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Abstract

The purpose of this descriptive, co-relational and cross-sectional study was to gain a better understanding of the relationships between Servant Leadership and job satisfaction of teaching staff working in the private MBA institute in the Pimpri Chinchwad Municipal cooperation. Data were collected by the distribution of two questionnaires among 156 employees through convenience sampling. The results of the paper indicate that the staffs are in the opinion of adopting servant leadership in the organization. Employees' job satisfaction and Servant leadership were closely inter-related ($P < 0.001$). The positive correlation between the two was expected. This may be due to external factors, such as job market conditions, which may influence perceived opportunities for career advancement elsewhere. The impact of such external factors is outside the scope of this study, but will have to be investigated in further research.

Keywords: job satisfaction, Servant leadership, Servant leadership sub score

Introduction

This study inquire about to determine the relationship between servant leadership and employee job satisfaction in a nonprofit organization, specifically the educational management institute in the Pune city. This research includes the problem of low levels of job satisfaction among the teaching employees employed in these organizations. Low levels of job satisfaction have several negative consequences (Aazami, Shamsuddin, Akmal, & Azami, 2015). Though there are many independent variables which affects the employee job satisfaction, leadership style is considered to be one of the prominent variable (Schneider & George, 2011). Servant leadership is one leadership style that emphasizes followers’ needs over leaders’ needs (Greenleaf, 1996, 1998, 2002).

According to the survey conducted by Monster (2019), Employees in India are satisfied with their current jobs, but not with the compensation they receive from the current employer. According to the survey, seventy five percent of the respondents are satisfied with their current job roles, but only 21.6 percent are satisfied with their pay. Due to the global
meltdown, companies are more cautious on pay hike. Hence, it is not surprise to conclude that there is dissatisfaction with the compensation levels among the employees. Education and research sector have registered the steepest fall in the satisfaction level. This sector has registered a drop of 20 percent. In India, higher education segment is expected to increase to Rs 2,44,824 crore (US$ 35.03 billion) by 2025. The education sector in India is estimated at Rs 6,40,891.3 crore (US$ 91.7 billion) in FY18 and is expected to reach Rs 7,06,587.9 crore (US$ 101.1 billion) in FY19.

In every budget Government of India gives strategic priority to the education sector. In 2002, government of India has allowed 100 percent FDI in the education sector. This sector has received cumulative Rs 17,262.83 crore (US$ 2.47 billion) up to March 2019 due to FDI investment. Indian education sector witnessed 18 merger and acquisition deals worth Rs 342.4 crore (US$ 49 million) in 2017. In May 2018, the Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India launched Samagra Siksha scheme with the aim of achieving holistic development of school education in the country. In August 2019, Maharashtra International Education Board (MIEB) has signed a collaboration agreement with Google India. India is one of the largest networks of higher education in the world. According to India Brand Equity Fund (2019), there were over 250 million schools going students are there in India. Number of colleges and universities in India reached 39,931 and 993, respectively in 2018-19. India had 37.4 million students enrolled in higher education in 2018-19. Hence there is a huge opportunity in the education sector but the increase in the dissatisfaction of the teachers is a concern. This study focuses on ……..

Past research shows that job dissatisfaction can result in increased levels of employee turnover, absenteeism, tardiness, grievance expression, and job stress. It also retards employee mental health, morale, organizational commitment, physical health, and productivity which have negative impact on organizations (Aazami et al., 2015). Employee turnover is a time consuming and costly process.

Servant Leadership
Servant leadership is a style of leadership that puts other people’s needs before the leader’s needs (Greenleaf, 2002). Greenleaf (1991, 2008) described two extremes, with leader-first at one extreme and servant-first at the other extreme. A servant leader is a servant first and this servant nature cannot be taken away. Servant leaders’ first give emphasizes on the development of his follower. He believes that the outcome of his performance solely depends on the performance of his followers. A servant leader tries to adapt them with this servant nature into the leadership role and it affects their behavior towards their follower. Greenleaf (2002) emphasizes that to adopt servant leadership; leaders require having tolerance for any imperfection, which is very difficult for any leader. A servant leader listens to understand the problem (Greenleaf, 1991, 2008, 2002). This requires acceptance of and empathy for others
to truly listen with the intent to serve others (Greenleaf, 2002). Greenleaf (2002) also identified foresight, awareness persuasion, conceptualizing, healing, and community as other characteristics of servant leadership.

