Eat More Chicken and Lead More People:

Perceived Measures of Servant Leadership at Chick-fil-A

_____

Presented to the Faculty

Liberty University

School of Communication

_____

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Master of Arts

In Communication Studies By

Michael S Mishler

May 2012

**Thesis Committee**

_____

Angela M. Widgeon, Ph.D., Chairperson                                    Date

_____

Faith Mullen, Ph.D.                                                      Date

_____

Cecil Kramer, D.Min.                                                     Date

This Project is Dedicated to My Parents—

Neal and Lorraine Mishler

--Who Have Always Epitomized the Value of Family, Truth, and Love

**Abstract**

This present study used survey data from 31 employees working at 2 Chick-fil-A locations to assess the supervisor's perceived level of supervisor's level of servant leadership and how the level (a) affects coworker's perceptions of performance, (b) job satisfaction, and (c) relational trust amongst coworkers. The participants ranged in ages from 18-50. The average age for the participants was 26.  The data for the study was collected through the distribution of surveys to individuals who currently work at Chick-fil-A. The two selected locations were approximately 300 miles apart in Virginia. The study employed quantitative research methods in order to collect and analyze the data from the participants at the two Chick-fil-A franchises. Positive correlations did exist between servant leadership and trust, satisfaction, and performance. Gender was not significant in determining perceived levels of servant leadership, trust, and performance but several survey items relating to gender and job satisfaction were significant.

Key words: servant leadership; trust; satisfaction; performance; Chick-fil-A, leadership, communication

## Acknowledgements

The entire thesis process has been a blessing. I have thoroughly enjoyed the past two years of graduate school. The experience was enriched through the contributions of professors, fellow students, and co-workers. I loved the opportunity to develop remarkable friendships with my peers while being challenged by my professors, personally and academically.

I would like to thank my thesis committee. Dr. Angela Widgeon, my thesis chair, has been an incredible example during this process. I appreciate her willingness, dedication, and insight toward me and my thesis.  Dr. Widgeon devoted herself to my thesis. Her personal involvement added to my overall experience of graduate school. I am appreciative of Dr. Faith Mullen and Dr. Kramer for contributing to the overall excellence of my thesis. Dr. Mullen has always challenged me to bring out the best in me. I have enjoyed the opportunity to grow personally and professionally through her graduate classes. I am also thankful for Dr. Kramer's contribution to my graduate experience. I appreciate his expertise and high standards.

To my fellow graduate students, I am thankful for each and every one of you. I have thoroughly enjoyed our experiences together in graduate school. I hope our friendships will continue getting stronger during this next step in our lives. Your friendship and love will never be forgotten.

Lastly, I would like to thank Chick-fil-A and the employees for making this thesis possible. I appreciate the willingness of the participants to take the time and effort to share their thoughts, feelings, and experiences in my study.

Eat More Chicken and Lead More People:

Perceived Measures of Servant Leadership at Chick-fil-A

**Table of Contents**

**CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION**

*"Nearly every moment of every day we have the opportunity to give something to someone else – our time, our love, our resources. I have always found more joy in giving when I did not expect anything in return." –* (Cathy, 2011, p.76)

It all began in 1946 when Truett Cathy opened his first restaurant, The Dwarf Grill. According to Chick-fil-A.com (2012), The Dwarf Grill was named due to its size but has since grown to become the second largest quick-service chicken restaurant chain in the United States, with over 1,500 locations in 39 states. The founder of Chick-fil-A is credited with inventing Chick-fil-A's well-known, boneless chicken breast sandwich. The franchise chain is privately held and family owned with annual sales over $3.5 billion.

The restaurant chain has experienced 43 consecutive years of positive sales growth. Chick-fil-A has been extremely successful through innovations within the workplace, community involvement, and strong principles. Cathy made no bones about Chick-fil-A being a company based upon biblical principles. In his autobiography Truett Cathy states, "I'm often asked, 'What do Christian principles have to do with running a corporation?' My reply is that they have everything to do with running Chick-fil-A. Ours is one of the only companies among many whose honesty and integrity match biblical principles" (1989, p.146). Cathy cares deeply about God, his employees, and his community.

The restaurant is an avid proponent of sponsorships, charities, and community outreach. Two examples include the Chick-Fil-A Bowl and the Winshape Foundation. The company sponsors the Chick-fil-A Bowl which is the classic college football match-up and longest running rivalry between the Atlantic Coast Conference (ACC) and Southeastern Conference (SEC) teams. The championship game continues to lead all bowls in charitable donations. This

past year the Chick-fil-A Bowl contributed a record $6.7 million to participating universities (Truettcathy.com, 2011).

Truett Cathy also started the WinShape Foundation to help with community outreach. Truett has always had an interest in inspiring young people and contributing to their growth and this mission is evident today through WinShape. Within several years, a boys' summer camp, followed by a girls' summer camp were added through WinShape. The foundation has continued to expand over its 20 years of existence with foster homes, retreats and sponsorships of mission trips. According to Truett Cathy.com (2011), the WinShape Foundation was established in 1984 with the goal to help "shape winners."

According to Truett Cathy.com (2012), one of the most well-known biblical principles of Chick-fil-A is "Remember the Sabbath day by keeping it holy." God modeled it himself in Exodus 20:8-11. According to the New International Version Bible, "Six days you shall labor and do all your work, but the seventh day is a Sabbath to the Lord your God. On it you shall not do any work. For in six days the Lord made the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that is in them, but He rested on the seventh day." God created the earth in six days and rested on the seventh. Truett Cathy believed a business could be built in 6 days and the 7th could be for rest. Since its opening, Chick-fil-A has been open for six days and closed on Sundays. Graves & Addington (2003) describe the view as "God invented both at virtually the same time; they are meant to complement, not fight against, each other" (p. 127). A godly life contains both a life of rest and work.

Cathy's approach to business is based upon biblical principles and a strong desire to give back and make a difference. In the past four decades this approach to business has become known as servant leadership. Many speculate that the servant leadership approach to business is

largely responsible for the success of Chick-fil-A as well as other businesses. In his book *God as my CEO,* Julian (2001) states,

> Serving others is good business. Finding good people and treating them well makes
> money. In our business, our clients bring out the best in our people, they are more
> inspired, more creative, and can serve the customer better. That results in satisfied
> customers and customer loyalty, and that produces revenue (p. 158).

Servant leadership is a powerful frame for shaping businesses. Its popularity has been evident from its early beginnings.

From the time Robert Greenleaf wrote his thought-provoking essay on leadership to present day, the concept of servant leadership has been a highly embraced topic. Greenleaf and Spears (2002) defined servant leadership in the following way:

> The servant-leader is servant first. It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to
> serve, to serve first. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead. The difference
> manifests itself in the care taken by the servant – first to make sure that other people's
> highest-priority needs are being served (p. 27).

As people begin thinking about others, putting others first, and serving others, people will grow and the society as a whole will grow and develop. According to Greenleaf and Spears (2002), servant leadership advances a "group-oriented approach to analysis and decision making as a means of strengthening institutions and improving society" (p. 9). The influence of servant minded leaders cannot be taken lightly.

Spears (2004) discusses the impact which can be seen across societies, "I believe that caring for persons, the more able and the less able serving each other, is what makes a good society" (p. 7). The primary purpose of any person or organization which implements the servant

leadership strategy should be to create a positive impact on its employees and community, rather than using profit as the sole motive. The focus is on serving others which includes employees, customers and the community.  An increasing number of companies have adopted servant leadership as part of their corporate philosophy or as a foundation for their mission statement. Two well-known organizations currently using the model of Servant Leadership include: Southwest Airlines and Chick-fil-A. The later will be the focus of this study.

There is no question that Chick-fil-A has built a successful corporation based upon biblical principles. The researcher focuses on Chick-fil-A and will examine if the organization embodies the principles they extol not only on a corporate level but also on a local level ? Is Chick-fil-A successful in communicating the principles of Servant Leadership throughout the organization as seen on a local individual restaurant level?

A company could use any number of measures of success but an organization who embraces servant leadership would use measures relevant to their service mission. Gersh (2006) discusses how servant leadership is based on the elements of trust, caring, empathy, and focus on others. Mehta & Pillay (2011) and Stramba (2003) examine how servant leadership correlates with job satisfaction. Jaramillo, Grisaffe, Chonko, & Roberts (2009) studied how servant leadership affects job performance.  This study proposes that the organizational measures of relational trust, personal satisfaction and organizational performance are appropriate to examining a servant organization.

Servant leadership has rarely been investigated in comparison with other leadership theories. Many scholars have looked individually at the measurements of trust, satisfaction, and performance and their relationships with servant leadership (Zhang, & Jia, 2010; Jones, 2010; Noblet, & Rodwell, 2009; Gould-Williams, & Davies, 2005; Ramaswami, Srinivasan, & Gorton,

1997; Chatbury, 2011; Gersh, 2006; Rieke, Hammermeister, & Chase, 2008; and Hamilton, 2005; Jaramillo, Grisaffe, Chonko, & Roberts, 2009; Indartono, Hawjeng, & Chun-His Vivia, 2010). Additionally, empirical research examining the correlation of servant leadership to all three areas of trust, satisfaction, and performance are lacking.

This study looked at the extent to which coworker's perceived perception of supervisors level of servant leadership correlated to levels of relational trust, personal job satisfaction, and organizational performance within Chick-fil-A. Chick-fil-A is a well-known, quick-service chicken restaurant chain. The organization was founded by Truett Cathy and strives to implement sound leadership principles. Until recent years, scholars have not fully embraced the idea of servant leadership as a valid leadership style. But the idea of a leadership shifting the attention, power, and authority off of themselves and to the employee's is not in the forefront of many CEO's or manager's minds. The empirical evidence supporting the effectiveness of servant leadership is still lacking but studies which have examined the relation of servant leadership and effectiveness in the workplace is promising.

Scholars such as Bass (2000), Blanchard (2002), and Northouse (2001) have brought forth the idea that the concept of servant leadership should be considered by CEOs, mangers, and leadership of today's organizations and companies. Servant leadership enables leadership to direct their power (Sashkin & Sashkin, 2003) in a positive manner while serving and developing others (Greenleaf, 1970) which will add to the overall effectiveness and success of an organization.

If coworkers don't trust each other or leadership within the company, the opportunity to succeed will be diminished. The same can be said for job satisfaction and organizational performance. If employees are not satisfied with their work environment and are not performing

at a high level, the likelihood of a company succeeding will be limited. If the servant leadership behaviors of supervisors show a positive correlation to levels of relational trust amongst coworkers, personal job satisfaction, and organizational performance, leaders and scholar alike will be unable to ignore the positive effects servant leadership can have on an organization.

The study of servant leadership from a biblical perspective in a successful, top restaurant chain does not exist. Well-known organizations and companies which are at the top of their market, and uphold biblical, Christian, leadership principles are few and far between. This present study encompasses three parts which include business values, Christian values, and academic value. Few other studies focus on these aspects in a top organization such as Chick-fil-A. Thus, by studying servant leadership and the measurements of trust, satisfaction, and performance in the workplace, the researcher and society will have a better understanding of the effectiveness of servant leadership in top companies. Servant leadership and Christian leadership involve influencing others. The researcher will propose a new typography for evaluating servant leadership in relation to organizational outcomes. Specifically, the outcome measures of trust, satisfaction, and performance will be used as indicators or servant leadership. Trust will cover the relational dimensions, job satisfaction will measure personal dimensions, and performance will measure organizational dimensions. By proposing trust, satisfaction, performance as measures of servant leadership, the researcher is proposing a typography that encompasses relational, personal, and organizational dimensions.

Chick-fil-A stands for its biblical principles through its model of leadership, remaining closed on Sunday's, and many other attributes. By understanding more about Chick-fil-A, servant leadership, and measurements of trust, satisfaction, and performance in the workplace, the researcher will help open a new field of learning. Future scholars could build off similar

research methods in comparing traditionally secular leadership methods in comparison to

biblically-based, Christian methods of leadership. Extensive research has been done on

leadership theories and servant leadership. However, little research has been done on specific

companies which use biblical approaches of servant leadership. The researcher will examine

servant leadership within Chick-fil-A and test perceived levels of trust, satisfaction, and

performance in the workplace. Using surveys, this study will determine if gender is a factor in

perceptions of servant leadership, trust, satisfaction, and performance along with correlations of

perceptions of supervisor's level of servant leadership and trust, satisfaction, and performance.

Using survey methodology, the researcher will test perceived trust, satisfaction and

performance amongst employees as organizational measures of Servant Leadership. The purpose

of the study is to uncover the existence and practice of servant leadership within two local

individual Chick-fil-A restaurants. Specifically, the researcher will address the following

research questions:

RQ1 A: Does employee's perception of supervisor's servant leadership affect
organizational performance?

RQ1 B: Does employee's perception of supervisor's servant leadership affect
personal job satisfaction?

RQ1 C: Does employee's perception of supervisor's servant leadership affect
perceived relational trust amongst coworkers?

RQ2 A: Does gender affect employee's perceptions of supervisor's servant
leadership?

RQ2 B: Does gender affect employee's perceptions of personal job satisfaction?

RQ2 C: Does gender affect employee's perceptions of perceived relational trust
amongst coworkers?

RQ2 D: Does gender affect employee's perceptions of perceived organizational
performance?

## CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

*"I'd like to be remembered as one who kept my priorities in the right order. We live in a changing world, but we need to be reminded that the important things have not changed, and the important things will not change if we keep our priorities in proper order." (Finch, 2008, p. 61)*

Truett Cathy first started Chick-fil-A as a tiny diner in Atlanta. The entrepreneur used his business skills and biblical based principles to create one of the most successful quick-service restaurants today. One of the greatest areas of distinction within the running of the organization is in leadership. Cathy did not support a traditional, transactional model of management but rather embraced a biblical servant model of leadership.

Numerous scholars have debated the difference between leading and managing (Maccoby, 2000; Young & Dulewicz, 2008). Leadership focuses on the creation of a common vision (Weathersby, 1999; Blewett, 2009; Fitzsimons, McCance, & Armstrong, 2006; Terry, 2003; Gluck, 1981). Management focuses more on the bottom-line and tasks (Frohman, 1984; Guay, & Waters, 1980; Wetzler, 1976). Management without proper leadership is treacherous. Likewise, leadership without outcome measures is ineffective. Organizational leaders must use both leadership and management to succeed (Schneider, 2004). In order to better understand the relationship between leading and organizational success, this chapter will review the literature in the following areas: 1.) Management vs. Leadership; 2.) Leadership Theory; 3.) Servant leadership; and 4.) Outcome Measures of Servant Leadership (specifically, trust, satisfaction and performance).

**Management Vs. Leadership**

The words leadership and management are often used interchangeably in the workplace. However, they are not the same. In his book, *What Leaders Really Do*, Kotter (1999) writes,

"Leadership is different from management, and the primary force behind successful change of any significance is the former, not the latter" (p. 6).  What is leadership within an organization? Kotter (1999) understood leadership as a set of processes that creates organizations in the first place or adapts them to significantly changing circumstances. Leadership defines what the future looks like, aligns people with that vision, and inspires them to make it happen despite the obstacles. Leaders within organization have a clear vision for the future and are able to communicate that vision to employees in an effective manner. By communicating a vision and inspiring them to act in a positive manner, the company or organization will have a greater overall chance of success. In another of Kotter's (1996) books, *Leading Change,* he explains that leadership drives change while management controls it. Leaders may be viewed as the visionaries of companies and management may be thought of more as the administrative aspect of a company. Management verses leadership will continue to be debated by scholars. The researcher will examine several scholars which discuss leadership and management along with leadership theory.

Weinrach (2005) describes how leadership tends to focus on providing guidance and direction. Management tends to focus on executive ability, supervision, and control. All managers should exude leadership if they want to be effective. However, strong leaders are not only the CEO's of companies or management level employees. Leaders can be found anywhere in an organization. The best and most effective leaders may actually be at the bottom of a company. Anyone who has the ability to inspire people to follow them towards a common goal is a leader. The most effective companies are the ones with the most effective visionaries or leaders. This can be illustrated through Chick-fil-A, their outstanding leaders, and especially their owner, Truett Cathy.

Colonna (2004) illustrated the difference between management and leadership by describing characteristics of leaders as passionate, empowerment, trusted, guiding, motivating, focuses on strategy, and established direction. Managers tend to try to be expert; display excitement, respected drives the change, offers opinions, prevents regression, focuses on structure, and creates explanations. Leaders have different characteristics and behaviors which they use in order to motivate employees in the workplace. The ability to manage people is easier to do in comparison to having the ability to lead and actually leading people.

Scholars have concluded that a supervisor's leadership style has a strong effect on employee behavior and attitude (Bass, 2001). Thus in addition to the type of leadership an organization as a whole prescribes to, the leadership type of individual supervisors has an effect on employees. A number of leadership styles have been identified, but most fall under the leadership style of autocratic or democratic. Packard and Kauppi (1999) state, "The continuum of leadership styles ranges from the completely autocratic, where there is no subordinate participation, to a maximum degree of democratic leadership, where subordinates' involvement in decision making and the maintenance of a cohesive group spirit is emphasized" (p. 5). The study (1999) concluded that leadership styles which involve more relationship behavior were consistently associated with higher levels of employee satisfaction. The model of leadership which Chick-fil-A implements in servant leadership also contains a high level of relationship behavior which will be discussed in detail throughout the literature review. Much research has been done in the area of leadership theory. The next section of the literature review relating to leadership theory will discuss different methods of leadership within organizations.

**Leader-Member Exchange (LMX)**

Leaders in all organizations develop relationship with their subordinates.  The leader-member exchange theory describes how the employee – employer relationships can develop in different ways. This particular theory focuses solely on the relationships between supervisors and subordinates. How close a supervisor is to subordinates, the level of trust, and the roles within the relationship are just some aspects of the leader-member exchange theory. In the article, "Perceived Organizational Support and Leader-Member Exchange" by Wayne, Shore and Linden, the ideas of specific forms of exchange are discussed. Perceived organizational support (POS) is described as the exchanges that occur between an employee and employing organization. In addition, leader-member exchanges are explained to be the exchanges that occur specifically between the employee and his or her leader (Wayne, Shore, & Linden, 1997, p. 82). According to Wayne, Shore and Linden (1997),

> "Immediate superiors may act as conduits of organizational resources, especially in hierarchically structured organizations. Superiors are often instrumental in determining salary increases and bonuses as well as in providing career advice, task and training opportunities, emotional support, and information" (p.104).

