and Bocârnea (2008) identified positive, significant correlations between servant-leadership and both job satisfaction and organizational commitment. However, when they controlled for role clarity and organizational support as first steps in their regression analysis, they found that these two constructs, rather than servant-leadership, accounted for nearly all of the variance in their model. These conflicting findings between previous studies suggest a general need for further investigation of the relationships between servant-leadership and the organizational outcomes of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, as well as any mediating or intervening effects of role clarity and organizational support regarding these relationships. Additionally, the stated commitment to, need for, and lack of empirical research regarding servant-leadership in the Philippines further suggests the need for conducting this research in a Filipino context. Establishing the existence of significant relationships between servant-leadership and organizational outcomes can provide decision makers with the empirical evidence necessary for them to consider incorporating a servant-leadership

paradigm into their leadership repertoire, both in the Philippines and generally.

The purpose of this study consisted of contributing to the knowledge bases of interested persons concerned about the relationships between servant-leadership and organizational outcomes, as well as the mediating or intervening relationships of role clarity and organizational support that exist between them. In fulfilling this purpose, we specifically considered the perspectives of Filipinos who serve primarily in the engineering, manufacturing, and technology industries. The participants formed a convenient sample (Creswell, 2002) that consisted of members of various professional engineering, manufacturing, and technology organizations within the Republic of the Philippines, as well as Filipino expatriates who resided in various other locations throughout the world. In this study we examined the direct relationship between the servant-leadership constructs of service, humility, and vision, as Hale and Fields (2007) describe them, and organizational commitment and job satisfaction. For the purposes of this study, servant-leadership consisted of service, humility, and vision, as described in Hale and Fields (2007). Organizational commitment consisted of affective commitment, as described by Fields (2002). In his work, Fields characterized affective commitment as: (a) one's dedication to organizational values and goals, (b) one's willingness to sacrifice for the good of the organization, and (c) one's desire to remain affiliated with the organization for reasons beyond obligation. Job satisfaction consisted of employees' affective reactions to their jobs (Fields, 2000). Constructs that have been shown to contribute to job satisfaction include: (a) one's feelings regarding specific constructs of the jobs; (b) one's met expectations or the difference or gap between what he or she desires and the actual outcomes; and (c) one's preferences, needs, and motives, as an employee.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

In this discussion, we briefly summarize the development of leadership as a concept, introduce transformational leadership, and compare the gen-

eral concepts of transformational leadership and servant-leadership. We next describe the constructs associated with servant-leadership that we use in the study. We then review the theoretical constructs that support the organizational outcomes of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, as well as those that support role clarity and organizational support. Finally, we report findings of empirical research that have identified significant and mixed relationships between and among these concepts and constructs.

Citing a popular dictionary of that day, Terry (1993) reported that leadership first appeared in the modern vernacular in an 1834 quote of Foublanque. He described the context of that quote as being limited to a political or an ideological nature. Terry further explained that by the 1930s, leadership had expanded in context to include "the idea of influence" (p. 12), which appears to have coincided with the advent of human relations-centered leadership generally attributed to Mayo, Roethlisberger, and Dickson, among others (Yukl, 2001). From their assessments of feudal lordship and serfdom as reflected in Western European societies during the middle ages, other scholars have surmised that leadership stems primarily from functional authority based upon the position of a given leader (Heifetz, 1995; Safty, 2003). In that regard, Barker (2002) suggested that what many people understand as traditional, mechanistic, or task-oriented leadership today generally represents an outgrowth of feudalistic lord/serf relationships. Scholars have also found theoretical relationships between leadership, human relations, functional position, and the uses of power and authority, as well as the directing of organizational change (Adler, 1997; Becker, 2007; Davidson, 2003; Eagan, 2000; Katzenbach & Smith, 1992; Leavitt, 2005; Winter, 1991; Yukl, Gordon, & Taber, 2002).

In his seminal work regarding leadership, Burns (1977) posited that "leadership is the reciprocal process of mobilizing, by persons with certain motives and values, various economic, political, and other resources, in a context of competition and conflict, in order to realize goals independently or mutually held by both leaders and followers" (p. 425). He defined transformative or transformational leadership as a form of leadership that tran-

scends the necessity to exploit followers' needs. He suggested that rather, transformational leadership possesses the ability to elevate people's individual conduct and to raise their ethical standards. He posited that the use of transformational leadership can cause followers to assume leadership roles and leaders to assume roles that provide for moral agency. Additionally, he theorized the functional attributes of transformational leadership as being idealized or individual consideration, charismatic influence, inspirational motivation, and intellectual stimulation, which researchers later validated (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Bass & Avolio, 1995; Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999). Additionally, Bass and Avolio (1993) concluded, as Burns had earlier implied, that transformational leadership affected not only systemic relationships within organizations, but cultural relationships as well. Consequently, it appears that in ideal applications, transformational leadership may equitably relate to task-centered, human relations-centered, and organizational change-centered relationships, strategies, and implementations.

Greenleaf (1977) suggested that servant-leaders possess the key values of service, vision, and humility. He theorized that the most effective servant-leaders begin as servants and that their leadership emerges based on their deep desire to help others. In expanding and validating Greenleaf's theory, Spears (2004) identified several central characteristics of servant-leaders that included: (a) listening, (b) empathy, (c) healing, (d) awareness, (e) persuasion, (f) conceptualization, (g) foresight, (h) stewardship, (i) commitment to the growth of people, and (j) building community. Similarly, Stone, Russell, and Patterson (2003) identified a list of servant-leader attributes that included: (a) vision, (b) trust, (c) honesty and integrity, (d) modeling, (e) service, (f) pioneering, (g) appreciation of others, and (h) empowerment. In comparing their list to the list of attributes associated with transformational leadership, they concluded that the only substantive difference between transformational leadership and servant-leadership existed in the primary concern of a given leader. They explained that while organizational outcomes serve as a transformational leader's primary concern, followers generally serve as a servant-leader's primary concern.

