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Abstract

The purpose of this correlational study was to determine the relationship between perceived servant leadership and job satisfaction within 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) program leaders in Maryland. The purpose of the 21st CCLC is to create out-of-school time programs that provide students with academic enrichment opportunities as well as additional services designed to complement their regular academic program. The approach used a quantitative methodology to analyze the relationship between servant leadership characteristics and job satisfaction. The target population for this study were the 21st CCLC program leaders in Maryland. The sample included all program leaders who attended Maryland 21st CCLC quarterly leadership meetings. The participants were asked to complete the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire to assess their level of job satisfaction. The participants were then asked to complete the Servant Leadership Survey to rate their perception of their leadership style. The study results indicate that there is a significant relationship, suggesting that adopting a servant leadership style in 21st CCLC programs may increase job satisfaction and decrease employee turnover.

*Keywords*: 21st century community learning center (CCLC), 21st CCLC program leader, afterschool program, job satisfaction, Minnesota satisfaction questionnaire, servant leadership, transactional leadership, transformational leadership.
Dedication

I would like to take this opportunity to thank those in my life who have supported me unconditionally throughout this tremendous process. Thank you to each of you for believing in me and reminding me to believe in myself. Thank you to the BEST dad in the universe, Warren Safran. I love you Dad. Thank you, Jon and Bridget Safran, my brother and sister, for your unwavering love and support. I love you both to the moon and back. To my brother and sister, Cecil and Alicia Rudd, thank you for loving me, I love you both. Jacqueline Taylor and Audrey Herring, thank you for always encouraging me. To my beautiful aunts, Francine Rudd-Coston, Marcie Dover, and Pat Edmond, thank you for keeping me sane. To the greatest nieces and nephew ever, Nadia, Gabi, and Hunter, I pray this motivates you to always go for your dreams. To Beverly Dover, Delores White, Shirley Jackson, Rosemary Johnson, Margaret Nottingham, Wilma Rudd, and the rest of my ancestors, thank you for paving the way for me.

To my magnificent children, Christopher and Kelsy Coston, you are my greatest accomplishment. I love you more than you will ever know, you are my heart and soul. I have the utmost confidence in each of you to do anything you want in this lifetime. Thank you both for your love and for being the most amazing children ever.

To my beautiful man, Walter Sallee, thank you for your unconditional love, strength, and encouragement. I couldn’t have done this without you. You are my rock. I love you.

Finally, this dissertation is dedicated to my beautiful, incredible mother, Rosemary Safran, who passed in January 2018. You were the first person to ever believe in me. I know you are an angel, shining down on me and will continue to be with me throughout all my life journeys. You will live in my heart forever and a day!

Thank you God!
Acknowledgments

I would like to acknowledge those who helped to make this dissertation possible. My love, Walter Sallee, thank you for everything. To my bestest friend, Dr. Juanita Sharpe, thank you for pushing me to stay on this path. Katherine Taylor, my Sandz, thank you for taking life’s turbulent ride with me. Danielle Susskind, Christy McKenzie, Dawn Jones Kemp, Tawanda Tracy, Rain Pryor, and Shanna Edmond, thank you for your encouraging words. To Glenda Myrick and Dr. Felicia Lanham-Tarason, thank you for stepping into the role of ‘Godmother’. To my bonus mom, Carolyn Sallee, you have truly been a blessing to me, I love you. To the rest of my family and friends, I thank you for your love and support.

Thank you, Wayne Coleman and Sarah Stollak for helping me get past my brain freezes and helping to make this feat possible. A special thank you to a remarkable person, Lyn Schaefer, for being with me every step of the way. I appreciate you more than you know!

I would be remiss if I didn’t say thank you to my Concordia family. A sincere thank you to my very patient dissertation chair, Dr. Chris Jenkins, who helped me navigate through this quest. I express my thanks to the best committee members, Dr. Heather Miller and Dr. John D’Aguanno, for providing direction. Dr. Connie Greiner and Dr. Jaqueline O’Dell, thank you for helping me build the foundation needed to succeed. Renee Leonard, who provided incredible support when I needed it most, thank you so much.

Finally, I would like to thank all the 21st CCLC program leaders in Maryland for the hard work you do to provide a safe environment, during non-school hours, for the most vulnerable students to improve academic achievement.
# Table of Contents

Abstract ........................................................................................................................................... ii

Dedication ......................................................................................................................................... iii

Acknowledgments ............................................................................................................................. iv

List of Tables ................................................................................................................................... viii

List of Figures ................................................................................................................................. ix

Chapter 1: Introduction ................................................................................................................... 1

  Background, Context, History, and Conceptual Framework of the Problem ......................... 3

  Statement of the Problem ............................................................................................................. 4

  Purpose of the Study ..................................................................................................................... 5

  Research Questions ....................................................................................................................... 6

  Rationale, Relevance, and Significance of Study ....................................................................... 7

  Definition of Terms ....................................................................................................................... 8

  Assumptions, Delimitations, and Limitations ............................................................................. 10

  Chapter 1 Summary .................................................................................................................... 11

Chapter 2: Literature Review ......................................................................................................... 12

  Conceptual Framework ............................................................................................................... 18

  Review of Research Literature and Methodological Literature .............................................. 19

  Review of Methodological Issues ............................................................................................... 35

  Critique of Instrumentation ......................................................................................................... 38

  Synthesis of Research Findings .................................................................................................. 48

  Critique of Previous Research .................................................................................................... 50

  Chapter 2 Summary .................................................................................................................... 53
Summary of the Results ................................................................. 88
Discussion of the Results ............................................................... 90
Discussion of the Results in Relation to the Literature ......................... 92
Limitations .................................................................................. 94
Implications of Results for Practice, Policy, and Theory ......................... 94
Recommendations for Future Research .............................................. 96
Conclusion .................................................................................. 97
References .................................................................................. 99
Appendix A: IRB Approval ............................................................... 116
Appendix B: Statement of Original Work ........................................... 117
Appendix C: Surveys ..................................................................... 119
List of Tables

Table 1. Servant Leadership Characteristics Defined ................................................................. 25
Table 2. Hertzberg two-factor theory Explained .............................................................. 30
Table 3. Demographics ........................................................................................................... 81
Table 4. Regression results for Research Question 1 ................................................................ 83
Table 5. Regression results for Research Question 2 ............................................................ 85
List of Figures

Figure 1. Power analysis output. ........................................................................................................................................72
Chapter 1: Introduction

Servant leadership is a global style of leadership that transcends culture and race. Servant leadership has been linked to job satisfaction. If leaders and their employees are satisfied with their job, turnover is less likely and increased job performance is more likely. Leaders in afterschool programs are responsible for the children left in their care. The leaders provide a safe haven for students, as well as, provide academic support (Maryland State Department of Education, 2015b). Studies have shown a link between leadership behaviors and student outcomes (Bolkan, Goodby, & Griffin, 2011; Noland & Richards, 2014). These studies have evolved into research on the relationship between specific leadership theories and leadership behaviors on student outcomes such as learning, motivation, engagement, and satisfaction (Bolkan, Goodboy, & Griffin, 2011; Horan, Chory, Carton, Miller, & Raposo, 2013).

According to Lamm, Lamm, Rodriguez, and Owens (2015), how people express their leadership styles and the results related to different styles and approaches to leadership has been a topic of discussion. A leader’s authority can range from someone who could have complete control over every decision made, such as a dictator, to the concept that subordinates have the decision-making power, like in a laissez-faire style of leadership. Exploring leadership theories and leadership behaviors makes leadership and job satisfaction an important topic to explore in afterschool programs. According to Hogan and Kaiser (2005), “leadership solves the problem of how to organize collective effort; consequently, it is the key to organizational effectiveness” (p. 169). Northouse (2017) stated, leadership is a process where individuals have influence with a group in order to achieve a common goal.

There are many different leadership characteristics depending on which leadership style is being described. Each leadership style has a different purpose or focus which has evolved over
time. Leadership in the early 20th century (1920s–30s) focused on the fact that leaders are born not made (Darwish & Nusairat, 2008). The idea was that leaders were born with certain traits such as physical appearance, social standing, and emotional stability (Darwish & Nusairat, 2008). According to Nahavandi (2000), it was ultimately determined that traits had an insignificant role in determining leader effectiveness. This was due to two primary reasons—the studies fell short in the areas of identifying the common characteristics of successful leaders and none of the studies were able to identify leaders from non-leaders.

Next, in the 1940s–1960s, behavioral theories of leadership were the focus of determining if there were common behaviors observable among effective leaders (Darwish & Nusairat, 2008), such as democratic, leadership where employees are involved in the decision-making process with leadership; autocratic, where leadership makes all of the decisions; and laissez-faire, where leadership has very little involvement and leaves the majority of decision-making up to the team. In this same time period, there were studies to determine if there were situational variables in which leadership effectiveness depends on whether followers accept or reject a leader and the extent to which followers have the ability and willingness to accomplish a specific task (Nahavandi, 2000; & Robbins & Cutler, 2002). Eventually, Fiedler (1967) developed a contingency model for leadership based on the hypothesis that different leadership styles were effective in different situations (Darwish & Nusairat, 2008). Fiedler’s (1967) model suggested that to improve the organizational performance one could change the leader to fit the environment or attempt to change the situation to fit the leader's basic style (Robbins & Coulter, 2002).

Greenleaf (1977) discussed the need for a better approach to leadership, one that puts serving others, including employees, customers, and community as the number one priority. This
study seeks to add to this research by analyzing a specific kind of leadership, servant leadership, and how it relates to job satisfaction. This study will explore how servant leadership has specific characteristics which may assist in improving a program or organization.

**Background, Context, History, and Conceptual Framework of the Problem**

Leadership is a phenomenon that has been studied over the years. According to Hogan and Kaiser, “Good leadership promotes effective team and group performance, which in turn enhances the wellbeing of the incumbents: bad leadership degrades the quality of life for everyone associated with it” (p. 169). This study will focus on servant leadership. According to Greenleaf (1970), the leader is servant first in servant leadership. “The leaders’ focus is to make the person served more competent to meet their needs and be better equipped to serve the organization and society in general” (Black, 2010, pp. 439–440). The strengths of a servant leader are: (a) the belief that visioning is not everything but is the beginning of everything, (b) the ability to expend energy to listen, (c) the belief in being a talent scout and committing to staff’s success, (d) the belief that it is good to give away power, and (e) the desire to be a community builder (Boone & Makhani, 2012). According to Gini and Green (2014), “Leadership, like stewardship, always aims at positive change in the life of an organization or a community” (p. 439). In all situations, a good leader acts as an agent of change and can motivate those around them.

There have been many studies over the last 40 years that have tried to identify the specific characteristics of servant leaders. Greenleaf (1977) stated that, “it begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first” (p. 52). Dierendonck and Nuijten (2011) identified empowerment, humility, authenticity, forgiveness, courage, accountability, and stewardship as key characteristics of servant leadership. Sendjaya, Sarros, and Santora (2008) recognized
transforming influence, transcendental spirituality, voluntary subordination, convenantal relationship, and authentic self as key characteristics; they also created a measurement tool using these six characteristics which has not been tested for reliability to date.

According to Dennis and Bocarnea (2005), empowerment, trust, humility, \textit{agapago} (love), and vision are key characteristics of servant leadership. Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) acknowledged emotional healing, organizational stewardship, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and altruistic calling as the key characteristics; while Wong, Davey, and Church (2007) credited serving and helping others, humility and selflessness, integrity and authenticity as key elements. Laub (1999), who created a tool to measure servant leadership which has been tested to be both valid and reliable, has identified the following key characteristics for servant leadership: developing people, sharing leadership, authenticity, valuing people, providing leadership, and building community. Liden, Wayne, Zhao, and Henderson (2008) also created a valid, reliable tool to measure servant leadership which was used for this study. Therefore, in this study, the following seven characteristics, as identified by Liden et al. (2008), was used to define servant leadership: emotional healing; creating value for the community; conceptual skills; empowering; helping subordinates grow and succeed; putting subordinates first; and behaving ethically.

\textbf{Statement of the Problem}

Currently, there is a lack of existing research to prove a relationship between perceived servant leadership and job satisfaction with 21st Century Community Learning Center (CCLC) program leaders in Maryland. 21st CCLC programs are designed to provide academic enrichment opportunities for students outside of the traditional classroom setting and hours. There is a high turnover rate in the leadership of the 21st CCLC afterschool programs within the State of Maryland. The leadership turnover rate was 40\% in 2016 as compared to 20\% in 2011.
(Maryland State Department of Education, 2017). It is difficult to retain not only the leaders, but also the teaching staff, within the programs. This turnover has led to 21st CCLC programs in the state not achieving their ascribed goals. At the heart of these programs is support for students, specifically at-risk students. It is important to discover how to stop this turnover and improve the 21st CCLC programs to improve the outcomes for many of Maryland’s at-risk children.

Turnover has been considered a negative indicator of organizational effectiveness (Babalola, Gbadegesin, & Patience, 2013). According to Kashyap and Rangnekar (2016), there is empirical evidence on the relationship between servant leadership and turnover intentions. Stemming from the argument that leadership style affects job satisfaction levels and job satisfaction levels, in turn, impacts the intentions of employee turnover, the authors suggest that perceived servant leadership style leads to decreased employee turnover intentions (Kashyap & Rangnekar, 2016, p. 443).

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this correlational study is to determine the relationship between perceived servant leadership and job satisfaction within 21st CCLC program leaders in Maryland. The study may be of importance to 21st CCLC program leaders for a few reasons: (a) the study may provide insight into areas of dominant servant leadership characteristics of 21st CCLC programs leaders; and (b) the study may provide insight into focus areas for a 21st CCLC pilot leadership training program.

It is widely believed that a good leader is the key to a successful program. With an effective leader, staff members are motivated to do their best and in turn the students are encouraged to learn and make academic gains. It stands to reason that an ineffective leader can promote (intentionally or unintentionally) disarray. According to Branch, Hanushek, and Rivkin
(2013), highly effective principals can raise the achievement of students in their schools by two to seven months of learning in a school year while an ineffective principal can lower the achievement by the same amount. While teachers have a direct impact on students, principals have an impact on the entire school (Branch et al., 2013). Applying this concept to program leaders and the teachers in afterschool programs, the importance of an effective leader becomes even more apparent. Additionally, the literature, as cited above, indicates that servant leadership is a positive form of leadership that may be more effective.

Studies have addressed servant leadership in a variety of settings, such as schools, churches, businesses, and the military, but the literature review exposed a gap in the research related to servant leadership among out-of-school time programs. There has been little research conducted on the relationship between self-perceived servant leadership and job satisfaction within 21st CCLC programs. The Hertzberg two-factor theory can explain the relationship between perceived servant leadership and job satisfaction. This study can provide insight to develop professional development training for potential program leaders for hiring and retention purposes.

**Research Questions**

The following research questions and hypotheses are addressed in this study:

**RQ1.** Is there a significant relationship between the perceived level of servant leadership and the level of overall job satisfaction among 21st CCLC leaders in Maryland?

**Ho1.** There is no statistically significant relationship between the perceived level of servant leadership and the level of overall job satisfaction among 21st CCLC leaders in Maryland.
**H1.** There is a statistically significant relationship between the perceived level of servant leadership and the level of overall job satisfaction among 21st CCLC leaders in Maryland.

**RQ2.** Is the relationship between the perceived level of servant leadership and the level of overall job satisfaction among 21st CCLC leaders in Maryland significantly moderated by age, time on the job, and education level?

**H0.** The relationship between the perceived level of servant leadership and the level of overall job satisfaction among 21st CCLC leaders in Maryland is not significantly moderated by age, time on the job, and education level.

**H1.** The relationship between the perceived level of servant leadership and the level of overall job satisfaction among 21st CCLC leaders in Maryland is significantly moderated by age, time on the job, and education level.

**RQ3.** Does the Herzberg two-factor theory explain the relationship between perceived servant leadership characteristics and job satisfaction of 21st CCLC program leaders in Maryland.

**H0.** The Herzberg two-factor theory does not explain the relationship between perceived servant leadership characteristics and job satisfaction of 21st CCLC program leaders in Maryland.

**H1.** The Herzberg two-factor theory explains the relationship between perceived servant leadership characteristics and job satisfaction of 21st CCLC program leaders in Maryland.

**Rationale, Relevance, and Significance of Study**

Before servant leadership is thoroughly discussed, it is important to understand the setting of the program. Afterschool programming began as early as the 1870s, mostly operating in churches; however, it wasn’t until the early 1900s that schools became a base for afterschool
activities and recreation (Halpern, 2000). During the early years (1870–1910), afterschool activities were focused on informal skill building such as, carpentry, printing, and cobbling, with the added goal of keeping children safe (Halpern, 2000). According to Kremer, Manyard, Polanin, Vaughn, and Sarteschi (2015), afterschool programs support children by increasing academic achievement, school attendance, decrease crime and behavioral issues, and develop social-skills.

According to Afterschool Alliance (2014), over 10.2 million children participate in afterschool programs and over 11.3 million children are without supervision between the hours of 3 and 6 p.m. Eighty-four percent of parents believe that afterschool programs keep kids safe and out of trouble (Afterschool Alliance, 2014). Safety has been a concern for children since afterschool programs began and is still a concern today. The need to keep children safe makes this study very important as 21st CCLC are a key provider of after school programs in this State. According to Afterschool Alliance (2014):

Almost 3 in 4 parents (73%) and 4 in 5 parents of participants (83%) agree that afterschool programs can help reduce the likelihood that youth will engage in risky behaviors, such as commit a crime or use drugs, or become a teen parent. (p. 11) which is why parents want children to participate in afterschool programs. Determining whether servant leaders strengthen these programs then is paramount to saving kids.

Definition of Terms

This section defines key terminology used throughout this study to ensure the reader has the proper understanding of how each term is used.

Twenty-first century community learning centers. An establishment that provides students with academic enrichment opportunities as well as additional services designed to
complement their regular academic program. Community learning centers must also offer families of participating students’ literacy instruction and related educational development. Proposed activities must target students and families of students who attend Title I, Part A school-wide programs (a federal program that provides financial assistance to local school systems and schools with high percentages of poor children to support the academic achievement of disadvantaged students) or schools that serve a high percentage (40% or higher) of students from low-income families. Twenty-first CCLC is a federal formula grant given to all 50 states and then distributed competitively within the state (NCLB, 2002).

**Twenty-first CCLC program leader.** The project director who leads a 21st CCLC program and attends state-level meetings (MSDE, 2015b).

