ABSTRACT

PERCEPTIONS OF THE BENEFITS OF SERVANT LEADERSHIP ON SMALL UNIT PERFORMANCE, MORALE, AND COMRADEY

By Andrew A. White

Senior civilian and uniformed leaders’ moral failings, across the Department of Defense, reveal selfish and nepotistic core values while eroding trust in leaders at all levels and echelons of responsibility. This study reviews servant leadership, its characteristics, and ability to benefit the United States Army by impacting team effectiveness (i.e., performance), follower satisfaction (i.e., morale), and team commitment and collaboration (i.e., comradery). Based on the foundational definitions of servant leadership established by Greenleaf (1970, 1977) and Irving and Longbotham (2007), the objective of this research was to determine the perceptions of currently serving U.S. Army officers, in the Central Michigan University Master of Science in Administration, regarding the benefits of servant leadership on small units’ performance, morale, and comradery. This research focuses on a thorough review of the current literature, a survey, analysis of survey results, and conclusions and recommendations regarding the perceptions of servant leadership.

This paper addresses the primary research question of what are the perceptions of the benefits of servant leadership on small unit performance, morale, and comradery? Secondarily, what are the perceptions and knowledge of servant leadership attributes? Thirdly, how are perceptions of servant leadership related to small unit performance, morale, and comradery? Finally, are there positive perspectives about servant leadership contributions for small unit performance through the creation of trust and commitment?
This research focused on collecting data related to understanding and assessing perceptions made by current serving U.S. Army officers, in the CMU MSA program through analysis of survey results. The most significant methodological limitations, of this study, were the small sample and respondent sizes. The small population limited the application of this research and transferability to other fields or organizations without careful assessment.

This research focused on the knowledge, attributes, and contributions of servant leadership on small unit performance, morale, and comradery. This research demonstrated the need for continued study and application of servant leadership in both academic and professional settings. Survey respondents evaluated the value of nine attributes derived from the prevailing research of servant leadership. The data indicated positive perceptions of mentoring employees, providing clear purpose, accountability, and communicating purpose and focus as critical characteristics of servant leadership. This research indicated servant leaders, in small unit settings, would increase organizational performance through the development of their employees and the use of clear statements of purpose and accountability.

This study concluded the need for further research about the implementation of servant leadership at the small unit level within the framework of the U.S. Army. Additionally, this study defined servant leadership as a leader (a) acting selflessly, (b) developing and mentoring employees for the benefit of the organization, (c) creating an effective team through accountability and collaboration, (d) valuing follower input, and (e) communicating purpose. Therefore, additional research should focus on the application of mentorship and providing purpose by a servant leader, at the small unit organizational level, within the framework of the U.S. Army.
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Chapter I: Definition of the Problem

The stress of combat routinely causes self-reflection and introspection by the leader of decisions made and the effect upon the soldiers within the command. Does the leader clearly and accurately communicate purpose and direction, when faced with life and death decisions? Does the leader properly motivate the soldiers to accomplish the mission and understand its significance? Do the soldiers trust the leader? Does the leader develop the soldiers to assume leadership in the leader’s absence? The leader’s application, whether consciously or unconsciously, of various and diverse leadership attributes to challenging situations and decisions effects how soldiers and organizations answer these questions.

Leadership researchers often utilize the military to measure and test their theories when studying forms and functions of leadership (Wong, Bliese, & McGurk, 2003). These studies capitalize upon the leadership laboratory of the military. These studies enable the analysis of the characteristics of leadership and leader actions, which contribute to high performing teams. Specifically, within the military community, the United States Army continuously seeks to develop leaders of character, who foster trust, inspire performance, display moral integrity, build morale, and nurture comradery with and among their subordinates, to accomplish the mission regardless of the challenges or setbacks (Department of the Army [DA], 2012).

The application of leadership remains critical throughout the U.S. Army. Its skillful use impacts the mission preparedness of organizations, organizational climate, and the preparation of leaders to understand and make critical decisions. U.S. Army leaders effect organizations ranging in size from team, squad, or platoon (4-45 personnel) to echelons above with hundreds,
thousands, or tens of thousands of personnel. Therefore, this study analyzes the theorized attributes of servant leadership and their perceived benefit on small unit performance, morale, and comradery, as applied within the U.S. Army framework of platoon and company leadership.

**Background of the Problem**

Since 2013, the Department of Defense investigated over 500 cases of serious misconduct, among the generals, admirals, and senior civilian leaders of all five service components (Brooks, 2017). Within the ranks of the U.S. Army, soldiers identified these leaders as toxic, to both the organization and the leadership environment across the U.S. Army. “Toxic leadership, like leadership in general, is more easily described than defined, but terms like self-aggrandizing, petty, abusive, indifferent to unit climate, and interpersonally malicious seem to capture the concept. A toxic leader is poison to the unit” (Reed, 2004, p. 71).

Whether identified as toxic or not, senior civilian and uniformed leaders’ moral failings reveal selfish and nepotistic core values. The misconduct erodes members’ trust in leaders at all levels and echelons of responsibility. Trust remains foundational to the U.S. Army’s leadership doctrine and leader expectations at all echelons of command (DA, 2012).

Sendjaya and Sarros (2002) considered the interconnection of a leader’s core beliefs and self-concept while researching leadership applications within corporate organizations. They concluded that leader misconduct was a derivative of their core beliefs and moral character. These failings fundamentally disrupted and eroded the followers’ trust in their leaders. Furthermore, Snider (2015) critiqued the U.S. Army for lacking a practical approach to developing their leaders’ moral character. Snyder (2015) linked the lack of moral character development to a detrimental reduction in the leadership quality of the professional officer corps and increasing leader misconduct. Leader misconduct and the lack of moral character
development further eroded trust between followers and leaders, which detrimentally impacted a positive work environment and the ability of the organization to promote high performance, build morale, and nurture comradery.

Snider (2015) concluded the U.S. Army failed to cultivate the moral character and leadership development necessary to foster a climate of trust within the profession. Snyder (2015) proposed, to the U.S. Army, an increased emphasis on leadership development to address developing a climate of trust, during the crucible years of leader development, as a platoon leader and company commander. Therefore, the U.S. Army should consider whether training on forms and theories of leadership, during these formative leadership experiences, could prevent the misconduct of future senior leaders. By building a foundation of moral character and ethical decision-making, leadership training could foster trust and encourage high performing teams, while countering the selfishness and nepotism revealed within senior leader misconduct.

It is necessary to identify leadership theories which advance the selflessness, moral character, and climate of trust fundamental to the U.S. Army and, thereby, inspire performance, morale, and comradery. Greenleaf’s (1977) seminal work, “Servant Leadership,” developed one such theory and formed the foundation for future research and study. Irving and Longbotham (2007) defined the characteristics of servant leadership as a leader acting selflessly; developing employees; creating an effective team through accountability, collaboration, and valuing follower input; and communicating organizational purpose. Following Greenleaf’s (1977) book, researchers analyzed and evaluated servant leadership to provide ample evidence of the impact of a servant leader on team effectiveness (performance), follower satisfaction (morale), and team commitment and collaboration (comradery).
Research Question

This paper addresses the primary research question of what are the perceptions of current serving U.S. Army officers, in the Central Michigan University Master of Science in Administration program, of the benefits of servant leadership on small unit performance, morale, and comradery? Secondarily, this research also addresses the following sub-questions. What are the perceptions and knowledge of servant leadership attributes? How are perceptions of servant leadership related to small unit performance, morale, and comradery? Are there positive perspectives about servant leadership contributions for small unit performance through the creation of trust and commitment?

Definition of Terms

Fundamental to this research is understanding and defining servant leadership and the associated terms, which facilitate understanding the perceptions of current serving U.S. Army officers. Greenleaf (1970) formed the first definition of servant leadership as a leader who serves first as opposed to the leader who leads first. Greenleaf (1977) postulated the litmus test of whether the leader serves the needs of the followers first and whether the followers are growing personally.

