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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this correlational research study was to investigate the relationship between authentic happiness and servant leadership among college professors. The study sought to close a gap in the research by examining the connection between authentic happiness as a positive psychological construct and servant leadership orientation by teachers in the classroom. Participants in the study included 71 faculty in a Midwestern state. Participants completed the Authentic Happiness Inventory, the Servant Leadership Profile-Revised, and demographic information on SurveyMonkey®. The results were analyzed using SPSS and a Spearman’s rho was calculated to determine the relationship between servant leadership and authentic happiness levels. A weak to moderate statistically significant positive relationship was found between servant leadership and authentic happiness resulting in rejecting the null hypothesis. Additional information about the study including discussion, implications, limitations, and suggestions for future research is included.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Overview

Servant leadership (Greenleaf, 1970) and authentic happiness (Seligman, 2002) have been studied in a variety of capacities; however, research on the relationship between the two variables both within higher education and overall is scant. Research shows servant leadership in the classroom might lead to increased student engagement (Noland & Richards, 2015) with virtuous leadership styles, such as servant leadership, showing increased happiness levels in both followers and leaders (Wang & Hackett, 2016). Other studies on the impact of positive behaviors, including those utilized by servant leaders, show negative results might occur in leaders exhibiting positive qualities (Koopman, Lanaj, & Scott, 2016). This dissertation investigated the relationship between authentic happiness and servant leadership among college professors in a Midwestern state.

Background

Servant leadership is a theory most frequently associated with positions of authority and power within organizations (Greenleaf, 1970) whereas servant teaching is often the definition used for those leading a classroom (Greenleaf, 1979). Although the connection between teaching and leadership is not always an easy one for people to recognize, educators are leaders within the classroom environment (Warren, 2016). Leaders guide a group (Keohane, 2010) and educators must show the students in the classroom the way to success. One study evaluated virtuous types of leadership, including servant leadership, related to happiness levels of both followers and leaders with findings pointing to increased happiness in both groups but additional research is necessary in the area of servant leadership and authentic happiness levels (Wang & Hackett, 2016). Additionally, some research showed a potential dark side to the impact positive
behaviors, such as servant leadership, might have on the people exhibiting those positive qualities (Koopman et al., 2016).

Because many educators feel most comfortable behind the podium essentially delivering a lesson to a classroom full of blank faces (Hays, 2008), educators might not always be comfortable following the practices of servant leadership (Greenleaf, 1970) including the use of an inverted hierarchy within the classroom (Hays, 2008). Teachers who fill the role as a servant style leader in the classroom might impact a variety of outcomes (Greenleaf, 1979). As Greenleaf (1970) put it, “A leader must have more of an armor of confidence in facing the unknown—more than those who accept his leadership” (p. 29). By not hiding behind the podium (Hays, 2008) but being vulnerable to the risks of leadership, college professors might impact students on a deeper level. The concept of being vulnerable to risk in an educational setting connects to Seligman (2002) writing, “Individuals with a calling see their work as contributing to the greater good, to something larger than they are, and hence the religious connotation is entirely appropriate” (p. 168). Because many educators view the role of teaching as a calling (Blackaby & Blackaby, 2011), it is likely those with a servant leadership philosophy in the classroom might also be authentically happy. With the seminal works of Seligman (2002) and Greenleaf (1970) at the center, the potential relationship between servant leadership and authentic happiness within the field of higher education was examined.

With education often characterized as a calling (Blackaby & Blackaby, 2011) and because professors can role model appropriate behavior (Rebore, 2014), passionate classroom leaders might encourage similar attitude development in followers (Jones, 1995). If educators utilized strengths in fulfilling the call to teach, authentic happiness might increase (Seligman, 2002); however, some educators might not want to utilize servant leadership methods in the
classroom because they fear that self-interest is sacrificed (Crippen, 2009) or workplace support might not be present (Savage-Austin & Honeycutt, 2011) or the leader might be viewed as lacking authority (Douglas, 2014). By studying the connection between authentic happiness and servant leadership, it might be possible to convince more educators to embrace a servant leadership style based on the increased level of student engagement which occurs in a servant led environment (Noland & Richards, 2015). Although servant leadership is about self-sacrifice, personal growth through servant style leadership might result in higher levels of authentic happiness which is important because students prefer educators exhibiting happiness behaviors (Eryilmaz, 2014). This study attempted to close a gap in knowledge concerning the connection between authentic happiness as a positive psychological construct and servant leadership orientation by teachers in the classroom.

**Historical Overview**

To understand the value of researching the relationship between servant leadership and authentic happiness levels in college faculty, one must understand how the process adults use to learn is different from the process for K-12 students. Kapp, a German educator, originally used the term *andragogy* to describe Plato’s Theory of Education (Savicevic, 1991), but Malcolm Knowles (1973) is the person credited with popularizing this titular adult learning theory. Later, the theory was expanded to include metacognitive theories which embrace the process of “knowing about knowing” (Schraw & Moshman, 1995). Adult learners make up a variety of students at the college level and includes nontraditional student populations consisting of students over the age of 25 which increased by 42% between 2000 - 2010 (Snyder & Dillow, 2011). The shift in the student demographic in high education has resulted in a switch away from rote memorization and toward content and active learning (Stewart, 2014).
The practices of andragogy align with servant leadership because this method of teaching might help professors eliminate barriers and seek common ground (Hays, 2008) which is also one of the goals of servant leaders. Servant leadership embodies biblical leadership where the style of Jesus involves being among those who serve (Luke 22:26-27) and offering blessings to servants (John 13:15-17). Being among followers is often a trait that separates servant style leaders from other types of leaders (Chung, 2011). Greenleaf (1970) officially coined the term servant leader through his work building this theory. Over the years, the traits associated with servant leaders have grown. Page and Wong (2000) organized the traits into 12 categories which included caring for others, developing others, empowering others, goalsetting, humility, integrity, leading, modeling, servanthood, shared decision-making, team-building, and visioning which are the foundation of the Servant Leadership Profile-Revised.

One of the traits not connected with servant leadership via research is authentic happiness and it could be questioned what type of impact the self-sacrificing nature of servant leadership has on authentic happiness. Happiness theory, much like servant leadership theory, is deeply grounded in historical works and goes back to ancient philosophers including Plato and Buddha (Seligman, 2002). The concept of positive well-being became more relevant when research started to focus on all components of mental health rather than mental health solely being defined as a lack of mental illness (Jahoda, 1958). This research led to the start of the authentic happiness and positive psychology movement (Seligman, 2002) and several assessments were created to evaluate components of authentic happiness including the Satisfaction with Life Scale (Diener, Emmons, Larson, & Griffin, 1985), the Subjective Happiness Scale (Lyubomirsky & Lepper, 1999), and the Authentic Happiness Inventory (Peterson, 2005). In 2002, Seligman
wrote about authentic happiness developing through the process of identifying, cultivating, and regularly using strengths (Seligman, 2002).

**Impact on Society-at-Large**

Positive change often occurs in those following servant leadership practices (Sendjaya & Cooper, 2010) which might result in followers developing higher self-esteem (Vilcalvi, 2006). With serving others for the common good at the center (Page & Wong, 2000), servant leaders are often able to develop the skills of followers. Because deep emotional satisfaction results from using signature strengths (Seligman, 2000), those called to lead students in a servant focused manner might develop a higher level of authentic happiness. An elevated happiness level might increase positive interactions within the classroom which could increase student success with 2.9013 positive interactions being necessary to cancel out each negative interaction (Losada, 1999; Fredrickson & Losada, 2005; Fredrickson & Losada, 2013). By following the process of servant leadership, professors eliminate barriers and seek common ground (Hays, 2008).

Following a servant leadership methodology might also help the 17.7% of college students diagnosed or treated for anxiety, the 14.9% diagnosed or treated for depression, and the 9.1% diagnosed or treated for panic attacks (American College Health Association, 2015) because students might feel more comfortable in the classroom and therefore more willing to address questions and concerns. Additionally, a positive relationship has been discovered between servant teaching and student engagement (Noland & Richards, 2015).

**Problem Statement**

Because students often thrive in a positive environment (Fredrickson & Losada, 2005; Fredrickson & Losada, 2013; Losada, 1999) and servant teachers often create a respectful and dignifying experience for students (Douglas, 2014), a servant led classroom might lead to
increased student success. Servant leadership frequently involves self-sacrifice (Crippen, 2009) and includes many traits associated with other-focused behaviors including humility which can result in servant leaders being viewed as lacking authority (Douglas, 2014). Therefore, authentic happiness levels might be lower in those using servant leadership methods in the classroom if an educator does not feel as though the level of classroom authority is respected and might be higher if the educator believes the process is positively impacting student learning outcomes.

Given the student-focused research emanating from constructivist and social learning paradigms in the last few decades around significant learning experiences (Fink, 2013), it seems conspicuous that more research has not been conducted on the link between servant leadership and effective teaching, especially given the characteristics of effective college teaching (Bain & Porter, 2004).

Much of the same can be said for the constructs of positive psychology and classroom teaching--a conspicuous lack of scholarship exists examining these important relationships. Although much of the work with the authentic happiness framework has occurred in the behavioral sciences, some see connections between a positive psychological framework and improved classroom teaching (Eryilmaz, 2014). Ignoring or separating the importance of healthy, psychological functioning from the behaviors of teachers and students in a classroom is naïve at best and irresponsible at worst (Eryilmaz, 2014). To suggest that scholars write and practitioners talk about effective classroom practices without addressing aspects of personality belies the strong connection between personality characteristics and individual differences that motivate behavior (Achor, 2010; Eryilmaz, 2014; Fredrickson & Losada, 2005; Fredrickson & Losada, 2013; Losada, 1999). Little research exists that examines authentic happiness and either effective teaching or improved student outcomes; no research exists that establishes a link
between authentic happiness, servant leadership, and improved classroom teaching. The problem is that servant leadership is often seen as or conceived of in terms not conducive to it being embraced either in the boardroom or in the college classroom because the benefits of a servant style are not always clear. For this reason, more research needs to be completed on the topic of servant leadership and authentic happiness.