136

In evaluating the concepts cited by other scholars to describe servant-leadership, Hale and Fields (2007) concluded that they consistently included the three original constructs noted by Greenleaf: service, humility, and vision. In that regard, Hale and Fields suggested that service applies to followers, to organizations, and to society. They also posited that constructs of service include: (a) orientation; (b) development, elevation, and empowerment of subordinates; (c) stewardship to the organization; (d) covenant relationships; and (e) the moral development of everyone in those relationships. They defined humility as placing the "success of followers ahead of a leader's personal gain" (p. 6), and they posited that constructs of humility include: (a) power of relations, (b) altruism and altruistic calling, (c) emotional healing, (d) credibility, (e) voluntary subordination of one's self, (f) self-authenticity, (g) transcendental spirituality, and (h) ethical behavior. They defined vision as "having foresight combined with the ability to communicate vision to and influence followers in developing a shared vision for an organization" (p. 6), and they posited that the constructs of humility include: personal and transforming influence, as well as "wisdom, persuasive mapping. . . credibility, creating value for the community, and conceptual skills" (p. 6). Like Hale and Fields, we used the three constructs of service, humility, and vision in this study to represent the concept of servant-leadership.

Managers, management teams, and researchers have typically employed studies of organizational commitment because it has been shown to correlate positively with other organizational outcomes such as involvement, job satisfaction, and perception of organizational justice (Iverson & Buttigieg, 1999; Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993; Riggs & Knight, 1994). In this regard, organizational commitment describes an attachment an individual has to a group, a business, or an institution. Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993) suggested that it may also take other forms, such as: (a) the linkage of the individual and the organization based on the attitude or orientation of that individual, (b) the correlation of shared goals between the individual and the organization, (c) the perception of rewards associated with partici-

pation, (d) the costs of non-participation, and (e) the nominal felt need to demonstrate goal alliance. Similarly, Mowday, Porter, and Steers (as cited in Fields, 2002) discussed organizational commitment as an individual member's belief in and acceptance of organizational goals and values, willingness to exercise great force on the organization's behalf, and willingness to remain associated with the organization. Allen and Meyer (1990) and Fields (2002) suggested that one may distill these various definitions into three categories of affective attachment, perceived costs, and obligation. Allen and Meyer labeled these three types of attitudinal commitments: (a) affective, where the member shares values with the organization; (b) continuance, where it becomes too costly for the individual to break ties with the organization; and (c) normative, where the individual feels morally or ethically obligated to stay with the organization. Mowday et al. also offered that personal characteristics, job characteristics, work experience, and structural characteristics serve as antecedents of an individual's affective attachment to an organization. However, several theorists have suggested that leadership relates only to the affective type of commitment (McColl-Kennedy & Anderson, 2005; De Cremer, van Dijke, & Bos, 2004).

Job satisfaction serves as the final direct construct for consideration in our study. Researchers have generally defined job satisfaction as a person's affective reaction to his or her job when he or she compares the desired and actual outcomes associated with that job (Cranny, Smith, & Stone, 1992). Curry, Wakefield, Price, and Mueller (1986) found no relationship between organizational commitment and job satisfaction. However, several other researchers have identified a positive relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Bedeian & Armenakis, 1981; Cetin, 2006; Fletcher & Williams, 1996; Porter & Steers, 1973). In their longitudinal investigation of the causal order of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, Vandenberg and Lance (1992) reported that organizational commitment causes job satisfaction. Conversely, Caykoylu, Ergi, and Havlovic (2007) reported job satisfaction as the main variable in determining the level of organizational commitment. Additionally, Caykoylu et al. reported

job satisfaction as a mediating variable between other predictor variables and organizational commitment.

Researchers have noted two additional constructs of organizational support and role clarity, which have significantly related to leadership, generally, and to both organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Scholars have described perceived organizational support as a member's perception of the extent to which an organization demonstrates the willingness to reward greater amounts of effort, ostensibly because of the value the organization places on the member and the subsequent care they provide regarding his or her well being (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchinson, & Sowa, 1986). Scholars have implied that role clarity, the antithesis of role conflict and ambiguity, exists to the degree that a member receives the necessary information regarding expected functions that the organization associates with the position in which he or she serves (Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970). Eisenberger et al. further discussed the importance of organizational support and its direct relationship to organizational commitment. Other researchers identified empirical relationships between organizational support and organizational commitment (Hutchison, Valentino, & Kirkner, 1998; Maertz, Griffeth, Campbell, & Allen, 2007), between organizational support and job satisfaction (Poon, Salleh, & Senik, 2007; Yoon, Seo, & Yoon, 2004), and between organizational support and transformational leadership, leadership development, and interpersonal leader behavior (Akroyd, Jackowski, & Legg, 2007; Hutchison, Valentino, & Kirkner; Tangirala, Green, & Ramanujam, 2007). Likewise, researchers have identified similar empirical relationships between role clarity and organizational commitment (Joiner & Bakalis, 2006), between role clarity and job satisfaction (Allen, Freeman, Russell, Reizenstein, & Rentz, 2001), and between role clarity and leadership (Shoemaker, 2003; Wood & Fields, 2007). Based on these relationships, we tested for the potential, separate mediating effects of organizational support and role clarity in regard to any relationships between the three constructs of servant-leadership and the organizational outcomes of affective organizational commitment and job satisfaction.

Theoretical Framework

In this study we examined the relationship between servant-leadership and organizational outcomes of affective organizational commitment and job satisfaction and for the mediating effects of role clarity and organizational support, as perceived by those who completed the instruments. Based on the theoretical support cited, we presumed that servant-leadership, as characterized by Hale and Fields (2007), affects organization members in ways that demonstrate a positive relationship to affective organizational commitment. The literature also suggested that servant-leadership relates to an individual's job satisfaction in terms of his or her personal ethic. Additionally, Daley and Vasu (1998) explained that trust relates positively to job satisfaction, and Reinke (2004) found that servant-leadership relates positively to trust. Therefore, we posited that closer value alignments between those associated with the techniques and methods a leader implements through servant-leadership and the desires of those led, should result in followers' reporting overall higher levels of job satisfaction. Previous empirical research by West and Bocârnea (2008) suggested that respondents in educational settings in the Philippines perceived relationships between servant-leadership, service, and both organizational commitment and job satisfaction, as well as between servant-leadership, humility, and job satisfaction.