Subsequent research yielded various definitions and characterizations. Sendjaya and Sarros (2002) described servant leadership as the leader placing the needs, goals, and interests of the subordinates before their own; serving followers was the primary motivation for leading; stewarding resources and personnel; and prioritizing follower development and advancement above self. Whereas, Robbins and Judge (2017) characterized servant leadership as acting selflessly, demonstrating moral courage and integrity, building a knowledge-sharing climate, exercising active listening, encouraging stewardship, and mentoring followers.
The variety and complexity of definitions, attributes, and characterizations of servant leadership necessitated a coalesced description. Irving and Longbotham (2007) synthesized a comprehensive literature review, along with research, to formulate a detailed definition of servant leadership. This study adapted Irving and Longbotham (2007) definition of servant leadership. Servant leadership is a leader acting selflessly; developing and mentoring employees for the benefit of the organization; creating an efficient team through accountability and collaboration; valuing follower input; and communicating purpose and focus (Irving & Longbotham, 2007).

In addition to understanding the definition of servant leadership, this study dealt with standard U.S. Army terms such as leadership, platoon, and company, along with the terms of performance, morale, and comradery. The U.S. Army leadership doctrine is Army Doctrine Publication 6-22, *Army Leadership*, which defines leadership as "the process of influencing people by providing purpose, direction, and motivation to accomplish the mission and improve the organization" (DA, 2012, p. 14). This definition does not differ significantly from academia, which defines leadership as "the ability to influence a group toward the achievement of a vision or set of goals" (Robbins & Judge, 2017, p. 382). Furthermore, this study characterizes small unit organizations by their U.S. Army identifications: platoon (tactical leader of 16-45 personnel) and company (organizational leader of 60-250 personnel). These small units focus on tactical operations with an expectation of direct leadership and visible leaders dynamically involved with all decisions and actions.

This study seeks to understand the perspectives of current serving U.S. Army officers and the organizational structures which temper and inform their experience. Because of the
leadership needed and fostered within these small units, they provide rapid and responsive feedback to leadership qualities and competencies.

Finally, this study relies on understanding the definitions of performance, morale, and comradery. Choudhary, Akhtar, and Zaheer (2012), in “Impact of Transformational and Servant Leadership on Organizational Performance,” define performance as the return on an asset, equity, or sales; the net rate of growth; or measured efficiency or effectiveness rates. Morale is the integration of follower satisfaction and motivation from completion of a task or establishment of competence (Bande, Fernandez-Ferrin, Varela-Neira, & Otero-Neira, 2016). Finally, comradery is team members working together in collaboration, with free information exchange, while maintaining a sense of unity (Irving & Longbotham, 2007).

Research Objective

The objective of this research was to determine the perceptions of currently serving U.S. Army officers, in the Central Michigan University (CMU) Master of Science in Administration (MSA), of the benefits of servant leadership on small units’ performance, morale, and comradery. This research focused on a thorough review of current literature, a survey of students within the MSA program, an analysis of survey results, and the conclusions and recommendations regarding the perceptions of servant leadership. This research added to the body of work on servant leadership regarding the perceptions of U.S. Army officers which could assist in spurring future studies.

Significance of Research

This study analyzed perceptions of servant leadership and provided utility to practitioners within the U.S. Army. This research supported officers and civilian instructors currently teaching leadership theory to officers within the same demographic sphere as the study
population, at the Command and General Staff School, Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. The perception information gathered could inform research and testing for future inclusion of servant leadership attributes into U.S. Army leadership doctrine. Furthermore, the research and analysis supported the effect of servant leadership attributes on performance, morale, and comradery, while also contributing to a positive command climate, built upon trust and shared organizational goals. Finally, this was the first study of the perceptions of the “Millennial” generation of U.S. Army officers, regarding servant leadership.

**Study Limitations**

The small sample size and the focus on currently serving U.S. Army officers, in the CMU MSA program, limited the application of this study. This study is not transferable to other fields or small unit organizations, without careful assessment, because it lacks empirical and quantifiable results based on a representative sample size. Additionally, since this study focused on servant leadership and the perception of its benefit on small units’ performance, morale, and comradery, it has limited applicability for similar attributes found within other leadership theories or for organizations beyond the scope of those in this study.
Chapter II: Review of the Related Literature

The study of servant leadership emerged in an organizational, managerial, and leadership context from two works by Robert K. Greenleaf, *The Servant as Leader* (1970) and *Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness* (1977). Greenleaf’s seminal articles formed the foundation for the field of servant leadership (Sendjaya & Sarros, 2002; Boone & Makhani, 2012; Parris & Peachey, 2013; Newman, Schwarz, Cooper, & Sendjaya, 2015). Greenleaf (1970) provided the initial definition of servant leadership as “The servant-leader is servant first” (Greenleaf, 1970, p. 6), which he further refined, stating the servant leader is “sharply different from one who is leader first” (Greenleaf, 1977, p. 27). Spears (2010) coalesced Greenleaf’s theory of servant leadership into a list of ten attributes: listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community (Spears, 2010). From Greenleaf’s original works stemmed further research and development of the theory of servant leadership.

While the concept of servant leadership predated Greenleaf’s works, with some scholars citing the model of Jesus Christ’s teachings to his disciples, this literature review examines the nature of current studies and research regarding the empirical and qualitative theory testing of servant leadership (Parris & Peachey, 2013). While researching the literature on servant leadership, this study identified the necessity of extending the literary search to books and academic articles published before 2007. The quantity of research published within the past ten years surpasses the academic resources available between 1970 and 2007, but most recent articles cite and reference the foundational research predating 2007.

This literature review divides servant leadership works into four focuses areas. First, studies defining and determining the attributes and nature of servant leadership. Second,
addressing the impact of servant leadership on team effectiveness (performance). Third, studies addressing critical components of follower satisfaction (morale). Finally, studies researching the implications of follower commitment and collaboration (comradery).

**Nature and Attributes**

Starting with Greenleaf (1970), researchers continually grappled with the paramount question of defining servant leadership, and each author, researcher, and team postulated the nature and characteristics that most strongly supported their areas of study. Therefore, understanding the nature and attributes of servant leadership and how numerous studies modified and clarified these terms, through research, proved essential to this study.

While Greenleaf invigorated the discussion of servant leadership, the debate of leadership and its attributes seems as old as humanity. Fuller, J. F. C. (1936) analyzed the U.S. Army following World War I and determined the nature and characteristics of leadership necessary for success in the next war. He emphasized the necessity of generalship (leadership by a different title) embodying shared hardship with subordinates, shared purpose through shared dangers, and “a general, however exalted by his rank, in body, heart and mind is still a soldier” (Fuller, 1936, p. 96). Coming full compass, Anderson (1980) distilled the qualities of a good combat leader from three categories of courage, personal integrity, and adaptability into twenty-one characteristics. Maintains a “calm controlled manner;” “cheerful, optimistic, and enthusiastic outlook;” and “friendly, impartial, and business-like” approach topped Anderson’s (1980) list of “Desirable Personal Characteristics of Leaders” (Anderson, 1980, p. 11). Therefore, between military applications and civilian organizational models lies the need and the true nature and attributes of servant leadership.
The nature of servant leadership. The nature of servant leadership defines the scope of definitions found within the field of leadership study and research. It seeks to understand how authors and researchers define servant leadership as distinct from other leadership theories. Greenleaf (1970) postulated the first definition of servant leadership. He stated, “The servant-leader is servant first” (Greenleaf, 1970, p. 6), which sharply contrasts “from one who is leader first” (Greenleaf, 1977, p. 27). Greenleaf felt the nature of servant leadership lay within the heart of the leader, as identifying as a servant as opposed to primarily self-defining as a leader. Greenleaf (1970, 1977) defined servant leadership as a way of life, not another management tool.

Greenleaf’s (1970, 1977) compare and contrast definition gave way to increasing degrees of complexity and completeness as researchers added to the field. Rapidly other authors and researchers noted and developed various and expanded definitions of servant leadership. Peterson, Galvin, and Lange (2012) categorized and researched how the servant-first nature of servant leadership counteracted the narcissistic tendencies within chief executive officers. Boone and Makhani (2012) advanced how servant leadership sought to institutionalize the character and quality of a leader as serving others and placing the needs of their followers before their own. Parris and Peachey (2013) noted the dual nature of servant leadership as both emphasizing service to others while enabling and mentoring individuals to grow and contribute to society. Regardless of national origin, researchers identified the nature of servant leadership as emphasizing the leader going beyond self-interest and serving their followers to encourage and foster growth and self-development (Song, Park, & Kang, 2015). Furthermore, Olsen (2018) summarized servant leadership, stating, “the servant leader cares about the needs of others and seeks to help those in his or her circle of influence” (Olsen, 2018, p. 53). In summation,
academicians within the field agree that the principle nature of servant leadership is “to serve first, as opposed to lead (Greenleaf, 1977)” (Sendjaya & Sarros, 2002, p. 57).