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the study was to evaluate the relationship between the servant leadership levels and the authentic happiness levels of college faculty in a Midwestern state drawn from a convenience sample of faculty connected with Indiana Campus Compact. The outcome variable for the study, servant leadership, focused on the leader putting the needs of followers first (Greenleaf, 1970) and was measured by scores on the Servant Leadership Profile-Revised (Wong & Page, 2003). The predictor variable of authentic happiness assessed the satisfaction someone had with life combined with emotions felt in the past, present, and future (Seligman, 2002). The happiness variable was measured using the Authentic Happiness Inventory (Peterson, 2005). The research was based on self-reported data from one point in time which is common in survey research (Kridel, 2010).

**Significance of the Study**

A servant leadership practice in the classroom leads to increased levels of engagement and learning with servant leaders focused on meeting the needs of individuals and empowering students (Noland & Richards, 2015); however, there is risk associated with being a servant leader in a non-supportive environment due to isolation often felt within the classroom environment (Savage-Austin & Honeycutt, 2011). Researchers have documented that college students prefer when professors exhibit happiness-oriented behaviors (Eryilmaz, 2014). Additionally, college
freshmen enrolled in a course focused on *The Happiness Advantage: The Seven Principles that Fuel Success and Performance at Work* (Achor, 2010) experienced an increase in scores related to not worrying, handling stress, and living in the moment (Achor, 2010). Although longitudinal research has not been conducted, experience in a servant led environment could lead to increased retention rates. With attrition rates for first year college students hovering between 30-50% (O’Keefe, 2013), college enrollment decreasing for the past four years (Marcus, 2015), first year persistence rates varying between 49.3% (for-profit universities) and 86.7% (four-year private) with two-year public at 60% and four-year public at 82.3% (National Student Clearinghouse Research Center, 2015), a 72.1% overall persistence rate, and a 60.6% retention rate at the original institution from Fall 2014 to Fall 2015 (National Student Clearinghouse Research Center, 2015), universities need to evaluate ways of increasing student success in the classroom. Because workplace support might not be present for those in servant leadership roles (Savage-Austin & Honeycutt, 2011), following a servant focused philosophy, although beneficial to students, might not appeal to faculty. Due to increased levels of engagement in classrooms with a servant leader (Noland & Richards, 2015) and college students preferring educators displaying happiness behaviors (Eryilmaz, 2014), the impact of servant leadership on the authentic happiness levels of college professors in a Midwestern state was worth evaluating. Although exploratory in nature, the outcomes of the current correlational study have the potential to influence more robust relationship and group outcomes research, including experimental designs, in the future.

**Research Question**

**RQ1:** Is there a relationship between Servant Leadership and Authentic Happiness in college professors?
Definitions

1. **Servant Leadership** - Although described with a variety of different characteristics, the central point of servant leadership is putting the needs of followers first (Greenleaf, 1970).

2. **Servant Teaching** - Servant teaching involves utilizing the characteristics of servant leadership within the classroom (Greenleaf, 1979).

3. **Authentic Happiness** - Authentic happiness combines hedonism, desire, and objective list. The combination of these three components of traditional happiness often lead to increased authentic happiness and a higher level of satisfaction with life. When all three components of traditional happiness combine, people are more likely to experience authentic happiness and satisfaction with life (Royzman & Seligman, 2003; Seligman, 2002). The authentic happiness variable was measured using the Authentic Happiness Scale.

4. **Positive Psychology** - The pioneer of modern positive psychology is Martin Seligman (Achor, 2010; Fowler, Seligman, & Koocher, 1999; Seligman, 1991). The positive psychology movement is described as building the individual’s positive qualities including courage, optimism, future-mindedness, work ethic, interpersonal skills, social responsibility, and the ability to feel pleasure (Fowler et al., 1999).

6. **Losada Line** - The Losada line is a theory that people need to have 2.9013 positive experiences for every negative interaction to flourish but up to six to fully thrive (Fredrickson & Losada, 2005; Fredrickson & Losada, 2013; Losada, 1999). Although the Losada line has been heavily debated in terms of scientific merit, positive and negative interactions might impact both the college professor and the college student in the study.
Due to the potential impact interactions have on individuals, research about the Losada line is being included.

7. **Servant Leadership Profile-Revised** – The Servant Leadership Profile-Revised (SLPR) assessment, located in Appendix B, consists of 62 questions ranked on a 7-point Likert scale. Questions align with seven dimensions of servant leadership including empowering others, power/pride, serving others, participatory leadership, inspiring leadership, visionary leadership, and courageous leadership (Wong & Page, 2003).

8. **Authentic Happiness Inventory** – The Authentic Happiness Inventory assessment, located in Appendix A, consists of 20 questions ranging from a negative to extremely positive response related to various constructs of authentic happiness (Peterson, 2005; Shepherd, Oliver & Schofield, 2015).

9. **College Professor** - In the study, the term college professor refers to anyone teaching at least one college course at one of the partner schools of Indiana Campus Compact (2016). The research group might include full-time tenured faculty, full-time non-tenured faculty, part-time or adjunct faculty, and visiting professors.

10. **College Student** - Although adult learning theory (Knowles, 1973) is used as a framework, college students the professors in the study interact with might be as young as 13 through enrollment in the Ivy Tech dual credit program in the state of Indiana.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Overview

Throughout the literature review, the components of authentic happiness, including satisfaction with life and subjective happiness, were assessed as well as the literature about positive impacts of servant leadership on both business and educational outcomes. The following literature review also focuses on the theoretical frameworks and historical background for servant leadership and authentic happiness. The background information is followed by research linking servant leaders, authentic happiness, and the college environment, thus providing a warrant for the evidence that justified the study. The study was completed through the evaluation of self-reported authentic happiness levels in college professors related to self-reported servant leadership results gathered via survey research.

Theoretical Framework

The study was rooted in two theoretical frameworks: servant leadership theory (Greenleaf, 1970) and authentic happiness theory (Seligman, 2002). Happiness theory, specifically related to authentic happiness, connects to the outcome variable being evaluated within the group of servant leaders. Leadership theory, specifically related to servant leadership, grounds the study’s predictor variable of servant leadership.

Seligman’s Authentic Happiness Theory

Throughout history, the concept of happiness has been evaluated by a variety of different groups and individuals. Happiness and what makes people happy was discussed by ancient philosophers including Plato, Aristotle, Buddha, and Confucius (Seligman, 2002). Aquinas tried to answer what happiness is and if it is attainable while alive (Seligman, 2002). Even the Bible asks Christians to rejoice (Philippians 4:4) and delight (Psalms 37:4) in the Lord which are
components of happiness. Happiness has been on the minds of philosophers, political leaders, and religious figures since the beginning of recorded history.

The definition of happiness has evolved some over the years; however, the main pillars of the philosophy have remained the same. Within the field of psychology, four traditional philosophical frameworks of happiness exist (Lambert, Passmore, & Holder, 2015). These philosophical frameworks are utilitarianism, virtue, hedonism, and eudemonism (Lambert et al., 2015). In modern psychology, a movement toward positive psychology has occurred with an increased focus on authentic happiness (Achor, 2010). Authentic happiness evaluates the overall satisfaction with life (Diener et al., 1985; Peterson, 2005; Seligman, 2002).

Although discussions about happiness have occurred for centuries, focusing on happiness as a part of overall mental health was not discussed until more recently. Maslow (1943) developed a hierarchy of needs. Maslow’s pyramid focused loosely on happiness within each area with Maslow mentioning a hungry man being happy with a guarantee of food for the remainder of his life (Maslow, 1943). Maslow’s pyramid has been taught in psychology, education, and business courses in the years since it was initially written about by Maslow. It is one of the reasons educators encourage students to eat breakfast before a big test, it helps organizational leaders develop programs including employee assistance to help people after a tragedy in life, and it gives psychologists a way to help patients set goals which move people into a higher level on the pyramid. Maslow gives a point for people to go back to when building competencies to further develop success.

The development of discussion about positive psychology and authentic happiness started after Psychologist Marie Jahoda wrote Current Concepts of Positive Mental Health (Jahoda, 1958). Within Jahoda’s book, a framework was set to explain the characteristics of mentally
healthy people. The list of characteristics included (a) self-attitudes including identity and self-esteem; (b) personal growth; (c) integration or a balance between attitude and growth; (d) autonomy; (e) appropriate perception of reality with a level of empathy and awareness of social situations; and (f) environmental mastery with an ability to build relationships, solve problems, and adapt to various situations (Jahoda, 1958). The lack of mental illness cannot be the only benchmark in the assessment of mental health (Jahoda, 1958). By working on increasing the competencies of mentally healthy people, it might be possible for people to also increase authentic happiness. The idea of improving mental health of all individuals led to the authentic happiness and positive psychology movements (Fowler et al., 1999).

Authentic happiness and positive psychology became a bigger part of the discussion psychologists were having around the end of the 20th century (Fowler et al., 1999). The discussion resulted partially as a response to Jahoda’s research (1958) building a framework of traits to increase mental health. It also happened due to Csikszentmihalyi’s (1990) work entitled *Flow: The Psychology of Optimal Experience* which pointed to the quick passing of time when people are fully engaged in an activity which brings joy into life. Diener et al. (1985) created an assessment called the Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS) to evaluate happiness levels with results skewing right which showed most people that responded were relatively happy. The body of knowledge developed by the research of other psychologists as well as Seligman’s speech at the American Psychological Association Conference (Seligman, 1998) led to Seligman’s *Authentic Happiness: Using the New Positive Psychology to Realize Your Potential for Lasting Fulfillment* (2002) and the theory of authentic happiness.

While it is important to note the work of Maslow initially opened the door to more open discussion about humanistic psychology with a focus on the strengths rather than neurosis,
Seligman is credited as a pioneer of the modern positive psychology movement (Seligman, 1991; Fowler, Seligman, & Koocher, 1999; Achor, 2010) because of his seminal work and his role as President of the American Psychological Association (APA) when positive psychology became a focus in the field (Fowler et al., 1999). When giving his inauguration speech in 1998 as the President of the APA, Seligman (1998) called for members to use positive psychology which was described as a science focused on developing and understanding the positive qualities of individuals related to social responsibility, pleasure, work ethic, courage, optimism, and future-mindedness. The APA conference speech by Seligman created the momentum behind a movement toward studying both authentic happiness and positive psychology more in depth.

