

2016

Servant Leadership, Organizational Commitment, and Perceived Organizational Support in the Restaurant Industry

Chee Kiong Piong
Walden University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations>

 Part of the [Business Administration, Management, and Operations Commons](#), and the [Management Sciences and Quantitative Methods Commons](#)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection at ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu.

Walden University

College of Management and Technology

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Chee Piong

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee

Dr. Stephanie Hoon, Committee Chairperson, Management Faculty

Dr. Godwin Igein, Committee Member, Management Faculty

Dr. Diane Stottlemyer, University Reviewer, Management Faculty

Chief Academic Officer

Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University

2016

Abstract

Servant Leadership, Organizational Commitment, and Perceived Organizational
Support in the Restaurant Industry

by

Chee Piong

MIBA, Nova Southeastern University, 1995

BSAE, Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University, 1993

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Management

Walden University

December 2016

Abstract

The high employee turnover rate in the U.S. restaurant industry constitutes a major expense for restaurants. The research problem for this study was to determine if restaurant employees' perceptions of their supervisor's servant leadership practices were associated with the employees' organizational commitment and perceived organizational support, which have been shown to reduce turnover. Greenleaf's servant leadership theory provided the theoretical framework. The research question for this study was whether restaurant employees' perceptions of their supervisor's servant leadership practices were associated with the employees' organizational commitment and perceived organizational support, thereby potentially reducing employees' turnover rate. A purposive sample of 88 nonsupervisory employees of several South Florida casual dining restaurants completed a demographic questionnaire, short forms of the Servant Leadership Scale and Survey of Perceived Organizational Support, and the Organizational Commitment Scale. Correlation analysis was used to determine any significant ($p < 0.5$) relationships between the independent and dependent variables. The study correlation results suggested that instituting a servant leadership approach may enable casual dining restaurants to raise their nonsupervisory employees' organizational commitment and perceived perception of organizational support, thereby possibly retaining them longer. The findings have implications for social change because they may motivate casual dining restaurants to institute servant leadership, thereby potentially increasing the well-being and job satisfaction of their employees and the service experience of their customers.

Servant Leadership, Organizational Commitment, and Perceived Organizational
Support in the Restaurant Industry

by

Chee Piong

MIBA, Nova Southeastern University, 1995

BSAE, Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University, 1993

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Management

Walden University

December 2016

Dedication

I dedicate my dissertation work to my wonderful parents who supported and inspired me throughout my academic endeavor. My parents, Mr. Piong Sim and Madam Wong Bee Sin, have always loved me unconditionally, and their good examples have taught me to work hard for the things that I aspire to achieve. I am truly thankful for having them in my life and throughout the entire challenging journey of graduate school and life.

Acknowledgments

I would like to acknowledge and thank my chair, Dr. Stephanie Hoon, and my committee member, Dr. Godwin Igein, who helped me reach this point in my academic career. Because of their unwavering commitment to see me succeed, they provided me with useful and excellent feedback in my dissertation work. I would like to thank the University Research Reviewer, Dr. Diane Stottlemeyer and the forms and styles editor, Dr. Basil Considine for providing thorough feedback and editing comments in the final stages.

I am also thankful to the authors of the Servant Leadership surveys and Organizational Support Scale who gave me permission to use them in my research. Additionally, I am forever grateful to the participants and to those who contributed information to help me complete my dissertation journey. Thank you.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	v
Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study.....	1
Background of the Study	2
Problem Statement	3
Research Question(s) and Hypotheses.....	5
Theoretical Foundation	6
Nature of the Study	7
Definitions.....	9
Assumptions.....	10
Scope and Delimitations	11
Limitations	12
Significance of the Study	13
Summary and Transition.....	15
Chapter 2: Literature Review	17
Literature Search Strategy.....	18
Theoretical Foundation	20
Greenleaf’s Conception of Servant Leadership	21
Interpretations of the Servant Leadership Model.....	24
Servant Leadership Compared to Other Major Leadership Models	27
Explanations for How Servant Leadership Leads to Positive Outcomes	31
Organizational Commitment and Perceived Organizational Support.....	35

Organizational Commitment.....	35
Perceived Organizational Support	41
Empirical Studies on Servant Leadership.....	46
Servant Leadership Related to Organizational Commitment and Perceived Organizational Support	48
Servant Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior	59
Servant Leadership and Other Organizational Outcomes.....	65
Summary of Chapter	70
Chapter 3: Research Method.....	72
Research Design and Rationale	72
Methodology	73
Population	73
Sample and Sampling Procedure	74
Procedures for Recruitment of Participants	74
Instrumentation and Operationalization of Constructs	75
Data Collection	78
Data Analysis Plan.....	79
Initial Statistical Procedures	79
Answering Research Questions	80
Threats to Validity	81
External Validity.....	81
Internal Validity	82

Construct Validity	82
Ethical Procedures	83
Summary	84
Chapter 4: Results	86
Introduction.....	86
Initial Examination of Data.....	87
Demographic Profile of the Participants.....	91
Internal Reliability of Instruments	94
Summary	102
Chapter 5: Discussion	103
Introduction.....	103
Interpretation of the Findings.....	104
Descriptive Findings	104
Pearson’s Correlation Findings.....	106
Limitations of the Study.....	112
Recommendations.....	116
Implications.....	118
Conclusion	121
References.....	125
Appendix A: Invitation Information to Participate in the Study.....	150
Appendix B: Informed Consent Information	151
Appendix C: Servant Leadership Scale (SLS) – 7 Items	153

Appendix D: Organizational Commitment Scale (OCS) – 24 Items	154
Appendix E: Survey of Perceived Organizational Support (SPOS) - 8 Items	156
Appendix F: Demographic Questions - 3 Items and 1 General Question.....	157
Appendix G: Permission to Use Survey Instruments in the form of emails.	158

List of Tables

Table 1. Demographic Profile of Participants in the Final Sample (N = 88).....	92
Table 2. Summary of Descriptive Statistics for Responses to Three Instruments (N = 88)	93
Table 3. Internal Reliability of the Final Scales for the Study.....	96
Table 4. Results of Pearson's Correlation Procedures for Addressing the Research Questions.....	101

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

A serious problem for the U.S. restaurant industry is the high rate of employee turnover (Batt, Lee, & Lakhani, 2014; Han, Bonn, & Cho, 2016). Research done in nonrestaurant organizations suggests that leadership style may be a factor that can help reduce employee turnover (Tse, Huang, & Lam, 2013; Waldman, Carter, & Hom, 2015). In particular, servant leadership, with its emphasis on the well-being of employees, may reduce turnover by increasing employees' organizational commitment and perceived organizational support, two outcomes that have been shown to reduce employee turnover and turnover intentions (Allen, Shore, & Griffeth, 2003; Edwards & Peccei, 2010). The literature review for this study did not identify any prior studies on the effects of servant leadership on employees' organizational commitment and perceived organizational support in the restaurant industry. To help close this gap in the literature and to address the problem of high employee turnover in restaurants, this study investigated whether servant leadership was associated with restaurant employees' organizational commitment and perceived organizational support. The potential implication of the study was that evidence might be found that could help restaurants reduce their employee turnover by revising their leadership model.

This chapter provides an overall introduction to the study. The chapter is divided into 12 main sections following this introduction. After a brief background, the problem and purpose of the study are presented and two research questions with associated hypotheses are identified. The theoretical framework and nature of the study are then discussed and the variables, assumptions, scope, and limitations of the study are

explained. Following discussion of the study's significance, a summary of the chapter is provided.

Background of the Study

Employee turnover is a significant problem for organizations because turnover incurs substantial direct and indirect costs (Silverthorne, 2004). Turnover is of special concern in the U.S. restaurant industry because of the high rate at which restaurant employees leave their jobs (Han et al., 2016). Efforts to understand factors affecting employee turnover have mostly focused on *push-to-leave* forces, such as job dissatisfaction, and *pull-to-leave* forces, such as job opportunities elsewhere, though increasing research is being done on *pull-to-stay* forces that induce employees to stay at their job (Waldman et al., 2015, p. 1725). Some research on pull-to-stay forces suggests that leadership style is a factor that may help keep employees at their job (Tse et al., 2013; Waldman et al., 2015).

Servant leadership is a leadership model first developed by Greenleaf (1977). Central to the servant leadership model is the idea that being concerned about the growth and well-being of followers is essential to the leadership role (Tischler, Giambatista, McKeage, & McCormick, 2016; Van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011). The concern for employees that characterizes the servant leadership model suggests that use of the servant leadership style might help reduce the high employee turnover rate in restaurants. Servant leadership might do so by increasing employees' organizational commitment and perceived organizational support, two organizational outcomes shown to reduce employee turnover and turnover intentions (Allen et al., 2003; Edwards & Peccei, 2010).

Despite the importance of understanding effective leadership in food service organizations (Hein & Rigel, 2012), few studies have examined the effects of servant leadership in the restaurant industry. An exhaustive literature search identified only two studies in peer-reviewed journals that examined organizational outcomes of servant leadership in restaurants. Carter and Baghurst (2013) found that servant leadership increased engagement of restaurant employees. Liden, Wayne, Liao, and Meuser (2014) also found that servant leadership was positively associated with the job performance of restaurant employees. The literature search showed that research was needed to address a gap in the literature on how servant leadership affects restaurant employees' organizational commitment and perceived organizational support. Such research could provide information to restaurants that might help them reduce their employee turnover by modifying their leadership model.

Problem Statement

Annual turnover in moderate- to low-priced restaurants ranges between 40% and 50% annually (Batt et al., 2014). This annual turnover is an aggregate of the monthly averages of 3.3% to 4.2%, which are high compared to rates in other industries. For example, monthly turnover rates for the manufacturing, education and health services, information, and financial activities industries for 2015 averaged 2.1%, 2.5%, 2.8%, and 2.3%, respectively (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2016). The high turnover rates in the restaurant industry constitute a serious restaurant management problem because it costs \$4,900 to replace one hourly employee (Perez & Mirabella, 2013).

Two organizational outcomes that reduce turnover are employees' perceived organizational support and organizational commitment (Edwards & Peccei, 2010). The servant leadership model emphasizes employee well-being, suggesting that servant leadership may increase restaurant employees' perceived organizational support and organizational commitment. However, the literature review for this study suggested a lack of prior research on how servant leadership is related to these organizational outcomes among restaurant employees. Therefore, this study was designed to determine whether restaurant employees' perceptions of the servant leadership practices of their immediate supervisor were positively associated with the employees' perceived organizational support and their affective, normative, continuance, and overall organizational commitment.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this quantitative correlational study was to determine if restaurant employees' perceptions of the servant leadership practices of their immediate supervisor were positively associated with the employees' perceived organizational support and their affective, normative, continuance, and overall organizational commitment. The independent variable for the study was restaurant employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisor's servant leadership practices. The dependent variables were the employees' perceived organizational support and the employees' affective, normative, continuance, and overall organizational commitment.

Participants consisted of employees of several restaurants that belong to two nationwide restaurant chains. Data were gathered through an online survey consisting of

four instruments to measure the independent and dependent variables, and a brief demographic survey. The statistical analysis was performed using Pearson's correlation procedure. The results of the study are potentially valuable to owners and managers of restaurants by providing information that could help them reduce employee turnover.

Research Question(s) and Hypotheses

The following two research questions constituted the focus of the research:

- RQ1: Are restaurant employees' perceptions of the servant leadership practices of their immediate supervisor positively associated with the employees' perceived organizational support?
 - Ho1: Restaurant employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisor's servant leadership practices are not positively associated with the employees' perceived organizational support.
 - Ha1: Restaurant employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisor's servant leadership practices are positively associated with the employees' perceived organizational support.
- RQ2: Are restaurant employees' perceptions of the servant leadership practices of their immediate supervisor positively associated with the employees' affective, normative, continuance, and overall organizational commitment?
 - Ho2: Restaurant employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisor's servant leadership practices are not positively associated with the employees' affective, normative, continuance, or overall organizational commitment.

- Ha2: Restaurant employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisor's servant leadership practices are positively associated with the employees' affective, normative, continuance, or overall organizational commitment.

Null Hypothesis Ho1 was supported by the study findings if restaurant employees' perceptions of the servant leadership practices of their immediate supervisor was not found to be associated with the employees' perceived organizational support.

Alternative Hypothesis Ha1 was supported by the study findings if restaurant employees' perceptions of the servant leadership practices of their immediate supervisor was found to be associated with the employees' perceived organizational support.

Null Hypothesis Ho2 was supported by the study findings if restaurant employees' perceptions of the servant leadership practices of their immediate supervisor was not found to be associated with the employees' affective, normative, continuance, or overall organizational commitment. Alternative Hypothesis Ha2 was supported by the study findings if restaurant employees' perceptions of the servant leadership practices of their immediate supervisor was found to be associated with the employees' affective, normative, continuance, or overall organizational commitment.

Theoretical Foundation

The theoretical framework for the study was servant leadership. This leadership model emphasizes the idea of leaders being authentically concerned with the well-being and needs of their followers and being of service to them (Van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011). Since Greenleaf's (1970) original description of servant leadership, several models have been developed that differ in their interpretation of the dimensions of servant

leadership. The particular model of servant leadership used as the conceptual framework for the study was the seven-dimensional model of servant leadership developed by Liden, Zhao, Wayne, and Henderson (2008).

The seven dimensions of Liden et al.'s (2008) servant leadership model are emotional healing, creating value for the community, empowering, and conceptual skills, helping subordinates grow and succeed, putting subordinates first, and behaving ethically. According to Liden et al.'s (2008) model, servant leaders are individuals who, in their role as leaders, display qualities that reflect these seven dimensions. Liden et al. (2008) developed a 28-item servant leader scale to measure subordinates' perceptions of their supervisor or manager's servant leader practices in these seven dimensions. Liden et al. (2008) found that servant leadership, as measured by their scale, was positively associated with employees' in-role performance, community citizenship behaviors, and organizational commitment at the individual level. These three positive associations were found when controlling for leader-member exchange and transformational leadership, supporting the discriminant validity of the servant leader scale (Liden et al., 2008).

Nature of the Study

The study was a quantitative correlational investigation of how restaurant employees' perceptions of their supervisor's servant leadership practices were related to the employees' affective, normative, continuance, and overall organizational commitment and their perceived organizational support. Qualitative methods were not appropriate for the study because the study did not be exploring intangible factors that may be involved in relationships and perceptions of people and groups. Instead, the study collected

numeric information that can be analyzed statistically for the purpose of evaluating hypotheses, which are hallmarks of quantitative research (ACAPS, 2012). The independent variable for this study was restaurant employees' perceptions of their supervisor's servant leadership. The dependent variables were restaurant employees' perceived organizational support and their affective, normative, continuance, and overall organizational commitment.

The restaurants whose employees were participants in the study belong to a large food service organization with operations across the United States. Participants from several restaurants were invited to participate. I first sought approval of restaurant management for the participation of restaurant employees in the study; a minimum sample size of 77 employees were sought.

Data were gathered through the participants completing an online survey consisting of several survey instruments. To measure the independent variable, Liden et al.'s (2008) 28-item servant leadership scale (SLS) was used. The SLS was developed by Liden et al. (2008) as a measure of the seven-dimensional model of servant leadership that was the theoretical framework for this study, with four items for each of the seven dimensions.

I used the eight-item version of the Survey of Perceived Organizational Support (SPOS; Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986) to measure the dependent variable of the restaurant employees' perceived organizational support. I also used Allen and Meyer's (1990) 24-item Organizational Commitment Scale (OCS) to measure the dependent variables of the restaurant employees' affective, normative, continuance, and

overall organizational commitment. In addition, participants were asked several demographic questions, including their age, education, and number of years being employed by the restaurant.

Analysis was by Pearson's correlation procedure to determine whether the independent variable was significantly correlated with any of the dependent variables. The hypotheses were tested at the 0.05 level of significance in order to answer the study's research questions.

Definitions

Affective organizational commitment: The degree to which an individual has an emotional attachment to an organization that may involve identifying with and being involved in the organization as well as enjoying being a member of the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990, p. 2).

Continuance organizational commitment: The tendency to continue with an organization due to the costs that would be incurred by leaving the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990).

Normative organizational commitment: An organization member's beliefs about their responsibility to the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990).

Perceived organizational support: Employees' general beliefs about to what degree the employing organization is concerned with their well-being and values their contributions (Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vandenberghe, Sucharski, & Rhoades, 2002).

Servant leadership. A leadership model introduced by Greenleaf (1977) that holds that being of service to followers and being concerned with their well-being is essential for leadership (Van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011).

Assumptions

The assumptions of a study are statements of circumstances that are taken for granted as a study begins (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2016). This study had several assumptions. One assumption is that participants will respond to items on the instruments honestly by reporting their true opinions about all questions asked. To help ensure honest answers, I emphasized to the participants the confidentiality and anonymity of the study and the importance of providing honest answers.

A second assumption was that there was no relevant difference between the restaurant employees who choose to take part in the study and those who do not. Selection bias is a phenomenon that occurs when some potential participants self-select to participate in a study and others self-select not to participate and this difference in participation leads to a bias in the study's results (Nilsen et al., 2013). Selection bias may be difficult to determine because information on nonparticipants is typically not available, so comparing those who selected to be in the study with those who did not is impossible (Khazaal et al., 2014). In this study, for example, it was possible for appreciative employees of the restaurant to be more likely to choose to take the survey than less appreciative employees and for this difference to lead to a bias in the study's results. To help reduce the possibility of selection bias, material explaining the study to potential participants emphasized the importance of obtaining a wide range of employee

input no matter their gender, age, position, experience, or how they felt about their employment.

A third assumption of the study was that no extraneous variables had an impact on participants' responses to the online survey. Examples of extraneous variables included an employee's feeling ill or having to deal with a family problem or a problem with another employee at the time of taking the survey. Accounting for possible extraneous variables among the participants is impossible, as such variables may occur among the sample for any survey. Any effects of such variables were assumed to be negligible.

Scope and Delimitations

The scope of the study encompassed surveying employees of moderately priced restaurants in two national U.S. chains to determine their perceptions of their supervisor's servant leadership practices. The resulting data determined the independent variable for the study. The scope of the study also encompassed surveying the restaurant employees to determine their affective, normative, continuance, and overall organizational commitment and their perceived organizational support. The resulting data determined the dependent variables for the study. The independent and dependent variables were compared using Pearson's correlation procedure to determine whether there were any significant relationships between them.

Study delimitations are the way in which the scope has been narrowed and consist of a researcher's decisions about the study's overall design (Bloomberg & Volpe). This study was delimited in three ways. First, the study is delimited by the fact that only

restaurant employees of two nationwide chains of moderately priced restaurants were surveyed; employees of other restaurants were not included in the study. Second, there were no independent variables in the study other than restaurant employees' perceptions of the servant leadership practices of their supervisor. The employees' perceptions of other leadership practices and behaviors of their supervisor, such as transactional or transformational leadership practices, were not investigated.

Third, the only dependent variables for the study were employees' affective, normative, continuance, and overall organizational team commitment and their perceived support from their organization. Other organizational constructs that might be related to servant leadership, such as organizational trust and team effectiveness, were not investigated.

Limitations

One limitation of the study was that the sample was a convenience sample, as opposed to a random sample, of restaurants. Therefore, generalizability of the study's results was limited. However, given the choice several different restaurants within two nationwide restaurant chains and the expectation that training and practices for restaurants in each chain were similar nationwide, the results for the restaurants selected were suggestive for all restaurants in each chain. To the extent that the restaurants chosen had similarities to other moderately priced restaurants, the results were also suggestive for those other restaurants.

A second limitation was that the employees in the sample worked for moderately priced restaurants, and employees of moderately priced restaurants may have important

differences from employees of fast-food restaurants and fine-dining restaurants.

Therefore, the results were only suggestive for employees of other types of restaurants.

A third limitation of the study was that participants may not have had sufficient time to complete the three surveys measuring the independent and dependent variables. To attempt to offset this limitation, overly long surveys were avoided. Together, the SLS, OCS, and SPOS contain a total of 60 items. The demographic section of the survey consisted of only four questions. The time required for restaurant employees to complete the entire online survey was approximately 10 to 15 minutes.

A fourth limitation of the study was that the categorization of possible responses to survey items required participants to respond in terms of specific indicated categories. This was a limitation of the participants' range of responses that cannot be avoided in the use of quantitative surveys.

Significance of the Study

There is a lack of dedicated research on how servant leadership is related to important organizational constructs in the restaurant industry. This study helped close this gap in research and added knowledge about the leadership model of servant leadership as applied to leadership of restaurant employees. In particular, the study was significant by providing knowledge of whether servant leadership increases the perceived organizational support of restaurant employees as well as their affective, normative, continuance, and overall organizational commitment. This knowledge may help restaurant managers and owners decide whether to embrace the servant leadership model as a way to reduce costly employee turnover.

The study may also have general societal value because for many individuals and families, going out to eat at a restaurant is a valued practice that is an important part of their leisure-time activities. Physical atmosphere and quality of service have been found to contribute to restaurant image and customer perceived value (Ryu, Lee, & Kim, 2012). Creating such an atmosphere and ensuring that restaurant employees provide such service are responsibilities of the restaurant leadership. By providing information that may result in improved restaurant leadership and reduced employee turnover, the study may have value for the general public in their pursuit of enjoyable leisure-time activities.

If findings help lead to improved restaurant leadership by reducing employee turnover, the study may also have economic benefits for restaurant organizations by increasing restaurant profits. Increased restaurant profitability might, in turn, have beneficial effects on restaurant investors, management, and employees. In regard to restaurant employees, for example, increased organizational profitability might result in increased opportunities for pay raises. Furthermore, improved leadership that leads to reduced turnover and longer tenures for restaurant employees would enable them to increase their skills over a longer period of time, providing them with further possible opportunities for increased pay.

The study may also have other benefits for restaurant employees if the findings motivate restaurants to embrace servant leadership practices. In that event, restaurant employees' sense that they are appreciated by the organization might increase, which could lead to greater job satisfaction. Since working often fills a large portion of

individuals' time, such an increase in job satisfaction could lead to an increase in restaurant worker's overall life satisfaction.

Finally, it was determined that if the study found that restaurant employees' perceptions of the servant leadership practices of their immediate supervisor are positively associated with the employees' perceived organizational support or organizational commitment, these results might motivate increased employment of the servant leadership model by other kinds of organization in which job turnover is relatively high, such as hospitality organizations and retail organizations. Finding a positive association between study variables would suggest that using the servant leadership model in other high-turnover organizations could increase employees' perceived organizational support and organizational commitment and thereby decrease turnover, which could potentially add to the organizations' profitability, the employees' job satisfaction, and improved customer service.

Summary and Transition

This chapter consisted of an introduction to this study. Following a brief background section, the general management problem for the study was explained. This general problem is the high turnover rates in the restaurant industry (Han et al., 2016). The specific problem for the study follows from research showing that employees' organizational commitment and perceived organizational support predict decreased turnover. Therefore, the study's specific problem was explained as being whether restaurant employees' perceptions of the servant leadership practices of their supervisor are related to the employees' affective, normative, continuance, and overall

organizational commitment and their perceived organizational support. The purpose of the study was stated as being to determine whether restaurant employees' perceptions of the servant leadership practices of their supervisor are related to their affective, normative, continuance, and overall organizational commitment and their perceived organizational support. The study's two research questions were then identified and hypotheses related to the research questions were given.

The theoretical framework for the study was explained as being servant leadership. Because there are several models of servant leadership, one of these particular models should be chosen. For this study, Liden et al.'s (2008) seven-dimensional model of servant leadership will serve as the specific theoretical framework. The nature of the study as being quantitative and correlational was outlined. The discussion of the nature of the study included describing the participants and the instruments. Pearson's correlation is the statistical procedure to be used to analyze the data, answer the research questions, and evaluate the hypotheses. Key definitions were then given, and assumptions of the study were outlined. The scope and delimitations of the study were explained, and limitations of the study were identified. The significance of the study for learning and for social change was discussed in the final section.