**The attributes of servant leadership.** Founded upon the nature of servant leadership, researchers proposed, theorized, and tested various attributes to determine the characteristics correlating to servant leadership. Irving and Longbotham (2007) explained that servant leadership is a follower-oriented leadership theory placing the needs of the follower before those of the leader, based on their analysis of Greenleaf's (1977) groundbreaking study of the emerging discipline. Irving and Longbotham’s (2007) literature examination revealed studies focused on identification of the elements at the core of the theory. They further recommended and tested six attributes of servant leadership impacting team effectiveness: “(a) providing accountability, (b) supporting and resourcing, (c) engaging in honest self-evaluation, (d) fostering collaboration, (e) communicating with clarity, (f) valuing and appreciating” (Irving & Longbotham, 2007, p. 98).

Since Irving and Longbotham (2007), numerous researchers fielded and tested their list of attributes. Liden, Wayne, Zhao, and Henderson (2008) detailed nine dimensions of servant leadership. They understood servant leadership through the qualities of emotional healing and concern, helping the community, conceptual skills, empowering followers, foster follower growth and success, placing others needs before self, ethical behavior, long-term relationship building, and servanthood (Liden, Wayne, Zhao, & Henderson, 2008). Additionally, Earnhardt (2008) evaluated servant leadership traits “based on the following: (a) agapao love, (b) humility, (c) altruism, (d) vision, (e) trust, (f) empowerment, and (g) service” within the military context (Earnhardt, 2008, p. 14). Earnhardt (2008) concluded the validity of servant leadership within the military framework and the lack of adverse effect from gender, rank, and branch of military service. Furthermore, Earnhardt (2008) emphasized the importance of servant leadership to help
organizations grow through leaders empowering followers, honoring their commitments, and developing respect and trust within their organization.

Dierendonck and Nuijten (2011) developed the Servant Leadership Survey (SLS) to measure the factors and qualities which enhance leader and organizational improvements. They tested eight attributes determined through a detailed literature review of servant leadership. They empirically tested empowerment, accountability, standing back, humility, authenticity, courage, interpersonal acceptance, and stewardship. Dierendonck and Nuijten’s (2011) empirical research determined the strongest of these eight servant leadership indicators to be empowerment, standing back, humility, and stewardship.

Moreover, Boone and Makhani (2012) recognized servant leadership as a formidable approach for leaders and identified five attributes of successful servant leadership: vision casting, listening, seeking and encouraging success, power sharing, and coalition building. Additionally, Boone and Makhani (2012) cautioned practitioners of the time-consuming nature of servant leadership when practicing the listening, vision casting, and mentoring required to affect an organization positively. Finally, Song, Park, and Kang (2015) recommended organizations grow servant leaders from within the organization while fostering the essential attributes to serve their followers and encourage the followers’ personal growth and betterment.

**Impacts on Team Effectiveness (Performance)**

The studies reviewed by this research found servant leadership impacted performance by increasing leader and organizational trust, providing accountability, and fostering a mentoring climate. Sousa and van Dierendonck (2017) theorized the correlation between the moral virtue of humility and the impact upon follower engagement. They conducted empirical research demonstrating the relationship between trust in the leader and the leader’s authentic display of
humility. They concluded that servant leadership provided the best foundation for encouraging humility within leaders, which resulted in increased organizational trust. Additionally, trust building was the first benefit identified by Boone and Makhani (2012), who concluded that the servant leadership attribute of listening created mutual trust from the leader to the follower and from the follower back to the leader. They also identified how mentoring of followers enabled the leader to recognize the followers’ potential while delegating more authority and responsibility, which fostered increased organizational trust (Boone & Makhani, 2012).

While trust building is foundational to team effectiveness, Choudhary et al. (2011) hypothesized about the positive relationship between servant leadership and a learning organization (e.g., knowledge sharing, collaboration). They determined the causal linkage between servant leadership, organizational learning, and increased organizational performance. Moreover, Irving and Longbotham (2007) studied the effect of servant leadership by examining the variables which provided the most significant predictors of team effectiveness. They generalized the focus of their study on investigating the question "what form of leadership will be the most effective in our emerging world of team-based and networked systems?" (Irving & Longbotham, 2007, p. 101). They identified “providing accountability” and “supporting and resourcing” as the servant leadership attributes with the highest correlation to predicting team effectiveness (Irving & Longbotham, 2007, p. 98).

The mentoring of followers compliments the impacts of trust building and accountability on team effectiveness. Sousa and van Dierendonck (2017) determined the positive effects of follower mentoring as amplifying the overall leader effectiveness of the humble servant leader. Researchers further described mentoring followers as “A servant leader walks with his/her followers and helps them realize their true potential” (Boone & Makhani, 2012, p. 93). Boone
and Makhani (2012) noted how serving and developing followers allowed the leader to see what the follower can contribute as opposed to focusing on what the follower cannot provide. Mentoring of followers built the team climate and invigorated the team towards a shared vision.

**Components of Follower Satisfaction (Morale)**

The best indication of high morale emanates from measuring follower satisfaction and improvements in the follower’s well-being. Dierendonck and Nuijten (2011) identified the highest correlation for job satisfaction between servant leadership and empowerment, humility, and authenticity. Furthermore, Bande, Fernandez-Ferrin, Varela-Neira, and Otero-Neira (2016) hypothesized and verified the positive effect of servant leadership on the intrinsic motivation of the followers. Meanwhile, Sousa and van Dierendonck (2017) contribute to the understanding of servant leadership and how the attribute of humility could affect motivation (morale) within followers. They determined humility increased motivation by amplifying the effect and perception of “trustworthiness, honesty, confidence, and competence” (Sousa & van Dierendonck, 2017, p. 17). Therefore, empowerment, humility, authenticity, sense of accomplishment, participative decision-making, shared vision, and listening fostered high morale while producing satisfaction and follower well-being (Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011; Bande et al., 2016; Sousa & van Dierendonck, 2017).

Servant leadership also impacts increased intrinsic motivation through providing a sense of accomplishment for work performed and fostering personal growth within the followers (Bande et al., 2016). Intrinsic motivation resulted from “the focus placed by servant leaders on empowering followers through the provision of work autonomy and participative decision making (Ehrhart 2004)” (Newman et al., 2015, p. 54). Boone and Makhani (2012) noted how follower satisfaction and commitment emanated from the servant leadership approach. They
stated this approach created a cohesive and supportive environment by not forcing compliance to a mission or vision but the leader serving first to move the organization towards a shared vision. Additionally, Boone and Makhani (2012) identified listening as the most critical servant leadership attribute, which caused higher job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Several studies noted the improvement of follower welfare based on the implementation of servant leadership. Chen, Chen, and Li (2013) researched the relationship between motivation and well-being, with the presence of spiritual values, within the context of a servant leadership environment. Reed, Vidaver-Cohen, and Colwell (2011) related servant leadership to ethical leadership, which, both directly and indirectly, impacted follower well-being. They determined how the caring climate of servant leadership promoted well-being and job satisfaction. In summation, follower satisfaction and well-being indicate positive morale. “Servant leadership may be particularly effective at improving performance by motivating and empowering knowledge workers to reach their full potential and feel engaged in a greater cause that benefits a wide range of stakeholders” (Peterson, Galvin, & Lange, 2012, p. 589).

