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ABSTRACT

Servant leadership is one of the most important forms of leadership and some authors and experts even consider servant leaders to be among the best leaders. The purpose of this quantitative research study is to examine the relationship between teachers’ perceptions of their principals’ servant leadership style and teacher job satisfaction. The target population of the study was teachers. There are eight public schools in this district; all are similar with respect to the school buildings, curricula, number of teachers and students, and their socioeconomic status. Two separate survey instruments were used for this study: Liden et al.’s (2008) Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ), which is a validated survey instrument that identifies seven dimensions of servant leadership characteristics. Mohrman et al.’s (1977) Mohrman–Cooke–Mohrman job satisfaction survey (MCMJSS) also was administered to measure the teachers’ job satisfaction. The data was formatted using Qualtrics survey software and all data were analyzed in SPSS v. 24. The results from the data analysis indicated that teachers do perceive their school leaders’ behavior reflects servant leadership characteristics and also showed a significant positive correlation between teachers’ perceptions of their principals’ servant leadership and their job satisfaction. The findings of this study indicate that the positive correlation between servant leadership and job satisfaction. This field of research can continue to examine if this relationship exists as an embedded part of specific cultures or if it is inherently true that those who lead through service contribute to a greater sense of job satisfaction despite any differences in job category, pay scales, or cultural differences. Moreover, the results were consistent with the theoretical framework with respect to servant leadership theory and job satisfaction, and with the results of previous research.

INTRODUCTION

Educators’ relationship with their principals is an integral aspect in job satisfaction (Quinn & Andrews, 2004). Guarino et al. (2006) suggested that leaders in education are the most successful when they have the ability to build stronger, more cooperative, and effective environments in schools. Many of the principal’s behaviors optimize educators’ job satisfaction, including cooperative interactions, effective communication skills, and positive tone (Porter, Wrench, & Hoskinson, 2007). It is not possible for every manager to be a good leader; however, every leader generally should be able to demonstrate good management skills and knowledge (Sigford, 2005), and understand the value of effective management (Huber, 2010). Stoten (2013) argued that the investigation of different factors in servant leadership can be conducted to identify the appropriate national cultural values and present practices in the management of education. In Turkey, Cerit (2009) found proof of a positive relationship between job recommendation, satisfaction, and servant leadership that stimulated further studies in several other countries to confirm his findings. Williams (2012) investigated a number of significant factors that enhanced teachers’ job satisfaction, including perceptions, expectancy, class size, principal and collegial support, salary, professional development, and discipline issues. Servant leadership has attracted much attention in organizations worldwide. An employee’s job satisfaction is essential to face dynamic challenges and maintain organizational productivity by keeping the workforce engaged and motivated. Rewards, recognition, and other intrinsic and extrinsic motivations are related significantly to the outcome of teachers’ job satisfaction. Thus, every organization should develop policies that strengthen the work environment and enhance employees’ satisfaction to increase their performance and productivity. Alternatively, it also can be predicted that job satisfaction has no positive relation with servant leadership, and instead, servant leadership has a significant and negative influence on job satisfaction. This study predicted many factors related to servant leadership and teachers’ job satisfaction.