It is crucial that the role of the leader is accepted and understood as a highly influential agent in social exchange within an organization. Leader-member exchange theory can be applicable to any organization. All organizations have relationships between supervisors and subordinates. Numerous other approaches to leadership contain similarities to the leader-member exchange theory.

**Leadership Theory**

Polleys (2002) explored servant leadership and distinguished it from three predominant leadership paradigms – the trait, the behavioral, and the contingency approaches to leadership. Significant research has been completed by Jennings (1960), Lester (1974) and Bass (1981) in studying of traits theory of leadership. Traits theory is generally not recognized as a method of determining the successful characteristics of a leader (Gehring, 2007). In addition to trait theory, behavioral theory examined leadership in relationship to behavior and acknowledged that managers develop diverse behavioral repertoires and that it is through these response sets that they perform the act of leadership. These three theories – the trait, behavioral, and contingency have been studied in conjunction with leadership. Researchers have looked at a number of leadership theories. Polleys (2002) views are closely aligned with transforming leadership (Burns, 1978) and servant leadership but made no distinctions among charismatic, transformational, and servant leadership.

*Charismatic Leadership*

In comparison to other leadership theories, the study of charismatic leadership is relatively deficient.  One of the reasons scholars have not focused on charismatic leadership is because of its elusive nature and the mystical connotation of the term (Conger & Kanungo, 1987).  The lack of study, research, or interest does not however indicate that charismatic leaders are not found in organizations. Numerous businesses and organizations contain forms of charismatic leadership (Bass, 1985; House, 1977).  Sandberg and Moreman (2011) communicate that charismatic business leaders are often seen in new or changing organizations and they present high self-esteem and strong convictions. Of course, leaders from all leadership and personality styles can have high self-esteem and strong convictions but charismatic leaders are

often more outspoken about their beliefs and convictions. This outspoken nature is due to their expressive and charismatic personality and human nature.  The application of charismatic leadership is seen within many organizational settings (House, 1977).  Leaders have a strong influence on their subordinates or employees. By expressing an inspirational vision and behaviors, employees may believe both the leader and organization are extraordinary (Cicero & Pierro, 2007).  Perceptions of supervisors are key in getting employees to act in a positive manner within the workplace. In comparison to other leadership theories and models, charismatic leaders tend to display big ideas, visions, and behaviors in expressive ways. In turn, employees may be motivated beyond expected expectations simply by having a charismatic leader (Yukl, 1998). Employees are motivated by what they see, believe, and witness through their supervisors. Research in this section of the review of literature suggests that charismatic leaders may be more likely to foster motivation in the workplace due to the expressive nature of the leaders. Charismatic leadership is one of many different leadership styles. By discussing the nature and context of charismatic leadership, the researcher provided a framework for leadership theory and its comparison to other models of leadership.

*Transformational Leadership Theory*

Bass (1981) describe transformational leadership as being comprised of four elements: inspirational motivation, idealized influence, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation. Bycio et. al (1995) argue that transformational leadership impacts both individuals and groups. At the individual level, transformational leadership enhances employee satisfaction, commitment, motivation, performance, and empowerment (Dvir, Eden, Avolio, & Shamir, 2002). Organizations which chose to implement transformational leadership can have followers that can be continuously developed to higher levels of motivation, morality, and empowerment.

Of course, all organizations can use varying methods of leadership and obtain motivation within the workplace but these mentioned studies illustrate the value of transformational leadership. There is evidence illustrating a positive correlation between performance and transformational leadership. Scholars have indicated these correlations are stronger in respect to transformational leadership versus transactional leadership (Lowe, 1996). At the group level, transformational leadership enhances collective efficacy (Walumba, Wang, Lawler, & Shi, 2004), as well as personal identification with leaders and social identification with the work unit (Kark, Shamir, & Chen, 2003). Individuals will act different according to what they believe or how they perceive their supervisors. The scholars articulate (2003), "how much effort they put into it and their staying power when collective efforts fail to product results. Thus, it is possible that employees with lower efficacy are likely to call in sick rather than face another day of frustration on a job they feel unable to perform" (p. 518). Similar to any leadership theory within an organization, the theory can lead to opportunities for success or failure depending on how employees and employers respond. Thus, scholars have brought forth evidence of the effectiveness of transformational leadership within organizations.

Bass (1981) discussed transformational leadership and its relationship with other theories, including servant leadership. In this work, servant leadership was described as having a number of parallels with transformational leadership (vision, influence, credibility, trust, and service), but it moved beyond transformational leadership with its alignment of leaders and followers motives.

**Servant Leadership**

Another form of leadership which is discussed along with transformational leadership is servant leadership. Robert Greenleaf has advanced knowledge of servant leadership through research and publications. Greenleaf states, "A low-trust culture that is characterized by high-

control management, political posturing, protectivism, cynicisim, and internal competition and

adversarialism simply cannot compete with the speed, quality, and innovation of those

organizations around the world that do empower people" (2002, p. 127). Much research has been

done in the area of servant leadership.  Servant leadership often begins with the natural feeling

that one wants to serve" (2002). Both teaching and servant leadership focus heavily on

relationships. Listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight,

stewardship, commitment to the growth of others, building community, and calling all relate

directly to servant leadership.

Akuchie (1993) explored the bibilical roots of servant leadership and explored the

religious and spiritual articulations of the construct. However, this work did not articulate a clear

framework for understanding servant leadership, as distinct from other forms of leadership.

Others have drawn close ties to biblical  figures (see Hawkinson & Johnston, 1993; Snodgrass,

1993), but this approach has been tangential to the larger body of servant leadership literature.

Spears (1995) extended Greenleaf's work by articulating 10 characteristics of a servant

leader – listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight,

stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and community building. These 10

characteristics are seen in many studies relating to servant leadership. This work did not connect

to or distinguish itself from other conceptualizations of leadership as Graham's (1995) work had;

however, it did provide the closest representation of an articulated framework for what

characterizes servant leadership. Servant leadership communicates the idea of caring less about

oneself and more about others. Spears (1995) 10 characteristics of listening, empathy, healing,

awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of

people, and community building illustrate the central idea of servant leadership and the aspect of putting other people first.

Farling, Stone, and Winston (1999) presented a hierarchial model of servant leadership as a cyclical process, consisting of behavioral (vision, service) and relational (influence, credibility, trust) components. The behavioral and relational aspects of leadership are brought forth in more detail through servant leadership. Scholars have differing views of leadership theories. Even focusing on servant leadership, scholars are not unified on the exact inclusions and model of servant leadership. The differing views are due in part to the relatively new interest in studying servant leadership. Therefore the amount of studies on servant leadership is few in comparison to other leadership theories such as transformational leadership (Bass, 1985).

Sendjaya and Sarros (2002) examined the research viability of servant leadership, studying its philosophy dating back for religious scriptures. They argued that servant leaders view themselves as stewards and are entrusted to develop and empower followers to reach their fullest potential. However, this work did not develop or propose a testable framework, and no connection or distinction from other constructs were described. Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) described servant leadership as composed of 11 characteristics built on the more influential works in the field. The eleven characteristics consist of calling, listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, growth, and community building (2006). This framework specified calling as fundamental to servant leadership and consistent with Greenleaf's original message. This work was geared for practitioners and lacked the theoretical development necessary to advance the servant leadership construct to an operational level.

McCuddy and Calvin's study (2009), "Fundamental Moral Orientations, Servant Leadership, and Leadership Effectiveness: An empirical test," goal is to determine the overall effectiveness of servant leadership based on three hypotheses.  Selfishness is a major factor involving servant leadership.  The study also describes corporate leadership as being measured from the bottom line including profit and loss statements.  The article also describes how no one leadership style is effective in all situations.  In addition, how does one determine effectiveness in business?  Effectiveness could be group cohesion, relationships, profit, or expanding markets.  The results of the study illustrate selfless people more often exhibit servant leadership behaviors.  Also, a person possessing servant leadership behaviors is orientated with greater leadership effectiveness.  Another study illustrates servant leadership behaviors vary across demographic characteristics.  Socioeconomic status, level of educational attainment, age, domicile, and gender are examined to determine demographic effects on servant leadership.  Each of the demographic effects except gender ,brought forth a tendency to exemplify servant leadership.

Karl (2000) identifies the main function of any organization, business, church, agency, is to serve.  The main problem of many organizations is being the lack of effective, ethical leadership.  Servant leaders tend to serve each other first.  In contrast, leaders who choose to lead first instead of serving will use people or stand on their shoulders.  The article goes on to describe Christ as a servant leader. Sendjaya, Sarros, and Santor describe two interesting behavioral dimensions of servant leadership which include: "Spirituality and morality/ethics, both of which address specific work behaviors often excluded from traditional measures of leadership" (2008, p. 402). Successful leaders spend a large majority of time actively trying to change employee's behaviors.  Effective communicators and leaders have a theory of influence,

go beyond talking, and don't believe in a simple gimmick or tactic to change a person's behavior.

The goal of a successful leader is to create an environment where people are motivated to work to their fullest potential.  Leaders must be concerned with how to become more effective while recognizing the importance of values and relationships.  Savage-Austin, and Honeycutt (2011) examine how organization barriers may prevent effective servant leadership from taking place which can impact the goals of an organization.  The goal of servant leadership is for employers to ensure the needs of subordinates are met.  Employees are encouraged to serve each other, solve problems, and to communicate effectively with one another.

From the time Robert Greenleaf (1970) wrote his thought-provoking essay on leadership to present day, the concept of servant leadership has been a highly embraced topic. According to Spears (1998), servant leadership advances a "group-oriented approach to analysis and decision making as a means of strengthening institutions and improving society (p. 9)."Authentic leaders are chosen by followers.  A leader should be someone that knows where they are going and can convince others to follow. The ability to lead with integrity depends on the leader's skills for withdrawal and action, listening and persuasion, practical goal setting and intuitive prescience. Servant leadership begins with the self, a person that exemplifies this leadership style has a mindset and goal within oneself to have a mindset of service. Oftentimes people focus on how to climb the corporate ladder, while stepping over and on top of coworkers. Servant leaders put others before themselves.

How can an organization become more focused on serving others? Spears (1998) describes, "I see no other way than that the people who inhabit it serve better and work together toward synergy – the whole becoming greater than the sum of its parts" (p. 21). Servant

leadership must be reinforced from the top-down. Organizations and companies which want to

have servant leadership throughout the company to have leadership by example. Strong

leadership at the top will bring forth opportunities for many more people to use servant

leadership. Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) compared servant leadership, transformational

leadership, and lead-member exchange (LMX) theories through the following table:

**TABLE 1**
**Comparing Servant Leadership, Transformational Leadership, and Leader-Member-Exchange (LMX) Theories**

|  | *Servant Leadership Theory* | *Transformational Leadership Theory* | *LMX Theory* |
|---|---|---|---|
| Nature of theory | Normative | Normative | Descriptive |
| Role of leader | To serve followers | To inspire followers to pursue | To develop positive relationships with followers |
| Role of follower | To become wiser, freer, more autonomous | To pursue organizational goals | To develop positive relationships with leaders |
| Moral component | Explicit | Unspecified | Unspecified |
| Outcomes expected | Follower satisfaction, development, and commitment to service, societal betterment | Goal congruence; increased effort, satisfaction, and productivity; organizational gain | High LMX--satisfaction, mutual trust, increased effort |
| Individual level | Desire to serve | Desire to lead | Desire to relate |
| Interpersonal level | Leader serves follower | Leader inspires follower | Leader exchanges with follower |
| Group level | Leader serves group to meet members needs | Leader unites group to pursue group goals | Leader develops different exchanges with each person |
| Organizational level | Leader prepares organization to serve community | Leader inspires followers to pursue organizational goals | Unspecified |

| Societal level | Leader leaves a positive legacy for the betterment of society | Leader inspires nation or society to pursue articulated goals | Unspecified |
|---|---|---|---|

*Measures of Servant Leadership*

Cook and Wall examine three instrumental measures which include: interpersonal trust at work, organizational commitment, and personal need non-fulfillment.  Trust is described as having confidence in the words and actions of others (2002).  Trust is a major factor in communication and leadership within any organization. Relational trust amongst coworkers can lead to the success or failure of an organization. Organization commitment is having concern with feelings and attachment of goals and values of the organization.  Organizational commitment also distinguished three components: identification, involvement, and loyalty Personal need non-fulfillment focuses on the higher needs of people in non-managerial and non-professional jobs where satisfaction of needs is restricted by tasks performed.

In Ray's (1993) study of communication and social support in the workplace, participants completed the Interpersonal Solidarity Scale, the Revised Self-Disclosure Scale, and the Individualize Trust Scale.  The results reveal perceived solidarity and trust were lower with information peers than with collegial or special peers, but self-disclosure was not. Informational peers refer to relationships in the workplace which predominantly are used for information exchange. In contrast, collegial or special peers refer to workplace relationships in which coworkers work together, develop more in-depth friendships, and exchange information. This study is important because it indicates trust and self-discloser are different among coworkers depending on the quality of relationships in the workplace.

**Social Exchange Theory**

Coworkers are constantly determining whether to tell or not tell each other information. How will the exchange of information or lack thereof affect workplace relationships? According to Littlejohn and Foss (2008), "Within social exchange theory, human interaction is like an economic transaction: you seek to maximize rewards while minimize costs" (p.203). Supervisors and businesses alike want to maximize rewards and minimize costs. "Every decision is a balance between costs and rewards" (p.203). Employees of organizations are constantly determining if a possible action (cost) will bring about enough of a benefit (reward).

Numerous scholars identified Social Exchange Theory as a framework in studying employees, leadership in the workplace, and employee outcomes (Zhang, & Jia, 2010; Jones, 2010; Noblet, & Rodwell, 2009; Gould-Williams, & Davies, 2005; Ramaswami, Srinivasan, & Gorton, 1997). Gould-Williams and Davies (2005) discussed how team-working was found to predict employee commitment and motivation, with employee involvement, empowerment, the offer of fair rewards and job security having significant effects on worker motivation.  Team work is a major aspect of all organizations. How well a team works together is highly influenced by supervisors and management. If management's actions are positively viewed by employees, it is likely they will reciprocate with attitudes and behaviors by the organization. This behavior can be seen in many organizations and business such as Chick-fil-A. Management and supervisors are a major part of organizations and the social exchange theory. The relationships between employees and supervisors include both social and economic exchanges (Aryee, Budhwar, & Chen, 2002).These exchanges will include actions which may or may not be taken by employees. The employees decide the value of taken particular actions in the workplace.

Bolat, Bolat, and Seymen (2009) examined the effects of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, leadership, and such variables have on organizational commitment behavior. Bolat et al surveyed 280 hotel employees through questionnaires. The study concluded that empowering leader behaviors generally have a positive effect on the behavior of employees. The study did not look at specific forms of leadership or leadership types but was able to determine the behaviors and actions of leadership impact employee attitudes and performance.

In a study focused on leadership and social exchange, authors Keller and Dansereau (1995) studied 20 managers, 30 professionals, and 42 hourly workers. Dyads of subordinates and superiors' reports were analyzed. According to Keller and Dansereau (1995), "superiors invest in subordinates by providing support for self-worth and negotiating latitude" (p.143). There is a significant relationship between leadership and empowerment and this study provides support that placing power and trust in subordinates results in satisfying performance on all levels. Effective leadership can enable employees to perform actions in the workplace which can lead to benefits to both the employee and employers.  The social exchange theory directly relates to leadership methods and measurements of trust, satisfaction, and performance because employees must decide if taking an action is worth any possible "cost."

**Trust**

Trust is considered a measurement of servant leadership and has been studied by Chatbury, 2011; Gersh, 2006; Rieke, Hammermeister, & Chase, 2008; and Hamilton, 2005 in relationship to servant leadership. Gersh (2006) discussed how servant leadership is based upon the elements of trust, caring, empathy, and focus on others. Trust must be present in any organization in order for effective communication and actions to take place. Greenleaf (1977) communicated the idea that trust is first when it comes to servant leadership. Trust must be

brought forth in order for effective decisions to occur within the workplace. The reason why it is important to have trust in any relationship, and in this case the workplace; is that people constantly are taking risks (Gersh, 2006). People are willing to accept anticipated risk because employees trust the leadership of that particular company. This section will examine studies relating to trust and servant leadership within organizations. By examining scholarly research and studies on trust, the review of literature will discuss the measure of relational trust and the correlation with perceived measures of supervisor's servant leadership.

Rieke, Hammermeister, and Chase (2008) looked at servant leadership from the aspect of a coach and found many elements of the servant leadership model, such as trust, inclusion, humility and service, are correlate to effective coach-athlete relationships. The purpose of the study was to examine how coaches who were perceived by their athletes to possess "servant leader" characteristics were associated with their athletes use of mental skills, motivation, satisfaction and performance. The study (2008) concluded that the high-school athletes preferred the servant-leader coaching style to more traditional styles and found coaches who use the methods advocated by the servant leader model produce athletes with a healthier psychological profile for sport who also perform well.

One main aspect of the servant leader model is the trust within the organization. Truett Cathy's employees and employers enjoy their work. Truett Cathy's website states, "The bottom line is that our people, from our restaurant Operators to the team members they hire, enjoy their work. Fewer than five percent of our franchises Operators leave the chain in any given year" (2009). The low turnover is a testimony to the success of the business.

Spector (2005) describes trust in individuals as an expectation or belief that actions from another party will be motivated by good intentions (p. 311). Karl (2000) noted that trust among

organizational members is at an all-time low, and Morris (1995) found that 56% of

nonmanagement employees in 57 service and manufacturing organizations viewed a lack of trust

literature (Whitener, Brodt, Korsgaard, & Werner, 1998) showed that personal trust is linked to

cooperation, performance, and quality of communication in organizations. Working together

requires some degree of trust, and the type of work encounters that occur in today's

organizations require trust to be formed rather quickly (McKnight, Cummings, & Chervany,

1998). Trust in individuals is an expectation or belief that actions from other persons are

motivated by good intentions. However, individuals can take a risk in due to the fact that the

other party may not act out of benevolence (Whitener, 1998). A critical time for the development

of trust for another person in an organizational context is the beginning of the relationship.