**Afterschool program.** Afterschool programs (also called *out-of-school-time programs*) are programs that occur before school, after school, during the summer, and on Saturdays (MSDE, 2015b).

**Job satisfaction.** Defined in this study as being fulfilled and happy with one’s employment. “A pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences” (Locke, 1976, p. 1304).

**Minnesota satisfaction questionnaire (MSQ).** The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) short form is a 20-question Likert-scale survey developed by Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist (1967) to measure an employee’s satisfaction with his or her job.

**Servant leadership.** Servant leadership is a philosophy and set of practices that enriches the lives of individuals, builds better organizations and ultimately creates a more just and caring world (Greenleaf, 1977). In this study, emotional healing; creating value for the community; conceptual skills; empowering; helping subordinates grow and succeed; putting subordinates
first; and behaving ethically are the characteristic essential for servant leadership (Liden et al., 2008).

**Servant leadership survey (SLS).** Servant Leadership Survey (SLS) is a 28-question Likert-scale survey developed by Liden et al. (2008) designed to assess the degree to which one exhibits servant leadership behaviors.

**Transactional leadership.** Transactional leadership refers to a leadership style in which expectations of an exchange relationship between the leader and follower are clearly expressed by the leader (Bass, 1985).

**Transformational leadership.** Leaders show transformational behavior when they articulate a shared vision of the future, act as role models, encourage the acceptance of collective goals, set high expectations, and when they provide intellectual stimulus and support for the individual development needs of subordinates (Bass, 1985).

**Assumptions, Delimitations, and Limitations**

For the purposes of this study, the following assumptions are identified: (a) all participating 21st CCLC leaders will be honest in reporting their perceptions of satisfaction with their jobs; (b) all participating 21st CCLC leaders will provide responses that are independent of the responses of others; and (c) the evaluator of the surveys will not be biased or prejudiced in the rating of respondent data.

The delimitation in the study is that it is confined to including only 21st CCLC leaders in Maryland. The study does not include program leaders from other states. This will impact generalizing the results to all 21st program leaders throughout the nation.
There is at least one limitation in conducting this research study. 21st CCLC leaders may be impacted by the level of experience as a leader in an out-of-school time program. There is a wide range of the level of experience among the 21st leaders.

**Chapter 1 Summary**

Chapter 1 presented the problem of a high turnover rate of 21st CCLC program leaders. One of the major components contributing to the high turnover rate was identified as job satisfaction (Babalola et al., 2013; Kashyap & Rangnekar, 2016). The proposed leadership model for 21st CCLC programs is servant leadership. The Servant leadership philosophy and set of practices that enriches the lives of individuals, builds better organizations and ultimately creates a more just and caring world (Greenleaf, 1977) may demonstrate a relationship to increased job satisfaction among 21st CCLC program leaders. In this study, emotional healing; creating value for the community; conceptual skills; empowering; helping subordinates grow and succeed; putting subordinates first; and behaving ethically are the characteristic which were evaluated for servant leadership (Liden et al., 2008).
Chapter 2: Literature Review

This chapter explores existing literature on three main topics. The first topic is an overview of servant leadership in the context of historical leadership styles, with attention placed on leadership turnover rates. The second topic is the relationship between servant leadership characteristics and job satisfaction, evaluated through use of the Herzberg two-factor theory. The third topic is the relationship between job satisfaction, leadership retention, and effectiveness of 21st CCLC programs in Maryland. Comprehensive coverage of existing literature within the boundary of these three topics demonstrates the need for further research into the relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction. This was evaluated specifically for Maryland 21st CCLC leaders through use of the Herzberg two-factor theory.

The current atmosphere of afterschool programs in the U.S. will be discussed, with attention given to Maryland 21st CCLCs, to provide context and justification. The 21st CCLCs constantly aim to improve program effectiveness and are in some cases observing negative impacts caused by high leadership turnover rates. This introduction will also include a focus on various leadership styles, and how they relate to the research topic. Three main categories of leadership will be outlined. The first is transactional leadership, in which followers are motivated to carry out the goals of the leader either in exchange for rewards, or in avoidance of punishment. The second form of leadership discussed is transformational leadership, in which a leader aims to transform the values of the followers themselves to align with the goals of the organization. In this form of leadership, the followers are motivated to work towards the goal of the leader because they share the same vision. The last form of leadership to be introduced is servant leadership, where the leader nurtures and fosters the autonomy of the group to accomplish the common goal themselves.
This study explores the idea that effective programs can be established through increased retention of program leaders, and increased retention can be achieved by improving job satisfaction (Thibodeaux, Labat, Lee, & Labat, 2015; Zhang et al, 2015). Furthermore, it is believed that servant leadership characteristics lead to job satisfaction, and studies have shown that job satisfaction leads to increased retention (Babalola et al., 2013; Kashyap & Rangnekar, 2016). This study considers the relationship between perceived servant leadership characteristics and job satisfaction for 21st CCLC program leaders in Maryland. Thus, determining if 21st CCLC leaders are self-perceived as servant leaders, have greater job satisfaction and consequently see greater retention. This research can have a significant impact on the field.

The meaning of leadership is complex. Northouse (2017) defined leadership as a trait, ability, skill, behavior, relationship, and an influence process. According to Northouse (2017) “for some people, leadership is a trait or an ability, for others it is a skill or a behavior, and for still others it is a relationship or a process” (p. 9). Throughout the literature review, it appears that the term leadership includes all of these elements with each one explaining a facet of overall concept of leadership. 21st CCLC leaders share diverse backgrounds. Some are educators, administrators, social workers, or business persons; others work in areas unrelated to education. According to Northouse (2017), there is a strong demand for effective leadership at the local and community levels, as well as nationally. For the purposes of this study, leadership is a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal (Northouse, 2017).

Prior research has supported the evolution of leadership theories, as discussed in the introduction to this study (Fiedler, 1967; Greenleaf, 1977; Nahavandi, 2000). In the first three decades of the 20th century, leadership had a common theme of domination and emphasized that
the leader held the power and the follower should be obedient (Moore, 1927). By the 1930s, leadership was defined by a leader’s traits, including but not limited to personality (Rost, 1991). Another approach in the 1930s was that of the laissez-faire leadership style, first introduced by social psychologist Kurt Lewin, in the study “Leadership and Group Life.” Billig (2015) stated Laissez-faire leadership is a type of leadership where all decisions are made by the followers, with little guidance provided by the leaders. The group approach, leadership by persuasion, and leadership by coercion, were all introduced in the 1940s as forms of leadership which involved an individual involved in directing group activities (Copeland, 1942; Hemphill, 1949). The transactional leadership theory, the idea that leaders give followers something they want in exchange for getting something they want, was first introduced by the German sociologist Max Weber in 1947. According to Rost (1991), three leadership themes dominated the 1950s: continuance of group theory; leadership as a relationship that develops shared goals; and effectiveness. Continuance of group theory defined leadership as what leaders do in a group. Effectiveness defined leadership by the ability of the leader to influence the group.

One view of leadership that became prevalent during the 1960s was that leadership does not come from a universal formula, but that it requires context and adaptability to be successful (Schedlitzki & Edwards, 2017). This type of leadership focused on developing interpersonal relationships and meeting the needs of working groups. The experiences of the leader played an important role in their decision making. For example, John F. Kennedy was given practical training and gained experience in the navy during WWII in Pearl Harbor which had an influence in his decisions made as president of the United States.

The 1970s expanded the behaviors from the 1960s group focus to an organizational approach. Burns (1978), who was instrumental in developing Transformational Leadership,
stated, “Leadership is the reciprocal process of mobilizing by persons with certain motives and values, various economic, political, and other resources, in a context of competition and conflict, in order to realize goals independently or mutually held by both leaders and followers” (p. 425). John Rockefeller is an example of a transformational leader. As the founder of Standard Oil, much of the company, which began as a single refinery, grew into a multimillion-dollar company through acquisitions. Rockefeller had one goal and held everyone accountable for their part in accomplishing that goal.

In the 1980s several leadership themes emerged. Burns’ (1978) transformational process which was initiated in the 1970s was gaining momentum. At this time, Burns (1978) made a clear distinction between transformational and transactional leadership styles. Burns (1978) posited that a series of exchanges of gratification took place for organizational and individual gain between leaders and followers. Peters and Waterman (1982) discussed leadership being based on traits, bringing traits back to the forefront. According to Rost (1991), influence, was the word most often used in leadership definitions of the 1980s. The last theme of the 1980s was ‘do as the leader wishes’, which was defined as followers doing whatever the leader wanted done.

In the 21st century, the definitions of leadership have emphasized the process of leadership rather than a new way of defining leadership. Servant leadership is an example of a process used to define leadership. The power of servant leadership is in the idea to inspire one to collectively be more than the sum of our individual parts. The process of becoming a servant leader means having a clear understanding of one’s strengths and weaknesses. It is the process of improving one’s community and oneself.

This literature review validates why this study’s focus is servant leadership, centralizing on the influence that servant leadership has on job satisfaction and consequently, program
effectiveness. Significant coverage of leadership styles in general is also provided to show that servant leadership characteristics are unique within this context. Understanding the context of this study is critical in understanding its importance.

In 2001, the United States Department of Education (USDE) reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 which became known as No Child Left Behind (NCLB). Title I, Part A of NCLB provides financial assistance to local educational agencies (LEAs) and schools with a high quantity or percentage of children from low-income families, to help ensure that all children meet challenging state academic standards. NCLB also prioritized the 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) Programs as Title IV, Part B (USDE, 2016). Title IV, Part B (21st CCLC) is a formula grant from the USDE to each of the states and the District of Columbia. The states have a grant competition open for local school systems, schools, community and faith-based organizations, and others to partner in order to provide out-of-school time programs for students and families (NCLB, 2002).

Funding for 21st CCLC programs in Maryland increased from $794,000 to approximately $17 million dollars between 1998 and 2017 (MSDE, 2017). One of the elements of the 21st CCLC grants is the requirement for educational agencies to partner with at least one outside organization. “Partners may include local youth development organizations, settlement houses, community centers, childcare organizations, businesses, colleges and universities, and others” (Anderson-Butcher & Ashton, 2004, p. 48). Since most afterschool programs are run by non-profit organizations, there is increased pressure to write grants for funding in order sustain programming.

Title IV, Part B (21st CCLC) is still a fundamental part of the 2015 reauthorization of NCLB now known as Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA, 2015). The purpose of 21st CCLC is
to provide opportunities for communities to establish or expand activities in community learning centers, which provide opportunities for academic enrichment. This is aimed particularly for students who attend low-performing schools, offering a broad array of additional services, programs, and activities. In addition, 21st CCLCs offer families of students served by the center’s opportunities for active and meaningful engagement in their children’s education, including opportunities for literacy and related educational development (ESSA, 2015).

Currently, over 1.16 billion dollars is being given to all 50 states and the District of Columbia for low-income students to participate in 21st CCLC programs across the nation for this fiscal year (USDE, 2016).

The goal of 21st CCLC programs in Maryland is to keep students safe, and to teach not only students, but also their families, how to be successful in all areas of life (MSDE, 2015b). In Maryland, another purpose of the 21st CCLC programs is to enhance family engagement (MSDE, 2015b). The family engagement component requires programs to provide opportunities for meaningful educational development of family members. This includes, but is not limited to, general educational development, college courses, job placement, financial literacy, and other workshops which help family members be more competent in meeting the students’ and families’ needs (ESSA, 2015; MSDE, 2015b).

The results of this study will give education policy developers insight into which leadership characteristics should be emphasized during leadership recruitment and training, to ensure that 21st CCLCs have reduced leadership turnover, and to employ leaders who will effectively run afterschool programs. The knowledge gained from the study will serve as a resource for educational decisions and desired characteristics needed to ascertain leadership to operate effective programs to keep students safe during afterschool hours. The 21st CCLC
leaders will be able to use information from this study for professional development purposes for staff.

**Conceptual Framework**

As has been stated previously, this study will primarily investigate the relationship between perceived servant leadership characteristics and job satisfaction. The Herzberg’s two-factor theory is used to explain the relationship between perceived servant leadership and job satisfaction of 21st CCLC leaders in Maryland. The Herzberg two-factor model, also known as, the motivation-hygiene theory proposed that satisfaction and dissatisfaction with a job were affected by two different sets of factors. The first category was the motivation factors and the second was the hygiene factors. Motivational factors include employee achievement, employee recognition, the difficulty of the work itself, employee responsibility and advancement or the possibility for growth (Herzberg et al., 1959).

Conversely, hygiene factors encompass dimensions of the job role such as company policies, interpersonal relationships, working conditions and salary (Herzberg et al., 1959). The motivation factors are intrinsic, and the hygiene factors are extrinsic to the job. According to Herzberg et al. (1959), motivation factors increase and improve job satisfaction while hygiene factors reduce job dissatisfaction.

The relationship between perceived servant leadership and job satisfaction can be significant to the safety of underserviced youth in Maryland, through the following logical framework. The primary purpose of afterschool programs is to keep students safe between the time when regular school hours end, and the time when parents are off work. According to Hill et al. (2015), approximately seven million school-age children lack afterschool care, and crimes are four times more likely to occur during out-of-school time. Crimes can be avoided if at-risk
youth spend this time in afterschool programs which physically keep them in a supervised space, while enriching them through constructive activities that reduce their motivation to engage in dangerous activities. For this to be possible, there must be effective after school programs in place. Effective programs can be established through quality program leadership, which is achieved through improved leadership retention. Retention is driven by job satisfaction, which can be improved by placing emphasis on servant leadership characteristics during leadership recruitment and training. To summarize: student safety is achieved through afterschool programs, which are effective only with quality leadership. According to Hertzberg’s two-factor theory, leadership quality improves with retention, and retention is driven by job satisfaction. Thus, job satisfaction is improved through servant leadership.

**Review of Research Literature and Methodological Literature**

The goal of this portion of the study is to identify the gap in knowledge pertaining to the relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction as described by Herzberg’s two-factor theory, for Maryland 21st CCLC leaders. To fully demonstrate that servant leadership is unique, and that this gap is not already filled through knowledge of similar, servant-like characteristics in other forms of leadership, a comprehensive review of all significant leadership styles is required. For this reason, existing literature on the major categories of leadership, along with literature on servant leadership, Herzberg’s two-factor theory, and Maryland 21st CCLCs, is all comprehensively reviewed in this section.

The first portion of this literature review will begin with an in-depth examination of leadership styles. Transactional leadership will be examined first, after which a review of scholarship on transformational leadership and servant leadership will be elucidated. Subsequent to the exploration of transactional, transformational, and servant leadership a comprehensive
overview of Hertzberg’s two-factor theory was completed to facilitate a more complete understanding of the framework which guides this study. Within the overview of the theoretical framework, Hertzberg’s two-factor theory will be related to job satisfaction. Finally, this section will end with a summary of key points prior to the next section on the review of methodological issues.

Transactional leadership. “Transactional leadership motivates followers by appealing to their self-interest and exchanging benefits” (Yukl, 2010, p. 263). Employees are motivated to complete a task based on receiving something in return such as pay or other benefits. There is an agreement between the employer and the employee so that each receives something of value. According to Penn (2015), transactional leadership is a contractual agreement between a leader and his follower. There is an expectation of a fulfillment of an agreed transaction on each side of the relationship. The employee completes a desired task and the employer provides a desired reward. If the desired task is not successfully completed by the employee, it is expected that a punishment may be administered by the employer. There are established rewards and punitive systems to enforce positive work behaviors and discourage negative ones. Rewards are given for good work or positive outcomes. Punishment is administered for poor work or negative outcomes. Transactional leaders are effective in getting tasks completed. According to Odumeru and Ifeanyi (2013), transactional leaders are looking to keeping things the same as opposed to changing the future. These leaders are focused on carrying out a project in a specific fashion. Transactional leaders are more task-oriented than people-oriented.

Transactional leadership utilizes a one-size-fits-all universal approach to leadership with rewards and punishments. Burns (1978) originally defined transactional leadership. Bass (1985) expanded on Burns’ idea that employees receive rewards from employers to a cost–benefit
process. There is a connection between transactional and transformational leaders. Burns viewed them on opposite ends while Bass viewed them as separate dimensions. According to Bass (1985), transformational leadership can build on transactional leadership but not the reverse. Northouse (2017) noted that transactional leadership does not focus on the personal development of employees but focuses on the role of supervision, organization, and group performance. It is the best interest of the employees to do what the employers want.

There are four transactional leadership factors: contingent rewards; contingent penalization; active management by exception; and passive management by exception. Contingent rewards are where the employer tries to obtain agreement from the employee on what must be done and what the reward will be for completing the task. The reward can range from intrinsic factors like praise, to more tangible concepts such as money, extra time, or a promotion. Contingent penalizations are given when an employee does not complete a task successfully or performance quality is low. Punishment can be given in a variety of forms such as suspension, no pay, demotion, or termination. Active management by exception engages employees on a regular basis looking for mistakes to make immediate corrective actions while on the job. Passive management by exception, on the other hand, waits until the employee makes the mistakes and then gives a poor performance evaluation. The goal of the transactional leader is to use rewards and punishments to coerce employees to comply (Odumeru & Ifeanyi, 2013).

**Transformational leadership.** Another popular form of leadership is transformational leadership, which was defined by James Burns (1978) and Bernard Bass (1985). Burns and Bass’ work was further developed by Bass and Avolio (Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1990). Transformational leaders transform the personal values of followers to support the vision and goals of the organization. This is done by fostering environments where relationships can be
formed and by establishing a climate of trust in which visions can be shared (Bass, 1985). Yukl (2010) determined that transformational leaders’ foci are directed toward the organization. “The primary focus is on the organization, with follower development and empowerment secondary to accomplishing the organizational objectives” (Stone, Russell, & Patterson, 2004, p. 355).

Avolio et al. (1991) created four primary behaviors that constitute transformational leadership: (a) charismatic influence, (b) inspirational motivation, (c) intellectual stimulation, and (d) individualized consideration. Charismatic influence within transformational leadership is where the leader is viewed as a role model who is respected, admired, and trusted (LePine, Zhang, Crawford, & Rich, 2015). Inspirational motivation is created by the leader by "providing meaning and challenge to their followers' work" (Avolio & Bass, 2002, p. 2). Intellectual stimulation is when leaders stimulate their followers to be innovative and creative when problem solving. According to Avolio and Bass (2002), individualized consideration is when the leader is a mentor or a coach to their followers.