Effects on Follower Collaboration (Comradery)

This study analyzed the relevant publications regarding follower collaboration and commitment as emblematic of comradery to understand the effect of servant leadership upon comradery. Team collaboration indicated increased levels of comradery based upon empowerment of followers, a sense of belonging, and a positive work environment. Dierendonck and Nuijten (2011) identified the most reliable correlation for organizational commitment between servant leadership and empowerment, stewardship, and humility. Newman, Schwarz, Cooper, and Sendjaya’s (2015) study identified the positive correlation between servant leadership and the increase in the quality of the relationship between followers
and leader, which heightens the followers’ motivation and sense of belonging. In addition to this sense of belonging, Neubert, Kacmar, Carlson, Chonko, and Roberts (2008) and Jaramillo, Grisaffe, Chonko, and Roberts, (2009) identified and established the correlation between servant leadership, a positive work environment, and increased organizational commitment (as cited by Bande et al., 2016, p. 221).

Team collaboration and commitment increased comradery through servant leadership promoting a community building environment, a climate of integrity and honesty, knowledge sharing, and talent management. Irving and Longbotham (2007) determined the positive effect of servant leadership to encourage cooperation among followers and thereby reducing the competitive work environment. This emphasis on collaboration fostered a community building environment, whereby comradery increased across for workforce, resulting in expanded team functionality (Irving & Longbotham, 2007). Reed et al. (2011) determined building community resulted in increased organizational commitment by the followers, through their research. Therefore, community building, both internal and external to the organization, was critical for servant leadership’s effectiveness. Furthermore, servant leadership promoted and encouraged collaboration and a commitment to shared success because of the environment created through emphasis on personal integrity and honesty (Peterson et al., 2012). Song et al. (2015) determined servant leadership positively affected knowledge sharing and thereby created a collaborative climate which increased organizational performance, as measured by quarterly sales growth rate.

Along with knowledge sharing, “[b]y directing followers’ special talents toward accomplishing the organization’s vision, servant leaders create a collaborative and effective team environment by utilizing everyone’s strengths” (Boone and Makhani, 2012, p. 91). Boone and
Makhani (2012) noted how servant leaders recognize success originating from the development of a productive community, sharing a shared vision, and making collaborative decisions. The attributes of collaboration, humility in actions, positive work environment, knowledge sharing, and talent management, emanating from leaders employing servant leadership, fostered comradery between followers and within the organization.

Summary of the Literature

Greenleaf’s (1970, 1977) articles remain the seminal works and continue to spawn research and studies. Beyond Greenleaf (1970, 1977), the studies reviewed herein revealed servant leadership’s impact on performance by increasing leader and organizational trust, providing accountability, and fostering a mentoring climate. Secondary to performance, the literature exposed the elements of morale emanating from empowerment, humility, authenticity, sense of accomplishment, participative decision-making, shared vision, and listening. Thirdly, researchers indicated elevated levels of comradery based upon team collaboration and commitment resulting from the empowerment of followers, a sense of belonging, a positive work environment, a community building environment, climate of integrity and honesty, knowledge sharing, and talent management. Moreover, the literature review informed the nature and attributes of servant leadership which apprises the research into the perceptions of the benefit of servant leadership upon the performance, morale, and comradery of small unit organizations. Finally, This literature review yielded a definition of servant leadership adapted by this research stating a servant leader is characterized by (a) acting selflessly, (b) developing and mentoring employees for the benefit of the organization, (c) creating an efficient team through accountability and collaboration, (d) valuing follower input, and (e) communicating purpose and focus (Irving & Longbotham, 2007).
Chapter III: Methodology

Over the past three decades, the observations, research, studies, and implementation of servant leadership revealed the dynamic nature of this leadership theory. The literature review provided four lenses of understanding servant leadership through the nature and attributes of servant leadership, impacts on team effectiveness (i.e., performance), components of follower satisfaction (i.e., morale), and effects on follower collaboration (i.e., comradery). Furthermore, the moral and ethical failings, within the ranks of senior U.S. Army military leaders, necessitate reflecting on the potential benefits of servant leadership.

Therefore, this study sought to understand the perceptions, of the benefits, of servant leadership, on small unit performance, morale, and comradery. The focus population for this study was current serving U.S. Army officers, in the Central Michigan University Master of Science in Administration program. The methodology developed for this study addressed the data collection, target population, sample details, instrumentation, procedures, timing, approach for data analysis and synthesis, and methodological limitations.

Data Collection Approach and Procedures

Data collection. This research focused on collecting data related to understanding and assessing perceptions made by current serving U.S. Army officers, in the CMU MSA program. This study sought to elicit responses to qualities and characteristics of servant leadership, which correlate to the research question and sub-questions. Fundamental to answering the research question was determining the knowledge-base of respondents regarding the attributes of servant leadership. Additionally, this research introduced and connected servant leadership attributes to the performance, morale, and comradery of and within small units and organizations. The data collected enabled descriptive statistical analysis focused on attributes of trust, community
building, humility, serve-first approaches, knowledge sharing, and team accountability. Finally, this research revealed responses to the nature of servant leadership as a follower-centric theory based on service to, mentorship and development of, and humble interaction with followers.

**Data collection procedures.** This research utilized an anonymous, online survey to collect the data. Upon approval of this research, this study established a SurveyMonkey account and built, distributed, and collected all data through an online survey. This study received approval of the Research Review Application on May 3, 2018, and Central Michigan University administrative personnel distributed the survey to 69 students, on May 14, 2018. The survey closed on June 15, 2018, with 12 respondents. The survey took an average of three minutes and 58 seconds to complete.

**Target Population.** The target population for the results of this research, broadly defined, was Department of the Army civilian and uniformed leaders, both officer and non-commissioned officers. The U.S. Army must steward itself and apply critical analysis of leadership and systems to maintain the integrity and honesty of the profession. Therefore, all leaders, within or supporting the U.S. Army, have a personal stake in the nature and quality of leadership exhibited and trained, regardless of rank or position. Additionally, the target population for this research was current serving U.S. Army officers, in the CMU MSA program. The target population available was 69 students from the CMU Fort Leavenworth Global Campus.

**Sample Details.** The study sample population was 69 current CMU MSA program students, with 12 respondents. The respondents identified generational demographics of 75% Generation X (i.e., GenX) and 25% Millennial. Additionally, the respondents reported U.S. Army source of commission information as depicted in Table 1.
Table 1

*Source of Commission in the U.S. Army*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Commission</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC)</td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Candidate School (OCS)</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Commission</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Service</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Military Academy (USMA)</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sample was random within the demographic of CMU MSA program students, with no vulnerable populations participating in this study. Finally, this study required no contact information and provided a permission consent form to all participants (see Appendix B).

**Instrumentation.** This study utilized an anonymous, online survey, through SurveyMonkey, to identify the demographics, background experience, perceptions of servant leadership, and perceived benefits from the application of servant leadership. The survey's primary objective was measuring perceptions of the attributes of servant leadership and its benefits for small units’ performance, morale, and comradery, within the U.S. Army. This study developed the survey but executed no validity and reliability testing. Additionally, this survey incorporated categorized responses for six questions and a Likert scale for four questions regarding the perceptions of servant leadership. The study divided the survey into four sections: demographic information, leadership experience background; perspectives on servant leadership; and perspectives regarding small units’ performance, morale, and comradery through the application of servant leadership (see Appendix A).

**Procedures.** The nature and goals of the study were to collect, through survey responses, the demographics, leadership experience, and perceptions of the benefit of servant leadership.  
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**Procedures.** The nature and goals of the study were to collect, through survey responses, the demographics, leadership experience, and perceptions of the benefit of servant leadership.
regarding small units’ performance, morale, and comradery. The data collection approach for this study consisted of three parts. First, the literature review focused on significant and relevant academic articles and books related to the topic of servant leadership. The literature review also analyzed the effect on organizations based on academic research and empirical studies. Second, this study surveyed current CMU MSA students’ perceptions of servant leadership and its benefit on small unit performance, morale, and comradery, using non-probability sampling. Finally, the research approach focused on the interpretation of the sampling results and reported the perceptions of respondents regarding servant leadership and its benefits.

This study compiled demographics of generational identification (i.e., Generation X, Millennial), commissioning source, military occupational specialty, and total months in small unit leadership positions (see Appendix A). This research experienced a return rate of 17.3%, with 12 responses. All surveys remained secure online with no personally identifiable information, to ensure the anonymity of all respondents.