Trust is important because of its key relationship with human interactions. Cook 2005

described trust that develops from general beliefs about expectations is closely related to one's

willingness to trust others during the interaction process. These type of interactions will develop

relationships in social and organizational lives that go beyond economic interests according to

Lewicki & Bunker (1996). Trust is extremely important in relationships in the workplace. The

attitude of trust held by individuals relating to each other in the workplace  is vital to the

relationships (Costa, 2003). Trust within the organization, according to Gabarro and Athos

(1976) is described as one's expectations, assumptions, or beliefs for the organization actions

that will influence the likelihood of the employee's future actions. Costa (2001) describes the

lack of trust will make an employee feel tense, unsatisfied, less emotionally committed, and may

become unproductive, resulting in a number of different potential responses by employees. The

responses could include confrontation in the workplace, social withdrawal, working less, or

leaving the organization (Lewicki, McAllister, Bies, & Tripp, 1998). The initial level of trust can affect long-term trust levels within organizations such as Chick-fil-A.

**Satisfaction**

The relationship between satisfaction and servant leadership has been studied by Mheta, & Pillay, 2011; Jaramillo, Grisaffe, Chonko, & Roberts 2009; and Stramba, 2003. Researchers Chung, Chan, Kyle, & Petrick (2010) revealed that two dimensions of servant leadership which were trust in leader and leader support significantly influenced job satisfaction. There were also significant differences in the perceived leadership and job satisfaction between supervisors and non-supervisors (2010). The findings offer practical implications for how supervisors can create a just and fair organizational culture for increasing job satisfaction. This study examined the correlation between perceived level of servant leadership by the employees is related to job satisfaction within Chick-fil-A. Several studies have been shown to positively correlate job satisfaction and perceived level of servant leadership (e.g., Bateman & Strasser, 1984; Matheiu & Zajac 1990; Vandenberg & Lance, 1992). The researcher will determine if the same correlation of perceived levels of servant leadership and job satisfaction exists within this present study.

In recent years job satisfaction has received a great deal of attention from economists and policy makers. Researchers and studies have established that job satisfaction was related to a number of objective job features and was able to predict consequences such as absenteeism and quits (Borjas, 1979; Freeman, 1978; Hamermesh, 1977). Scholars have looked at the importance of satisfaction in the workplace. However, few scholars have examined the correlation between job satisfaction and coworkers perceived level of supervisor's servant leadership. Thompson (2002) concluded employees who worked in an organization which focused on the servant leader

model responded with a higher level of job satisfaction.  Thus, satisfaction in the workplace can lead to an overall more successful and effective organization.

An employee can be satisfied with the basic content of the job, but may be frustrated if it does not allow one to grow or move in to roles in other areas of the organization. Lautizi (2009) describes how important it is to have access to opportunity to learn and grow. Sabiston and Laschinger (1995) found that nurses who considered their work environments empowering felt a greater sense of power and autonomy at work. The concept of servant leadership involves giving the opportunity for subordinates or employees to be empowered. Many leaders do not even give employees the opportunity to be empowered in their work environment. By not empowering individuals in the workplace, leaders are limiting the chances of employees to experience a high level of job satisfaction. More empowered individuals believed they gained autonomy from their involvement in decision making processes within the organization. Satisfaction is more likely to occur when individuals can make their own decisions in the workplace. Based on the research in this section, employees are satisfied when empowered and given opportunities to learn and grow.

Workplace satisfaction and empowerment also relates to burnout and stress among employees. Cho (2006) studied the impact of empowerment on how a person "fits" in a job, the level of engagement on the job, and burnout among employees. Manojlovich (2007) concluded that employees whom feel dissatisfied and powerless with their jobs are particularly susceptible to burnout and depersonalization. Burnout in the workplace will likely lead to limited productivity in the workplace and a less pleasing work environment.

When employee communication satisfaction is low, outcomes include: lower employee commitment, increased absenteeism, higher employee turnover, and reduced productivity (Hargie, 2002). For individual employees, poor organization communication can result in

burnout, increased stress, and increased uncertainty about the self, others, relationships, or situations (Ray, 1993). Many features of a job affect job satisfaction.

In this study, the researcher will determine if the perceived level of supervisor's servant leadership affects the job satisfaction of employees. Of course, many other factors go into job satisfaction in the workplace but for this study the researcher will focus on how perceived level of servant leadership affects job satisfaction. Numerous other scholars concluded that job satisfaction positively correlated to perceived levels of servant leadership (Bateman & Strasser, 1984; Matheiu & Zajac 1990; Vandenberg & Lance, 1992). For the purpose of this study, the researcher will determine if employee's perceptions of Chick-fil-A supervisors affects personal job satisfaction.  The next section of the review of literature examines the relationship between organizational performance and servant leadership.

**Performance**

In addition to satisfaction within the workplace, performance is an exceedingly studied topic and rightly so. Job performance and servant leadership have been looked at within organizations and businesses. Scholars have examined the impact of servant leadership and performance (Jaramillo, Grisaffe, Chonko, & Roberts, 2009; Indartono, Hawjeng, & Chun-His Vivia, 2010; Vinod, & Sudhakar, 2011; Melchar, & Bosco, 2010; Carver, 2010; Ebener, & O'Connell, 2010).  All businesses and organization want to obtain success and high performance. Businesses in today's society are focused on the bottom-line. What can an organization do in order to become more successful? Many organizations have decided to operate under the leadership style of servant leadership. The organizations and businesses that choose to implement servant leadership give subordinates their full attention which can lead to successful

company productivity. This section of the literature review examines studies which have been done in relation to organizational performance and servant leadership.

Organizations are constantly striving to enhance performance in the workplace. In order to maximize the productive potential of human capital in organizations, a basic building block is the individual contributor. Employers need to focus on their associates according to Schermerhorn (2004) "Rather than trying to manipulate or even logically persuade others, they achieve positive influence through integrity, trustworthiness and genuine concern" (p. 53). People love to get attention and focus from others. Servant leadership enables supervisors to devote their full attention to serving their employees. Servant leadership is a style which focuses on showing care and concern for others. This leadership style gives employees and employers the opportunity to develop positive relationships in the workplace.

Support for the employees is extremely important in order to seek organizational success. Support in organizations comes from many different areas including management, coworkers, and organizational support. Facteau (1998) discusses organizational support as "the extent to which employees perceive that they are valued and cared about by the organization and that the organization cares about their development. Chen, Eisenberger, Johnson, Sucharski, & Aselage (2009) brought forth the aspect that perceived organizational support is influenced by various aspects of an employee's treatment by the organization and in turn influences the employee's interpretation of organizational motives underlying that treatment. Additional researchers Van Yperen and Hagedoorn (2003) discovered that intrinsic motivation related positively to the presence of social support with supervisors, coworkers in the workplace.  Businesses across all markets need to maximize their employees performance in order to stay in the black. Organizations have introduced new forms of organizational communication, management, and

leadership methods such as servant leadership. Leadership styles can lead to employees being more motivated to perform at a high level and meet the responsibilities of a job. What are some actions or conditions that would maximize or minimize performance in the workplace? Enhancing job social support in particular can reduce strain and increase motivation and performance.

Employers and researchers alike seek ways to improve performance in the fast-paced, ever-changing business workplace. All the leadership methods mentioned in this review of literature can potentially lead to an increase in job productivity. For the purpose of this study, the researcher examines the possible correlation between organization job performance and employees perceptions of supervisor's servant leadership. Scholars have examined the impact of servant leadership on performance (Schermerhorn, 2004; Chen, Eisenberger, Johnson, Sucharski, & Aselage, 2009; Van Yperen and Hagedoorn, 2003). This study will add to previous research in determining if organizations and businesses that choose to implement servant leadership give subordinates their full attention which can lead to successful company productivity. This section of the literature review examined studies which have been done in relation to organization performance and servant leadership. The goal of the study is to examine the correlation of employee's perceptions of supervisor's level of servant leadership and trust, satisfaction, and performance in the workplace. This present study will also determine if gender is a factor in perceptions of servant leadership, trust, satisfaction, and performance.

Extensive research has been conducted on leadership, leadership theory, servant leadership, as well as trust, satisfaction, and performance in the workplace. Though extensive research has been done on leadership and indicators of effective leadership, few studies have been done on specific companies which implement the servant leadership model from a biblical

perspective. Well-known organizations and companies which are at the top of their market, and uphold biblical, Christian, leadership principles are few and far between. Thus, by studying servant leadership and the measurements of trust, satisfaction, and performance in the workplace, the researcher and society will have a better understanding of the effectiveness of servant leadership in top companies. By understanding more about Chick-fil-A, servant leadership, and measurements of trust, satisfaction, and performance in the workplace, the researcher will help open a new field of learning; The new field of learning and thought which is in the secular world. Future scholars could build off similar research methods in comparing traditionally secular leadership methods in comparison to biblically, Christian methods of leadership. Using surveys, this study assessed servant leadership within Chick-fil-A and its correlation to measurements of trust, satisfaction, and performance along with differing views in relation to gender. The study will use a quantitative approach using surveys. The next chapter explores the methodological processes employed in this study.

**CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY**

The review of literature reiterates how important additional research on servant leadership is within organizations and the workplace. Ferch (2011) articulates:

When night falls darkness comes, but at dawn, light illuminates the world. In the literature of humanity light is vision, clarity, and hope – the awaited answer to the cry heard in darkness. Servant-leadership is such a light: subtle, noted for its dignity, and shining on the edge of a bread landscape, drawing the people of the world to a fuller experience of what it means to be with one another (p. 21).

In addition to the servant leader model, the literature review covered leadership theory, trust, satisfaction, and performance. Servant leadership can have an effect on each of these items. The purpose of the study was to test the relationship between the perceived level of servant leadership in supervisors and the level trust, satisfaction, and performance in the workplace.

The researcher has always been interested in leadership and its effect on others. For the past four summers the researcher has worked with an internship program which focuses on developing servant minded leaders. The researcher's educational background is in international business and communication. Servant leadership relates directly to both fields of study. Businesses and organizations have implemented servant leadership into their purpose and mission. In addition, servant leadership is only attainable through effective communication.  The researcher performed the study to continue to gain a better understanding of how servant leadership affects the workplace.

Merrigan and Huston describe the importance of researcher credibility, "For interpretive communication scholars, researcher credibility is an especially important standard because the researcher is the instrument through which interpretations are made" (p. 89). The goal of the

researcher throughout the study was to set aside subjective opinions regarding the topics of research and focus on the objective data.

**Research Design**

The data for the study was collected through the distribution of surveys to individuals who currently work at Chick-fil. The two selected locations were approximately 300 miles apart in Virginia. One location was in a predominately college town and the other location was in a predominately urban and touristy setting. In describing the two different Chick-fil-A franchise restaurants the researcher used location A and location B in order for the information to remain confidential. The data was collected through traditional paper-and-pencil administration. Statistical data were analyzed in reference to the two research questions which each contained three parts. In this section of the results, the findings are discussed in relation to the research questions.

The study employed quantitative research methods in order to collect and analyze the data from the participants at the two Chick-fil-A franchises. In order to conduct the quantitative study, the researcher surveyed individuals who currently work at one of the two Chick-fil-A franchises using a series of demographic questions as well as four survey scales. The researcher included a number of demographic questions at the beginning of the survey. The following demographic questions were included in the survey: What is your gender, what is your race/ethnicity, what is the highest level of education you have completed, how long have you been employed at Chick-fil-A, please mark the shift you normally work, please mark which best reflects your role at Chick-fil-A, and please mark the location you work at.

The four scales measured satisfaction, trust, performance, and servant leadership. The survey measures test RQ1:

RQ1 A: Does employee's perception of supervisor's servant leadership affect organizational performance?

RQ1 B: Does employee's perception of supervisor's servant leadership affect personal job satisfaction?

RQ1 C: Does employee's perception of supervisor's servant leadership affect perceived relational trust amongst coworkers?

The survey measurement used to test the perception of servant leadership in immediate supervisor's has been tested by Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) with initial development of the survey recommended by Pillai, Schriesheim, and Williams (1999). Barbuto and Wheeler's study captured the 11 characteristics of servant leadership. Items were written for clarity and congruence to Spear's (1995) descriptions were appropriate. The survey measure was tested for internal reliability using SPSS scale internal reliability functions, which featured a removal of poor item performance function based on item total factor correlations. The reliabilities of each of the 10 servant leadership subscales were accessed by Barbuto and Wheeler (2006).

The next survey instrument which was used in this study was designed to measure the employee's perception of servant leadership for their immediate supervisor. The 13 item scale was developed by Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) and included the following statements: This person puts my best interests ahead of his/her own. This person does everything he/she can to serve me. This person sacrifices his/her own interests to meet my needs. This person goes above and beyond the call of duty to meet my needs. This person seems alert to what's happening. This person has great awareness of what is going on. This person seems in touch with what's happening. This person seems to know what is going to happen. This person believes that the organization needs to play a moral role in society. This person sees the organization for its potential to contribute to society. This person encourages me to have a community spirit in the workplace. This person is preparing the organization to make a positive difference in the future.

In order to test whether the perception of servant leadership in supervisors has an effect on employees performance, trust, and satisfaction, three additional survey tools were implemented. "Small Group Socialization Scale" (SGSS), developed through Riddle et al. (2000), brings forth a discussion relating to people's perceptions of effective group communication and satisfaction. The SGSS scale tested how satisfied employees were within their work-group.  Effective group communication is evaluated based on both task and relational dimensions.  SGSS using a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree) in order to measure perceptions of group socialization.  The survey questions are designed to allow respondents to reflect on their experiences and perceptions of groups.

The Small Group Socialization Scale is proven reliable through two studies of Riddle et al. (2000) The first study tested for reliability by asking open-ended questions relating to fitting in, comfort, certainty, and satisfaction.  The second study performed by Riddle et al. (2000) used the SGSS while also tested for cohesion, consensus, satisfaction, and loneliness.  The study surveyed 210 small group communication students.  The results demonstrated concurrent validity for the SGSS.  The SGSS is a valid scale but has not been used across all fields of studies. Future research should continue to test the validity of the scale while broadening the testing across all fields of studies.

The researcher also evaluated how the perceived level of servant leadership affects co-workers performance in the workplace. In order to test for performance the researcher used a 12-item survey tool which included the following statements: Coming up with new ideas, work to implement new ideas, find improved ways to do things, create better processes and routines, work as part of a team or work group, seek information from others in his/her work group, make sure his/her work group succeeds, respond to the needs of others in his/her work group, do things

that helps others when it's not part of his/her job, work for the overall good of the company, do things to promote the company, and help so that the company is a good place to be. The researcher asked the participants to respond to the survey items based on a five-point likert-scale ranging from very unlikely to very likely in regards to feelings of how likely a co-worker would perform in the workplace.

The researcher also used the "Individualized Trust Scale" (Wheeles, & Grotz, 1997) to test how if the perceived level of servant leadership effects how much employees trust each other in the workplace. Trust is described by Wheeles & Grotz (1997) as "a process of holding certain relevant, favorable perceptions of another person which engender certain types of depend behaviors in a risky situation where the expected outcomes that are dependent upon that other person(s) are not know with certainty" (p. 251). Individualized trust is an important factor within interpersonal communication and the workplace. The survey measure asked the participants to indicate their feelings of trust towards their coworkers.

**Participants**

There were several criteria participants needed to meet in order to have taken part in this study. The participants needed to currently work at one of the two selected Chick-fil-A franchise restaurants. In addition to currently working at one of the Chick-fil-A franchise restaurants, the participants needed to fall within the age range of 18 and 65. Both male and female workers were considered for participation in the study.

**Participant Anonymity and Confidentiality**

The name of the participants will not be discussed or disclosed to any other persons. The decision to participate would not affect the participant's current or future relations with Chick-fil-A or Liberty University. All responses will be kept secure under password protection and in a

locked file cabinet that can only be accessed by the researcher. After three years all information

pertaining to the study will be destroyed. Participation in this study was voluntary. The

participants were instructed that they were free to not answer any of the questions or withdraw at

any time. The participants were instructed to feel free to contact the researchers if they had any

questions pertaining to the study.

**Data Collection**

All current employees of the two Chick-fil-A franchises which fall under eligible

participates previously mentioned were able to participate in the study.  The owner of each

Chick-fil-A restaurant allowed employees to take the survey before or after work during a one-

week time frame. The participants answered questions which took approximately 5-10 minutes

to complete. Participants volunteered to participate in the study by agreeing to the statement of

consent on the first page of the survey. The participants did not need to put their name or any

personal contact information anywhere on the survey. The researcher confirmed the participants'

anonymity and verified at the beginning of the survey that any response would be kept

confidential. By providing anonymity, the researcher hoped participants would be able to provide

unrestricted replies to the survey questions. Consistent with typical research practices, the

participants were also asked several demographic questions, such as their age, gender, and

ethnicity.

The surveys were administered in print form. Print surveys offer several advantages in

contrast to online surveys (Evans & Mathur, p. 197). Participants did not need to have the

technological skills or online experience necessary to complete the surveys accurately. Print

surveys can be more costly and take more time inputting the data but can be seen as more

personal due to being face-to-face. Print surveys in a face-to-face setting also typically offer

more socially desirable responses (Heerwegh, 2009). Print surveys were a very effective method of data collection.

**Data Analysis**

After collecting all the surveys, the researcher created a document in order to input the data and begin the steps of analysis. The researcher coded all the demographic and survey items with key words and phrases in order to properly transfer the information to SPSS. The responses were also coded with numbers for accurate quantitative analysis. The first demographic question related to gender. If the participant indicated female the researcher would code "1" in the document and if the participant indicated male the researcher would code "2" in the document. For 5 point likert-scale questions the researcher would code "1" for strongly disagree and "5" for strongly agree and "2," "3", and "4" for response in the middle. The researcher was consistent with this method of data entry throughout the entirety of this study. The consistent approach enabled research reliability and validity.

**Research Reliability and Validity**

To confirm the reliability of the study's results, the researcher remained consistent with the measurement, collection, and analysis throughout the duration of the study. The communication methods and instructions were also consistent throughout the process. Each survey was identical to each other. The survey began with a consent form, followed by 7 demographic questions, and four survey measurements. The questions and order of questions for each survey was consistent.

Another important quality in the research process is validity (Brod, Tesler, and Christensen, p. 1263). To increase the results' validity, the researcher reviewed the participants

responses several times and used SPSS in order to determine the significance of questions and participants responses.