Research Hypotheses

RH1. The servant-leadership constructs of service, humility, and vision are linear predictors of organizational commitment.

RH2. The servant-leadership constructs of service, humility, and vision are linear predictors of job satisfaction.

RH3a. Role clarity mediates the relationship between the servant-leadership constructs of service, humility, and vision and organizational commitment.

RH3b. Organizational support mediates the relationship between the

servant-leadership constructs of service, humility, and vision and organizational commitment.

RH3c. Role clarity mediates the relationship between the servant-leadership constructs of service, humility, and vision and job satisfaction.

RH3d. Organizational support mediates the relationship between the servant-leadership constructs of service, humility, and vision and job satisfaction.

METHOD

The research method for this study included scientific, empirical, but non-experimental measurement in the conduct of mid-range analyses (Kerlinger & Lee, 2000). We first compared the central tendencies and reliabilities of each construct. We then investigated the ability of the servant-leadership constructs to predict the outcomes of organizational commitment and job satisfaction. These methods supported each variable based on theories previously cited in the literature.

We designed this study to contribute to the literature in identifying relationships between variables in specific, minimally tested combinations. In that regard, we investigated organizational commitment and job satisfaction as outcome variables; the servant-leadership constructs of service, humility, and vision as predictor variables; and role clarity and organizational support as mediating variables. Our results serve to expand the base of knowledge, especially concerning servant-leadership, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction in a Filipino context.

Sampling and Data Collection

We conducted the sampling by collecting data primarily from Filipino members of professional organizations representing engineering, manufacturing, and technology disciplines. Respondents contributed the convenient sample data over a period of two months by answering either an on-line questionnaire or a hard copy questionnaire. Dioscoro P. Marañon, Jr., the

141

Director of Research, Development, and Extension at West Negros University in Bacolod City, coordinated the administration of data collection in the RP. The respondents included members of the targeted professions located in the Philippines, as well as Filipino expatriates from other countries who were identified primarily from membership lists of professional organizations. A total of 164 respondents completed enough of the survey to allow for their inclusion in the analysis: 34 participants reported engineering as their profession; 35 reported education and government service as their profession; 78 reported manufacturing as their profession; 10 reported technology as their profession, and 7 reported other professions. The number of respondents who reported their gender as male was 135; 122 respondents reported their ages as being between 46 and 65 years; 101 respondents reported their tenure as 12 or more years; 2 respondents reported that they had less than a Bachelor's degree; and 50 respondents had completed at least some graduate school through post-doctoral work.

Measures

We asked each respondent to consider his or her current, immediate organizational supervisor as the focal person when marking their responses to the items. For each instrument, respondents marked their choices regarding their level of agreement with each of the items using a seven-point Likert-type scale. Permission for using the instruments was granted by their authors.

We measured servant-leadership using Hale and Field's (2007) Servant Leadership Dimensions instrument, which includes 18 items that measure service (SLS), humility (SLH), and vision (SLV). Previous studies reported reliability coefficient alphas ranging from .92 to .94 for service, .82 to .95 for humility, and .83 to .93 for vision (Hale & Fields, 2007; West & Bocârnea, 2008). Dennis (2004) and Dennis and Bocârnea (2005) reported validity through their development and factor analyses of the unabridged instrument. An example of an item in the service portion of the instrument was: "Models service to inspire others." An example of an item

in the humility portion of the instrument was: "Is humble enough to consult others in the organization when he or she may not have all the answers." An example of an item in the vision portion of the instrument was: "Has encouraged me to participate in determining and developing a shared vision."

To measure organizational commitment, we used the 8 original and revised affective commitment items from Meyer and Allen's Organizational Commitment Scale (as cited in Fields, 2002, p. 52). We measured only the main component of organizational commitment, affective commitment, because of its close theoretical relationship with perceived leadership behaviors and the lack of theoretical or empirical relationships between perceived leadership and normative or continuance commitment (Akroyd, Jackowski, & Legg, 2007; Hutchison, Valentino, & Kirkner, 1998). Fields further cited previous studies as having reported reliability coefficient alphas for this affective commitment instrument ranging in value from .77 to .88, and he cited several of those same studies as having reported validity through confirmatory factor analyses. An example of an item in this instrument was: "I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization."

To measure job satisfaction, we used the 3-item Overall Job Satisfaction instrument as adapted from Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, and Klesh (as cited in Fields, 2002, p. 5). Fields further cited previous studies as having reported reliability coefficient alphas for this job satisfaction instrument ranging in value from .67 to .95, and he cited various studies as having reported validity through confirmatory factor analyses and correlation. An example of an item in this instrument was: "All in all, I am satisfied with my job."

To measure role clarity, we used the 6-item Role Ambiguity scale, adapted and measured in reverse, from Rizzo et al. (as cited in Fields, 2002, p. 148). Fields further cited previous studies as having reported reliability coefficient alphas for this role ambiguity instrument ranging in value from .71 to .95, and he cited various studies as having both questioned and

reported validity through confirmatory factor analyses and correlation. An example of an item in this instrument was: "I know exactly what is expected of me."

To measure organizational support, we used the abbreviated Perceived Organizational Support, 8-item instrument, adapted from Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchinson, and Sowa (as cited in Fields, 2002, pp. 117-118). Fields further cited previous studies as having reported reliability coefficient alphas for this organizational support instrument ranging in value from .74 to .95, and he cited various studies as having both questioned and reported validity through confirmatory factor analyses and correlation. An example of an item in this instrument was: "The organization is willing to extend itself in order to help me perform my job to the best of my ability.

Analyses

The first steps of the analyses included reversing scoring for the appropriate items, followed by performing a check for the reliability level of each variable and separately considering each item that contributed to the variables. Variable descriptive statistics and correlations were then investigated. To determine the results for RH1 and RH2, each of the three servant-leadership constructs were sequentially loaded and regressed, using linear regression, first against organizational commitment and then against job satisfaction (Kerlinger & Lee, 2000). Finally, mediated regression analyses were utilized to test the mediating effects of both role clarity and organizational support in the specified relationships between the three servant-leadership variables and the two organizational outcome variables, affective organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Baron & Kenny, 1986). The steps suggested by Baron and Kenny and used by us to test for mediation were: (a) regress the independent or predictor variables upon the mediating variable (serving in the role of an outcome or dependent variable) and determine the existence of a significant relationship between them, (b) regress the predictor variables upon the outcome variable and determine the existence of a significant relationship between them, and then (c) regress

144

the predictor and the mediating variables simultaneously upon the outcome variable. Mediation occurs when the relationship between the predictor and outcome variables becomes non-significant upon the introduction of the mediating variable.