In talking about authentic happiness, one of the items frequently discussed is money. Although income had risen 16% in the United States in the 30 years prior to the publication of Seligman’s book, the number of people self-reporting as “very happy” dropped from 36% to 29% (Seligman, 2002). A seven percent drop in the happiness levels within society is important to evaluate which led Seligman to write a book on authentic happiness. The rates have since risen some with 33% of Americans self-reporting as “very happy” in 2011 (The Harris Poll, 2011). The results also showed women (36%) were happier than men (31%), those earning over $100,000+ were happiest (37%) with those earning $75,000-99,999 being the least happy (29%), and people over 65 being the happiest (42%) while people 30-49 were the least happy (29%) (The Harris Poll, 2011). In terms of education, people with a post graduate degree (39%) were happier than those with a high school education or less (32%), some college (33%), and college graduates (35%) (The Harris Poll, 2011). Based on the happiness levels of people relevant to educational level and the fact faculty salaries average around $58,830 per year (Inside Jobs, 2013), college professors most likely fall into some demographic groups currently experiencing
greater levels of authentic happiness based on educational attainment. Depending on salary, happiness levels likely vary greatly between different groups of professors.

Another item of interest when it comes to authentic happiness is the use of strengths in career. Seligman (2002) wrote, “Authentic happiness comes from identifying and cultivating your most fundamental strengths and using them every day in work, love, play, and parenting” (p. xi). If educators are truly fulfilling a calling by teaching, the strengths developed throughout life are being used daily. By using strengths in a manner connected to calling, one might conclude servant leaders should ideally have a higher level of authentic happiness and teachers that are happy are following a servant leadership philosophy.

Authentic happiness (Seligman, 2002) focuses on a full life embracing hedonism, desire, and objective list portions of the happiness puzzle (Royzman & Seligman, 2003). When all three components of traditional happiness combine, people are more likely to experience authentic happiness (Royzman & Seligman, 2003; Seligman, 2002). Authentic happiness combines the positive emotions of the past and the positive emotions about the future with the pleasures and gratifications of the present. These emotions include confidence, contentment, faith, hope, optimism, pride, satisfaction, and trust (Seligman, 2002). Seligman’s writing on authentic happiness was the seminal work in the field. By focusing on the ways happiness builds upon positive emotion, engagement or flow, and meaning in life, positive psychology aims to increase the level of authentic happiness people achieve.

**Greenleaf’s Servant Leadership Theory**

Servant leadership focuses on putting the needs of the follower before the needs of the leader. The servant leadership philosophy has led to additional research on leaders as servants,

Although not attributed as servant leadership concepts until modern times, servant leadership concepts go back to the literature of late antiquity with Jesus often being viewed as the primary servant leader. The four Gospels touch on Jesus’ role as a servant leader. Matthew 23:11-12 (NIV) states, “The greatest among you will be your servant. For those who exalt themselves will be humbled, and those who humble themselves will be exalted.” Mark 10:45 (NIV) goes on to say, “For even the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many.” Luke 22:26-27 speaks of Jesus being among those who serve and John 13:15-17 offering a blessing to those that serve. Jesus had the value of being among His followers (Chung, 2011) which is why servant leadership is often a focus of Christian educational institutions more than secular educational.

In 1970, Robert K. Greenleaf officially coined the term servant leadership in the book, The Servant as Leader and formally introduced servant leadership. Greenleaf deviated from the belief at his time that both serve and lead were words which had developed a negative connotation (1970). He focused on the concept people should be servants first and then leaders with an understanding these groups of individuals are often two extreme types. Greenleaf understood the challenge being a servant leader might create for followers of the servant leadership philosophy. The seminal work of Greenleaf developed the concept of leaders putting the needs of followers first. Kouzes and Posner (2012) also provided a list of five practices exemplary leaders follow. Leaders “model the way, inspire a shared vision, challenge the process, enable others to act, and encourage the heart” (Kouzes & Posner, 2012, p. 15). Kouzes
and Posner’s list of traits builds upon the theories of servant leadership by focusing on the extraordinary things which might occur in an organization with strong leadership in place.

Greenleaf also composed an essay entitled *The Teacher as Servant: A Parable* which focused on servant teaching (1979). When a servant leader steps into a teaching role, servant teaching occurs. Within the college classroom, professors with a servant leader philosophy would often be called servant teachers. In Christian practices, Jesus is often thought of as the original servant teacher by giving His life in service (John 3:16; John 13:12-17) and reminding followers of the value of looking out for the needs of others (Philippians 2:3-4) and loving others (Mark 12:31). Greenleaf became a Quaker later in his life (Frick, 2004) embracing the Quaker spices of simplicity, peace, integrity, community, equality, and stewardship (Gulley, 2014). Although the concept of servant leadership is deeply rooted in religious concepts, people from both secular and religious backgrounds follow servant leadership practices.

As the field of research on servant leadership has grown over the years, numerous other researchers have developed a list of qualities servant leaders might have. The list of qualities includes (a) respect (Hunter, 1998); (b) commitment to growth of people (Linden, Wayne, Zhao, & Henderson, 2008; Spears, 2000) or growth (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006); (c) leading (Page & Wong, 2000); (d) empowerment (Russell & Stone, 2002; Patterson, 2003; Page & Wong, 2000; Linden, Wayne et al., 2008; Van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2010); (e) transforming influence (Sendjaya, Sarros & Santora, 2008); (f) humility (Hunter, 1998; Patterson, 2003; Page & Wong, 2000; Van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2010); (g) putting subordinates first (Linden et al., 2008); (h) transcendental spirituality (Van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2010); (i) trust (Russell & Stone, 2002; Patterson, 2003); (j) accountability (Van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2010) or commitment (Hunter, 1998); (k) listening (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006; Spears, 2000); (l) empathy (Barbuto & Wheeler,
The University of Saint Francis combined the extensive list of servant leadership attributes to evaluate eight dimensions of servant leadership (Hicks et al., 2006; Spears, 2000) or caring for others (Page & Wong, 2000) or kindness (Hunter, 1998); (m) conceptualization (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006; Linden et al., 2008); (n) persuasion (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006; Spears, 2000); (o) servanthood (Linden et al., 2008; Page & Wong, 2000) or service (Patterson, 2003; Russell & Stone, 2002); (p) patience (Hunter, 1998); (q) relationships (Linden et al., 2008) or covenantal relationships (Sendjaya et al., 2008); (r) vision (Russell & Stone, 2002) or visioning (Page & Wong, 2000; Patterson, 2003) or foresight (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006; Spears, 2000); (s) honesty (Hunter, 1998; Russell & Stone, 2002); (t) integrity (Page & Wong, 2000; Russell & Stone, 2002); (u) awareness (Spears, 2000; Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006); (v) healing (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006; Spears, 2000) or emotional healing (Linden et al., 2008); (w) calling (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006); (x) community building (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006) or building community (Spears, 2000) or modeling team building (Page & Wong, 2000) or creating value for the community (Linden et al., 2008); (y) altruism (Patterson, 2003); (z) goal setting (Page & Wong, 2000); (aa) pioneering (Russell & Stone, 2002); (bb) conceptualization (Spears, 2000); (cc) appreciation of others (Russell & Stone, 2002); (dd) shared decision making (Page & Wong, 2000); (ee) modeling (Russell & Stone, 2002); (ff) behaving ethically (Linden et al., 2008); (gg) authentic self (Sendjaya et al., 2008) or authenticity (Van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2010); (hh) courage (Van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2010); (ii) responsible morality (Sendjaya et al., 2008); (jj) standing back (Van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2010); (kk) agapao love (Patterson, 2003); (ll) stewardship (Spears, 2000; Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006; Van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2010); (mm) selflessness (Hunter, 1998); (nn) interpersonal acceptance (Van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2010); (oo) voluntary subordination (Sendjaya et al., 2008); and (pp) service and sacrifice (Hunter, 1998).
These dimensions include empowerment, humility, stewardship, communication, social justice, cultural leadership, personal integrity, and accountability (Hicks et al., 2013).

Because of Greenleaf’s initial work and the personal experiences of Wong and Page within the field, Wong and Page (2000, 2003, 2005) were able to build upon the research related to servant leadership and develop the Servant Leadership Profile-Revised (Wong & Page, 2003). After reviewing the literature and the list of qualities servant leaders might portray, Page and Wong (2000) organized the traits into 12 categories which included caring for others, developing others, empowering others, goalsetting, humility, integrity, leading, modeling, servanthood, shared decision-making, team-building, and visioning. Because the Servant Leadership Profile-Revised (Wong & Page, 2003) was used for gathering data about servant leadership, these 12 traits were the focus of the study.

**Servant Leadership and Authentic Happiness**

When it comes to servant leadership and authentic happiness, some of the values of both theories overlap. Six core virtues are contained within the work of Aquinas, the *Bhagavad-Gita*, Aristotle, Confucius, and Bushido samurai code. The list of virtues includes (a) courage; (b) wisdom and knowledge; (c) love and humanity; (d) temperance; (e) justice; and (f) spirituality and transcendence, which forms a cross-cultural inventory that positive psychologists use to guide research (Seligman, 2000). These virtues are also included in servant leadership frameworks with (a) love (Patterson, 2003); (b) justice (Hicks et al., 2013); and (c) transcendental spirituality (Van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2010) being underlying traits of both the movements toward authentic happiness and servant leadership.

When it comes to authentic happiness and servant leadership, researchers have not evaluated if a positive or negative correlation exists. Servant leaders might focus too much on
the needs of others which might decrease happiness. On the other hand, happiness might increase through the efforts to help other people achieve goals. Also, if followers are happier because of the environment created by the servant leader, the environment for the servant leader might also improve. By evaluating the potential correlation between authentic happiness and servant leadership, it might be possible to determine the relevancy of potential negative, positive, and neutral impacts of servant leadership and how it adds to or detracts from the authentic happiness levels of college professors.

To evaluate the potential relationship between authentic leadership and servant leadership, survey data was collected using the Servant Leadership Profile-Revised located in Appendix C (Wong & Page, 2015) and the Authentic Happiness Inventory (Peterson, 2005). The author evaluated the potential relationship between authentic happiness and servant leadership in college professors in Indiana. The potential link between authentic happiness and servant leadership and the literature surrounding these two topics were evaluated more in depth in the related literature section.