**Ethical Consideration**

The research study contained minimal ethical considerations. In accordance to federal regulations, the researcher gained approval for the study from the Internal Review Board (IRB) and Liberty University. The participants were notified prior to the study that the study was being conducted by researchers from Liberty University School of Communication. Participation in the study would not affect participant's current or future relations with Liberty University or Chick-fil-A.

The study involved no more emotional or physical stress than might be anticipated in daily life and did not put participants at financial or legal risk. The research was minimal risk due to participants answering questions relating to perceptions of servant leadership and trust, satisfaction, and performance between coworker relationships. The records of this study were kept private. The participants were notified that in any sort of report the researchers publish, they would not include any information that would make it possible to identify a subject. The research records would be stored securely and only the researcher would have access to the records. The participants were required to agree to terms of the study and acknowledge consent prior to taking part in the study. Throughout the entire process of the research study, the researcher executed the study with ethical concerns in mind.

**CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS**

The study employed quantitative research methods in order to collect and analyze the data from the participants at the two Chick-fil-A franchises. In order to conduct the quantitative study, the researcher surveyed individuals who currently work at one of the two Chick-fil-A franchises using a series of demographic questions as well as four survey scales. The researcher included a number of demographic questions at the beginning of the survey. The following demographic questions were included in the survey: What is your gender, what is your race/ethnicity, what is the highest level of education you have completed, how long have you been employed at Chick-fil-A, please mark the shift you normally work, please mark which best reflects your role at Chick-fil-A, and please mark the location you work at.

The present study utilized four different survey scales based on likert-scale analysis to measure satisfaction, trust, performance, and servant leadership. The data for the study was collected through the distribution of surveys to individuals who currently work at one of the two selected Chick-fil-A franchises in Virginia. In describing the two different Chick-fil-A franchise restaurants the researcher used location A and location B in order for the information to remain confidential. The data was collected through traditional paper-and-pencil administration. Statistical data were analyzed in reference to the two research questions which each contained three parts. In this section of the results, the findings are discussed in relation to the research questions.

The study contained a total of 31 qualified participants. Of these 31 participants, 21 were female (67.7%) and 10 were male (32.3%). The participants ranged in ages from 18-50. The average age for the participants was 26.24. The participants represented several different ethnicities including White/Caucasian (N=27, 87.1%), American Indian/Native American (N=3,

9.7%), and Black/African American (N=1, 3.2%). The participants also had different educational

backgrounds. The majority of participants (N=22) had at least some college and 4 were college

graduates.

Nearly half of the employees surveyed from Chick-fil-A had been employed for 1-3 years

(N=15). Approximately 16% of the participants worked at Chick-fil-A for less than a year and

about 16% worked at Chick-fil-A for longer than six years. The participants indicated working in

the morning (N=7, 22.6%), afternoon (N=4, 12.9%), evening (N=16, 51.6%) and other (N=4,

12.9%). Thus, the majority of respondents (N=16) indicated that they primarily work during the

evening shift. The participant's role at Chick-fil-A included shift manager (N=7, 22.6%), cook

(N=3, 9.7%), cashier (N=17, 54.8%), and other (N=4, 12.9%). The participants worked at one of

the two Chick-fil-A restaurants including location A (N=11, 35.5%) and location B (N=20,

64.5%).

**Analysis of Each Survey Item**

The results section will go through the results from the four different scales which

measured job satisfaction, relational trust, organizational performance, and perceived measures

of supervisor's servant leadership. Following the examination of responses from individual

survey items, the research questions will be inspected. After looking at the results, the next

chapter will discuss and interpret the results in greater detail and meaning.

*Job Satisfaction*

The first survey instrument relating to job satisfaction instructed participants to "Respond

to the following statements about the people you work with at Chick-fil-A." The first set of 12

questions on the survey instructed participants to rate their level of agreement on satisfaction in

the workplace based on a five-point likert scale. The following 12 statements were used in the

study and participants indicated responses ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

| Table 2 |
| --- |
| *Organizational Performance Survey Items* |
| The group members spend time getting to know each other.<br>The members make me feel a part of the group.<br>I look forward to coming to the group meetings.<br>I do not feel part of the group.<br>The members make me feel liked.<br>My absence would not matter to the group.<br>I can trust group members.<br>We can say anything in this group without worrying.<br>I prefer not to spend time with members of the group.<br>The members made me feel involved in the group.<br>Some of the group members could become my friends.<br>The group atmosphere is comfortable. |

The first item on the survey relating to job satisfaction was "the group members spend

time getting to know each other." In response to the first item, 7 (22.6%) respondents indicated

they neither agree nor disagree, 15 (48.4%) indicated they agree, and 9 (29%) indicated they

strongly agree. Thus, none of the participants disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement.

The results indicate that the coworkers surveyed at Chick-fil-A spend time getting to know each

other in the workplace.

The second item on the survey relating to job satisfaction stated "the members make me

feel part of the group." In response to the second item, 6 (19.4%) indicated they neither agree nor

disagree, 11 (35.5%) indicated they agree, and 14 (45.2%) indicated they strongly agree.

Similarly to the first item, participants did not disagree or strongly disagree with the statement.

Members whom work at Chick-fil-A seem to make each other feel part of the group.

The third item on the survey relating to job satisfaction was "I look forward to coming to the group meetings." In response to the third item, 1 (3.2%) strongly disagreed with the statement, 5 (16.1%) disagreed, 7 (22.6%) neither agreed nor disagreed, 6 (19.4%) agree, and 12 (38.7%) strongly agreed. Nearly 20% of employees that work at Chick-fil-A do not like coming to the group meetings but approximately 80% of employees are undecided or enjoy coming to group meetings.

The fourth item on the survey relating to job satisfaction was "I do not feel part of the group." In response to the fourth item, 22 (71%) indicated they strongly disagree, 6 (19.4%) indicated they disagree, and 3 (9.7%) indicated they neither agree nor disagree. The likert-scale was reversed for this question in order to ensure accuracy throughout the survey. The results indicated all the participants are undecided or agree with feeling part of the group. Thus, employees of Chick-fil-A feel part of the group within the workplace.

The fifth item on the survey relating to job satisfaction was "The members make me feel liked." In response to the fifth item, 1 (3.2%) indicated they disagree, 3 (9.7%) indicated they neither agree nor disagree, 8 (25.8%) indicated they agree, and 19 (61.3%) indicated they strongly agree. The majority of employees at Chick-fil-A believe they feel liked by coworkers in the workplace.

The sixth item on the survey relating to job satisfaction was "my absence would not matter to the group." In response to the sixth item, 19 (61.3%) indicated they strongly disagree, 7 (22.6%) indicated they disagree, 2 (6.4%) indicated they neither agree nor disagree, and 3 (9.7%) indicated they disagree. Results illustrated that nearly 84% of employees at Chick-fil-A believe their absence would matter to the group. Thus the employees seem to be dependent on each other and care about whether their coworkers come to work.

The seventh item on the survey relating to job satisfaction was "I can trust my group members." In response to the seventh item, 3 (9.7%) indicated they disagree, 5 (16.1%) indicated they neither agree nor disagree, 10 (32.3%) indicated they agree, and 13 (41.9%) indicated they strongly agree. Approximately 73% of respondents specified that they can trust their coworkers at Chick-fil-A.

The eighth item on the survey relating to job satisfaction was "we can say anything in this group without worrying." In response to the eighth item, 5 (16.1%) indicated they strongly disagree, 1 (3.2%) indicated they disagree, 10 (32.3%) indicated they agree, 6 (19.4%) indicated they strongly agree. Participant's response were more evenly divided on this statement. About 20% of employees of Chick-fil-A thought they should be careful of saying anything in the workplace and about 50% responded by indicating they could say anything in this group without worrying.

The ninth item on the survey relating to job satisfaction was "I prefer not to spend time with members of the group." In response to the ninth item, 21 (67.7%) indicated they strongly disagree, 6 (19.4%) indicated they disagree, 3 (9.7%) indicated they neither agree nor disagree, and 1 (3.2%) indicated they strongly agree. Employees of Chick-fil-A (about 87%) indicate that they enjoy spending time with their coworkers.

The tenth item on the survey relating to job satisfaction was "the members made me feel involved in the group." In response to the tenth item, 1 (3.2%) indicated they disagree, 5 (16.1%) indicated they neither agree nor disagree, 14 (45.2%) indicated they agree, and 11 (35.5%) indicated they strongly agree. Approximately 80% of participants surveyed from Chick-fil-A seem to feel that their coworkers make them feel involved in the group.

The eleventh item on the survey relating to job satisfaction was "some of the group members could become my friends." In response to the eleventh item, 3 (9.7%) indicated they neither agree nor disagree, 7 (22.6%) indicated they agree, and 21 (67.7%) indicated they strongly agree. Again, the results showed that about 80% of the employees believe their coworkers could become their friends.

The twelfth item on the survey relating to job satisfaction was "the group atmosphere is comfortable." In response to the last item, 3 (9.7%) indicated they disagree, 1 (3.2%) indicated they neither agree nor disagree, 8 (25.8%) indicated they agree, and 19 (61.3%) indicated they strongly agree. Thus, approximately 85% of employees surveyed specified that the group atmosphere of Chick-fil-A is comfortable.

Responses from the twelve survey items relating to job satisfaction within Chick-fil-A illustrated employees being satisfied with the work environment, and indicated overall job satisfaction.

*Trust*

In addition to job satisfaction, relational trust amongst employees was tested within the organization of Chick-fil-A. The study used the Individualized Trust Scale to test levels of trust in the workplace. The participants responded regarding their immediate feelings towards their co-workers. Participants were instructed to place an "X" in the circle that represented their immediate "feelings" about their co-workers based on a seven point semantic differential scale. If respondents indicated a response of 7 that would represent the highest level of trust while a 1 would represent the lowest level of trust. The survey tool contained the following 14 comparison of "feelings" relating to trust amongst coworkers using a semantic differentiation scale.

Table 3
*Relational Trust Survey Items*

Trustworthy – Untrustworthy
Confidential – Divulging
Greedy – Generous
Safe – Dangerous
Deceptive – Candid
Not deceitful – Deceitful
Tricky – Straightforward
Respectful – Disrespected
Inconsiderate – Considerate
Honest – Dishonest
Unreliable – Reliable
Faithful – Unfaithful
Insincere – Sincere
Careful – Careless

The first item for the Individualized Trust Scale asked participants to describe their level of trust about their coworkers as "trustworthy" or "untrustworthy." In response to the first item, 1 (3.2%) indicated one, 3 (12.9%) indicated four, 1 (3.2%) indicated five, 14 (45.2%) indicated six, and 12 (38.7%) indicated seven. The majority of participants (about 85%) indicated they trust their coworkers at a relatively high number of 6 or 7. Thus employees of Chick-fil-A believe their coworkers are trustworthy.

The second item on the survey relating to relational trust compared "confidential" and "divulging." In response to the second item, 1 (3.2%) indicated one, 1 (3.2%) indicated three, 4 (12.9%) indicated four, 4 (12.9%) indicated five, 9 (29%) indicated six, and 12 (38.7%) indicated seven. Employees of Chick-fil-A believe their coworkers can keep information confidential.

The third item on the survey relating to relational trust compared "greedy" and "generous." In response to the third item, 1 (3.2%) indicated one, 2 (6.4%) indicated three, 3

(9.7%) indicated four, 8 (25.8%) indicated six, and 17 (54.8%) indicated seven. More than 90% of employees at Chick-fil-A believe their coworkers are more generous compared to being greedy.

The fourth item on the survey relating to relational trust compared "safe" and "dangerous." In response to the fourth item, 1 (3.2%) indicate four, 3 (9.7%) indicated five, 9 (29%) indicated six, and 18 (58.1%) indicated seven. The highest number selected was seven for this question which indicated the majority of employees at Chick-fil-a feel that their coworkers are extremely safe compared to dangerous.

The fifth item on the survey relating to relational trust compared "deceptive" and "candid". In response to the fifth item, 1 (3.2%) indicated one, 1 (3.2%) indicated 2, 1 (3.2%) indicated three, 5 (16.1%) indicated four, 1 (3.2%) indicated five, 12 (38.7%) indicated six, and 10 (32.3%) indicated seven. Several employees did indicate that they felt some of their coworkers were deceptive but the majority viewed their coworkers as candid.

The sixth item on the survey relating to relational trust compared "not deceitful" and "deceitful." In response to the sixth item, 1 (3.2%) indicated one, 1 (3.2%) indicated two, 1 (3.2%) indicated three, 1 (3.2%) indicated five, 8 (25.8%) indicated six, and 19 (61.3%) indicated seven. Three employees responded by saying that they feel their coworkers display attitudes and behaviors of deceitfulness while the remaining participants from Chick-fil-a feel their coworkers are not deceitful.

The seventh item on the survey relating to relational trust compared "tricky" and "straightforward." In response to the seventh item, 1 (3.2%) indicated one, 1 (3.2%) indicated two, 4 (12.9%) indicated four, 2 (6.4%) indicated five, 13 (38.7%) indicated six, and 10 (32.3%)

indicated seven. Approximately 70% of respondents feel their coworkers at Chick-fil-A are straightforward.

The eighth item on the survey relating to relational trust compared "respectful" and "disrespected." In response to the eighth item, 1 (3.2%) indicated 2, 2 (6.4%) indicated four, 1 (3.2%) indicated five, 11 (35.5%) indicated six, and 16 (51.6%) indicated seven. Participants responded to the survey question by indicating that they feel their coworkers tend to be more respectful versus disrespected.

The ninth item on the survey relating to relational trust compared "inconsiderate" and "considerate."  In response to the ninth item, 1 (3.2%) indicated one, 1 (3.2%) indicated three, 1 (3.2%) indicated four, 4 (12.9%) indicated five, 8 (25.8%) indicated six, and 16 (51.6%) indicated seven. 24 of the participants (77%) believe that their coworkers are more considerate then inconsiderate.

The tenth item on the survey relating to relational trust compared "honest" and "dishonest." In response to the tenth item, 1 (3.2%) indicated one, 1 (3.2%) indicated three, 2 (6.4%) indicated five, 12 (38.7%) indicated six, and 15 (48.4%) indicated seven. Nearly half of the respondents indicated that they feel their coworkers are honest at the highest possible level compared to being dishonest.

The eleventh item on the survey relating to relational trust compared "unreliable" and "reliable." In response to the eleventh item, 1 (3.2%) indicated two, 2 (6.4%) indicated four, 2 (6.4%) indicated five, 11 (35.5%) indicated six, and 15 (48.4%) indicated seven. The employees of Chick-fil-A feel their coworkers are more reliable than unreliable.

The twelfth item on the survey relating to relational trust compared "faithful" and "unfaithful."  In response to the twelfth item, 1 (3.2%) indicated one, 1 (3.2%) indicated three, 2

(6.4%) indicated five, 9 (29%) indicated six, and 18 (58.1%) indicated seven. Approximately 80% of employees surveyed in the study feel their coworkers are faithful at a high level compared to the opposite of being unfaithful.

The thirteenth item on the survey relating to relational trust compared "insincere" and "sincere." In response to the thirteenth item, 1 (3.2%) indicated one, 1 (3.2%) indicated two, 3 (9.7%) indicated four, 2 (6.4%) indicated five, 9 (29%) indicated six, and 14 (45.2%) indicated seven. About 75% of coworkers at Chick-fil-A feel their coworkers are extremely sincere while 5 (about 16%) felt coworkers displayed some levels of being insincere.

The fourteen items on the survey relating to relational trust compared "careful" and "careless." In response to the fourteenth item, 1 (3.2%) indicated two, 4 (12.9%) indicated four, 3 (9.7%) indicated five, 8 (25.8%) indicated six, and 14 (45.2%) indicated seven.  The majority of respondents from Chick-fil-A feel their coworkers are careful compared to the alternative of being careless.

The results display feelings and attitudes of trust amongst employees within Chick-fil-A. Several outlines in the responses could have affected the study as well. Overall, employees at Chick-fil-A have feelings of trust towards their coworkers.

*Performance*

In addition to relational trust, organizational performance was evaluated in the workplace. The participants were asked to "evaluate your co-workers performance in the workplace." The survey tool contained 12 questions related to performance in the workplace. The researcher asked the participants to respond to the survey items based on a five-point likert-scale ranging from very unlikely to very likely in regards to feelings of how likely a co-worker would perform in the workplace based on the following statements.

Table 4

*Organizational Performance Survey Items*

Coming up with new ideas.
Work to implement new ideas.
Find improved ways to do things.
Create better processes and routines.
Work as part of a team or work group.
Seek information from others in his/her work group.
Make sure his/her work group succeeds.
Respond to the needs of others in his/her work group.
Do things that helps others when it's not part of his/her job.
Work for the overall good of the company.
Do things to promote the company.
Help so that the company is a good place to be.

The first item on the survey relating to organizational performance was "coming up with new ideas." In response to the first item, 2 (6.4%) indicated very unlikely, 6 (19.4%) undecided, 12 (38.7%) likely, and 11 (35.5%) very likely.  Employees at Chick-fil-A believed their coworkers would be more likely to come up with new ideas than not.

The second item on the survey relating to organizational performance was "work to implement new ideas." In response to the second item, 2 (6.4%) indicated very unlikely, 1 (3.2%) unlikely, 3 (9.7%) undecided, 15 (48.4%) likely, and 10 (32.3%) very likely. The majority of respondents (about 80%) indicated that their coworkers would be likely to implement new ideas within Chick-fil-A

The third item on the survey relating to organizational performance  was "find improved ways to do things." In response to the third item, 2 (6.4%) indicated very unlikely, 2 (6.4%)

undecided, 16 (51.6%) likely, and 10 (32.3%) very likely. Over 80% of responses indicated that coworkers within the organization of Chick-fil-A would find improved ways to do things.

The fourth item on the survey relating to organizational performance was "create better processes and routines." In response to the fourth item, 1 (3.2%) indicated very unlikely, 4 (12.9%) unlikely, 1 (3.2%) undecided, 11 (35.5%) likely, and 14 (45.2%) very likely. Chick-fil-A employees believe that their coworkers are going to create better processes and routines.