RESULTS

Results of the reliability analysis of each measure indicated that the removal of several items would not considerably improve the overall reliability of the given measurements, as all the Cronbach's alpha coefficients had acceptable values (see Table 1). Table 1 provides the resulting descriptive statistics for the study and identifies the numbers of respondents per variable, means, standard deviations, and reliability for each scale of the primary constructs. Results indicated that respondents reported experiencing relatively high levels of job satisfaction and role clarity, compared to organizational support and organizational commitment. They also perceived that their leaders generally exercise service more than they develop and incorporate shared vision, and that they exercise shared vision more than humility. Table 2 further provides correlation information revealing significant statistical relationships between each of the primary constructs.

Table 3 presents the results of the initial regression analyses. Results for organizational commitment are shown in column 1, demonstrating significant relationships and a fit model, $F(3,160) = 18.93$, $p = .00 < .05$, in which the servant-leadership constructs accounted for 25% of the variance. Of note, however, is the fact that the servant-leadership humility construct failed to independently relate to organizational commitment in the regression and therefore, RH1 is partially supported. Column 2 shows the results for job satisfaction, in which the servant-leadership constructs accounted for 31% of the variance and also demonstrated significant relationships and a fit model, $F(3,160) = 25.53$, $p = .00 < .05$. Therefore, RH2 is supported.

The mediated regression results are provided in Tables 4a through 4d. Previous analyses demonstrated significant correlations (see Table 2) between the predictor variables, servant-leadership service (SLS), servant-

145

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics of the Comprehensive Study

Variable	N- Valid	N- Missing	Mean	Standard Deviation	Cronbach's á
OC	161	4	5.04	.87	.74
JS	160	5	5.75	1.00	.74
SLS	163	2	5.62	1.09	.96
SLH	157	8	5.30	1.05	.90
SLV	161	4	5.49	1.08	.95
RC	161	4	5.86	.79	.91
OS	164	1	5.10	1.10	.93

Table 2

Correlations

		OC	JS	SLS	SLH	SLV	RC
JS	Pearson Correlation	.67$^{(**)}$					
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.00					
SLS	Pearson Correlation	.49$^{(**)}$	.54$^{(**)}$				
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.00	.00				
SLH	Pearson Correlation	.41$^{(**)}$	.30$^{(**)}$	.71$^{(**)}$			
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.00	.00	.00			
SLV	Pearson Correlation	.47$^{(**)}$	.47$^{(**)}$	.77$^{(**)}$	.69$^{(**)}$		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.00	.00	.00	.00		
RC	Pearson Correlation	.44$^{(**)}$	.51$^{(**)}$	.67$^{(**)}$	.47$^{(**)}$	.57$^{(**)}$	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	
OS	Pearson Correlation	.61$^{(**)}$	.63$^{(**)}$	.57$^{(**)}$	.46$^{(**)}$	.66	.57$^{(**)}$
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Listwise *N*=164

leadership a humility (SLH), and servant-leadership vision (SLV) and both outcome variables, organizational commitment (OC) and job satisfaction (JS). These analyses also demonstrated significant correlations between SLS, SLH, SLV, and the potential mediating variables, role clarity (RC), and organizational support (OS). The results of the first mediated regression

Table 3
Regression Results, Non-mediated

	OC		JS	
	β	t	β	t
SLS	.28	2.46**	.54	4.86***
SLH	.07	.66	−.23	−2.35**
SLV	.21	1.83*	.22	2.03**
Adj. R²		.25		.31
F		18.93***		25.53***

* $p < .10$, ** $p < .05$, *** $p < .001$

analysis are presented in Table 4a. These equations indicate the mediated framework containing the RC variable as it applied to OC. Equation 1a reveals a significant positive relationship between SLS and RC, but not between RC and either of the other predictor variables. Equation 2a reveals significant positive relationships between OC and the predictor variables SLS and SLV, but not between OC and SLH. Equation 3a indicates the existence of a significant relationship between RC and OC, as well as between SLV and OC, and the lack of a significant relationship between SLS and OC. Consequently, we concluded that RC mediated the link between SLS and OC, and it appeared to facilitate or otherwise enhance the relationship between SLV and OC. Therefore, RH3a is partially supported.

Table 4b includes the results for the mediated framework that contains the OS variable as it applied to OC. Equation 1b demonstrates a significant positive relationship between SLV and OS, a marginal positive relationship (at the $p < .10$ level) between SLS and OS, but no relationship between SLH and OS. Equation 2b demonstrates significant positive relationships between OC and both SLS and SLV, but no relationship with OC. Equation 3b identifies a significant relationship between OS and OC, as well as a significant relationship between SLS and OC. However, equation 3b further identifies that no relationship existed between SLH and OC or between SLV and OC. One could therefore conclude in this study, that OS mediated

the relationship between SLV and OC and that it provided little quantifiable impact regarding SLS and SLH's relationships with OC. Therefore, RH3b is partially supported.

Table 4c provides a description of the mediated framework of how the RC variable related to JS. Equation 1c shows that SLS relates significantly to RC, but that, as was the case earlier in this study, SLH and SLV do not relate to RC. Likewise, equation 2c demonstrates a significant relationship between JS and all of the servant-leadership constructs, SLS, SLH, and SLV. Additionally, equation 3c reveals that the servant-leadership constructs reduce in numerical value, but retain their statistical significance. This suggests that RC provided little mediating effect on the relationships between JS and SLS and no mediating effect on the relationships between JS and servant-leadership constructs of SLH and SLV. Therefore, RH3c is partially supported.