Spears (2004) describes the essential characteristics of servant leaders: (a) listening, (b) empathy, (c) healing, (d) awareness, (e) persuasion, (f) conceptualization, (g) foresight, (h) stewardship, (i) commitment to people’s development, and (j) building community.

Russell and Stone (2002) concluded servant leadership included the following functional and accompanying attributes: functional attributes of (a) vision, (b) honesty, (c) integrity, (d) trust, (e) service, (f) modeling, (g) pioneering, (h) appreciation of others, and (i) empowerment and accompanying attributes of (a) communication, (b) credibility, (c) competence, (d) stewardship, (e) visibility, (f) influence, (g) persuasion, (h) listening, (i) encouragement, (j) teaching, and (k) delegation.

Many researchers had provided different models of servant leadership and additional enhancements to servant leadership theory. For example, Russell and Stone (2002) developed a practical model of servant leadership which included values (core beliefs, principles); functional attributes (vision, honesty, integrity, trust, service, modeling, pioneering, appreciation of others, empowerment); complementary attributes (communication, credibility, competence, stewardship, visibility, influence, persuasion, listening, encouragement, teaching, delegation); leading to organizational culture, employee attitudes and work behaviors, and organizational performance. In this model, job satisfaction fits into the employee attitudes and work behaviors. In contrast, van Dierendonck (2011) developed a conceptual model of servant leadership which included the antecedents of culture, need to serve and motivation to lead, and individual characteristics; servant leadership characteristics (empowering and developing people, humility, authenticity, interpersonal acceptance, providing direction, stewardship); leading to high quality leader-follower relationship and psychological climate; in turn leading to self-actualization with follower job attitudes (commitment, empowerment, job satisfaction, engagement), performance (organizational citizenship, behavior, team effectiveness), and organizational outcomes (sustainability, corporate social responsibility). In this model, job satisfaction fits into the follower job attitudes. In further contrast, Northouse (2013) developed a model of servant leadership which included antecedent conditions (context and culture, leader attributes, follower receptivity), servant leader behaviors (conceptualizing, emotional healing, putting followers first, helping followers grow and succeed, behaving ethically, empowering, creating value for the community), leading to outcomes (follower performance and growth, organizational performance, societal impact). In this model, job satisfaction fits into the outcomes.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction has been defined in a number of ways by many researchers. According to Vroom (1964) job satisfaction is defined as the positive orientation of an individual towards...
the role which he or she is presently performing. Hackman and Oldham (1975) defined it as the degree to which the employee is satisfied and happy with his or her current employment. According to Spector (1997), job satisfaction includes feeling of an employee towards his or her job, consisting different factors of the job. Cranney, Smith and Stone (1992) described that job satisfaction is the reaction to a job on the basis of employees comparing actual output to be desired with the expected or deserved output. A more comprehensive definition is given by Evans (2000), it is a state of mind encompassing all those feelings determined by the extent to which the individual perceives her/his job-related needs to be being met. According to Akhtar (1994), appreciating attitude of the boss and good job experience give positive emotional stage that leads to job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the perception of the one’s job as fulfilling or allowing the fulfillment of one’s important job values, providing these are compatible with one’s physical and psychological needs (McPhee & Townsend, 1992). Job satisfaction can be defined as an individual’s total feeling about their job and the attitudes they have towards various aspects or facets of their job, as well as an attitude and perception that could consequently influence the degree of fit between the individual and the organization (Ivancevich & Matteson 2002). A person with high job satisfaction emerges to hold generally positive attitudes than one who is dissatisfied to hold negative attitudes towards their job (Robbins 1993).