Northouse (2017) posited that transformational leadership “gives more attention to charismatic and affective elements of leadership” (p. 185), elaborating on that further by describing transformational leadership as being “based on a process that changes and transforms people . . . it is concerned with emotions, values, ethics, standards, and long-term goals” (Northouse, 2017 p. 186). According to Chen, Wang, and Lee (2015), there are four “personality characteristics of a charismatic leader which are being dominant, having a strong desire to influence others, being self-confident, and having a strong sense of one’s own moral values” (p. 186).

A college professor may be used as an example of a transformational leader. Upon amassing great power over followers, a transformational leader must take on a great deal of
discretion in its use. Just as leaders have an ethical obligation to their followers, they also have an obligation to transform themselves, if needed. Transformation can only happen if the leader is willing to critically reflect and challenge their assumptions. Leaders must embrace the role and be open to new and different ways of thinking. As a leader one must engage in critical reflection to analyze oneself and ensure they are leading based on the most rational way of thinking and not based solely on their own experiences, beliefs and attitudes. “A true leader is genuinely concerned with the welfare of others and is able to express this concern on a personal level with everyone he or she leads” (Bradberry & Greaves, 2012, p. 9). Being an effective transformational and charismatic leader means constantly transforming.

Although followers have a significant role in transformational leadership, the primary role is for the leader to inspire followers to pursue the organizational goals (Bass, 1985). In order to have followers pursue organizational goals the leader must establish trust. Jung and Avolio (2000) determined that transformational leadership had both direct and indirect effects on performance based on the followers’ trust in the leader and value similarity. Podsakoff, MacKenzie, and Bommer (1996) showed that individualized support (mentoring and coaching) is an important determinant of employees’ attitudes, role perceptions and behaviors. “Followers respect and trust transformational leaders, so they conform their values to those of the leaders and yield power to them” (Stone et al., 2004, p. 3). However, the focus is still on the goals of the overall organization rather than what is intrinsic to one’s personality or what may be more a more effective way of building individuals.

**Servant leadership.** In contrast to transactional and transformative leadership, the idea behind servant leadership is not serving others by doing something for them, but making the person served more capable and proficient to do it themselves. Servant leadership is a global
style of leadership that transcends culture and race. Tischler, Giambatista, McKeage, and McCormick (2016) believed that servant leaders take leadership a step further than other types of leaders by stressing the importance of developing and nurturing the well-being of followers as whole people. In servant leadership, leaders and followers are individuals who are to be lifted to their superior selves (Ljungholm, 2016). Ultimately, the leader is aware of the needs of the organization and hires accordingly but pays attention to the characteristics of the individual being hired and how those characteristics may be a benefit to the organization and the organization to the person.

Many characteristics have been linked to successful servant leaders. Mughal and Kamal (2018) established 10 characteristics as essential for servant leaders: (a) listening, (b) empathy, (c) healing, (d) awareness, (e) persuasion, (f) conceptualization, (g) foresight, (h) stewardship, (i) commitment to the growth of people, and (j) building community. Laub (1999) and Dierendonck (2011) both identified six characteristics of servant leadership. Dierendonck’s (2011) six characteristics incorporate Greenleaf’s philosophy of servant leadership and comprehensively define servant leadership. The six characteristics are empowering and developing people; humility; authenticity; interpersonal acceptance; providing direction; and stewardship. Liden et al. (2008) identified the following seven characteristics: emotional healing; creating value for the community; conceptual skills; empowering; helping subordinates grow and succeed; putting subordinates first; and behaving ethically (see Table 1).
Table 1

**Servant Leadership Characteristics Defined**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Healing</td>
<td>The act of showing sensitivity to others’ personal concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating Value for the Community</td>
<td>A conscious, genuine concern for helping the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Skills</td>
<td>Possessing the knowledge of the organization and tasks at hand so as to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be in a position to effectively support and assist others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering</td>
<td>Encouraging and facilitating others in identifying and solving problems,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as well as determining when and how to complete work tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping Subordinates Grow and Succeed</td>
<td>Demonstrating genuine concern for others’ career growth and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by providing support and mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putting Subordinates First</td>
<td>Using actions and words to make it clear to others that satisfying their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>work needs is a priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaving Ethically</td>
<td>Interacting openly, fairly, and honestly with others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The focus of servant leadership is on others rather than the self (Greenleaf, 1970). The servant leaders’ primary goal is to serve and meet the needs of others (Chen, Wang, & Lee, 2015). According to Greenleaf (1977), servant leaders develop people. Servant leadership, on the other hand, is to serve others to be what they are capable of becoming (Greenleaf, 1977). According to Sendjaya and Sarros (2002), “The motivational element of servant leadership (i.e., to serve first) portrays a fundamental presupposition which distinguishes the concept from other
leadership thoughts” (p. 60). The servant leader serves and leads as opposed to commands and controls.

Empirical studies have found that servant leadership is positively related to outcome variables at the individual, team, and organizational levels (Tischler et al., 2016). Chu (2008), Johnson, (2008), and Svoboda (2008) each determined that servant leadership was positively related to job satisfaction. Al-Mahdy, Al-Harthi, and Salah El-Din (2016) linked a positive correlation between servant leadership and public secondary school performance. Cerit (2009) identified a positive correlation to teacher job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Organizational and leader trust has also been positively correlated to servant leadership (Joseph & Winston, 2005). Tuan (2016) found servant leadership correlated positively with individual job performance. Harwicki (2013) also found a positive correlation between servant leadership and job satisfaction.

A large number of studies have been conducted to investigate the effect of servant leadership on job satisfaction. For example, Afaq, Arshad, and Sajid (2017) found a significant positive impact on teachers’ job satisfaction when they upheld servant leadership attitudes. A sample of teachers were selected from business schools in Kotli, Azad Kashmir. The researchers inferred from these results that by directing attitude and behaviors of their leadership teams towards servant leadership, educational administrators would see an increase in teacher job satisfaction. Alonderiene and Majauskaite (2016) conducted an analysis on the effect of multiple leadership styles on job satisfaction. Seventy-two faculty members as well as 10 supervisors were selected from public and private educational institutions in Lithuania. A survey was conducted among this sample, to investigate how the leadership styles of each supervisor
influenced the job satisfaction within the faculty, not only for other faculty members, but for the supervisors themselves as well.

The results of this study fall well in line with what has been seen in other contexts. A positive correlation was found between several leadership styles and job satisfaction, with the highest positive impact being observed from servant leadership. It was found that autocratic leadership, also known as authoritarian leadership, had the lowest impact on job satisfaction. This is where an individual has complete control over all aspects of the sample’s activity, with little to no input from the followers.

Studies relating servant leadership to job satisfaction are in great abundance. One area that is slightly less explored, is the relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction in environments where staff are unpaid. This is important in the context of this study, as many of the after school program operators may be volunteers. Fung (2017) investigated this topic in the context of unpaid staff of religious educational institutions. He focused on relationships between level of self-funding, servant leadership style, and job satisfaction.

The goal of this study was to explore ways that job retention could be increased, similar to most other studies on this topic. Fung gathered nonexperimental, quantitative data primarily from Black Forest Academy in Kandern, Germany. This school is staffed fully by self-funded volunteers. The methodology in determining the level of servant leadership characteristics was an OLA instrument; a five-point questionnaire consisting of 66 questions.

The results fall in line with their other studies discussed in this section. A strong, positive relationship was found between servant leadership attitudes and job satisfaction. Furthermore, the level of self-funding was found to have an insignificant influence on the relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction. Servant leaders were found to have a deep motivation to
serve for the benefit of the organization, and not for financial gain. This proved that the level of staff funding was not responsible for high turnover, for those acting in servant leadership. This is an important point in the context of this study, as 21st CCLCs do not have a great amount of flexibility in budget and how they allocate funds. A solution to improve leadership retention that does not require higher funding would be very beneficial.

Another area that is slightly less explored, is the effect different leadership styles can have on job satisfaction for employees with mental illness. Given that mental illness is a growing cause of unemployment, this topic is important to consider. Baumgaertner, Boehm, and Kreissner (2018) worked with a large social insurance company in Europe for access to a sample of employees in the first labor market, with diagnosed mental illness. Survey methodology was used to analyze the employees’ job satisfaction before and after an 18-month control period. While this study was not explicitly focused on servant leadership, the results are related. Through hierarchical regression analysis, a significant relationship was found between job satisfaction and relationship quality with leaders, for employees with mental illness. Three of the qualities of servant leadership discussed previously in this section are emotional healing, helping subordinates grow and succeed, and putting subordinates first. These three qualities are strongly relevant to employee-leader relationship quality.

**Transformational leadership and servant leadership.** To be clear, transformational and servant leadership are both people-oriented leadership styles (Stone et al., 2004). According to the concept of both leadership styles, their frameworks incorporate “(a) influence, (b) vision, (c) trust, (d) respect or credibility, (e) risk-sharing or delegation, (f) integrity, and (g) modeling” (Stone et al., 2004, p. 4). Dierendonck, Stam, Boersma, De Windt, and Alkema (2014), determined that both servant and transformational leadership are positively related to
organizational commitment and work engagement. However, the difference is in how the leader motivates and influences his/her followers. Transformational leaders motivate followers by providing a clear vision and encouraging intellectual stimulation (Bass, 1985). According to Rafferty and Griffin (2006), servant leaders emphasize the development and well-being of followers as whole people more than any other style of leadership.

Furthermore, Stone et al. (2004) stated, “The principal difference between transformational leadership and servant leadership is the focus of the leader” (p. 4). The transformational leader is focused on getting the follower to support organizational objectives while servant leaders are focused on the well-being of those who make up the organization. According to Stone et al. (2004), “Anecdotal evidence suggests that transformational leaders rely more on their charismatic attributes to influence followers, whereas servant leaders significantly influence followers through service itself” (p. 6). This study focuses on servant leadership rather than transformational leadership because, according to Greenleaf (1977), educational institutions must utilize all available resources in order to achieve its highest objectives and goals. Servant leadership could be the most favorable leadership model for 21st CCLC programs utilizing the seven characteristics identified by Liden et al. (2008).

**Herzberg two-factor theory.** Herzberg’s two-factor model was developed in 1959 by Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman. The Herzberg two-factor model, also known as, the motivation-hygiene theory, was influenced by Maslow’s hierarchy of needs. Abraham Maslow proposed that motivation was the result of a person attempting to fulfill five basic needs: physiological, safety, social, esteem, and self-actualization. According to Herzberg et al. (1959), satisfaction and dissatisfaction with a job were affected by two different sets of factors. The first category was the motivation factors and the second was the hygiene factors. “Motivation factors
included (1) achievement, (2) recognition, (3) the work itself, (4) responsibility, (5) advancement and (6) the possibility for growth” (Herzberg et al., 1959, p. 12).

In contrast to motivation factors, facets of the job such as company policies, interpersonal relationships, working conditions and salary comprise the hygiene factors (Herzberg et al., 1959). The motivation factors are intrinsic, and the hygiene factors are extrinsic to the job.

Table 2

_Hertzberg's Two-Factor Theory Explained_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Type</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Relationship to Employee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivation Factors</td>
<td>Employee Achievement</td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employee Recognition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difficulty of Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employee Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advancement Opportunity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Possibility for Growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene Factors</td>
<td>Company policy</td>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpersonal Relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Herzberg et al. (1959), motivation factors increase and improve job satisfaction while hygiene factors reduce job dissatisfaction. However, the relationship is not reciprocal. According to Alshmemri, Shahwan-Akl, and Maude (2017), motivational factors can produce job satisfaction, but the lack of motivational factors leads to no job satisfaction. Poor hygiene factors can cause job dissatisfaction, though better hygiene factors can reduce dissatisfaction but cannot cause job satisfaction.
“In the two-factor theory, motivation is the variable most strongly correlated with job satisfaction and Herzberg and his colleagues argued that to increase employees’ job satisfaction the motivation factors must be improved” (Alshmemri et al., 2017, p. 13). The motivation factors are intrinsic and lead to positive attitudes towards the job because they satisfy the need for growth or self-actualization. Herzberg (1966) identified advancement, the work itself, possibility of growth, responsibility, recognition, and achievement as motivation factors related to a person’s job satisfaction. This also begins to show why servant leadership makes sense to study through the Herzberg two-factor lens since the characteristics of the servant leader correlate to the motivation factors.

The first motivation factor is achievement. Achievement can exist positively or negatively. Positive achievement may include completing a task in a timely manner, solving a difficult problem, or saving the company money. Negative achievement involves failing in some way, for example, not making progress on an assignment or poor decision-making on the job.

Secondly, recognition can be either positive or negative. Positive recognition can be given to an employee in the form of praise or rewards for reaching a goal(s) or producing high quality work. Negative recognition may be given as criticism and/or blame for a job done.

The work itself is the third motivation factor. Tasks being too easy or difficult, too boring or very interesting can have a positive or negative impact and effect the employees’ perception of the work itself. The actual content of the job can impact job satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

The responsibility factor includes both responsibility and authority, the fourth motivation factor. In order to gain satisfaction, one must be given responsibility and the freedom to make decisions. Gaps between responsibility and authority can lead to job dissatisfaction (Alshmemri et al., 2017). According to Sanjeevand Surya (2016), advancement can be both positive and
negative. Positive is the upward status or position of the employee in the workplace. Negative advancement is the downward or neutral status at work. Advancement is the fifth motivation factor of the Herzberg two-factor theory.

Lastly, opportunities for personal growth and promotions in the workplace allows for professional growth. The possibility for growth allows for increased chances to learn new skills, new techniques, and new professional knowledge. One could posit this would increase job satisfaction.

Hygiene factors are the other factors in Herzberg’s two-factor theory. According to Herzberg et al. (1959), the term hygiene is used in reference to “medical hygiene which operates to remove health hazards from the environment” (p. 113). The idea is that health hazards are preventable just as employee dissatisfaction is preventable when one considers hygiene factors. According to Alshmemri et al. (2017), hygiene factors reduce the level of job dissatisfaction because they react to the environment and workplace for the need to avoid unpleasantness. Hygiene factors include interpersonal relations; salary; company policies and administration; relationship with supervisors and; working conditions (Herzberg, 1966).

The first hygiene factor, interpersonal relations, includes interactions between the employee and his/her supervisors, subordinates and peers. It includes all interactions whether professional or social in the work environment. These interactions can be either positive or negative.

Salary includes all forms of compensation. Salary increases and/or decreases, as well as, bonuses, should be clearly established. This is true for all company policies and administration. The company policy descriptions may be adequate or inadequate which can be adequately addressed but remedying it may not create satisfaction.
Next, supervision is associated with many factors such as the level of competence, fairness, job knowledge, ability to teach, and the ability to delegate responsibility. The supervisor must be willing to delegate responsibility or to teach the needed skills. According to Alshmemri et al. (2017), a good supervisor can enhance the employee’s level of job satisfaction while a poor supervisor may decrease the level of job satisfaction.

Working conditions, hygiene factor five, includes the physical surroundings such as the facility, work space, ventilation, temperature, safety, and the environment (Alshmemri et al., 2017). Fixing poor company policies; providing effective, supportive supervision; creating a culture of respect for all team members; ensuring competitive wages; and providing job security are all actions which can lead to help eliminate job dissatisfaction. There is no point in trying to motivate anyone until these factors are eliminated.

The influence of motivational practices is important in determining how servant leadership may increase job satisfaction because being not dissatisfied doesn’t mean one is satisfied. According to Herzberg (1959) the motivating factors associated with work need to be addressed in order to be made better and more satisfying.

**Job satisfaction.** Job satisfaction can be defined as “a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences” (Locke, 1976, p. 24). Job satisfaction is an important topic for organizations to study. If leaders and their employees are satisfied with their jobs, turnover is less likely and increased job performance is more likely. Judge and Klinger (2008) found a positive correlation between job satisfaction and job performance. McCarthy, Lambert, and Ullrich (2012) found a positive correlation between employee attitudes and job satisfaction. Pink (2009) determined satisfied employees are self-motivated and seek to accomplish more tasks.
Servant leadership has been linked to job satisfaction (Cerit 2009; Thompson, 2003). More specifically, servant leadership has been linked to teachers’ job satisfaction (Miears, 2004), which indicates that the more a teacher perceived a leader as a servant leader, the higher their level of job satisfaction. Cerit’s (2009) study showed that principals as servant leaders had a significant effect on teachers’ job satisfaction. Thompson (2003) demonstrated a positive correlation between participant’s perception of servant leadership and their job satisfaction. This study will further expand this field of research by determining the impact of servant leadership leading to job satisfaction leading to retention and ultimately program effectiveness.

Ingersoll (2002) discussed the reasons behind the teacher shortage. During that time, concern over teacher shortages opened the door for research on teacher turnover, to determine why teachers were departing at such high rates outside of regular retirement. There were many reasons why teachers were leaving not only the schools in which they were assigned, but the profession itself. Researchers throughout the late 20th century determined that teacher turnover was affected by a number of contextual factors, including the academic field they taught in such as special education, mathematics, and science, as well as the teacher’s age. Higher turnover rates are noticed for younger teachers, which indicates unrest in their position rather than typical turnover reasons such as retirement. More recent studies are focused on the impact of different leadership styles as it relates to turnover and job satisfaction (Cerit, 2009; Judge & Klinger, 2008; Miears, 2004; Pink, 2009).

This section provided an in-depth examination on three distinct leadership styles, transactional, transformational and servant leadership. Transactional leadership occurs when employees are motivated to complete a task based on receiving something in return such as pay or other benefits. Transactional leadership is regarded in stark contrast to transformational
leadership in which leaders utilize the personal values of followers to support the goals of the organization.

While transactional and transformational leadership differs greatly, transformational and servant leaderships share similarities. Both transformational and servant leaderships are follower oriented with focus on understanding subordinate persons, however, the way in which transformational and servant leaders motivate employees differ. Transformational leaders motivate employees by facilitating values into clear goal-achieving strategies while servant leaders focus on creating goal achievement through employee wellbeing.

Within the overview of the theoretical framework, Hertzberg’s two-factor theory, servant leadership was related to job satisfaction. Findings from Thompson (2003) demonstrated a positive relationship between participant’s perception of servant leadership and their job satisfaction. This study will further expand this field of research by determining the impact of servant leadership leading to job satisfaction leading to retention and ultimately program effectiveness.