Chapter 2 consists of a review of literature relevant to the study. The methodology that was used for the study is explained in detail in Chapter 3. The results of the study are reported in Chapter 4. A discussion of the study's results, including implications, limitations, and recommendations is provided in Chapter 5.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

This study addressed the general problem of high employee turnover in the restaurant industry (Batt et al., 2014; Han et al., 2016), which constitutes a serious restaurant management problem due to the high cost of employee turnover (Perez & Mirabella, 2013). This study specifically examined whether the servant leadership model would help reduce restaurant turnover by positively affecting restaurant employees' organizational commitment and perceived organizational support, both of which have been shown to predict lower turnover in nonrestaurant organizations (Allen et al., 2003; Edwards & Peccei, 2010). The purpose of the study was therefore to determine whether restaurant employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisor's servant leadership practices are related to their affective, normative, continuance, and overall organizational commitment and their perceived organizational support.

This chapter consists of a review of literature pertinent to the study. The chapter is divided into five main sections. The first section describes the literature search strategy used for the review. The second section focuses on the servant leadership model, which is the theoretical foundation for the study. The second section includes a description of servant leadership as originally defined by Greenleaf (1970), a review of several main interpretations of the servant leadership model, and the rationale for choosing Liden et al.'s (2008) seven-dimensional interpretation of servant leadership. The section also includes a comparison of servant leadership to several alternative leadership models and explanations for how servant leadership may produce organizational benefits.

The third section of the chapter focuses on the constructs of organizational commitment and perceived organizational support. The section is divided into two subsections. The nature of each of the two organizational outcomes is explained and empirical research related to each outcome is reviewed. The fourth section of the chapter consists of a review of empirical studies that have investigated how servant relationship is related to various organizational outcomes. The main emphasis in this section is on studies comparing servant leadership to organizational commitment and perceived organizational support. Several studies on the relationship of servant leadership to other important organizational outcomes are also reviewed. The fifth section of the chapter provides a summary of the review. The summary also includes discussion of the gap in the literature that exists and that this study will help fill.

Literature Search Strategy

Literature searches were conducted on the Google and Google Scholar search engines and on several databases, including Business Source Complete, ABI/INFORM Complete, Emerald Management, SAGE Premiere, and Science Direct. Search terms used in literature searches included the following alone or in combination with each other: *leadership, servant leadership, servant leadership models, organizational commitment, affective commitment, normative commitment, continuance commitment, perceived organizational support, perceived supervisor support, organizational citizenship behavior, employee turnover, job satisfaction, Greenleaf, restaurants, and restaurant leadership.*

Searches were made to locate seminal works on servant leadership, organizational commitment, and perceived organizational support no matter how old. The need to locate seminal works on several different main concepts, surveys, and interpretations of servant leadership required citing a considerable number of older studies. However, the great majority of searches were for empirical studies that have been published since 2012, and the bulk of the literature reviewed was published since that date. The number of full resources and abstracts reviewed was approximately 700. Main features of the literature search strategy were as follow:

- Search Engines and Databases Searched
 - Google and Google Scholar
 - Business Source Complete
 - ABI/INFORM Complete
 - Emerald Management
 - SAGE Premiere
 - Science Direct
- Search Terms
 - Leadership, servant leadership, servant leadership models
 - Organizational commitment; affective, normative, and continuance commitment Perceived organizational support, perceived supervisor support
 - Organizational citizenship behavior
 - Employee turnover, job satisfaction

- Greenleaf, restaurants, and restaurant leadership
- Types of Literature Sought
 - Peer reviewed articles
 - Dissertations
 - Books

Theoretical Foundation

The theoretical foundation of this study was servant leadership, which was first introduced by Greenleaf (1970) in the essay *The Servant as Leader*. Since Greenleaf's introduction of servant leadership, several interpretations of the model have been offered by various researchers. The particular interpretation of servant leadership chosen for this study was the seven-dimensional interpretation offered by Liden et al. (2008).

The purpose of this section is to provide an overview of servant leadership in four subsections. The first subsection consists of an explanation of servant leadership as originally set out by Greenleaf (1970). The second subsection focuses on several main interpretations of the servant leadership model and compares them to Greenleaf's (1970) original description of servant leadership. The second subsection also provides a rationale for choosing Liden et al.'s (2008) seven-dimensional interpretation of servant leadership as the study's theoretical foundation. In the third subsection, servant leadership is contrasted to several alternative leadership models. The fourth subsection provides several explanations for how servant leadership may produce organizational benefits.

Greenleaf's Conception of Servant Leadership

The outlines of the servant leadership theory were first set out by Greenleaf (1970), who claimed that a new moral principle was developing concerning leadership. This principle, Greenleaf stated, was that authority to lead is conferred only by followers who recognize that true leaders are people who want to serve others; such servant leaders have a natural servant nature. Greenleaf (1970) held that servant leadership begins with a person's realization that they want to serve others first, and want to do so by leading them. Greenleaf contrasted such a person to someone whose first desire is to lead, rather than to serve. Greenleaf maintained that the difference between the two was in the care that the servant leader provides the follower. Proper issues to consider, according to Greenleaf, are how followers grow in their personhood; whether they become healthier, more autonomous, wiser, and more likely to become servant leaders themselves; and what is the effect of the servant leader on those in society who are less privileged (Greenleaf, 1970).

Greenleaf's (1970) characterization makes clear that the primary quality of the servant leader is an ethical desire to serve others for the sake of their well-being and the well-being of society. A second primary quality of servant leaders, according to Greenleaf, is that they provide a vision to followers, which gives an overall direction and purpose to the people in a group or organization.

According to Greenleaf (1970), there are several other qualities of servant leaders besides the desire to serve others and the ability to provide a vision to followers. These can be classified into three categories: people-oriented qualities, cognitive abilities, and

combined people-oriented and cognitive qualities. People-oriented characteristics of servant leaders include acceptance of others as they are and empathy, which Greenleaf (1970) defined as “the imaginative projection of one’s own consciousness into another being” (p. 10). The people-orientation of the servant leader also includes healing, which Greenleaf (1970) equated to making whole, maintaining that both servant leaders and their followers share a need for wholeness. Servant leaders also focus on lifting people up. Greenleaf (1970) explained that lifting people up is connected to acceptance and empathy because people can be lifted up only when they are accepted for what and who they are. Finally, servant leaders’ people orientation includes their concern for the community and for building community.

Greenleaf (1970) also highlighted several cognitive abilities of servant leaders, including possessing a high degree of awareness. Greenleaf described awareness as a leader’s being open to and able to perceive reality. Greenleaf held that most people have a relatively narrow perceptual capacity, but servant leaders have a high degree of awareness that helps them view situations with detachment and increases their ability to set priorities. Another cognitive ability, which Greenleaf called the prime leadership talent, is conceptualizing. Greenleaf stated that clear thinking is essential for the servant leadership. Greenleaf insisted that the enemy of a better society is not the system or any particular type of people but rather unclear thinking, stating, “The real enemy is fuzzy thinking on the part of good, intelligent, vital people, and their failure to lead, and to follow servants as leaders” (p. 26).

Another cognitive characteristic of servant leaders is intuition, which Greenleaf (1970) explained is the ability to synthesize imperfect information and make correct evaluations. Servant leaders have the ability to recognize, consciously or unconsciously, patterns in the information available. This intuitive ability is closely connected to yet another cognitive characteristic of the servant leader, foresight, which is the result of being able to synthesize present and historical awareness into a rational projection of what will happen in the future (Greenleaf, 1970).

A servant leader characteristic that can be categorized as both people-oriented and cognitive is listening. Greenleaf (1970) highlights listening as being a crucial communication skill. When communicating with others, the first requirement for a servant leader is to listen to what others have to say. If a problem is brought to a servant leader, he or she will automatically respond by listening to what the problem is, rather than immediately trying to assign blame for the problem (Greenleaf, 1970). A second quality of servant leaders that is both people-oriented and cognitive is the ability to persuade others through rational argument. In his essay, Greenleaf (1970) used examples of people who brought about substantial change through persevering in their persuasive arguments, sometimes one person at a time. A summary of the servant leader characteristics that Greenleaf (1970) set out are the following:

- *Primary qualities*
 - An ethical desire to serve others for their well-being
 - Providing a vision for overall direction and purpose
- *People-oriented qualities*
 - Acceptance and empathy

- Healing
- Lifting people up
- Concern for community and building community
- *Cognitive qualities*
 - Awareness
 - Conceptualizing
 - Intuition
 - Foresight
- *Cognitive and people-oriented qualities*
 - Listening
 - Persuasion

Interpretations of the Servant Leadership Model

Several interpretations of Greenleaf's (1970) servant leadership model have been put forth by various researchers. One of the main expositors of servant leadership has been Spears (2005), who viewed servant leaders as having 10 qualities. These were the same qualities presented in the previous section with two exceptions. Spears did not include the quality of intuition, though he did include the quality of foresight. Because Greenleaf (1970) discussed the foresight of servant leaders as involving intuition, Spears (2005) may have combined these two qualities into one quality: foresight. The other exception is that Spears (2005) added the quality of stewardship to the list of qualities. The addition of stewardship to the list may reflect Greenleaf's (1970) claim that there is a need for servant leaders to be trustees of institutions. According to Greenleaf (1970), trustees are leaders who are outside the institution in whom trust is placed for resolving internal issues. They are leaders who take a stewardship role in relation to the institution.

By adding stewardship to the list of servant leader qualities, Spears (2005) appears to be extending stewardship to also characterize servant leaders who are inside an institution or organization.

Laub (1999) is another interpreter of Greenleaf's (1970, 1977) writings on servant leadership. Based on a review of literature about servant leadership and the results of a 14-member Delphi panel of experts on servant leadership, Laub (1999) developed the 80-item Organizational Leadership Assessment to measure six main clusters of servant-leadership qualities: providing leadership, valuing people, developing people, sharing leadership, building community, and displaying authenticity. Four of Laub's (1999) six quality-clusters reflect several of Greenleaf's (1970) original explanation of servant-leader qualities: desire to serve others by leading, lifting people up, and building community. Laub's (1999) quality-clusters of sharing leadership and displaying authenticity do not appear to explicitly reflect Greenleaf's (1970) original listing of servant leader qualities; however, the servant leader's possession of these two quality-clusters may be implied by the other servant leader qualities Greenleaf described.

Two other main interpreters of servant leadership are Van Dierendonck and Nuijten (2011). These two researchers developed the 30-item Servant Leadership Scale on the basis of a literature review, interviews with managers believed to be servant-leaders, and exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis of a preliminary instrument. Van Dierendonck and Nuijten (2011) analyzed servant leadership to consist of eight dimensions: standing back, empowerment, forgiveness, courage, accountability, authenticity, humility, and stewardship. Of these eight servant leadership dimensions,

empowerment and stewardship can be viewed as being explicitly mentioned by Greenleaf (1970) referring to lifting people up and being a trustee. The other six qualities that were claimed by Van Dierendonck and Nuijten (2011) to be servant-leader qualities were apparently not explicitly mentioned by Greenleaf (1970), though servant leaders' possession of the six qualities of standing back, forgiveness, courage, accountability, authenticity, and humility may be implied by the servant leader qualities that Greenleaf explicitly discussed.

Liden et al. (2008) make up a fourth group of researchers who have developed an influential interpretation of servant leadership. Based on a review of servant leadership literature, an initial pilot study, and confirmatory factor analysis on the results of a study using a preliminary instrument, Liden et al. (2008) developed a seven-factor model of servant leadership. The researchers also constructed a 28-item servant leadership scale (SLS) to measure seven dimensions of servant leadership: emotional healing, creating value for the community, conceptual skills, empowering, helping subordinates grow and succeed, putting subordinates first, and behaving ethically. In a later study, Liden et al. (2014) defined emotional healing as sensitivity to the personal issues of followers, and they defined creating value for the community as involving the promotion of community volunteer engagement among followers. Of Liden et al.'s (2008) seven dimensions, behaving ethically seems to be implied by Greenleaf's (1970) characterization of servant leaders as leaders who have an ethical desire to serve others for the sake of their well-being. In addition, five of the seven dimensions explicitly reflect other servant leader qualities that were originally identified by Greenleaf. These five dimensions are creating

value for the community, conceptual skills, putting subordinates first, helping subordinates grow and succeed, and empowering. One of Liden et al.'s (2008) servant leader dimensions—emotional healing—was not explicitly mentioned by Greenleaf (1970); however, emotional healing may be implied by Greenleaf's view that understanding and empathy are qualities of servant leaders.

Of the four reviewed interpretations of servant leadership, the two that most closely reflect Greenleaf's (1970) explanation of the qualities of servant leaders appear to be the interpretations by Spears (2005) and Liden et al. (2008). While Spears (2005) did not develop an instrument to measure servant leadership, Liden et al. (2008) did develop the SLS instrument to measure seven dimensions of servant leadership. Thus, Liden et al.'s (2008) seven-factor interpretation has been chosen as the conceptual framework for the present study, and the SLS has been chosen as the instrument to measure restaurant employees' perceptions of the servant leadership practices of their supervisors.

Servant Leadership Compared to Other Major Leadership Models

Several researchers have investigated the issue of whether the servant leadership model is distinct from other major leadership models, including the transactional, transformational, and leader-member exchange models. Washington, Sutton, and Sauser (2014) compared the servant leadership model with transactional and transformational leadership models. Transactional leadership was conceptualized by Washington et al. (2014) as a style of leadership in which leaders use authority, sanctions, and rewards as strategies to influence followers to perform their work as directed and was considered as having four versions: contingent reward, active management by exception, passive

management by exception, and laissez-faire management. The researchers conceptualized transformational leadership as having four dimensions: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration.

Washington et al. (2014) surveyed 207 employees of five organizations to determine whether there were any significant statistical differences between the employees' perceptions of the servant leadership, transformational, and transactional characteristics of their supervisors. The researchers used Liden et al.'s (2008) SLS to measure employee perceptions of their supervisor's servant leadership characteristics and Avolio and Bass's (2004) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) to measure employee perceptions of their supervisor's transformational and transactional leadership characteristics.

Using regression to analyze their survey data, Washington et al. (2014) found that employees' perceptions of servant leadership characteristics were negatively related to their perceptions of some transactional leadership characteristics and positively related to others. Employee perceptions of supervisor servant leadership characteristics were also positively related to their perceptions of transformational leadership characteristics. Washington et al. (2014) concluded from their findings that servant leadership "shares much in common with other theories of leadership, especially transformational leadership" (p. 22). They also suggested the possibility that servant leadership and transformational leadership are the same theory under two different names.

In contrast to the conclusion of Washington et al. (2014) that servant leadership and transformational leadership may be identical, Liden et al. (2008) held that servant

leadership is distinct from transformational leadership. The researchers noted that while there are similarities between the two leadership models, the servant leadership model differs from the transformational leadership model in three basic ways: it emphasizes putting followers first, contributing to the welfare of the community, and promoting servant leadership behaviors among followers. Liden et al. (2008) argued that there might be some correlation between servant leadership and transformational leadership, but the three main differences that they noted distinguished servant leadership from transformational leadership.

Liden et al. (2008) tested their claim of a difference between servant leadership and transformational leadership by surveying 162 employees (145 subordinates and 17 supervisors) of a U.S. production and distribution company. Instruments used were the SLS to measure employees' perceptions of superiors' servant leadership characteristics, Avolio and Bass's (2004) MLQ to measure perceptions of transformational leadership characteristics, and Liden and Maslyn's (1998) multidimensional measure of leader-member exchange to measure perceptions of Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) leadership characteristics. Liden et al. (2008) also measured subordinates' self-rated organizational commitment and community citizenship behavior, and the supervisor-rated in-role performance of subordinates. Using hierarchical linear modeling, the researchers found that in regard to several of the dependent variables, servant leadership explained variances beyond what was explained by transformational and LMX leadership. Liden et al. (2008) concluded that because servant leadership at the individual level was able to explain variances in the three outcomes beyond what was explained by

transformational or LMX leadership, their results supported the distinction between the servant leadership model and the other models.

The results of three separate studies conducted by Van Dierendonck, Stam, Boersma, de Windt, & Alkema (2014) indicated that transformational leadership and servant leadership differed in the way they affected work engagement and organizational commitment. Transformational leadership affected the outcomes mainly through employees' perceptions of leadership effectiveness, while servant leadership worked mainly through the employees' need satisfaction. These results suggest that the servant leadership and transformational leadership models are distinct from one another. Results of these studies were also reported in Van Dierendonck and Stam (2014).

Further support for the claim that the servant leadership model is distinct from the transformational leadership model came from a study by Peterson, Galvin, and Lange (2012), who investigated the relationship of firm performance to the servant leadership behaviors of 126 firm CEOs. Peterson et al. (2012) controlled for transformational leadership and found that CEO servant leadership characteristics were positively related to firm financial performance. In reviewing Peterson et al.'s (2012) study, Kausel and Culbertson (2013) noted that controlling for transformational leadership allowed Peterson et al. (2012) to isolate how CEO servant leadership behaviors affected firm performance. The results of Peterson et al.'s (2012) study suggest that transformational leadership and servant leadership are distinct leadership models.

An additional study supporting the distinction of the two leadership models was performed by Choudhary, Akhtar, and Zaheer (2013) who found different effects of

transformational leadership and servant leadership on organizational performance in service organizations in Pakistan. The results of the study conducted by Hunter et al. (2013), which are reported later in this chapter, also suggest that servant leadership and transformational leadership are distinct leadership models.

In summary, the results of various studies indicate that servant leadership is a unique leadership model distinct from transformational, transactional, and LMX leadership models. The servant leadership model, under the interpretation developed by Liden et al. (2008), served as the theoretical foundation for this study.

Explanations for How Servant Leadership Leads to Positive Outcomes

As detailed in a later section of this review, the results of a number of studies suggest that servant leadership leads to benefits for a wide range of organizations. Various researchers have put forward explanations of how servant leadership works to produce such benefits. This subsection reviews several of these proposals in order to provide a more in-depth view of servant leadership.

Liden et al. (2014) held that servant leadership leads to positive benefits because it produces a serving culture that is modeled on the behaviors of the servant leader. The researchers noted that the occurrence of such modeling behavior is a central tenet put forward by Greenleaf (1970). By modeling their behavior on their servant leader's behavior, followers gain greater identification with their organizational unit. This, in turn, produces benefits for the organization. To test their model of how servant leadership produces organizational benefits, Liden et al. (2014) surveyed 1,143 employees and 71 managers of 76 restaurants in a restaurant chain to determine perceived servant

leadership, restaurant serving culture, and several outcome variables. The researchers found that servant leadership was positively associated with serving culture, which predicted greater employee identification with the store, which in turn was positively related to in-store performance, customer service behaviors, and creativity, and was negatively related to turnover intentions. Liden et al. (2014) held that in creating a serving culture, servant leaders emphasize the importance of organizational unit objectives and nurturing group members, which leads employees to consider themselves to be members of the organizational unit. This sense of identity may result in a number of benefits for the store or other organizational unit.

Sousa and Van Dierendonck (2015) and Sousa (2014a) suggested that two key aspects of servant leadership—humility and action—lead to positive outcomes because they promote work engagement. In both studies, the researchers tested their proposed explanation by surveying 232 employees in a range of companies. Using a multiple regression method suggested by Hayes (2013), the researchers found that perceived humility in leaders was positively associated with follower engagement, especially when leaders were in higher positions. The researchers noted that these findings were similar to those by Owens and Hekman (2012) and Owens, Johnson, and Mitchell (2013), who found humility to be associated with engagement. Sousa and Van Dierendonck (2015) also found that for leaders in higher hierarchical positions, perceived humility appeared to strengthen their action-oriented leadership. The researchers concluded that the combination of humility and action-orientation might be especially effective in higher

levels of an organization, while at lower levels, action-orientation might be sufficient to generate worker engagement.

In a two-part study, Van Dierendonck, Stam, Boersma, de Windt, and Alkema (2014) compared the way servant leadership works to the way transformational leadership works with a total of 384 participants. Analysis of results showed that in the case of transformational leadership, the positive effects were the result of perceived leadership effectiveness. In the case of servant leadership, increases of work engagement and organizational commitment were the result of satisfying the needs of followers. These results were also reported in Van Dierendonck and Stam (2014).

The results of several studies suggest that servant leaders bring about desirable organizational outcomes by inspiring a sense of trust in their followers. These studies have found trust in leader to mediate the positive relationship of servant leadership to organizational commitment (Goh & Low, 2014; Ramli & Desa, 2014), job satisfaction (Chan & Mak, 2014), organizational trust (Rezaei, Salehi, Shafiei, & Sabet, 2012), and leader effectiveness, job satisfaction, and additional effort (Han & Kim, 2012).

Several studies suggest that perceiving that one's self and others are being treated justly by servant leaders has positive organizational effects. Hackett and Wang (2012) noted that a commitment to justice was one of the qualities of a servant leader. Zehiri, Akyuz, Eren, and Turhan (2013) also found that employees' perceptions of organizational justice mediated the relationship between servant leadership and both organizational citizenship behavior and job performance. In addition, Kool and Van

Dierendonck (2012) found that interactional justice mediated the relationship between servant leadership and commitment to organizational change.

Finally, both Van Dierendonck and Sousa have put forward several additional suggestions about the way in which servant leadership works to benefit organizations (Van Dierendonck & Patterson, 2015; Van Dierendonck; Van Dierendonck & Sousa, 2016; Sousa, 2014b). Van Dierendonck and Patterson (2015) suggested that servant leaders feel compassionate love, which encourages humility, altruism, and other virtuous qualities and leads to servant leader behaviors such as empowerment, providing direction, and stewardship. Van Dierendonck (2015) maintained that servant leadership brings benefits to organizations by capitalizing on employees' intrinsic motivations and aspirations, while Van Dierendonck and Sousa (2016) argued that servant leaders provide a sense of meaningfulness to employees and are able to convey to them a larger vision that goes beyond the organization. In addition, Sousa (2014b) maintained that servant leadership leads to positive outcomes by helping followers to feel more involved and in control of their work.

This review of possible mechanisms by which servant leadership leads to positive organizational outcome suggests that there may be several such mechanisms. In summary, one such mechanism may be that employees model their servant leader's behavior (Liden et al., 2014). Based on the studies reviewed, mechanisms through which servant leadership leads to positive results may include servant leaders exhibiting a combination of humility and action-orientation (Sousa & Van Dierendonck, 2015), satisfying the needs of followers (Van Dierendonck et al., 2014), inspiring employees'

intrinsic motivations and encouraging them to flourish (Van Dierendonck, 2015), and creating meaning for employees (Van Dierendonck & Sousa, 2016). Other possible mechanisms may be servant leaders inspiring leader trust (Chan & Mak, 2014; Goh & Low, 2014; Han & Kim, 2012; Ramli & Desa, 2014; Rezaei et al., 2012) and creating a sense of organizational justice (Kool & Van Dierendonck, 2012; Zehiri et al., 2013), both of which may help lead to positive organizational outcomes.

Organizational Commitment and Perceived Organizational Support

Employees' commitment to their organization and their perceptions of the degree of support they receive from their organization are important for organizational health (Morganson, Major, Oborn, Verive, & Heelan, 2010). This section reviews literature concerned with these two organizational outcomes. The section is divided into two subsections. Each subsection includes an explanation of one of the two organizational outcomes as well as why the outcome is important and a review of recent empirical studies that focus on the outcome.