Cherrington (1994) has identified two aspects in understanding the concept of job satisfaction while performing his studies on job satisfaction. The two aspects are facet satisfaction and overall satisfaction. A facet of job satisfaction can be described as any part of a job that produces feelings of satisfaction or dissatisfaction (Spector 1997). This perspective can be useful to organizations that wish to identify employee retention areas in which improvement is possible (Westlund & Hannon 2008). Facet satisfaction refers to the tendency for an employee to be more or less satisfied with various facets or aspects of the job (Johns, 1996) whereas Overall satisfaction focuses on the general internal state of satisfaction or dissatisfaction within the individual. Hence, Job satisfaction is implicit as affective response to the job viewed either in its entirety (global satisfaction) or with regard to some particular aspects (facet satisfaction) i.e. pay, supervision etc. (Tett, Meyer, & John, 1993). Wallace and Schwab (1974) in their research found that pay is the most important factor linked to employee satisfaction. There are many factors like recognition, training and career development, promotion practices adopted by organization, communication, working environment, company policies, team work, leadership style adopted by the superiors etc. which can affect job satisfaction. Many researchers have correlated job satisfaction with enhanced job performance, positive work values, high levels of employee motivation, and lower rates of absenteeism, turnover and burnout (Begley & Czajka, 1993).

Many theoretical analyses have criticized job satisfaction as being too narrow conceptually (Andre Bussing et al., 1999). There are generally three accepted dimension of job satisfaction. First, job satisfaction is an emotional response to a job situation. It cannot be seen; it can only be inferred. Second, job satisfaction is often determined by how well
outcomes meet or exceed expectations. For example, if employees of one department feel that
they are working much harder than other department but are receiving fewer rewards, they
will probably have a negative attitude towards their work. They will be dissatisfied. On the
other hand, if they feel that they are being treated well and are being paid fairly, they are
likely to have a positive attitude towards job and will be considered as job satisfied. Third,
job satisfaction represents several related attitude.
Job satisfaction can reduces the cost of operation by many ways. If the employees are
satisfied with the current employment and have a chance for growth in the organization, their
absenteeism will reduce. Satisfaction leads to employee motivation which results in task
error. Hence the productivity per employee can be increased with the help of employee
satisfaction. Attrition rate can be checked with the help of satisfied work force. Now a day’s
management practitioners are more focused and devising various methods for improving
satisfaction among their employees. Greater job satisfaction equates to both a better quality of
life and better physical health, and thus potentially greater performance and productivity
(Cranny et al., 1992). Work is an important aspect of people’s lives as most people spend a
large part of their lives at work place, an understanding of the factors involved in job
satisfaction is very much crucial to improving employee’s performance and productivity.
Furthermore, apart from the importance of job satisfaction, it has been seen that satisfied
employees have better health and live longer. Satisfaction at the workplace carries over to the
employee’s life outside the life. For management satisfied work force translates into higher
productivity due to less interruption caused by absenteeism or core employee quitting the
organization, as well as into lower medical costs (Saimir and Jonida, 2013). Job satisfaction
can be assessed by summing the satisfaction reported for many different aspects of the job
and the work condition. Such an assessment will give an accurate picture of the employee’s
total job satisfaction (Falkenburg and Schyns, 2007).

Significance of the Study

India has a substantial problem of low job satisfaction among the employees working in the
educational institutes. This low level of job satisfaction affects their outputs. This study
examines the relationship between servant leadership and employee job satisfaction the
private educational institutes. If there is a positive relationship between the two variables
taken in this study, then adopting this leadership style in the private educational sector could
be the interest of leader and the employees working in this organization.

Research Hypothesis

H0: There is no relationship between servant leadership and employee job satisfaction in
educational private institute
H1: There is a positive relationship between servant leadership and employee job satisfaction
in educational private institute
Research Design

This study used a quantitative non experimental, cross-sectional research design for collecting survey data. Correlation is used to measure the association between the variables. The impact of servant leadership on Job satisfaction was done with the help of regression analysis.

There are almost 195 private Colleges who are offering MBA degree. Most of the colleges do not disclose their strength so it is very difficult to estimate the population as a result of which infinite population is taken for this study. Convenience Sampling is used in this study to collect the information related to the independent and dependent variable. 350 questionnaires were distributed in 22 different colleges. Out of which 157 valid questionnaires were received from the respondents, which is about 44 percent of the overall response rate. Among 157 respondents 63 percent (99) were males and 37 percent (58) were females.