The fifth item on the survey relating to organizational performance was "work as part of a team or work group." In response to the fifth item, 1 (3.2%) indicated unlikely, 2 (6.4%) undecided, 17 (54.8%) likely, and 11 (35.5%) very likely.   Approximately 90% of employees at Chick-fil-A described their coworkers as being very likely or likely to work as part of a team or work group.

The sixth item on the survey relating to organizational performance was "seek information from others in his/her work group." In response to the sixth item, 1 (3.2%) indicated very unlikely, 1 (3.2%) indicated unlikely, 4 (12.9%) undecided, 11 (35.5%) likely, and 14 (45.2%) very likely. Again, just over 90% of employees surveyed believed their coworkers likely or very likely seek information from others in his or her work group. Thus, Chick-fil-A employees are not afraid to ask clarifying questions or are seeking to gain a better understanding within the workplace.

The seventh item on the survey relating to organizational performance was "make sure his/her work group succeeds." In response to the seventh item, 3 (9.7%) indicated they were undecided, 11 (35.5%) likely, 15 (48.4%) very likely. None of the respondents did not believe their coworkers at Chick-fil-A would not make sure his or her work group succeeds. Thus, all the employees believe in the value of organizational and group success.

The eighth item on the survey relating to organizational performance was "respond to the needs of others in his/her work group." In response to the eighth item, 4 (12.9%) indicated they were undecided, 12 (38.7%) likely, and 15 (48.4%) very likely. Chick-fil-A employees view their coworkers as being likely to respond to the needs of others within the workplace. The employees are willing to help each other during the day.

The ninth item on the survey relating to organizational performance was "do things that helps others when it's not part of his/her job." In response to the ninth item, 1 (3.2%) indicated very unlikely, 3 (9.7%) undecided, 14 (45.2%) likely, and 13 (41.9%) very likely. Chick-fil-A employees seem to be willing to put forth the extra effort and go the second mile in helping coworkers in the workplace accomplish a task.

The tenth item on the survey relating to organizational performance was "work for the overall good of the company." In response to the tenth item, 1 (3.2%) indicated unlikely, 12 (38.7%) likely, and 18 (58.1%) very likely. Coworkers viewed each other as likely or very likely to work for the overall good of Chick-fil-A the majority of the time.

The eleventh item on the survey relating to organizational performance was "do things to promote the company." In response to the eleventh item, 1 (3.2%) indicated unlikely, 2 (6.4%) undecided, 14 (45.2%) likely, and 14 (45.2%) very likely. Over 90% of participants believed that their coworkers would do things to promote Chick-fil-A.

The twelfth item on the survey relating to organizational performance was "help so that the company is a good place to be. "In response to the last item, 2 (6.4%) indicated unlikely, 1 (3.2%) undecided, 13 (41.9%) likely, and 15 (48.4%) very likely. Similar to the last item, over 90% of employees at Chick-fil-A believed their coworkers would help so that Chick-fil-A is a good place to be.

Overall, the employees at Chick-fil-A seem to believe that their coworkers will take the necessary steps and put forth the effort in order to make sure their work group and ultimately, Chick-fil-A succeeds.

*Servant Leadership*

The final results to be brought forth relate to servant leadership. The instructions told the employees of Chick-fil-A that the survey was measuring your perceptions of leadership for your immediate supervisor. The responses ranged on a five point likert scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The following set of twelve statements asked participants to measure their perceptions of servant leadership for their immediate supervisor.

| Table 5 |
| --- |
| *Servant Leadership Survey Items* |
| This person puts my best interests ahead of his/her own. <br> This person does everything he/she can to serve me. <br> This person sacrifices his/her own interests to meet my needs. <br> This person goes above and beyond the call of duty to meet my needs. <br> This person seems alert to what's happening. <br> This person is good at anticipating the consequences of decisions. <br> This person has great awareness of what is going on. <br> This person seems in touch with what's happening. <br> This person seems to know what is going to happen. <br> This person believes that the organization needs to play a moral role in society. <br> This person sees the organization for its potential to contribute to society. <br> This person encourages me to have a community spirit in the workplace. <br> This person is preparing the organization to make a positive difference in the future. |

The first item for the survey instrument relating to employee's perceived measures of supervisor's servant leadership was "this person puts my best interests ahead of his/her own." In response to the first item, 1 (3.2%) indicated strongly disagree, 2 (6.4%) disagree, 5 (16.1%)

neither agree nor disagree, 11 (35.5%) agree, and 12 (38.7%) strongly agree. Approximately

73% of employees surveyed believe that their immediate supervisor puts the employee's best

interests ahead of their own.

The second item for the survey instrument relating to employee's perceived measures of

supervisor's servant leadership was "this person does everything he/she can to serve me." In

response to the second item, 2 (6.4%) indicated strongly disagree, 3 (9.7%) indicated disagree, 4

(12.9%) neither agree nor disagree, 12 (38.7%) agree, and 10 (32.3%) strongly agree. Again,

overwhelming, employees view their supervisor as putting their subordinates first by doing

everything they can do to serve them.

The third item for the survey instrument relating to employee's perceived measures of

supervisor's servant leadership was "this person sacrifices his/her own interests to meet my

needs." In response to the third item, 1 (3.2%) indicated strongly disagree, 4 (12.9%) disagree, 4

(12.9%) neither agree nor disagree, 12 (38.7%) agree, and 10 (32.3%) strongly agree. About 70%

of respondents believe that their supervisor sacrifices their own interests to meet my needs.

The fourth item for the survey instrument relating to employee's perceived measures of

supervisor's servant leadership was "this person goes above and beyond the call of duty to meet

my needs." In response to the fourth item, 1 (3.2%) indicated strongly disagree, 4 (12.9%)

disagree, 4 (12.9%) neither agree nor disagree, 11 (35.5%) agree, and 11 (35.5%) strongly agree.

Just over 70% of respondents indicated that their immediate supervisor goes above and beyond

the call of duty to meet the needs of their subordinates at Chick-fil-A.

The fifth item for the survey instrument relating to employee's perceived measures of

supervisor's servant leadership was "this person seems alert to what's happening." In response to

the fifth item, 1 (3.2%) indicated strongly disagree, 2 (6.4%) disagree, 7 (22.6%) neither agree

nor disagree, 8 (25.8%) agree, and 13 (41.9%) strongly agree. Almost a quarter of respondents were undecided if their supervisors seemed alert to what's happening. The majority agreed that their supervisor seemed alert to what's happening.

The sixth item for the survey instrument relating to employee's perceived measures of supervisor's servant leadership was "this person is good at anticipating the consequences of decisions." In response to the sixth item, 4 (12.9%) indicated disagree, 2 (6.4%) neither agree nor disagree, 11 (35.5%) agree, and 14 (45.2%) strongly agree. Chick-fil-A employees believe that their supervisors are good at anticipating the consequences of decisions.

The seventh item for the survey instrument relating to employee's perceived measures of supervisor's servant leadership was "this person has great awareness of what is going on." In response to the seventh item, 2 (6.4%) indicated disagree, 6 (19.4%) neither agree nor disagree, 11 (35.5%) agree, and 12 (38.7%) strongly agree. Just under 80% of employees at Chick-fil-A believe that their supervisor has a great awareness of what is going on.

The eighth item for the survey instrument relating to employee's perceived measures of supervisor's servant leadership was "this person seems in touch with what's happening." In response to the eighth item, 3 (9.7%) indicated disagree, 5 (16.1%) neither agree nor disagree, 10 (32.3%) agree, and 13 (41.9%) strongly agree. Right above 70% of respondents surveyed felt that their supervisor seemed in touch with what was happening within the organizational of Chick-fil-A.

The ninth item for the survey instrument relating to employee's perceived measures of supervisor's servant leadership was "this person seems to know what is going to happen." In response to the ninth item, 3 (9.7%) indicated disagree, 5 (16.1%) neither agree nor disagree, 11 (35.5%) agree, and 12 (38.7%) strongly agree. Over 80% of results showed that employees

believe their supervisor seems to know what is going to happen within the workplace of the organization.

The tenth item for the survey instrument relating to employee's perceived measures of supervisor's servant leadership was "this person believes that the organization needs to play a moral role in society." In response to the tenth item, 1 (3.2%) indicated disagree, 3 (9.7%) neither agree nor disagree, 11 (35.5%) agree, 16 (51.6%) strongly agree. Approximately 86% of employees surveyed indicated that they believe their supervisor believes that Chick-fil-A needs to play a moral role in society.

The eleventh item for the survey instrument relating to employee's perceived measures of supervisor's servant leadership was "this person sees the organization for its potential to contribute to society." In response to the eleventh item, 1 (3.2%) indicated strongly disagree, 1 (3.2%) disagree, 3 (9.7%) neither agree nor disagree, 12 (38.7%) agree, and 14 (45.2%) strongly agree. Similar to the previous item, over 80% of employees believe their supervisor sees Chick-fil-A for its potential to contribute to society.

The twelfth item for the survey instrument relating to employee's perceived measures of supervisor's servant leadership was "this person encourages me to have a community spirit in the workplace. In response to the thirteenth item, 1 (3.2%) indicated disagree, 2 (6.4%) neither agree nor disagree, 15 (48.4%) agree, and 13 (41.9%) strongly agree. Almost 90% of employees of Chick-fil-A said that their supervisor encourages them to have a community spirit in the workplace.

The thirteen item for the survey instrument relating to employee's perceived measures of supervisor's servant leadership was "this person is preparing the organization to make a positive difference in the future." In response to the fourteenth item, 1 (3.2%) indicated strongly disagree,

1 (3.2%) disagree, 4 (12.9%) neither agree nor disagree, 13 (41.9%) agree, and 12 (38.7%) strongly agree. Approximately 80% of employees surveyed marked that their supervisor is preparing Chick-fil-A to make a positive difference in the future.   Results indicate that Chick-fil-A employees believe their supervisors exemplify characteristics of servant leadership in the workplace.

**Analysis by Research Question One**

The first research question examined the correlation of employee's perceptions of supervisor's level of servant leadership to measurements of relational trust, job satisfaction, and organizational performance. RQ1 A:

RQ1 A: Does employee's perception of supervisor's servant leadership affect

organizational performance?

RQ1 B: Does employee's perception of supervisor's servant leadership affect personal

job satisfaction?

RQ1 C: Does employee's perception of supervisor's servant leadership affect

perceived relational trust amongst coworkers?

The researcher found significance in research question one relating to a positive correlation between perceived levels of supervisors servant leadership and organizational performance. The results are illustrated through the survey questions "coming up with new ideas" P=0.002, "work to implement new ideas" P=0.000, "find improved ways to do things" P=0.000, "create better processes and routines" P=0.001, "seek information from others in his/her work group" P=0.024, "make sure his/her work group succeeds" P=0.040, "do things to promote the company" P=0.009, and "help so that the company is a good place to be" P=0.001.

The researcher found significance in research question one relating to a positive correlation between perceived levels of supervisors servant leadership and personal job satisfaction through data from the survey questions with "the members make me feel part of the group" P=.040, "I look forward to coming to the group meetings" P=0.000, "I do not feel part of the group" P=0.012, "we can say anything in this group without worrying" P=0.004, and "the group atmosphere is comfortable" P=0.002.

The researcher found significance in research question one relating to a positive correlation between perceived levels of supervisors servant leadership and significance relating to correlation between "trustworthy" and 3 survey items "this person puts my best interests ahead of his/her own" P=0.034, "this person sacrifices his/her own interests to meet my needs" P=0.022, "this person goes above and beyond the call of duty to meet my needs" P=0.018.

**Analysis by Research Question Two**

RQ2 A: Does gender affect employee's perceptions of supervisor's servant leadership?

RQ2 B: Does gender affect employee's perceptions of personal job satisfaction?

RQ2 C: Does gender affect employee's perceptions of perceived relational trust amongst coworkers?

RQ2 D: Does gender affect employee's perceptions of perceived organizational performance?

Does gender affect employee's perceptions of supervisor's servant leadership? The study revealed no significance in relation to gender and employee's perceptions of supervisor's servant leadership. The most significant response came from item four on the scale which involved servant leadership and was "this person goes above and beyond the call of duty to meet my needs. The level of significance was P=0.313. The mean response for females was 3.57 (N=21) and males were 4.10 (N=10). The standard deviation for females was 1.207 and males 1.595.

Thus, male employees believed that their supervisors took the extra effort to meet their needs in comparison to females.

The second research question asked, "Does gender affect employee's perceptions of personal job satisfaction?" The study revealed significance for one survey item and very close for two other survey items. The item "I do not feel part of the group" had a level of significance of P=0.031. The mean response for females was 4.71 (N=21) and males 4.40 (N=10). The standard deviation for females was .644 and males .699. Two other items were close to significant. The item "I can trust group members" had a level of significance of P=0.052. The item "We can say anything in this group without worrying" had a level of significance of P =0.058. In this study, females were less satisfied with their jobs. The findings of gender differences are intriguing and will be discussed in greater detail in the next section.

The study did not reveal a level of significance in relation to "Does gender affect employee's perceptions of perceived relational trust amongst coworkers" nor "Does gender affect employee's perceptions of perceived organizational performance?"

**CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION**

Leading people is a big responsibility and not one that should be taken lightly. There are many different approaches to leadership (Blewett, 2009; Terry, 2003; Maccoby, 2000; Young & Dulewicz, 2008). Colonna (2004) emphasizes the difference between management and leadership by describing characteristics of leaders as passionate, empowered, and trusted. Leaders guide, motivate, focuses on strategy, and establish direction. Managers tend to display excitement, offer opinion, prevent regression, focus on structure, and create explanations (2004). Leaders have different characteristics and behaviors, which they use in order to motivate employees in the workplace. The ability to manage people is easier to do in comparison to having the ability to lead. Approaches to management tend to emphasize task and while leadership tends to emphasize relationships. Servant Leadership is a type of leadership that takes this focus to a deeper level. According to Greenleaf (1977), leaders are first and foremost servants who fulfill a desire to serve others. The embodiment of servant leadership is the principle of putting other people first. Every leader should have a servant's heart and show care and concern for others.

Greenleaf (1977) suggests that caring for others has moved from personal involvement to becoming something that is mediated through organizations, companies, and institutions, which are often large, complex, and sometimes incompetent. Supervisors within organizations are focusing less on the individuals and more on the company goals. Originally, the concept of servant leadership included a clear idea about the term "higher authority," and early research and literature closely tied the model to religious theology (Robinson, 2009). Greenleaf alludes to a "calling" but does not identify any specific entity or higher presence. A leadership style, which

by some is considered biblically focused with a "higher presence" is uncomfortable to many and yet embraced by some—such as Chick-fil-a.

After reviewing the literature on servant leadership, the researcher proposed a new typography for examining organizational outcomes for servant leadership. Specifically, the researcher postulated that if present, servant leadership would permeate throughout the organization. It would be evident in the relationships that exist between co-workers (Trust), the way people personally feel about their job (Satisfaction), and also in how well an organization functions (Performance). The researcher examined the existence and practice of servant leadership within two local individual Chick-fil-A restaurants. A new organizational outcomes measure of servant leadership involving trust, satisfaction, and performance was tested using surveys. This chapter will discuss the findings from the survey and their contribution to the study of servant leadership.

*Trust*

Organizations are no longer able to solely rely on the strengths of individual employees to complete tasks. Coworkers must work together in the workplace in order to accomplish organizational goals. Drucker (1998) concluded that teams are the basic unit of today's organizations. According to Ming-Jian and Ming-Chia (2007), the main prerequisite to maximize team performance is "the ability of team members to cooperate with each other in order to produce amplified positive results" (p. 644).  How well a team works together is decidedly influenced by supervisors and management. If employees view the actions of leaders in the company in a positive manner, the employees will be more likely to counter with a positive work ethic, attitudes, and behaviors (Gould-Williams & Davies, 2005). Leaders have to realize that trust must be earned. Every action, interaction or reaction affects how employees view leaders

and their coworkers. Trust must be brought forth in order for effective decisions to occur within the workplace. This present study examined the correlation between relational trust amongst Chick-fil-A coworkers and employee's perceived levels of supervisor's servant leadership.

Similarly to other scholars (Hamilton, 2005) the researcher found a positive correlation with relational trust amongst Chick-fil-A coworkers and employee's perceived perceptions of supervisor's servant leadership. Servant leadership is shown to have an impact on relational trust in the workplace (Rieke, Hammermeister, & Chase, 2008. Chick-fil-A's use of servant leadership leads to high levels of trust amongst employees. SPSS data analysis illustrated a level of significance with 3 survey items within the Individualized Trust Scale (ITS). The remaining survey items did not show significance but were at a relatively low level.

This study indicated that servant leadership leads to higher levels of relational trust in the workplace. Not all organizations contain high levels of relational trust amongst their coworkers. Costa describes the lack of trust will impact employee performance. Distrust amongst coworkers can lead to employees feeling tense, unsatisfied, and ultimately unproductive (2001). The researcher also tested for gender differences in perceptions of trust amongst employees. The sample size for the present study was N=31 participants with N=21 female participants and N=10 male participants. The study found no significant differences relating to relational trust amongst male and female employees. Within this present study employees, regardless of gender are able to trust each other at relatively the same level. Thus, trust is extremely important in the workplace in order to maximize company productivity. Chick-fil-A and its use of the servant leader model help cultivate an atmosphere of relational trust amongst employees.

Servant leadership is a relatively new model of leadership. This present study shows the significance effective servant leadership can have on relational trust in the workplace. Overall

organizational effectiveness is exemplified by observing the relation between servant leadership and trust within the organization of Chick-fil-A. The study did not compare other methods of leadership but does show significance and may lead to numerous other companies adopting practices of servant leadership in order to achieve higher levels of relational trust amongst their employees.

*Satisfaction*

In addition to trust, effective leadership can influence job satisfaction. Scholars have indicated servant leadership positively impacts employee job satisfaction (Thompson, 2002). This current study tested the correlation between job satisfaction and perceived levels of servant leadership within Chick-fil-A. The results show a positive correlation between measures of job satisfaction and servant leadership. Similarly, researchers Chung, Chan, Kyle, & Petrick (2010) revealed that two dimensions of servant leadership which were trust in leader and leader support significantly influenced job satisfaction. Other studies have also shown a positive correlation to job satisfaction and perceived level of servant leadership (Bateman & Strasser, 1984; Vandenberg & Lance, 1992). The researcher determined similar correlations exist in the current study within Chick-fil-A.  The findings offer practical implications for how supervisors can create a just and fair organizational culture for increasing job satisfaction.