**Review of Methodological Issues**

The existing literature relevant to this study can be summarized within three main categories; job satisfaction and retention, after school programs and student well-being, and leadership, including literature that synthesizes two or more of these categories. This section of the literature review analyzes the most significant sources, with a focus on methodology qualities such as framework, strengths, weaknesses, and risks.

Literature on student well-being and afterschool programs is well supported by surveys, with comprehensive information gathered from parents, students, teachers, and program administrators. Sources in this area are either prescriptive; providing a hypothesis and suggestion
for improved student care, or descriptive; providing an assessment of the current state of student care and afterschool programs. For example, Afterschool Alliance (2014) provides a deep analysis of the current state of afterschool care, including the impacts afterschool programs have on student development and well-being. Attention is placed on what needs to be done, but the practical suggestions do not extend past financial support. This source is primarily descriptive, with a small element included for suggestions. Durlak, Weissberg and Pachan (2010) provide a more prescriptive view, promoting the idea that by focusing programs on activities that foster social and personal skills of youth, after school programs will see a reduction in problem behavior, increase in bonding to school and self-perception, as well as improvement in school grades and academic achievement. Both methodologies used in major literature on afterschool programs and student wellbeing are valuable when looking for potential areas of improvement. The descriptive sources on this topic are strong because they are comprehensive and draw information from a wide net, but they do not provide hypotheses for creative new solutions which is a methodological weakness in the context of this study. The prescriptive sources provide a more elaborate suggestion for improvement; however, many do not extend their scope to include the synthesis between their hypothesis and the explicit next steps to execute their suggestions.

Existing literature on traditional forms of leadership is strong in the element of description and hypothesis, however sources focus largely on the effectiveness of the leadership styles on the organization being led, or goal being accomplished. The significant sources reviewed in this study lack focus on the impact that the leadership style has on the leader themselves, and the enjoyment that the leader has of their position. For example, Deichmann and Stam (2015) posit that transactional and transformational leadership results in increased
organizational commitment, focusing specifically on continuance commitment, a subset of organizational commitment. Northouse (2017) notes that transactional leadership is beneficial as it can be adapted to fit any and all organizations, and that if enforced, it is effective in leading the group to the collective goal. Both sources provide a clear view on what transactional leadership is and whether or not it is effective, however they do not provide insight as to whether it is enjoyable for the leader themselves, or whether transactional leaders experience high turnover.

The methodology used in literature on servant leadership is particularly strong because it focuses not only on the effectiveness of the leadership style, but also on the characteristics that define a servant leader and the individual experience of the leader themselves. Liden et al. (2008) provides a clear definition of servant leadership characteristics, outlining seven qualities that servant leaders possess. By this definition, a servant leader is someone who shows emotional healing, creates value for the community, has conceptual skills, is empowering, helps subordinates grow and succeed, puts subordinates first, and behaves ethically. Furthermore, many sources have explored the relation between servant leadership and job satisfaction, three of which were reviewed in this section. For example, Chu (2008) investigated the potential correlation between servant leadership and perceived job satisfaction for call center employees, finding a positive correlation. Johnson (2008) explored this topic in the context of high-tech employees. Svoboda (2008) investigated the same topic for elementary school principals in Ohio public school districts. Many studies have been published for a variety of environments ranging from the aforementioned high-tech employees or call centers, to hospitals, government divisions, and more. It is important to note here, that these studies share the most similarities with this paper in both methodology and scope. They investigate the potential relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction, for specific environments. A study of this nature has not
been completed for Maryland 21st CCLCs, which is the research gap that this paper intends to fill.

Sources on job satisfaction and retention use an experimental methodology, by either inspecting the current state, or analyzing the results of an imposed change of state. Blackburn, Bunchm, and Haynes (2017) provide a clear description of the current state of the national teacher market in the United States, reaching the conclusion that the perceived teacher shortage is a result of job satisfaction, as opposed to a lack of supply. They elaborate on this, by suggesting that placing more emphasis on improved teacher job satisfaction would increase teacher retention. This study is theoretical, posing a clear hypothesis. Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) created a clearly defined model for job satisfaction, known now as the Herzberg two-factor model. This model describes job satisfaction as being driven by motivational factors such as achievement and recognition, and hygienic factors such as interpersonal relationships and working conditions. The model also differentiates the effect of these factors, specifying that motivational factors increase job satisfaction, while hygienic factors decrease job dissatisfaction. Due to this distinction, the Herzberg two-factor methodology is very useful when assessing job satisfaction.

Critique of Instrumentation

Measures of job satisfaction. Throughout the review of the literature, information on employee job satisfaction has been presented from many sources, each source utilizing differing ways to collect and analyze data. Although many studies employ a qualitative approach to understanding a job satisfaction with the use of interviews, this study used a quantitative methodological approach to better understand the relationship between servant leadership style
and job satisfaction. As such, a review of quantitative instruments to measure job satisfaction was conducted during the literature review.

Many ways have been identified to measure and evaluate employee job satisfaction, however, finding a way to operationalize and define job satisfaction can be challenging for a variety of reasons (Özpehlivan & Acar, 2015). First, a person may be simultaneously satisfied with some aspects of employment and dissatisfied with others (Herzberg et al., 1959). For example, a person may dislike the hours they must work per day but enjoy the workplace culture in which they are employed.

A second reason job satisfaction is so hard to measure is that it is a concept based on an amalgamation of factors that are often subjective to the individual (Alshmemri et al., 2017; Özpehlivan & Acar, 2015). As such, job satisfaction may be comprised of a various number of subscales that are not only difficult to operationalize but may not have the same importance amongst participants (Özpehlivan & Acar, 2015). Thus, one individual may consider commute part of job satisfaction while another person does not. Additionally, measuring job satisfaction is difficult as even discontented employees may not perceive their respective dissatisfaction as notable or important, as often workplace frustration is normalized (Herzberg et al., 1959).

As workplace satisfaction is so difficult to measure, previous research indicated that there exist two distinct approaches to measuring workplace job satisfaction. One approach is to survey participants to rate overall satisfaction as a function of one score (Wanous, Reichers, & Hudy, 1997). In this approach, employees are asked to rate their respective workplace satisfaction with an algorithm developed specifically to create one numeric score of satisfaction, without breaking satisfaction down into subscales or categories (Wanous et al., 1997). Although easy to score, and
results are easy to understand, this approach offers little specificity to which aspects of workplace culture create high or low employee satisfaction (Gillespie et al., 2016).

The other approach to quantifying or measuring job satisfaction is to surveys participants about multiple aspects of job satisfaction in which are added together to create a score (Gillespie et al., 2016). In this approach, each participant can indicate how each facet of their employment impacts overall job satisfaction (Wanous et al., 1997). Although the result of this method is also one numeric value, this value can be broken down and each part can be examined independently (Gillespie et al., 2016). Although this approach creates some issues with scoring between categorical importance, often this multifaceted method to measuring job satisfaction allows for more practical application of results (Gillespie et al., 2016). Results of measuring job satisfaction in this way, creates a more robust understanding to superiors and administrators which seek to target and modify aspects of workplace culture to mitigate employee turnover and improve morale (Munir & Rahman, 2016).

As the first approach to measuring workplace satisfaction is straightforward, little instrumentation has been developed to measure workplace satisfaction as an overall score without dimension. However, researchers have created many different instruments to measure job satisfaction as a function of many different subscales. These instruments include the Jobs Descriptive Index, the Job Satisfaction Survey and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire.

**Jobs descriptive index.** Based on the seminal work of Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969) the Jobs Descriptive Index (JDI) was developed to measure job satisfaction using simple adjectives which were easy for participants to understand. The JDI was created using words that were common amongst previously surveyed individuals when questioned about workplace satisfaction (Smith et al., 1969). These adjectives include bad, good, boring and exciting.
Researchers included easy to understand language to ensure proper understanding by participants and reduce ambiguity throughout data analysis (Lake, Gopalkrishnan, Sliter, & Withrow, 2015).

As the JDI was formed from common previous responses, the JDI measures five subscales of workplace culture through 72 questions (Knicki, McKee-Ryan, Schriesheim & Carson, 2002). Questions within the JDI measure contentment in overall job satisfaction, supervisor support and behavior, salary and other compensatory benefits, interpersonal relationships with peers and opportunity for promotion (Lake et al., 2015).

Although the questions on the JDI are descriptive, they are scored on a three-point Likert-Scale in order to better score overall assessments (Smith et al., 1969). The scores of all subscales are combined to create an overall measure of job satisfaction (Lake et al., 2015).

**Job in general index.** Based directly on the JDI, a quantitative tool known as the Jobs in General Index (JIG) was created for measuring job satisfaction (Lopes, Chambel, Castanheira & Oliveira-Cruz, 2015). The JIG was developed by Ironson, Smith, Brannick, Gibson, and Paul (1989) using easy to understand adjectives similar to the JDI. Additionally, the JIG also creates one composite score from multiple subscales just like the JDI (Ironson et al., 1989). However, the JIG possesses some differences to the JDI (Beebe, Blaylock, & Sweetser, 2009).

First, the JIG was designed to measure long-term job satisfaction, instead of short-term, or immediate, satisfaction like the JDI (Beebe et al., 2009). To accomplish this, the JIG omits any questions regarding to specific aspects of workplace culture (Beebe et al., 2009). The JIG is focused more on measuring long-term job satisfaction and include subscales about customer influence on workplace culture (Lopes et al., 2015). As such, the JIG does not ask participants about subscales related to advancement or interpersonal relationships (Ironson et al., 1989).
These specific subscales were removed as these facets were viewed by Ironson et al. (1989) as too transient, or subjective in nature to really predict overall job satisfaction.

**Job satisfaction survey.** Similar to the JDI and JIG, the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) measures workplace satisfaction through a composite score from a variety of nine subscales (Spector, 1985). Developed by Spector (1985), the JSS is composed of 36 questions scored on a six-point Likert-scale from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.” Questions on the JSS ask participants about compensation, advancement opportunity, the role of supervisors, benefits, workplace rewards, workplace rules or policy, interpersonal relationships with coworkers, interoffice communication and the type of work performed by employees (Batura, Skordis-Worrall, Thapa, Basnyat, & Morrison, 2016).

**The minnesota satisfaction questionnaire.** Although the aforementioned instruments were considered for use within this study, this study will employ the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). The MSQ comes in two forms, the long and short form. The long form consists of 100 questions divided amongst 20 subscales while the short form is comprised of 20 questions which represent all 20 subscales established within the MSQ long form.

Developed by Weiss et al. (1967) the MSQ short form was designed to comprehensively measure job satisfaction. To accomplish this the MSQ short form compiles participant answers from all 20 questions and then a factor analysis is completed. Results of this factor analysis of the 20 items create two distinct, but interrelated measurements of intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction. Once intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction is ascertained, the scores can be integrated with a general satisfaction score to create a measurement of overall satisfaction score.

The short form requires about five minutes for participants to complete 20 questions. Participants are asked to answer questions which are scored using a five-point Likert-scale with
the following choices: Very Satisfied, Satisfied, “N” (Neither Satisfied or Dissatisfied), Dissatisfied, and Very Dissatisfied. Additionally, the highest and lowest scores are adjusted to compensate for a phenomenon known as the ceiling effect. The ceiling effect occurs when a participant does not adequately differentiate between a choice and the same choice with a modifier. For example, when a participant does not differentiate between satisfied and very satisfied. To adjust for ceiling effect, the very satisfied equals 5 and very dissatisfied will equal one.

The MSQ has been utilized in a variety of research and thus has been tested for reliability and validity (Weiss et al., 1967). The manual for the MSQ (1967) reported reliability coefficients for the general satisfaction scale from 0.87 to 0.92. The median reliability coefficient for general satisfaction is 0.90. Weiss et al. (1967) stated, “Other evidence for the validity of the short-form MSQ is available from two sources: (1) studies of occupational group differences and (2) studies of the relationship between satisfaction and satisfactoriness, as specified by the Theory of Work Adjustment” (p. 24). As the MSQ short form has been tested through repeated use in organizational research, the short form of the MSQ has been demonstrated to be reliable and valid.

In addition to being comprehensive and easy to complete, the MSQ was also selected as it has previously been used in research based on servant leadership and job satisfaction (Hashim, Khattak, & Kee, 2017; Heyadari, Saeidi & Danai, 2016; Holcomb-McCoy & Addison-Bradley, 2005; Thompson, 2015). Hashim et al. (2017) utilized the MSQ as part of their research on the impact of servant leadership on job satisfaction amongst 300 teaching faculty in universities of Peshawar, Pakistan. Hashim et al. (2017) opined that the most common type of leadership amongst higher education faculty in Pakistan was authoritarian. As authoritarian leadership is
often defined as leading with little or no input from followers, Hashim et al. (2017) were interested in how servant leadership could influence student outcomes and faculty employment satisfaction. Using the MSQ short-form, researchers found a significant relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction.

In another study, Heydari et al. (2016) sought to examine the relationship between leadership styles and job satisfaction in 210 faculty of Shahed high schools for girls in Tehran. The MSQ short form was used to measure opinions of faculty in relation to aspects of job satisfaction. Results of this study indicated that there was a relationship between service leadership and job satisfaction, and as the MSQ was used successfully, the validity and reliability was reinforced.

Validity and reliability of the MSQ short-form were also reinforced using this instrument in the research conducted by Holcomb-McCoy and Addison-Bradley (2005). Holcomb-McCoy and Addison-Bradley (2005) used the MSQ to examine African-American counselor educators’ job satisfaction and participants’ perceptions of departmental racial climate. Results of that study indicated that African American counselor educators within this study were generally satisfied with their jobs, however, tenure and academic rank were unrelated to job satisfaction.

One final study that utilized the MSQ short form to survey participants to quantify job satisfaction was a study completed by Thompson (2015). Thompson (2015) examined the relationship between servant leadership levels of job satisfaction within 116 educators at a Christian college. Using a Pearson correlation, Thompson (2015) indicated that there was a positive correlation between the demonstration of servant leadership and job satisfaction.

The research completed by Hashim et al. (2017), Heyadari et al. (2016), Holcomb-McCoy & Addison-Bradley (2005), and Thompson (2015) established that the MSQ short-form
is an appropriate tool to examine the relationship between job satisfaction and leadership style, especially servant leadership. Additionally, researchers affiliated with these studies found that the MSQ short form was a valid and reliable instrument. Thus, as the MSQ short form is well validated and reliable and has been demonstrated as effective, the MSQ was used within this correlational study to determine the relationship between perceived servant leadership and job satisfaction within 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) program leaders in Maryland.

**Measures of servant leadership.** Like job satisfaction, measuring servant leadership is not straightforward. First, the definition of servant leadership is not standardized, as it is typically defined by a variety of behaviors and may be both subjective and different in various environments (Liden et al. 2008). As there is no universal definition for servant leadership, constructing instruments to measure this leadership style has long been difficult (VanMeter, Chonko, Grisaffe, & Goad, 2016).

As creating instruments to measure servant leadership is confounded by lack of accepted definition, differing tools have been developed to quantify servant leadership, including the Servant Leadership Behavior Scale developed by Sendjaya, Sarros, and Santora (2008), Servant Leadership Questionnaire by Barbuto and Wheeler (2006), and the Servant Leadership Scale created by Liden et al. (2008). The first approach to quantifying servant leadership is through utilization of the Servant Leadership Behavior Scale (SLBS) created by Sendjaya et al. (2008).

The SLBS was developed by Sendjaya et al. (2008) after an exhaustive literature review of qualitative, quantitative and mixed-methods articles concerned with defining and recognizing servant leadership behavior. Sendjaya et al. (2008), synthesized their findings to establish a measurement tool that contains six different subscales and 35 questions which are distributed
normally between categories. Additionally, as this instrument was created utilizing common themes throughout various servant leadership studies, the subscales of the SLBS encompass facets of service, morality, spirituality and overall leadership behaviors (Sendjaya et al., 2008).

Thus, the subscales of the SLBS include voluntary subordination, authentic self, covenantal relationship, responsible morality, transcendent spirituality and transforming influence (Sendjaya, Eva, Butar, Robin, & Castles, 2019). The SLBS instrument is a valid and reliable method to measure servant leadership, as the SLBS has been used in numerous previous studies. However, the SLBS has been cited as having a defined spiritual undertone which may interfere with the self-report nature of this instrument as not every person values spirituality similarly (Sendjaya et al., 2019). The spiritual facets of the SLBS are omitted in the second approach to measuring servant leadership, utilizing the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) by Barbuto and Wheeler (2006).

The SLQ was developed by Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) after an exhaustive review of previous literature on servant leadership. Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) created the SLQ to be more specific than the SLBS. As such, the SLQ encompasses eleven facets of servant leadership which were most commonly observed within the literature. These factors include empathy, awareness of self, aptitude for healing, personal growth, calling, the ability to listen, ability to conceptualize goals, foresight, the ability to persuade others, stewardship and growth.

After Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) surveyed 80 leaders to aid in constructing validity and reliability, results indicated that the above eleven facets of servant leadership can be categorized into five main subscales. These subscales include selfless (altruistic) calling, emotional healing, wisdom, organizational stewardship and persuasive mapping. Additionally, Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) were able to reinforce similarities between servant and transformational leadership,
organizational loyalty and employee satisfaction. Similar to Barbuto and Wheeler (2006), Liden et al. (2008) sought to refine measurement tools to quantify servant leadership. Liden et al. (2008) aimed to develop a valid, reliable instrument that shortened and condensed the eleven facets of SLBS. To accomplish this, Liden et al. (2008) formulated a tool that measured servant leadership which was easy to use and measured the complexity of this style of leadership.

The Servant Leadership Survey (SLS) developed by Liden et al. (2008) defined servant leadership into seven dimensions instead of the eleven described in the SLBS. These seven dimensions include (a) emotional healing, which involves the degree to which the leader cares about followers’ personal problems and well-being; (b) creating value for the community, which captures the leader's involvement in helping the community surrounding the organization as well as encouraging followers to be active in the community; (c) conceptual skills, reflecting the leader's competency in solving work problems and understanding the organization's goals; (d) empowering, assessing the degree to which the leader entrusts followers with responsibility, autonomy, and decision-making influence; (e) helping subordinates grow and succeed, capturing the extent to which the leader helps followers reach their full potential and succeed in their careers; (f) putting subordinates first, assessing the degree to which the leader prioritizes meeting the needs of followers before tending to his or her own needs; and (g) behaving ethically, which includes being honest, trustworthy, and serving as a model of integrity.