This area of study has gained popularity and importance because it improves our knowledge of particular servant leadership behaviors in the public education sector. This information can help enhance leaders’ effectiveness, which could support principals and lead to higher job satisfaction and increased effectiveness on the part of teachers.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena (Burns, 1978; Bass, 2008), and the topic has attracted the attention of scholars worldwide (Northouse, 2015). Advanced scientific studies in this field began in the 20th century (Daft, 1999). However, the concept of leadership dates back to antiquity (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005) and, according to Bass (1981), the study of leadership is an ancient art. Stogdill (1974)
mentions that the Oxford English Dictionary (1933) notes the appearance of the word “leader” in the English language as early as 1300. However, the word “leadership” did not appear until approximately the 18th century. Nonetheless, written rules of “leadership” were discovered much earlier, as early as 2300 B.C. with Egyptian Ptahhotep’s document of instruction (Bass, 2008). Bass noted in his review that “Notions about leader qualities could be found in early Egyptian, Babylonian, Asian, and Icelandic sagas” (Bass, 1990, p. 102; Zaccaro, Kemp, & Bader, 2004). Lao Tzu described the features of effective leaders in Chinese Literature of the 6th Century B.C. In addition, religious texts offer many accounts of leaders who were prophets, priests, chiefs, and kings (Bass, 2008) and leadership continues to be a topic in modern literature: Leadership is a popular topic that is discussed widely, as evidenced by the 18,299 books on leadership in English, French, and Spanish as of April 14, 2005. Google Scholar listed 16,800 books, 95,500 publications, and 386,000 citations related to leadership (p. 6). In fact, defining leadership as it is recognized by a majority of researchers is complicated, because there are a number of methods and approaches to studying and understanding the concept. Moreover, the definition of leadership has evolved over time and in accordance with the ideas of those providing the definition. Studies have revealed that each person who tries to define the concept on their own and did so according to their knowledge of leadership. Stogdill (1974) indicated that “There are almost as many different definitions of leadership persons who have attempted to define the concept” (p. 7). Evans (2010) concluded that “Despite thousands of empirical studies yielding more than 850 definitions of leadership there was still no consensus about it” (p. 4). This is similar to the words democracy, love, and peace, all of which have different meanings to different people (Northouse, 2015). The definitions are used frequently simply to focus on the leader as a person, his/her behavior, effects, or the communication process between a leader and followers (Bass, 2008).

Burns (1978) defined leadership as: “…leaders inducing followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and the motivation, the wants and the needs, the aspirations, and expectations of the both leaders and followers” (p. 19). Gardner (1990) discussed leadership as “…the process of persuasion or example by which an individual induces a group to pursue objectives held by the leader or shared by the leader and his or her follower” (p. 1). Covey (2004) outlined leadership as “…communicating to people their self-worth and potential so clearly that they come to see it themselves” (p. 98). Yukl (2006) defined the word as follows: “Leadership is the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how it can be done effectively, and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish the shared objectives” (p. 8).

Northouse (2015) stated that definitions of leadership are subjective and identified four dimensions of leadership as a basis for developing a working definition. The first is that leadership is a process whereby an individual influences a group of other individuals to achieve a common goal. The second dimension is concerned with the way in which the leader affects followers, as, without influence, leadership does not exist. The third dimension is that leadership occurs in groups. Leadership is about one individual influencing a group of others to accomplish common goals. The final dimension is attention to common goals; leaders and followers work together toward a common good.

Servant Leadership One of the most important leadership theories is Servant Leadership, in which leaders serve their subordinates, put them first, and empathize with, and nurture them (Northouse, 2015). Servant leadership was developed by Greenleaf, who wished strongly to serve others (Greenleaf 1970; Northouse, 2015). In his opinion, serving followers is the essence of ethical leadership and a leader’s primary responsibility (Yukl, 2006). The servant leader “…begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first” (Greenleaf, 1977). Although the term servant leader may have existed earlier, Greenleaf’s definition popularized it (Koganti, 2014). According to Dierendonck and Patterson (2010, p. 5), “Servant leadership is viewed as a leadership style that is beneficial to organizations by awakening, engaging, and developing employees, as well as beneficial to followers or employees by engaging people as whole individuals with heart, mind and spirit.” Servant leadership has generated considerable controversy among scholars, as some consider it a trait, while others view it as a behavior. Further, some writers have focused on the ideal form of servant leadership, while others have focused on what it is in practice. Nevertheless, many publications over the past ten years have contributed to explanations of servant leadership and substantiated its underlying assumptions (Northouse, 2015).