Study

Servant leadership theory and authentic happiness theory provided the theoretical frameworks for the study. The leadership portion of the study related to servant leadership behavior presented by Greenleaf because of the belief both serve and lead have a negative connotation (Greenleaf, 1970). With educators having a role in both serving and leading groups of students, servant style leadership is valuable to evaluate within the classroom setting. Happiness theory connected to the research related to positive psychology and specifically the construct of authentic happiness which results from the combination of net pleasure, obtaining what you want, and achieving worthwhile results (Royzman & Seligman, 2003; Seligman, 2002).
With most educators striving to be remembered in a positive light and obituaries of college professors commonly listing qualities associated with servant leadership such as being influential, helping, committing, patience, respect, and responsibility (Macfarlane & Chan, 2014), one is led to ask if a correlation exists between servant leadership and authentic happiness. The goal of the study is to evaluate the potential relationship to build upon the field of study for further research in the future.

**Related Literature**

Although the needs of college students might vary based on a variety of aspects such as major, age, and purpose for obtaining an education, the role of the college professor is to help ensure students leave the classroom with a thorough understanding of the course material. Because many classroom formats are switching away from traditional theory-based lectures and toward the use of case studies, discussions, and other application-based activities, more classroom activities fixate on strategies that increase learning including focusing on the content of the course and active learning (Stewart, 2014) and away from the lecturing or rote memorization generally used in college classrooms. By embracing a servant leadership methodology in the classroom, research by Noland and Richards (2015) found student engagement levels increased. Additionally, Hays (2008) discovered students had an increased connection to educators utilizing servant leadership which might increase overall understanding of course material. With stress levels of students being reported as lower with the student-centered pedagogy (Eagan & Garvey, 2015) often used by servant leaders, it is important to evaluate the potential connection between servant leadership and authentic happiness. After all, if a positive connection exists between these two theories, it might increase the likelihood of
educators to embrace a servant leader philosophy of teaching which has led to increased student engagement levels (Noland & Richards, 2015).

Minimal research exists around authentic happiness and servant leadership; however, one of the areas the research focused on was student centered pedagogy (Eagan & Garvey, 2015). With many colleges and universities moving from a lecture-based model to a facilitation-based model, the role of the professor often shifts from that of “sage on the stage” to “guide on the side” (Fink, 2013). Fink (2013) proposed a different metaphor for educators referring to the role of the teacher as the helmsman. Much like a leader on a whitewater rafting trip, the teacher must embrace the role of leading a group together through the learning process which is sometimes rocky and treacherous. The students involved in the learning process must be actively involved through class participation, activities, and completing the reading much like participants on a whitewater rafting trip must paddle the oars to stay afloat (Fink, 2013). The description of the educator as helmsman works within the constraints of servant leadership because the educator must direct the students while encouraging the students to also be personally committed to the educational process.

When it comes to leadership within the classroom, one philosophy some educators follow is servant leadership. Servant leaders focus on the priorities of the followers (Greenleaf, 1970); however, limited research exists on the impact the practice of being a servant leader might have on the authentic happiness levels of the servant leaders and on the connection between servant leader as a construct that has applicability in the classroom for teachers, either in K-12 or higher education. With the needs of the follower being at the center of servant leadership, limited studies have been completed on the overall well-being of servant leaders. One study evaluated various virtuous types of leadership, including servant leadership, and compared it to happiness
levels of both leaders and followers with preliminary findings showing happiness increased in both groups (Wang & Hackett, 2016); however, additional research is necessary. Also, an increase has occurred in research showing a potential negative impact on the people exhibiting positive traits such as the ones utilized by servant leaders (Koopman et al., 2016) which means additional research on how servant leadership impacts authentic happiness levels might add to a current gap in literature.

The follower-first philosophy (Greenleaf, 1970) is consistent throughout and aligns with the 12 traits identified by Page and Wong (2000) which provide the framework for the study. These traits include caring for others, developing others, empowering others, goalsetting, humility, integrity, leading, modeling, servanthood, shared decision-making, team-building, and visioning (Page & Wong, 2000). Authentic happiness (Seligman, 2002) is not viewed as one of the traits of a servant leader; however, the study researched if a correlation existed between authentic happiness levels and servant leadership in college professors in Indiana. This section of the literature review focuses on empirical research related to the predictor variable of servant leadership and the outcome variable of authentic happiness while also presenting the current gap in literature related to the topic.

Impact of Servant Leadership on Followers

Since Greenleaf’s seminal work on servant leadership was written in 1970, many leaders and institutions have embraced his follower-first philosophy (Greenleaf, 1970). The use of servant leadership in the workplace often leads to an increase in certain factors including job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviors; however, some researchers believe a dark side (Koopman et al., 2016) also exists when evaluating these qualities. By evaluating these factors, proponents of servant leadership can discuss the concrete business outcomes which
result from a philosophy of leadership with some naysayers while also considering the potential negative impacts on the servant leader.

Because a higher level of job satisfaction often leads to lower levels of turnover and higher levels of employee engagement within a work environment (Noe, Hollenbeck, Gerhart, & Wright, 2015), job satisfaction is often evaluated when determining the impact of leadership styles on organizational success. In a field study utilizing three different types of firms, servant leadership was positively correlated at $r = .80$ with job satisfaction (Tischler, Giambatista, McKeage, McCormick, 2016). Within the field of higher education, a study compared the correlations between the employee’s intention to stay in the position, level of job satisfaction, and servant leadership practices at the college. A strong correlation existed between the aspects of servant leadership evaluated and job satisfaction with a Pearson $r$ range of .618 for the quality of building community to .675 for shared leadership (Harris, Hinds, Manansingh, Rubino, & Morote, 2016). For students within the educational environment, job satisfaction and intent to stay might be compared to satisfaction and retention efforts. To evaluate the relationship between servant leadership and satisfaction of students, a study was completed where 471 students completed a survey to evaluate satisfaction with advising and servant leadership constructs. The research study revealed positive significant relationships between servant leadership characteristics and student satisfaction with advising (Paul & Fitzpatrick, 2015). Those led by servant leaders as business professionals, college employees, and college students tend to have higher levels of satisfaction with the workplace or college (Harris et al., 2016; Paul & Fitzpatrick, 2015; Tischler et al., 2016).

**Impact of Servant Leadership on Leaders**
Although the impact servant leaders have should be viewed as positive because the focus is on serving others, the self-sacrifice involved in servant leadership might be challenging for the servant leader at various points in time. For example, many servant leaders utilize organizational citizenship behaviors (Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983) while fulfilling various roles within the workplace. Although a study by Koopman, Lanaj, and Scott (2016) found job satisfaction increased in some ways when employees focused on organizational citizenship behavior, the study found negative impacts also occurred through the process including emotional exhaustion and deterioration of job satisfaction when evaluated in relation to work goal balance (Koopman et al., 2016). Ultimately, employees fulfilling servant roles within an organization often end up torn between the positive and negative effects of the behaviors. Koopman et al. (2016) wrote, “Of late, scholars have identified a number of “positive” constructs that, upon closer inspection, appear to have darker aspects to them” (p. 427). Additionally, Panaccio, Donia, Saint-Michael, and Liden (2015) wrote, “The possibility that servant leaders, in their quest to serve multiple stakeholders, may suffer from stress and possibly even burnout as a result of excessive role conflicts” (p. 351). With servant leaders often having such a positive impact on organizations and followers, it is important to assess the authentic happiness levels of the leaders.

Impact of Servant Leadership on the Classroom Environment

When it comes to the classroom environment, servant leaders must be aware of the current climate within the college setting. The number of students attending college has increased by approximately 5.7 million since 2000 (U.S. Department of Education, 2014). Attrition rates for first term college students hover between 30-50% (O’Keefe, 2013) with a cost to the university of approximately $14,000-17,000 per student (O’Keefe, 2013) for students not persisting to graduation. With colleges often focused on factors including SAT scores and high
school GPA for admission decisions, factors such as a student’s current mindset about success and level of happiness are often ignored (Seligman, 1991).

With enrollment at colleges and universities declining for the fourth year in a row and enrollment numbers for students over 24 decreasing by over 4% (Marcus, 2015), it is important for educational administrators to evaluate strategies to increase retention. Marcus wrote, “Adult students are still leaving higher education in large numbers, particularly for-profit institutions and community colleges” (2015). Current information conflicts with reports colleges received in 2011 stating the fastest growing group was nontraditional students (Hillman, 2008) with an expected growth of 40% through 2019 (Rood, 2011). Attrition rates are also higher for nontraditional college students because of the challenges with acclimating to the college environment (Kenner & Weinerman, 2011). To continue to thrive in a changing market, all colleges and universities need to evaluate long-term plans for enrollment and retention. Because student satisfaction increases through interactions with servant leaders (Paul & Fitzpatrick, 2015) and people might potentially move toward servant leadership practices if it increases authentic happiness, it is important to evaluate the relationship between these two variables among college professors. In his analysis of the changing landscape of higher education, McGee (2015) addressed the demographic, economic, and cultural disruptions facing higher education now and in the future. These three disruptions led to colleges and universities admitting, trying to retain, and attempting to teach populations of students who look and act differently from previous generations (McGee, 2015). Because of these demographic, economic, and cultural changes and due to essentially no improvement in the retention rate of students in the last 50 years (Digest, 2015; Tinto, 2012), it might be valuable for educational institutions to consider ways to increase student engagement and learning. In a study related to student engagement and servant
leadership, Noland and Richards (2015) found servant teaching might impact both student learning and engagement. Additionally, evidence of a relationship between both learning indicators and affective learning of participants was found when evaluating servant behaviors in the classroom as well as lower stress levels for students taught in a student-centric manner (Noland & Richards, 2015). Servant leadership frequently involves self-sacrifice (Crippen, 2009) and includes many traits associated with other-focused behaviors including humility. Perhaps because of these characteristics, servant leadership can be viewed as lacking authority (Douglas, 2014) which is something most educators are fearful of giving up within a classroom environment. Therefore, authentic happiness levels might be lower in those using servant leadership methods in the classroom if an educator does not feel as though the level of classroom authority is respected. Given the student-focused research emanating from constructivist and social learning paradigms in the last few decades around significant learning experiences (Fink, 2013), it seems conspicuous that more research has not been conducted on the link between servant leadership and effective teaching, especially given the characteristics of effective college teaching (Bain & Porter, 2004).