The results of the final mediated regression analysis are presented in Table 4d. These equations investigated the mediation role of OS in the relationships between JS and the servant-leadership constructs of SLS, SLH, and SLV. Of the servant-leadership constructs in equation 1d, SLV related significantly and SLS related marginally (at the $p < .10$ level) to OS. As previously described, and as equation 2d shows, SLS, SLH, and SLV all demonstrated significant relationships with JS. Equation 3d reveals that a significant relationship existed between RC and JS, that no relationship existed between SLV and JS, and that SLS marginally lessened in statistical significance from equation 2d to equation 3d. Therefore, we concluded that OS fully mediated the relationship between SLV and JS and that it minimally mediated the relationship between SLS and JS. Therefore, RH3d is partially supported.

DISCUSSION

The main objective of this present study was to investigate the relationship between the three servant-leadership constructs of service, humility, and vision with affective organizational commitment and job sat-

148

Table 4a.

Regression Results, Mediation of RC with OC as the Outcome Variable

	CV	PV	β	s.e.	t	Adj. R^2	F
(3a-1)	RC	SLS	.60	.26	6.12***	.45	45.67***
		SLH	−.06	.07	−.71		
		SLV	.15	.07	1.57		
(3a-2)	OC	SLS	.28	.09	2.46***	.27	21.37***
		SLH	.07	.08	.66		
		SLV	.21	.09	1.83**		
(3a-3)	OC	SLS	.18	.11	1.43	.29	17.92***
		SLH	.02	.09	.24		
		SLV	.22	.10	2.03**		
		RC	.21	.11	2.38**		

* $p < .10$, ** $p < .05$, *** $p < .001$
CV = Criterion Variable
PV = Predictor Variable

Table 4b.

Regression Results, Mediation of OS with OC as the Outcome Variable

	CV	PV	β	s.e.	t	Adj. R^2	F
(3b-1)	OS	SLS	.17	.10	1.67*	.44	43.18***
		SLH	−.05	.09	−.57		
		SLV	.57	.10	5.87***		
(3b-2)	OC	SLS	.31	.10	2.70***	.27	21.37***
		SLH	.01	.09	.10		
		SLV	.25	.10	2.31**		
(3b-3)	OC	SLS	.21	.09	2.14**	.45	34.09***
		SLH	.04	.08	.44		
		SLV	−.07	.10	−.63		
		OS	.56	.07	2.38***		

* $p < .10$, ** $p < .05$, *** $p < .001$
CV = Criterion Variable
PV = Predictor Variable

Table 4c.

Regression Results, Mediation of RC with JS as the Outcome Variable

	CV	PV	β	s.e.	t	Adj. R^2	F
(3c-1)	RC	SLS	.60	.07	6.12***	.45	45.67***
		SLH	−.06	.07	−.71		
		SLV	.15	.07	1.57		
(3c-2)	JS	SLS	.54	.10	4.86***	.31	25.53***
		SLH	−.23	.09	−2.35**		
		SLV	.22	.10	2.03**		
(3c-3)	JS	SLS	.39	.11	3.22**	.34	22.09***
		SLH	−.21	.09	−2.23**		
		SLV	.18	.10	1.71*		
		RC	.25	.11	2.88**		

* $p < .10$, ** $p < .05$, *** $p < .001$
CV = Criterion Variable
PV = Predictor Variable

Table 4d.

Regression Results, Mediation of OS with JS as the Outcome Variable

	CV	PV	β	s.e.	t	Adj. R^2	F
(3d-1)	OS	SLS	.17	.10	1.67*	.44	43.18***
		SLH	−.05	.09	−.57		
		SLV	.57	.10	5.87***		
(3d-2)	JS	SLS	.54	.10	4.86***	.31	25.53***
		SLH	−.23	.09	−2.35**		
		SLV	.22	.10	2.03**		
(3d-3)	JS	SLS	.45	.09	4.56**	.46	36.15***
		SLH	−.20	.08	−2.35**		
		SLV	−.08	.10	−.78		
		OS	.53	.07	6.81***		

* $p < .10$, ** $p < .05$, *** $p < .001$
CV = Criterion Variable
PV = Predictor Variable

isfaction, especially among Filipinos engaged in the engineering, manufacturing, and technology disciplines. In that regard, the results of this study indicated that respondents perceived that their supervisors, in roles of servant-leaders, have provided greater levels of service, as compared to how they developed and maintained shared visions with subordinates, and as compared to how they practiced humility toward their subordinates. Additionally, we found that the servant-leadership constructs, as predictor variables, generally correlated with the outcome variables, in that respondents who perceived the application of servant-leadership behaviors by their functional supervisors generally reported higher levels of affective organizational commitment and job satisfaction. In that regard, Robert, Probst, Martocchio, Grasgow, and Lawler (2000) suggested that affective commitment and job satisfaction generally retain their effects, regardless of whether the representative cultures present as collectivist or individualist in nature. Therefore, we posit that the use of affective organizational commitment and job satisfaction as outcome variables provided results by which one can consider the range of effects of the servant-leadership constructs, as compared with subordinates experiencing servant-leadership in other cultures, but without the constraints that might otherwise confound the results due to the effects of collectivism and individualism in relation to those other cultures.

The results of our analyses indicating that respondents reported relatively higher levels of role clarity and job satisfaction than affective organizational commitment and organizational support (see Table 1) suggest that individuals within the respondents' organizations have provided respondent members with clear information regarding demands, rewards, and other organizational expectations. We further suggest that because the servant-leadership variables contributed 45% to the variance of role clarity, servant-leadership service related significantly to role clarity and job satisfaction in the regression equations, that role clarity provided only a limited mediating effect between servant-leadership service and job satisfaction, and that as

role clarity improved and the needs for the services of supervisors decreased, job satisfaction among respondents also improved.

Further results regarding job satisfaction indicated that the servant-leadership variables contributed 44% to the variance of organizational support, that servant-leadership vision related significantly to organizational support, to job satisfaction, and to organizational commitment in the regression equations, and that organizational support fully mediated the relationship between servant-leadership vision and job satisfaction, as well as between servant-leadership vision and affective organizational commitment. Therefore, we concluded that respondents generally found satisfaction in and became committed to jobs in which supervisors shared their visions with subordinates and incorporated inputs from subordinates toward the development and implementation of shared visions. However, these same respondents appeared to find generally greater levels of satisfaction and to generally become more committed in situations in which organizations, presumably through the activities of those same supervisors, provided support that would allow them to achieve outcomes and receive recognition for those outcomes.