Greenleaf (1904–1990) first described Servant Leadership as it is understood today. He spent 40 years as Director of Management Development at AT&T, where he promoted the first females and Blacks to non-menial positions, and provided them with education. After he retired in 1964, he founded the Center for Applied Ethics, which was renamed the Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership in 1985, and contributed to writing and disseminating information pertaining to servant leadership (Northouse, 2015; Dierendonck & Patterson, 2010; Frick, 2004). Greenleaf served as a consultant for, or guest lecturer at, many institutions, including M.I.T., Harvard School of Business, Ohio University, the Ford Foundation, the R.K. Mellon Foundation, and the American Foundation for Management. He also taught at the University of Virginia. According to Dierendonck and Patterson (2010), Greenleaf’s idea came in the 1960s, “…when he read Hermann Hess’ short novel, Journey to the East—a account of a mythical journey by a group of people on a spiritual quest. After reading this story, Greenleaf concluded that the central meaning of it was the great
leader is experienced first as a servant to others, and that this simple fact is central to his or her greatness. True leadership emerges from those whose primary motivation is a deep desire to help others.” (p. 13) In 1970, Greenleaf published his first essay, The Servant as a Leader, in which he proposed that the best leaders were servants first (Dierendonck & Patterson, 2010; Frick, 2004). Greenleaf wrote many other essays related to servant leadership in business, education, foundations, churches, and society, which were published subsequently in the book, Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness (Frick & Spears, 1996).

In The Servant as Leader, Greenleaf (1991) stated, the servant leader is servant first...It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead...The difference manifests itself in the care taken by the servant—first to make sure that other people’s highest priority needs are served. (p. 7) Wheatley (as cited in English, 2011) mentioned that Greenleaf was a great supporter of servant leadership. Moreover, he argued that leaders had the duty to act as servants to mankind and it was their responsibility to nurture the human spirit. Greenleaf claimed that servant leadership was applicable to people regardless of faith, and secular or religious institutions (Frick, 2016).

Characteristics of Servant Leaders Larry C. Spears (1994, 1995, 1998, 2002, and 2010), who was the CEO of the Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership, defined the ten critical characteristics in Greenleaf’s literature that are central to servant leaders:

**Listening**
Communication skills are very important to leaders, especially servant leaders. Servant leaders start by listening first, as well as listening receptively, showing a commitment to listening to followers, and being attentive to what others say. When servant leaders are listening, they will acknowledge the different viewpoints of followers.

**Empathy**
Spears (2002) wrote that, “The servant leader strives to understand and empathize with others” (p. 5). The most successful servant leaders show and understand what followers are thinking and feeling.

**Healing**
“To heal means to make whole” (Northhouse, 2015, p. 228). The most powerful servant leaders have the ability to heal themselves and followers. Servant leaders care for their followers by dealing with their personal problems. If followers suffer from broken spirits or emotional hurts, servant leaders strive to help make them whole.

**Awareness**
General awareness, self-awareness, attentiveness, and responsiveness are very important to servant leaders. These attributes help them understand themselves and others in terms of ethics, power, and values. This trait also helps the servant leader view cases from a more holistic perspective.

**Persuasion**
Stogdill (1974) proposed that persuasion, as a leadership concept, tends to refer to politics as well as social movements. However, Spears (2002) argued that this trait distinguishes clearly between the traditional authoritarian pattern and servant leadership. A servant leader persuades rather than coerces.

**Conceptualization**
Vision for an organization, the potential to see beyond boundaries, and long-term goals distinguish servant leaders from others. Conceptualization provides servant leaders the ability to adjust goals, as well as to deal with the complex problems of the organization in intelligent ways.

**Foresight**
Not unlike the concept of conceptualization, servant leaders consider what has happened in the past and understand the present. Therefore, they have the ability to make predictions about the future.

**Stewardship**
Servant leaders lead their organizations and followers, as well, carefully and benefit from, and earn the trust of, their communities. Stewardship is a commitment to carry out the needs of others with openness, transparency, and persuasion rather than control.

**Commitment to the Growth of People**
Servant leaders believe that their followers have significant value. Therefore, the servant leader seeks to improve followers professionally and personally.

**Building Community**
Servant leaders should provide a suitable place for their followers, where they feel safe and connected with others and free to express themselves individually.