One study did find educators lacked classroom management and behaved in a narcissistic way when viewed as unhappy by students (Eryilmaz, 2014). Because students often thrive in a positive environment (Fredrickson & Losada, 2005; Fredrickson & Losada, 2013; Losada, 1999) and servant teachers often create a respectful and dignifying experience for students (Douglas, 2014), a servant led classroom might lead to increased student success.

In religious universities, servant leadership might be more accepted as a teaching methodology than it would be in a public college or a university without a religious tradition. As a biblical principle, servant leadership ties to all four of the gospels through Matthew 23:11-
12, Mark 10:45, Luke 22:26-27, and John 13:15-17 with Jesus often being mentioned as the first servant leader. Educators fulfilling the role of a servant leader are often referred to as servant teachers. Servant teaching might increase connection to the material due to the student’s increased connection to the educator (Hays, 2008). The servant style methodology of teaching also allows the educator to be present in the moment and create a big picture view of the classroom experience (Crippen, 2010). About a servant teacher in the classroom, one student said,

He has opened our eyes and our minds (and believe it or not, even our hearts) - something rare that is found in only the very best teachers. He has made us think about ourselves, our work and our lives. This is real guidance as its influence doesn't leave after the final assignment. It will stay with us as an invaluable part of our being as we continue on with our careers.

(Hays, 2008, p. 115)

Educators might have a lifelong impact on students by embracing servant leadership.

After completing a study related to servant leadership and student engagement, Noland and Richards (2015) wrote, “Servant teaching is well positioned to impact student indicators of learning and engagement” (p. 24). By teaching in the capacity of a servant, evidence of a relationship between both learning indicators and affective learning of participants in the study was found (Noland & Richards, 2015). Because student learning in the classroom should be the number one priority of the students, faculty, and staff at colleges and universities, it is important to evaluate methods to increase the willingness of faculty to embrace a servant leadership model where the needs of the follower are the primary concern (Greenleaf, 1970). If authentic happiness levels of professors embracing a servant leader philosophy are higher, it might be
possible to get more buy-in from staff reluctant to relinquish any level of control within the classroom environment.

Servant leadership allows college professors a framework for developing a more compassionate environment. Douglas wrote, “Given the movement towards servant learning and experiential teaching within higher education it seems reasonable for professors to consider adopting Greenleaf’s paradigm as a guide for effective instruction” (2014, p. 79). By embracing a philosophy of servant leadership, educators might be able to create a more effective environment for teaching while also role modeling appropriate leadership behavior for students. Although the idea of getting out of behind the podium might be terrifying for professors due to a fear of losing control in the classroom, it sends a message to students that the professor is not afraid to eliminate barriers and seek common ground (Hays, 2008). An open classroom environment might lead to more in depth learning and a stronger environment for all members of the group.

Although the needs of college students might vary based on a variety of aspects such as major, age, and purpose for obtaining an education, the role of the college professor is to help ensure students leave the classroom with a thorough understanding of the course material. Because of many classroom formats switching away from traditional theory-based lectures and toward the use of case studies, discussions, and other application-based activities, more classroom activities fixate on strategies that increase learning including focusing on the content of the course and active learning (Stewart, 2014) and away from the lecturing or rote memorization generally used in college classrooms. By embracing a servant leadership methodology in the classroom, research by Noland and Richards (2015) found student engagement levels increased. Additionally, Hays (2008) discovered students had an increased
connection to educators utilizing servant leadership which might increase overall understanding of course material. With stress levels of students being reported as lower through the use of the student-centered pedagogy (Eagan & Garvey, 2015) often used by servant leaders, it is important to evaluate the potential connection between servant leadership and authentic happiness. After all, if a positive connection exists between these two theories, it might increase the likelihood of educators to embrace a servant style philosophy of teaching which has led to increased student engagement levels (Noland & Richards, 2015).

With retention rates becoming increasingly important for funding and accreditation at the university level, college leaders need to assess methods that might increase persistence of students and contribute to increased student engagement in improved teaching and learning. Additionally, the development of faculty might more positively contribute to aspects other than financial aid that are related to student persistence and academic achievement (Kuh et al., 2010). Moreover, through role modeling of positive behaviors and reactions, professors might increase the potential of students to behave appropriately in challenging situations (Rebore, 2014) confronted in both the classroom and the workplace because passionate and dedicated leaders might encourage followers to develop a similar attitude (Jones, 1995).

The Practices of Exemplary Leadership® framework (Kouzes & Posner, 2012) provides leaders a framework to evaluate personal practices in leadership. While discussing the value of experimentation and risk taking in leadership, Kouzes and Posner mentioned the work of Martin Seligman (2012). Specifically, the value of perseverance through failure and setback is mentioned. Seligman’s research points to grit developing from situations where people view setbacks as temporary or changeable (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). By having educators in the classroom that are able to help students understand the temporary nature of a setback related to
academic achievement, persistence might increase. After all, the Losada line points to the necessity of 2.9013 positive interactions for every negative interaction someone has with a topic (Fredrickson & Losada, 2005; Fredrickson & Losada, 2013; Losada, 1999). A student struggling with achievement in a course might need three positive interactions in other courses to get back on track. If a student has three A’s and an F, the F might be viewed as a temporary setback; however, if a student has an F and one A, it might be viewed as a situation where long-term educational success is not feasible. The setback might result in the student leaving the university setting and not persisting to graduation.

**Potential Negative Influences of Servant Leadership**

Although most people agree there is some merit in the use of servant leadership, some problems have resulted from utilizing a servant leadership philosophy. Some shy away from following a philosophy of servant leadership due to a fear of followers not respecting the authority of the leader. Others have found the idea of self-sacrifice to be concerning. Servant leaders might also have a problem balancing the role of putting followers first while meeting departmental expectations.

Over the years, some individuals and organizations have stated a lack of respect for the concept of servant leadership viewing it as a situation where the leader embraces a parental role (McCrimmon, 2010). About the topic of servant leadership, McCrimmon (2010) wrote the following about servant leadership, “The move from autocrat to the other extreme of servant makes little sense when adult partnership is what we need. Thus, regardless of how servant leadership is defined, it has too many negative connotations to be widely persuasive” (p. 3).

Another issue with servant leadership occurs with the idea of selflessness. When people are asked to consider the needs of others over the needs of self, concern might arise. With
servant leadership, people put the followers first. By taking action and following a servant leader philosophy, self-interests might need to be sacrificed (Crippen, 2009), workplace support might not be present (Savage-Austin & Honeycutt, 2011), and the leader might be viewed as lacking authority (Douglas, 2014). These concerns must be addressed by administrators trying to encourage educators to follow a servant leadership model in the classroom.

Servant leaders put the follower first (Greenleaf, 1970). Crippen (2009, p. 33) wrote, “A servant-leader wants to make a difference for others and to have an impact on their lives. They will sacrifice their own self-interests for the sake of others.” In the role of a college professor, a task might be challenging to complete because of the need to put the material or departmental expectations first. When the needs of the students are not put first and material is not taught based on student need, the material might only be retained for short-term successes including passing a midterm or a final exam (Stewart, 2014). A conflicting list of values might be exceptionally problematic for professors at institutions without an understanding of servant leadership.

Servant leadership might be a lonely road for educators. Savage-Austin and Honeycutt wrote, “Servant leaders who work in environments that do not support servant leadership practices miss the opportunity to fully develop and teach their followers” (2011, p. 53). Because of the risk of servant leadership being a challenge for those in a non-supportive environment due to the perpetuated silos (Savage-Austin & Honeycutt, 2011), authentic happiness levels of servant leaders need to be assessed more in depth. If servant leaders are found to be less happy, particularly in situations without institutional support, the educational leadership might need to address additional ways to improve the work environment to increase long-term retention of quality instructors.
Potential Positive Influences of Servant Leadership

A lot of positive experiences might arise from following the methodology of servant leadership. Servant leaders often create positive changes in followers (Sendjaya & Cooper, 2010) while serving the common good (Page & Wong, 2000) and using signature strengths (Seligman, 2002). Focusing on the positive impacts of servant leadership practices on the leader as well as the followers might help to increase feelings of authentic happiness.

When individuals understand personal strengths and are able to utilize those strengths for a calling, a higher level of purpose is often obtained (Seligman, 2002). After completing 20,000 in depth interviews with leaders and surveying over 10,000 followers, Gallup Polls found one of the key competencies of an effective leader is the ability to invest in strengths of self and employees (Rath & Conchie, 2008). Within the workplace, if an employee’s strengths are not utilized, there is only a 9% chance the employee will be engaged (Rath & Conchie, 2008). When strengths are the focus, engagement goes up to 73% (Rath & Conchie, 2008). In a classroom setting, imagine the positive impact on both the instructor and the students if strengths were the focus to help obtain success. Instead of rote memorization occurring for the purpose of passing a test, transformative learning might occur to help students reach long-term and short-term goals (Stewart, 2014).

Servant leaders are often able to create positive change for those being led (Sendjaya & Cooper, 2010). Seeing positive changes occur might increase personal satisfaction levels in the servant leader. As a result of the increase in satisfaction, authentic happiness levels might also increase. The process also might result in followers with a higher level of self-esteem and self-awareness about strengths (Vilcalvi, 2006). The development of positive change in followers might result in the development of servant leader behaviors in another generation of leaders. A
change in the classroom might help to improve organizational culture at places where students are employed after graduation as well as help the student to develop the personal attributes necessary to increase career success.

An additional positive impact of servant leadership might be the impact the leader has over the common good. Page and Wong (2002) wrote, “At the very heart of servant-leadership is the genuine desire to serve others for the common good” (p. 2). When the servant leader can increase the overall quality of the environment, the authentic happiness level of the servant leader might improve. After all, when a leader has ownership over the development of the environment work is completed within and the followers are content, the environment will often be more enjoyable for the leader. The cycle of creating an appropriate environment might lead to everyone within the classroom being more willing to contribute to a strong organizational culture within the classroom.

Servant leaders are in a role which allows strengths to be fully utilized. Seligman (2000) wrote, “The highest success in living and the deepest emotional satisfaction comes from building and using your signature strengths” (p. 13) and “The good life is using your signature strengths every day to produce authentic leadership and abundant gratification” (p. 13). By combining passion for a subject area and an environment focused on followers, servant leaders might be able to create a deeper level of authentic happiness within the classroom environment. After all, even when things get difficult for the servant leader, the servant leader is utilizing strengths to build a higher quality of life. An increased quality of life within the workplace will likely impact other areas of life in positive ways since it takes 2.9013 positive interactions to cancel out each negative interaction a person has (Fredrickson & Losada, 2005; Fredrickson & Losada, 2013;
Losada, 1999). By utilizing strengths and having a positive impact on others, authentic happiness levels within servant leaders might increase.