Males and females may have differing views of job satisfaction in the workplace. Previous scholarly research relating to job satisfaction and males or females being more satisfied is not completely conclusive (Westover, 2010; Bokemeier and William, 1987). The present study concluded that gender differences existed in employee's perceptions of personal job satisfaction. The findings of gender differences are intriguing and may be caused by several factors. If males or females are more satisfied with their job, this can lead to conflict, communication challenges,

and changes in hiring practices. Less satisfied employees may be more apt to conflict with their coworkers if they are not happy with their situation which can lead to bigger organizational problems. Communication problems between employees and relating to employee-employer relationship could also occur if people are not satisfied with their work environment. Also, if an organization discovers that one gender is overall more satisfied with their job, they may promote more of that gender to management or hire new employees based on gender. Future research will continue to examine the impact of gender on workplace behaviors and motivators such as leadership, trust, satisfaction, and performance.

Job satisfaction is one of the most important factors in overall organizational effectiveness and success. Satisfaction amongst employees can lead to a better atmosphere in the workplace, employee retention, and ultimately a successful organization. The relation between high levels of supervisor's servant leadership and the subordinates being satisfied with their jobs is significant. Many companies and organization have employees that are not satisfied with their organization, bosses, and workplace. The study of servant leadership brings forth scholarly knowledge of its effectiveness in the workplace. This study could lead to employees within organizations to have more satisfied employees if they decide to implement servant leadership practices.

*Performance*

Servant leadership within organizations can lead to an overall more effective organizational performance (Chen, Eisenberger, Johnson, Sucharski, & Aselage, 2009; Van Yperen, & Hagedoorn, 2003). This present study also illustrated a positive correlation between employee's perceptions of supervisor's level of servant leadership and organizational performance. Businesses and organizations are always looking for ways to get ahead in this fast-

past world. Productivity has been examined in countless studies (Tziner, Kaufmann, Vasiliu, & Tordera, 2011; Faisal, Azeem, Aysha, Saleem, & Nadeem, 2012). The abundance of studies relating to the topic of productivity in the workplace communicates both the value and importance of the topic. For the present study, the researcher did not find any significant difference in relation to differences in perceptions of organizational performance with gender.

Chick-fil-A uses the method of servant leadership in the workplace which is shown to increase organizational productivity. The focus which Chick-fil-A puts on its employees through positive messages such as genuine concern enables them to feel valued and perform at a higher level (Facteau, 1998). Truett Cathy and Chick-fil-A historically have focused on their employees and customer's first. By putting others first through the model of servant leadership, the organization constantly has performed at a high level and is one of the top quick-service chains in the country.

*Chick-fil-A*

Well-known organizations and companies that are at the top of their market and uphold biblical, Christian leadership principles are few and far between. Chick-fil-A was selected as the organization for this case study because of their corporate success and their organizational values. Founder Truett Cathy and Chick-fil-A strive to empower their employees in order to create a more effective workplace. Chick-fil-A stands for its biblical principles through its model of leadership, remaining closed on Sunday's, scholarship programs, charitable efforts, and other attributes. By using servant leadership in Chick-fil-A, the organization does very well in cultivating an effective work environment.  Thus, by studying servant leadership and the measurements of trust, satisfaction, and performance in the workplace, the researcher and society gained a better understanding of the effectiveness of servant leadership. The measurements of

relational trust amongst employees, personal job satisfaction, and organizational performance are some indicators of an effective work environment as well as strong measurements for servant leadership. This section of the discussion will draw conclusions based on results of the study.

The leadership methods of Chick-fil-A enable employees to perform actions that are deemed beneficial to themselves and others. The idea of the social exchange theory is that employees are empowered to make decisions in the workplace after looking at possible "costs" and "benefits" of carrying out an action. The actions of employees in the workplace impact the overall success of an organization. This study along with previous research (scholar, year; scholar, year) determined that effective leadership from supervisors enables employees to take more actions in the workplace while worrying less about any "costs." Effective leadership can lead to high levels of relational trust amongst employees, job satisfaction, and a high level of organizational performance.

Measurements of relational trust amongst coworkers, (Chatbury, 2011; Gersh, 2006) job satisfaction (Bateman & Strasser, 1984; Matheiu & Zajac 1990), and organizational performance (Schermerhorn, 2004; Van Yperen and Hagedoorn, 2003) positively correlated to high levels of servant leadership displayed in supervisors in previous studies. The researcher's focus of this study was to propose a new typography for examining organizational outcomes for servant leadership (i.e. trust, satisfaction, and performance). The present study tested the correlation of employee's perceptions of supervisor's level of servant leadership and relational trust amongst coworkers, job satisfaction, and organizational performance.

As an enhancement to the study, gender was examined in relation to perceptions of servant leadership, trust, satisfaction, and performance within Chick-fil-A. Scholars have examined the impact of gender on perceptions of leadership and workplace behaviors (Lewis,

Fagenson-Eland, 1998; Linimon, Baron, & Falbo, 1998). The sample size for the present study

was N=31 participants with N=21 female participants and N=10 male participants. The study

found no significant differences relating to relational trust amongst employees, servant

leadership, or organizational performance, but did find gender differences relating to job

satisfaction. The study did show a difference in gender and employee's perceptions of personal

job satisfaction but should continue to be examined in future research. Businesses across all

markets need to maximize their employee's performance in order to stay in business. This

present study similar to previous studies (Schermerhorn, 2004; Chen, Eisenberger, Johnson,

Sucharski, & Aselage, 2009; Van Yperen and Hagedoorn, 2003) indicates that implementing the

servant leader model in the workplace can lead to overall higher organizational performance.

The study does support previous research relating to the overall effectiveness of servant

leadership. Specifically, Truett Cathy and Chick-fil-A focus on serving their employees which

leads to relational trust amongst employees, job satisfaction, and organizational performance.

        Ultimately, this study does show meaning for strategies to achieve organizational

success. The researcher's typography for evaluating servant leadership in relation to

organizational outcomes was tested. Specifically, the outcome measures of trust, satisfaction, and

performance were used as indicators or servant leadership. Trust covered the relational

dimensions, job satisfaction measured personal dimensions, and performance measured

organizational dimensions. By proposing trust, satisfaction, performance as measures of servant

leadership, the researcher proposed a typography that encompasses relational, personal, and

organizational dimensions. This study brings forth quantitative evidence from a top quick-service

chicken restaurant chain, Chick-fil-A. The evidence confirms that if employees perceive high

levels of servant leadership of their supervisors, they will likely be satisfied with their job, trust

their coworkers, and seek to achieve effective organizational performance. Organizations can see evidence from this study on the potential effectiveness of using servant leadership within their own organization. Why would a company that is experiencing employees with low job satisfaction, distrust amongst employees, and poor organizational performance not want to seek alternative methods of leadership such as the method of servant leadership? This present study created opportunities for scholars and the business world alike to see the benefits of servant leadership in the workplace. Servant leadership brings forth opportunities for increased levels of trust, satisfaction, and performance, which can ultimately lead to increasing the bottom-line of any business while cultivating a satisfying atmosphere for employees and employers alike.

**Limitations**

Several limitations in this study are addressed in this section which provides opportunities for future research. This study involved 31participants from 2 Chick-fil-A restaurants in Virginia. In studying top companies such as Chick-fil-A, a more effective approach would involve studying franchise locations across the United States.  A larger study with an increased number of participants and franchises from different geographical locations in the United States would add to the significance, validity, and overall scholarly impact of a study.

For the current study, a large majority of the participants were female. Females who participated in the study composed of 67.8% (N=21) of participants while only 32.3% (N=10) participants were male. Previous scholarly research in psychology indicates that females are traditionally more relational in nature. A study which consists of a majority of female participants may impact the data and results due to the studies focus on supervisor's leadership styles which relates to relationships in the workplace. A more balanced gender representation

would enable more reliable and conclusions to be drawn in relation to gender effects and effects of leadership.

Certainly, what employee's feel about themselves and their supervisors is important. However, it would be useful to integrate more of the supervisor's view of the employees as well as the customers' responses to assess similarities and differences. By understanding the individuals on both sides of the counter (customers and employees), the researcher could gain a better understanding of the effects of servant leadership within an organization.

Also, this study involved solely quantitative survey measurements which can be effective in analysis data but a mixed methods approach with both surveys and follow-up interviews could give the researcher a better understanding of how the perception of the level of servant leadership in supervisors affects the perception of trust, satisfaction, and performance in coworkers. The study did not allow for any subjective responses from employees of Chick-fil-A. Self-reports only represents what a respondent chooses to communicate. The level of agreement with a particular survey measurement may be different. The researcher measured servant leadership, trust, satisfaction, and performance though likert-scale responses from employees. Thus, a mixed methods type study would draw out more in-depth responses from employees which could lead to more conclusions to be drawn.

The participants were completing a survey based on perceptions of their supervisor and correlating effects. The survey contained a consent form which stated "Your decision to participate will not affect their current or future relations with Chick-fil-A or Liberty University. All responses will be kept secure under password protection and in a locked file cabinet that can only be accessed by the researcher." Participants may have been hesitant to reveal their true feelings about their supervisors due to negative opinions and fear of their coworkers or

employees discovering their true negative feelings. The researcher took measure to enable the data to remain confidential, but participants may still have feared possible repercussions.

The current study did not give employees any incentive to take part in the survey. Participants were primarily recruited by the owner of the franchise location and had to take time out of their day to participate in the study. An incentive to take the study could increase the willingness of employees to take the survey and could increase the response rate.

The participants who took part in the survey used in-print surveys to increase the response rate at the two selected Chick-fil-A locations. However, the in-print surveys required a large amount of time to collect, input, and analyze the data. The researcher extend the data manually into a document prior to analyzing the data. The in-print surveys were beneficial due to the fact that some employees of Chick-fil-A may not have access to a computer to take the survey. However, using in-print surveys in a larger study would be unrealistic due to the amount of time and tedious nature of inputting the entirety of the data. Electronic surveys would enable a larger amount of participants to take part in the study along with a smoother and quicker input and analysis of data.

In addition to the lack of incentive to take the survey, the survey was only distributed over a period of several days. Some employees may not have been working over those days due to not being scheduled, sickness, school, or other reasons. A longer length of time distributing the survey to employees could increase participant's abilty to respond as well as the overall number of participants.  By addressing these limitations in future research, more thorough conclusions could be brought forth.

**Future Research**

The data collected through this study contributes to studies relating to leadership. The methodological processes and results bring forth an abundant amount of knowledge relating to biblical leadership and a new typography process for evaluating servant leadership in relation to organizational outcomes. However, additional research needs to be taken in the field of servant leadership, leadership theory, leadership effects on specific companies, and comparison of servant leadership to traditional methods of leadership.

The study examined measures of servant leadership within Chick-fil-A. Scholars and researchers have become more knowledgeable on servant leadership and potential benefits. Future research needs to continue on what servant leadership has done for companies. Actual results of the impact of servant leadership could lead to other companies and organizations implementing this style of leadership in their own companies.

Servant leadership may impact the long-term success of a company through the relationships being developed. Servant leaders focus on putting others first and serving each other's needs. Research should be done on the long-term impact of servant leadership in the workplace. Relationships continue to grow and develop over time and communication is a major aspect of building relationships. The atmosphere and behaviors within the workplace affects the productivity of organizations.

This present study examined servant leadership and the measurements of trust, satisfaction, and performance in the workplace. Leadership affects behavior and attitudes of employees within the workplace. Workplace attitudes and behaviors should continue to be studied relating to servant leadership and the correlation to overall effective organizational performance.

Servant leadership is just one type of leadership which an organization can decide to implement. Further research can examine which leadership methods bring forth the most effective communication between employees, employers, and customers in the workplace. Scholars will continue to debate leadership theory or the model that is most effective and applicable to organizations. Effective leadership within organizations can lead to positive behaviors from employees. Employees may become more driven to attain success in the work environment while displaying a positive attitude. Continued studies would more clearly and accurately reveal advantages or disadvantages of specific styles of leadership to organizations.

Leadership is probably the most frequently studied topic when it comes or organizational success. However, additional research can be done in the area of leadership and on specific companies. The present study examined Chick-fil-A and the effects of servant leadership. Leadership styles and methods have been studied by many researchers and scholars. Leadership methods have been studied in correlation with organizational outcomes such as organizational citizenship behavior, organizational commitment, worker engagement, and other measures of performance. Leadership influences all aspects of organizations and should be studied accordingly.

The present study examined one organization which exemplifies servant leadership. More research is needed in studying specific companies. Studies on large companies such as Southwest Airlines, AT&T, and Google would benefit scholars and businesses alike. Companies which have illustrated success through a positive company atmosphere, the mission or purpose, and cash flow/profit are obviously doing things right and should be further studied in order to discover what is working in relation to leadership, so that other companies may implement the same strategies. Large companies were once small companies. Thus, smaller companies should

be studies as well. The organizational culture and amount of employees within an organization

may be affected by the style of leadership of a company. This can be examined through future

research.  Additional research commissioned to study specific companies in any market or

product line could prove effective for the business world and academics alike.

Scholars have studied leadership theory and the effects of leadership within

organizations. However, the amount of scholarly research comparing servant leadership to

traditional methods of leadership is lacking. Servant leadership can be compared to historically

traditional theories such as behavioral theories, contingency theories, leader-member exchange,

and charismatic leadership would benefit scholarly research on leadership theory.

**Conclusion**

Servant leadership has become a highly discussed topic. Levels of servant leadership can

be measured through trust, satisfaction, or performance. Trust is considered a measurement of

servant leadership and has been studied by Chatbury, 2011; Gersh, 2006; Rieke, Hammermeister,

& Chase, 2008; and Hamilton, 2005 in relationship to servant leadership. The relationship

between satisfaction and servant leadership has been studied by Mheta, & Pillay, 2011;

Jaramillo, Grisaffe, Chonko, & Roberts 2009; and Stramba, 2003. Job performance and servant

leadership is a highly studied field. Scholars have examined the impact of servant leadership and

performance (Jaramillo, Grisaffe, Chonko, & Roberts, 2009; Indartono, Hawjeng, & Chun-His

Vivia, 2010; Vinod, & Sudhakar, 2011; Melchar, & Bosco, 2010; Carver, 2010; Ebener, &

O'Connell, 2010).

However, this present study was able to focus on all three measurements of servant

leadership in this quantitative study. It appears that strong relationships with positive outcomes

such as employees' extra effort, employee's satisfaction, and perceptions of organizational

effectiveness were found. Organizations may look for opportunities to recruit individuals who

possess servant leadership characteristics. Leadership development opportunities exist to

enhance managers' servant leadership skills. With over 1,390 Chick-fil-A restaurants in 37 states

and Washington, D.C., Chick-fil-A is the second-largest quick-service chicken restaurant chain

in the nation. Successful leadership principles have led to the rapid success of the organization.

The ability to lead with integrity depends on the leader's skills for withdrawal and action,

listening and persuasion, practical goal setting and intuitive prescience. Servant leadership

begins with the self, a person that exemplifies this leadership style has a mindset of service.

Oftentimes people focus on how to climb the corporate ladder, while stepping over and on top of

coworkers. Servant leaders put others before themselves.

     This study looked at how co-workers perception of supervisor's servant leadership affects

the trust, satisfaction, and performance in the workplace.  The researcher used a quantitative

approach while examining servant leadership within two Chick-fil-A franchises. Specifically, the

study focused on Chick-fil-A restaurants in two different cities within the state of Virginia. The

quantitative survey method approach included a demographic section along with four survey

instruments which tested trust, satisfaction, performance, and servant leadership. The purpose of

using four different survey instruments was to gain a better understanding of how co-workers

perceptions of servant leadership affects trust, satisfaction, and performance in the workplace.

     A successful businessman and leader, Truett Cathy is known for his devotion to biblical

principles, development of young people, and love for others. Truett Cathy also chose to apply

the principle of the Sabbath day to Chick-fil-A by being open for six days and closed on

Sundays. Graves and Addington describe the view as "God invented both at virtually the same

time; they are meant to complement, not fight against, each other" (127). A godly life contains

both a life of rest and work. Truett Cathy illustrates this principle through Chick-fil-A.

Prior to this study, the examination of servant leadership from a biblical perspective in a

successful, top restaurant chain did not exist. Well-known organizations and companies which

are at the top of their market, and uphold biblical, Christian, leadership principles are few and far

between. Thus, by studying servant leadership and the measurements of trust, satisfaction, and

performance in the workplace, the researcher and society gained a better understanding of the

effectiveness of servant leadership in Chick-fil-A. Servant leadership and Christian leadership

involve influencing others. Chick-fil-A stands for its biblical principles through its model of

leadership, remaining closed on Sunday's, and through many other attributes. By understanding

more about Chick-fil-A, servant leadership, and measurements of trust, satisfaction, and

performance in the workplace, the researcher helped open a new field of learning.

**REFERENCES**

(2012). In Chick-fil-A. Retrieved from http://www.chick-fil-a.com/

(2012). In S. Truett Cathy. Retrieved April 4, 2012, from http://truettcathy.com/

Akuchi, N. D. (1993). The servants and the superstars: An examination of servant leadership

in light of Matthey 20:20-28. The Christian Educational Journal, 16, 39-43

Aryee, S., Budhwar, P. S. & Chen, Z. X. (2002). Trust as a mediator of the relationship between

organizational justice and work outcomes: Test of a social exchange model. *Journal of

Organizational Behavior*. 23:3 pp267 − 85.

Babcock-Roberson, M., & Strickland, O. J. (2010). The relationship between charismatic

leadership, work engagement, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal Of

Psychology*, *144*(3), 313-326.

Barbuto, J., Wheeler, D. (2006). Scale development and construct clarification of servant

leadership. *Group & Organization Management 31(3),* 300-326.

Bass, B. (1981). *Stogdill's handbook of leadership*. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1985) *Leadership performance beyond expectations*. New York: Academic Press.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press

Bass, B. M. (2000). The future of leadership in learning organizations. *The Journal of

Leadership Studies*, *7*(3), 18-40.

Bateman, T. S., & Strasser, S. (1984). A longitudinal analysis of the antecedents of

organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Journal, 27*, 95-112.

Blanchard, K. (2002). Foreword: The heart of servant-leadership. In L. C. Spears & M.