**Timing.** This study initiated the survey, on May 14, 2018, following acceptance of the proposal and approval of the research review application (RRA) and survey cover letter. Central Michigan University administrative personnel distributed the survey to 69 students, on May 14, 2018, and the study closed on June 15, 2018, with 12 respondents. The survey took an average of three minutes and 58 seconds to complete.

**Approach for Data Analysis and Synthesis**

This study utilized descriptive statistics to report the perception responses. The descriptive statistics focus on measures of frequency and position. The data analysis collated and categorized the perceptions, with attention to demographic groupings and response categorization. The data synthesis concentrated on perceptions of the attributes of servant
leadership and the correlation identified between small unit leadership and positive benefits for the performance, morale, and comradery within small units of the U.S. Army.

**Methodological Limitations**

The most significant methodological limitations, of this study, were the small sample and respondent sizes combined with the focus on currently serving U.S. Army officers in the CMU MSA program. The small population limited the application of this research and transferability to other fields or organizations without careful assessment. This study utilized convenience non-probability sampling with a small sample size (i.e., 69). The sample size retained representative qualities, based upon the current demographics of the CMU MSA student population, at the Fort Leavenworth Global Campus. The lack of respondents (i.e., 12) eliminated a representative sample size, which constrained the validity and reliability of the data set. Additionally, the CMU MSA student population also allowed for purposive sampling, because the survey focuses on persons with a background and experience-set based upon service within the U.S. Army.

The survey design limited the focus to perceptions of the benefits of servant leadership on small unit performance, morale, and comradery. This limitation restricted the applicability of identified attributes to other leadership theories or for organizations differing from those represented. Finally, the survey relies on self-reporting data, which allows for subject data biases through the respondent’s assessment of their leadership abilities and experiences.
Chapter IV: Data Analysis

This study addressed the primary research question of what are the perceptions of the benefits of servant leadership on small unit performance, morale, and comradery? Additionally, this study sought to understand the perceptions and knowledge of servant leadership attributes; the strength of opinions related to performance, morale, and comradery; and positive assessments about servant leadership contributions and applicability. The data analysis evaluated and analyzed the survey data from 12 respondents of the survey sample of 69 current CMU MSA students. Finally, the data analysis facilitated a description of data sources, the summary of analytical results based on the data collection, and a detailed review of the respondents’ perceptions of the benefits of servant leadership.

Description of Data Sources

This study utilized an online survey to collect data from respondents about their perceptions of servant leadership and its effectiveness in small units to improve performance, morale, and comradery. The survey consisted of ten questions pertaining to demographics of the respondents, leadership experience, and perceptions of servant leadership. This study received twelve responses from the 69 CMU MSA students contacted to participate in the online survey. The respondents identified their generational demographics as 75% GenX and 25% Millennial.

Furthermore, the respondents reported their military occupational fields as five in Operations, four in Force Sustainment, one in Health Services, and two as “not applicable” (see Table 2). These military occupational fields provided clarification of the respondents’ experience with distinct types and forms of organizations. Organizational dynamics and leadership within Operations occupational fields tend to focus on hierarchical leadership...
structures and decisive action leader decisions. Whereas, Force Sustainment occupational fields cultivates decentralized leadership and emphasizes independent leader actions.

Table 2

*Current or Former Military Occupational Field of Expertise*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Military Field</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Support</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force Sustainment</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, all respondents reported moderate to expert leadership experience within small units (see Table 3). This study defined small units through the leadership framework of U.S. Army organizations. First, the Company Commander, or similar leadership assignment, leads an organizational structure of 60 or more personnel. Second, a Platoon Leader, or comparable leadership assignment, employs direct leadership for a tactical organization with 16 or more personnel. Six respondents reported expert experience as a Company Commander, and eight respondents reported expert experience as a Platoon Leader. Additionally, eight respondents self-identified as a strong practitioner at the company or platoon level.

Table 3

*Military Small Unit Leadership Experience*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader Experience</th>
<th>No Experience</th>
<th>Basic/Entry Level Experience</th>
<th>Some/Moderate Experience</th>
<th>Strong Practitioner</th>
<th>Expert Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company Commander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platoon Leader</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, this study gathered service data from respondents regarding the number of months spent in small unit leadership (see Table 4). This study gathered the total cumulative
time served in small unit leadership positions to register the experience quantity informing their perceptions of servant leadership. The most common response for time served was four survey participants reporting 31 to 48 months, in a combination of platoon and company leadership positions. An additional three respondents exceeded 49 months of small unit leadership experience. These seven respondents exhibited the desired background and leadership experience to enable comprehensive and relevant perceptions of servant leadership. Two other individuals responded with 19-30 months of small unit leadership. Finally, three respondents identified their small unit leadership experience at 0-12 months, 13-18 months, and “not applicable” respectively.

Table 4

*Time Served in Small Unit Leadership*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Months</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-12</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-30</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-48</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49+</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Summary of Analytical Results*

The results of the survey focused on four aspects. The first aspect analyzed the perceptions of the respondents regarding the benefits of servant leadership, as identified through the servant leader attributes demonstrated within small units. These responses were critical to understanding the respondents’ perceptions of servant leadership, and, therefore, this study weighted the responses to the final three aspects. The final three aspects measured were performance, morale, and comradery, based on the perception of servant leadership’s benefit through the attributes identified within this research.
Perceptions of the Benefits of Servant Leadership

The initial question provided overall insight into the respondents’ perceptions of servant leadership. The surveyed population rated the value of nine attributes of servant leadership, as identified from the current research and study literature available. The respondents rated these characteristics on a Likert scale from “Most Valuable” to “Negatively Impacts.” The survey responses identified the attribute of mentoring employees as the most significant, at a 4.64 weighted average, while providing clear purpose, with a 4.42 weighted average, was a close second (see Table 5). Acting selflessly, collaboration, and vision casting were the final three attributes of value identified. Finally, the two most identifiable attributes recognized in the majority of previous studies, as paramount to servant leadership, were serve first and acting selflessly, yet the surveyed personnel rated them fourth and sixth respectively (e.g., Greenleaf, 1977; Sendjaya & Sarros, 2002; Irving & Longbotham, 2007; Liden et al., 2008; Parris & Peachey, 2013; Song et al., 2015; Olsen, 2018).

Table 5

Rating of the Value of Attributes of Servant Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Negatively Impacts</th>
<th>Lacks Value</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Valuable</th>
<th>Most Valuable</th>
<th>Weighted Average</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring employees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing clear purpose</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating purpose and focus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve first</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuing follower input</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting selflessly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision casting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Benefits for performance. The evaluation of survey responses to the perception of the impacts of servant leadership on performance underscored the connection between leader actions and the organization’s operations. Survey respondents identified increasing leader and organizational trust as the most impactful benefit (see Table 6). Eight of the twelve responses classified increased trust as “Extremely” impactful on organizational performance. Whereas, fostering a mentoring climate garnered half the perceived impact with four “Extremely” and five “Very Closely” responses. Finally, two respondents perceived providing accountability as having no relationship to the performance of the team or organization.

Table 6

*Perception of Servant Leadership Benefits for Performance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts on Performance</th>
<th>No Relation</th>
<th>Somewhat Closely</th>
<th>Moderately Closely</th>
<th>Very Closely</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
<th>Weighted Average</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increasing leader and organizational trust</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering a mentoring climate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing accountability</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Benefits for morale. Table 7 details the perception of the application of servant leadership to impact small unit and organizational morale, based upon the question “how closely do you believe servant leadership relates” to the seven traits listed. The survey responses identified empowerment as the most impactful and listening as a close second. Furthermore, respondents identified sense of accomplishment, with three “Moderate” responses regarding its impact on morale, which tied for third most impactful with authenticity. These four qualities of servant leadership denoted the greatest perceived benefit for small unit’s morale. Finally,
humility, shared vision, and participative decision-making completed the ranking of the seven servant leadership traits affecting small unit morale.