**Strength of Servant Leadership**
Servant leadership is distinguished from other styles in many ways. A servant leader cares genuinely about serving his/her followers. This approach encourages followers to give the best performance possible. A servant leader does not rely on power to accomplish tasks, but instead shows his/her followers the strength of leading through service, an act that allows them more freedom to achieve their own success. This is characterized by encouraging followers to learn, grow, and develop independence. Servant leadership also is characterized by its unique focus on the success of organizational stakeholders (Walumbwa, Hartnell, and Oke, 2010). Servant leadership emphasizes leaders’ humility to counter hubris, which means that servant leaders allow themselves to be influenced by what their followers say, and thereby are more powerful than those who rule by fiat (Graham,
Job Satisfaction and Leadership Theories

A review of existing literature suggests an informal consensus among experts that any good form of leadership is likely to have a positive effect on subordinates' level of job satisfaction. According to Bavendam (2000), good leadership is among the six most important factors associated with employees' job satisfaction. Randolph-Robinson (2007) found that teachers' level of morale and satisfaction was likely to be higher in an environment in which the school principal demonstrates participative, rather than autocratic behavior.

Employees who work under a transformational leader are likely to be motivated more highly and satisfied with their working environment (Bass & Riggio, 2008). Nyencymbe, Maslowski, Nimrod, and Peter (2016) mentioned that the transactional leadership style is also known to have a positive influence on teachers' levels of job satisfaction. Moreover, they discussed that the transactional leadership style appeals to teachers' self-interest and hence, motivates them to perform better as well as provides greater job satisfaction. It is a common understanding that a satisfied employee is more productive and efficient. However, understanding job satisfaction may not be a straightforward task. Various authors have defined it in different ways, as Table 3 shows. Locke (1976) defined job satisfaction as a pleasurable emotional state that is a direct result of a person's job. Locke (1976) also found a direct relation between job satisfaction and such factors as happiness, creativity, self-esteem, and decreased absenteeism.

According to Davis (1981), job satisfaction is the relation between an employee's expectations of the job and the rewards that the job provides. Job satisfaction affects general life satisfaction because it is an important part of life. Similarly, the effects of job satisfaction can be seen in higher productivity as a direct result of commitment and motivation to perform better (Argyle, 1989). Some authors have viewed job satisfaction as a way to evaluate the job. According to Weiss (2002), job satisfaction can be determined by the way an employee evaluates his/her job and working environment, either positively or negatively. Cetinkanat (2000) and Cerit (2009) believed that job satisfaction is a matter of personal evaluation. Such an evaluation can either be made on the basis of the working environment, such as the relationship with a supervisor, or the job's direct outcomes, such as salary and job security. While different authors provide varying perspectives, all of these viewpoints have a certain degree of significance, and any inconsistency is attributable to the fact that it can be a very wide area to examine.

Theories of Job Satisfaction

Various authors, experts, and researchers have proposed theories related to job satisfaction. The Hawthorne Studies are considered to be among the first on this topic, and provided the foundation for further exploration. The Hawthorne Studies were conducted at the Western Electric Company's Hawthorne Works from 1924 to 1932 (Franke, 1979; Gillespie, 1986) and provided valuable insights about the relation between illumination at the workplace and workers' productivity. The National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences took part in the study, which performed tests on 12,000 company workers. The researchers found no noticeable correlation between the level of illumination and workers' productivity. Surprisingly, however, they found a correlation between positive human interactions and productivity. In 1970, Lawler developed the Discrepancy theory, which is considered to be among the first models of job satisfaction. In his theory, Lawler (1970) argued that job satisfaction is associated directly with the structure of motivation. He believed that this motivation and, hence, the resulting satisfaction, depends on the gap between employees' expectations and their achievements—the difference between what they wanted to achieve versus what they have actually achieved. Moreover, the theory proposes that people in the same job role can have varying levels of satisfaction. Lawler's work was furthered by Lawler, Hall, and Oldham in 1974 when they created a successful job characteristics model, formally called the Growth-Need Strength theory, or the GNS theory. These researchers (1974) concluded that job satisfaction is achieved if the growth needs of the worker match the job characteristics. Furthermore, they claimed that the characteristics of skill variety, task significance and identity, feedback, and autonomy determined an employee's behavior and attitude in the workplace. An employee's perception of the amount of effort required to complete the task versus the actual time taken to do so also had an effect on his/her productivity. An employee was likely to become motivated both intrinsically and extrinsically if s/he had a higher level of productivity than perceived. Herzberg's work in 1968 and 1974 resulted in his Motivation-Hygiene theory. Also referred to as the two-factor theory, it identifies motivating and maintenance factors. According to Wang (2005), an employee is likely to be satisfied per Herzberg's theory if such important motivators as achievement, responsibility, and recognition are present. On the other hand, the absence of maintenance, or hygiene, factors, such as better supervision and healthy relationships with coworkers, is likely to cause job dissatisfaction.