Organizational Commitment

Allen and Meyer (1990) noted that although there are various conceptions of organizational commitment, what is common to those conceptions is the idea that employee commitment to an organization reduces employee turnover. Organizational commitment is thus important for organizations because turnover is expensive (Silverthorne, 2004). The various conceptions of organizational commitment all fall into one of three kinds of commitment according to Allen and Meyer (1990): emotional or affective attachment to the organization, perceived costs of leaving the organization, and

the felt obligation to stay with the organization. These three kinds of organizational commitment amount to three kinds of reason an individual may have for continuing with an organization. Thus, organizational commitment can be viewed as a global psychological state that involves varying levels of the three kinds of commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Meyer, Stanley, & Vandenberg, 2013).

The three conceptions of organizational commitment may be called affective, continuance, and normative commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1990, 1991). Affective organizational commitment implies that an individual identifies with and is involved in the organization. Continuance commitment implies a balancing of the perceived costs of leaving the organization with perceived costs of staying with the organization. Normative commitment is a sense of obligation to stay with the organization. The three kinds of reasons for organizational commitment can be summarized as employees staying with an organization because they want to, need to, or feel they ought to (Meyer & Allen, 1990). The three-component analysis of organizational commitment has informed a great deal of research that has been conducted on the outcome since the analysis was developed (Kell & Motowidlo, 2012; Nagar, 2012).

Several studies have focused on the relationship of organizational commitment to employee turnover. Jehanzeb, Rasheed, and Rasheed (2013) investigated the effect of organizational commitment on turnover and how this relationship may be affected by training. Participants were 251 employees of private organizations in Saudi Arabia who completed a self-administered questionnaire. Analysis by Pearson correlation showed a negative relationship ($p < .01$) between organizational commitment and turnover

intention. Jehanzeb et al. (2013) also found that availability of a training program and manager support for a training program were both positively associated with organizational commitment. The generalizability of these results was limited by the study's geographic restriction to Saudi Arabian companies and the means of turnover intention not being reported by the researchers.

Sow (2015) examined the relationship of organizational commitment to turnover among healthcare internal auditors. Participants were 92 members of the Association of Healthcare Internal Auditors who completed a survey to measure three components of organizational commitment and employees' turnover intentions. Analysis by multiple regression showed that greater affective commitment predicted lower turnover intention ($p = .000$). Normative and continuance organizational commitment were not significantly related to turnover intention. Limitations of the study included the fact that only correlation and not causality could be attributed to affective organizational commitment. A second limitation was that factors other than organizational commitment that might have affected turnover intention were not investigated. Sow (2015) recommended that employers of healthcare auditors make efforts to promote normative and continuance organizational commitment among the auditors.

Not all studies that have investigated the relationship of organizational commitment to turnover intention have shown a positive relationship between all three aspects of organizational commitment to turnover intention. Zopiatis, Constanti, and Theocharous (2014) conducted a study on how affective and normative organizational commitment relate to turnover intention among hospitality employees working in Cyprus.

Completed survey responses were received from 482 participants, and these were analyzed by multivariate statistical analysis and structural equation modeling. Results showed that affective organizational commitment but not normative commitment was negatively related to turnover intention ($p < .05$). Zopiatis et al. (2014) concluded that organizations should carefully manage their employees' post-hiring experiences in order to help promote commitment to their organization. Limitations of the study mentioned by the researchers included its geographical limitation, which limited the study's generalizations to other geographic contexts. A second limitation was not including continuance commitment as a variable for investigation.

Recent research has showed a significant negative relationship between one or more aspects of organizational commitment and turnover intention, including Brunetto et al.'s (2013) study of separate samples of nurses in both the United States and Australia. Weng and McElroy (2012); Juhdia, Pa'wanb, and Hansaram (2013); and Park, Christie, and Sype (2014) also found that organizational commitment predicted decreased turnover intention.

Considerable research has been conducted to investigate the antecedents of organizational commitment. A number of those studies have found that job satisfaction predicts one or more forms of organizational commitment. Yücel (2012) investigated the relationship of job satisfaction to organizational commitment and turnover intention among employees of a manufacturing company in Turkey. Survey responses by 188 employees were analyzed by structural equation modeling. Results showed that job satisfaction was positively associated with all three aspects of organizational commitment

($p < .01$). Yücel (2012) concluded that to improve organizational commitment and reduce turnover, organizations should take steps to improve employees' job satisfaction. Yücel mentioned that the restriction to employees of a single company in a single geographic region was a limitation of the study. In addition, the study's lack of investigating the effects of other variables was also considered a limitation.

Suma and Lesha (2013) found that job satisfaction predicted organizational commitment in a survey of public administration employees in Albania. The sample consisted of 56 participants who completed surveys measuring several variables, including an instrument to measure organizational commitment published by Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1979). Using Pearson's correlation procedure to analyze results, Suma and Lesha (2013) found that satisfaction with work, supervision, and co-workers were positively related to organizational commitment ($p < .01$). In addition, satisfaction with promotion was related to organizational commitment ($p < .05$). Suma and Lesha (2013) concluded that a way to improve organizational commitment is for resource officers to improve various facets of job satisfaction. Limitations of the study included its correlational nature that does not allow causality to be concluded. Another limitation was the size of the sample, which was not large.

Other recent research that has found a positive association between job satisfaction and one or more aspects of organizational commitment includes a study by Top and Gider (2013) of nurses and medical secretaries in Turkey. Eslami and Gharakhani (2012) found a positive association between the organizational commitment and job satisfaction in a sample of services-company employees in Iran. Bratt and Felzer

(2012) found job satisfaction to be positively related to organizational commitment among graduate nurses, and Nagar (2012) found a positive relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment among university teachers in Pakistan.

Various studies have found antecedents of organizational commitment other than job satisfaction. These antecedents include psychological empowerment (Bani, Yasoureini, & Mesgarpour, 2014), availability of training (Jehanzeb et al., 2013), job engagement and organizational engagement (Albdour & Altarawneh, 2014), manager support regarding work-life conflict issues (Agarwala, Arizkuren-Eleta, del Castilli, Muñiz-Ferrer, & Gartzia, 2014), career and psychosocial mentoring (Craig, Allen, Reid, Riemenschneider, & Armstrong, 2013), ethical leadership (Hassan, Wright, & Yukl, 2014), and supervisory behavioral integrity (Fritz, O'Neil, Popp, Williams, & Arnett, 2013).

The ethical and follower-centric nature of servant leadership suggests that servant leadership may promote several of the factors that have been found to predict increased organizational commitment. Such factors, noted just above, include psychological empowerment, manager support for work-life conflict issues, career and psychosocial mentoring, ethical leadership, and supervisory behavioral integrity. Insofar as servant leadership promotes such factors in restaurants, those factors may help mediate a positive association between servant leadership and the organizational commitment of restaurant employees.

Perceived Organizational Support

In a foundational paper, Eisenberger et al. (1986) proposed that employees of organizations typically have beliefs about how much their organization cares about their well-being and values their contributions. These beliefs constitute the employees' perceived organizational support. In a study of 361 employees of varying types of organization and a second study of 71 high school teachers, Eisenberger et al. (1986) found evidence that organizational commitment is strongly related to the degree employees believe their organization is committed to them. The researchers argued that that perceived organizational support probably increases employees' emotional attachment to their organization. Eisenberger et al. (1986) also found that the strength of the relation between perceived organizational support and organizational commitment varies with the degree employees embrace the idea of trading their work efforts for material and symbolic benefits.

A number of other studies have also found that greater perceived organizational support predicts increased organizational commitment or decreased intention to leave. Gutierrez, Candela, and Carver (2012) found perceived organizational support to be positively related to both affective and normative organizational commitment ($p < .01$) among a sample of nurses. A study by Madden, Mathias, and Madden (2015) found that perceived organizational support had both a direct and indirect influence on reducing turnover among 73 healthcare employees. Hussain and Asif (2012) found perceived organizational support predicts both organizational commitment and negative turnover intention ($p < .01$) among Telecom employees in Pakistan. In a study of pharmacists

working at community pharmacies in Lithuania, Urbonas, Kubiliene, Kubilius, and Urboniene (2015) found perceived organizational support predicted organizational commitment and less turnover intention ($p < .001$).

Perceived organizational support has also been found to predict other organizational benefits. In a follow-up to the Eisenberger et al. (1986) paper, Eisenberger, Fasolo, and Davis-LaMastro (1990) found a positive association of perceived organizational support with job attendance, job performance, employee conscientiousness in performing work tasks, and work innovation without the expectation of reward. The researchers also found perceived organizational support to be positively associated with affective attachment to the organization and with employees' expectancies that their high work performance would be rewarded by the organization. Eisenberger et al. (1990) interpreted the study findings using a social exchange approach. The researchers argued that employees form a general belief about their organization's commitment to them in order to meet their needs for affiliation, approval, and esteem and to calculate their organization's willingness to reward extra effort. According to Eisenberger et al. (1990), perceiving organizational support encourages employees to add their organization membership and role status to their self-identity. This addition causes them to interpret the organization's welfare to be their own welfare and to internalize organizational values and norms. Perceived organizational support also leads to trusting the organization to fulfill work-reward exchange obligations. Through creating affective attachment to the organization and the belief that hard work will be rewarded, perceived organizational

support results in better work performance and less likelihood of voluntary turnover (Eisenberger et al. 1990).

Several recent studies have investigated the factors that affect the relationship between perceived organizational support and beneficial organizational outcomes. Three such studies were reported by Eisenberger et al. (2002), who found that when employees identify supervisors with the organization, the employees' perceptions of the support they receive from their supervisor affects their perceived organizational support. In the first study, the researchers surveyed 314 employees from a variety of organizations to learn their perceived support from their supervisor and their organization at two different times. Using structural equation modeling, the researchers found change in perceived supervisor support was positively associated with change in perceived organizational support ($p < .001$). The second study surveyed 300 retail employees. Using hierarchical regression analysis, Eisenberger et al. (2002) found that the positive relationship of perceived supervisor support was greater when supervisors had a high organizational status ($p < .01$). In a third study, the researchers surveyed 493 retail sales employees. Using hierarchical logistic regression, the researchers found that perceived supervisor support was negatively related to turnover ($p < .05$). The results also showed that perceived organizational support mediates the negative relationship of perceived supervisor support to turnover. The researchers concluded that the three results together suggest that perceived supervisor support affects perceived organizational support, with the relationship gaining strength the more supervisors are perceived as representing the organization. A strength of Eisenberger et al.'s (2002) study is the use of three different

samples to investigate how perceived supervisor support may affect perceived organizational support. A limitation of the study is that the researchers did not investigate the possible role of variables other than supervisor organizational status in affecting the relationship between perceived supervisor support and perceived organizational support.

Further evidence that employees' perceptions of their supervisors affect perceived organizational support has been provided in studies by Guchait, Cho, and Meurs (2015) and Shoss, Eisenbeger, Restubog, and Zagenczyk (2013). Shoss et al. (2013) found that employees blame the organization, at least partially, if they believe they have been subjected to abusive supervision. The researchers investigated three samples of employees. One sample consisted of 148 employee-supervisor dyads, with employees being full-time employees in the Philippines. The second sample consisted of 254 employee-supervisor dyads, with employees being professionals in a large Philippine organization. The third sample consisted of 187 employees of a large financial organization in the Philippines. All participants in the three samples were surveyed to determine perceived organizational support, the degree to which employees identified their supervisor with the organization, abusive supervision, and counterproductive work behavior.

Using regression to analyze their results, Shoss et al. (2013) found that abusive supervision was associated with decreased perceived organizational support for samples 1 and 2 ($p < .01$) and sample 3 ($p < .05$). Abusive supervision was associated with high perceived identification with the organization for all three samples ($p < .01$), but not associated when supervisors were perceived with low identification with the

organization. Abusive supervision was also correlated with counterproductive work behavior. Shoss et al. (2013) interpreted the results as showing that employees consider abusive supervision as evidence the organization does not value them, which may contribute to their behaving negatively toward the organization. The researchers mentioned several limitations of their research including not investigating the possibility that other factors, such as negative emotional responses, were involved in the negative relationship between abusive supervision and perceived organizational support. The fact that the studies were conducted in the Philippines also limits the generalizability of the results to other national contexts. Shoss et al. (2013) noted that because the Philippines is a country where there tends to be wide acceptance of the difference in power in organizational hierarchies, the results of the study might be even stronger in countries where there is less acceptance of organizational power differentials.

A number of other factors have been shown to affect perceived organizational support or the relationship between perceived organizational support and organizational commitment. Allen and Shanock (2013) found that socialization efforts by the organization positively correlated with perceived organizational support. Kim, Eisenberger, and Baik (2016) found that perceived organizational competence strengthened the positive association between perceived organizational competence and organizational commitment among employees in the United States and South Korea. Hayton, Carnabuci, and Eisenberger (2012) found that for employees of a large manufacturing organization, social embeddedness (as measured by employees' exchange relationships with fellow employees) was positively associated with perceived

organizational support. The relationship held true for all three aspects of social embeddedness: size, density, and quality of social networks. Gillet, Colombat, Michinov, Pronost, and Fouquereau (2013) found that procedural justice and support for supervisor autonomy were positively related to perceived organizational support, which in turn positively predicted organizational identification as well as work satisfaction and performance.

Results of the studies reviewed and cited in this subsection provide strong evidence that employees' perceived organizational support predicts a number of positive organizational benefits. These include organizational commitment, organizational identification, job satisfaction, reduced turnover, job attendance, work performance, and worker innovation

Empirical Studies on Servant Leadership

An increasing number of empirical studies have focused on the use of servant leadership in different kinds of organization. Researchers have investigated servant leadership in environments as diverse as:

- small business (Van Winkle, Allen, DeVore, & Winston, 2014),
- the public sector (Miao, Newman, Schwartz, & Xu, 2014),
- the service sector (Choudhary, Akhtar, & Zaheer, 2013),
- financial institutions (Rubio-Sanchez, Bosco, & Melchar, 2013), primary and secondary education (Mahembe & Engelbrecht, 2013, 2014),
- higher education (Arrington, 2015; Güçel and Begeç, 2012),
- retail stores (Hunter, Neubert, Perry, Witt, Penney, & Weinberger, 2013),

- sales organizations and teams (Grisaffe, VanMeter, & Chonko, 2016), hotel employees (Kwak, & Kim, 2015),
- technology organizations (De Clercq, Bouckenoghe, Raja, & Matsyborska, 2014),
- volunteer firefighters (Tuckey, Bakker, & Dollard, 2012),
- creative arts (Akdemir, 2014), healthcare organizations (McCann, Graves, & Cox, 2014; Trastek, Hamilton, & Niles, 2014),
- civic leadership (Barbuto, Gottfredson, & Searle, 2014), and
- hairstyling salons (Chen, Zhu, & Zhou, 2014).

Much of the research on servant leadership has examined the leadership model in relation to various organizational outcomes. The two organizational outcomes that are most relevant to the present study are employees' organizational commitment and perceived organizational support. While a number of studies have been conducted on the relationship of servant leadership to organizational commitment, few studies have examined the relationship of servant leadership to perceived organizational support. In the next subsection, recent empirical studies examining servant leadership in relation to these two key outcomes are reviewed in detail. Several studies on the relationship of servant leadership to organizational citizenship behavior and to other outcomes are reviewed in the last two subsections.

Servant Leadership Related to Organizational Commitment and Perceived Organizational Support

Considerable research has been conducted to examine the relationship of the servant leadership model to employee organizational commitment. Relatively few studies have been conducted on how servant leadership may affect perceived organizational commitment. The purpose of this subsection is to review research that has investigated the relationship of servant leadership to organizational commitment, perceived organizational support, or both.

Liden et al. (2008) investigated the relationship of servant leadership to organizational commitment as part of their development of the SLS instrument. This investigation of the relationship of servant leadership to organizational commitment was done to determine the predictive validity of the seven servant leadership dimensions reflected in the SLS. Liden et al. (2008) surveyed 17 supervisors and 145 employees of a production and distribution company using the SLS along with measures for employees' perceptions of transformational leadership and leader-member exchange (LMX), employees' self-ratings of organizational commitment and community citizenship behaviors, and supervisors' ratings of subordinates' work performance. Data were analyzed by hierarchical linear modeling, while controlling for transformational leadership and LMX. Liden et al. (2008) found that servant leadership explained variance beyond that explained by transformational leadership or LMX for all three variables of organizational commitment, community citizenship behaviors, and work performance. The researchers suggested that their results implied that servant leadership may help

increase organizational commitment and job performance and may inspire followers to volunteer their services to their local communities. A limitation of Liden et al.'s (2008) study mentioned by the researchers was its cross-sectional design, which limited any causal inferences that could be made about associations between variables. In addition, the researchers noted that the sample included only U.S. employees and suggested that research using their SLS scale to measure servant leadership should be conducted using non-U.S. samples.

Bobbio, Van Dierendonck, and Manganelli (2012) surveyed employees of profit and nonprofit organizations in Italy to investigate servant leadership behaviors in these organizations and to learn whether servant leadership was associated with organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, leader integrity, and employee cynicism. Using an eight-dimensional model of servant leadership, the researchers surveyed 814 blue- and white-collar workers and managers. Bobbio et al. (2012) analyzed responses using correlation and multiple regression and found that all dimensions of servant leadership behaviors of Italian organizational leaders were positively correlated with one or more forms of organizational commitment ($p < .01$) and with perceived leader integrity and employees' organizational citizenship behavior ($p < .01$). In addition, servant leadership was negatively correlated with employee cynicism ($p < .01$).

Bobbio et al. (2012) noted that the servant leadership scores in the study were lower than scores found for the U.K. and the Netherlands. The researchers also remarked that the positive outcomes of the study suggest that even when perceived servant

leadership is low, the amount of servant leadership that does exist can have beneficial results. Limitations of the study mentioned by Bobbio et al. (2012) included the fact that the study was not longitudinal and causality could not be inferred. The use of self-report questionnaires also allowed for the possibility of social desirability effects. Finally, the study was geographically limited.

In a study on the relationship of several dimensions of servant leadership to organizational commitment, Krog and Govender (2015) surveyed a sample of 48 project team members of a medium-sized fleet management organization in South Africa. Barbuto and Wheeler's (2006) Servant Leadership Questionnaire was administered to the employees. This questionnaire is based on five dimensions of servant leadership as suggested by the developers: persuasive mapping, emotional healing, altruistic caring, wisdom, and organizational stewardship. Participants were also administered surveys measuring their organizational commitment, perceived empowerment, and innovative behavior. Responses were analyzed using the Smart PLS structural equation modeling program (Hair, Hult, Ringle, & Sarsted, 2014). The findings of Krog and Govender (2015) showed significant positive associations between two dimensions of Barbuto and Wheeler's (2006) proposed five dimensions of servant leadership and employee perceived empowerment. In particular, persuasive mapping and altruistic caring were positively associated with perceived empowerment. The dimensions of emotional healing and wisdom were not significantly associated, and the dimension of organizational stewardship was negatively associated with employee perceived empowerment. Krog and Govender (2015) also found that persuasive mapping had the strongest positive

relationship to employee innovative behavior, followed by employee organizational commitment and employee trust mediated by perceived empowerment. The researchers noted that two limitations of their study were that participants of only a single organization were surveyed and that the study was geographically limited.

Lee, Lee, Kim, and Park (2015) examined the association of servant leadership to organizational commitment among Korean nurses. The researchers had a special interest in determining the role that the nurses' perceived empowerment might play in mediating the relationship between servant leadership and organizational commitment. Lee et al. (2015) surveyed a sample of 249 nurses from three South Korean hospitals to determine their perceptions of their head nurse's servant leadership practices as well as their organizational commitment and perceived empowerment at work. Analysis of the nurses' responses was done by Pearson correlation, independent t-test, one-way ANOVA, and linear regression. Results of the study showed that the nurses' perceptions of their head nurse's servant leadership practices were positively associated with the nurses' organizational commitment and their self-reported empowerment. Also, the nurses' perceived empowerment was associated with their organizational commitment and partly mediated the relationship between servant leadership and organizational commitment. All relationships were significant at the $p < .001$ level. Lee et al. (2015) concluded that in the health care field, servant leadership practices among head nurses should be improved in order to improve nurses' sense of empowerment and their organizational commitment. Limitations of the study include its geographical limitation to Korean hospitals. In

addition, the great proportion of nurses who participated in the research were female (247, 99.2%), and thus the sample was limited in the genders surveyed.

Several studies have investigated whether leader trust mediates the relationship between servant leadership and organizational commitment. Goh and Low (2014) studied the relationship between servant leadership and organizational commitment and how trust may play a mediating role in such a relationship. The sample for the study consisted of 177 employees of 30 market research firms in Malaysia. Participants completed questionnaires to determine perceived servant leadership, organizational commitment, and affective and cognitive trust. Responses were analyzed by using multiple linear regression. Results showed servant leadership to be positively associated with organizational commitment, as well as with affective and cognitive trust in the leader, with all of these relationships significant at the $p < .01$ level. In addition, Goh and Low (2014) used multiple linear regression to find that affective trust and cognitive trust both partially mediated the relationship between servant leadership and organizational commitment. All of these regressions were also significant at the $p < .01$ level. The researchers concluded that servant leadership practices break down walls between leaders and followers by showing followers that leaders care about their well-being. This promotes trust for leaders among their followers, which in turn leads to greater organizational commitment among followers. The researchers also noted that trust in their leaders encourages employees to continue with an organization and that the implementation of servant leadership could provide a competitive advantage to organizations by raising organizational commitment among employees. A limitation of

Goh and Low's (2014) study was its geographical concentration on only Malaysian firms and concentration only on market research firms.

Another study investigating the relationship between servant leadership and organizational commitment, including the factor of leader trust, was done in Malaysia by Ramli and Desa (2014). These researchers investigated the relationship between servant leadership, affective organizational commitment, and trust in leader by surveying 143 employees working in various organizations throughout Malaysia. Van Dierendonck and Nuijten's (2011) Servant Leadership Scale, which measures eight dimensions, was used to measure employees' perceived servant leadership, along with measures for affective organizational commitment and trust in leader. Results were analyzed using correlation analysis and multiple regression to determine if any of the eight dimensions of perceived servant leadership were associated with employees' organizational commitment or trust in their leader. The results of the study revealed that the combined eight dimensions of servant leadership had a significant positive association with employees' affective organizational commitment ($p < .01$). Only one of the separate dimensions—authenticity—was correlated with affective organizational commitment ($p < .05$). Although Ramli and Desa (2014) reported the dimension of humility as being correlated with affective organizational commitment at the $p < .05$ level, they also reported the specific p value for that relationship as being .053, which is above the .05 significance level.

In regard to the relation of servant leadership to leader trust, Ramli and Desa (2014) found that the combined eight servant leadership dimensions were positively

associated with leader trust at the $p < .01$ level. Only two of the eight dimensions of servant leadership were found to be associated with leader trust. These were humility and stewardship, with both relationships being significant at the $p < .05$ level. Ramli and Desa (2014) also found that affective organizational commitment was positively associated with trust in leader at the $p < .01$ level. The researchers found trust to mediate the relationship between the combined eight dimensions of servant leadership and affective organizational commitment. Trust mediated the relationship of only one of the specific dimensions of servant leadership—humility—and affective organizational commitment. The researchers concluded that by training leaders in the servant leadership model, organizations may be able to enhance employees' relations with their leaders and to increase employees' satisfaction with their job and their organizational commitment. A limitation of their study mentioned by Ramli and Desa (2014) was that the results were not generalizable to organizations other than the ones their participants worked for. They also noted that the correlations between overall servant leadership and affective organizational commitment were not strong, which suggested the presence of other variables influencing affective organizational commitment that were not explored in their study.