As noted, the servant-leadership constructs contributed 45% to the variance of role clarity, while servant-leadership service related significantly with role clarity and with affective organizational commitment. Consequently, because the regression equations demonstrated that role clarity fully mediated the relationship between servant-leadership service and organizational commitment, we concluded that: (a) the respondents perceived a willingness on the parts of their supervisors to serve them and other subordinates, and that (b) this resulted in those subordinates' commitment to their respective organizations. However, these same respondents appeared to develop and maintain greater levels of commitment to their organizations in situations in which organizations, presumably through the activities of those same supervisors, provided information and understanding of expectations and requirements associated with members' positions.

Finally, organizational commitment failed to regress significantly on

servant-leadership humility. Additionally, job satisfaction regressed significantly, but inversely with servant-leadership humility at $t = -2.35$, $p = .02 < .05$ (this means that as followers' perception of leaders' humility increased, their job satisfaction decreased). In light of the initial observed correlation between these constructs, we believe that cultural dynamics beyond the scope of this present study likely influenced the results. Specifically, Hofstede (2000) found the Philippines ranked fourth in power distance among fifty countries surveyed (p. 87), and House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, and Gupta (2004) found that managers in East Asian cultures often exhibit *self-protected leadership*. Some of the notable characteristics of cultures exhibiting high power distance include that subordinates consider superiors as different or apart, that those with power should present as powerful, and that order based on inequality presents as the norm. Self-protected leadership includes characteristics of self-centeredness, status consciousness, and face saving. The characteristics of both high power distance and self-protected leadership appear to conflict somewhat with constructs that support servant-leadership humility, including those of voluntary subordination and building relations across social classes. We posit that respondents therefore likely reported lower levels of commitment to organizations whose leaders violated cultural norms associated with high power distance and self-protected leadership and instead chose to exhibit humility as a construct of servant-leadership. We also suggest that this presents a need for further research to discover whether power distance, self-protected leadership, or some other constructs mediate the effects of servant-leadership humility on organizational outcomes. Specifically, if servant-leadership legitimately requires the employment of humility on the part of leaders and if that exhibition of humility works against the perceived cultural norms of followers, future research needs to discover how leaders may employ servant-leadership, as defined in the literature, without reducing levels of organizational outcomes among followers.

LIMITATIONS

This study was subject to a number of potential limitations. The relatively small size of the respondent sample compared to the number of items prevented us from performing a factor analysis. A factor analysis could have confirmed that the items actually loaded in clusters that support the identified variables. It could have also allowed us to better identify situations of multi-collinearity and opportunities for convergence and discriminability, and thereby it could have provided the opportunity for us to report more exact results. Additionally, as we utilized a convenient sample for the study, confounding variables may have influenced the results through the lack of random selection of participants. Moreover, as the study considered data that represented multiple constructs, using a self-report instrument without triangulation, a possibility exists that common method variance introduced some amount of bias to the results. Finally, we recognize that several researchers have shown that other variables beyond leadership and its associated constructs, and role clarity and organizational support might contribute to organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Our focus was to determine whether supervisors in Filipino contexts utilize servant-leadership and, if so, how servant-leadership relates to organizational outcomes. However, future studies, with the appropriate sample sizes, should further investigate how demographics and constructs such as resource availability relate to servant-leadership and other outcome variables, in addition to affective organizational commitment and job satisfaction.

CONCLUSION

This study makes an important contribution to the literature, given the findings. It offers insight into the relationships between servant-leadership, affective organizational commitment, and job satisfaction, where servant-leadership service and vision predicted organizational commitment and servant-leadership service and vision directly predicted job satisfaction. It also

identifies the substantial mediating effects of: (a) role clarity on the relationship between servant-leadership service and organizational commitment, (b) organizational support on the relationship between servant-leadership vision and organizational commitment, and (c) organizational support on the relationship between servant-leadership vision and job satisfaction. Most importantly, however, we found that servant-leadership humility failed to result in organizational commitment and it inversely predicted job satisfaction — as it increased, job satisfaction actually decreased. This suggests the possibility that cultural norms might work against the employment of some servant-leadership constructs in some contexts. In light of the reported needs and desires for and utilization of the employment of servant-leadership in multiple sectors throughout the Republic of the Philippines, this study provides for a deeper understanding of the perceptions of Filipino engineers, technologists, and members of manufacturing concerns regarding the strengths and weaknesses of their supervisors' utilization of servant-leadership constructs in praxis.

Bud West serves as an independent leader development and organization effectiveness consultant and he currently attends Regent University in the School of Global Leadership and Entrepreneurship as a Ph.D. student in Organizational Leadership. He has previously served as a Principal Program Management Specialist for an international training and development company, where he evaluated organizations' cultures, helped improve communications in professional relationships, and facilitated the development and re-engineering of multi-national teams. His current research interests include the ontology of leadership, social power dynamics in dyadic relationships, and cross-cultural applications of servant-leadership.

Dr. Mihai C. Bocârnea, originally from Romania, came in 1995 to Regent University, where he currently serves as an associate professor in the School of Leadership Studies and director of the Ph.D. in Organiza-

tional Leadership program. Dr. Bocarnea is an expert in the areas of leadership, communication, research methods, and statistics. His research interests include organizational communication, cross-cultural leadership, servant-leadership, organizational change, and pedagogy of online learning.

Dioscoro P. Marañon, Jr., serves as the Dean of the College of Engineering and Chair of the WNC Research and Development Foundation, Inc., of West Negros University in the Republic of the Philippines. He also serves as a consultant for the Cleaner Production Assessment and Manufacturing Productivity Extension Program of the Department of Science and Technology in Western Visayas for small and medium-sized enterprises. He holds a B.S. and an M.S. in Mechanical Engineering and is currently studying for a Ph.D. in Technology Management. He previously served as the Research Director of West Negros University, as a Research Associate for the University of the Philippines - Diliman, and as an Assistant Manager for Production in a manufacturing concern. His varied research interests include cook stove improvement, computer simulations, process and systems improvement/optimization, indoor air pollution minimization, biofuels and other alternative fuels, sustainable development, energy conservation and recovery, management in engineering and technology, waste management, and climate change mitigation.