Alderfer's Erga Omnes theory (1969, 1972) is another famous theory related to job satisfaction. According
to this theory, each employee has three types of needs, the fulfillment of which is likely to increase the level of job satisfaction. These needs include existence, such as food, shelter and clothing; relatedness, such as better communication in the workplace, and growth, such as creativity and self-development (Wang, 2005).

**Servant Leadership and Teacher’s Job Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Primary Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Laub</td>
<td>Positively correlated with teacher job satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Hebert</td>
<td>Significant relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td>Positive correlation between level of job satisfaction and perception of participant's servant leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Miears</td>
<td>Linked servant leadership to job satisfaction level among teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Cerit</td>
<td>Positive and significant relationship between servant leadership behaviors of principal's and teachers' job satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Krog &amp; Govender</td>
<td>The effective traits of servant leadership that played an effective role to enhance the job satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Noland &amp; Richards</td>
<td>Servant leadership positively impacts the motivation of the student and teacher in the school environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Servant leadership has the tendency to establish the job satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Various studies have been performed in different ways to determine the relation between servant leadership and teachers’ job satisfaction, as shown in Table 4. As presented by Laub (1999), six constructs of servant leadership correlate positively with teachers’ job satisfaction. While examining the interrelations between perceptions of servant leadership and followers’ job satisfaction, Hebert (2003) found a very remarkable relation between the two. Similarly, Thompson (2003) also found a statistically positive correlation between the level of job satisfaction and perceptions of participants’ servant leadership.

Miears (2004) linked servant leadership specifically to teachers’ level of job satisfaction. He reported further that the level of job satisfaction among individual teachers increased as their perception of the implementation of servant leadership in their schools increased. There also was a noteworthy correlation between principals’ servant leadership behaviors and the corresponding level of job satisfaction among teachers (Cerit, 2009).

Krog and Govender (2015) analyzed the relation between servant leadership and employee empowerment, trust, commitment, and innovative behavior. Altruistic calling; emotional healing; wisdom; persuasive mapping, and stewardship of an organization are some of the traits of servant leadership that played an effective role in enhancing employees’ job satisfaction in various types of organizations. Virtues and morality were considered effective variables linked to the ethics of servant leadership and job satisfaction. Higher employee commitment, trust, and innovative behavior were some of the outcomes achieved by effective servant leadership.

Noland and Richards (2015) explored the effects of teachers’ servant leadership on student outcomes, and found that servant leadership was associated positively with students’ engagement and learning indicators. Students with servant teachers seemed to be more empowered, invested, and confident. These interconnected relations have led to the conclusion that servant leadership influences the motivation of both students and teachers positively.

According to Sun (2016), servant leadership can increase personnel’s happiness and performance, and also tends to establish job satisfaction effectively. The servant leadership style has a significant effect on employees’ innovative performance as well, in that performance control moderated the strength of servant leadership. Servant leadership also has been shown to affect the behaviors of team leaders, and a high level of servant leadership is related directly to employees’ increased autonomy. These positive effects of servant leadership have played various roles within different environments of performance control.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

This chapter explains the methodology that was used for the study, and reviews the research questions, describes the population, and confirms the validity and reliability of the study as well. The purpose of this study was to examine the level of principals’ servant leadership as determined by their teachers, and what, if any, influence this has on their teachers’ job satisfaction. The study used Liden et al’s (2008) Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ), which is a validated survey instrument that identifies seven dimensions of servant leadership characteristics. Mohrman et al’s (1997) Mohrman–Cooke–Mohrman job satisfaction survey (MCMJSS) also was administered to measure the teachers’ job satisfaction.