Miao et al. (2014) investigated the relationship between servant leadership, organizational commitment, and trust in leader among civil servant employees in the Chinese public sector. The sample consisted of 239 participants who completed surveys to determine perceived servant leadership practices of supervisors, three kinds of organizational commitment (affective, normative, and continuance), and two kinds of

trust in leader (cognitive and affective). Analysis of responses by structural equation modeling indicated a positive association between servant leadership and affective and normative organizational commitment ($p < .01$), but servant leadership had no relationship to continuance commitment. Affective trust more strongly mediated the relationship between servant leadership and affective and normative commitment ($p < .01$) than cognitive trust did ($p < .05$). This result differed from the results of Goh and Low (2014), reviewed above, who found that among employees of market research firms in Malaysia, both affective and cognitive trust mediated the relationship between servant leadership and organizational commitment. Miao et al. (2014) concluded that greater use of servant leadership in the public sector might help restore trust and perceived legitimacy for the Chinese civil service. A limitation of the study was its inclusion of only participants living and working in a China. A further limitation was that the sample came from a relatively affluent region of China and results might differ for other regions. In addition, the study participants included only civil servants and no other public or private employees. A strength of the study is that the researchers investigated the relationship of servant leadership to three difference aspects of organizational commitment.

Few studies have examined the relationship of servant leadership to perceived organizational support. Zhou and Miao (2014) sampled 239 full-time Chinese public sector employees. Participants were administered three rounds of surveys on which they reported the perceived servant leadership practices of their supervisors along with the employees' affective commitment to the organization and their perceived organizational

support. Zhou and Miao (2014) found perceived servant leadership to be positively associated with affective organizational commitment ($p < .001$). However, when perceived organizational support was included in the model, the strength of the association decreased, indicating that perceived organizational support mediated the relationship between servant leadership and affective organizational support. The results suggest that servant leadership practices increase followers' evaluations of the support they receive from their organization and that this perception helps further their affective commitment to the organization. Zhou and Miao (2014) concluded that their research suggested that positive effects of the servant leadership model do not appear in only Western cultures but that those effects can also be seen in the Chinese culture. Limitations of the study included its restriction to only Chinese employees and its being limited to only employees working in the public sector. Also, the study did not explore whether any other constructs, such as leader trust or perceived empowerment, mediated the relationship between servant leadership and organizational commitment.

Bobbio and Manganelli (2015) surveyed two different samples of nurses ($n = 371$ and $n = 340$) who worked in one of two large Italian hospitals in different areas of the country to determine the relationship between perceived servant leadership and perceived organizational support. The researchers also wanted to learn the relationships of servant leadership and perceived organizational support to trust in leader, trust in the organization, and turnover intention. Using correlation and structural equation modeling to analyze responses, Bobbio and Manganelli (2015) found that servant leadership was positively associated with perceived organizational support for nurses in both samples (p

< .01). Both servant leadership and perceived organizational support were also positively correlated with trust in leader and trust in the organization in both samples, and negatively correlated with turnover intention in both organizations ($p < .01$ for all relationships). The researchers also found that trust in leader and trust in the organization mediated the relationship between servant leadership and perceived organizational support. Bobbio and Manganeli (2014) concluded that servant leadership, because it is oriented to followers and based on trust, is an appropriate leadership style for the complex and emotionally demanding work hospital nurses must perform and may help hospitals retain their nursing workforce.

A strength of Bobbio and Manganeli's (2015) study was that the researchers surveyed two independent samples of nurses from two different regions of Italy. A limitation was that the study was cross-sectional rather than longitudinal in design. Also, the participants self-selected to take part in the study, which may have introduced some bias into the results. In addition, the study did not include a measure of actual turnover rates of the nurses.

Rai and Prakash (2016) conducted a study to examine the relationship of servant leadership to perceived organizational support and to the knowledge-absorptive capacity of employees. Participants were 182 employees of manufacturing and service organizations who completed surveys measuring perceived servant leadership, perceived organizational support, and four aspects of knowledge-absorptive capacity. The researchers found that servant leadership was positively associated with perceived organizational support ($p < .001$) and with knowledge assimilation, application, and

dissemination ($p < .01$). Rai and Prakash (2016) also found that perceived organizational support mediated the relationship between an employee's identification of knowledge contingent on the need for cognition of an employee. The researchers concluded that leadership style, and in particular servant leadership, can have a substantial effect on the absorptive capacity of employees in knowledge organizations. They suggested that servant leadership works to strengthen perceived organizational support by strengthening perceived supervisor support. The resulting increase in perceived organizational support may then help mediate the relation of servant leadership to absorptive capacity.

A limitation of their study mentioned by Rai and Prakash (2016) is that the study was cross-sectional rather than longitudinal in design limiting the conclusions that can be drawn from the study. The researchers also noted that absorptive capacity is only one aspect of individuals' learning behavior, and other aspects need to be addressed in future research. The study was also limited by not exploring how learning behavior might differ among different kinds of organization.

Yildiz and Yildiz (2015) conducted a conceptual study about the relationship of servant leadership to perceived organizational support. The researchers conducted a literature review with the objective of developing and presenting a theoretical model specifying that perceived organizational support mediated the relationship between servant leadership and organizational psychological ownership, which Yildiz and Yildiz (2015) defined as "the feeling of possession developed by members of the organization as a whole towards to the organization" (pp. 66-67). The researchers concluded that empirical research should be conducted to evaluate their theoretical model by

determining whether perceived organizational support serves as a mediator of the relationship between servant leadership and organizational psychological ownership.

Overall, the studies reviewed in this section have shown that servant leadership has a positive association with employees' overall organizational commitment or with one or more particular dimensions of organizational commitment. These studies include those conducted by Liden et al. (2008), Bobbio et al. (2012), Krog and Govender (2015), Lee et al. (2015), Goh and Low (2014), Ramli and Desa (2014), Miao et al. (2014), and Zhou and Miao (2014).

Although research investigating the relationship of servant leadership to perceived organizational support is meager, the few studies that have been done suggest that there is a positive relationship between the leadership style and the outcome. Bobbio and Manganelli (2015) and Rai and Prakash (2016) both found that servant leadership predicted perceived organizational support. Zhou and Miao (2014) found that there was a positive relationship between servant leadership and perceived organizational support and that perceived organizational support mediated the relationship between servant leadership and affective organizational commitment. Yildiz and Yildiz (2015) did not perform an empirical study but rather proposed a theoretical model relating servant leadership with perceived organizational support, and the model is in need of empirical support.

Servant Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

An important organizational outcome that servant leadership studies have investigated is organizational citizenship behavior. Organizational citizenship behavior is

an employee's job performance, such as working extra hours or helping other workers at their jobs, that goes beyond fulfilling tasks that are required by a certain job description and benefits the organization (Bambale, 2014). Employees' performance of organizational citizenship behaviors has been found to be positively associated with their organizational commitment in various contexts and countries (Asiedu, Sarfo, & Adjei, 2014; Ibrahim & Aslinda, 2013; Islam, Khan, Shafiq, & Ahmad, 2013; Pourgaz, Naruei, & Jenaabadi, 2015).

Hunter et al. (2013) investigated the effects of servant leadership on retail sales employees' organizational citizenship behavior, turnover intentions, work disengagement, and sales behavior, as well as store service climate and store sales performance. The researchers were especially interested in how leader personality and store service climate might affect how servant leadership behavior is related to the other study variables. A total of 425 followers, 110 store managers, and 40 regional managers from 224 stores in a U.S. retail chain were surveyed. Employees were surveyed to measure perceived servant leadership behavior of store managers, store sales climate, turnover intentions, and work disengagement. Store managers completed surveys measuring employees' organizational citizenship behavior and sales behavior, and completed a self-report questionnaire measuring their own agreeableness and extraversion. Performance data for stores was reported by regional managers.

Hunter et al. (2013) used regression to analyze the gathered data. Results showed a direct and indirect positive association of servant leadership with organizational citizenship helping behaviors. In addition, store manager agreeableness was positively

associated with employees' perceptions of manager servant leadership, while store manager extraversion was negatively associated with perceived servant leadership, with both associations significant at the $p < .01$ level. Hunter et al. (2013) also found that servant leadership was positively associated with sales behavior ($p < .01$) and negatively associated with employees' turnover intentions ($p < .01$) and work disengagement ($p < .05$). Store service climate was positively associated with task-focused organizational citizenship behavior. Servant leadership was positively associated with store sales performance only for the servant leadership ratings of regional managers.

Hunter et al. (2013) suggested that their finding that followers being more likely to perceive agreeable leaders who are low in extraversion as servant leaders might be because servant leaders strive for communion and status. The researchers noted that their finding about the negative relationship between servant leadership and extraversion suggested that servant leadership is distinct from transformational leadership, which is positively related to extraversion. Hunter et al. (2013) also noted that their findings suggest that one way servant leadership provides benefits to organizations is by promoting a climate of service to customers. The researchers held that servant leadership may positively affect organizational citizenship behaviors, with employees providing help to one another because they model those behaviors on their leaders' behaviors, in alignment with Liden et al.'s (2008) conclusions that employees model their servant leader's behavior.

Hunter et al. (2013) identified a strength of their study as that it included multilevel data from multiple sources to evaluate servant leadership in relation to leader

personality and follower outcomes. One study limitation mentioned by the researchers was that their data were collected from a single organization, which limits the generalizability of the study. Also, store managers were the ones to invite employees of their stores to take part in the study, and this method may have resulted in sampling bias. A further limitation of the study was the cross-sectional design, which limited the ability to draw causal inferences from the results. The study was also potentially limited by a low response rate from some stores, which may have increased the possible occurrence of a Type II statistical error.

Overall, Hunter et al. (2013) concluded that their results suggest that servant leadership fosters a climate of serving others. The leadership model also leads to reduced follower withdrawal. These benefits may be especially beneficial to retail organizations where turnover is high, partly due to nonregular work hours (Martin, Sinclair, Lelchook, Wittmer, & Charles, 2012). The researchers suggested that organizations that use the servant leadership model might consider selecting leaders based on their agreeableness and care for others rather than solely their extraverted personality.

A second study on the relationship of servant leadership to organizational citizenship behavior was conducted by Zehiri et al. (2013), who investigated the effect of servant leadership behaviors exhibited by principals of private high schools in Turkey on teachers' job performance, organizational citizenship behavior, and perceived organizational justice. The researchers surveyed 300 teachers in 10 private high schools in Turkey using instruments to measure teachers' perceived servant leadership, organizational citizenship behavior, perceived organizational justice, and job

performance. The researchers used structural equation modeling to analyze results, finding that servant leadership had direct positive effects on perceived organizational justice and on job performance. Servant leadership also had indirect positive effects on organizational citizenship behavior and job performance, which was mediated by perceived organizational justice. In their conclusions, Zehiri et al. (2013) noted that a number of studies have shown a positive relationship between servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior, but their own study showed no direct relationship between the two constructs if perceived organizational justice was taken into account as a mediating factor. The researchers mentioned several limitations of their study. One limitation was the size and coverage of the sample. The researchers also suggested having a larger sample from more private high schools covering a wider area of Turkey and including public school teachers in a larger sample. Zehiri et al. (2013) also suggested conducting further similar research in the sectors of health, business, and security. A final limitation mentioned by the researchers was that the study was restricted to investigating only certain organizational outcomes. Other organizational outcomes, including organizational trust, organizational commitment, and organizational identity, were not investigated.

A third study on the relationship of servant leadership to organizational citizenship behavior was conducted by Wu, Tse, Fu, Kwan, and Liu (2013). These researchers investigated the association between servant leadership and customer-oriented organizational citizenship behavior among hotel employees while focusing on how leader-member exchange (LMX) might mediate that association. Wu et al. (2013)

examined 304 supervisor-follower pairs from 19 Chinese hotels. The researchers found servant leadership to be positively associated with customer-oriented organizational citizenship behavior ($p < .01$), with the relationship being mediated by LMX. Wu et al. (2013) also found that employee sensitivity to favorable treatment of others strengthened servant leadership's direct association with LMX and its indirect association with customer-oriented organizational citizenship behavior. The researchers concluded that their study shows the important servant leadership has for promoting customer service in hospitality industry employees. Wu et al. (2013) suggested that training programs to improve management servant leadership skills would be likely to prove beneficial to hospitality organizations. Limitations of the study included the lack of investigating the effects of other leadership styles and the being unable to infer causality in the relationships found by the study. In addition, Wu et al. (2013) did not collect data on the personality characteristics of leaders, although such characteristics might have affected the relationship between servant leadership and the other variables. Finally, the study was geographically limited to Chinese hospitality industry firms.

Abid, Gulzar, and Hussain (2015) conducted a study on the relationship of servant leadership to organizational citizenship behavior, trust in leader, and group cohesiveness. The researchers surveyed 202 employees of three public sector organizations in Pakistan, to measure perceived servant leadership and the other study variables. Responses were analyzed by regression analysis. Abid et al. (2015) found that servant leadership was positively associated with both organizational citizenship behavior ($p = .000$) and trust in leader ($p = .000$). Both trust in leader and group cohesiveness mediated the relationship

between servant leadership and organizational citizenship behavior. Abid et al. (2015) concluded that their study results suggested that servant leaders working in public sector organizations in Pakistan should focus on building trust in their leadership and group cohesiveness in order to positively affect employees' organizational citizenship behavior. Limitations of the study mentioned by the researchers included the small size of the sample. Further limitations of the study were the fact that the sample came from only three organizations, the geographic limitation of the study to organizations in Pakistan, and the lack of a breakdown of how many participants were employed by each of the three organizations.

Overall, the reviewed studies investigating the relationship of servant leadership to organizational citizenship behavior have found a positive association between the two variables. These include the studies by Hunter et al. (2013) and Abid et al. (2015). Zehir et al. (2013) found that servant leadership had an indirect effect on organizational citizenship behavior, and Wu et al. (2013) found that servant leadership was positively related to customer-oriented organizational citizenship behavior.

Servant Leadership and Other Organizational Outcomes

A number of studies have investigated the effects of servant leadership on organizational outcomes different from organizational commitment, perceived organizational support, and organizational citizenship behavior. In this subsection, a several of these studies are described briefly in order to provide an idea of the wide range of empirical studies that have been conducted on servant leadership. Almost all of these studies have found servant leadership to be positively associated with desirable

organizational outcomes. Two studies that did not find a positive association are identified at the end of this subsection.

Job satisfaction. Several studies have found servant leadership to be positively associated with employees' job satisfaction. These include studies by Jones (2012); Wilson (2013); Donia, Raja, Panaccio, and Wang (2016); and Tischler, Giambatista, McKeage, and McCormick (2016). A study by Chan and Mak (2014) found that the positive association of servant leadership to job satisfaction was mediated by trust in leader. Ding, Lu, Song, and Lu (2012) found that employee satisfaction mediated the positive relationship between servant leadership and employee loyalty. Kashyap and Rangnekar (2014) found that servant leadership was positively correlated with employees' intended retention among Indian public- and private-sector employees.

Innovation and creativity. Research that has found a positive association between servant leadership and innovation or creativity include a study by Sun (2016), who found servant leadership had a positive association with employees' innovation performance. Yoshida, Sendjaya, Hirst, and Cooper (2014) found that servant leadership promotes sharing team norms, values, and beliefs with the team leader, which promotes employee creativity and team innovation. Rastegar, Mazlounian, Ghasemi, and Seig (2015) found that servant leadership, especially humility and service aspects, had an indirect effect on organizational entrepreneurship. Halaychik (2014) found that implementing servant leadership themes as a guide for organizational change helped in revitalizing a college library's space and services.

Organizational learning and knowledge sharing. Song, Park, and Kang (2015) found that for direct sales teams, servant leadership was positively associated with a climate of team knowledge sharing and that knowledge-sharing climate mediated a positive association between servant leadership and team sales performance. In another study, Choudhary, Akhtar, and Zaheer (2013) found that among surveyed line managers and executives of Pakistani service sector organizations, servant leadership was positively associated with organizational learning, although transformational leadership was more strongly associated with the outcome.

Work engagement and performance. Researchers De Clercq, Bouckennooghe, Raja, and Matsyborska (2014) found that for employees of four information technology companies, servant leadership was positively associated with employee work engagement. Koyuncu, Burke, Astakhova, Eren, & Cetin (2014) found that for hotel frontline service employees, perceptions of supervisor servant leadership were positively associated with higher levels of service quality. Maden, Göztaş, and Topsümer (2014) found servant leadership to be positively associated with strategic competence and customer orientation among 106 Turkish firms' executive assistants. Peterson, Galvin, and Lange (2012) found that CEO servant leadership was positively related to firm performance.

Work and family enrichment. Research that has shown a positive association of servant leadership with various forms of work enrichment includes a study by Van Winkle, Allen, DeVore, and Winston (2014), who found that for small business employees, servant leadership was positively related to their perceptions of being

empowered at work. Allameh, Naeinib, Aghaeic, and Khodaeid (2015) found that among employees of a utility company, servant leadership was positively correlated with reported quality of work life. Kool and Van Dierendonck (2012) found that servant leadership was positively related to optimistic attitude and commitment to change among employees of a reintegration company. In a study investigating work-family enrichment, Zhang, Kwan, Everett, and Jian (2012) found servant leadership to be positively related to work-family enrichment among Chinese married managers.

Psychological health. A study suggesting that servant leadership is positively associated with the psychological health of followers was conducted by Park, Lee, and Park (2015) that found servant leadership to be negatively associated with nurses' emotional labor. In another study, Rivkin, Diestel, and Schmidt (2014) found servant leadership to be negatively associated with psychological strain.

Other positive outcomes studies. Research on outcomes that are difficult to classify includes a study by Paul and Fitzpatrick (2015), who found that college undergraduates' perceived servant leadership characteristics of their academic advisors were positively associated with the students' satisfaction with advising. Zarei, Rastagar, and Safari (2013) surveyed 366 employees of a bank in Iran to learn the relationship between servant leadership and organizational culture. Using structural equation modeling methodology, the researchers found that servant leadership had a significant positive influence on organizational culture.

Outcome studies finding no association with servant leadership. Research that found servant leadership to not be associated with a desirable organizational outcome

includes a study by de Waal and Sivro (2012) that found not relationship between servant leadership and organizational performance among employees of a university medical center. In another study, Han and Kim (2012) found no direct association between servant leadership and nurse satisfaction among RN-BSN students and nurses. Finally, in the study by Donia et al. (2016) reviewed above, although servant leadership was found to be positively associated with employee job satisfaction, the model was not found to be significantly associated with employees' organizational citizenship behavior.

The review of empirical studies on the effects of servant leadership indicate that for the majority of such studies, servant leadership has been found to be positively associated with a number of desirable organizational outcomes. In regard to organizational commitment, an outcome that is of special interest to the proposed research, a number of studies indicate that servant leadership is positively related to organizational commitment in different work environments and countries. However, none of the studies reviewed examined the effect of servant leadership on organizational commitment in the restaurant environment.

In regard to the relationship of servant leadership to perceived organizational support, which is the second outcome that is of special interest to this study, very little empirical research has been conducted. Two empirical studies examining servant leadership and perceived organizational support found a positive relationship (Bobbio & Manganelli, 2015; Rai & Prakash, 2016). Zhou and Miao (2014), who found that servant leadership was positively associated with affective organizational commitment. This relationship was mediated by perceived organizational support. None of these studies

were conducted in a restaurant environment; therefore, whether servant leadership is related to perceived organizational support in that environment remains unknown.

Summary of Chapter

This chapter reviewed literature pertinent to this study. After an Introduction and an explanation of the research strategy, the next section of the chapter focused on the nature of servant leadership, which is the theoretical framework for the study. The section was divided into four subsections. Greenleaf's (1970) original conception of servant leadership was first explained, and in the second subsection, Greenleaf's original conception was compared to several interpretations of servant leadership that have been put forward. The rationale for choosing Liden et al.'s (2008) seven-dimensional conception of servant leadership was then explained. The third subsection contrasted servant leadership with transactional and transformational leadership, and this was followed by the fourth subsection, which focused on suggested explanations for how servant leadership works to produce positive organizational outcomes.

The next main section of the chapter focused on the two dependent variables for this study, which are organizational commitment and perceived organizational support. The section explained the prevailing views on these concepts and reviewed empirical studies that have investigated the outcomes and antecedents of the two concepts.

The final section of the chapter before this summary consisted of reviews of studies investigating the relationship of servant leadership to organizational commitment, perceived organizational support, and other organizational outcomes in various contexts. For the most part, prior studies have found servant leadership to be positively associated

with organizational commitment and perceived organizational support, which were the dependent variables for this study. However, none of these studies investigated the relationship of servant leadership to these two outcome variables in the restaurant environment. Therefore, whether the positive outcomes for organizational commitment and perceived organizational support that have been found for servant leadership in other studies also occur in restaurants and among restaurant employees is unknown.

Because of the scarcity of research on how servant leadership may be associated with organizational commitment and perceived organizational support in the restaurant environment, such research should be conducted. If findings show that servant leadership increases organizational commitment and perceived organizational support in restaurants, this result could be valuable to restaurant owners and managers. The information could be valuable because organizational commitment and perceived organizational support have been shown to improve job satisfaction and reduce employee turnover intentions in other contexts. They may also do so in the restaurant environment, thereby helping alleviate the major problem of high turnover in restaurants.

Chapter 3: Research Method

The purpose of this quantitative correlational study was to determine whether there were any relationships between restaurant employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisor's servant leadership practices and the employees' organizational commitment, and perceived organizational support. The relationship of employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisor's servant leadership practices were compared to three dimensions of organizational commitment (affective, normative, and continuance) and to organizational commitment overall.

This chapter describes the methodology that was used for the study. The chapter is divided into seven main sections following this introduction. The first section explains the research design and rationale, while the second section identifies the population, the sample for the study, and sampling procedures. The third section describes instrumentation and operationalization of constructs, and the fourth section explains the data analysis plan. The fifth and sixth sections focus on threats to validity and the study's ethical procedures, with the final section providing a summary of the chapter.

Research Design and Rationale

The independent variable for this study was restaurant employees' perceptions of their supervisor's servant leadership practices. The dependent variables were the restaurant employees' affective, normative, continuance, and overall organizational commitment and the employees' perceived organizational support. The objective of the study was to determine whether the independent variable is significantly related to any of the dependent variables.

Methodology

The study used a quantitative correlational research design. The use of a quantitative methodology was appropriate because the study focused on numerical relationships between the independent variable and the dependent variables, and quantitative methods provided numeric data about variables (Maxwell, 1998). Numerical data gathered by quantitative methods were then analyzed by statistical tests. In contrast, qualitative methods provide textual or narrative data for analysis by qualitative methods (Maxwell, 1998), and this study was not concerned with textual or narrative data.

A correlational design was appropriate for the study because the research questions were concerned with determining what, if any, correlations exist between the independent and dependent variables. In particular, the study investigated whether restaurant employees' perceptions of the servant leadership practices of their supervisor was correlated with the employees' organizational commitment or perceived organizational support.

Population

The population for this study consisted of U.S. nonsupervisory restaurant employees. These individuals included front-line customer-service employees such as waiters and waitresses, food preparers, and cleaning staff (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2015a, 2015b). There are approximately 14.4 million restaurant employees in over one million restaurants across the United States (National Restaurant Association, 2015).

Sample and Sampling Procedure

The sample for the study consisted of a nonprobabilistic purposeful sample consisting of nonsupervisory employees who worked for restaurants in two nationwide restaurant chains. The sample had been restricted to nonsupervisory employees of restaurants located in south Florida. The purposive sample was restricted to the region where I lived due to the necessity of having to travel to visit restaurant district managers and managers in order to explain the study and enlist their cooperation. Given that the restaurant employees were not selected by a random method, results of the study will only be suggestive for nonsupervisory restaurant employees in different restaurants and in different regions of the country.