**Potential Neutral Influences of Servant Leadership**

In addition to positive and negative impacts, some impacts remain neutral. Stress might be a potential negative impact, or it might be a potential positive impact of servant leadership (Hurtado, Eagan, Pryor, Whang, & Tran, 2012). Therefore, stress is currently being labeled as a neutral impact of servant leadership. Although stress rates of professors might be increasing due to new demands (Hurtado et al., 2012), stress often leads to the sharing of more personal life lessons and experiences resulting in a more student-centric classroom (Eagan & Garvey, 2015). The willingness of both faculty and students to be more open in the classroom is likely to help more meaningful conversations to occur.

A high level of stress often leads to a low level of mental health (Govind, Ratchagar, & Rani, 2014). With expectations related to research and university service increasing, stress rates among professors might also increase (Hurtado et al., 2012). Combined with increased expectations at work, faculty might also experience a hostile workplace, family demands, and school requirements for personal development to continue in the role (Eagan & Garvey, 2015). The research from Eagan and Garvey on stress levels and student-centered pedagogy found significant positive correlations (2015). Although stress is often viewed as a negative component in the workplace, it often leads to a more student-centric classroom (Eagan & Garvey, 2015) possibly due to realizing these professors had of the value of teaching skills that might increase levels of authentic happiness within the students.

Through the evaluation of potential negative, positive, and neutral impacts of servant leadership, a call to evaluate authentic happiness levels of servant leaders developed. The mood
of a professor often impacts the classroom environment. With a higher level of authentic happiness, it is likely the professor will impact a classroom in a more positive manner.

**Authentic Happiness**

When it comes to authentic happiness, some research has been conducted on the state of happiness of students; however, the research is lacking when it comes to faculty. The American College Health Association National College Health Assessment evaluates self-reported data about circumstances college students faced during the spring of 2008. With 14.9% of students being diagnosed or treated for depression in the 12 months preceding the survey, 17.7% of students being diagnosed or treated for anxiety in the 12 months preceding the survey, and 45.4% of students reporting academics had been traumatic or difficult to handle in the 12 months preceding the survey (American College Health Association, 2015), it is important for colleges to assess methods educators might be able to take to increase happiness and success within the college classroom. Being engaged in an active classroom where the student feels valued by the servant educator and classmates, results in a stronger sense of mental well-being (Sung & Yang, 2008). Additionally, a servant led environment might increase the student’s critical positivity ratio (Fredrickson & Losada, 2005; Fredrickson & Losada, 2013; Losada, 1999).

The critical positivity ratio for people to thrive is 2.9013 (Fredrickson & Losada, 2005; Fredrickson & Losada, 2013; Losada, 1999) meaning students need to have approximately three positive interactions for every negative interaction to flourish. Therefore, a student filled with self-doubt related to the material might benefit from an instructor with a positive mindset. An ideal rate of positive interactions to negative interactions to achieve optimum results is six (Achor, 2010; Fredrickson & Losada, 2005). When a professor focuses on building the student’s self-doubt instead of the student’s self-confidence, increases in knowledge and classroom
success might decrease (Hays, 2008). Because a decrease in student success might result in lower graduation and persistence rates, professor happiness is important to evaluate.

Seligman (1991) wrote about optimists doing better in college than pessimists. With knowledge about the benefits of being optimistic and the practice of utilizing positive psychology increasing, college educators should be shifting to create a positive environment of success in the classroom. An adjustment might be difficult initially but could lead to increased persistence rates over time. The potential impact of servant leadership and happiness on the classroom is important to consider.

Potential Influence on Classroom Experience

Within a classroom led by an authentically happy servant leader, a variety of impacts might occur. Student self-esteem and confidence might increase, peer relationships might develop at a deeper level, empathy levels might increase, a more civil environment might be developed, and the overall well-being of both the students and educator might improve. By evaluating more in-depth the research tied to these outcomes, it is possible to get a better view of potential benefits of servant leadership and authentic happiness within the classroom environment.

Because servant leaders focus on the follower first (Greenleaf, 1970), students taught by a servant leader might have a better college experience. Servant leaders often develop an environment where students feel more supported. Due to the support students experience, self-confidence might increase (Hays, 2008). An increase in self-confidence might lead to higher levels of self-esteem (Wei, Liao, Ku, & Shaffer, 2011). Also, increased self-esteem might help a student to build a stronger success identity. By building upon small successes and achieving manageable goals, students might be more motivated to accomplish bigger goals including
persisting to graduation (Downing, 2005). Additionally, stronger peer relationships might
develop as a result of positive emotional attachment occurring within the classroom (Sung & Yang, 2008).

Servant leadership provides educators with tools which might increase student engagement levels within the classroom with a positive relationship ($r = .530, p < .01$) existing between student engagement and educators practicing servant leadership in the classroom (Noland & Richards, 2015). By increasing the engagement levels of students, the knowledge gained might increase. With knowledge transfer being one of the key components of an educational environment, student engagement in servant led classrooms is key.

Although the students are the key component in the classroom of a servant leader, it is important to consider the impact servant leadership methods might have on the professor. Macfarlane and Chan (2014) developed a qualitative study focused on the wording from obituaries of college professors. The list of most common characteristics from the obituary research included influential, helping, commitment, patient, respected, and responsible (Macfarlane & Chan, 2014) which are also considered qualities of servant leaders. If asked to write obituaries most college professors would probably include similar words; however, it is important to self-assess to discover if those actions are also taking place in the classroom. Because most people want to be remembered in a positive light, servant leadership might be a good avenue for educators to utilize to achieve this goal. Along the way, it might also result in higher authentic happiness levels.

A conspicuous lack of scholarship exists examining the important relationship between the constructs of positive psychology and classroom teaching. Research within the psychological discipline is typically used to address mental health and behavior but only one
positive article has been written for every 17 negative articles (Achor, 2010) even though the number of psychologists focusing on positive mental health has increased since the turn of the century. With the push toward positive psychology increasing, many happiness theories exist including hedonism theory, desire theory, and objective list theory (Royzman & Seligman, 2003), but one with both theoretical, empirical, and practical significance which combines these three components of authentic happiness is Seligman’s authentic happiness theory (Seligman, 2002). Although much of the work within the framework of authentic happiness has occurred in the behavioral sciences, some see connections between a positive psychological framework and improved classroom teaching (Eryilmaz, 2014). Ignoring or separating the importance of healthy, psychological functioning from the behaviors of teachers and students in a classroom is naïve at best and irresponsible at worst (Eryilmaz, 2014). To suggest that scholars write and practitioners talk about effective classroom practices without addressing aspect of personality belies the strong connection between personality characteristics and individual differences that motivate behavior (Achor, 2010; Fredrickson & Losada, 2005; Fredrickson & Losada, 2013; Eryilmaz, 2014; Losada, 1999).

Students tend to have a more positive experience with happy educators. In a study by Eryilmaz (2014), teachers that are liked by students often are viewed as being happy and using happiness-oriented behaviors. Disliked teachers tend to display negative personality traits and exhibit signs of unhappiness (Eryilmaz, 2014). Although being liked or disliked by students is not the most important quality in an educational environment, the study found disliked teachers also lacked classroom management and behaved in a narcissistic way (Eryilmaz, 2014). Both actions might be improved if the educator in the classroom embraces a servant leadership mentality.
With college student empathy levels decreasing over the past 30 years (Swanbrow, 2010), it is essential for college professors to role model appropriate classroom behaviors. With empathy (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006; Spears, 2000) or caring for others (Page & Wong, 2000) or kindness (Hunter, 1998) being mentioned as a key trait of servant leaders, the use of a follower first philosophy in the classroom might lead to an increase in the recognition and embracement of the key competency of servant leadership by students. With all major religions having a Golden Rule of some type, the concept of empathy crosses cultural boundaries and is an essential piece of emotional intelligence. With people averaging $29,000 more on an annual basis with a high level of emotional intelligence (Bradbeary & Greaves, 2009), it is important for college students to develop an understanding of empathy. Additionally, the increase in empathy levels of students from interactions with servant leaders in the classroom might create an environment where authentic happiness is able to flourish.

A servant led environment might also lead to increased classroom civility. With 68 percent of students in college admitting to cheating on tests or written work (International Center for Academic Integrity, 2017) and an increase in violence at colleges and universities, civility within the classroom is becoming increasingly important to address. A classroom where the focus is on behaviors related to servant leadership naturally lends itself to an environment where a civility code addressing anti-harassment and respect (Weeks, 2011) is easier to enforce. By creating an environment where civility is the norm, students might develop additional skills and competencies related to developing as servant leaders. A civil classroom type of environment might also lead to higher authentic happiness levels for faculty.
Summary

Caring for others, developing others, empowering others, goalsetting, humility, integrity, leading, modeling, servanthood, shared decision-making, team-building, and visioning (Page & Wong, 2003) are all important characteristics of servant leaders. As the list of qualities of servant leaders has changed over time and the study of servant leadership has grown, it is important to consider how being a servant leader impacts the overall well-being of leaders with the question of what makes people happy being a central focus of discussions by political leaders, philosophers, and religious figures. With the development of the hierarchy of needs (Maslow, 1943), happiness started to be thought about as a construct that could change based on someone’s current state in life and Psychologist Marie Jahoda encouraged peers to recognize that a lack of mental illness was not the only important benchmark in the assessment of a person’s mental health (Jahoda, 1958). These developments led to Seligman’s Authentic Happiness: Using the New Positive Psychology to Realize Your Potential for Lasting Fulfillment (2002) which asks the essential question of, “What makes people happy?”. Because authentic happiness is a relatively new field of study (Seligman, 1998) and servant leadership has been around for less than fifty years (Greenleaf, 1970), research is missing on the potential relationship between these two theories.