**Research Design**

The study used a survey and a quantitative, non-experimental, correlational design to address the research questions. Creswell (2012) defined quantitative research as “…an inquiry approach useful for describing trends:
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and explaining the relationship among variables found in the literature” (p. 626). He also defined correlational designs as “…procedures in quantitative research in which investigators measure the degree of the association (or relation) between two or more variables using the statistical procedure of correlational analysis” (p. 21). The independent variable for the study was servant leadership, measured with the SLQ (Liden et al., 2008), while the dependent variable was teachers’ job satisfaction, measured with the MCMJSS (Mohrman et al., 1977). Demographic factors, including teaching experience, educational background, and gender of teachers within the schools, were moderating variables. The study evaluated these variables to determine whether they influenced teachers’ perceptions of their principals and their job satisfaction.

Population
Creswell (2012) defined a population as “…a group of individuals who comprise the same characteristics” (p. 625). The population of the study was teachers in the school, all of whom were invited to participate in the study. Based on the literature review, there is no gender difference in servant leadership styles and servant leadership is not limited to men; Mother Teresa is a famous example of a female servant leader who worked to serve humanity (Fawell, 2007).

The school system is organized with males and females in separate schools, with students, faculty, and administrative staff that have the same responsibilities. Therefore, the study was conducted in both the male and female schools. There are eight public schools: 2 male elementary, 2 female elementary, 1 male middle, 1 female middle, 1 male high, and 1 female high school. The study’s target population was 311. All are similar with respect to the school buildings, curricula, number of teachers and students, and their socioeconomic status.

Data Collection
An online questionnaire with the two instruments was used to facilitate data collection, and was formatted using google form survey software. First, the names, email addresses, and school phone numbers of all school principals and teachers were obtained from the Department of Education websites, after which each was sent an email with the questionnaire attached.

Data Management
All data were analyzed in SPSS v. 24. All of the responses were received digitally and then saved securely. The google form software ensures that the data are not tampered with or manipulated in any way.

Data Analysis
Descriptive statistics, frequencies, means, and standard deviations were used to address research question 1. To answer research question 2, bivariate correlations were conducted and scatter plots were constructed prior to regression analysis that tested the relationship between perceived servant leadership and teachers’ job satisfaction using a two-tailed Pearson correlation.

Thereafter, simple linear regression was performed to examine the prediction of job satisfaction by servant leadership. Multiple linear regression was used to address question 3 and predicted the moderating effects of teaching experience, educational background, and gender on both the perceptions of servant leadership and job satisfaction.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
The purpose of this study was to examine the level of servant leadership of principals as determined by their teachers and what, if any, influence it had on teachers’ job satisfaction. The study took place in a public school and included 8 schools and 311 teachers.

The independent variable was teachers’ perceptions of their principals’ servant leadership characteristics and the dependent variable was the teachers’ job satisfaction. The following research questions guided the study:

1. To what extent do teachers perceive that their school leaders’ behavior reflects servant leadership characteristics?
2. What is the relation between teachers’ perceptions of their principals’ servant leadership style and their job satisfaction?
3. Do teaching experience, educational background, and gender predict teachers’ perceptions of their principals’ servant leadership and their job satisfaction?

This chapter reports the results relevant to the research questions, demographics and descriptive data, and a description of the correlated subscale. To begin the questionnaire process, the researcher contacted the Department of Education and asked for permission to conduct a survey of the teachers. Once permission was obtained, a consent form and questionnaire were sent to each school within the district. A follow-up email was sent after three weeks requesting that those who had not yet participated complete the surveys. Participants responded to a group of demographic questions, as well as 36 questions that combined elements of the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) and the Mohrman–Cooke–Mohrman Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (MCMJSS). All non-demographic items were measured on a 4-point Likert scale that ranged from 1 = strongly agree to 4 = strongly disagree.