Procedures for Recruitment of Participants

To develop the sample, I first contacted the district managers of restaurants in the two chains that were located in and within 70 miles of Fort Lauderdale, Florida. These restaurants were located in the Fort Lauderdale, Miami, West Palm Beach, and Stuart areas. I made appointments to personally visit with district managers and explain the nature of the study. I requested the district managers' consent to contact restaurant managers in their district to ask them participate in the study.

After receiving these permissions, I then contacted and visited managers in each restaurant chain to explain the nature of the study and ask their assistance to distribute researcher-developed invitations to participate in the study to their nonsupervisory employees (Appendix A). Managers were asked to post invitations on an employee bulletin board or distribute them to employees in some other way. I provided as many

invitations as the restaurant manager believed were needed given the method of distribution chosen. I contacted each of the restaurant managers until at least five from each restaurant chain had agreed to make available invitations to their employees.

I conducted a power analysis to determine the minimum sample size required to detect possible relationships between the independent and dependent variables. For the correlation procedure, the G*Power statistical program provided the minimum sample size for a statistical significance level of .05, a statistical power of .80, and an effect size of .30. The statistical significance level of .05 is a commonly used significance level (Lehman, O'Rourke, Hatcher, & Stepanski, 2013), the power of .80 or above is normally considered acceptable (Hedges & Rhoads, 2010); and according to Cohen (1992), .30 represents a moderate effect. For these parameters, the G*Power program indicated that a minimum of 67 nonsupervisory employees from the two restaurant chains were needed, per Erdfelder, Faul, and Buchner's (2005) guidelines. At least 10 additional participants were sought due to the possibility that some participants may not complete the survey and will have to be excluded from the study. Therefore, a minimum of 77 nonsupervisory restaurant employees were sought for the study.

Instrumentation and Operationalization of Constructs

Study participants completed an online survey consisting of three instruments and a brief demographic questionnaire. The online survey began with an informed consent form that provided information about the study and stated participants' rights (Appendix B). When a participant clicked on a link stating that they had read the information and agreed to the study, the individual proceeded to the rest of the survey.

The first instrument in the survey was Liden et al.'s (2014) shortened version of the Servant Leadership Scale, which measured employees' perceptions of the servant leadership practices of their immediate supervisor. This seven-item scale (Appendix C) consists of the highest loading items in the seven-dimensional Servant Leadership Scale developed by Liden et al. (2008). In a study of 178 employee-supervisor dyads in a large real estate company, Liden et al. (2014) compared the longer and shorter versions of the scale and found that the correlation between the two versions was .97. The researchers conducted a confirmatory factor analysis on the short version of the scale and found that the seven items measured a single factor. Reliability of the seven-item scale was $\alpha = .87$. This constitutes a satisfactory reliability according to the criterion established by Nunnally (1978), which holds that internal reliability equal to .70 or above is satisfactory. Items on the Servant Leadership scale are evaluated on a seven-point scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

The second instrument in the online survey was Allen and Meyer's (1990) 24-item Organizational Commitment Scale (OCS; Appendix D). This scale consisted of three eight-item subscales, each of which was used to measure one of three dimensions of organizational commitment: the affective commitment scale (ACS), normative commitment scale (NCS), and continuance commitment scale (CCS). Allen and Meyer (1990) developed the OCS using a study of 256 employees in three different organizations and, based on the study, reported the internal reliability of the three scales as being $\alpha = .87$, $.79$, and $.75$ for the ACS, NCS, and CCS, respectively, which are all satisfactory according to Nunnally's (1978) criterion. A factor analysis showed that the

24 items in the OCS loaded on three factors that accounted for 58.8, 25.8, and 15.4 percent of variance. These three factors were considered to be affective, normative, and continuance commitment and were reflected in the three eight-item subscales. Each item in the three subscales loaded highest on the factor that represented the assumed construct. Items on the OCS are evaluated on a seven-point scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

The third instrument in the online survey was the eight-item version of the Survey of Perceived Organizational Support (SPOS; Appendix E). The long version of the SPOS was developed by Eisenberger et al. (1986), who found the 36-item version to have an internal reliability of $\alpha = .97$, which is satisfactory according to Nunnally's (1978) criterion. All items loaded strongly on a single factor that explained 48.3% of total variance. Eisenberger et al. (2002) selected eight high-loading items from the longer SPOS to form an eight-item version of the SPOS in a study to determine how supervisor organizational status affected the relationship between perceived supervisor support and perceived organizational support among 300 employees of a large U.S. discount and appliance store. Eisenberger et al. (2002) reported the internal reliability of this short SPOS to be $\alpha = .88$. Items on the short SPOS are evaluated on a seven-point scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

The fourth part of the online survey was a short demographic questionnaire asking the restaurant employees to report their age, education, and number of years being employed by their restaurant (Appendix F).

Participants' responses to the seven-item SLS (Liden et al., 2014) were used to operationalize the independent variable of restaurant employees' perceptions of the servant leadership practices of their immediate supervisor. Participants' responses to the 24-item OCS (Meyer & Allen, 1990) were used to operationalize the restaurant employees' affective, normative, continuance, and overall organizational commitment. Participants' responses to the eight-item SPOS (Eisenberger, 2002) were used to operationalize the restaurant employees' perceived organizational support. I requested and received permission to use the instruments in the study from their developers (Appendix G).

Data Collection

Participants self-selected to take part in the study by going to the website indicated on the invitation to participate. After reading and agreeing to an online consent form that explained the nature of the study and stated the participant's rights, the participant was led to the first part of the survey and then to each subsequent part. Completing the survey was expected to take no more than 10 minutes. Clicking the "submit" button on the survey sent the survey results to SurveyMonkey.com, which forwarded the results to me.

The survey was available online to potential participants for two and one-half weeks after my first contact with a restaurant manager, until it was certain that over 77 participants had completed the survey. At that point, surveymonkey.com downloaded to me an Excel spreadsheet with 93 restaurant employees' responses for statistical processing.

Data Analysis Plan

Initial Statistical Procedures

I performed the data analysis using the SPSS statistical program. Data from each instrument of the survey were first checked for completion. Following Hair, Hult, Ringle, and Sarstedt's (2014) guidelines, if more than 15% of the items on the survey were not answered by a participant, the participant's responses to the survey were eliminated from the data analysis. In addition, according to Hair et al.'s (2014) recommendation, if 5% or more of participants fail to answer a particular item, then those participants' responses are to be eliminated from the data analysis; however, in this study, it was judged to be preferable to accept two items with 5.4% missing responses, as both items were on the Affective Organizational Commitment scales, and deleting the items would have reduced the scale from eight to only six items, which might have adversely affected the scale's sensitivity. If fewer than an acceptable percentage of participants failed to answer a particular item, the mean of all responses to that item replaced the missing data, as suggested by Hair et al. (2014).

Statistical analysis began with evaluating the internal reliability of each of the three instruments. Internal reliability was determined by calculating the Cronbach's alpha measure for all responses to each instrument. In the case of the OCS, Cronbach's alpha was calculated and reported for the overall scale and for the three subscales of affective, normative, and continuance commitment.

The mean response of all participants to each survey item on all three instruments was calculated and reported. In addition, I calculated standard deviations for each survey

item. The overall means for all items on each instrument were then determined. In the case of the OCS, the overall mean for each subscale was also calculated.

Answering Research Questions

The study had the following two research questions:

- RQ1: Are restaurant employees' perceptions of the servant leadership practices of their immediate supervisor positively associated with the employees' perceived organizational support?
 - Ho1: Restaurant employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisor's servant leadership practices are not positively associated with the employees' perceived organizational support.
 - Ha1: Restaurant employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisor's servant leadership practices are positively associated with the employees' perceived organizational support.
- RQ2: Are restaurant employees' perceptions of the servant leadership practices of their immediate supervisor positively associated with the employees' affective, normative, continuance, and overall organizational commitment?
 - Ho2: Restaurant employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisor's servant leadership practices are not positively associated with the employees' affective, normative, continuance, or overall organizational commitment.

- Ha2: Restaurant employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisor's servant leadership practices are positively associated with the employees' affective, normative, continuance, or overall organizational commitment.

Pearson's correlation procedure was used to determine whether there were any correlations between the independent variable of participants' perceived servant leadership practices and the dependent variables of the participants' overall organizational commitment and their affective, normative, and continuance commitment, and their perceived organizational support. In performing the Pearson's correlation procedures, the overall means for each instrument and for the three OCS subscales were used. The .05 probability level indicated statistical significance.

Threats to Validity

External Validity

A threat to external validity was the fact that the sample consisted of a purposeful sample of nonsupervisory restaurant workers employed by two restaurant chains in South Florida. Because the participants were not chosen by a random sampling method, the sample cannot be assumed to be representative of the entire population of restaurant employees located in different regions of the country and in different types of restaurants. Therefore, the results for the sample were only suggestive for the entire population of U.S. nonsupervisory restaurant employees. Due to the nature of the purposive sample, the results of the study may be somewhat more suggestive for nonsupervisory employees of casual full-service chain restaurants, in contrast to fine dining or quick-service restaurants.

Internal Validity

There were several threats to internal validity. First, due to the nonrandom self-selection nature of the sample, selection bias might have occurred, with there being a relevant difference in attributes between restaurant employees who self-selected to be in the study and those who did not. To help counteract this possibility, invitations to take part in the study were worded to encourage all employees of restaurants contacted to participate. In addition, responses might be biased due to social desirability effects that led some participants to provide responses that they perceived as being socially desirable to some items. To help counteract this possibility, instructions for completing the survey emphasized to the participants the importance of answering items truthfully and accurately. A third threat to internal validity was that circumstances unrelated to the independent variable might have occurred during the study that influenced participants' responses. Such circumstances may have included the participant's mood or degree of alertness. There was no way to eliminate the possibility of such circumstances occurring.

Construct Validity

Threats to statistical conclusion validity include potential threats based on sample size, instrument reliability, and data assumptions. In regard to sample size, power analysis showed that 67 participants were needed for correlation tests with power of .80, a statistical significance level of .05, and an effect size of .30 (Erdfelder et al., 2005). To take into account the possibility that some completed surveys will need to be discarded due to missing data, an additional 10 participants were sought to total 77. In regard to instrument reliability, the reliability of the three instruments has been shown to be

satisfactory according to the criterion established by Nunnally (1978), as reported in the Instrumentation section. In regard to data assumptions, participants were assumed to respond to all items honestly and accurately. To help ensure honest and accurate responses, online instructions for completing the surveys emphasized the importance of accurate responses. Participants were also assumed to respond to all items so that the data would be complete. The suggestions of Hair et al. (2014) for dealing with missing data were followed in analyzing the data, with one alteration, as reported above in the section on Data Analysis.

Ethical Procedures

No data were gathered until permission from the IRB was received to conduct the study. When permission to perform the study is granted, the study will commence. Prior to completing the survey, participants were presented an informed consent agreement form that explained the nature of the study and its anonymity and confidentiality. Participants were given the right to withdraw from the study without penalty of any kind. When a participant indicates consent to participating in the study, they were taken to the beginning of the survey. Participants who did not indicate their agreement were not be able to proceed to the survey (Appendix B).

The survey was administered by surveymonkey.com. No names or identifying information were recorded on the surveys. Different surveys were identified by consecutive numbers beginning with 1. After two and one-half weeks, the data collected in the survey were transferred to me for data analysis. I kept all data in password-

protected files. The data will be kept for five years per Walden University dissertation guidelines and will then be destroyed.

The names of the restaurants and restaurant chains at which participants are employed were not included in the final dissertation report and will remain confidential. The restaurants involved were identified simply as members of two large national chain of restaurants.

Summary

This chapter explained the methodology for this quantitative correlational study to investigate the relationship of restaurant employees' perceptions of the servant leadership practices of their immediate supervisor to the employees' organizational commitment and perceived organizational support. After providing an overview of the study and its rationale, the population, which is nonsupervisory restaurant employees, and the sample were described. The sample for the study was a purposive sample of nonsupervisory restaurant employees who were invited to participate in the study with the assistance of restaurant managers. The sample consisted of at least 67 nonsupervisory employees of restaurants in the two chains.

Participants who self-selected for the study visited an online website administered by SurveyMonkey.com. After reading and agreeing to a consent form, they completed a four-part online survey. The four parts of the survey used was (a) Liden et al.'s (2014) short version of the Servant Leadership Scale, (b) Meyer and Allen's (1990) 24-item Organizational Commitment Scale, (c) Eisenberger et al.'s (2002) short version of the Survey of Perceived Organizational Support, and (d) a three-question demographic

questionnaire. Reliability and factor analysis results were reported for the first three instruments.

Responses to the survey were compiled and analyzed using the SPSS statistical program. Reliabilities of the scales were examined, means and standard deviations for individual items were calculated, and overall means for scales and subscales were determined. Pearson's correlation procedure was then utilized to determine if there were any significant relationships between the independent variable of restaurant employees' perceptions of the servant leadership practices of their immediate supervisor and the dependent variables of the employees' affective, normative, continuance, and overall organizational commitment and their perceived organizational support. On the basis of these results, the hypotheses were evaluated and the research questions answered.

In the latter sections of the chapter, several threats to external, internal, and statistical validity were identified and discussed. Ethical considerations guiding the study were also discussed. Chapter 4 reports the results of the study.

Chapter 4: Results

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether U.S. restaurant employees' perceptions of the servant leadership practices of their immediate supervisor were positively associated with the employees' perceived organizational support and their affective, normative, continuance, and overall organizational commitment. The independent variable for the study was restaurant employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisor's servant leadership practices. The dependent variables were the employees' perceived organizational support and the employees' affective, normative, continuance, and overall organizational commitment.

The study participants were employees of restaurants in two nationwide restaurant chains. Data were gathered through an online survey consisting of a brief demographic section and three instruments. The first instrument was Liden et al.'s (2014) seven-item short form of the Servant Leadership Scale (SLS), which measured the independent variable. The other two instruments measured the dependent variables. These instruments were Eisenberger et al.'s (2002) eight-item short form of the Survey of Perceived Organizational Support (SPOS) and Allen and Meyer's (1990) 24-item Organizational Commitment Scale (OCS), which is divided into three sections of eight items each: the Affective Commitment Scale, the Continuance Commitment Scale, and the Normative Commitment Scale. I performed Pearson's correlation procedure to determine the answers to the two research questions.

This chapter reports the results of the study. The chapter is divided into six main sections. The first section reports on the initial examination of the survey data for straightlining and missing data. Based on this examination, the final sample of participants was determined. The second section presents demographic information about the study participants, and the third section reports descriptive statistics. The fourth section reports on the internal reliability of the instruments. The fifth section presents the results of the analysis of survey results using Pearson's Correlation procedure. Based on these results, the study's hypotheses are evaluated and the two research questions are answered. The final section provides a summary of the chapter.

Initial Examination of Data

Data gathering for the study took place in the summer of 2016. Employees from seven different restaurants in two restaurant chains were invited to take part in the study. A total of 93 restaurant employees from these restaurants chose to participate. Survey responses were downloaded in the form of an Excel spreadsheet and then transferred to the statistical program SPSS version 23 for analysis.

In preparation for statistical analysis, the data for the three instruments were first coded numerically, from 1 to 7, for responses ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. I then reverse-scored the items on the OCS (Allen & Meyer, 1990) and the SPOS (Eisenberger et al., 2002) that the developers of the scales indicated should be reverse scored. These reverse-scored items comprised eight items on the OCS and two items on the SPOS.

The data from the three instruments used in the survey were then examined for possible straightlining and for completion. Straightlining consists of a participant responding to a high proportion of an instrument's items with the same response regardless of the way the item is worded (Hair et al., 2014). Such a response pattern suggests that the participant did not read the items through and respond to the best of their ability. Hair et al. (2014) noted that straightlining constitutes a reason to delete a participant's responses from a data set. In the examination of the present study's dataset, straightlining was detected for four participants, and these participants' responses were deleted from the dataset, resulting in 89 remaining participants.

The examination for missing values involved two steps. The first step was to determine if any of the participants should be eliminated from the study or from part of the study based on failure to respond to items. To make this determination, I used Hair et al.'s (2014) suggested criterion for missing responses. This criterion specifies that a participant's responses be eliminated from an instrument's results if they have missing responses on more than 15% of the instrument's items. Responses for each instrument were thus examined separately.

In regard to the SLS, several participants did not respond to one (14.3%) of the seven items on the scale. This percentage fell within Hair et al.'s (2014) 15% criterion; therefore, the responses of these participants were not eliminated. However, one participant failed to respond to two (28.6%) of the seven items on the SLS, which fell outside Hair et al.'s criterion. Because the SLS results measured the independent variable

of the study, this participant's responses were eliminated from the study. This elimination resulted in 88 remaining sets of participant data.

The OCS, which consists of 24 items on three subscales of eight items each, was examined next. The three subscales of the OCS are the Affective Organizational Commitment, Continuance Organizational Commitment, and Normative Organizational Commitment Scales. At this time, I discovered that the first item on the Affective Organizational Commitment Scale had been inadvertently repeated on the online survey, reappearing as a ninth item on the scale. A bivariate correlation analysis comparing the responses to the first and ninth items on the survey showed a correlation of $r = .315$, which had a statistical significance of $.001$, and it was therefore decided to retain the results for both Items 1 and 9 of the Affective Commitment Scale and treat it as a nine-item scale for the sake of further statistical analysis. In regard to the entire OCS instrument, examination revealed that one participant failed to respond to five (20.8%) of the OCS items, which exceeded Hair et al.'s (2014) 15% criterion; however, the participant did not exceed the 15% criterion of missing responses in answering the SLS and the SPOS items. Therefore, this participant's data were eliminated from statistical analyses that involved results from the OCS but were not eliminated from analyses that involved the OSS.

In regard to the SPOS results, three participants failed to respond to two (25%) of the eight items on the scale. However, these participants answered sufficient numbers of items from the SLS and OCS to be within Hair et al.'s (2015) 15% tolerance criterion.

These three participants' data were therefore eliminated from all statistical analyses that involved results from the SPOS but not from analyses involving the OCS.

In summary, the results of the first step of the initial examination of data were that one additional participant was eliminated from all further statistical analysis, resulting in a sample of 88 participants. Also based on the results of this examination, four additional participants were restricted to statistical analyses involving their responses on either the OCS or the SPOS.

The second step in examining the survey data for missing responses was to determine whether any items on the three instruments had sufficient nonresponses from the 88 participants in the sample to require elimination of the results for that item. For this step, responses to all items were examined in the light of Hair et al.'s (2014) suggested criterion for missing responses to an item, which specifies using mean value replacement for items with less than five percent missing values. For most items with missing responses on the three instruments, there were only one (1.1%) to four (4.3%) missing values. Therefore, missing values for each of those items were replaced with the mean value of all responses to that item.

Two items, the first and second items on the Affective Organizational Commitment Scale of the OCS, had five (5.4%) missing values. Because the percentage of values missing for these items was only slightly above Hair et al.'s (2014) five-percent criterion and reducing the eight-item scale to only six items might make the scale less sensitive, it was judged to be preferable to retain the two items. Therefore, missing responses for each of these two items were replaced by the mean value of all responses to

that item. The final sample for the study was therefore 88 participants. This number exceeded the 67 participants that are required for one-tailed bivariate correlation procedures, as indicated by the G*Power program (Erdfelder et al., 2005).

Demographic Profile of the Participants

The survey's demographic section included questions asking for the participants' gender, age, education, and how many years they had worked for the restaurant chain where they were employed. Of the 88 participants in the final sample, 50 were female and 38 were male. In regard to age, 52 participants reported being in the 18-24-year-old range, 18 were 25-34, eight were 35-44, six were 45-54, four were 55-64, and none were 65 or over.

In response to the question asking participants to report their highest education level, four participants reported having less than a high school education, 32 reported being a high school graduate, 32 had some college or technical school work, 15 had a bachelor's degree, five had some graduate work, and none had a graduate degree. In response to the question about the number of years they had worked for their restaurant chain, 33 reported working for less than one year, 32 reported working from one to two years, 17 had worked for three to five years, four had worked for six to 10 years, and one had worked for more than 10 years, with one participant not responding to this item. Table 1 provides a summary of the demographic results.

Overall results for the seven items on the SLS showed a range of 1.00 to 7.00, a mean response of 4.88, and a standard deviation of 0.73. For the nine items on the Affective Organizational Commitment Scale of the OCS, the range was 1.00 to

*Table 1**Demographic Profile of Participants in the Final Sample (N = 88)*

Attribute	Response	Number of Participants
Gender	Female	50
	Male	38
Age	18-24	52
	25-34	18
	35-44	8
	45-54	6
	55-64	4
	65 or over	0
Highest education level	Less than high school diploma	4
	High school graduate	32
	Some college or tech school	32
	Bachelor's degree	15
	Some graduate work	5
	Graduate degree	0
Years worked for the chain ^a	Less than 1 year	33
	1-2 years	32
	3-5 years	17
	6-10 years	4
	More than 10 years	1

^aOne participant did not respond to this question.

7.00, the overall mean was 3.65, and the standard deviation was 0.64. For the eight items on the Continuance Organizational Commitment Scale of the OCS, the range was 1.00 to 7.00, with a mean of 4.32, and a standard deviation of 0.57. For the Normative Organizational Commitment Scale of the OCS, the range was 1.00 to 7.00, the mean was 4.11, and the standard deviation was 0.46. The grand mean for all items on the OCS was 4.01, and the standard deviation was 0.30. For the SPOS, responses ranged from 1.00 to 7.00, with a mean for all eight items combined of 3.77, and the standard deviation was equal to 0.65. These descriptive results are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2

Summary of Descriptive Statistics for Responses to Three Instruments (N = 88)

Instrument	Range	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
SLS (7 items)	1.00-7.00	4.88	0.73
OCS	1.00-7.00	4.01	0.30
Affective Commitment Scale (9 items)	1.00-7.00	3.65	0.64
Continuance Commitment Scale (8 items)	1.00-7.00	4.32	0.57
Normative Commitment Scale (8 items)	1.00-7.00	4.11	0.46
SPOS (8 items)	1.00-7.00	3.77	0.65

Internal Reliability of Instruments

Internal reliability of the three instruments was examined by calculating the Cronbach's alpha measure for responses to the instruments. Internal reliability of the seven-item SLS was calculated as equal to .616. This value was considered to be acceptable, as values above .6 are considered adequate in exploratory research (Hair et al., 2014).

The internal reliability of the nine items on Affective Commitment Scale of the OCS was calculated at .422, a score indicating poor internal reliability. In order to raise this value, the method suggested by Kripalani, Risser, Gatti, and Jacobson (2009) of deleting one or more scale items and then re-evaluating internal reliability was used. Various combinations of deletions were examined, and the elimination of the fourth and eighth items on the Affective Commitment Scale produced the highest internal reliability at $\alpha = .627$, which was deemed acceptable. The two items deleted from the scale were "I think that I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one" and "I do not feel a *strong* sense of belonging to *my* organization," both of which were reverse scored. The Affective Commitment Scale retained for further statistical analysis included the remaining seven items on the Allen and Meyer's (1990) original scale.

Internal reliability of the eight items on the Continuance Commitment Scale was calculated to be .055, which was considered to be very low. Again, various combinations of deletions of items were considered, with the highest reliability for the scale being .480 with the first, fourth, and fifth items of the scale deleted. These items were, "I am not afraid of what might happen if I quit my job without having another one lined up," "It

wouldn't be too costly for me to leave my organization now,” and “Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire,” with the first two of these items being reverse scored. Although the .480 measure was poor, it was found to be the highest internal reliability measure of any combination of items on the scale.

Therefore, the Continuance Commitment Scale retained for further statistical analysis included the five items 2, 3, 6, 7, and 8 of Allen and Meyer's (1990) original scale.