Lawrence (Eds.), *Focus on leadership: Servant leadership for the twenty-first

century* (ix-xii). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Blewett, P. A. (2009). Leadership essentials: shaping vision, multiplying influence, defining

    character. *Journal Of Youth Ministry*, *7*(2), 125-127.

Bokemeier, J. L. & William, B. L. (1987). Job values, rewards, and work conditions as factors in

    job satisfaction among men and women. *The Sociological Quarterly*, Vol. 28(2), p. 189-

    204.

Bolat, O., Bolat, T., & Seymen, O. (2009). Güçlendirici lider davranişlari ve örgütsel vatandaşlik

    davranişi arasindaki iliskinin sosyal mübadele kuramindan hareketle i... (Turkish).

    *Balikesir University Journal Of Social Sciences Institute*, *12*(21), 215-239.

Borjas G. (1979) Job satisfaction, wages and unions. *Journal of Human*

    *Resources*, 14: 21–40.

Brod, M, Tesler, L. & Christensen, T. (2009). Qualitative research and content validity:

    Developing best practices based on science and experience. *Quality of life research*.18.9:

    1263-1278. Academic Search Complete. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

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

Butler, J. K., Cantrell, R. S., & Flick, R. J. (1999). Transformation leadership behaviors, upward

    trust, and satisfaction in self-managed work teams. *Organizational Development Journal*,

    17, 13–28.

Bycio, P., Hackett, R. D., & Allen, J. S. (1995). Further assessment of Bass's (1985)

    conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied*

    *Psychology*, 80, 468-478.

Carver, J. (2010). Board servant leadership from intention to performance. *Board Leadership*,

    *2010*(110), 1-7.

Cathy, T. S. (2004). *It's Better To Build Boys Than Mend Men*. Decatur, GA: Looking Glass

    Books.

Cathy, T. (1989). *It's Easier to Succeed than to Fail*. Alpharetta, GA: Oliver-Nelson.

Chai & Bargh, J.A. *The use and abuse of power*. PA: Psychology Press.

Chatbury, A. S. (2011). Servant leadership, trust and implications for the "base-of-the-pyramid"

    segment in South Africa. *South African Journal Of Business Management*, *42*(4), 57.

Chen, Z., Eisenberger, R., Johnson, K. M., Sucharski, I. L., & Aselage, J. (2009). Perceived

    organizational support and extra-role performance: Which leads to which?. *Journal Of*

    *Social Psychology*, 149(1), 119-124.

Cho, J., Laschinger, H.K.S. & Wong, C. (2006). Workplace empowerment, work engagement

    and organizational commitment of new graduate nurses. *Canadian Journal of Nursing*

    *Leadership 19*(3), 43–60.

Chung, J. Y., Chan Su, J., Kyle, G. T., & Petrick, J. F. (2010). Servant leadership and procedural

    justice in the U.S. national park service: the antecedents of job satisfaction. *Journal Of*

    *Park & Recreation Administration*, *28*(3), 1-15.

Cicero, L., & Pierro, A. (2007). Charismatic leadership and organizational outcomes: The

    mediating role of employees' work-group identification. *International Journal Of*

    *Psychology*, *42*(5), 297-306.

Colonna, J. (2004). Management and leadership differences require levelheadedness. *Healthcare*

    *Purchasing News*, *28*(10), 66-67.

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. A. (1987). Towards a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership

    in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 637–647.

Cook, J., & Wall, T. (1980). New work attitude measures of trust, organizational commitment

and personal need non-fulfillment. *Journal Of Occupational Psychology*, *53*(1), 39-52.

Cook, K. S. (2005). Networks, norms and trust: The social psychology of social capital. *Social

Psychology Quarterly 68*(I); 4-14.

Costa, A. C. (2003). Understanding the nature and the antecedents of trust within work teams. In

B. Nooteboom and F. Six (Eds.), *The Trust Process in Organizations*: 105-24. UK:

Edwar Edgar Publishing Limited.

Creed, W. E. D., & Miles, R. E. (1996). Trust in organizations: Linking organizational forms,

managerial philosophies, and the opportunity costs of controls. In R. M. Kramer & T. R.

Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research*. Thousand Oaks,

CA: Sage.

Denison, D. R., Hooijberg, R., & Quinn, R. E. (1995). Paradox and performance: Toward a

theory of behavioral complexity in managerial leadership. *Organization Science*, *6*(5),

524-540.

DiFonzo, N., Hantula, D. A., & Bordia, P. (1998). Microworlds for experimental research:

Having your (control and collections) cake, and realism too. *Behavior Research

Methods,Instruments & Computers*, 30, 278–286.

Drucker, P. F. (1998). *Managing in a time of great change*. New York: Penguin books.

Dvir, T., Eden, D., Avolio, B. J., & Shamir, B. (2002). Impact of transformational leadership on

follower development and performance: A field experiment. *Academy of Management

Journal*, 45, 735-744.

Ebener, D. R., & O'Connell, D. J. (2010). How might servant leadership work?. *Nonprofit

Management & Leadership*, *20*(3), 315-335.

Eldridge, D., & Nisar, T. M. (2006). The significance of employee skill in flexible work

    organizations. *International Journal Of Human Resource Management*, *17*(5), 918-937.

Evans, J. R., & Mathur, A. (2005) The value of online surveys. *Internet Research* 15.2 :195 –

    219.

Facteau, C. D. (1998). Reactions of leaders to 360-degree feedback from subordinates and peers.

    *Leadership Quarterly*, *9*(4), 427.

Faisal, A., Azeem, M., Aysha, F., Amina, F., Saleem, F., & Nadeem, R. (2012). Impact of

    educational leadership on institutional performance in Pakistan. *Journal Of Public

    Administration & Governance*, *2*(1), 57-94.

Farling, M. L., Stone, A. G., & Winston, B. E. (1999). Servant leadership: Setting the stage for

    empirical research. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 6, 49-72.

Ferch, S. R., & Spears, L. C. (Eds.). (2011). *The spirit of servant-leadership*. New York, NY:

    Paulist Press.

Finch, B. (2008). *A remarkable practice: Developing leaders personally and professionally*.

    Maitland, FL: Xulon Press.

Fitzsimons, D., McCance, T., & Armstrong, N. (2006). Vision, leadership and partnership: How

    to enhance the nursing and midwifery contribution to research and development. *Journal

    Of Advanced Nursing*, *55*(6), 748-756.

Freeman R. B. (1978). Job satisfaction as an economic variable., *American Economic Review:

    Papers and Proceedings*. 68: 135–141.

Frick, D. M. (2004). *Robert K. Greenleaf: A life of servant leadership*. San Fransico, CA:

    Berrett-Kohler.

Frick, D. M., & Spears, L. C. (Eds.). (1996). *On becoming a servant leader*. San Fransico, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Frohman, M. A. (1984). Human resource management in action: Human resource management and the bottom line: evidence of the connection. *Human Resource Management*, *23*(3), 315-334.

Gabarro, J. & J. Athos. (1976). *Interpersonal relations and communications*. Engliwood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Gehring, D. R. (2007). Applying traits theory of leadership to project management. *Project Management Journal*, *38*(1), 44-54.

Gersh, M. (2006). Servant-leadership: A philosophical foundation for professionalism in physical therapy. *Journal Of Physical Therapy Education*, *20*(2), 12-16.

Gluck, F. W. (1981). Vision and leadership in corporate strategy. *Mckinsey Quarterly*, (4), 13-27.

Gould-Williams, J., & Davies, F. (2005). Using social exchange theory to predict the effects of HRM practice on employee outcomes. *Public Management Review*, *7*(1), 1-24.

Graham, J. W. (1995). Leadership, moral development, and citizenship behavior. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, *5*(1), 43-54.

Graves, S. R., & Addington, T. G. (2003). *Behind the bottom line: Powering business life with spiritual wisdom*. San Fransico, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1970). *The servant as leader*. Indianapolis, ST: The Robert K. Greenleaf Center.

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

Greenleaf, R. K., & Spears, L. C. (Eds.). (2002). *Servant leadership: A Journey Into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.

Guay, C. G., & Waters, J. A. (1980). Start with results: A bottom-line strategy for management development. *Management Review*, *69*(2), 25.

Hamermesh D. S. (1977). Economic aspects of job satisfaction. in Ashenfelter O. C. and Oates W. E. (eds.) *Essays in Labor Market Analysis*, New York: Wiley: 53–72.

Hamilton, F. (2005). Practicing servant-leadership: Succeeding through trust, bravery, and forgiveness. *Academy Of Management Review*, *30*(4), 875-877.

Hargie, O., Tourish, D., & Wilson, N. (2002). Communication audits and the effects of increased information: A follow-up study, *The Journal of Business Communication*, *39*(4), 414-436.

Hawkinson, J. R., & Johnston, R. K. (1993). *Servant leadership, vol 1 : Authority and governance in the Evangelical Covenant Church*. Chicago: Covenant Pubns.

Heerwegh, D. (2009). Mode differences between face-to-face and web surveys: an experimental investigation of data quality and social desirability effects. *International Journal Of Public Opinion Research*, *21*(1), 111-121.

Henderson, M., & Argyle, M. (1985). Social support by four categories of work colleagues: Relationships between activities, stress and satisfaction. *Journal Of Occupational Behavior*, *6*(3), 229-239.

House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. H. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: The cutting edge*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

House, R. J., & Shamir, B. (1993). Toward the integration of transformational, charismatic, and

 visionary theories. In M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research*

 *perspectives and directions*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Indartono, S., Hawjeng, C., & Chun-His Vivian, C. (2010). The joint moderating impact of

 personal job fit and servant leadership on the relationship between the task characteristics

 of job design and performance. *Interdisciplinary Journal Of Contemporary Research In*

 *Business*, *2*(8), 42-61.

Jackson, I. A., & Nelson, J. (2004). *Profits with principles: Seven strategies for delivering*

 *value with values*. New York, NY: Doubleday.

Jaramillo, F., Grisaffe, D. B., Chonko, L. B., & Roberts, J. A. (2009). Examining the impact of

 servant leadership on sales force performance. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales*

 *Management*, *29*(3), 257-275.

Jennings, E. (1960). *An anatomy of leadership--Princes, heroes and supermen*. New York:

 Harper & Brothers.

Jones, D. A. (2010). Does serving the community also serve the company? Using organizational

 identification and social exchange theories to understand employee responses to a

 volunteerism programme. *Journal Of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, *83*(4),

 857.

Jones, G. E. (1999). Hierarchical workplace romance: An experimental examination of

 team member perceptions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20, 1057–1072.

 doi:10.1348/096317909X477495

Jones, M. K., Jones, R. J., Latreille, P. L., & Sloane, P. J. (2009). Training, job satisfaction, and

 workplace performance in Britain: evidence from WERS 2004. *Labour*, 23, 139-175.

Julian, L. (2001). *God is my CEO*. Avon, MA: Adams Media Corporation.

Kark, R., Shamir, B., & Chen, G. (2003). The two faces of transformational leadership: Empowerment and dependency. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*(2), 246-255.

Karl, K. A. (2000). Trust and betrayal in the workplace: Building effective relationships in your organization. *Academy of Management Executive*, 14, 133–135.

Keller, R. T. (2001). Cross-functional project groups in research and new product development: Diversity, communications, job stress, and outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44, 547–555.

Keller, T., & Dansereau, F. (1995). Leadership and empowerment: A social exchange perspective. *Human Relations*, 48(2), 127.

Kipnis, D. (1996). Trust and technology. In R. M. Kramer & T. R. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kotter, J. (1999). *What Leaders Really Do*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.

Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading Change*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.

Kram, K. E., & Isabella, L. A. (1985). Mentoring alternatives: the role of peer relationships in career development. *Academy Of Management Journal*, 28, 110-132.

Kramer, R. M. (1999). Trust and distrust in organizations: Emerging perspectives, enduring questions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 50, 537–567.

Lautizi, M., Laschinger, H., & Ravazzolo, S. (2009). Workplace empowerment, job satisfaction and job stress among Italian mental health nurses: an exploratory study. *Journal Of Nursing Management*, *17*(4), 446-452.

Lester, D. (1974). *A physiological basis for personality traits--A new theory of personality.*, Charles C. Thomas, Publisher.

Lewicki, R. J., McAllister, D. J., & Bies, R. J. (1998). Trust and distrust: New relationships and

    realities. *Academy of Management Review*, 23, 438–458.

Lewis, A. E., & Fagenson-Eland, E. A. (1998). The influence of gender and organization level

    on perceptions of leadership behaviors: A self and supervisor comparison. *Sex Roles*,

    *39*(5-6), 479-502.

Linimon, D., Baron III, W. L., & Falbo, T. (1984). Gender differences in perceptions of

    leadership. *Sex Roles*, *11*(11/12), 1075-1089.

Littlejohn, S.W. & Foss, K.A. (2008). *Theories of human communication*. Belmont, CA:

    Thomson Wadsworth.

Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of

    transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ

    literature. *Leadership Quarterly*, *7:* 385-425.

Maccoby, M. (2000). Understanding the difference between management and leadership.

    *Research Technology Management*, *43*(1), 57-59.

Manojlovich, M. (2005). A leadership strategy to improve practice. *Journal of Nursing*

    *Administration*, 35, 271–278.

Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates,

    and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin, 108*(2), 171-

    124.

McCuddy, M.K., & Cavin, M. C. (2009). The demographic context of servant leadership.

    *Journal of the Academy of Business & Economics*, *9*(2), 129-139. Retrieved from

    EBSCOhost.

McKnight, D. H., Cummings, L. L., & Chervany, N. L. (1998). Initial trust formation in new

    organizational relationships. *Academy of Management Review*, 23, 473–490.

McLennan, J., & Omodei, M. M. (2000). Conceptualizing and measuring global interpersonal

    mistrust-trust. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 140, 279–294.

Mehta, S., & Pillay, R. (2011). Revisiting servant leadership: An empirical study in Indian

    context. *Journal Of Contemporary Management Research*, *5*(2), 24-41.

Melchar, D. E., & Bosco, S. M. (2010). Achieving high organization performance through

    servant leadership. *Journal Of Business Inquiry: Research, Education & Application*,

    *9*(1), 74-88.

Merrigan, G., & Huston, C.L. (2009). *Communication research methods*. New York, NY:

    Oxford University Press.

Miller, M. (2010) The secret of great leaders. *T+D*, *64*(3), 42. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

Ming-Jian, S., & Ming-Chia, C. (2007). The relationship of leadership, team trust and team

    performance: a comparison of the service and manufacturing industries. *Social Behavior*

    *& Personality: An International Journal*, *35*(5), 643-657.

Morris, L. (1995). Creating and maintaining trust. *Training & Development*, *49*(12), 52–54.

Moser, F. (2007). Strategic management of educational technology—The importance of

    leadership and management. *Tertiary Education & Management*, *13*(2), 141-152.

Myers, S., & Johnson, A. (2004). Perceived solidarity, self-disclosure, and trust in organizational

    peer relationships. *Communication Research Reports*, *21*(1), 75-83. Retrieved from

    EBSCOhost.

Noblet, A. J., & Rodwell, J. J. (2009). Integrating job stress and social exchange theories to

    predict employee strain in reformed public sector contexts. *Journal Of Public*

    *Administration Research & Theory*, *19*(3), 555-578.

Northouse, P. G. (2001). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Packard, S. H., & Kauppi, D. R. (1999). Rehabilitation agency leadership style: Impact on

    subordinates' job satisfaction. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, *43*(1), 5-11.

Patterson, J., & Kim, P. (1991). *The day America told the truth*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Pawlowski, D. (1999). Rubber bands and sectioned oranges: Dialectical tensions and metaphors

    used to describe interpersonal relationships. North Dakota Journal of Speech & Theatre,

    1213-30. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

Peters, C. (2005). What Leadership is NOT. *Tennessee Libraries*, 55(1), 4-8.

Pierce, C. A., & Aguinis, H. (1997). Using virtual reality technology in organizational behavior

    research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18, 407–410.

Pillai, R., Schriesheim, C. A., & Williams, E. S. (1999). Fairness perceptions and trust as

    mediators for transformational and transactional leadership: A two-sample study. *Journal*

    *Of Management*, *25*(6), 897-933.

P.J. & Veiga, J. (1999). Putting people first for organizational success. *Academy of Management*

    *Executive*. *13*(2), 37-48.

Polleys, M.S. (2002). One university's response to the anti-leadership vaccine: Developing

    servant leaders. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, *8*(3), 117-130.

Ramaswami, S. N., Srinivasan, S. S., & Gorton, S. A. (1997). Information asymmetry between

    salesperson and supervisor: Postulates from agency and social exchange theories. *Journal*

    *Of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, *17*(3), 29-64.

Ray, E. (1993). When the links become chains: Considering the dysfunctions of supportive

    communication in the workplace, *Communication Monographs*, 60, 106-111.

Riddle, B., Anderson, C., Martin, M. (2000). Small group socialization scale: Development and

    validity. *Journal of Business Communication*. 48, 3-26.

Rieke, M., Hammermeister, J., & Chase, M. (2008). Servant leadership in sport: A new paradigm

    for effective coach behavior. *International Journal Of Sports Science & Coaching*, *3*(2),

    227-239.

Robinson F.P. (2009). Servant teaching: the power and promise for nurse education.

    *International Journal of Nursing Education Scholarship.*

Sabiston J.A. & Laschinger H.K.S. (1995). Staff nurse work empowerment and perceived

    autonomy: Testing Kanter's theory of structural power in organization. *Journal of*

    *Nursing Administration*, 25, 42–50.

Salk, R. J., & Schneider, I. E. (2009). Commitment to learning within a public land management

    agency: The influence of transformational leadership and organizational culture. *Journal*

    *of Park & Recreation Administration*, *27*(1), 70-84.

Sandberg, Y., & Moreman, C. M. (2011). Common threads among different forms of charismatic

    leadership. *International Journal Of Business & Social Science*, *2*(9), 235- 240.

Sandy J.W., Lynn M.S., & Linden, R.C.. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-

    member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*,

    *40*(1), 82-111.

Sashkin, M., & Sashkin, M.G. (2003). *Leadership that matters: The critical factors for*

    *making a difference in people lives and organizations' success*. San Francisco:

    Berrett-Koehler.