REFERENCES

Abesamis, T. S. (2002, August 20). To take a stand. *BusinessWorld.* Retrieved October 6, 2007, from ABI/INFORM Trade & Industry database. (Document ID: 153386561)

Akroyd, D., Jackowski, M.B., & Legg, J.S. (2007). Factors affecting radiographers' organizational commitment. *Radiologic Technology, 78*(6), 467-475.

Adler, N. (1997). Global leaders: A dialogue with future history. *Management International, 1*(2), 21-33.

Allen, N.J., & Meyer, J.P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective,

continuance, and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 63*(1), 1-18.

Allen, T.D., Freeman, D.M., Russell, J.E.A., Reizenstein, R.C., & Rentz, J.O. (2001). Survivor reactions to organizational downsizing: Does time ease the pain? *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 74*, 145-164.

Autry, J.A. (2004). *The servant leader: How to build a creative team, develop great morale, and improve bottom line performance*. New York: Three Rivers Press.

Avolio, B.J., Bass, B.M., & Jung, D.I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the multifactor leadership questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 72*, 441-462.

Barker, R.A. (2002). *On the nature of leadership*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Baron, R.M., & Kenny, D.A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*(6), 1173-1182.

Bass, B.M. (2000). The future of leadership in learning organizations. *The Journal of Leadership Studies, 7*, 18-40.

Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.J. (1995). *The multifactor leadership questionnaire*. Palo Alto, CA: Mind Garden.

Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Beazley, H., & Beggs, J. (2002). Teaching servant leadership. In L. Spears & M. Lawrence (Eds.), *Focus on leadership for the 21st century* (pp. 53-63). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Becker, G.K. (2007). The competitive edge of moral leadership. *International Management Review, 3*(1), 50-71, 176.

Bedeian, A.G., & Armenakis, A.A. (1981). A path-analytic study of consequences of role conflict and ambiguity. *Academy of Management Journal, 24*, 417-28.

Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper Torchbooks.

Cagogo, J.L. (2006, March). Raising up credible leaders for the future. *BusinessWorld*. Retrieved April 30, 2008, from ABI/INFORM Trade & Industry database. (Document ID: 1009678861)

Caykoylu, S., Egri, C.P., & Havlovic, S. (2007). Organizational commitment across different employee groups. *The Business Review, Cambridge, 8*(1), 191-197.

Cetin, M.O. (2006). The relationship between job satisfaction, occupational and

organizational commitment of academics. *Journal of American Academy of Business, Cambridge, 8*(1), 78-88.

Cranny, C.J., Smith, C.P., & Stone, E.F. (1992). *Job satisfaction: How people feel about their jobs and how it affects their performance.* New York: Lexington Books.

Cruz, E.S. (2006, March). Framework. *BusinessWorld.* Retrieved April 30, 2008, from ABI/INFORM Trade & Industry database. (Document ID: 1007389131)

Curry, J.P., Wakefield, D.P., Price, J.L., & Mueller, C.W. (1986). On the causal ordering of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Journal, 29*(4), 847-858.

Daley, D.M., & Vasu, M.L. (1998). Fostering organizational trust in North Carolina: The pivotal role of administrators and political leaders. *Administration and Society, 30*(1), 62-84.

Davidson, B. (2003). Enterprise leadership. *Leader to Leader, 2003*(30), 44-50.

De Cremer, D., van Dijke, M., & Bos, A. (2004). Distributive justice moderating the effects of self-sacrificial leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 25*(5/6), 466-475.

Dennis, R.S. (2004). *Servant leadership theory: Development of the servant leadership assessment instrument.* Unpublished Ph.D., Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA.

Dennis, R.S., & Bocârnea, M. (2005). Development of the servant leadership assessment instrument. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 26*(7/8), 600-615.

Drury, S. (2004). *Employee perceptions of servant leadership: Comparisons by level and with job satisfaction and organizational commitment.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA.

Eagan, M. (2000). Managers as kings: Shakespeare on modern leadership. *Management Decision, 38*(5), 315-327.

Ehrhart, M.G. (2004). Leadership and procedural justice climate as antecedents of unit-level organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology, 57*(1), 61-94.

Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*(3), 500-507.

Fernandez, E.V. (2003, November). The Financial Executive. *BusinessWorld, 1.* Retrieved April 30, 2008, from ABI/INFORM Trade & Industry database. (Document ID: 437556531)

Fields, D.L. (2002). *Taking the measure of work: A guide to validated scales for organizational research and diagnosis.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fletcher, C., & Williams, R. (1996). Performance management, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *British Journal of Management, 7*(2), 169-179.

Greenleaf, R.K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York: Paulist.

Hale, J.R., & Fields, D. (2007). Exploring servant leadership across cultures: A study of followers in Ghana and the USA. *Leadership, 3*(4), 397-417.

Heifetz, R. (1995). Leadership. *Nieman Reports, 49*(3), 20-21.

Hofstede, G. (2003). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

House, R.J., Hanges, P.J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P.W., & Gupta, V. (Eds.). (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 cultures*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hutchison, S., Valentino, K.E., & Kirkner, S.L. (1998) What works for the gander does not work as well for the goose: The effects of leader behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 28*(2), 171-182.

Iverson, R.D., & Buttigieg, D.M. (1999). Affective, normative, and continuance commitment: Can the 'right kind' of commitment be managed? *Journal of Management Studies, 36*(3), 307-333.

Joiner, T.A., & Bakalis, S. (2006). The antecedents of organizational commitment: The case of Australian casual academics. *The International Journal of Educational Management, 20*(6), 439-452.

Katzenbach, J.R., & Smith, D.K. (1992). The delicate balance of team leadership. *The McKinsey Quarterly, 4*, 128-142.

Kerlinger, F.N., & Lee, H.B. (2000). *Foundations of behavioral research* (4th ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt.