Internal reliability of the eight items on the Normative Commitment Scale was calculated to be -.182, which was also considered very low. Various combinations of item deletions were explored with the highest reliability being for the scale with all but the fifth and sixth items deleted, which had internal reliability equal to .566. Three of the six deleted items had been reverse scored. The remaining two items on the reduced scale were Items 5 and 6, “If I got another offer for a better job elsewhere I would not feel it was right to leave my organization” and “I was taught to believe in the value of remaining loyal to one organization.” Although the .566 internal reliability was below the .6 criterion for Cronbach's alpha measure, it was the highest reliability of any combination of items on the scale. Thus, the Normative Commitment Scale retained for statistical analysis consisted of Items 5 and 6 of Meyer and Allen's (1990) original scale.

Internal reliability of the OCS overall, which included all items on all subscales, was very low at .005. Internal reliability of the 14-item OCS, using the reduced subscales indicated above, remained low at .520. Internal reliability of the eight items on the Survey of Perceived Organizational Support was calculated as .514, which was below the .6 acceptability measure suggested by Hair et al. (2014) for exploratory research. Various

combinations of item deletions were explored, with the highest resulting reliability being equal to .691 for the scale with Items 5, 6, and 7 deleted. These items were, “The organization is willing to help me when I need a special favor,” “If given the opportunity, the organization would take advantage of me,” and “The organization shows very little concern for me,” with the first two items having been reverse scored. The .691 internal reliability of the resulting scale was considered acceptable. Therefore, the Survey of Perceived Organizational Support retained for further statistical analysis consisted of the five items 1, 2, 3, 4, and 8 of Eisenberger et al.’s (2002) original scale. Table 3 summarizes results for scale reduction and internal reliability.

Table 3

Internal Reliability of the Final Scales for the Study

Scale	Items Retained	Internal Reliability
SLS	All seven	.614
OCS		
Affective Commitment Scale	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9	.627
Continuance Commitment Scale	2, 3, 6, 7, 8	.480
Normative Commitment Scale	5, 6	.566
Overall	14 items on 3 subscales	.520
SPOS	1, 2, 3, 4, 8	.691

Pearson's Correlations to Address Research Questions

The study's first research question was: Are restaurant employees' perceptions of the servant leadership practices of their immediate supervisor positively associated with the employees' perceived organizational support? The null and alternative hypotheses for this research question were the following:

Ho1: Restaurant employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisor's servant leadership practices are not positively associated with the employees' perceived organizational support.

Ha1: Restaurant employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisor's servant leadership practices are positively associated with the employees' perceived organizational support.

To address the first research question and evaluate the hypotheses, the composite averages for each of 85 participants' responses to the seven items on the SLS and the composite averages for the participants on the reduced SPOS consisting of Items 1, 2, 3, 4, and 8 were calculated. (Three participants' data were deleted from this procedure due to missing values on the SPOS). These two composite averages were then compared using a one-tailed Pearson's correlation procedure. The results of this bivariate correlation test showed Pearson's r value to equal .487. This value had a statistical significance of .000, indicating that the SLS measure was positively associated with the SPOS measure at the .01 significance level, supporting the alternative hypothesis. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative hypothesis was accepted, answering

the first research question. A summary of the results pertinent to the first research question is presented in Table 4.

The study's second research question was: Are restaurant employees' perceptions of the servant leadership practices of their immediate supervisor positively associated with the employees' affective, normative, continuance, and overall organizational commitment? The null and alternative hypotheses for this research question were the following:

Ho2: Restaurant employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisor's servant leadership practices are not positively associated with the employees' affective, normative, continuance, or overall organizational commitment.

Ha2: Restaurant employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisor's servant leadership practices are positively associated with the employees' affective, normative, continuance, or overall organizational commitment.

To address the second research question and evaluate the hypotheses, four separate Pearson's correlation procedures were conducted. For each of these four procedures, one of the 88 participants in the final sample was deleted due to missing values on the OCS.

The first procedure was performed to determine whether there was a statistically significant association of the SLS measure with the Affective Organizational Commitment measure of the OCS. This procedure began with determining the composite averages for each of 87 participants' responses to the seven items on the SLS and the composite averages for the 87 participants' responses to the reduced Affective

Organizational Commitment Scale of the OCS, consisting of Items 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 9. The next step was to compare these two composite averages for the 87 participants using a one-tailed Pearson's correlation procedure. The results of this bivariate correlation showed a Pearson's r value of .233. This value had a statistical significance of .015, indicating that the SLS measure was positively associated with the Affective Organizational Commitment measure at the .05 significance level.

The second procedure relevant to answering Research Question 2 was performed to determine whether there was a statistically significant association of the SLS measure with the Continuance Organizational Commitment measure of the OCS. This procedure compared the composite averages of each of the 87 participants' responses to the seven items on the SLS to the composite averages of their responses the reduced Continuance Commitment Scale of the OCS, consisting of Items 2, 3, 6, 7, and 8. A one-tailed Pearson's correlation procedure was used, showing a Pearson's r value of .116. This value had a significance of .141 and was not statistically significant. Thus, the result did not indicate that the SLS measure was positively associated with the Continuance Organizational Commitment measure.

The third procedure relevant to answering Research Question 2 was performed to determine whether there was a statistically significant association of the SLS measure with the Normative Organizational Commitment measure of the OCS. This procedure compared the composite averages of each of the 87 participants' responses to the seven items on the SLS to the composite averages of their responses to the reduced Normative Commitment Scale, consisting of Items 5 and 6, using a one-tailed Pearson's correlation

procedure. The results of this bivariate correlation showed a Pearson's r value of .036. This value had a significance of .369 and was not statistically significant. Therefore, this result did not indicate that the SLS measure was positively associated with the Continuance Organizational Commitment measure.

The fourth procedure relevant to addressing Research Question 2 was performed to determine whether there was a statistically significant association of the SLS measure with the overall OCS measure consisting of the combined Affective, Continuance, and Normative scales of the OCS. This procedure compared the composite averages of each of the 87 participants' responses to the seven items on the SLS to the composite averages of their responses to the three reduced subscales of the OCS, consisting of 14 items, using a one-tailed Pearson's correlation procedure. The results of this bivariate correlation showed a Pearson's r value of .251. This value had a .010 significance and was thus statistically significant at the .01 level.

In summary, the results of the four Pearson's correlation procedures relevant to addressing the study's second research question showed that there was no significant correlation between the participants' responses on the SLS and their responses on either the Continuance Organizational Commitment Scale or the Normative Organizational Commitment Scale. However, there was a significant correlation between responses on the SLS and the Affective Commitment Scale and to the combined Affective, Continuance, and Normative Organizational Commitment Scales of the OCS. Therefore, the null hypothesis, which stated that there would be no significant association between the SLS measure and any of the three scales on the OCS, was rejected. The alternative

hypothesis, which stated that there would be a significant association between the SLS measure and one or more of the three scales of the OCS was accepted. The results for the statistical analyses pertinent to the second research question are further summarized in Table 4.

Table 4

Results of Pearson's Correlation Procedures for Addressing the Research Questions

Perceived Servant Leadership (SLS Measure) Compared to:	<i>n</i>	Pearson's <i>r</i>
Research Question 1		
Perceived Organizational Support (SPOS measure)	85	.487**
Research Question 2		
Affective Organizational Commitment (OCS, Scale 1)	87	.233*
Continuance Organizational Commitment (OCS, Scale 2)	87	.116
Normative Organizational Commitment (OCS, Scale 3)	87	.036
Overall Organizational Commitment (OCS, all scales)	87	.251**

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level

Summary

This chapter reported the results of the study. In the first section of the chapter, the initial examination of responses was reported. This examination resulted in five participants being eliminated from the study for straight line responses or missing data, leaving a final sample of 88 participants. Of these 88, statistical analyses were limited for four additional participants due to missing data on one instrument only.

The second and third sections of the chapter reported demographic results and descriptive statistics. These sections were followed by internal reliability analyses of the three study instruments in the form of Cronbach's alpha measure. In several cases, these reliability estimates were low, and item elimination was carried out in order to increase reliability. These evaluations resulted in shortened versions of the SPOS instrument and the three scales of the OCS.

The fifth section reported the results of performing Pearson's correlation procedures to address the study's two research questions. These procedures resulted in a positive significant association at the .01 level found between the SLS measure and the reduced OSS measure. They also resulted in a positive significant association at the .05 level between the SLS measure and the reduced Affective Organizational Commitment Scale of the OCS, and a positive significant association at the .01 level between the SLS measure and overall organizational commitment as measured by all three reduced scales of the OCS. As a result, both of the study's alternative hypotheses were accepted and the null hypotheses were rejected, answering the study's two research questions.

Chapter 5: Discussion

Introduction

This study was conducted to address the problem of high employee turnover in the restaurant industry. The purpose of the study was to learn whether restaurant employees' perceptions of the servant leadership practices of their immediate supervisor are positively associated with the employees' perceived organizational support and their organizational commitment.

To fulfill the study's purpose, a sample of nonsupervisory casual dining restaurant employees were surveyed with three instruments to measure their perceptions of the servant leadership practices of their manager (the independent variable), as well as their degree of organizational commitment and their perceptions of the organizational support they received from their restaurant organization (the dependent variables). I surveyed a sample of 88 nonsupervisory employees from seven restaurants in two national casual dining restaurant chains. Results were then analyzed using Pearson's correlation procedure to determine whether there were any significant correlations between the independent and dependent variables and answer the study's two research questions.

The study results showed that casual dining restaurant employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisor's servant leadership practices were positively associated with their perceived organizational support at the .01 statistical significance level. In addition, the employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisor's servant leadership practices were positively associated with their affective organizational commitment at the .05

statistical significance level and positively associated with their overall organizational commitment at the .01 significance level.

This chapter provides a discussion of the results of the study. The chapter is divided into five main sections. The first section presents an interpretation of the findings, while the second section provides a discussion of limitations of the study. Recommendations are presented in the third section, and implications of the study findings are discussed in the fourth section. The fifth and final section of the chapter provides a conclusion for the study.

Interpretation of the Findings

Two main kinds of findings from the study are important to discuss. The first kind of finding consists of the descriptive statistics for the restaurant employees' perceptions of their manager's servant leadership practices, their organizational commitment, and their perceptions of the organizational support they received. The second kind of finding consists of the results of the Pearson's correlation procedures that examined the relations between the independent and the dependent variables. Interpretations of each kind of finding are discussed below.

Descriptive Findings

In regard to descriptive statistics, the results from the SLS suggested that the restaurant employees' perceptions of the servant leadership practices of their manager study were slightly positive on the average. The overall average of 4.88 suggests that on average, the 88 participants did not perceive their manager as having a high degree of servant leadership characteristics. It is possible that on average, participants from all

seven restaurants perceived their managers as having only a small degree of servant leadership characteristics. It is also possible that on average, some of the managers were rated by their particular employees as being higher in servant leadership characteristics than other managers were. There is no way to determine which of these possibilities is correct since the sample of restaurant employees was not broken down by their employment by a particular restaurant.

The average scores on the OCS for each of its three sections and overall suggested that organizational commitment among the 88 participants was neither particularly high nor low. The average score on the Affective Organizational Commitment Scale was 3.65, suggesting that the restaurant employees' average affective commitment to their organization was slightly on the negative side. The average responses for the Continuance Commitment and Normative Commitment scales of the OCS were 4.32 and 4.11 respectively, with both values indicating slightly positive average responses. Overall, the average for the all three sections of the OCS considered together was 4.01, suggesting that the participants' organizational commitment to their restaurant organization, when averaged over all three kind of organizational commitment, was neither positive nor negative, but rather almost exactly neutral.

The average score for the SPOS was found to be 3.77. This score indicated that on average, the 88 participants had slightly negative perceptions of the organizational support they received. Again, it was impossible to determine whether the perceived organizational support among employees in some of the seven restaurants was higher

than in others, or whether the slightly negative average score was true for employees for the particular restaurant where they worked.

Pearson's Correlation Findings

The finding that the nonsupervisory restaurant employees' perceptions of the servant leadership practices of their immediate supervisor were positively associated, at the .01 significance level, with their perceived organizational support was in agreement with the findings of several other researchers for employees in various industries. For instance, Bobbio and Manganelli (2015) surveyed two samples with a total of 711 nurses who worked in large Italian hospitals to learn how perceived servant leadership and perceived organizational support were related. The researchers found that perceived servant leadership was positively associated with perceived organizational support for nurses at the .01 statistical level in both samples.

In another study, Rai and Prakash (2016) examined the relationship of perceptions of servant leadership to perceived organizational support among 182 manufacturing and service workers and found servant leadership to be positively associated with perceived organizational support at the .001 statistical significance level. Furthermore, Zhou and Miao (2014) examined the association between perceived servant leadership and both perceived organizational support and affective organizational commitment among 239 Chinese employees working in the public sector and found that perceived organizational support mediated a significant relationship at the .001 level between perceived servant leadership and affective organizational commitment. The results of these three studies that used samples from various employee populations are in agreement with the results of

the present study concerning casual dining restaurant employees, with the findings of all four studies indicating that perceived servant leadership is positively associated with perceived organizational support among the different employee groups.

The finding that perceived servant leadership is positively associated with perceived organizational support among casual dining restaurant employees is significant because it suggests that increasing servant leaderships practices in such restaurants may help increase the restaurant employees' perception of the support they receive from the organization, and this may in turn help decrease employee turnover. Several studies suggest that perceived organizational support may be inversely related to employee turnover. For example, Madden et al. (2015) found perceived organizational support to reduce turnover among healthcare employees. In addition, Hussain and Asif (2012) found that perceived organizational support was associated with reduced turnover intention among Pakistani telecom employees. Urbonas et al. (2015) also found perceived organizational support to be associated with reduced turnover intention among pharmacists at community pharmacies in Lithuania.

Eisenberger et al. (1990) suggested that when employees perceive that an organization supports them, they are encouraged to add their membership in the organization and their role within the organization to their self-identity. As a result, they internalize the organization's values and norms, and they tend to view the organization's welfare as being an aspect of their own welfare. In addition, a greater affective attachment to the organization is created. The combination of these results leads to there being a decreased likelihood of the employee voluntarily leaving the organization.

Eisenberger et al.'s (1990) explanation for the effects of perceived organizational support was not restricted to any particular type of employee or industry. Therefore, it can be viewed as an explanation of how an increase in perceived organizational support may help decrease employee turnover among restaurant employees.

Whether or not Eisenberger et al.'s (1990) explanation is correct, prior research showing that perceived organizational support leads to decreased turnover or turnover intention among various employee groups suggests that initiatives leading to greater perceived organizational support may be valuable for employee retention. This study's finding that perceived servant leadership practices are positively associated with perceived organizational support among restaurant employees therefore suggests that increasing servant leadership practices in a restaurant may result in lower employee turnover.

This study also found that the restaurant employees' perceptions of the servant leadership practices of their managers are significantly related to affective organizational commitment and total organizational commitment. These findings are in agreement with the results of several other studies conducted with various employee groups. For example, Lee et al. (2015) examined how the perceived servant leadership practices of their head nurses was associated with the organizational commitment of 249 Korean nurses from three South Korean hospitals. The researchers found that the nurses' perceived servant leadership practices were positively correlated with the nurses' organizational commitment. In another study investigating the relationship between perceived servant leadership and organizational commitment, Goh and Low (2014) found

a statistically significant association at the .01 level between the two variables among 177 employees of Malaysian market research firms. In addition, Ramli and Desa (2014) found a positive association at the .01 significance level between perceived servant leadership practices and affective organizational commitment among 143 Malaysian employees who worked in various organizations.

The findings in this study of a positive association between perceived servant leadership and affective and total organizational commitment among the sample of restaurant employees are significant for casual dining restaurants because they suggest that such restaurants may be able to increase their employees' affective and/or total organizational commitment by increasing their servant leadership practices. This, in turn, may help decrease employee turnover as suggested by research findings indicating that organizational commitment leads to reduced employee turnover. For example, Sow (2015) found affective organizational commitment to be associated with lower turnover intention at the .01 level among a sample of 92 healthcare internal auditors. Zopiatis et al. (2014) also found that affective organizational commitment was related to decreased turnover intention at the .05 statistical significance level among a sample of 482 employees in the hospitality industry who were working in Cyprus. Jehanzeb et al. (2013) also investigated the relationship of organizational commitment with turnover among 251 employees of Saudi Arabian private organizations in Saudi Arabia and found a negative relationship between organizational commitment and employee turnover at the .01 significance level.

The view that greater organizational commitment leads to decreased employee turnover as a general phenomenon across organizations was supported by Allen and Meyer (1990), who developed the Organizational Commitment Scale. Allen and Meyer stated that what is common to different conceptualizations of organizational commitment is that such commitment by an employee always tends to result in less likelihood of the employee voluntarily leaving an organization. Previous research studies have supported this claim for affective organizational commitment and for organizational commitment considered as a single construct, for various employee groups. If organizational commitment, especially affective organizational commitment, does help reduce employee turnover, then the results of the present study suggest that increasing servant leadership practices in restaurant organizations can result in decreased employee turnover among restaurant workers.

Not all of the kinds of organizational commitment that were measured in the present study were found to be related to the restaurant employees' perceptions of their manager's servant leadership practices. In particular, no relationship was found between perceived servant leadership and either continuance or normative organizational commitment. The findings about continuance commitment were similar to findings of two studies for two different kinds of employee groups. Miao et al. (2014) found that perceived servant leadership practices were not significantly related to continuance organizational commitment among a sample of 239 civil servant employees working in the public sector in China, although there was a significant relationship with affective and normative organizational commitment at the .01 statistical significance level. Rimes

(2011) also found no relationship between perceived servant leadership and continuance organizational commitment.

This study's finding that servant leadership was not associated with continuance or normative organizational commitment should be understood in the light of research results indicating that for some employee groups, continuance and normative organizational commitment may not be associated with reduced employee turnover. In particular, a study by Sow (2015) found that among healthcare auditors, continuance and normative organizational commitment were not associated with the turnover intentions of healthcare internal auditors although affective organizational commitment did predict lower employee turnover. In addition, Zopiatis et al. (2014) found that normative organizational commitment was not negatively related to turnover intention among hospitality employees in Cyprus although affective organizational commitment was negatively related to turnover intention.

Given these prior research results about the relation of continuance and normative commitment to employee turnover, the present study's finding of no significant association between perceived servant leadership practices and both continuance and normative organizational commitment does not seem highly relevant to the issue of turnover in the restaurant industry. What seems more relevant to that issue is the present study's findings of a significant positive relationship between perceived servant leadership practices and affective organizational commitment among restaurant employees. These findings are relevant to the issue of turnover since it appears that the majority of prior studies investigating how affective organizational commitment is related

to employee turnover in various employee groups have found that affective organizational commitment predicts lower employee turnover, as previously discussed in this section.

Limitations of the Study

An important limitation of the study was the low internal reliability on some of the study measures. These low internal reliabilities made it necessary to reduce the number of items on most measures in order to locate a combination of items that produced the highest internal reliability for the measure. The basic rationale for removing items to produce higher internal reliabilities for an instrument is that by doing so, a group of items will be detected that will provide a relatively consistent measure of the construct being measured. The only instrument that did not need to be reduced was the SLS, which had an internal reliability of .614 and was above the .6 minimum that is expected for exploratory research (Hair et al., 2014).

The internal reliability of the SPOS reached .691 with the deletion of three items, while the Affective Organizational Commitment Scale of the OCS had an internal reliability of .627 after the deletion of two items. However, both the Continuance and Normative Organizational Commitment Scales of the OCS did not achieve an internal reliability reaching the .6 criterion even with the deletion of three and six items, respectively. The internal reliabilities for the two measures after those deletions were only .480 and .566 respectively.

One possible reason for the low reliability measures for several of the instruments is that the participants found some of the items difficult to understand, which affected

their responses. Understanding may have been made more difficult by the fact that a number of items on the OCS and the SPOS were worded so that they were required to be reverse scored. Examples of reverse-scored items on the Normative and Continuance Organizational Commitment Scales are the following: “Jumping from organization to organization does not seem at all unethical to me,” and “I am not afraid of what might happen if I quit my job without having another one lined up.” Both of these items include double negatives (“not” and “un-” for the first item and “not” and “without” for the second item). In addition, several items on the Normative and Continuance Scales not reverse scored were relatively long and may have been somewhat difficult to understand for some participants. These were items such as “One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice—another organization may not match the overall benefits I have here,” and “One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that I believe that loyalty is important and therefore feel a sense of moral obligation to remain.”

Inclusion of items with double negatives and long items on these scales may have been confusing for some participants, especially if their reading skills were poor. Notably, the highest stage of education completed for 32 (36.4%) of the 88 participants was a high school degree, and four (4.5%) participants had less than a high school degree, which suggests the possibility that some of the participants may have been somewhat deficient in reading comprehension. Furthermore, there is evidence that some of the items on the Continuance and Normative Organizational Commitment Scales have reading levels above 12th Grade. Using MS Word 2013’s Ease of Reading function, an

evaluation of the Normative Organizational Commitment Scale item “Jumping from organization to organization does not seem at all unethical to me” showed a Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level value of 12.6. Evaluation of the two Continuance Organizational Commitment Scale items “One of the few serious consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives” and “One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice—another organization may not match the overall benefits I have here” shows Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level scores of 15.0 and 13.9, respectively.

The fact that four of the employees who took the online survey had to be deleted from the final sample because of straightlining also suggests the possibility that some of the final participants read and replied to the items with less than perfect understanding. If so, these individuals could not be identified because their responses did not exhibit a clearly suspicious response pattern as those of the straight liners did. As a result, any such responders could not be eliminated from the sample. It is also possible that one or more of the participants rushed through the online survey without reading items carefully. Again, if any such individuals were among the final sample, they could not be identified.

In sum, the use of items worded with double negatives and long items on the Continuance Organizational Commitment and Normative Organizational Commitment Scales suggests that one factor in the low internal reliability scores was the wording on some items on the instruments. This seems possible even though Allen and Meyer (1990), who developed the OCS, conducted a study of 256 employees in three different organizations and found the internal reliability of the Affective, Continuance, and

Normative Organizational Commitment Scales to be .87, .79, and .75, respectively. It may have been that the sample in Allen and Meyer's study had higher reading comprehension skills than the participants in the present study. If some items in the OCS are confusing to individuals with lower reading comprehension abilities, then it might be valuable to conduct research to find ways to simplify the wording of the items on the OCS scales, especially items on the Continuance and Normative Scales, to make them more understandable to a wider range of potential survey takers.

A second major limitation of the study was its lack of true generalizability. The study was restricted in several ways. One of these ways was that the participants were not randomly selected to be in the study. Instead, a convenience sampling method was used, which resulted in the participants self-selecting to be in the study. The absence of selecting participants using a random selection method limits the generalizability of the study so that the results can only be considered suggestive for the population of restaurant employees in moderately priced casual dining restaurants.

Another way in which the generalizability of the study results is limited is by being restricted to restaurant employees working in restaurants in South Florida. Since these restaurants were members of nationwide chains, then it is expected that similarly branded restaurants in other regions of the country will be similar in their operations and management, and thus that the results of the study will be suggestive of these other restaurants and their employees. However, the results cannot be truly generalized to restaurants in other regions due to possible unknown differences.

A third factor that limits the generalizability of the study is that all participants were employees of one type of restaurant, which consisted of moderately priced casual dining restaurants. Employees of other types of restaurant did not participate in the study. Other types of restaurants include fast-food restaurants, fine dining restaurants, buffets, and cafeterias. The results of the study cannot be generalized to these other types of restaurants due to differences that characterize the various types. Even to consider the result of this study as suggestive for these other types of restaurants should be done with care due to differences between the types.