The SLS contains 28 questions which are distributed amongst the different subscales (Liden et al., 2015). Participants that are engaging in the SLS rates their responses to questions on a seven-point Likert-scales (Liden et al., 2014). The SLS is scored using a Likert-scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Scores are then tabulated, and a singular measurement
is created to quantify the degree in which an individual demonstrates servant leadership (Liden et al., 2014). The SLS has been tested for validity and reliability (Liden et al., 2008).

The SLS is the first measure of servant leadership in which the underlying factor structure was developed and confirmed across several fields, including psychology, sociology and theology in two countries (Netherlands and United Kingdom) through previous research completed by Noland and Richards (2015). Noland and Richards (2015) examined the efficacy of servant leadership on student outcomes within the educational systems of the United States, Netherlands and the United Kingdom through the use of an SLR. As research within the SLR indicated that the SLS was a valid and reliable tool, these studies reinforce the validity and reliability of the SLS. Additionally, results of the study completed by Nolan and Richards (2015) indicated that servant leadership does improve outcomes within students examined.

As the SLS has been used in previous research, and boasts high validity and reliability, the SLS was selected for use within this study. The SLS was also selected as for use within this study as the subscales and factors used to measure servant leadership are condensed and easier to understand than either the SLQ or the SLBS. Through the completion of this literature review the appropriateness of the SLS and the MLQ for use within this study were reinforced.

**Synthesis of Research Findings**

Sources on leadership qualities provide a broad understanding of various historical and modern leadership styles, including servant leadership. Job satisfaction, retention, afterschool care, and the Herzberg two-factor model are also covered extensively by existing literature (Alshmemri et al., 2017; Cerit, 2009; Harwicki, 2013; Judge & Klinger, 2008; Miears, 2004; Pink, 2009; Tuan, 2016). The aim of this section is to provide a synthesized overview of the existing literature and findings, and how it relates to the research topic of this paper.
This synthesis begins with an outline of leadership styles with respect to job satisfaction. Many leadership styles exist, with ranging effectiveness in different environments (Alonderiene & Majauskaite, 2016). Servant leadership, a contemporary innovative approach, focuses on leadership as a servantile position, with the primary objective to serve the group being led, fostering skills required for their autonomy. This leadership style has been found to have a positive correlation with perceived job satisfaction, in many environments such as call centers, schools, technology companies, and more (Chu, 2008; Johnson, 2008; Svoboda, 2008).

The second part of the synthesis begins with a view on after school programs. Afterschool programs provide a safe and supervised environment for youth to reside in between when regular school hours end, and when parents are typically finished work and available to take care of them. Twenty-first CCLCs are a form of afterschool programs and are continually looking for ways to improve program quality and effectiveness. This study focuses on Maryland 21st CCLCs. Positive correlations have been found between 21st CCLC program effectiveness, and program leadership retention (MSDE, 2017). Job satisfaction has a strong impact on retention, with much evidence that increased job satisfaction results in increased retention. Relating this back to the first part of the synthesis, it can be posited that by enforcing servant leadership qualities in the recruitment and training of Maryland 21st CCLCs leaders, an increase in job satisfaction, retention, and consequently, program effectiveness, could be observed.

To summarize, in the previous sections, a deep dive of all relevant literature that exists on this topic within the boundaries of a well-defined scope was conducted, including literature on transactional, transformational, and servant leadership, the Herzberg two-factor theory, and Maryland 21st CCLCs. The research was discussed in the subsequent two sections, which analyzed the methodologies used, and synthesized the findings. The existing literature strongly
supports the idea that higher job satisfaction leads to reduced leadership turnover, and that high levels of turnover are negatively impacting the quality of 21st CCLC programs. The methodology used in existing research on servant leadership is strong because it discusses the relationship between leadership style and leadership retention. Many studies conducted in specific environments such as hospitals or tech companies support the idea that promoting servant leadership qualities during leadership recruitment and training, results in higher leadership job satisfaction. A similar study does not exist for Maryland 21st CCLCs, which is the research gap that this study aims to fill.

**Critique of Previous Research**

This section of the literature review provides a critique of existing literature on this topic, focusing on assumptions, discontinuities in framework or logic, scope, risks, and ethical issues. These potential problems will be considered and used as lessons-learned for this study. The existing research is divided into three categories; job satisfaction and retention, afterschool programs, and leadership styles.

Existing literature on job satisfaction and retention has a strength of being very analytical with little to no assumptions. Existing studies are based off of large amounts of collected information such as surveys, retention statistics, and more. For example, Judge and Klinger (2008) employ both correlational analysis and hierarchical regression analysis to collected data, to outline a statistically significant link between job and life satisfaction. Control was given for demographic and socioeconomic factors, allowing the researchers to identify how the levels of job satisfaction varied between different age groups. That methodology is robust, with few risks or assumptions.
In analysis, this study aimed to employ an equally robust approach. Some of the existing literature on job satisfaction and retention, however, has a tendency to employ a current-state or snapshot approach, without deeply considering the historical factors of each individual. For example, Podsakoff et al. (1996) outline the effects of transformational leadership behaviors on employee job satisfaction, as well as other factors such as trust, commitment, and organizational behavior. While analytically robust, that study did not place a large emphasis on the creative factors that may have influenced each individual’s results, instead analyzing the group at a macro level. Afaq, Arshad, and Sajid (2017) found a significant positive impact on teachers’ job satisfaction when they upheld servant leadership attitudes. Locke (1976), however, dove deep into the core nature and potential causes of job satisfaction, investigating at an individual level. This study aimed to uphold a similarly creative, and comprehensive scope.

Literature on after school programs is highly survey oriented. Given that the data collected must come from the general public, particularly underserviced demographics, attention should be given to the sensitive nature of collecting this data. Some of the reviewed literature does not place enough importance on these ethical risks. For example, Durlak, Weissberg, and Pachan (2010) provide an analysis of the impacts that after school programs have had on participants from underserviced areas, focusing on self-perception, bonding to school, social behavior, grades, and academic achievement. The results and framework are discussed comprehensively, however the paper does not include a section outlining how the methodology was cognizant and respectful of the sensitive nature of this topic. Especially given that some of the participants are children, it is important that these topics are considered, and this study will aim to uphold this awareness.
Lastly, research on various leadership styles has strengths and weaknesses that vary between the studies themselves. As previously mentioned, much of the published material on leadership focuses on the results of the leadership style in accomplishing the intended goal but does not extend the scope to include the intrinsic qualities and level of enjoyment experienced by the leader themselves. For example, Deichmann and Stam (2015) outline how both transactional and transformational leadership styles can produce effective results in a wide variety of environments, but do not discuss factors such as leadership job satisfaction, or leadership retention. Literature on servant leadership, however, often synthesizes these two topics, providing a view into how servant leadership can increase job satisfaction of leaders. Svoboda (2008) found a correlation between servant leadership and higher job satisfaction, for principals in Ohio public school districts. This study focused on a very similar topic, in the context of 21st CCLCs, so it will be very important that this synthesis is included.

Across all the literature reviewed, the major weaknesses revolved around scope, and attention to social and ethical sensitivity. These factors will be considered for this study, to ensure that it is robust and comprehensive in filling the existing research gap on this topic. As is described in the introduction to the literature review, the fundamental justification for this research is to improve the effectiveness of afterschool programs, which by nature require sensitivity and attention to ethics in how they are operated. Naturally research conducted in this area should uphold the same level of sensitivity.

To summarize, this section covered a brief critique of previous research, identifying potential issues around scope, logic, framework, assumptions, and more, also outlining how they will be used as lessons learned for this study. Past research on leadership styles had a common flaw in scope, with many studies focusing on certain topics without pursuing synthesis with
surrounding topics. For example, Afterschool Alliance (2014) provided a deep view of areas in underperforming after school programs that can be improved with increased funding, however it did not provide a context on why this funding may be low, or how it could be increased. Literature on servant leadership, with the most parallel framework to this paper however, had no major flaws in methodology.

**Chapter 2 Summary**

Chapter 2 provided a comprehensive backdrop to contextualize and justify the research topic of this paper. The review began with a general introduction of the research topic, which is to identify the components needed to run a successful training and recruitment program for Maryland 21st CCLCs, with the aim of increased leadership retention. This discussion led to an overview of the framework used for this study, which can be summarized as follows. After school programs increase student safety, and these programs see improved effectiveness with quality leadership. Leadership quality increases with retention, which is driven by job satisfaction. Higher job satisfaction is noticed in leaders identified as servant leaders.

Following the introduction of the research topic and framework, a deep dive was conducted of all relevant literature that exists on this topic. The existing literature and its methodology were critiqued and synthesized, and a clear research gap was found. This gap is what affect servant leadership could have on leadership retention, within the context of Maryland 21st CCLCs.

In conclusion, existing literature on leadership, job satisfaction, retention, afterschool programs, 21st CCLCs, and the Herzberg two-factor theory, has all been reviewed within the bounds of a well-defined scope, to identify the research gap and justify the research topic of this paper. It was found that the existing literature provides a strong backdrop with minimal issues in
methodology, each of which will be considered in this study. An investigation has not been conducted to explore the potential relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction of Maryland 21st CCLCs. Given the results of existing literature on servant leadership in relation to job satisfaction, it is expected that Maryland 21st CCLCs could see positive results in leadership retention through the promotion of servant leadership qualities in leader recruitment and training. This is the research gap that this study will fill.
Chapter 3: Methodology

Introduction

The 21st Century Community Learning Centers’ Program (CCLC) leaders are responsible for influencing others to accomplish desired purposes and goals (Spendlove, 2007). 21st CCLC program leaders come from diverse educational backgrounds. Although some 21st CCLC leaders are educators, administrators, and social workers, others are business persons, and some are in areas not related to education. No matter what background they possess, they are expected to create educational environments with complex challenges and expectations for the delivery of academic services to students (Cole, 2010). This is a diverse group of leaders all with the common goal of giving back to their constituents and communities (Maryland State Department of Education, 2015a). While keeping all this in mind, the ultimate goal is to keep students safe during afterschool hours. Children will stay safe if they stay in effective programs. According to Branch et al. (2013), effective programs are established when leaders/staff are retained. Leaders/staff are retained when they have job satisfaction (Cerit 2009). According to Judge and Klinger (2008), leaders and staff find job satisfaction when they are led by those exhibiting servant leadership traits. Therefore, servant leadership characteristics lead to job satisfaction which leads to retention and ultimately to more effective programs that retain and protect children.

Purpose of the Study

As stated in Chapter 1, the purpose of this quantitative study is to determine the relationship between perceived servant leadership and job satisfaction within 21st CCLC program leaders in Maryland. The study may be of importance to 21st CCLC program leaders for a few reasons: (a) the study may provide some insight into areas of dominant servant
leadership characteristics of 21st CCLC programs leaders; and (b) the study may provide insight into focus areas for a 21st CCLC pilot leadership training program.

It is widely believed that a good leader is the key to a successful program. With an effective leader the staff is motivated to do their best and in turn the students are encouraged to learn and make academic gains. When the leadership is ineffective, it can lead to the disarray in an organization. According to Branch et al. (2013), highly effective principals can raise the achievement of students in their schools by two to seven months of learning in a school year while an ineffective principal can lower the achievement by the same amount. While teachers have a direct impact on students, principals have an impact on the entire school (Branch et al., 2013). This concept can be transferred to program leaders and the teachers in afterschool programs. Additionally, this literature indicates that servant leadership is a positive form of leadership that may be more effective.

Many studies have addressed servant leadership in a variety of settings such as schools, churches, businesses, and the military, as discussed in the literature review, but the literature review exposed a gap in practice related to servant leadership among out-of-school time programs. There has been little research conducted on the relationship between self-perceived servant leadership and job satisfaction in order to develop professional development training for potential program leaders within 21st CCLC programs for retention/hiring purposes.

**Research Questions**

The following research questions and hypotheses were addressed in this study:

**RQ1.** Is there a significant relationship between the perceived level of servant leadership and the level of overall job satisfaction among 21st CCLC leaders in Maryland?
H01. There is no statistically significant relationship between the perceived level of servant leadership and the level of overall job satisfaction among 21st CCLC leaders in Maryland.

H11. There is a statistically significant relationship between the perceived level of servant leadership and the level of overall job satisfaction among 21st CCLC leaders in Maryland.

RQ2. Is the relationship between the perceived level of servant leadership and the level of overall job satisfaction among 21st CCLC leaders in Maryland significantly moderated by age, time on the job, and education level?

H02. The relationship between the perceived level of servant leadership and the level of overall job satisfaction among 21st CCLC leaders in Maryland is not significantly moderated by age, time on the job, and education level.

H12. The relationship between the perceived level of servant leadership and the level of overall job satisfaction among 21st CCLC leaders in Maryland is significantly moderated by age, time on the job, and education level.

RQ3: Does the Herzberg two-factor theory explain the relationship between perceived servant leadership characteristics and job satisfaction of 21st CCLC program leaders in Maryland.

H03. The Herzberg two-factor theory does not explain the relationship between perceived servant leadership characteristics and job satisfaction of 21st CCLC program leaders in Maryland.

H13. The Herzberg two-factor theory explains the relationship between perceived servant leadership characteristics and job satisfaction of 21st CCLC program leaders in Maryland.
Research Design

In this study, the relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction amongst 21st CCLC program leaders was addressed. The approach used quantitative data to analyze the relationship between servant leadership characteristics and job satisfaction. This study identified the dominant servant leadership characteristics amongst 21st CCLC program leaders.

According to Privitera (2015), the quantitative method is appropriate when the researcher needs to describe and predict the relationship between variables that are not manipulated. The variables of this study are quantifiable in nature, which further supports using quantitative approach. A strength associated with using a quantitative approach to the problem related to identifying dominant servant leadership characteristics and job satisfaction among 21st CCLC program leaders is the use of objective data to provide clarity. Another strength is both factors of servant leadership and job satisfaction are measurable using surveys. A correlational method is suitable for this study because the factors of servant leadership and job satisfaction are measurable, and the literature indicates a possible association. The correlational analysis of the data can effectively answer the research question. Valid, reliable instruments are available to measure both variables making a quantitative methodology appropriate. The quantitative data obtained in this study will add to the existing body of knowledge on servant leadership and job satisfaction and will serve as a guide for future research for leadership training programs.

Target Population, Sampling Method (power) and Related Procedures

The target population for this study are the 21st CCLC program leaders in Maryland. The sample includes all program leaders who attend Maryland 21st CCLC quarterly leadership meetings. In Maryland, there are no educational leadership requirements in order to run a 21st CCLC program (MSDE, 2015a). Maryland has a grant competition open for local school
systems, schools, community and faith-based organizations, and others to partner in order to provide out-of-school time programs for students and families. Maryland has priorities that make the 21st CCLC programs distinctive from others throughout the nation: (a) Integrate character education in accordance with programs in place in the schools of the target population; and (b) Integrate service-learning in accordance with the Maryland 7 Best Principles (MSDE, 2015, p. 5). Maryland 21st CCLC awards three-year grants ranging from $50,000 to $400,000 per year. Grants are awarded based on what is written in the proposal. The 21st CCLC program leaders in Maryland have a variety of titles such as, but not limited to, Executive Director, Program Director, Program Coordinator, Site Coordinator, and Program Manager. The population included members with varying levels of years of experience, education, age, socio-economic backgrounds, and ethnicity. Since there are currently no specific requirements or guidelines for out-of-school time program leadership in Maryland, the varying levels of education ranged between high school graduates to leaders possessing doctorate degrees. There are over 100 leaders of the 21st CCLC programs in Maryland. There was potential for participation to be high due to the number of leaders per program who were sent to attend the quarterly meeting when the surveys were completed.

Since all participants of 21st CCLC program leadership in Maryland were invited to attend the required quarterly meeting, this was a census sampling. A census is a survey conducted on the full set of observation objects belonging to a given population (Field, 2013). An announcement was made to the target population about the study and they were asked by a third party selected by the researcher to volunteer to participate during a state meeting. Permission to conduct the study was obtained from MSDE, as well as, each participant prior to completing the surveys. Although participation was voluntary, participants were asked to
complete the surveys during each meeting. The survey was conducted via paper/pencil to increase the likelihood of participation. Participants were asked to return completed survey packet, without any personally identifying information, in a sealed envelope to an enclosed box.

**Instrumentation**

*The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire.* The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) short form developed by Weiss et al. (1967) was designed to measure an employee’s satisfaction with his or her job. The short form requires about five minutes to complete 20 questions. The MSQ is scored using a Likert-scale with the following choices: Very Satisfied, Satisfied, “N” (Neither Satisfied or Dissatisfied), Dissatisfied, and Very Dissatisfied. The answers are scored with Very Satisfied equaling 5 and Very Dissatisfied equaling 1. The sum of all responses determines overall job satisfaction score. The MSQ has been tested for reliability and validity (Weiss et al., 1967). The manual for the MSQ (1967) reported reliability coefficients for the general satisfaction scale from 0.87 to 0.92. The median reliability coefficient for general satisfaction is 0.90. Weiss et al. (1967) stated, “Other evidence for the validity of the short-form MSQ is available from two sources: (1) studies of occupational group differences and (2) studies of the relationship between satisfaction and satisfactoriness, as specified by the Theory of Work Adjustment” (p. 24). The short form of the MSQ has been demonstrated to be reliable and valid for measuring satisfaction based on a test–retest correlation of the General Satisfaction scale of the long-form MSQ.

Hashim, Khattak, and Kee (2017) used the MSQ to measure the impact of servant leadership on job satisfaction of teaching faculty in universities of Peshawar. The traditional leadership style in Pakistan universities is authoritarian, therefore, servant leadership was explored. A significant relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction was found.
The MSQ was also used in the Heydari, Saeidi, and Danai, (2016) study to examine the relationship between leadership styles with job satisfaction in Shahed high schools for girls in Tehran with positive results. Holcomb-McCoy and Addison-Bradley (2005) used the MSQ to examine African American counselor educators’ job satisfaction and perceptions of departmental racial climate indicating that African American counselor educators were generally satisfied with their jobs. Over the past 20 years, several researchers have provided support for the validity and reliability of the MSQ (Hirschfield, 2000; Judge, Parker, Colbert, Heller & Ilies, 2001; Schleicher, Watt, & Greguras, 2004).