Laub, J.A. (1999). *Assessing the servant organization: Development of the organizational leadership assessment (OLA) instrument*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, FL.

Leach, L.S. (2005). Nurse executive transformational leadership and organizational commitment. *Journal of Nursing Administration, 35*(5), 228-237.

Leavitt, H.J. (2005). Hierarchies, authority, and leadership. *Leader to Leader, 2005*(37), 55-61.

Libre, M.B. (2003, January 25). Libre: Servant leader. *Sun Star Cebu*. Retrieved May 5, 2008 from http://www.sunstar.com.ph/static/ceb/2003/01/25/oped/mel.b.libre.seriously.now.html

Limon, E. (2003, August). The financial executive. *BusinessWorld*. Retrieved April

30, 2008, from ABI/INFORM Trade & Industry database. (Document ID: 387072301)

Lugo, L.M.T. (2003, January). Weekender: Labor & management. *BusinessWorld*. Retrieved April 30, 2008, from ABI/INFORM Trade & Industry database. (Document ID: 278165971)

Maertz, C.P., Griffeth, R.W., Campbell, N.S., & Allen, D.G. (2007). The effects of perceived organizational support and perceived supervisor support on employee turnover. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 28*(8), 1059-1075.

McColl-Kennedy, J.R., & Anderson, R.D. (2005). Subordinate-manager gender combination and perceived leadership style influence on emotions, self-esteem and organizational commitment. *Journal of Business Research, 58*(2), 115-125.

Meyer, J.P., Allen, N.J., & Smith, C.A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*(4), 538-551.

Meyer, J.P., & Allen, N.J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Patterson, K.A. (2003). *Servant leadership: A theoretical model*. Ph.D. dissertation, Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA. Retrieved October 2, 2007, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT 3082719)

Pilapil, J. (2005, December 10). Bishops call for revolution of the heart. *Manila Standard Today*. Retrieved January 14, 2009, from http://www. manilastandardtoday.com/?page=politics01_dec08_2005

Poon, J.M.L., Salleh, A.H.M., & Senik, Z.C. (2007). Propensity to trust as a moderator of the relationship between perceived organizational support and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior, 10*(3), 350-365.

Porter, L.W., & Steers, R.M. (1973). Organizational, work, and personal factors in employee turnover and absenteeism. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80*, 151-76.

Reinke, S.J. (2004). Service before self: Towards a theory of servant-leadership. *Global Virtue Ethics Review, 5*(3), 30-57.

Riggs, M., & Knight, P. (1994). The impact of perceived group-success-failure on motivational beliefs and attitudes: A causal model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*,755-766.

Rizzo, R., House, R.J., & Lirtzman, S.I. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 15*, 150-163.

Robert, C., Probst, T.M., Martocchio, J.J., Drasgow, F., & Lawler, J.J. (2000).

Empowerment and continuous improvement in the United States, Mexico, Poland, and India: Predicting fit on the basis of dimensions of power distance and individualism. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*(5), 643-658.

Safty, A. (2003). Moral leadership: Beyond management and governance. *Harvard International Review, 25*(3), 84-89.

Shoemaker, M.E. (2003). Leadership behaviors in sales managers: A level analysis. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice, 11*(2), 17-29.

Smith, B.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.

Spears, L. (2004). Practicing servant-leadership. *Leader to Leader, 2004*(34), 7-11.

Spears, L.C., & Lawrence, M. (Eds.). (2004). *Practicing servant leadership: Succeeding through trust, bravery, and forgiveness.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Stone, A.G., Russell, R.F., & Patterson, K. (2004). Transformational versus servant leadership: A difference in leader focus. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 25*(4), 349-361.

Suleik, M.B. (2003, September). The view from Taft. *BusinessWorld.* Retrieved June 19, 2008, from ABI/INFORM Trade & Industry database. (Document ID: 395400011)

Tangirala, S., Green, S.G., & Ramanujam, R. (2007). In the shadow of the boss's boss: Effects of supervisors' upward exchange relationships on employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(2), 309-320.

Terry, R. (1993). *Authentic leadership: Courage in action.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tey, B. (2006). Dare to be a servant leader: An interview with Larry Spears. *The International Journal of Servant Leadership, 2*(1), 45-54.

Vandenberg, R.J., & Lance, C.E. (1992). Examining the causal order of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Journal of Management, 18*(1), 153-168.

Viator, R.E. (2001). The relevance of transformational leadership to nontraditional accounting services: Information systems assurance and business consulting. *Journal of Information Systems, 15*(2), 99-125.

Walumbwa, F.O., Lawler, J.J., Avolio, B.J., Wang, P., & Shi, K. (2005). Transformational leadership and work-related attitudes: The moderating effects of collective and self-efficacy across cultures. Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, *11*(3), 2-16.

Walumbwa, F.O., Orwa, B., Wang, P., & Lawler, J.J. (2005). Transformational

leadership, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction: A comparative study of Kenyan and U.S. financial firms. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 16*(2), 235-256.

Walumbwa, F.O., Wang, P., Lawler, J.J., & Shi, K. (2004). The role of collective efficacy in the relations between transformational leadership and work outcomes. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology, 77*(4), 515-530.

West, G.R.B., & Bocârnea, M. (2008). Servant leadership and organizational outcomes: Relationships in United States and Filipino higher educational settings. In *Servant Leadership Research Roundtable Proceedings*. Available from Regent University, School of Global Leadership and Entrepreneurship website: http://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/sl_proceedings/2008/West-Bocarnea.pdf

Winter, D. (1991). A motivational model of leadership: Predicting long-term management success from TAT measures of power, motivation, and responsibility. *The Leadership Quarterly, 2*, 67-80.

Wood, M.S., & Fields, D. (2007). Exploring the impact of shared leadership on management team member job outcomes. *Baltic Journal of Management, 2*(3), 251-272.

Yoon, M.H., Seo, J.H., & Yoon, T.S. (2004). Effects of contact employee supports on critical employee responses and customer service evaluation. *The Journal of Services Marketing, 18*(4/5), 395-412.

Yukl, G. (2001). *Leadership in organizatons* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.