Recommendations

Several recommendations can be made on the basis of the findings of this study. It is first recommended that management of moderately priced casual dining restaurants consider the results of this study. Several of the study's findings are potentially important to such restaurants because they suggest a way to decrease employee turnover. In particular, it was found that restaurant employees' perceptions of the servant leadership practices of their manager were associated with their perceptions of organizational support and their affective and total organizational commitment. In several previous studies, employees' perceptions of organizational support and affective organizational commitment have both been found to predict lower employee turnover for employees in various industries. Though it appears that no empirical study has yet shown that these two constructs reduce employee turnover in the restaurant industry, there seems a strong possibility that they do. Therefore, this study's findings that perceived servant leadership predicts perceived organizational support and affective organizational commitment

suggests that management of casual dining restaurant organizations might be able to reduce employee turnover by instituting servant leadership in their restaurants. I intend to develop an article based on the present study to be published in a peer-reviewed journal, which all interested parties, including restaurant managers, can access.

A second recommendation is that additional research be conducted on the relationship of perceived servant leadership to various beneficial organizational outcomes for restaurant organizations. First, further research should be conducted on how perceived servant leadership is related to organizational commitment and perceived organizational support for employees of casual dining restaurants in different regions of the country. Research should also be conducted on how these variables are related for samples of employees in different kinds of restaurant, including fast food and fine dining establishments. Research should also be conducted on how perceived servant leadership is related to beneficial organizational outcomes such as organizational citizenship behavior, trust in leader, work engagement and performance, psychological health, and job satisfaction. Such research could focus on restaurant employees in different kinds of restaurant, including casual dining, fine dining, and fast food establishments.

A third recommendation is to conduct research to investigate ways to simplify the instruments used in this research, especially the Continuance and Normative Organizational Commitment Scales of the OCS. The findings of this study suggest the possibility that for participants with lower reading skills, some items on the OCS may be confusing. Such items may include those that contain double negatives or are relatively long. It is recommended to carry out research to determine the minimum reading

comprehension ability the instruments should be adapted to and then revise them as necessary so that revised items retain their meaning and are valid and reliable for individuals with that minimum reading comprehension ability. It is also recommended that the instruments as they currently exist be examined for the grade level reading ability they require and that this information be published along with the instruments. More generally, it may be valuable for publishers of all survey instruments in all fields to test their instruments for the minimum grade level required to understand all instrument items and to publish this information along with the instrument.

A fourth recommendation is that researchers attempt to determine methods to screen survey participants to help ensure that they have sufficient reading comprehension skills to understand the items on the survey instruments they complete. One possible method might be to include several additional items on an instrument that would somehow serve to flag a participant as possibly lacking sufficient reading comprehension skills to understand all items on the instrument.

Implications

Several implications for different segments of society can be drawn on the basis of this study. The first implication is for casual dining restaurant organizations and their top levels of management. The study documented the problem of high employee turnover in restaurants and the need for initiatives to mitigate that problem. Instituting servant leadership in restaurants was identified as a potential way restaurant organizations might be able to decrease employee turnover by increasing the organizational commitment of employees as well as their perceptions of the organizational support they receive.

Liden et al. (2014) held that servant leadership leads to positive benefits for organizations, and the results of a number of studies of various employee groups have suggested that servant leadership does indeed tend to increase employees' organizational commitment and perceived organizational support. However, there has been a gap in examining how servant leadership may be related to organizational commitment and perceived organizational support among restaurant employees.

The present study helped fill this gap in research and found that for casual dining restaurant employees, too, servant leadership is positively associated with affective and total organizational commitment and with perceived organizational support. These findings suggest that by instituting servant leadership practices in their restaurants, casual dining restaurant organizations may be able to mitigate the problem of high turnover. Doing so would potentially benefit the organizations by decreasing the costs involved in finding and training new employees to replace those who voluntarily leave, thereby increasing restaurant profits. Greater use of servant leadership by casual dining restaurants might also help increase profits by helping them retain experienced and highly skilled employees at their jobs for longer periods of time, increasing efficiency and quality of service.

A second societal group that may benefit from this study consists of casual dining restaurant employees if consideration of the study's results helps lead to more casual dining restaurants implementing servant leadership. This is because it is the nature of servant leadership to emphasize employees' well-being (Tischler et al., 2016; Van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011). An essential aspect of being a servant leader is to put

subordinates first and help them grow and succeed (Liden et al., 2008). Servant leaders provide a sense of meaningfulness to employees (Van Dierendonck & Sousa, 2016) and help them feel more in control and more involved in their work (Sousa, 2014b). All of these results of servant leadership accrue to the benefit of employees and can be expected to lead to happier, more involved restaurant employees if servant leadership practices are instituted.

A third societal group that may benefit from the study is the casual dining restaurant-frequenting public if the study's findings result in more casual dining restaurants instituting servant leadership. Quality of service contributes to customer perceived value (Ryu, et al., 2012), and if instituting servant leadership in a restaurant improves employee retention, the quality of restaurant service in those restaurants can be expected to increase. This is because longer employee tenure is likely to lead to more experienced and skillful restaurant employees serving customers. Restaurant employees who are led by servant leaders can also be expected to provide better service because they are likely to be more satisfied with their jobs (Chan & Mak, 2014) and are happier due to reduced psychological strain (Rivkin et al., 2014) and increased psychological health (Park et al., 2015).

Finally, this study is potentially valuable to nonrestaurant organizations if the study's results encourage those organizations to institute servant leadership. The study might be especially valuable to nonrestaurant organizations with relatively high employee turnover, such as hospitality organizations and retail organizations. Study results suggest that by instituting servant leadership, such organizations might raise the affective

organizational commitment and perceived organizational support of employees. Such beneficial outcomes might then help decrease turnover, thereby potentially increasing the organizations' profitability, the job satisfaction of employees, and the service experience of customers.

Conclusion

The nature of servant leadership as developed by Greenleaf (1970, 1977) to seek the growth and well-being of subordinates. Given servant leadership's philosophy of putting subordinates first, it is reasonable to think that organizations instituting servant leadership practices will increase the organizational commitment and perceptions of organizational support of their employees and that these outcomes will result in a decrease in employee turnover. Considerable research supporting these propositions has been done, and the bulk of this research has shown that servant leadership does lead to beneficial outcomes for various industries and employee groups. However, little of this research appears to have been done in regard to restaurant organizations and their nonsupervisory employees. Because the restaurant industry experiences high employee turnover, and research that may suggest ways to reduce that turnover could be valuable to restaurant organizations.

This study helped fill the gap in research on the outcomes of servant leadership for casual dining restaurant organizations. In doing so, the findings of the study are in agreement with studies that have examined the employee outcomes of servant leadership for other employee groups. In particular, this study found that casual dining restaurant employees' perceptions of the servant leadership practices of their managers were

significantly positively associated, at the .01 statistical level, with their perceptions of the support they received from their organization. Furthermore, their perceptions of the servant leadership practices of their managers was significantly positively associated with the affective organizational commitment at the .05 statistical level and with their total organizational commitment at the .01 level. These findings served to address the two research questions of the study.

These results are highly relevant for several entities. First, these findings are important for casual dining restaurant organizations because if increases in organizational commitment and perceived organizational support lead to decreased employee turnover (as a number of studies have found for various employee groups) then these outcomes may also lead to decreased employee turnover for such restaurants. Therefore, the study's findings that casual dining restaurant employees' perceptions of the servant leadership practices of their managers lead to increases in the employees' perceived organizational support and their affective and total organizational commitment suggest that instituting servant leadership in casual dining restaurants could help reduce employee turnover and increase profitability.

The results of the study are also good news for casual dining restaurant employees and customers in case those results encourage casual dining restaurant organizations to institute servant leadership. Employees who believe that their managers and organization have their best interests at heart are likely to be happier and more satisfied employees. If, as a result, they remain with their organizations for longer periods, then customers will reap the benefits of having happier, more experienced, and more highly skilled

employees serving them, which can be expected to increase the quality of customer service.

An unexpected study finding was the low internal reliabilities for several of the instruments, which required deleting items from the instruments in order to generate higher internal reliabilities. The reasons for these low internal reliabilities were unclear, but one possibility is that the reading comprehension skills of some of the participants, many of whom had only a high school education or less, may have not been adequate for them to understand some of the items on the instruments, especially on the Continuance and Normative Organizational Commitment Scales of the OCS. The fact that several of the items on these scales were found to have reading level scores above 12th grade level added to this suspicion. As a result, a recommendation was made to conduct research to simplify the wording of some of the items on the OCS while still retaining their meaning. It was also recommended that survey developers pay close attention to the minimum reading proficiency needed for all the items on their survey and publish this information along with other information about their survey.

Overall, despite some limitations, the study was a successful effort to determine how perceived servant leadership is related to perceived organizational support and organizational commitment among nonsupervisory employees of moderately priced casual dining restaurants. I hope that higher management of such restaurant organizations will carefully consider the results of the study and the possible advantages of instituting servant leadership in their restaurants. I also hope that the study will serve as a steppingstone to further research on the relationship of servant leadership to other

beneficial organizational outcomes for restaurant organizations. Finally, I hope that the results of the study will encourage research on how servant leadership is related to perceived organizational support and organizational commitment in other types of restaurants, including fine dining and fast-food restaurants.

References

- Abid, H. R., Gulzar, A., & Hussain, W. (2015). The impact of servant leadership on organizational citizenship behaviors with the mediating role of trust and moderating role of group cohesiveness: A study of public sector of Pakistan. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 5(3), 234-242.
- ACAPS. (2012). *Qualitative and quantitative research techniques for humanitarian needs assessment: An Introductory brief*. Retrieved from <http://www.acaps.org/img/documents/q-qualitative-and-quantitative-research.pdf>
- Agarwala, T., Arizkuren-Eleta, A., del Castilli, E., Muñiz-Ferrer, M., & Gartzia, L. (2014). Influence of managerial support on work–life conflict and organizational commitment: An international comparison for India, Peru and Spain. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 25(10), 1460-1483. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2013.870315>
- Akdemir, F. (2014). Emotional kindergarten: Cross-cultural research about leadership of creative personalities. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 119(2014), 397-406. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042814021363>
- Albdour, A. A., & Altarawneh, I. I. (2014). Employee engagement and organizational commitment: Evidence from Jordan. *International Journal of Business*, 19(2), 192-212. Retrieved from <http://www.craig.csufresno.edu/IJB/Volumes/Volume%2019/V192-5.pdf>

- Allameh, S. M., Naeinib, S. G., Aghaeic, M., & Khodaeid, S. A. (2015). Analyzing the effect of servant leadership on quality of work life in Isfahan Gas Company (with emphasis on the teaching of Nahjolbalaghe). *International Journal of Management Academy*, 3(2), 28-38. Retrieved from http://www.ijoma.org/pdf_16511_ad6ee200030f6c39f93659b0809402b8.html
- Allen, D. G., & Shanock, L. R. (2013). Perceived organizational support and embeddedness as key mechanisms connecting socialization tactics to commitment and turnover among new employees. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34(3), 350-369. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.1805>
- Allen, D. G., Shore, L. M., & Griffeth, R. W. (2003). The role of perceived organizational support and supportive human resource practices in the turnover process. *Journal of Management*, 29(1), 99-118. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/014920630302900107>
- 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. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1990.tb00506.x>
- Arrington, J. M. (2015). Academic support staff as servant leaders and the relationship to student satisfaction. Unpublished Ph.D dissertation, The University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, MS.
- Asiedu, M., Sarfo, J. O., & Adjei, D. (2014). Organisational commitment and citizenship behavior: Tools to improve employee performance; an internal marketing

- approach. *European Scientific Journal*, 10(4), 288-305. Retrieved from <http://eujournal.org/index.php/esj/article/viewFile/2698/2631>
- Bambale, A. J. (2014). Relationship between servant leadership and organizational citizenship behaviors: Review of literature and future research directions. *Journal of Marketing and Management*, 5(1), 1-16. Retrieved from <http://www.gsmi-ijgb.com/Documents/JMM%20V5%20N1%20P01%20Abdu%20Jaafaru%20Bambale%20-Servant%20Leadership.pdf>
- Bani, M., Yasoureini, M., & Mesgarpour, A. (2014). A study on relationship between employees' psychological empowerment and organizational commitment. *Management Science Letters*, 4, 1197-1200. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2014.5.007>
- Barbuto, J. E., Gottfredson, R. K., & Searle, T. P. (2014). An examination of emotional intelligence as an antecedent of servant leadership. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 21(3), 315-323. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1548051814531826>
- Barbuto, J. E., & Wheeler, D. W. (2006). Scale development and construct clarification of servant leadership. *Group & Organization Management*, 31, 300-326. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1059601106287091>
- Batt, R., Lee, J. E., & Lakhani, T. (2014). *A national study of human resource practices, turnover, and customer service in the restaurant industry*. New York, NY: Restaurant Opportunities Centers United.
- Bloomberg, L. D., & Volpe, M. (2016). *Completing your qualitative dissertation: A road*

map from beginning to end (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Bobbio, A., & Manganelli, A. M. (2015). Antecedents of hospital nurses' intention to leave the organization: A cross sectional survey. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 52(7), 1180-1192. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2015.03.009>
- Bobbio, A., Van Dierendonck, D., & Manganelli, A. M. (2012). Servant leadership in Italy and its relation to organizational variables. *Leadership*, 8(3), 229-243. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1742715012441176>
- Borrego, M., Douglas, E. P., & Amelink, C. T. (2009). Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed research methods in engineering education. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 98(1), 53-66.
- Bratt, M. M., & Felzer, H. M. (2012). Predictors of new graduate nurses' organizational commitment during a nurse residency program. *Journal for Nurses in Staff Development*, 28(3), 108-119. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/NND.0b013e31825515c4>
- Brunetto, Y., Xerri, M., Shriberg, A., Farr-Wharton, R., Shacklock, K., Newman, S., & Dienger, J. (2013). The impact of workplace relationships on engagement, well-being, commitment and turnover for nurses in Australia and the USA. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 69(12), 2786-2799. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jan.12165>
- Carter, D., & Baghurst, T. (2013). The Influence of servant leadership on restaurant employee engagement. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 124(3), 1-12. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1882-0>

- Chan, S. C. H., & Mak, W-m. (2014). The impact of servant leadership and subordinates' organizational tenure on trust in leader and attitudes. *Personnel Review*, 43(2), 272-287. <http://dx.doi.org/>
- Chen, Z., Zhu, J., & Zhou, M. (2014). How does a servant leader fuel the service fire? A multilevel model of servant leadership, individual self-identity, group competition climate, and customer service performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(2), 511-521. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0038036>
- Choudhary, A. I., Akhtar, S. A., & Zaheer, A. (2013). Impact of transformational and servant leadership on organizational performance: A comparative analysis. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 116(2), 433-440. <http://dx.doi.org/0.1007/s10551-012-1470-8>
- Craig, C. A., Allen, M. W., Reid, M. F., Riemenschneider, C. K., & Armstrong, D. J. (2013). The impact of career mentoring and psychosocial mentoring on affective organizational commitment, job involvement, and turnover intention. *Administration & Society*, 45(8), 949-973. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0095399712451885>
- De Clercq, D., Bouckenoghe, D., Raja, U., & Matsyborska, G. (2014). Servant leadership and work engagement: The contingency effects of leader-follower social capital. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 25(2), 183-212. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.21185>
- de Waal, A., & Sivro, M. (2012). The relation between servant leadership, organizational performance, and the high-performance organization framework. *Journal of*

Leadership & Organizational Studies, 19(2), 173-190.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1548051812439892>

Ding, D., Lu, H., Song, Y., & Lu, Q. (2012). Relationship of servant leadership and employee loyalty: The mediating role of employee satisfaction. *iBusiness*, 4, 208-215. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/ib.2012.43026>

Donia, M. B. L., Raja, U., Panaccio, A., & Wang, Z. (2016). Servant leadership and employee outcomes: The moderating role of subordinates' motives. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 25(5), 722-734.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2016.1149471>

Edwards, M. R., & Peccei, R. (2010). Perceived organizational support, organizational identification, and employee outcomes: Testing a simultaneous multifoci model. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 9, 17-26. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000007>

Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P., & Davis-LaMastro, V. (1990). Perceived organizational support and employee diligence, commitment, and innovation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75(1), 51-59. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.75.1.51>

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

Eisenberger, R., Stinglhamber, F., Vandenberghe, C., Sucharski, I. L., & Rhoades, L. (2002). Perceived supervisor support: Contributions to perceived organizational support and employee retention. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(3), 565-573. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.87.3.565>

- Eslami, J., & Gharakhani, D. (2012). Organizational commitment and job satisfaction. *ARPN Journal of Science and Technology*, 2(2), 85-91. Retrieved from <http://web3.apiu.edu/researchfile/Research%20Materials/Employee%20Job%20Satisfaction/Organizational%20commitment%20and%20job%20satisfaction.pdf>
- Fritz, J. H., O'Neil, N. B., Popp, A. M., Williams, C., & Arnett, R. C. (2013). The influence of supervisory behavioral integrity on intent to comply with organizational ethical standards and organizational commitment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 114(2), 251-263. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1345-z>
- Gillet, N., Colombat, P., Michinov, E., Pronost, A-M., & Fouquereau, E. (2013). Procedural justice, supervisor autonomy support, work satisfaction, organizational identification and job performance: the mediating role of need satisfaction and perceived organizational support. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 69(11), 2560-2571. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jan.12144>
- Goh, S-K., & Low, Z-J. (2014). The Influence of servant leadership towards organizational commitment: The mediating role of trust in leaders. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 9(1), 17-25. Retrieved from <http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/ijbm/article/viewFile/26378/19010>
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1970). *The servant as leader*. Indianapolis, IN: Greenleaf Center
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant-leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York, NY: Paulist Press.
- Grisaffe, D. B., VanMeter, R., & Chonko, L. B. (2016). Serving first for the benefit of others: Preliminary evidence for a hierarchical conceptualization of servant

leadership. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 36(1), 40-59.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08853134.2016.1151303>

Güçel, C., & Begeç, S. (2012). The effect of the servant leadership on organizational citizenship behavior: Case study of a university. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanity Studies*, 4, 107-116. Retrieved from

http://www.sobiad.org/ejournals/journal_ijss/archives/2012_1/cem_gucel1.pdf

Guchait, P., Cho, S., & Meurs, J. A. (2015). Psychological contracts, perceived organizational and supervisor support: Investigating the impact on intent to leave among hospitality employees in India. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 14(3), 290-315. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15332845.2015.1002070>

Gutierrez, A. P., Candela, L. L., & Carver, L. (2012). The structural relationships between organizational commitment, global job satisfaction, developmental experiences, work values, organizational support, and person-organization fit among nursing faculty. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 68(7), 1601-1614.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2012.05990.x>

Hair, J. F., Jr., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2014). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Halaychik, C. S. (2014). Rapid organizational change through servant leadership. *Library Leadership & Management*, 28(3) 1-18.

Han, S. J., Bonn, M. A., & Cho, M. (2016). The relationship between customer incivility, restaurant frontline service employee burnout and turnover intention.

International Journal of Hospitality Management, 52, 97-106.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2015.10.002>

Hassan, S., Wright, B. E., & Yukl, G. (2014). Does ethical leadership matter in government? Effects on organizational commitment, absenteeism, and willingness to report ethical problems. *Public Administration Review*, 74(3), 333-343.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/puar.12216>.

Hayton, J. C., Carnabuci, G., & Eisenberger, R. (2012). With a little help from my colleagues: A social embeddedness approach to perceived organizational support. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33(2), 235-249 (2012).

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.755>

Hein, S., & Rigel, C. (2012). Human resource and organizational management content in the hospitality curriculum: How the professionals view it. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 11(2), 165-181. DOI:

10.1080/15332845.2012.648897

Hussain, T., & Asif, S. (2012). Is employees' turnover intention driven by organizational commitment and perceived organizational support? *Journal of Quality and Technology Management*, 8(2), 1-10. Retrieved from

<http://results.pu.edu.pk/images/journal/iqtm/PDF-FILES/01->

Is%20Employees_%20Turnover%20Intention%20driven-

Dr%20Tajammal_V_VIII_IssueII_Decem2012.pdf

Hayes, A. (2013). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

- Hunter, E. M., Neubert, M. J., Perry, S. J., Witt, L., Penney, L. M., & Weinberger, E. (2013). Servant leaders inspire servant followers: Antecedents and outcomes for employees and the organization. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24, 316–331.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.12.001>
- Ibrahim, A., & Aslinda, A. (2013). Relationship between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) at government-owned corporation companies. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, 3(3), 35-42.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/jpag.v3i3.4379>
- Islam, T., Khan, S. R., Shafiq, A., & Ahmad, U. N. U. (2012). Leadership, citizenship behavior, performance, and organizational commitment: The mediating role of organizational politics. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 19(11), 1540-1552.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.5829/idosi.wasj.2012.19.11.2093>
- Jehanzeb, K., Rasheed, A., & Rasheed, M. F. (2013). Organizational commitment and turnover intentions: Impact of employee's training in private sector of Saudi Arabia. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 8(8), 79-90.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v8n8p79>
- Jones, D. (2012). Does servant leadership lead to greater customer focus and employee satisfaction? *Business Studies Journal*, 4(2), 21-35. Retrieved from:
<http://www.alliedacademies.org/articles/bsjvol422012.pdf#page=27>
- Juhdia, N., Pa'wanb, F., & Hansarmb, R. M. K. (2013). HR practices and turnover intention: The mediating roles of organizational commitment and organizational engagement in a selected region in Malaysia. *The International Journal of Human*

Resource Management, 24(15), 3002-3019.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2013.763841>

- Kashyap, V., & Rangnekar, S. (2014). The moderating role of servant leadership: Investigating the relationships among employer brand perception and perceived employee retention. *Review of HRM*, 3(1), 105-118.
- Kausel, E. E., & Culbertson, S. S. (2013). CEOs who are servant leaders: The path to better firm performance? *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 27(1). Online only. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/amp.2013.0027>. Retrieved from <http://aom.org/Publications/AMP/Academy-of-Management-Perspectives.aspx>
- Kell, H. J., & Motowidlo, S. J. (2012). Deconstructing organizational commitment: Associations among its affective and cognitive components, personality antecedents, and behavioral outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 42(1), 213-251.
- Khazaal, Y., van Singer, M., Chatton, A., Achab, S., Zullino, D., Rothen, S., & Thorens, G. (2014). Does self-selection affect samples' representativeness in online surveys? An investigation in online video game research. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 16(7):e164. Retrieved from <http://www.jmir.org/2014/7/e164/?newDesign>
- Kim, K. Y., Eisenberger, R., & Baik, K. (2016). Perceived organizational support and affective organizational commitment: Moderating influence of perceived organizational competence. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* (in press).