In 2000, Hirschfield verified the MSQ by comparing the original subscales to recently revised subscales. Hirschfield collected two separate samples of data to further verify the study results. Prior to undertaking the study, Hirschfield (2000) developed revised subscales through critique from notable researchers. After revising the subscales, Hirschfield (2000) tested the validity of both the original and revised scales using factor analysis. Both the new and original questionnaire include scales for both intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction measures. Hirschfield (2000) used multiple hierarchical regression models using variables such as job engagement, satisfaction, number of absences, and other components related to job satisfaction. Hirschfield (2000) found that both the original and revised models were valid. Furthermore, Hirschfield (2000) found that the results obtained from the original and revised models were similar, suggesting validity of the original model through confirmation from the revised model.

A year later, Judge et al.(2001) referred to the MSQ as one of the most extensively validated measures of job satisfaction. The authors state that the advantage of the MSQ is that it is versatile. Researchers can choose to use a long or a short form of the MSQ, which allows the MSQ to be applied in settings where the participants are prepared for high or low levels of time
commitment (Judge et al., 2001). Additionally, these authors state that an advantage of the MSQ is that it includes subcomponents for intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction measures.

In 2004, Schleicher, Watt, and Greguaras used the MSQ for a widespread study on the operationalization of job satisfaction. The authors specifically considered the cognitive consistency of job attitudes and the implications consistent job attitudes had on job performance and employee behavior. They conducted the study in two parts; the first part of the study suggested that consistent job attitudes correlated with job satisfaction and job performance. Conversely, Schleicher, Watt, and Greguaras (2004) found that individuals with inconsistent job attitudes had inconsistent job performance and job satisfaction.

The second part of study was a duplication of the original work, which allowed Schleicher, Watt, and Greguaras (2004) to confirm the original study findings. Both the first part of the study and the second part of the study included 65 full time employees working for a wide range of job industries in the state of California. The average length of employment of the participants was 32 months (Schleicher, Watt, & Greguaras, 2004). Schleicher, Watt, and Greguaras (2004) used two different measurements of job satisfaction to confirm the study results, including the MSQ and the Overall Job Satisfaction Scale (OJS) (Brayfield & Rothe, 1951). Schleicher, Watt and Greguaras (2004) stated that they selected the MSQ and OJS for concurrent use because both measures were closely equivalent in terms of format, reliability, and representation. Additionally, the MSQ was more cognitively based which the OJS was more affectively based. The different approaches to measuring job satisfaction allowed the researchers to triangulate job satisfaction.

Schleicher, Watt, and Greguaras (2004) state that the MSQ is more cognitively based than OJS, though both measures include both cognitive and affective aspects. Practically,
Schleicher, Watt, and Greguaras (2004) assert that the MSQ focuses on what participants believe about different aspects of their jobs. This results on a closer focus on cognition, rather than focusing on how participants feel about their jobs (Schleicher, Watt, & Greguaras, 2004).

Schleicher, Watt, and Greguaras (2004) assert that their determination that the MSQ is focused cognitively is supported by previous research in the field, including work by Moorman (1993). In order to further confirm these classifications, Schleicher, Watt, and Greguaras (2004) surveyed 37 industrial-organizational, social, and cognitive psychologists. According to Schleicher, Watt and Greguaras (2004), all of the surveyed psychologists believed that the MSQ was more cognitively based than the OJS.

The results of Schleicher, Watt, and Greguaras (2004)’s study further confirm the validity of the MSQ. The authors used multiple instruments to test employee satisfaction and found that the results were consistent across all of the utilized instruments. They found that all of the job satisfaction indexes were correlated with job performance. By using multiple tools to determine correlation, they triangulated their results and validated the utilized tools.

More recently, researchers validated the MSQ for use in other countries and with participants from other cultures (Amissh et al., 2016; Keles, 2015; Saner & Eyupoglu, 2015). Amissh et al. (2016) used the MSQ to evaluate factors influencing job satisfaction among participants employed by hotels in Ghana. To determine the factors which influenced job satisfaction among the studied population, Amissh et al. (2016) collected questionnaires from 190 employees. Amissh et al. (2016) used the MSQ to determine job satisfaction levels. Using factor analysis and multiple regression, Amissh et al. (2016) determined that Ghana hotel employees were slightly satisfied with their jobs. In addition to having slight satisfaction levels, Amissh et al (2016) found that pay, supervision, and promotional opportunities were the factors
most associated with employee satisfaction. As a secondary factor, Amissh et al. (2016) found that employees were also influenced to a lesser but significant degree, by job training and promotional training opportunities.

Focusing on North Cyprus, Saner and Eyupoglu (2015) studied job satisfaction among bank employees. They used the MSQ, stating that the measure provided a broad spectrum of data by using 20 facets of the participant’s job. Saner and Eyupoglu (2015) conducted the study using 723 bank employees as participants. From the 702 initial participants, 679 returned valid questionnaires. Analytically, Saner and Eyupoglu (2015) focused on descriptive statistics to determine the level of job satisfaction common among bank employees working in North Cyprus.

Further verifying the validity of the MSQ, Saner and Eyupoglu (2015) state that the MSQ is one of the most widely used instruments for assessing job satisfaction in participants. To validate this claim, Saner and Eyupoglu (2015) reference Scarpello and Campbell (1983). Part of the MSQ’s widespread use is derived from its applicability to many different job sectors. This is useful for researchers undertaking research in lesser-studied fields (Saner & Eyupoglu, 2015).

Saner and Eyupoglu (2015) translated the MSQ from its original English to Turkish for the purposes of the study, and validated the translation using Crobach’s alpha coefficient (internal consistency, 0.92). For the purposes of the study, Saner and Eyupoglu (2015) used the short-form MSQ which focuses on the 20 job facets and explores intrinsic satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction, and overall job satisfaction. The study findings suggest that, overall, bank employees in North Cyprus are moderately satisfied with their jobs (Saner & Eyupoglu, 2015). The employees are satisfied overall, as well as intrinsically and extrinsically. Some common dissatisfaction points among bank employees were responsibility, independence, policies,
advancement, compensation, and human resources management (Saner & Eyupoglu, 2015). Saner and Eyupoglu (2015) found evidence to suggest employee training and heightened advancement opportunities would improve satisfaction.

Focusing on Turkey, Keles (2015) used the MSQ to evaluate job satisfaction among higher education staff. The study population consisted of 68 employees working at a private higher education facility in Turkey (Keles, 2015). Keles (2015) state that the MSQ was developed for Turkish by Baycan (1985). The reliability coefficient for the Turkish conversation from English was .899, suggesting a highly reliable scale (Keles, 2015). Using SPSS, Keles (2015) performed a descriptive analysis and a hypothesis analysis. Keles (2015) determined that, overall, employees at the Turkish higher education facility were satisfied with their jobs. Interestingly, Keles (2015) found no connection between job satisfaction and learned resourcefulness. Learned resourcefulness was the study's primary independent variable, so Keles (2015) rejected the hypothesis.

**Servant leadership survey.** Liden et al. (2008) aimed to develop a valid, reliable instrument that measured servant leadership which was easy to use and measured the complexity of this style of leadership. Currently, there is still not an agreed upon definition for servant leadership which is why a variety of measurements exist. For the purpose of this study, The Servant Leadership Survey (SLS) developed by Liden et al. (2008) defined servant leadership into seven dimensions (also addressed in Chapter 1): (a) emotional healing, which involves the degree to which the leader cares about followers' personal problems and well-being; (b) creating value for the community, which captures the leader's involvement in helping the community surrounding the organization as well as encouraging followers to be active in the community; (c) conceptual skills, reflecting the leader's competency in solving work problems and understanding
the organization's goals; (d) empowering, assessing the degree to which the leader entrusts followers with responsibility, autonomy, and decision-making influence; (e) helping subordinates grow and succeed, capturing the extent to which the leader helps followers reach their full potential and succeed in their careers; (f) putting subordinates first, assessing the degree to which the leader prioritizes meeting the needs of followers before tending to his or her own needs; and (g) behaving ethically, which includes being honest, trustworthy, and serving as a model of integrity. The SLS contains 28 questions. The SLS is scored using a Likert-scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The SLS has been tested for validity and reliability (Liden et al., 2008). It is the first measure where the underlying factor structure was developed and confirmed across several fields in two countries (Netherlands and United Kingdom).

Liden et al. (2008) developed the SLS assessment in two phases. In the first phase of the research, Liden et al. (2008) generated qualities related to servant leadership by utilizing a literature review framework. Liden et al. (2008) developed a list of possible items for inclusion then validated the items using content validation. The result of the literature review was seven dimensions of servant leadership. The initial list of items included 85 elements of leadership which were divided as follows: relationships (8 items), value of community (9 items), empowerment (8 items), subordinate development (10 items), ethical behavior (10 items), conceptual skills (10 items), prioritizing subordinates (12 items), emotional healing (8 items) and servanthood (12 items).

Liden et al. (2008) then tested the resulting dimensions of leadership on a diverse group of student participants. The participants were asked to rank the above-mentioned items in terms of importance and relevancy (Liden et al., 2008). During the study phase of the project, Liden et al. (2008) performed an exploratory factor analysis. The SLS tool comprised of 28 unique items,
including four of the most relevant items from each of the seven dimensions (Liden at el, 2008). Finally, using hierarchical linear modeling, Liden at el (2008) to determine if the identified dimensions of servant leadership explained variances in employee, student, or subordinate outcomes (like job performance).

In 2011, Dierendonck and Nuijten validated the SLS. To validate the tool, the authors conducted a literature review. To accompany the literature review, they conducted interviews with experts. The authors used eight sampling techniques and gathered data from 1571 persons residing in the Netherlands and United Kingdom. They sampled from a diverse group of participants and then conducted an exploratory and confirmatory analysis. Finally, Dierendonck and Nuijten (2011) conducted an analysis of criterion-related validity on the SLS tool at a means of validating servant leadership styles.

Dierendonck and Nuijten (2011) found that the SLS had a high level of internal consistency. The authors determined that the SLS was congruent with other tools designed to test servant leadership. The confirmatory results suggest that the SLS is a valid tool for assessing servant leadership in the studied population (Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011). In addition to retaining congruence with other measures with the same purpose, they argue that the SLS adds additional information to the field of servant leadership studies. Specifically, the SLS had eight dimensional measures across 30 items. The dimensions in the SLS were forgiveness, ability to stand back, empowerment of employees, accountability, authenticity, humility and stewardship of culture. Finally, Dierendonck and Nuijten (2011) concluded that the survey was both a valid and reliable tool for assessing and measuring servant leadership in employees.

In 2016, Green, Rodriguez, Wheeler, and Baggerly-Hinojosa undertook a study to test and validate six commonly used measures for evaluating servant leadership. The SLS was one of
the included instruments (Green et al., 2016). The authors reference Dierendonck and Nuijten’s (2011) above referenced results as support for the validation of the SLS. To further validate the SLS, Green et al. (2016) reference numerous studies which used and validated the SLS, including Parris and Peachey (2013). After reviewing 84 results from 20 different peer reviewed studies, the authors concluded that that the SLS was a valid tool for measuring servant leadership styles in employees.

Interested in validated the SLS for use in an international context, Dierendonck et al. (2017) examined the equivalence of the SLS across eight different countries which spoke different languages. The studied countries included the Netherlands, Portugal, Germany, Iceland, Italy, Spain, Turkey and Finland. In order to determine the relevance of the study, Dierendonck et al. (2017) sampled 5201 respondents across the eight included countries. Specifically, Dierendonck et al. (2017) considered configural invariance, measurement equivalence and structural equivalence. Ultimately, Dierendonck et al. (2017) confirmed the SLS configural invariance across all eight countries and partially confirmed structural equivalence. According to Dierendonck et al. (2017), structural equivalence was confirmable in its entirety when Iceland was removed from the sample. With the inclusion of Iceland, Dierendonck et al. (2017) found only partial equivalence. Dierendonck et al. (2017) state that the lack of consistency for Iceland populations might have been due to cultural or language differences. However, Dierendonck et al. (2017) also state that the variance could have been sample specific and more testing should be done to either confirm or refute structural validity for that population.

Rodríguez-Carvajal et al (2014) further validated the SLS by adapting it for and testing its validity among Spanish speaking people. In order to test the validity of the SLS, Rodríguez-Carvajal et al. (2014) sampled 638 employed individuals from three different Spanish speaking
countries: Spain, Argentina, and Mexico. Rodríguez-Carvajal et al. (2014) performed a confirmatory factor analysis. Though Rodríguez-Carvajal et al. (2014) noted that there were cultural differences among the Spanish speaking countries and the English-speaking countries the model was originally developed for, the differences did not invalidate the SLS as an appropriate tool for assessing servant style leadership. Rodríguez-Carvajal et al. (2014) corroborated the relevance of the eight factors used by the SLS (empowerment, accountability, standing back, humility, authenticity, courage, forgiveness, and stewardship). Across the three sample populations, Rodríguez-Carvajal et al. (2014) found that the adapted SLS had factor loadings, reliability, and convergent validity. Overall, Rodríguez-Carvajal et al.’s (2014) strongly validate the SLS for use among Spanish speaking populations.

The SLS has been used numerous times by researchers studying servant leadership styles in recent years (Noland & Richards, 2015). For example, the SLS was used in the Noland and Richards (2015) study involving faculty and students at a Mid-Atlantic University. This study was an exploration of teacher servant leadership on student outcomes. Noland and Richards (2015) conducted the study using a total of 434 participants. The participants were largely female, though Noland and Richards (2015) targeted a co-ed population in general. Noland and Richards (2015) used a survey for the primary data collection instrument. Based on the results, the evidence showed that servant leadership was an appropriate leadership style for instruction of students at Mid-Atlantic University (Noland & Richards, 2015).

In 2017, Lacoix and Verdorger used the SLS as a tool for assessing servant leadership in the context of healthcare employees. Lacoix and Verdorger (2017) conducted the study in two parts, including 227 employees in part 1 and 222 employees in part 2. Lacoix and Verdorger’s (2017) hypothesis was that, by adopting servant leadership styles, leaders in the healthcare
industry could reduce instances of leadership avoidance behaviors among staff. In order to test the hypothesis, Lacoix and Verdoger used the SLS to gather information on leadership styles and asked respondents questions related to avoidance behavior and ideal leadership styles. Lacoix and Verdoger (2017) found that, for employees with indicated a preference for servant style leadership, leaders exhibiting servant style leadership reduced leadership avoidance. However, instances where employees preferred other leadership styles, servant style leadership did not reduce leadership avoidance for the employee. Lacoix and Verdoger’s (2017) results suggest that servant style leadership does not uniformly reduce leadership avoidance among employees but does reduce avoidance in employees who prefer the leadership style.

Data Collection

In this study, all participants are 21st CCLC leaders within the state of Maryland. Twenty-first CCLC program leaders attend quarterly meetings. The researcher works as the Section Chief for Extended Learning at the Maryland State Department of Education and grant manager of the 21st CCLC Programs. As the researcher/grant manager, it may be a perceived conflict of interest by some participants if the researcher had asked the participants to complete the survey packet due to the fact that the participants may have felt some pressure to participate. To avoid any perceived conflicts of interests, all participants were asked to participate by a third party. The researcher’s name was on the consent form. The third party described the purpose of the study and outlined the steps to participate. The survey packet was presented to all the 21st CCLC leaders to ensure the targeted number of surveys was reached. Each survey and its purpose were clearly explained.

The participants were asked to complete the MSQ to assess their level of job satisfaction. The participants were asked to complete the SLS to rate their perception of their leadership.
Participants were asked to return completed survey packets, without any personally identifying information, in a sealed envelope to an enclosed box in a central meeting location. The researcher collected all enclosed boxes with sealed envelopes at the end of the meeting. Number 2 pencils were given out prior to completing the survey packet to ensure no identifiable measures were used. The researcher left the room while the surveys were completed. The envelopes were locked in a briefcase until data were entered and verified by a third party for accuracy into Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS).

To determine the appropriate sample size for the study in order to achieve desired power, a G*Power power analysis was conducted a priori. G*Power version 3.1.9.2 was used to calculate the appropriate number of participants needed for this study. According to the hypotheses using eight predictor variables in a multiple linear regression model, the appropriate number of participants should have been 109. This is based on an alpha level of .05, a medium effect size of .15, and a power of .80 (see Figure 1). The number indicated is the minimum number of participants needed in order to generate generalizable results. The researcher sought to collect additional responses in case of missing data. If data were missing, the analysis proceeded utilizing listwise deletion in SPSS. In listwise deletion, if any data value were missing from a particular variable, that case/participant was dropped. Listwise deletion enabled for statistical analysis to be performed on a complete dataset. If the minimum sample size was not achieved, bootstrapping was employed which does not have any assumptions about the distribution. It also combated low sample sizes by resampling from the data set several thousand times as set by the user.
Operationalization of Variables

In this study, self-perceived servant leadership was the independent variable (x), and job satisfaction was the dependent variable (y). Creswell (2012) asserted that independent variables are those that (probably) cause, influence, or affect outcomes; they are also called treatment, manipulated, antecedent, or predictor variables. Dependent variables are those that depend on the independent variables; they are outcomes or results of the influence on the independent variables (Creswell, 2012). For the purposes of this study, it was proposed that job satisfaction was
dependent on self-perceived servant leadership characteristics of 21st CCLC program leaders. Factors producing satisfaction can motivate someone to work better (Wahyuni et al., 2014). The Herzberg two-factor theory explained the relationship between perceived servant leadership characteristics and job satisfaction of 21st CCLC program leaders in Maryland based on the dominate servant leadership characteristics and levels of job satisfaction.

Liden et al.’s (2008) SLS survey was used to measure the leader’s perception of servant leadership, the independent variable (x). The SLS contained 28 questions using a Likert-scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The MSQ survey was used to assess job satisfaction, the dependent variable (y). The overall job satisfaction was evaluated using a 5-point Likert-scale survey consisting of 100 questions. The MSQ has been tested for validity and reliability (Weiss et al., 1967).

Shaw and Newton’s (2014) study on teacher retention and satisfaction with a servant leader as a principal from 15 schools in the United States showed a strong correlation between perceived servant leadership levels, job satisfaction levels, and teacher retention rates. The findings have implications for current school leaders. According to Shaw and Newton (2014) The implications include adding content to leadership programs related to servant leadership and its value, specific training for principals and other practicing school leaders as to how to be more servant-like in meeting the needs of teachers, and the development of superintendents and school boards as they hire the next generation of leaders. (p. 106)

If a strong correlation is shown between perceived servant leadership and job satisfaction for afterschool program leaders, specific leadership training related to servant leadership may have implications.
Data Analysis Procedures

The data collected from the surveys were analyzed using a Pearson correlation and multiple regression. Once all scores were tabulated, the researcher created a total score for the MSQ which measures job satisfaction and the SLS. For the MSQ, each of the 20 items had a score of 1–5. Each individual total score ranged from 20–100. For the SLS, each of the 28 items had a score of 1–7. Each individual total score ranged from 28–196. First, a descriptive analysis using frequencies, mean, and standard deviation was conducted. Next, descriptive statistics for subgroups based on demographic variables (gender, age, etc.) were produced. These descriptive analyses informed further analyses.