Table 7

Perception of Servant Leadership Benefits for Morale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts on Morale</th>
<th>No Relation</th>
<th>Somewhat Closely</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Very Closely</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
<th>Weighted Average</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of accomplishment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authenticity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared vision</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative decision-making</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Benefits for comradery. The survey further queried the impact on comradery from the application of servant leadership within small unit organizations. Respondents rated seven characteristics affecting organizational comradery (see Table 8). Positive work environment and empowerment of followers ranked as the top two traits resulting from the application of servant leadership. Additionally, survey responses noted the close correlation of knowledge sharing, sense of belonging, and climate of integrity and honesty to the organizational climate of comradery. Finally, talent management and community building environment presented reduced perceptions of impacting the comradery of small units through the application of servant leadership with four and two “Extremely” responses, respectfully.
### Perception of Servant Leadership Benefits for Comradery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts on Comradery</th>
<th>No Relation</th>
<th>Somewhat Closely</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very Closely</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
<th>Weighted Average</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive work environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment of followers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge sharing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of belonging</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate of integrity and honesty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talent management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community building environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.83</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Perceptions and Knowledge of Servant Leadership Attributes

The final question probed “what is your perception of the application of servant leadership to small unit organizations?” This general question focused the surveyed population on their perceptions of the strength of servant leadership as it related to small unit performance, morale, and comradery (see Table 9).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely valuable</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very valuable</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat valuable</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not so valuable</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all valuable</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, this question of overall perception gauged the level of positive perspectives about servant leadership’s contributions to small unit performance through the previously specified traits and characteristics. Six of twelve respondents identified the application of
servant leadership as “Extremely valuable,” while conversely, two respondents identified servant leadership as “Not so valuable.” Overall, ten of twelve responses perceived “Somewhat” or greater value from the application of servant leadership to the performance, morale, and comradery of small unit organizations.
Chapter V: Summary, Conclusion, and Recommendations

Since Greenleaf (1970, 1977) invigorated the discussion of servant leadership, researchers continue to postulate and analyze its principles, characteristics, and effects. Researchers identify both the attributes necessary for leaders to demonstrate servant leadership and the positive impacts it has on organizational structure and performance. This study focused on determining the perceptions of current serving U.S. Army officers, in the Central Michigan University Master of Science in Administration program, regarding the benefits of servant leadership on small unit performance, morale, and comradery.

Summary

Leadership and its study transcends generational boundaries but remains influenced and shaped by culture and individual experience. This research contented to place the perceptions of the survey respondents in the context of their demographics and experience. Therefore, this study focused on current serving U.S. Army officers enrolled in the CMU MSA program.

The climate across the Department of Defense and the U.S. Army drove the necessity of studying servant leadership. The U.S. Army continues to reel from toxic leaders and their misconduct which erodes organizational trust, unit readiness, and soldier and leader performance (Reed, 2014). Therefore, the U.S. Army must employ leadership styles that foster trust, build high-performing organizations, reinforce morale, and infuse comradery (DA, 2012).

Research focus. This research focused on answering the question of what are the perceptions of the benefits of servant leadership on small unit performance, morale, and comradery? Additionally, this research focused on the knowledge, attributes, and contributions of servant leadership on small unit performance through the creation of trust and commitment. The survey respondents provided insight into their perceptions and knowledge of servant
leadership and its connection to enhancing unit and organizational performance, morale, and comradery.

While the survey size limited the conclusions drawn, this research demonstrated the need for continued study and application of servant leadership in both academic and professional settings. This research queried a sample size of 69 current CMU MSA students, with twelve students responding. This research provided insight into the perceptions of servant leadership and yielded findings pertinent for further research.

**Perceptions of servant leadership.** Survey respondents evaluated the value of nine attributes derived from the prevailing research of servant leadership. The data indicated positive perceptions of mentoring employees, providing clear purpose, accountability, and communicating purpose and focus as critical characteristics of servant leadership. This research indicated servant leaders, in small unit settings, would increase organizational performance through the development of their employees, the use of clear statements of purpose and timely and appropriate application of accountability. Additionally, serve first, value follower input, and act selflessly reflected the perceived traits desired in a servant leader. The perception of these attributes linked the applicability of servant leadership to the survey respondents’ perceptions of its impact on performance, morale, and comradery.

**Performance.** Survey respondents perceived servant leadership as increasing leader and organizational trust, which provided the most significant benefit for the overall performance of the organization. The results of the survey indicated positive perceptions of servant leadership’s effect on the performance of an organization founded on an increase in organizational and leader trust, the fostering of a climate of mentoring and developing followers, and the appropriate use of accountability. Therefore, this research identified the perception of servant leadership as best
benefiting performance through the trust garnered between the leader and the organization and the development of followers through the application of mentorship and accountability.

**Morale.** This research gauged the respondent’s perceptions of seven aspects of servant leadership for their effect on and benefit for small unit morale. Survey responses rated empowerment, listening, and sense of accomplishment as the top three traits instilled by servant leadership. To a lesser degree, respondents rated authenticity, humility, shared vision, and participative decision-making as less impactful to the overall unit morale. The data indicated the positive perception of a servant leader within an organization to build morale through the evaluated traits of empowerment of followers, listening, and instilling a sense of accomplishment for followers across the organization.

**Comradery.** Finally, of the seven traits of servant leadership benefiting comradery, survey respondents identified a positive work environment, empowerment of followers, and knowledge sharing as the three strongest traits. Respondents perceived these three traits as providing the most benefit to small unit or organizational comradery. The survey population perceived a sense of belonging, a climate of integrity and honesty, talent management, and a community building environment as being less impactful to an organization's comradery.

**Conclusion**

The small survey size limited the applicability and conclusions drawn from this research. The study provided limited information on the results of the studied populations’ perceptions of servant leadership because of the low response rate. Therefore, these conclusions focus on previous expert and research-based studies. Finally, this study concluded the need for further research about the implementation of servant leadership at the small unit level within organizational constructs like the U.S. Army.
Expert and research-based conclusions. The primary definition of servant leadership, established through a review of literature and research, stated a servant leader orders the needs of their followers before their own, provides mentoring and support, and fosters a positive working environment through shared purpose and community (Greenleaf, 1970, 1977; Irvine & Longbotham, 2007; Liden et al., 2008; Earnhardt, 2008; Boone & Makhani, 2012; Song et al., 2015). Multiple studies provided lists of successful servant leadership attributes to provide concise categorization and expanded understanding necessary for research and implementation.

Similar in nature to the results of this study, Irving and Longbotham (2007) identified two matching attributes, of six tested, as primary: provide accountability and the supporting and resourcing of followers. Liden et al. (2008) and Boone and Makhani (2012) recognized the characteristics of emotional concerns, listening, establishing of community, and vision casting as foundational for effective servant leadership. The correlation between previous research and the data of this study validated the traits and characteristics analyzed and indicated the need for continued research into perceptions and application.

Conversely to this study, Spears (2010) identified ten characteristics of a servant leader with listening, empathy, and healing being the top three. Spears (2010) further elaborated the need for a leader to exhibit active listening “coupled with periods of reflection,” while coupling this with empathetic leadership, which understands and accepts follower behavior and performance (Spears, 2010, p. 27). Furthermore, Spears (2010) defined healing as the mending of relationships, which provided for transformation and integration across the organization. Finally, Spears completed his list of character traits with self-awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community.
While this study did not seek to define new characteristics of servant leadership, researchers continue to examine and better identify those qualities best representative of servant leadership. No study nor research endeavored to provide an exhaustive list of all characteristics of servant leadership, but researchers continue to examine those traits necessary for successful organizations. Therefore, the aspects of servant leadership investigated in this study offered the most significant correlation to small unit performance, morale, and comradery.