- Kool, M., & Van Dierendonck, D. (2012). Servant leadership and commitment to change, the mediating role of justice and optimism. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 25(3), 422-433. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09534811211228139>
- Koyuncu, M., Burke, R. J., Astakhova, M., Eren, D., & Cetin, H. (2014). Servant leadership and perceptions of service quality provided by front-line service workers in hotels in Turkey: Achieving competitive advantage. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 26(7), 1083-1099. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-06-2013-0238>
- Kripalani, S., Risser, J., Gatti, M. E., & Jacobson, T. A. (2009). Development and evaluation of the Adherence to Refills and Medications Scale (ARMS) among low-literacy patients with chronic disease. *Value in Health*, 12(1), 118-123.
- Krog, C. L., & Govender, K. (2015). The relationship between servant leadership and employee empowerment, commitment, trust and innovative behaviour: A project management perspective. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 13(1), 1-12. <http://dx.doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/sajhrm.v13i1.712>
- Kwak, W. J., & Kim, H-K. (2015). Servant leadership and customer service quality at Korean hotels: Multilevel organizational citizenship behavior as a mediator. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 43(8), 1287-1298. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2015.43.8.1287>
- Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Liao, C., & Meuser, J. D. (2014). Servant leadership and serving culture: Influence on individual and unit performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(5), 1434-1452. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/amj.2013.0034>

- Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment. *The Leadership Quarterly, 19*, 161-177.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.01.006>
- Lee, S. Y., Lee, M. H., Kim, H. K., & Park, O. L. (2015). Effects of head nurses' servant leadership on organizational commitment among clinical nurses: Focused on the mediating effect of empowerment. *Journal of the Korean Academy of Nursing Administration, 21*(5), 552-560. <http://dx.doi.org/10.11111/kjana.2015.21.5.552>
- Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Liao, C., & Meuser, J. D. (2014). Servant leadership and serving culture: Influence on individual and unit performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 57*(5), 1434-1452. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/amj.2013.0034>
- Madden, L., Mathias, B. D., & Madden, T. M. (2015). In good company: The impact of perceived organizational support and positive relationships at work on turnover intentions. *Management Research Review, 38*(3), 242-263.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/MRR-09-2013-0228>
- Maden, D., Göztas, A., & Topsümer, F. (2014). Effects of service standards communication and servant leadership on strategic competence and customer orientation. *Chinese Business Review, 13*(11), 659-667.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.17265/1537-1506/2014.11.001>
- Mahembe, B., & Engelbrecht, A. S. (2013). The relationship between servant leadership, affective team commitment and team effectiveness. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management, 11*(1), 1-10. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/sajhrm.v11i1.495>

Retrieved from <http://sajhrm.co.za/index.php/sajhrm/article/view/495/592>

- Mahembe, B., & Engelbrecht, A. S. (2014). The relationship between servant leadership, organisational citizenship behaviour and team effectiveness. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology, 40*(1), 1-10. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v40i1.1107>
- Martin, J. E., Sinclair, R. R., Lelchook, A. M., Wittmer, J. S., & Charles, K. E. (2012). Non-standard work schedules and retention in the entry-level hourly workforce. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 85*(1), 1-22. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1348/096317910X526803>
- McCann, J. T., Graves, D., & Cox, L. (2014). Servant leadership, employee satisfaction, and organizational performance in rural community hospitals. *International Journal of Business and Management, 9*(10), 28-38. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v9n10p28>
- 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), 1-18. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1990.tb00506.x>
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review, 1*, 64-98.
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, L., & Vandenberg, R. J. (2013). A person-centered approach to the study of commitment. *Human Resource Management Review, 23*(2013), 190-202.

- Miao, Q., Newman, A., Schwartz, G., & Xu, L. (2014). Servant leadership, trust, and the organizational commitment of public sector employees in China. *Public Administration, 92*, 727-743. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/padm.12091>
- Morganson, V. J., Major, D. A., Oborn, K. L., Verive, J. M., & Heelan, M. P. (2010). Comparing telework locations and traditional work arrangements. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 25*(6), 578-595. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02683941011056941>.
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1979). The measurement of organisational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 14*, 224-247.
- Nagar, K. (2012). Organizational commitment and job satisfaction among teachers during times of burnout. *Vikalpa, 37*(2), 43-60. Retrieved from <http://www.vikalpa.com/pdf/articles/2012/Pages-from-Vikalpa37.2-43-60.pdf>
- Nilsen, R. M., Suren, P., Gunnes, N. Alsaker, E. R., Bresnahan, M., Hirtz, D., ... Stoltenberg, C. (2013). Analysis of self-selection bias in a population-based cohort study of autism spectrum disorders. *Paediatric Perinatal Epidemiology, 27*(6), 553-563. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ppe.12077>
- Owens, B. P., & Hekman, D. R. (2012). Modeling how to grow: An inductive examination of humble leader behaviors, contingencies, and outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal, 55*(4), 787-818.
- Owens, B. P., Johnson, M. D., & Mitchell, T. R. (2013). Expressed humility in organizations: Implications for performance, teams, and leadership. *Organization Science, 24*, 1517-1538.

- Park, H. Y., Christie, R. L., & Sype, G. W. (2014). Organizational commitment and turnover intention in union and non-union firms. *Sage Open*.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/2158244013518928>. Retrieved from
<http://sgo.sagepub.com/content/4/1/2158244013518928>
- Park, N. K., Lee, H., Lee, T., & Park, J. S. (2015). Correlations among emotional labor, servant leadership, and communication competence in hospital nurses. *Korean Journal of Occupational Health Nursing*, 24(2), 57-66.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.5807/kjohn.2015.24.2.57>
- Paul, W. K., & Fitzpatrick, C. (2015). Advising as servant leadership: Investigating student satisfaction. *NACADA Journal*, 35(2), 28-35. Retrieved from
<http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1090142.pdf>
- Perez, J., & Mirabella, J. (2013). The relationship between leadership practices and restaurant employee turnover. *International Journal of Accounting Information Science & Leadership*, 6(8), 40-47. Retrieved from
http://www.academia.edu/6093526/The_Relationship_Between_Leadership_Practices_and_Restaurant_Employee_Turnover
- Peterson, S. J., Galvin, B. M., & Lange, D. (2012). CEO servant leadership: Exploring executive characteristics and firm performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 65, 565-596. DOI: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2012.01253.x
- Pourgaz, A. W., Naruei, A. G., & Jenaabadi, H. (2015). Examining the relationship of organizational citizenship behavior with organizational commitment and equity

perception of secondary school administrators. *Psychology*, 2015(6), 800-807.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/psych.2015.66079>

Parris, D. L., & Peachey, J. W. (2012). A systematic literature review of servant leadership theory in organizational contexts. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 113(3), 377-393. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1322-6>

Perez, J., & Mirabella, J. (2013). The relationship between leadership practices and restaurant employee turnover. *International Journal of Accounting Information Science & Leadership*, 6(8), 40-47. Available from http://www.academia.edu/6093526/The_Relationship_Between_Leadership_Practices_and_Restaurant_Employee_Turnover

Rai, R., & Prakash, A. (2016). How do servant leaders ignite absorptive capacity? The role of epistemic motivation and organizational support. *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* (in Press).

<http://dx.doi.org/10/1016/j.rpto.2016.02.001>

Ramli, A., & Desa, N. M. (2014). The relationship between servant leadership and organizational commitment: The Malaysian perspectives. *International Journal of Management and Sustainability*, 3(2), 111-123. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/9233749/The_Relationship_between_Servant_Leadership_and_Organizational_Commitment_The_Malaysian_Perspectives

Rastegar, A., Mazloumian, S., Ghasemi, N., & Seig, M. H. (2015). A causal model of servant leadership, psychological empowerment and entrepreneurship (case study: the staff of Zahedan University of Medical Sciences). *Journal of Health*

Administration, 18(61), 69-80. Retrieved from

http://jha.iums.ac.ir/browse.php?a_code=A-10-1445-1&slc_lang=en&sid=1

Rezaei, M., Salehi, S., Shafiei, M., & Sabet, S. (2012). Servant leadership and organizational trust: The mediating effect of the leader trust and organizational communication. *Emerging Markets Journal*, 2(2012), 69-78.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.5195/emaj.2012.21>

Rimes, W. D. (2011). The relationship between servant leadership and organizational commitment (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Tennessee Temple University, Chattanooga, TN.

Rivkin, W., Diestel, S., & Schmidt, K-H. (2014). The positive relationship between servant leadership and employees' psychological health: A multi-method approach. *German Journal of Research in Human Resource Management*, 28(1-2), 52-72. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/239700221402800104>

Rubio-Sanchez, A., Bosco, S. M., & Melchar, D. E. (2013). Servant leadership and world values. *Global Studies Journal*, 5(3), 19-33.

Ryu, K., Lee, H-R., & Kim, W. G. (2012). The influence of the quality of the physical environment, food, and service on restaurant image, customer perceived value, customer satisfaction, and behavioral intentions. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 24(2), 200-223.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09596111211206141>

Shoss, M. K., Eisenbeger, R., Restubog, S. L. D., & Zagenczyk, T. J. (2013). Blaming the organization for abusive supervision: The roles of perceived organizational

- support and supervisor's organizational embodiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98(1), 158-168. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0030687>
- Silverthorne, C. (2004). The impact of organizational culture and person-organization fit on organizational commitment and job satisfaction in Taiwan. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 25(7), 592-599. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01437730410561477>
- Song, C., Park, K. R., & Kang, S. (2015). Servant leadership and team performance: The mediating role of knowledge-sharing climate. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 43(10), 1749-1760. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2015.43.10.1749>
- Sousa, M. J. (2014a). Servant leadership to the test: New perspectives and insights (No. EPS-2014-313-ORG. *ERIM Ph.D. Series Research in Management*. Erasmus Research Institute of Management (ERIM).
- Sousa, M. J. (2014b). Putting servant leadership to the test. *RSM Discovery – Management Knowledge*, 19(3), 10-12. Retrieved from <http://repub.eur.nl/pub/77138>
- Sousa, M., & Van Dierendonck, D. (2015). Servant leadership and the effect of the interaction between humility, action, and hierarchical power on follower engagement. *Journal of Business Ethics*, (2015), 1-13. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2725-y>. Retrieved from <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10551-015-2725-y/fulltext.html>
- Sow, M. T. (2015). Relationship between organizational commitment and turnover intentions among healthcare internal auditors. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation,

- Walden University. Retrieved from <http://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2351&context=dissertations>
- Suma, S., & Lesha, J. (2013). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment: The case of Shkodra Municipality. *European Scientific Journal*, 9(17). Retrieved from <http://www.eujournal.org/index.php/esj/article/viewFile/1156/1172>
- Sun, Y. (2016). Does servant leadership inspire personnel's innovation performance: Performance control as a moderator. *International Journal of Business Administration*, 7(2), 86-91. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5430/ijba.v7n2p86>
- Tischler, L., Giambatista, R., McKeage, R., & McCormick, D. (2016). Servant leadership and its relationships with core self-evaluation and job satisfaction. *The Journal of Values-Based Leadership*, 9(1), 1-20. Retrieved from <http://scholar.valpo.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1148&context=jvbl>
- Top, M., & Gider, O. (2013). Interaction of organizational commitment and job satisfaction of nurses and medical secretaries in Turkey. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(3), 667-683. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2012.680600>
- Trastek, V. F., Hamilton, N. W., & Niles, E. E. (2014). Leadership models in health care: A case for servant leadership. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings*, 89(3), 374-381. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.mayocp.2013.10.012>
- Tuckey, M. R., Bakker, A. B., & Dollard, M. F. (2012). Empowering leaders optimize working conditions for engagement: A multilevel study. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 17(1), 15.

- Tischler, L., Giambatista, R., McKeage, R., & McCormick, D. (2016). Servant leadership and its relationships with core self-evaluation and job satisfaction. *The Journal of Values-Based Leadership*, 9(1), 1-20. Retrieved from <http://scholar.valpo.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1148&context=jvbl>
- Tse, H. H. M., Huang, X., & Lam, W. (2013). Why does transformational leadership matter for employee turnover? A multi-foci social exchange perspective. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(5), 763-776. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.07.005>
- Urbonas, G., Kubiliene, L., Kubilius, R., & Urboniene, A. (2015). Assessing the effects of pharmacists' perceived organizational support, organizational commitment and turnover intention on provision of medication information at community pharmacies in Lithuania: A structural equation modeling approach. *BMC Health Services Research*, 15(82). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12913-015-0741-3>
- U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2016). *Job openings and labor turnover survey*. Retrieved June 16, 2016 from <http://data.bls.gov/cgi-bin/surveymost?jt>
- Van Dierendonck, D. (2015). Building people-oriented organizations. *ERIM Inaugural Address Series Research in Management*. Retrieved from repub.eur.nl/pub/79288/Erim-15-oratie-vanDierendonck-fulltekst.pdf
- Van Dierendonck, D., & Patterson, K. (2015). Compassionate love as a cornerstone of servant leadership: An integration of previous theorizing and research. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 128(1), 119-131. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2085-z>

- Van Dierendonck, D., & Sousa, M. (2016). Finding meaning in highly uncertain situations: Servant leadership during change. In C. Peus, S. Braun, & B. Schyns (eds.). *Leadership lessons from compelling contexts* (pp. 403-424). Somerville, MA: Emerald Group.
- Van Dierendonck, D., & Stam, D. A. (2014). Combination of leadership styles means success. *RSM Discovery–Management Knowledge*, 18(2), 16-17. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/1765/77107>
- Van Dierendonck, D., Stam, D., Boersma, P., de Windt, N., & Alkema, J. (2014). Same difference? Exploring the differential mechanisms linking servant leadership and transformational leadership to follower outcomes. *Leadership Quarterly*, 25(3), 544-562. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.014>
- Van Winkle, R., Allen, S., DeVore, D., & Winston, B. (2014). The relationship between the servant leadership behaviors of immediate supervisors and followers' perceptions of being empowered in the context of small business. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 13(3), 70-82. <http://dx.doi.org/1012806/V13/I3/R5>
- Van Dierendonck, D., & Nuijten, I. (2011). The Servant Leadership Survey: Development and validation of a multidimensional measure. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 26(3), 249-267. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10869-010-9194-1>
- Waldman, D. A., Carter, M. Z., & Hom, P. W. (2015). A multilevel investigation of leadership and turnover behavior. *Journal of Management*, 41(6), 1724-1744. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0149206312460679>

- Washington, R. R., Sutton, C. D., & Sauser, Jr., W. I. (2014). How distinct is servant leadership theory? Empirical comparisons with competing theories. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability and Ethics, 11*(1), 11-25.
- Weng, Q., & McElroy, J. C. (2012). Organizational career growth, affective occupational commitment and turnover intentions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 80*, 246-265. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2012.01.014>
- Wilson, D. F. (2013). Servant leadership and job satisfaction in a multicultural hospitality organization: A quantitative, non-experimental descriptive study. Ed.D. dissertation, Grand Canyon University, Phoenix, AZ. Retrieved from http://media.proquest.com/media/pq/classic/doc/3125634281/fmt/ai/rep/NPDF?_s=A%v6UIRXUK7wCcY4fuMTIh0bRNNI%3D
- Wu, L., Tse, E. C., Fu, P., Kwan, H. K., & Liu, J. (2013). The impact of servant leadership on hotel employees' "servant behavior." *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly, 54*(4), 383-395. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1938965513482519>
- Yildiz, B., & Yildiz, H. (2015). The effect of servant leadership on psychological ownership: The moderator role of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Global Strategic Management, 9*(2), 65-77. <http://dx.doi.org/10.20460/JGSM.2015915574>
- Yoshida, D. T., Sendjaya, S., Hirst, G., & Cooper, B. (2014). Does servant leadership foster creativity and innovation? A multi-level mediation study of 10 identification and prototypicality. *Journal of Business Research, 67*(7), 1395-1404. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.08.013>

- Yücel, I. (2012). Examining the relationships among job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention: An empirical study. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 7(20), 44-58.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v7n20p44>
- Zarei, A., Rastagar, A. A., & Safari, H. (2013). Servant leadership and organizational culture: A survey in Iran. *Asian Journal of Research in Business Economics & Management*, 3(1), 367-381.
- Zehiri, C., Akyuz, B., Eren, M. S., & Turhan, G. (2013). The indirect effects of servant leadership behavior on organizational citizenship behavior and job performance: Organizational justice as a mediator. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science*, 2(3), 1-13, Retrieved from
https://www.academia.edu/4091147/The_Indirect_Effects_of_Servant_Leadership_Behavior_on_Organizational_Citizenship_Behavior_and_Job_Performance_Organizational_Justice_as_a_Mediator
- Zhang, H., Kwan, H. K., Everett, A. M., & Jian, Z. (2012). Servant leadership, organizational identification, and work-to-family enrichment: The moderating role of work climate for sharing family concerns. *Human Resource Management*, 51(5), 747-767. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21498>
- Zhou, Y., & Miao, Q. (2014). Servant leadership and affective commitment in the Chinese public sector: the mediating role of perceived organizational support. *Psychological Reports*, 115(2), 381-395.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.2466/01.21.PR0.115c23z4>

Zopiatis, A., Constanti, P., & Theocharous, A. L. (2014). Job involvement, commitment, satisfaction and turnover: Evidence from hotel employees in Cyprus. *Tourism Management* 41, 129-140. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2013.09.013>

Appendix A: Invitation Information to Participate in the Study

You are invited to take part in a research study about how the servant leadership style of leadership is related to employees' feelings about their organization. The researcher is inviting nonsupervisory employees of two different restaurant chains to be in the study. I asked your restaurant manager to provide his or her nonsupervisory employees a link to this survey.

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/7LWH8G6>

Appendix B: Informed Consent Information

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

You are invited to take part in a research study about how the servant leadership style of leadership is related to employees' feelings about their organization. The researcher is inviting nonsupervisory employees of two different restaurant chains to be in the study. I asked your restaurant manager to provide his or her nonsupervisory employees a link to this survey. This form is part of a process called "informed consent" to allow you to understand this study before deciding whether to take part.

This study is being conducted by a researcher named Chee Piong, who is a doctoral student at Walden University.

Background Information:

The purpose of this study is to learn how the servant leadership style of leadership in restaurants is related to employees' feelings about the restaurant organization. The survey is for nonsupervisory employees of Olive Garden™ and Longhorn Steakhouse™ restaurants. The survey is completely anonymous. Your name will not be asked on the survey, and all survey participants will be identified by an assigned number only.

Procedures:

If you agree to be in this study, you will be asked to:

- Complete a questionnaire with a total of 39 items.
- Answer three questions about your age, education, and years working in your restaurant organization.

Answering these items should take no more than 10 minutes of your time.

Here are some sample items in the questionnaire:

For each statement below, indicate how much you agree on the provided seven-point scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree).

My manager makes my career development a priority.
I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside it.
My organization cares about my opinions.

Voluntary Nature of the Study:

This study is voluntary. Everyone will respect your decision of whether or not you choose to be in the study. No one at your restaurant will treat you differently if you decide not to be in the study. If you decide to join the study now, you can still change your mind later. You may stop at any time

Risks and Benefits of Being in the Study:

Being in this type of study involves some risk of the minor discomforts that can be encountered in daily life, such as fatigue or stress. Being in this study would not pose any risk to your safety or wellbeing.

There are no personal benefits to being in the study. There may be benefits to the larger community in the form of knowledge that may be useful to restaurant organizations in deciding what style of leadership to use.

Payment:

There is no payment for being in the study.

Privacy:

Reports coming out of this study will not share the identities of individual participants. Details that might identify participants, such as the location of the study, also will not be shared. Even the researcher will not know who you are. The researcher will not use your personal information for any purposes outside of this research project. Data will be kept secure in the researcher's password-protected computer. Data will be kept for a period of at least 5 years, as required by the university.

Contacts and Questions:

You may ask any questions you have now. Or if you have questions later, you may contact the researcher at Chee.Piong@WaldenU.edu. If you want to talk privately about your rights as a participant, you can call the Research Participant Advocate at my university at 612-312-1210. Walden University's approval number for this study is _____ and it expires on _____.

Please print or save this consent form for your records.

Obtaining Your Consent

If you feel you understand the study well enough to make a decision about it, please indicate your consent by clicking the link below.

Appendix C: Servant Leadership Scale (SLS) – 7 Items

Liden et al.'s (2014) Servant Leadership Scale (SLS)

1. My manager can tell if something work-related is going wrong.
2. My manager makes my career development a priority.
3. I would seek help from my manager if I had a personal problem.
4. My manager emphasizes the importance of giving back to the community.
5. My manager puts my best interests ahead of his/her own.
6. My manager gives me the freedom to handle difficult situations in the way that I feel is best.
7. My manager would NOT compromise ethical principles in order to achieve success.

Appendix D: Organizational Commitment Scale (OCS) – 24 Items

Allen and Meyer's (1990) Organizational Commitment Scale (OCS)*Affective Commitment Scale items*

1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.
2. I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside it.
3. I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.
4. I think that I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one.
5. I do not feel like 'part of the family' at my organization.
6. I do not feel 'emotionally attached' to this organization.
7. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.
8. I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization.

Continuance Commitment Scale items

9. I am not afraid of what might happen if I quit my job without having another one lined up.
10. It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.
11. Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now.
12. It wouldn't be too costly for me to leave my organization now.
13. Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.
14. I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.
15. One of the few serious consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.

16. One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice — another organization may not match the overall benefits I have here.

Normative Commitment Scale items

17. I think that people these days move from company to company too often.

18. I do not believe that a person must always be loyal to his or her organization.

19. Jumping from organization to organization does not seem at all unethical to me.

20. One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that I believe that loyalty is important and therefore, feel a sense of moral obligation to remain.

21. If I got another offer for a better job elsewhere I would not feel it was right to leave my organization.

22. I was taught to believe in the value of remaining loyal to one organization.

23. Things were better in the days when people stayed with one organization for most of their careers.

24. I do not think that wanting to be a 'company man' or 'company woman' is sensible anymore.

Appendix E: Survey of Perceived Organizational Support (SPOS) - 8 Items

Eisenberger et al.'s (2002) Survey of Perceived Organizational Support (SPOS)

1. The organization strongly considers my goals and values.
2. Help is available from the organization when I have a problem.
3. The organization really cares about my well-being.
4. The organization would forgive an honest mistake on my part.
5. The organization is willing to help me when I need a special favor.
6. If given the opportunity, the organization would take advantage of me.
7. The organization shows very little concern for me.
8. The organization cares about my opinions.

Appendix F: Demographic Questions - 3 Items and 1 General Question

1. What is your age?
2. What is your gender?
3. What is your education level?
4. How long have you worked in this restaurant chain?

Appendix G: Permission to Use Survey Instruments in the form of emails.

1. Robert Liden et. al's Servant Leadership Scale (SLS)

From: Bob Liden
Sent: Sunday, May 22, 2016 3:13 PM
To: 'Chee Piong'
Subject: RE: Permission to Use Your Servant Leadership Survey Instrument

You are most welcome....Bob

From: Chee Piong [mailto:chee.piong@waldenu.edu]
Sent: Sunday, May 22, 2016 1:47 PM
To: Bob Liden <bobliden@uic.edu>
Subject: Re: Permission to Use Your Servant Leadership Survey Instrument

Thank you for the wonderful news. I am extremely appreciative for the additional resources. Wishing you a wonderful day.

On Sun, May 22, 2016 at 1:48 PM, Bob Liden <bobliden@uic.edu> wrote:

Yes Chee Piong,

You are welcome to use either our long (SL-28) or short (SL-7) servant leadership scale. Be advised, though, if you think you may want to analyze the 7 dimensions separately, you should use the full scale. I have attached some recent articles as well as the scale. If you need it in other languages, let me know.

Best of luck with your research,

2. Allen and Meyer's Organizational Commitment Scale (OCS)

From: Natalie Allen
Sent: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 8:14 AM
To: Chee Piong
Subject: Re: Permission to Use Your Survey Instrument

Hello Chee,
 Thank you for your interest in our work. You asked for permission for a Servant Leadership Survey...this is not a measure we developed. Perhaps, instead, you meant to ask for permission to use our Three Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey in your research? If so, you can get information about the measure, a Users' Guide, and the measure itself at:
<http://employeecommitment.com/>
 For academic / research purposes, please choose the Academic Package. (There is no charge for this package.)
 I wish you well with your research!
 Best,
 Natalie Allen

On 05/24/16, Chee Piong <cpiong@hotmail.com> wrote:

Good morning Dr. Natalie,

My name is Chee Piong. I am a Ph.D student working on my dissertation entitled "Servant Leadership, Organizational Commitment, and Perceived Organizational Support in the

3. Eisenberger et al.'s Survey of Perceived Organizational Support (SPOS)