Pearson correlation and multiple regression was employed in order to address the following research questions:

**RQ1.** Is there a significant relationship between the perceived level of servant leadership and the level of overall job satisfaction among 21st CCLC leaders in Maryland?

**RQ2.** Is the relationship between the perceived level of servant leadership and the level of overall job satisfaction among 21st CCLC leaders in Maryland significantly moderated by age, time on the job, and education level?

Analyzed information from questions, RQ1 and RQ2 was used to address the following question:

**RQ3.** Does the Herzberg two-factor theory explain the relationship between perceived servant leadership characteristics and job satisfaction of 21st CCLC program leaders in Maryland.

Research question one was answered by conducting Pearson correlation which was used to measure the strength and direction of the association between two continuous of interval
variables. There was no distinction between independent and dependent variables when conducting Pearson correlations. In this case, Pearson correlations were conducted to assess the correlations between perceived level of servant leadership and the level of overall job satisfaction among 21st CCLC leaders in Maryland.

There were some assumptions that needed to be tested prior to conducting Pearson correlations. First, normality testing was conducted through investigation of skewness and kurtosis statistics and histogram were investigated to assess normality of the dataset of the two main variables of the study. To determine whether the data followed normal distribution, skewness statistics greater than three indicated strong non-normality and kurtosis statistics between 10 and 20 also indicated non-normality (Kline, 2005). Second, the linearity test involved producing scatterplot of perceived servant leadership versus job satisfaction to determine if there was a linear pattern observed in the graph. Third, checking the presence of outliers was conducted by investigating z-scores of the data set. Z-score greater than 3 or less than -3 was considered to be an outlier.

In order to answer Research question two, multiple regression was employed. The following model was tested in SPSS version 23:

\[
\text{Job Satisfaction} = b_0 + b_1\text{ServantLeadership} + b_2\text{Age} + b_3\text{TimeOnJob} + b_4\text{Education} + b_5\text{Age*ServantLeadership} + b_6\text{TimeOnJob* ServantLeadership} + b_7\text{Education* ServantLeadership}.
\]

The dependent variable was Job Satisfaction, the independent variable was Servant Leadership, and the moderators tested were age, time on job, and education. Moderation was assessed through the significance of the interaction terms Age*ServantLeadership, TimeOnJob* ServantLeadership and Education* ServantLeadership.
Parametric assumptions of multiple linear regression were conducted. Parametric assumptions are those assumptions about the population being analyzed. For multiple regression, these included linearity, the normality of the standardized residuals, homoscedasticity, and multicollinearity. To assess linearity and homoscedasticity, plots of the standardized residuals and the standardized predicted values were examined. If the plots were not curvilinear, then there was no violation of the assumption of linearity (Field, 2013; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2012). Additionally, if the plots form a rectangular pattern, then there was no violation of the assumption of homoscedasticity (Field, 2013; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2012). Kurtosis and skewness statistics were generated in order to assess normality. Finally, the variable inflation factor (VIF) was calculated for each variable to determine if there was a violation in multicollinearity between any two pairs of independent variables in the analysis.

Hierarchical multiple regression had assumptions as well. These included: (a) the two variables involved should be continuously measured using interval or ratio level, (b) there should be independence of errors (residuals), (c) there should be homoscedasticity of residuals (equal error variances, (d) normality or the errors (residuals) should be approximately normally distributed, (e) linearity or there should be a linear relationship between the predictor variable and the criterion variable, (f) there should be no multicollinearity, and (g) there should be no presence of multivariate outlier. If VIF scores are below 10, then there was no violation of the assumption of multicollinearity (Field, 2013; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2012). Outlier detection was assessed through inspection of standardized variables.

**Limitations and Delimitations of the Research Design**

There were certain limitations in conducting this research study. The limitations were as following: (a) participating 21st CCLC leaders were impacted by the level of experience as a
leader in out-of-school time programs; and (b) participating 21st CCLC leaders wanted to be viewed as positive, effective leaders in order to sustain or increase funding opportunities.

The sample was delimited to 21st CCLC leaders in Maryland. Creswell (2012) explained that researchers have limited control in establishing boundaries, exceptions, and qualifications when conducting research. Although a census approach was used, this study was limited to 21st CCLC program leaders in Maryland. The results only allowed for generalization for 21st CCLC program leaders within Maryland and not for all 21st CCLC program leaders throughout the nation.

**Internal and External Validity**

The reliability and validity of the measures used in this study were established through consistent use of the established written procedures described in the management plan of the Institutional Review Board. Both surveys, MSQ and SLS, are valid and reliable. The sample population used was a census population. Participation in the study was optional and all participants remained anonymous throughout the entire study. The data were entered and analyzed during the research study. All data entered was reviewed by a third party for accuracy.

**Expected Findings**

A goal of 21st CCLC programs in Maryland is to teach students and their families to be successful in all areas of life (MSDE, 2015b). Leaders of these programs need to want to serve and provide opportunities for those they serve to become more autonomous (MSDE, 2015a). This study determined the degree to which those in leadership within 21st CCLC programs are self-perceived as servant leaders. Making a connection between how 21st CCLC leaders self-perceived as servant leaders and job satisfaction can have a significant impact on the field. Although Maryland does not currently have leadership requirements or a training program for
21st CCLC leaders, the results of this study will provide the State insight on what areas to include for a leadership training program. The knowledge gained from this study may serves as a resource for educational decisions concerning leadership standards for out-of-school time programs.

**Ethical Issues in the Study**

There were no perceived ethical issues in this study. All guidelines were followed in regard to conducting research with human subjects. Surveys were returned without personally identifying information to ensure participants were not negatively impacted. Each participant received an informed consent form prior to participating which clearly explained that participation was voluntary. As the prior grant manager and funder, it was a conflict of interest by some participants if the researcher asked the participants to complete the survey packet and the participants felt forced to do so. To avoid any perceived conflicts of interests, all participants were asked to participate by a third party.

**Chapter 3 Summary**

21st CCLC program leaders are servant leaders who put their participants and staff first. Many studies examined servant leadership and job satisfaction. Researchers have found a positive correlation between servant leadership and employee job satisfaction in business and educational settings. The goal of this study is two-fold. First, to determine if 21st CCLC program leader perceive themselves as servant leaders and secondly, to determine a correlation between 21st CCLC program leaders' servant leadership and job satisfaction in order to identify dominant servant leadership characteristics for a leadership training program.
Chapter 4: Data Analysis and Results

Introduction

The purpose of this correlational study was to determine the relationship between perceived servant leadership and job satisfaction within 21st CCLC program leaders in Maryland. Turnover has led to less successful 21st CCLC programs in the state. At the heart of these programs is support for students, specifically at-risk students. It is important to discover how to stop this turnover and improve the 21st CCLC programs to improve the outcomes for many of Maryland’s at-risk children. Turnover has been considered a negative indicator of organizational effectiveness (Babalola, Gbadegesin, & Patience, 2013). According to Kashyap and Rangnekar (2016), there is empirical evidence on the relationship between servant leadership and turnover intentions. Stemming from the argument that leadership style affects job satisfaction levels and job satisfaction levels, in turn, impacts the intentions of employee turnover, the authors suggest that perceived servant leadership style leads to decreased employee turnover intentions (Kashyap & Rangnekar, 2016, p. 443).

However, there has been little research conducted on the relationship between self-perceived servant leadership and job satisfaction within 21st CCLC programs. In this study, the independent variable was servant leadership and the dependent variable was job satisfaction. The moderating variables were age, time on job, and education. The SLS survey was used to measure the servant leadership while the MSQ was used to measure both job satisfaction and the moderating variables. Pearson’s correlation analysis and regression analysis were used to analyze the data. A summary of the results concludes the chapter.
Description of Sample

The participants for this study were all program leaders who attended Maryland 21st CCLC quarterly leadership meeting. These program leaders came from various educational background, generational cohorts, socio-economic backgrounds, years of experience, and ethnicity. The program leaders of the 21st CCLC program in Maryland have a variety of job titles such as, but not limited to, Executive Director, Program Director, Program Coordinator, Site Coordinator, and Program Manager. Leaders are to submit proposal to be eligible for grants as program leaders. However, there are no educational leadership requirements in order to run a 21st CCLC program (MSDE, 2015a).

A total of 112 participants participated in the study. However, only 108 were used in the final data analysis. The remaining participants were excluded because of missing responses in one or more survey items.

Most of the participants were females (75.9%). Most of the participants were born in the 1970s (30.6%), followed by those who were born in the 1980s (26.9%) and 1960s (17.6%). Half of the participants hold a master’s degree (50%) and have jobs as site coordinator (16.7%), director (14.8%), program director/manager (10.2%), or program coordinator (9.3%). Majority of the participants have been working in their present for more than five years (38%) and more than five years working in the present line of work (78.7%). Most of the participants are direct supervisors (85.2%) and supervise 10 people or less (53.7%). Table 3 presents the frequency and percentages of the demographical information of the participants.
Table 3

**Demographics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year Born</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940–1949</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950–1959</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960–1969</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970–1979</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980–1989</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990–1999</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest Educational Attainment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate Degree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Title</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Coordinator</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Manager</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Coordinator</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Months in Present Job</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 12 months</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12–24 months</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–60 months</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 60 months</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Months in Present Line of Work</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 12 months</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12–24 months</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–60 months</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 60 months</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you directly supervise?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How many do you supervise?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 10 people</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–20 people</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–30 people</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31–50 people</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 50 people</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Results

Research question one was answered by conducting a Pearson correlation which was used to measure the strength and direction of the association between two continuous interval variables. There was no distinction between independent and dependent variables when conducting Pearson correlations. In this case, Pearson correlations were conducted to assess the correlations between perceived level of servant leadership and the level of overall job satisfaction among 21st CCLC leaders in Maryland.

In order to answer Research question two, a multiple regression was employed. The following model was tested in SPSS version 23:

\[ \text{Job Satisfaction} = b_0 + b_1 \text{ServantLeadership} + b_2 \text{Age} + b_3 \text{TimeOnJob} + b_4 \text{Education} + b_5 \text{Age} \times \text{ServantLeadership} + b_6 \text{TimeOnJob} \times \text{ServantLeadership} + b_7 \text{Education} \times \text{ServantLeadership}. \]

The dependent variable was Job Satisfaction, the independent variable was Servant Leadership, and the moderators to be tested were age, time on job, and education. Moderation was assessed through the significance of the interaction terms, Age\times\text{ServantLeadership}, TimeOnJob\times\text{ServantLeadership} and Education\times\text{ServantLeadership}.

Detailed Analysis

The first research question stated:

**RQ1.** Is there a significant relationship between the perceived level of servant leadership and the level of overall job satisfaction among 21st CCLC leaders in Maryland?

**H01.** There is no statistically significant relationship between the perceived level of servant leadership and the level of overall job satisfaction among 21st CCLC leaders in Maryland.

**H11.** There is a statistically significant relationship between the perceived level of servant
leadership and the level of overall job satisfaction among 21st CCLC leaders in Maryland.

The independent variable was the perceived level of servant leadership while the dependent variable was the overall job satisfaction. A simple linear regression analysis was used to test if the participants’ perceived level of servant leadership significantly predicted the participants’ overall job satisfaction. A significant regression equation was found \( (F(1,106) = 27.249, p < .01) \), with an \( R^2 = .204 \), thus finding sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis. CCLC leaders predicted overall job satisfaction is equal to 89.960 + 0.960 (servant leadership). This indicates that a positive relationship between perceived level of servant leadership and overall job satisfaction. Table 4 presents the regression results for RQ1.

Table 4

*Regression Results for Research Question 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12,110.001</td>
<td>12,100.001</td>
<td>27.249</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>47,108.323</td>
<td>444.418</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>59,218.324</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Lower 95%</th>
<th>Upper 95%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>89.960</td>
<td>15.212</td>
<td>5.914</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>59.801</td>
<td>120.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant Leadership</td>
<td>0.960</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>5.220</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.595</td>
<td>1.325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second research question stated:

**RQ2.** Is the relationship between the perceived level of servant leadership and the level of overall job satisfaction among 21st CCLC leaders in Maryland significantly moderated by age, time on the job, and education level?

**H02.** The relationship between the perceived level of servant leadership and the level of
overall job satisfaction among 21st CCLC leaders in Maryland is not significantly moderated by age, time on the job, and education level.

**H12.** The relationship between the perceived level of servant leadership and the level of overall job satisfaction among 21st CCLC leaders in Maryland is significantly moderated by age, time on the job, and education level.

The independent variable was the perceived servant leadership, the dependent variable was the overall job satisfaction, and the moderating variables were age, time on the job, and education level. All moderating variables were measured in years and therefore were measured continuously.

A multiple linear regression analysis was used to test the hypotheses. A significant regression equation was found ($F(1,100) = 8.246, p < .01$), with an $R^2 = .366$, thus finding sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis. CCLC leaders predicted overall job satisfaction is equal to $-158.716 + 1.365 \times \text{Servant Leadership} + 0.198 \times \text{Age} + 1.502 \times \text{Job Time} + 10.687 \times \text{Education} + 0.0 \times \text{Servant Leadership*Age} - 0.007 \times \text{Servant Leadership*Job Time} - 0.063 \times \text{Servant Leadership*Education}$. The servant leadership ($p = 0.002$) and education ($p = 0.005$) were found to be significant predictors while Age ($p = 0.838$) and Job Time ($p = 0.247$) were not. Looking into the interaction terms, it was observed that the interaction between servant leadership and education was found to be a significant, therefore making education a significant moderator ($p = 0.004$). Table 5 presents the regression results for RQ1.

Analyzed information from questions RQ1 and RQ2 was used to address the third question, which stated:
RQ3: Does the Herzberg two-factor theory explain the relationship between perceived servant leadership characteristics and job satisfaction of 21st CCLC program leaders in Maryland.

Table 5

*Regression Results for Research Question 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4,808.323</td>
<td>686.903</td>
<td>8.246</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8,330.594</td>
<td>83.306</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>13,138.917</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t Stat</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Lower 95%</th>
<th>Upper 95%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-158.716</td>
<td>74.389</td>
<td>-2.134</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>-306.301</td>
<td>-11.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td>1.365</td>
<td>0.426</td>
<td>3.204</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.520</td>
<td>2.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>0.964</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td>-1.715</td>
<td>2.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Time</td>
<td>1.502</td>
<td>1.290</td>
<td>1.164</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>-1.058</td>
<td>4.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>10.687</td>
<td>3.703</td>
<td>2.886</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>3.340</td>
<td>18.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL*Age</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>0.949</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL*Job Time</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>-1.029</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL*Education</td>
<td>-0.683</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>-2.934</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>-0.105</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H0₃: The Herzberg two-factor theory does not explain the relationship between perceived servant leadership characteristics and job satisfaction of 21st CCLC program leaders in Maryland.

H1₃: The Herzberg two-factor theory explains the relationship between perceived servant leadership characteristics and job satisfaction of 21st CCLC program leaders in Maryland.

The findings from RQ1 and RQ2 provide empirical evidences that the Herzberg two-factor theory can adequately explain the relationship between perceived servant relationship characteristics and job satisfaction of 21st CCLC program leaders in Maryland. In RQ1, it was found that there was a positive relationship between perceived level of servant leadership and
overall job satisfaction. This indicates that as the level of servant leadership characteristics of a leader increases, the overall satisfaction increases as well. As such, servant leadership is considered as motivators which give positive satisfaction. This finding was similar in RQ2 where servant leadership was found to be a significant factor of overall satisfaction along with education among other predictors (age and job time). Both servant leadership and education were found to have positive relationship with overall satisfaction and thus can be considered as motivators.

**Chapter 4 Summary**

The purpose of this correlational study was to determine the relationship between perceived servant leadership and job satisfaction within 21st CCLC program leaders in Maryland. A total of 112 CLCC leaders were included in the data analysis. Simple linear and multiple linear regression analyses were conducted to address the research questions. In RQ1, the simple linear regression analysis resulted to a significant relationship between perceived level of servant leadership and overall job satisfaction. As such, the null hypotheses were rejected and conclude that there was a statistically significant relationship between the perceived level of servant leadership and the level of overall job satisfaction among 21st CCLC leaders in Maryland. In RQ2, the multiple linear regression analysis resulted in a significant relationship between education and overall job satisfaction. As such, it was concluded that the relationship between the perceived level of servant leadership and the level of overall job satisfaction among 21st CCLC leaders in Maryland was significantly moderated by one’s education level. Although the education level assisted with determining rewards responses, it is not an identified motivation or hygiene factor. Therefore, the Hetzberg two-factor theory does not explain the relationship between perceived servant leadership and job satisfaction of 21st CCLC program leaders in
Maryland. No significant moderating interactions were found based on one’s age and time on job. Chapter 5 presents the discussion and recommendations for future research.
Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusion

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to determine the relationship between perceived servant leadership and job satisfaction within 21st CCLC program leaders in Maryland. The researcher hypothesizes that a perceived servant leadership relationship among afterschool providers contributes to high turnover rates in afterschool programs. It is widely believed that effective leadership styles contribute to low turnover rates and high levels of organizations success, and therefore it stands to reason that leadership styles which are perceived to be ineffective contribute to low levels of employee satisfaction (Babalola, Gbadegesin, & Patience, 2013).

Chapter 5 discusses the study results and implications, in addition to concluding the study with closing remarks. Chapter 5 will begin with a summary of the study results, described in greater detail in Chapter 4, then discuss the meaning of the results in a practical context. Chapter 5 will discuss how the results confirm or refute current literature on employee retention in educational afterschool programs. Next, Chapter 5 will describe the study limitations before outlining the implications for practice, policy, and theory. Finally, Chapter 5 will close with the recommendations for future research and concluding remarks.

Summary of the Results

The present study sought to address the following research questions related to leadership styles in afterschool programs:

RQ1. Is there a significant relationship between the perceived level of servant leadership and the level of overall job satisfaction among 21st CCLC leaders in Maryland?
RQ2. Is the relationship between the perceived level of servant leadership and the level of overall job satisfaction among 21st CCLC leaders in Maryland significantly moderated by age, time on the job, and education level?