By evaluating authentic happiness and servant leadership, the author developed a baseline understanding of the correlation between elements of servant leadership and feelings of authentic happiness in college professors. By understanding what impacts the authentic happiness levels of college professors, educational administrators might be better equipped to provide appropriate training to ensure success in the classroom. An increase in professor success might lead to higher achievement rates in the classroom resulting in a long-term increase in graduation and
persistence rates for college students as well as an increase in long-term commitment and motivation of educators within the institution. Although the authentic happiness level of constituents is important, it is necessary to also assess the impact being a servant leader might have on the authentic happiness levels of those using a follower-first philosophy (Greenleaf, 1970). Research on impact of followers is frequently addressed through research; however, the impact on leaders is often left unexamined. One area of personal success possibly impacted by the use of servant leadership by college professors is the level of authentic happiness one might experience as a result of following a philosophy of serving others first both inside and outside of the classroom environment. By combining the questions asked on the Servant Leadership Profile-Revised (Wong & Page, 2003) and the Authentic Happiness Inventory (Peterson, 2005) the researcher evaluated authentic happiness and servant leadership in college professors in a Midwestern state.

To evaluate the potential relationship between authentic happiness and servant leadership, college professors at member institutions of Indiana Campus Compact received a SurveyMonkey® (see Appendix C) combining the (a) the Authentic Happiness Inventory located in Appendix A (Peterson, 2005) and (b) the Servant Leadership Profile-Revised in Appendix B (Wong & Page, 2003); and (c) demographic information. Procedures for completing the current research study are explained more in depth in Chapter Three: Methodology.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

Overview

A positive correlation exists between servant leadership in the classroom and student engagement (Noland & Richards, 2015) and happiness is a quality of successful educators (Eryilmaz, 2014); therefore, the study evaluated the potential relationship between authentic happiness and servant leadership. The methodology section describes the rationale behind the study design, research question and hypothesis, setting used, participants surveyed, instrumentation and survey design, and procedures for data collection and data analysis.

Design

A correlational design was used in the study to determine the relationship between servant leadership and authentic happiness in college professors in a Midwestern state. Correlational design was an appropriate research choice because the degree of the relationship between variables was being evaluated (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007). Specifically, the study attempted to examine the relationship between servant leadership and authentic happiness in college professors in a Midwestern state. The data for both authentic happiness and servant leadership were obtained from the survey.

The study utilized survey research with correlational analysis to evaluate a potential relationship. Authentic happiness, which involves satisfaction with life combined with positive emotions toward the past, present, and future (Seligman, 2002) was the outcome variable assessed via the Authentic Happiness Inventory (Peterson, 2005). The Authentic Happiness Inventory (Peterson, 2005), located in Appendix A, was used to gather information related to authentic happiness. Servant leadership was the predictor variable assessed via the Servant Leadership Profile-Revised (Wong & Page, 2003). The Servant Leadership Profile-Revised
(Wong & Page, 2003), located in Appendix B, was used to gather information about servant leadership. Both assessments were combined into one SurveyMonkey® assessment, and the results were on self-report data from one point in time which is consistent with survey research (Kridel, 2010).

**Research Question**

**RQ1:** Is there a relationship between Servant Leadership and Authentic Happiness in college professors?

**Hypothesis**

**H₀₁:** There will be no statistically significant relationship between servant leadership as measured by the Servant Leadership Profile-Revised and happiness levels as measured by the Authentic Happiness Inventory.

**Participants and Setting**

Survey participants included college professors at member institutions of Indiana Campus Compact. Indiana Campus Compact focuses on building relationships and providing resources on civic engagement for faculty, staff, and students at 42 institutions within the state of Indiana (Indiana Campus Compact, 2015). The faculty from Indiana Campus Compact member institutions were sampled due to the geographical proximity to the researcher as well as the willingness of Indiana Campus Compact to email survey requests to connections at campuses within the state. The inclusion of Indiana Campus Compact in the survey distribution increased credibility and reduced the likelihood of a small sample size. Convenience samples were from a defined population which was accessible to study and readily available (Gall et al., 2007). Although random sampling would have been preferable, it is common to use convenience
samples in educational research due to accessibility of the research pool (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2015; Lochmiller & Lester, 2017).

For a survey design, it was suggested for researchers to obtain a minimum sample of 100 participants for major subgroups and 20-50 for minor subgroups (Gall et al., 2007). To be able to analyze the variables adequately, the researcher would have preferred a sample of 400 individuals; however, the sample of 71 participants provided enough participants to ensure a statistically valid and reliable study (Warner, 2013). The sample size did not produce enough participants for people with high happiness levels, low happiness levels, high servant leadership scores, and low servant leadership scores to be compared. A sample size of 400 would have helped to account for sampling errors and incomplete surveys (Gall et al., 2007).

The sample size was greater than 66 and exceeded the minimum number of participants required for a medium effect size of .7 at the .05 alpha level (Gall et al., 2007). Moreover, the sample was larger than the \( n = 30 \) standard cited by authoritative statistics texts needed for parametric statistical analysis (Field, 2013; Lind, Marchal, & Wathan, 2012; Vieira, 2017). The sample comprised the following:

- 23 males and 48 females;
- 43 individuals at institutions that support servant leadership, 9 individuals at institutions that do not support servant leadership, and 19 individuals at institutions where support of servant leadership was ranked as neutral;
- 19 individuals at private universities and 52 individuals at public universities;
- 26 full-time faculty (non-tenure track), 25 part-time adjunct faculty, and 15 full-time faculty (tenure-track), 4 other, and 1 contract employee;
• 62 White, 5 Black, 0 Hispanic, 1 Native American or American Indian, 1 Asian or Pacific Islander, and 1 Other; and
• 14 employees 30-39 years old, 16 employees ages 40-49, 19 employees ages 50-59, and 22 employees older than 60.

Using member institutions of Indiana Campus Compact provided feedback from faculty at a variety of institutions including both secular and religious schools. By including a variety of institutions within the state of Indiana, the results have greater generalizability for other states compared to the use of one college or university. By limiting the geographic area to one state and focusing only on higher education, the likelihood of participant demographics skewing the differences was decreased (Gall et al., 2007). Demographic differences including age, sex, role, and institutional support of servant leadership were evaluated to consider patterns which might have impacted data research to further decrease the possibility of skewed results.

Instrumentation

The Servant Leadership Profile-Revised located in Appendix B (Wong & Page, 2003) and the Authentic Happiness Inventory located in Appendix A (Peterson, 2005) were combined with demographic questions, and a survey was administered using SurveyMonkey®. Written permission was requested to use The Servant Leadership Profile-Revised (See Appendix C). Christopher Peterson, the author of the Authentic Happiness Inventory, passed away in 2012 (Heflin, 2012); consequently, the standard practice of being able to use surveys for academic purposes without permission was invoked (Gay & Airasian, 2003). To recruit survey participants, an email was sent to college professors connected with Indiana Campus Compact.

The Servant Leadership Profile-Revised.

A 99-question Servant Leadership Profile was originally developed to further evaluate
power and leadership dynamics related to servanthood (Page & Wong, 2000; Wong & Page, 2003). Using an extensive sample of more than 1,000 respondents, Page and Wong (2003) revised the Servant Leadership Profile and eliminated five of the original dimensions evaluated. Page and Wong’s revision led to the Servant Leadership Profile-Revised (Wong & Page, 2003) which includes 62 questions related to the seven dimensions of servant leadership. These dimensions include empowering others, humility, servanthood, participatory leadership, inspiring leadership, visionary leadership, and courageous leadership (Wong & Page, 2003).

The Servant Leadership Profile-Revised survey had an overall reliability score of 0.937 on a 12-factor scale (Page & Wong, 2000) with the individual reliability scores ranging from visionary leadership (0.569) to inspiring leadership (0.916) (Page & Wong, 2000). The assessment was later revised to include seven factors (Wong & Page, 2003). The validity of the instrument was tested by comparing the instrument to The Servant Leadership Questionnaire and the Organizational Leadership Assessment with relationships being the only category with an Alpha lower than .86 (Green, Rodriguez, Wheeler, & Baggerly-Hinojosa, 2015).

The instrument used a seven-point Likert scale that ranged from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. Responses were scored on a scale with 1 = Strongly Disagree, 4 = Undecided, and 7 = Strongly Agree labeled. The seven factors were scored separately in the following way:

- Factor 1 or Empowering and Developing Others included questions 16, 21, 23, 27, 31, 37, 38, 39, 42, 46, 48, 49, 53, 59, 61, and 62;
- Factor 2 was reverse scored to evaluate Vulnerability and Humility included questions 9, 14, 15, 18, 28, 29, 56, and 60;
- Factor 3 or Serving Others included questions 6, 17, 30, 44, 45, 47, 50, 51, 52, 57, and 58;
• Factor 4 or Open, Participatory Leadership included questions 2, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 34, 35, and 36;
• Factor 5 or Inspiring Leadership included questions 1, 13, 19, 20, 22, 25, and 26;
• Factor 6 or Visionary Leadership included questions 40, 41, 43, 54, and 55; and
• Factor 7 or Courageous Leadership included questions 3, 4, 24, 32, and 33.

Scales vary from 16-112 at the highest range with factor 1 to 7-35 at the lowest ranges with factors 6 and 7. The instrument was used in various studies (e.g., Pearson, 2013; Rohm, 2013; Malone, 2015).

The scores were calculated and interpreted based on information obtained after the assessment was administered using SurveyMonkey®. The researcher was responsible for tabulating the overall results for the individual assessments within the SurveyMonkey®. Data was exported from SurveyMonkey® and the individual scores were added together using an Excel document with one row of scores representing the answers for each question on the assessment and one column of scores representing each respondent. Individual scores were not evaluated for each of the individual factors due to the nature of correlation research; however, the overall combined score was evaluated.

**The Authentic Happiness Inventory**

The Authentic Happiness Inventory in Appendix A (Peterson, 2005) was developed as a result of research completed by Peterson and Seligman related to positive characteristics of human beings throughout history (Zabihi et al., 2014). The research completed by the team of Peterson and Seligman led to the development of the Steen Happiness Inventory, which was a 20-item self-report assessment related to happiness (Seligman, Steen, Park, & Peterson, 2005).
Peterson updated the instrument and developed a 24-item version of the assessment named the Authentic Happiness Inventory (Zabihi et al., 2014).