Participant Demographics
Percentage of Respondents in General and by Gender
The demographic data provided information important in understanding the associations between teachers’ perceptions of servant leadership and their job satisfaction.

The study’s target population was 311 teachers (N=311).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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158 teachers responded to the survey, for a response rate of 52%. Table 2 illustrates participants’ gender; 81 (51.3%) were male and 77 (48.7%) were female.

**Percentage by Level of Teachers’ School**
Table 3 illustrates the level of schools in which the respondents taught; eighty respondents (50.6%) taught in elementary schools. Nearly twenty-one respondents (13.3%) indicated that they worked in middle schools, and approximately 57 (36.1%) of respondents taught in high schools.

**Percentage of Respondents by Educational Background**
With respect to educational background, Table 4 shows that 133 respondents (84.2%) held a bachelor’s degree. Sixteen (10.1%) received a certificate of specialization after their bachelor’s degrees. Approximately seven (4.4%) of these respondents had a master’s degree, while only two respondents (1.3%) held doctoral degrees.

**Number of Years Teaching**
Table 5 illustrates the distribution of respondents by the number of years they had taught. The final two categories of years taught were combined to reveal eighteen respondents (11.4%) who taught twenty-six years or more, forty-two respondents (25.8%) had worked in education between twenty-one and twenty-five years. Forty-one (29.9%) had been educators between sixteen and twenty years. Twenty-eight (17.7%) indicated that they had taught between eleven and fifteen years. Fourteen respondents (8.9%) had taught between six and ten years, and seven of the respondents (4.4%) had worked in education for fewer than five school years.

**Percentage of Respondents by Number of Years at Current School**
Table 6 provides the distribution of respondents by number of years they have taught at their current school. Three respondents (1.9%) indicated that they had worked for more than twenty-one years in their current school.

**Findings**
The results of the study addressed three research questions. Many studies have been conducted to examine the relation between servant leadership characteristics and teachers' job satisfaction (Cerit, 2009; Hebert, 2003; Krog & Govender, 2015; Laub, 1999; Miears, 2004; Noland & Richards, 2015; Sun, 2016; Thompson, 2003). The results showed statistically significant positive relations between such practices and job satisfaction. A summary of the findings of this study is provided according to each research question.

**Research Question 1**
To what extent do teachers perceive that their school leaders’ behavior reflects servant leadership characteristics? The answer to this question was correlated with the answer to question two to determine the level of teachers’ job satisfaction. To address the first research question, the means and standard deviations for the 28 SLQ statements were calculated. According to Dierendonck and Patterson...
Table 7: Items that Showed the Highest Level of Participants’ Agreement in SLQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Valid Percent Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My principal holds high ethical standards</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal is interested in making sure that I achieve my career goals.</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal can recognize when I’m disappointed without asking me.</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal takes time to talk to me on a personal level.</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Items that Showed the Lowest Level of Participants’ Agreement in SLQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Valid Percent Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My principal puts my best interests ahead of his/her own.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal is always interested in helping people in our community.</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal wants to know about my career goals.</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal would not compromise ethical principles to achieve success.</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 above provides the four items that showed the lowest levels of participants’ agreement. On the other hand, the servant leadership practice item that demonstrated the lowest level of participant agreement was, “My principal puts my best interests ahead of his/her own.” Compared to the rest of the items, the lowest levels of agreement were, “My principal is always interested in helping people in our community,” “My principal wants to know about my career goals,” and “My principal would not compromise ethical principles to achieve success.”

Research Question 2

What is the relation between teachers’ perceptions of their principals’ servant leadership style and their job satisfaction?

Question two was assessed using the SLQ (Liden et al., 2008) and MCMJSS (Mohrman et al., 1977). To address research question two, servant leadership dimensions (Liden et al., 2008) were correlated with job satisfaction dimensions (Mohrman et al., 1977). Each item of the MCMJSS was correlated with each dimension of the SLQ. Further, simple linear regression was performed to examine the prediction of job satisfaction by servant leadership. The findings revealed a significant positive correlation between teachers’ perceptions of their principals’ servant leadership and their job satisfaction. The r values were greater than the level of significance of .05. The correlation between overall SLQ and overall JS was .816**, indicating that the all job satisfaction statements are positively and highly significant and correlated to all of the servant leadership dimensions.