RQ3. Does the Herzberg two-factor theory explain the relationship between perceived servant leadership characteristics and job satisfaction of 21st CCLC program leaders in Maryland?

For the first research question, the independent variable was the perceived level of servant leadership while the dependent variable was the overall job satisfaction. The researcher used a simple linear regression and found a significant relationship between the variables. The results showed a positive relationship between the level of servant leadership and overall job satisfaction. This finding rejects the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction. This finding supports the researcher’s hypothesis that a servant leadership style, where the leaders focuses on ensuring the person employee is more competent to meet the needs of the organization, is positively associated with job satisfaction.

For the second research question, the independent variable was the perceived servant leadership, the dependent variable was overall job satisfaction and the modeling variables were age, time on the job, and education level. The results indicate that servant leadership and education level were found to be significant variables, while age and job time were not significant. There was a positive relationship between servant leadership and education with job satisfaction. The findings partially reject the null hypothesis.
Discussion of the Results

There is a significant body of evidence which suggests that the leadership style used by people in power have a significant positive or negative impact on the organization’s employees (Bolkan, Goodboy, & Griffin, 2011; Horan et al., 2013). There are many different styles of leadership, including democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles, but the present study focused on testing the significance of servant leadership on job satisfaction. Greenleaf (1970) described servant leadership as when a leader’s focus is on making the person served, or employee, more competent to meet their needs and the needs of the organization. This leadership style includes the belief that visioning is helpful, scouting and curating employee talent is crucial, and giving away power is positive (Black, 2010). Finally, servant leadership includes elements of community building, which the researcher theorized would improve overall job satisfaction.

The results of this study support that there is a positive correlation between job satisfaction and perceived servant leadership styles. The researcher asked participants to rate their perception of their organization’s leaders and complete survey questions related to job satisfaction. In instances where participants reported a perception of servant style leadership, the participants were also more likely to report higher levels of job satisfaction. This result is significant to both 21st CCLC Programs specifically and the field of education generally.

There is a high employee turnover rate in the 21st CCLC afterschool programs, which could suggest organizational disfunction (Babalola, Gbadegesin, & Patience, 2013). There was a 20% staff turnover rate in 2011, and by 2016 the turnover rate reached 40% (Maryland State Department of Education, 2017). This very high turnover rate negatively impacts the organization, employees, and students. The organization is forced to pay constant costs
associated with recruiting and training new employees, while the employees experience negative feelings associated with poor job satisfaction and the constant strain of staffing challenges. Finally, high turnover rates can negatively impact students as they receive inconsistent support constantly experience new teachers and inexperienced teachers.

Previous research considered the impact of servant leadership in schools, churches, businesses and the military (Burns, 1978; Odumeru & Ifeanyi, 2013). However, there is a gap in research on the impact of servant leadership in out-of-school time programs. There was little or no research performed on the impact of servant leadership on 21st CCLC programs, and therefore the present study is important to practice in educational leadership and servant leadership.

The study results indicate that leadership styles do impact employee job satisfaction and that a servant leadership style may increase job satisfaction and reduce turnover rates. For some leaders in some institutions, focusing on employing a servant leadership style could be a no cost option for improving the workplace culture and reducing turnover. In other instances, leadership training may be required to help organizational leaders implement a servant leadership style in their organization. However, the long-term costs of high turnover rates are likely more substantial than either training current organizational leaders or recruiting new leaders.

The results of the analysis answering the second research question supported that there was a significant relationship between job satisfaction and servant leadership, with education level as a significant moderator. The results also support that age and time on the job were not significant moderators to job satisfaction. By demonstrating that higher education levels are correlated with higher levels of job satisfaction, the results suggest that out-of-school program staff may be more satisfied if they have higher education levels. Though determining the specific
cause for this correlation is outside the scope of the present study, it is possible that employees with higher education levels are more satisfied because they feel better able to complete the job well, or they perceive themselves to have more promotional opportunities or better wages. In order to reduce turnover in out-of-school programs, leaders could consider targeting their hiring practices towards employees with higher education levels. If such employees also receive higher pay, it would be important for future studies to consider this as a modifying factor. It is possible that leaders might be able to simulate the impact of higher education levels on job satisfaction by providing more training opportunities to employees.

Contrarily, it is useful for practitioners to know that age and experience level do not modify job satisfaction. This information suggests both that employees who have been employed for a long time may not be fully satisfied in their jobs. Additionally, hiring older or younger employees is unlikely to improve retention rates, though such a practice would likely be considered discriminatory.

**Discussion of the Results in Relation to the Literature**

Confirming literature, the study results suggest that servant leadership styles are correlated with positive economic outcomes for businesses (Chu, 2008; Johnson, 2008; Tischler et al., 2016). Further, the results support the more specific conclusions in literature which found that servant leadership styles were associated with higher levels of job satisfaction (Johnson, 2008; Svoboda, 2008). In 2013, Harwicki also found a positive correlation between servant leadership and job satisfaction, which is further confirmed by the present study.

In addition to confirming the conclusion of literature that servant leadership was positively correlated with job satisfaction, the present study extends practice by supporting that servant leadership styles may be positively correlated with job satisfaction in out-of-school
programs. There is little research on the impact of servant leadership on out-of-school programs, and therefore the present study both extends understanding and addresses an important gap in practices.

Though the study results do not directly support Hertzberg’s two-factor theory, the finding potentially suggest new avenues of research supporting the theory. Hertzberg (1959) identified the following hygiene factors as having influence on job satisfaction: company policies, interpersonal relationships, working conditions, and salary. The finding did support a positive correlation between job satisfaction and servant leadership, with education level as a significant modifier. Servant leadership may contribute to employees perceiving positive interpersonal relationships and positive working conditions. Furthermore, it is worth exploring in future research if the positive correlation between education and job satisfaction was possibly due to employees with higher education levels receiving higher salaries. If so, this represents a hygiene factor under Hertzberg’s two-factor theory (Hertzberg, 1959).

Hertzberg’s motivation factors are also indirectly present on the research results and warrant further study. According to Hertzberg (1959), motivation factors include achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility, advancement, and the possibility for growth. These factors are not directly addressed in the study, so future studies perhaps should include these variables specifically. However, utilizing a servant leadership style implies that the organizational leaders are willing to share authority with employees (Cerit, 2009; Harwicki, 2013; Judge & Klinger, 2008). Servant leadership styles may also offer greater recognition for employees, therefore indirectly addressing a second motivational factor (Herzberg, 1959).
Limitations

The results of this study rely largely on employee perception of leadership styles used within an organization. Though the survey was designed to identify servant-leadership styles through a series of questions, it is likely that individuals will have a varying degree of attention to details related to leadership styles. Employees may have differing opinions on the leadership style of a single individual based on the employee’s experiences. This limitation is inherent to studies relying on perception, and the present study sought to limit the impact of such concerns.

Though the data largely supported the study hypotheses, the results of the third research question was not fully addressed by the study results. After considering the study results, the researcher determined that the third research question could have yielded stronger findings if the hygiene factors outlined by Hertzberg (1959) were directly included as variables. Including Hertzberg’s variables directly in the model and testing their relationship with job satisfaction would have yielded a better understanding of the applicability of Hertzberg’s model to out-of-school programs.

Additionally, the methodology did not successfully isolate the impact of salary from the impact of education level. Logically, it stands to reason that employees with higher education levels may have higher salaries, which might contribute to job satisfaction under Hertzberg’s (1959) theory. While it is possible that teachers with higher education levels are not paid more than teachers with lower education levels, the study results would be even more illuminating if these variables were isolated and directly addressed.

Implications of Results for Practice, Policy, and Theory

Practice. The present study has several applications for practice, policy, and theory. Specifically, the present study findings could influence 21st CCLC program leaders in their
choice of leadership styles. 21st CCLC program leaders could leverage effective leadership styles to potentially increase job satisfaction and decrease turnover rates. The results of this study support that there is correlation between servant leadership and employee job satisfaction (1.365, tStat 3.204) in out-of-school programs. Horan et al. (2013), suggests that leadership style has a positive or negative impact on an organization’s employees. In the long run, it may be worthwhile to train organizational leaders to use servant leadership styles or to recruit leaders with natural inclinations towards a servant leadership style. Doing so, may have a positive impact on leader retention.

This strategy for practice is further supported by Hertzberg’s (1959) theory, which states that certain factors include job satisfaction. In RQ1, it was found that there was a positive relationship between perceived level of servant leadership and overall job satisfaction. Among other factors, working conditions and interpersonal relationships influence satisfaction. Servant leadership styles may be beneficial to developing both conditions. 21st CCLC could provide training opportunities for employees to attempt to simulate the impact of higher education levels. Additionally, mentor programs among employees may be beneficial in improving collegial relationships, workplace conditions, and educational preparedness of the employees.

Policy. By adopting a servant leadership style and cultivating characteristics shown to be effective in servant leadership, organizational leaders may increase job satisfaction among employees and reduce turnover rates (Greenleaf, 1977). According to Greenleaf (1977), the following characteristics are associated with servant leadership styles: empowerment, humility, authenticity, forgiveness, courage, accountability, and stewardship. Additionally, the 21st CCLC program may wish to consider the results of this study when making new hiring decisions. As mentioned previously, hiring leaders with servant leadership styles may be a relatively simple
way to increase job satisfaction among employees. Furthermore, the study results indicate that employees with higher levels of education were more likely to have higher job satisfaction (coefficient 10.687, $t$ Stat 2.886). According to the study results, participants who received higher degrees associated with their pre-service education had higher levels of job satisfaction than participants with lower education levels. This finding could be implemented in hiring policies by hiring employees with education levels at the higher end of the available rung.

**Theory.** The present study fills an important gap in practice by determining that there is a correlation between servant leadership and employee job satisfaction (1.365, $t$ Stat 3.204) in out-of-school programs. Studies have found that servant leadership is positively related to outcome variables at the individual, team, and organizational levels (Tischler et al., 2016). As servant leaders, each leader is to serve others to be what they are capable of becoming (Greenleaf, 1977), which also includes each leader becoming what they are capable to become. Potential avenues include to what extent training opportunities could substitute for higher employee education levels. By identifying factors which both influence and were shown not to influence employee satisfaction, the present study further fleshed academic understanding of Hertzberg’s two-factor theory and opened up new avenue for research. Servant leadership and education were found to have positive relationship with overall satisfaction and thus can be considered as motivators.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

The present study filled an important gap in understanding the implications of a servant leadership style on out-of-school programs. However, the study revealed future areas of interest and potential avenues of academic research. The researcher recommends future study into the application of Hertzberg’s two-factor theory on out-of-school programs. This question was partially addressed in the third research question, but information is missing. In future studies,
the researchers should specifically test the hygienic and motivation variables. By specifically testing these variables, rather than variables which are loosely connected, future studies will be better able to determine the applicability of the model.

Additionally, the researcher recommends that future research consider the relationship between salary and education level. If employees with higher education levels are paid more than employees with lower education levels, some of the study’s recommendations should be reconsidered. For example, if salary significantly contributes to job satisfaction, 21st CCLC might wish to consider a salary increase in order to decrease employee recruitment costs. However, if education level truly is the modifying variable 21st CCLC may wish to hire employees with more education or provide more training opportunities.

Though understanding the drivers of job satisfaction is undoubtably important to fostering a workplace with low turnover rates, future studies should also consider the studying the impact of leadership styles directly on turnover. In order to conduct such a study, researchers could ask 21st CCLC leaders to describe their leadership style (or employees to describe the leaders’ leadership style) then consider turnover rates as an independent variable. As an alternative approach, researchers could use a qualitative methodology to explore factors of job satisfaction and retention among 21st CCLC employees.

**Conclusion**

In recent years, 21st CCLC experienced turnover rates of up to 40%, suggesting possible organizational challenges with employee satisfaction. In order to understand the impact of a servant leadership style on employee satisfaction, the researcher undertook a quantitative study which asked if there was a statistically significant relationship between the perceived level of servant leadership and the level of overall job satisfaction among 21st CCLC leaders in
Maryland. The study results indicate that there is a significant relationship, suggesting that adopting a servant leadership style in 21st CCLC programs might increase job satisfaction and decrease employee turnover.

Additionally, the study supported education level as a modifying factor in the relationship between servant leadership and employee satisfaction. This suggests that employees with higher education levels are more satisfied in their positions. This finding is useful in practice because it suggests that hiring employees with higher education levels or providing more opportunities for training may be beneficial to 21st CCLC retention rates.

For further areas of study, the researcher recommends considering the relationship between salary and employee education level. Additionally, the researcher recommends directly studying Hertzberg’s factors and undertaking a qualitative project to consider employee perceptions of 21st CCLC leadership styles and job satisfaction.
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Appendix C: Surveys

Servant Leadership Questionnaire

Instructions: Select two people who know you in a leadership capacity such as a coworker, fellow group member, or subordinate. Make two copies of this questionnaire and give a copy to each individual you have chosen. Using the following 7-point scale, ask them to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree with the following statements as they pertain to your leadership. In these statements, “He/She” is referring to you in a leadership capacity.

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

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Others would seek help from him/her if they had a personal problem.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. He/She emphasizes the importance of giving back to the community.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. He/She can tell if something work related is going wrong.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. He/She gives others the responsibility to make important decisions about their own jobs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. He/She makes others’ career development a priority.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. He/She cares more about others’ success than his/her own.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. He/She hold high ethical standards.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. He/She cares about others’ personal well-being.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. He/She is always interested in helping people in the community.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. He/She is able to think through complex problems.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. He/She encourages others to handle important work decisions on their own.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. He/She is interested in making sure others reach their career goals.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. He/She puts others’ best interests above his/her own.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. He/She is always honest.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. He/She takes time to talk to others on a personal level.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. He/She is involved in community activities.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. He/She has a thorough understanding of the organization and its goals.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. He/She gives others the freedom to handle difficult situations in the way they feel is best.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. He/She provides others with work experiences that enable them to develop new skills.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. He/She sacrifices his/her own interests to meet others’ needs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. He/She would not compromise ethical principles in order to meet success.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. He/She can recognize when others are feeling down without asking them.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. He/She encourages others to volunteer in the community.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. He/She can solve work problems with new or creative ideas.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. If others need to make important decisions at work, they do not need to consult him/her.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. He/She wants to know about others’ career goals.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. He/She does what he/she can to make others’ jobs easier.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. He/She values honesty more than profits.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scoring

Using the questionnaires on which others assessed your leadership, take the separate scores for each item, add them together, and divide that sum by two. This will give you the average score for that item. For example, if Person A assessed you at 4 Item 2, and Person B marked you as a 6, your score for Item 2 would be 5.

Once you have averaged each item’s scores, use the following steps to complete the scoring of the questionnaire:

1. Add up the scores on 1, 8, 15, and 22. This is your score for emotional healing.
2. Add up the scores for 2, 9, 16, and 23. This is your score for creating value for the community.
3. Add up the scores for 3, 10, 17, and 24. This is your score for conceptual skills.
4. Add up the scores for 4, 11, 18, and 25. This is your score for empowering.
5. Add up the scores for 5, 12, 19, and 26. This is your score for helping subordinates grow and succeed.
6. Add up the scores for 6, 13, 20, and 27. This is your score for putting subordinates first.
7. Add up the scores for 7, 14, 21, and 28. This is your score for behaving ethically.

Scoring Interpretation

- **High range:** A score between 23 and 28 means you strongly exhibit this servant leadership behavior.
- **Moderate range:** A score between 14 and 22 means you tend to exhibit this behavior in an average way.
- **Low range:** A score between 8 and 13 means you exhibit this leadership below the average or expected degree.
- **Extremely low range:** A score between 0 and 7 means you are not inclined to exhibit this leadership behavior at all.

The scores you received on the Servant Leadership Questionnaire indicate the degree to which you exhibit the seven behaviors characteristic of a servant leader. You can use the results to assess areas in which you have strong servant leadership behaviors and areas in which you may strive to improve.
minnesota satisfaction questionnaire

The purpose of this questionnaire is to give you a chance to tell how you feel about your present job, what things you are satisfied with and what things you are not satisfied with.

On the basis of your answers and those of people like you, we hope to get a better understanding of the things people like and dislike about their jobs.

On the next page you will find statements about your present job.

• Read each statement carefully.

• Decide how satisfied you feel about the aspect of your job described by the statement.

Keeping the statement in mind:

— if you feel that your job gives you more than you expected, check the box under “Very Sat.” (Very Satisfied);

— if you feel that your job gives you what you expected, check the box under “Sat.” (Satisfied);

— if you cannot make up your mind whether or not the job gives you what you expected, check the box under “N” (Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied);

— if you feel that your job gives you less than you expected, check the box under “Dissat.” (Dissatisfied);

— if you feel that your job gives you much less than you expected, check the box under “Very Dissat.” (Very Dissatisfied).

• Remember: Keep the statement in mind when deciding how satisfied you feel about that aspect of your job.

• Do this for all statements. Please answer every item.

Be frank and honest. Give a true picture of your feelings about your present job.
Ask yourself: How **satisfied** am I with this aspect of my job?

**Very Sat.** means I am very satisfied with this aspect of my job.

**Sat.** means I am satisfied with this aspect of my job.

**N** means I can't decide whether I am satisfied or not with this aspect of my job.

**Dissat.** means I am dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

**Very Dissat.** means I am very dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

---

**On my present job, this is how I feel about . . .**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. The chance to work alone on the job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The chance to do different things from time to time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The chance to be &quot;somebody&quot; in the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The way my boss handles his/her workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The competence of my supervisor in making decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Being able to do things that don’t go against my conscience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The way my job provides for steady employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The chance to do things for other people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The chance to tell people what to do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The way company policies are put into practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. My pay and the amount of work I do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The chances for advancement on this job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The freedom to use my own judgment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The chance to try my own methods of doing the job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The working conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The way my co-workers get along with each other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. The praise I get for doing a good job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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1. Check one: ☐ Male  ☐ Female

2. When were you born? _______________ 19____

3. Circle the number of years of schooling you completed:

   4  5  6  7  8  9  10  11  12  13  14  15  16  17  18  19  20
   Grade School       High School       College       Graduate or
                    Professional School

4. What is your present job called? ____________________________________________

5. What do you do on your present job? _________________________________________

6. How long have you been on your present job? ___________ years ___________ months

7. What would you call your occupation, your usual line of work? ________________________

8. How long have you been in this line of work? ___________ years ___________ months