**Results regarding perceptions.** This study identified, based on the perceptions of the survey population, the ranking of attributes of servant leadership as follows: mentoring employees, providing clear purpose, accountability, communicating purpose and focus, serve first, valuing follower input, acting selflessly, collaboration, and vision casting. Irvine Longbotham (2007), Robins and Judge (2017), Sousa and van Dierendonck (2017), and Department of the Army (2010) identified comparable leadership traits, which informed those examined within this study. Similarly, Song et al. (2015) and Olsen (2018) concluded that servant leadership thrives through the leader emphasizing the growth, self-development, and mentoring necessary to encourage followers to develop and expand their capabilities and influences. Additionally, the conclusions within this study reinforced Greenleaf’s (1977) definition of servant leadership of serving first as opposed to leading first. Furthermore, half of the survey respondents identified servant leadership as extremely valuable, with an additional 25% ranking it as very valuable. Based on the perceptions of servant leadership, this study concluded the strength of servant leadership lies in the leader's ability to exhibit the identified traits and attributes. Therefore, the quality and effectiveness of a servant leader to manifest these traits impact the organization’s performance, morale, and comradery.
**Performance.** This study identified the perception of servant leadership's benefit for performance through the trait of increased leader and organizational trust. The increase of leader and organization trust, partnered with the fostering of a mentoring climate, presented the strongest correlation for increased small unit performance. Department of the Army (2012) explicitly stated that the U.S. Army seeks leaders of character who foster trust between the leader and their subordinates. Snyder (2015), Greenleaf (1977), Choudhary et al. (2011), and Boone and Makhani (2012) echo this same attribute within their studies and research. Therefore, this study provided similar insights into the benefits of servant leadership for small unit performance as identified in previous research through the servant leader imparting increased trust between followers, organization, and leaders.

**Morale.** This survey concluded that empowerment, listening, sense of accomplishment, authenticity, humility, shared vision, and participative decision-making garnered scaled perceptions of the effectiveness of servant leadership to benefit small unit morale. Respondents most strongly identified with empowerment, listening, and sense of accomplishment. Spears (2010), Liden et al. (2008), Dierendonck and Nuijten (2011), Newman et al. (2015), and Peterson et al. (2012) described through their research the need for servant leadership to stress the empowerment of the followers to create the positive work environment necessary for high morale. Additionally, Bande et al. (2016) and Dierendonck and Nuijten (2011) emphasized the need for servant leadership to provide a sense of accomplishment to the followers based upon the actions of the leader. Finally, these traits, while derived from current research, further substantiate the need for the study and implementation of servant leadership, within the context of U.S. Army small units.
Comradery. The perceptions of service leadership’s impact on comradery yielded the ranking of positive work environment, empowerment of followers, knowledge sharing, sense of belonging, climate of integrity and honesty, talent management, and community building environment. Servant leadership may not be the only leadership type producing a positive work environment, but servant leadership couples positive work environment with the empowerment of followers. Additionally, servant leadership, as identified by the survey respondents, integrates a climate of integrity and honesty with knowledge sharing to yield a keen perception of benefiting small unit comradery. Similarly, Bande et al. (2016), Neubert et al. (2008), Grisaffe et al. (2009), and Boone and Makhani's (2012) research included the correlation between servant leadership, a positive working environment, and the increase of organizational comradery.

Findings pertaining to further research. Emphasis on mentorship and providing of clear purpose generated the most pertinent findings of this study for future research. Although only 50% of respondents identified servant leadership as extremely valuable, the importance all respondents placed on the mentoring of employees and the leader providing clear purpose warrants increased study, both within the business environment and by the United States Army. While many studies identify mentoring and clear purpose as beneficial to and attributes of servant leadership, practitioners and researchers must conduct additional research to further understand the types and forms of mentorship which best serve employees and what characteristics compose clear and meaningful purpose for employees (Irvine & Longbotham, 2007; Liden et al., 2008; Boone & Makhani, 2012; Song et al., 2015).

Recommendations

The recommendations of this study focus on future research and not implementation because of the small study and respondent sizes. Current studies and research correlate the use
of servant leadership to business and organizational models. Therefore, the crux of this recommendation is for the U.S. Army to undertake a fundamental review of the leadership styles employed and for the possible inclusion of servant leadership attributes to their current leadership definitions.

**Further study.** Leadership, in its many forms and functions, is not a new topic, but the application of leadership, in various organizational and institutional contexts, warrants continued analysis and study, to ensure leaders retain the right tools necessary to motivate their employees and build high-performing teams. Since Greenleaf (1970), researchers and practitioners continue to examine and investigate servant leadership for its benefits and usefulness across various organizations, dynamics, and cultures. This study defined servant leadership as a leader (a) acting selflessly, (b) developing and mentoring employees for the benefit of the organization, (c) creating an effective team through accountability and collaboration, (d) valuing follower input, and (e) communicating purpose. Therefore, further study into the attributes of mentoring and communicating purpose will enable better application of servant leadership across various forms and functions.

Research by Irvine and Longbotham (2007), Liden et al. (2008), Boone and Makhani (2012), and Song et al. (2015) markedly showed the connection of mentoring and providing purpose, through the application servant leadership, to benefit teams and organizations. Their research focused on the attributes and did not offer definitive forms, functions, and characteristics of mentorship and providing purpose. Research must combine the application of servant leadership with the study of the components of mentoring and providing purpose and not isolate the examination of mentorship and providing purpose from the overall implementation of servant leadership. This research should examine the impacts and applicability of servant
leadership, through detailed analysis of mentorship and providing clear purpose, as a particular leadership form.

**Action plan.** Additional research should focus on the application of mentorship and providing purpose by a servant leader, at the small unit organizational level, within the framework of the U.S. Army. This research should isolate the attributes of mentorship and providing purpose through the application of the servant leadership model. Therefore, the U.S. Army should commission a study to evaluate the nature and characteristics of mentorship and providing clear and concise purpose, through the lens of applied servant leadership.

While current U.S. Army doctrine describes the use and implementation of mentorship, it fails to build an understanding on the foundation of applied servant leadership. The study should focus on small unit organizations ranging in size between platoon (e.g., 18-45 personnel) and company (e.g., 60–250 personnel), with the application of servant leadership throughout the organizations to ensure commonality of follower and leader experience. This study should employ a combination of surveys, field observations, and interviews with leaders and followers to ascertain the qualities, characteristics, and forms best suited for application within the U.S. Army. Finally, this study should be broad in scope to encompass garrison functions, contingency operations, and combat environments, as these impact the nature and forms of leadership and followership employed. This research must contend with the application of servant leadership through the development of the attributes of mentorship and providing clear purpose while comprehensively applying across the full spectrum of U.S. Army operations.

In conclusion, this study adapted the definition of servant leadership as a leader (a) acting selflessly; (b) developing and mentoring followers; (c) employing appropriate accountability, collaboration, and follower input; and (d) communicating purpose across the organization.
Therefore, this study recommends continued research and discussion of servant leadership, throughout the U.S. Army. Finally, this study concludes, based on the perceptions evaluated, that the application of servant leadership warrants additional evaluation and consideration to further increase the performance, morale, and comradery of platoons, companies, and small unit organizations throughout the U.S. Army.
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Survey

Perceptions of Servant Leadership

Central Michigan University

Nature and Goals of the Study:
What follows is a brief survey with questions regarding your demographics, leadership experience, perceptions of servant leadership, and perception of benefits from application of servant leadership for small unit performance, morale, and comradery.

Time to complete the survey: 5-10 minutes

Definition of Terms:
- Servant leadership is a leader acting selflessly; developing and mentoring employees for the benefit of the organization; creating an efficient team through accountability, collaboration, and valuing follower input; and communicating purpose and focus.
- The U.S. Army leadership doctrine is Army Doctrine Publication 6-22, which defines leadership as “the process of influencing people by providing purpose, direction, and motivation to accomplish the mission and improve the organization” (Department of the Army, 2012, p. 14).

1. What is your Generational Identification?

- [ ] Generation X
- [ ] Millennial
- [ ] Other (please specify)
2. What is your source of commission?

- Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC)
- United States Military Academy at West Point (USMA)
- Officer Candidate School (OCS)
- N/A
- Other (please specify) 

3. If current or former U.S. Army, what is/was your branch or occupational specialty?

4. On the scale below, rate your experience in the following areas:

   - Basic/Entry
   - Experience Level
   - Some/Moderate Experience
   - Strong Practitioner Experience
   - Expert Experience

   Company Command or like leadership assignment (organizational leader of 60+ personnel)
5. How much time have you served in positions of small unit leadership?