Results of OLA survey

OLA survey used in this study has nine different subscores: (a) values people, (b) develops people, (c) builds community, (d) displays authenticity, (e) provides leadership, (f) shares leadership, (g) job satisfaction scale, (h) organization, and (i) leadership. Table1.1 below describes the educational institute’s results on the nine sub scores. This table gives a specific direction in the OLA survey to be used to measure the sub score. The table also identifies the overall mean for each sub score and then the item mean score for each item. This table helps to understand the health of the institutes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub score</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value People (10 items)</td>
<td>43.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop People (9 items)</td>
<td>38.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds Community (10 items)</td>
<td>44.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display Authenticity (12 items)</td>
<td>53.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.1 OLA Survey Sub Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Item mean</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides Leadership (9 items)</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shares Leadership (10 items)</td>
<td>42.56</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction Scale (6 item)</td>
<td>28.09</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1 shows that six items score ranges from 4.0 to 4.49, which means they fall in Org 5 level which identified as servant organization with excellent health. The job satisfaction scale was in the range of 4.5 to 5.00 for an Org 6 level identified as servant organization with optimal health.

Table 1.2 describes the descriptive data of six of the nine OLA survey sub scores including the Cronbach’s alpha value for estimating the reliability of the respective sub score. For each sub score, the table includes (a) the number of survey items in the sub score, (b) the individual minimum score and the individual maximum score for a sub score, (c) the range between the minimum and maximum scores, (d) the overall mean score for the sub score, (e) the standard deviation for the sub score, (f) the item mean score for the sub score, and (g) the estimated reliability for the sub score using Cronbach’s alpha.

Table 1.2- Descriptive Statistics and Cronbach’s Alpha for OLA sub score

Relationship between Servant Leadership and Job Satisfaction

Table 1.3 demonstrates Pearson’s correlation between the six sub scores of servant leadership and job satisfaction and. The correlation coefficient between servant leadership and job satisfaction was r = 0.638, p = 0.001 (2 tailed). Hence, it was statistically significant positive relationship between job satisfaction and servant leadership. There was a strong and positive association between servant leadership and job satisfaction.
Variable | Job Satisfaction
---|---
Value People | 0.571**
Develop People | 0.621**
Builds Community | 0.517**
Display Authenticity | 0.622**
Provides Leadership | 0.627**
Shares Leadership | 0.634**
Servant Leadership Total | 0.638**

Table 1.3: Pearson’s Correlation coefficient between Servant leadership Sub score and Job Satisfaction

** Correlation is significant at 0.01 levels (2 tailed)

All the independent variables are positively associated and there is strong relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction.

In order to find the impact of servant leadership on job satisfaction bivariate regression analysis was done. The model summary stated that servant leadership explains 47.2 percent of the job satisfaction.

Table 1.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.594a</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td>.19154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Servant leadership
b. Dependent Variable: Satisfaction

Table 1.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>27.828</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27.828</td>
<td>85.101</td>
<td>.000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>51.051</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78.880</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Satisfaction
b. Predictors: (Constant), Servant leadership
Table 1.5 shows that the predictor and the dependent variable are significantly different.

Table 1.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>2.591</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td>10.233</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant leadership</td>
<td>.561</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>13.473</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Satisfaction

Regression analysis was performed on the Servant leadership sub score total as independent variable and their job satisfaction as the dependent variable. Results of the regression analysis indicate much of the variation in the dependent variable is explained with adjusted R2 of 0.472 and F-value 85.101 (p=0.000) with Job satisfaction. The figure reveals that 47.2% of the total variance of job satisfaction is explained by the servant leadership.

Regression coefficient ($\beta=0.561$) was significantly different from zero ($t=13.473; p = 0.000$) at the 5% significance level. Therefore, results of regression analysis support the alternate hypothesis. Thus null hypothesis is not accepted and its alternative hypothesis that servant leadership is positively related to job satisfaction supported by the data collected for this study. Hence it is concluded that servant leadership is highly required to increase the satisfaction of the employees of the private educational institute.

Limitations of the Study

Prior to conducting the research, the researcher identified three study limitations. First, there was a limitation with the relatively small target population and sample size found. The samples are collected from the private MBA institutes located in the Pimpri Chinchwad Municipal Cooperation, which restricts its generalizability. Second, there was a limitation with the use of quantitative surveys to capture data about complex phenomena such as servant leadership and job satisfaction. Third, there was a limitation with the use of quantitative surveys to capture the true perspectives of participants.
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