The findings of this research study were consistent with those of Thompson (2003), who found a statistically positive correlation between the level of job satisfaction and participants’ perceptions of servant leadership. The findings of this study also supported those of Miears (2004), who reported that the level of job satisfaction among individual teachers increased as their perceptions of the implementation of servant leadership in their schools increased. The order of the SLQ dimensions from the highest to lowest mean score was as follows: “Emotional healing,” “conceptual skills,” “empowering,” “helping subordinates grow,” “behaving ethically,” and “putting subordinates first,” while the lowest dimension was “creating value for the community.” On the other hand, the order of MCMJSS items from the highest to lowest mean score was: “the feeling of self-esteem or self-respect you get from being in your job,” “the amount of respect and fair treatment you receive from your supervisors,” “the amount of supervision you receive,” “the opportunity for participation in the determination of methods, procedures, and goals,” “the feeling of being informed in your job,” “the opportunity for personal growth development in your job,” and “the feeling of worthwhile accomplishment in your job,” while the lowest item was “your present job when you consider the expectations you had when you took the job.” Similarly, the results of this study did not differ greatly from those of previous studies of principals who practiced servant leadership behavior and teachers’ job satisfaction. The findings are consistent with previous research (Laub, 1999; Hebert, 2003; Thompson, 2003;
Research Question 3
Do teachers' teaching experience, educational background, and gender predict their perceptions of their principals' servant leadership and their job satisfaction? The purpose of question three was to determine whether selected demographic factors predicted perceptions of servant leadership and their job satisfaction level significantly. The final research question in this study evaluated the moderating variables of teachers' teaching experience, educational background, and gender. Data were analyzed with multiple regressions that compared the demographic factors to the seven SLQ and MCMJSS scores. The results showed that the three variables did not predict the teachers' perceptions of their principals' servant leadership and their job satisfaction.

The findings of this study had similar results like those by Barbuto and Hayden (2011) and Laub (1999), who did not find significant gender differences in perceptions of servant leadership. Furthermore, Bovee (2012) who did not find an effect on teacher job satisfaction by gender and years of experience in education.

CONCLUSIONS
This investigation revealed positive relations among principals who practice servant leadership behavior and their teachers' job satisfaction. Emotional healing, conceptual skills, and empowering were the highest servant leadership dimensions. With respect to job satisfaction, the statement "the feeling of self-esteem or self-respect you get from being in your job" got the highest mean score, followed by "the amount of respect and fair treatment you receive from your supervisors." The statement about "the amount of supervision you receive" also received a higher mean score in comparison to the rest. Moreover, the results were consistent with the theoretical framework with respect to servant leadership theory and job satisfaction, as well as with the results of previous research. Walumbwa, Hartnell, and Oke (2010) considered servant leadership is designated by its unique focus on the success of organizational stakeholders. Similar to the study by Cerit (2009) there was a noteworthy correlation between principals' servant leadership behaviors and the corresponding level of job satisfaction among teachers. The findings of this study expand our knowledge of previous work related to servant leadership and job satisfaction. The findings of this study indicate that the positive correlation between servant leadership and job satisfaction. This field of research can continue to examine if this relationship exists as an embedded part of specific cultures or if it is inherently true that those who lead through service contribute to a greater sense of job satisfaction despite any differences in job category, pay scales, or cultural differences.

REFERENCES
science/journal/00305073


Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). School leadership that works: From research to results. ASCD.


https://journals.e-palli.com/home/index.php/ajebi


Waterman, H. (2011). Principles of servant leadership and how they can enhance practice: Harold Waterman suggests that leaders can obtain the most from their staff and deliver better services by embracing a more egalitarian model of management. Nursing Management, 17(9), 24-26.