- 0-12
- 13-18
- 19-30
- 31-48
- 49+

Using the scale below, rate the value of the following attributes to servant leadership:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Negatively Impacts</th>
<th>Lacks Value</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Valuable</th>
<th>Most Valuable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serve First</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting Selflessly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring Employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Perception of Benefits from the Application of Servant Leadership on Performance. Using the scale below, how closely do you believe servant leadership relates to the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Relation</th>
<th>Somewhat Closely</th>
<th>Moderately Closely</th>
<th>Very Closely</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increasing leader and organizational trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering a mentoring climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Perception of Benefits from the Application of Servant Leadership on Morale. Using the scale below, how closely do you believe servant leadership relates to the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Relation</th>
<th>Somewhat Closely</th>
<th>Moderate Closely</th>
<th>Very Closely</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authenticity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accomplishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decision-making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared vision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Perception of Benefits from the Application of Servant Leadership on Comradery. Using the scale below, how closely do you believe servant leadership relates to the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Relation</th>
<th>Somewhat Closely</th>
<th>Moderate Closely</th>
<th>Very Closely</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment of followers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Overall, what is your perception of the application of servant leadership to small unit organizations?

- Extremely valuable
- Very valuable
- Somewhat valuable
- Not so valuable
- Not at all valuable
Appendix B
Survey Cover Letter

Date:

Dear Participant:

My name is Andrew White and I am a graduate student at Central Michigan University. For my final project, I am examining the perceptions of the benefits of servant leadership on small unit performance, morale, and comradery. Because you are current serving U.S. Army officers, in the Central Michigan University Master of Science in Administration program, I am inviting you to participate in this research study by completing the attached surveys.

The following questionnaire will require approximately 15 minutes to complete. There is no compensation for responding nor is there any known risk. In order to ensure that all information will remain confidential, please do not include your name. Copies of the project will be provided to my Central Michigan University instructor. If you choose to participate in this project, please answer all questions as honestly as possible and return the completed survey by clicking the “Submit” button at the bottom of the survey. Participation is strictly voluntary and you may refuse to participate at any time.

Thank you for taking the time to assist me in my educational endeavors. The data collected will provide useful information regarding perceptions of servant leadership and utility to practitioners currently teaching leadership theory at the Command and General Staff School, Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. If you would like a summary copy of this study please complete and detach the Request for Information Form and return it to me in a separate envelope. Completion and return of the questionnaire will indicate your willingness to participate in this study. If you require additional information or have questions, please contact me at the number listed below.

If you are not satisfied with the manner in which this study is being conducted, you may report (anonymously if you so choose) any complaints to the MSA Program, 989-774-6525 or 1-800-950-1144, ext. *6525.

Sincerely,

Andrew A. White (719-325-9637 and/or white3aa@cmich.edu)

Dr. Richard Stacy  (stacy1rd@cmich.edu)
Appendix C

Approved Research Review Application

Research Review Application approval/A. White

Prout, Christina Leigh
Thu 5/3/2018 2:44 PM
MSA000-099
To: White, Andrew Allen <white3aa@cmich.edu>
Cc: Stacy, Richard D <stacy1rd@cmich.edu>; Fort Leavenworth Center - CEL <ftlnwth@cmich.edu>

Dear Andrew,

Your Research Review Application has been reviewed and approved. You may start your data collection. This approval will not expire as long as your topic and methodology remain unchanged. If your topic or methodology changes, please submit a new Research Review Application and supporting documents to your instructor by e-mail.

Please contact your instructor if you have any questions. Also, be sure to check with your instructor concerning the due dates for your project.

Good luck with your project. This is the only notification you will receive. Please keep a copy for your records.

Kim Gribben
Assistant Director, MSA Program

Christina Prout
Administrative Secretary, Master of Science in Administration Program
Rowe 222 | Central Michigan University | Mount Pleasant, MI 48859
☎ 989-774-6525 📞 Fax 989-774-2575
1-800-950-1144, ext. 6525
Email: prout1st@cmich.edu
Visit us online!

WARNING: This message (including any attachment) may contain confidential information and is intended only for the individual(s) named. Please do not distribute, copy, or forward this e-mail without the permission of the sender. Please notify sender if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete it from your system. Thank you.
RESEARCH REVIEW APPLICATION
FOR MSA 699 AND EDU 776 CAPSTONE COURSE PROJECT

Project title: Perceptions of the Benefits of Servant Leadership

Student name: Andrew A. White
Student ID:
E-mail address: white3aa@cmich.edu Work phone: 913-684-2137 Home phone: 719-325-9637

Concentration: MSA - General Administration
Instructor's name: Dr. Richard Stacy Instructor e-mail: stacy1rd@cmich.edu
Course: MSA 699 Program center: Fort Leavenworth Global Campus

Do you intend to use human subjects or human subjects data in your project? Yes ☑ No ☐
Do you intend to publish your project or present project results outside of your organization? Yes ☑ No ☐

If you answered “yes” on both questions, you are required to complete CITI training and seek approval through CMU’s Institutional Review Board (IRB). The IRB process requires registration in IRBNet and submission of your application materials and supporting documents through IRBNet. Please consult with your Instructor and the appropriate program office for assistance.

If you answered “no” to one or both questions, you may use this form for your research review. Read the following directions:

Non-human subject research

In the box below describe the purpose of your research, describe the data you plan to use, and specify the sources of your data (URL, organizational source, etc.)
Required attachments: Permission letter on the organization’s letterhead if the data is not available to the general public.

Human subjects research

In the box below describe the purpose of your research; specify the source of your subject pool, the number of subjects, and the selection criteria. Specify your relationship to the subjects (co-worker, supervisor, work in same organization, etc.). Describe your research methodology.
Required attachments: Copy of survey or interview questions, cover letter or consent form, permission letter on the organization’s letterhead if the subject pool is not selected from a public source such as a phone directory or web page.

This study seeks to understand the perceptions of the benefits of servant leadership on small unit performance, morale, and comradery by current serving U.S. Army officers, in the Central Michigan University Master of Science in Administration program. The study sample population is currently serving U.S. Army officers in the CMU MSA program, with an estimated 40 respondents. Active duty officers in the grade of Captain the Lieutenant Colonel with between 24 and 60 months of direct leadership of small unit organizations characterize this sample population. The sample is random within the demographic of CMU MSA program students, with no vulnerable populations participating in this study.
Please check all that apply:
☑ My project is work-related  ☑ My project is related to my concentration  ☐ My project is not related to my work or to my concentration. Please provide a rationale for a project that is not work-related or concentration-related:

Directions: Insert digital signature or type in your name as verification/approval of the information presented in this application. Your signature also confirms your commitment to appropriate research ethics while conducting this research. Submit this form and applicable attachments to your instructor. Please wait for written approval prior to beginning data collection.

Student signature: ___________________________ Date: December 16, 2017

Student signature: Andrew A. White
(Please type or print your name.)

Date: December 16, 2017

Instructor signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

(Please type or print your name.)

Instructor signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

(Please type or print your name.)

Program approval signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

(Please type or print your name.)

Program approval signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________
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Research Review Application Letter Approving Survey

CMU
CENTRAL MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

4/10/2018

Andrew White
101 Allen Drive
Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027
CMU # 734172

Dear Andrew,

Ft. Leavenworth Central Michigan University (CMU) students who are completing their MSA 699 projects are granted permission to use other Ft. Leavenworth CMU students as survey participants. It is given that participation in the survey process is voluntary. The following procedure will be used:

The center staff at Ft. Leavenworth agree to distribute your survey cover letter with a survey link to our distribution list of Ft. Leavenworth CMU students. CMU e-mail addresses will be used for all students.

Please note: this letter must be included with your RRA or IRB package and you must have your RRA or IRB approval prior to conducting any survey.

Good luck with your MSA 699 project. We hope it will be a rewarding and enriching endeavor. If you have any questions or need further assistance, please contact our office at 913-682-1888

Sincerely,

Laura Stermer
Assistant Director of Enrollment - CMU Fort Leavenworth
Off Campus Programs
Central Michigan University
913-682-1888

CENTRAL MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY AT FORT LEAVENWORTH
120 Dickman Avenue, Bldg. 62, Room 11 • Fort Leavenworth, Kansas 66027
(913) 682-1888 • Fax: (913) 682-1801