Savage-Austin, A.R., & Honeycutt, A. (2011). Servant leadership: A phenomenological study of practices, experiences, organizational effectiveness, and barriers. *Journal of Business & Economics Research*, *9*(1), 49-54. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

Schermerhorn Jr., J. R., & McCarthy, A. (2004). Enhancing performance capacity in the workplace: A reflection on the significance of the individual. *Irish Journal Of Management, 25*(2), 45-60.

Schneider, M. (2003). Management vs. leadership. *Aftermarket Business*, 11.

Sendjaya, S. Arros, J.C., & Santora, J.C. (2008). Defining and measuring servant leadership behavior in organizations. *Journal of Management Studies*, *45*(2), 402-424. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

Shamir, B., Zakay, E., Breinen, E., & Popper, M. (1998). Correlates of charismatic leader behavior in military units: Subordinates' attitudes, unit characteristics, and superiors' appraisals of leader performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41, 387-409.

Sin, L., Tse, A., Yau, O., Chow, R., Lee, J. and Lau, L. (2005). Relationship marketing orientation Scale development and cross-cultural validation, *Journal of Business Research*, 58, 185-194.

Snodgrass, K.R. (1993). Your slaves – An account of Jesus' servant leadership in the New Testament. In J. R. Hawkinson & R.K. Johnstone (Eds.), *Servant leadership* (Vol. 1, pp. 17-19). Chicago: Covenant.

Spears, L.C. (1995). *Reflections on leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's theory of servant leadership influenced today's to management thinkers*. New York: John Wiley.

Spears, L.C. (2002). Introduction: Tracing the past, present, and future of servant leadership. In L.C. Spears (ed.) *Focus on leadership*. New York: John Wiley.

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

Spector, M. D., & Jones, G. E. (2004). Trust in the workplace: Factors affecting trust formation between team members. *Journal Of Social Psychology*, *144*(3), 311-321.

Stone, D. L., & Kotch, D. A. (1989). Individuals' attitudes toward organizational drug testing policies and practices. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 518–521.

Stramba, L. (2003). Servant leadership practices. *Community College Enterprise*, *9*(2), 103-113.

Stewart, R. N. (2005). Servant Leadership: a journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness. *Journal Of Religious Leadership*, *4*(1-2), 192-195.

Terry, P. E. (2003). Leadership and achieving a vision - how does a profession lead a nation?. *American Journal Of Health Promotion*, *18*(2), 162-167.

Thompson, R. S. (2002). The perception of servant leadership characteristics and job satisfaction in a church-related college. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 64* (08), 2738.

Trey, B. (1999). Trust in the workplace: Taking the pulse of trust between physicians and hospital administrators. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 59, 3326.

Tyler, T. R., & Kramer, R. M. (1996). Whither trust? In R. M. Kramer & T. R. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tziner, A., Kaufmann, R., Vasiliu, C., & Tordera, N. (2011). Organizational perceptions, leadership and performance in work settings: Do they interrelate?. *Revista De Psicologia Del Trabajo Y De Las Organizaciones*, *27*(3), 205-211.

Van Yperen, N. W., & Hagedoorn, M. (2003). Do high job demands increase intrinsic motivation or fatigue or both? The role of job control and job social support. *Academy Of Management Journal*, *46*(3), 339-348.

Vandenberg, R. J., & Lance, C. E. (1992). Examining the causal order of job satisfaction and

organizational commitment. *Journal of Management, 18*(1), 153-168.

Vinod, S., & Sudhakar, B. B. (2011). Servant leadership: A unique art of leadership!.

*Interdisciplinary Journal Of Contemporary Research In Business*, *2*(11), 456-467.

Walumbwa, F. O., Wang, P., Lawler, & Shi, K. (2004). The role of collective efficacy in the

relations between transformational leadership and work outcomes. *Journal of

Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77, 515-530.

Wayne, S. J., Shore, l. M., & Liden, R. C. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-

member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy Of Management Journal*,

*40*(1), 82-111.

Weathersby, G. B. (1999). Leadership vs. management. *Management Review*, 5.

Weinrach, J. (2001). EMS: The m stands for leadership?. *Environmental Quality Management*,

*11*(1), 89-92.

Wells, C. V., & Kipnis, D. (2001). Trust, dependency, and control in the contemporary

organization. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 15, 593–603.

Westover, J. H. (2010). "Gendered" perceptions: Job satisfaction and gender differences in the

workplace. *International Journal Of Diversity In Organisations, Communities & Nations*,

*10*(1), 49-57.

Wetzler, R. T. (1976). Management theory can produce a continuing bottom line impact.

*Management Review*, *65*(6), 45.

Wheeles, L. R., & Grotz, J. (1977). The measurement of trust and its relationship to self

disclosure. *Human Communication Research*, 3, 250-257.

Whitener, E. M., Brodt, S. E., Korsgaard, M. A., & Werner, J. M. (1998). Managers as initiators

of trust: An exchange relationship framework for understanding managerial trustworthy

behavior. *Academy of Management Review*, 23, 513–530.

Williams, M. (2001). In whom we trust: Group membership as an affective context for trust

development. *Academy of Management Review*, 26, 377–396.

Young, M., & Dulewicz, V. (2008). Similarities and differences between leadership and

management: high-performance competencies in the British royal navy. *British Journal

Of Management*, *19*(1), 17-32.

Yukl, G. (1998). *Leadership in organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Zhang, Z., & Jia, M. (2010). Using social exchange theory to predict the effects of high

performance human resource practices on corporate entrepreneurship: Evidence from

China. *Human Resource Management*, *49*(4), 743-765.

Appendix A

## Chick-fil-A Leadership

### Consent

**CONSENT FORM**
Masters Thesis Study
Michael Mishler
Liberty University Department of Communication Studies

Dear Possible Participant-

You are invited to be in a research study. You were selected as a possible participant because you currently work at Chick-fil-A.

The participants will answer questions which will take approximately 5-10 minutes to complete. This study is being conducted by researchers from Liberty University from the School of Communication. We ask that you read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the study. The research involves no more than minimal risk to the subjects.

Your name will not be discussed or disclosed to any other persons. Your decision to participate will not affect their current or future relations with Chick-fil-A or Liberty University. All responses will be kept secure under password protection and in a locked file cabinet that can only be accessed by the researcher. After three years all information pertaining to the study will be destroyed. Participation in this study is voluntary. If you decide to participate you are free to not answer any questions or withdraw at any time.

The records of this study will be kept private. In any sort of report the researchers publish, they will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a subject. The research records will be stored securely and only the researcher will have access to the records.

The researchers conducting this study are Michael Mishler and Dr. Angela Widgeon. If you have any questions about the study and your participation, you are encouraged to contact them at 717-387-2585, msmishler@liberty.edu or aawidgeon@liberty.edu.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher(s), you are encouraged to contact the Institutional Review Board, Dr. Fernando Garzon, Chair, 1971 University Blvd, Suite 1582, Lynchburg, VA 24502 or email at fgarzon@liberty.edu.

If you choose to decline participation please disregard the following survey. Thank you for your willingness and time.

Sincerely,

Michael Mishler

**Statement of Consent**

I have read and understood the above information. I have asked questions and have received answers. I consent to participate in the study.

## Chick-fil-A Leadership

### Demographics

**What is your gender?**

◯ Female

◯ Male

**What is your age?**

[                              ]

**What is your race/ethnicity?**

◯ American Indian/Native American

◯ Black/African American

◯ Hispanic/Latino

◯ White/Caucasian

◯ Pacific Islander

◯ Other

Other (please specify)

[                              ]

**What is the highest level of education you have completed?**

◯ Completed high school

◯ Some college, but did not finish

◯ Two-year college degree

◯ Four-year college degree

◯ Some graduate work

◯ Master's degree

◯ Doctorate degree

Other (please specify)

[                              ]

## Chick-fil-A Leadership

### How long have you been employed at Chick-fil-A?

◯ Less than a year

◯ 1-3 years

◯ 4-5 years

◯ 6-8 years

◯ 9 + years

◯ Other

Other (please specify)

[                                        ]

### Please mark the shift you normally work.

◯ Morning

◯ Afternoon

◯ Evening

Other (please specify)

[                                        ]

### Please mark which best reflects your role at Chick-fil-A.

◯ Owner

◯ Shift Manager

◯ Cook

◯ Cashier

Other (please specify)

[                                        ]

### Please mark the location you work at.

◯ Wards Rd.

◯ Chesapeake

◯ Candlers Mnt.

Other (please specify)

[                                        ]

## Chick-fil-A Leadership

| Setting/Scenario | | | | | Perceptions |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**Respond to the following statements about the people you work with at Chick-fil-A.**

| | 1 (Strongly Disagree) | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 (Strongly Agree) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The group members spend time getting to know each other. | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ |
| The members make me feel a part of the group. | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ |
| I look forward to coming to the group meetings. | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ |
| I do not feel part of the group. | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ |
| The members make me feel liked. | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ |
| My absence would not matter to the group. | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ |
| I can trust group members. | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ |
| We can say anything in this group without worrying. | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ |
| I prefer not to spend time with members of the group. | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ |
| The members made me feel involved in the group. | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ |
| Some of the group members could become my friends. | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ |
| The group atmosphere is comfortable. | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ |

**What are your feelings toward your co-workers?  Place an "X" in the circle that represents your immediate "feelings" about your co-workers.**

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Trustworthy | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | Untrustworthy |
| Confidential | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | Divulging |
| Greedy | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | Generous |
| Safe | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | Dangerous |
| Deceptive | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | Candid |
| Not Deceitful | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | Deceitful |
| Tricky | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | Straightforward |
| Respectful | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | Disrespected |
| Inconsiderate | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | Considerate |
| Honest | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | Dishonest |
| Unreliable | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | Reliable |
| Faithful | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | Unfaithful |
| Insincere | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | Sincere |
| Careful | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | Careless |

## Chick-fil-A Leadership

**Evaluation**                                                                 **Leadership**

**Evaluate your co-workers performance in the workplace.**

| | 1 (Very Unlikely) | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 (Very Likely) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Coming up with new ideas. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Work to implement new ideas. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Find improved ways to do things. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Create better processes and routines. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Work as part of a team or work group. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Seek information from others in his/her work group. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Make sure his/her work group succeeds. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Respond to the needs of others in his/her work group. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Do things that helps others when it's not part of his/her job. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Work for the overall good of the company. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Do things to promote the company. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Help so that the company is a good place to be. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

**Instructions: In this instrument, we are measuring your perceptions of leadership for your immediate supervisor. Please use the following scale:**

| | 1 (Strongly Disagree) | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 (Strongly Agree) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| This person puts my best interests ahead of his/her own. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| This person dies everything he/she can to serve me. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| This person sacrifices his/her own interests to meet my needs. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| This person goes above and beyond the call of duty to meet my needs. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| This person seems alert to what's happening. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| This person is good at anticipating the consequences of decisions. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| This person has great awareness of what is going on. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| This person seems in touch with what's happening. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| This person seems to know what is going to happen. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| This person believes that the organization needs to play a moral role in society. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| This person sees the organization for its potential to contribute to society. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| This person encourages me to have a community spirit in the workplace. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| This person is preparing the organization to make a positive difference in the future. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

Appendix B

Measures of Supervisor's Servant Leadership

| | Gender | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| lead ahead of his own | Female | 21 | 3.86 | 1.195 | .261 |
| | Male | 10 | 3.90 | 1.524 | .482 |
| lead serve me | Female | 21 | 3.57 | 1.121 | .245 |
| | Male | 10 | 3.90 | 1.853 | .586 |
| lead meet my needs | Female | 21 | 3.57 | 1.207 | .263 |
| | Male | 10 | 4.00 | 1.563 | .494 |
| lead duty to meet my needs | Female | 21 | 3.57 | 1.207 | .263 |
| | Male | 10 | 4.10 | 1.595 | .504 |
| lead what's happening | Female | 21 | 3.71 | 1.189 | .260 |
| | Male | 10 | 4.10 | 1.595 | .504 |
| lead consequences of decisions | Female | 21 | 4.00 | 1.049 | .229 |
| | Male | 10 | 4.00 | 1.700 | .537 |
| lead what is going on | Female | 21 | 3.81 | .981 | .214 |
| | Male | 10 | 4.20 | 1.549 | .490 |
| lead what's happening | Female | 21 | 3.81 | 1.078 | .235 |
| | Male | 10 | 4.20 | 1.549 | .490 |
| lead going to happen | Female | 21 | 3.86 | 1.062 | .232 |
| | Male | 10 | 4.00 | 1.563 | .494 |
| lead a moral role in society | Female | 21 | 4.14 | 1.108 | .242 |
| | Male | 10 | 4.00 | 1.563 | .494 |
| lead potential to contribute | Female | 21 | 4.14 | 1.108 | .242 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| to society | Male | 10 | 3.90 | 1.524 | .482 |
| lead spirit in the workplace | Female | 21 | 4.24 | .768 | .168 |
| | Male | 10 | 3.90 | 1.524 | .482 |
| lead positive difference in the future | Female | 21 | 4.00 | 1.095 | .239 |
| | Male | 10 | 3.90 | 1.524 | .482 |

Appendix C

Measures of Organizational Performance

| | Gender | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| perform new ideas | Female | 21 | 3.86 | 1.153 | .252 |
| | Male | 10 | 4.20 | .919 | .291 |
| perform implement new ideas | Female | 21 | 3.90 | 1.136 | .248 |
| | Male | 10 | 4.10 | .994 | .314 |
| perform ways to do things | Female | 21 | 4.00 | 1.140 | .249 |
| | Male | 10 | 4.10 | .738 | .233 |
| perform processes and routines | Female | 21 | 3.86 | 1.195 | .261 |
| | Male | 10 | 4.30 | 1.059 | .335 |
| perform work group | Female | 21 | 4.24 | .768 | .168 |
| | Male | 10 | 4.20 | .632 | .200 |
| perform his/her work group | Female | 21 | 3.95 | 1.071 | .234 |
| | Male | 10 | 4.60 | .699 | .221 |
| perform group succeeds | Female | 21 | 4.29 | .845 | .184 |
| | Male | 10 | 4.50 | .707 | .224 |
| perform others in work group | Female | 21 | 4.24 | .768 | .168 |
| | Male | 10 | 4.60 | .516 | .163 |
| perform it's not part of his job | Female | 21 | 4.10 | .995 | .217 |
| | Male | 10 | 4.50 | .527 | .167 |
| perform overall good of the company | Female | 21 | 4.48 | .750 | .164 |
| | Male | 10 | 4.60 | .516 | .163 |
| perform promote the company | Female | 21 | 4.33 | .796 | .174 |
| | Male | 10 | 4.30 | .675 | .213 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| perform good place to be | Female | 21 | 4.29 | .902 | .197 |
| | Male | 10 | 4.40 | .699 | .221 |

Appendix D

Measures of Relational Trust Amongst Employees

| | gender | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| trustworthy | female | 21 | 5.81 | 1.504 | .328 |
| | male | 10 | 6.40 | .516 | .163 |
| confidential | female | 21 | 5.52 | 1.601 | .349 |
| | male | 10 | 6.00 | 1.054 | .333 |
| generous | female | 21 | 5.81 | 1.750 | .382 |
| | male | 10 | 6.40 | .966 | .306 |
| safe | female | 21 | 6.43 | .811 | .177 |
| | male | 10 | 6.40 | .843 | .267 |
| candid | female | 21 | 5.33 | 1.713 | .374 |
| | male | 10 | 6.10 | 1.197 | .379 |
| not deceitful | female | 21 | 6.14 | 1.797 | .392 |
| | male | 10 | 6.30 | .675 | .213 |
| straightforwards | female | 21 | 5.57 | 1.690 | .369 |
| | male | 10 | 6.00 | .943 | .298 |
| respectful | female | 21 | 6.05 | 1.322 | .288 |
| | male | 10 | 6.60 | .516 | .163 |
| considerate | female | 21 | 5.86 | 1.590 | .347 |
| | male | 10 | 6.50 | .707 | .224 |
| honest | female | 21 | 6.00 | 1.517 | .331 |
| | male | 10 | 6.50 | .527 | .167 |
| reliable | female | 21 | 6.10 | 1.338 | .292 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | male | 10 | 6.30 | .675 | .213 |
| faithful | female | 21 | 6.10 | 1.546 | .337 |
|  | male | 10 | 6.60 | .516 | .163 |
| sincere | female | 21 | 5.76 | 1.758 | .384 |
|  | male | 10 | 6.30 | .823 | .260 |
| careful | female | 21 | 5.86 | 1.424 | .311 |
|  | male | 10 | 6.30 | .949 | .300 |

Appendix E

Measures of Job Satisfaction

| | Gender | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| satisfaction spend time | Female | 21 | 3.95 | .740 | .161 |
| | Male | 10 | 4.30 | .675 | .213 |
| satisfaction part of a group | Female | 21 | 4.24 | .831 | .181 |
| | Male | 10 | 4.30 | .675 | .213 |
| satisfaction group meetings | Female | 21 | 3.62 | 1.322 | .288 |
| | Male | 10 | 4.00 | 1.054 | .333 |
| satisfaction feel part of group | Female | 21 | 4.71 | .644 | .140 |
| | Male | 10 | 4.40 | .699 | .221 |
| satisfaction feel liked | Female | 21 | 4.33 | .913 | .199 |
| | Male | 10 | 4.20 | 1.549 | .490 |
| satisfaction absence would not matter | Female | 21 | 4.10 | 1.091 | .238 |
| | Male | 10 | 4.90 | .316 | .100 |
| satisfaction trust group | Female | 21 | 3.67 | 1.155 | .252 |
| | Male | 10 | 4.50 | .850 | .269 |
| satisfaction say anything | Female | 21 | 3.10 | 1.300 | .284 |
| | Male | 10 | 4.10 | 1.370 | .433 |
| satisfaction spend time with group | Female | 21 | 4.57 | .978 | .213 |
| | Male | 10 | 4.30 | .823 | .260 |
| satisfaction make me feel involved | Female | 21 | 3.86 | .910 | .199 |
| | Male | 10 | 4.40 | .699 | .221 |
| satisfaction become my friends | Female | 21 | 4.48 | .873 | .190 |
| | Male | 10 | 4.50 | .707 | .224 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| satisfaction atmosphere is comfortable | Female | 21 | 4.33 | 1.065 | .232 |
| | Male | 10 | 4.50 | .707 | .224 |