The version of the Authentic Happiness Inventory used for the study consisted of 20 items for self-reporting current happiness levels related to these items. The instrument was used in numerous studies (e.g., Finlay-Jones, Kane, & Rees, 2017; Ketabi, Tavakoli, & Ghadiri, 2014; Schiffirin & Nelson, 2010) and showed a high level of validity when compared to both the Satisfaction with Life Scale ($r=.76$, $p < .005$) and the Positive and Negative Affect Scale ($r=.82$, $p < .005$). Additionally, the Cronbach’s alpha was .92 with high test-retest reliability and a high level of internal consistency of .92 (Shepherd et al., 2015).

The purpose of the Authentic Happiness Inventory was to measure interpersonal relationships, a meaningful and purposeful life, pleasures and positive emotions, and engagement in life (Zabihi et al., 2014). All questions on the Authentic Happiness Inventory required participants to rank current factors related to happiness on a Likert scale, which includes a negative (1) to an extremely positive (5) response with no reverse scored items (Peterson, 2005; Shepherd et al., 2015; Zabihi, et al., 2014). Test scores range from 20 (extremely unhappy) to 120 (extremely happy) (Zabihi, et al., 2014).

The scores were calculated and interpreted based on information obtained after the assessment was administered using SurveyMonkey®. The researcher was responsible for tabulating the overall results of the individual assessments within SurveyMonkey®. Data were exported from SurveyMonkey®, and the individual scores were added together using an Excel document with one column of scores representing the answers for each question on the assessment and one row of scores representing each respondent.
Procedures

Initial approval for the current research study was obtained from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Liberty University. The two assessments were combined with questions about demographics of the sample into one SurveyMonkey®, an online survey and cloud-based data collection program. The research survey was electronically distributed to faculty at Indiana Campus Compact partner institutions. The way the survey was distributed resulted in a convenience sample from a defined population which was accessible to study and available (Gall et al., 2007). Although random sampling would have been preferable, it was appropriate to use convenience samples in educational research due to accessibility of the research pool (Gall et al., 2007; Gall et al., 2015, Lochmiller & Lester, 2016).

Upon approval from the IRB, a letter was sent to the Executive Director of Indiana Campus Compact formally requesting an email blast to participants within the program. The letter of request to Indiana Campus Compact is located in Appendix D. After IRB approval was obtained, the consent and recruitment paperwork were sent to college professors by Indiana Campus Compact (Appendix E). The letter explained the purpose of the study, a confidentiality clause, and implied permission to use the data after participants completed the SurveyMonkey® survey.

Professors were sent the initial letter with the survey description and SurveyMonkey® link (located in Appendix E) on November 6, 2017. Follow-up emails were sent on November 13, 2017, and November 20, 2017. A window of approximately three weeks was available for people to complete the survey. Once the data collection window closed on November 23, 2017, survey data were exported into an Excel spreadsheet from the SurveyMonkey® platform. The demographics were connected to the individual responses to the assessment questions with
university name removed from individual responses due to it being potentially identifiable information. All data were input into the IBM Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) and analyzed.

**Data Analysis**

Data were collected electronically via a survey on SurveyMonkey® before being exported into Excel and entered into SPSS. Descriptive statistics were reviewed for the demographics of the sample population including age, biological sex, type of institution, type of institutional role, and institutional support of servant leadership. The descriptive statistics for the overall happiness score based on the Authentic Happiness Inventory and the servant leadership score based on the Servant Leadership Profile-Revised were also evaluated. A box-and-whisker plot was used to check for outliers and any scores not falling within +/- three standard deviations of the mean were marked for further evaluation (Warner, 2013). Because the outliers might give additional insight into the relationship between authentic happiness and servant leadership, it was important to evaluate why the scores were outliers.

Correlation values range from +1.0 for a perfect positive correlation to -1.0 for a perfect negative correlation (Field, 2013). A negative correlation meant that variables moved in opposite directions, or had an inverse relationship, and a positive correlation meant that variables moved in the same direction, or had a direct relationship (Warner, 2013). Because the variables of authentic happiness and servant leadership were on a continuous scale, a bivariate Pearson’s $r$ correlation was initially proposed to evaluate the relationship between the predictor variable of servant leadership and the outcome variable of authentic happiness. The Pearson’s $r$ test was initially proposed because the strength of relationship between two quantitative variables was
assessed (Warner, 2013) and because Pearson’s $r$ has the smallest standard error level for bivariate correlation (Gall et al., 2007).

Despite Likert scales not meeting the requirement of true equal intervals (Warner, 2013), Pearson’s $r$ correlation is nonetheless standard to use for Likert scale assessments and has been shown to classify as interval-level for parametric statistical testing (Gay & Airasian, 2003; Harwell & Gatti, 2001; Velleman & Wilkinson, 1993). The assumptions test for Pearson’s $r$ would have been met if the predictor, or x variable, of servant leadership and the outcome, or y variable, of authentic happiness were both normally distributed and quantitative (Warner, 2013). Scatterplots were used to assess for linearity between the variables and to see if any significant outliers were present in the data. Independent observations were used with each x score being independent of other x scores and each y score being independent of other y scores (Warner, 2013). Normality of the data and outliers were also checked using a histogram to assess for normal distribution and the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to assess if the frequency distribution was not normal (Warner, 2013). To evaluate the assumption of bivariate outliers a scatterplot of the independent and dependent variables was used to evaluate extreme outliers.

After completing assumption testing, the data did not meet the qualifications of linearity and normality necessary for a Pearson’s $r$ correlation. Because assumptions were not met, a Spearman’s rho correlation was completed. Assumptions testing for the non-parametric statistics were completed including checking if the variables were ordinal level or higher and running a scatterplot matrix to assess the data for a monotonic relationship (Laerd Statistics, 2015). A 95% confidence interval with an alpha of .05 was used to evaluate the data and either reject or fail to reject the null hypothesis (Warner, 2013).
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

Overview

The purpose of this bivariate correlational study was to determine if a relationship existed between servant leadership and authentic happiness among faculty in a Midwestern state. To determine a potential relationship, faculty at Indiana Campus Compact institutions completed a survey containing demographic information as well as questions from the Servant Leadership Profile-Revised (Wong & Page, 2003) and the Authentic Happiness Inventory (Peterson, 2005). A link to the survey contained the consent form and IRB approval information (see Appendix F) and was sent to 148 individuals signed up for the Campus Liaisons’ listserv at Indiana Campus Compact to forward to other faculty resulting in a convenience sample (Gall et al., 2007).

Research Question

RQ1: Is there a relationship between Servant Leadership and Authentic Happiness in college professors?

Null Hypothesis

H01: There will be no statistically significant relationship between servant leadership as measured by the Servant Leadership Profile-Revised and happiness levels as measured by the Authentic Happiness Inventory.

Descriptive Statistics

Demographics of Sample

The consent form for the survey was approved by 106 participants. Of those 106 individuals, 71 completed the entire survey for a sample size of N = 71. From the group of participants completing the survey (N=71), 48 (67.6%) were female and 23 (32.4%) were male. As age increased, the number of participants in the study also increased with 14 (19.7%)
individuals in the 30-39 range, 16 (22.5%) in the 40-49 range, 19 (26.8%) in the 50-59 range, and 22 (31%) over the age of 60. Due to the level of education required for individuals to become college faculty, the number of participants increasing as age increased is self-evident (Stonebraker & Stone, 2015). Age of participants is reported in Table 1. In terms of ethnicity, 62 (87.3%) of the participants identified as White, five (7%) of participants identified as Black, and one (1.4%) participant identified in each of the following categories: Native American, Asian, and Other.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% of n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the respondents were either full-time faculty (non-tenure track) at 26 (36.6%) or part-time adjunct faculty at 25 (35.2%) with full-time faculty (tenure track) consisting of 15 (21.1%) individuals. Four (5.6%) participants defined the role as other and one (1.4%) participant self-identified as a contract employee. Of the participants completing the study, 19 (26.8%) worked at a private university and 52 (73.2%) worked at a public university.

When asked if the current employer supported servant leadership, 16 (22.5%) strongly agreed, 27 (38%) agreed, 19 (26.8%) were neutral, eight (11.3%) disagreed, and one (1.4%) strongly disagreed. The majority of individuals completing the survey picked strongly agree or agree for the question about institutional support. Because the faculty surveyed were members of Indiana Campus Compact member institutions and ICC focuses on providing universities with a
variety of resources related to civic engagement and servant leadership, the results align with the mission and focus of Indiana Campus Compact member institutions. Table 2 shows the Likert scale related to institutional support of servant leadership.

Table 2

*Institutional Support of Servant Leadership*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Agreement</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% of n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The demographic information showed the majority of the participants 43 (60.5%) either strongly agreed or agreed there was institutional support for servant leadership before completing the assessments. The assessment results were compared to assess the potential relationship between authentic happiness and servant leadership.

**Assessments for Data Collection**

Two assessments were used to collect data for the study. The Servant Leadership Profile-Revised developed by Wong and Page (2003) was used to assess if faculty could be classified as servant leaders. To assess authentic happiness levels of faculty, the Authentic Happiness Inventory developed by Peterson (2005) was utilized.

The Servant Leadership Profile-Revised (Wong & Page, 2003) contained 62 items related to seven characteristics of servant leadership. Items in the assessment were scored on a Likert scale by assigning one to “strongly disagree” to seven which indicated “strongly agree.” Six of the factors were regularly scored including Empowering and Developing Others, Serving Others,
Open Participatory Leadership, Inspiring Leadership, Visionary Leadership, and Courageous Leadership. Factor 2, which was determined by questions 9, 14, 15, 18, 28, 29, 56, and 60, was reverse scored to evaluate Vulnerability and Humility. In general, higher total scores meant someone was more likely to be a servant leader with a score above an average of 5.6 for each question, or 347 total points, meaning someone was a servant leader (Page & Wong, 2008).

The mean total for the Servant Leadership Profile-Revised was 367.87 with a median score of 374.00 and a mode of 371.00. The standard deviation for the Servant Leadership Profile-Revised was 34.14 with a range of scores from 199 to 417. The descriptive statistics for the Servant Leadership Profile-Revised are available in Table 3. The histogram for the variable of the Servant Leadership Profile-Revised is displayed in Figure 1.

Table 3
Descriptive Statistics of Servant Leadership-Profile Revised and Authentic Happiness Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Servant Leadership-Profile Revised</th>
<th>Authentic Happiness Inventory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>367.87</td>
<td>70.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>374.00</td>
<td>71.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>371.00</td>
<td>74.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>34.14</td>
<td>8.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>199-417</td>
<td>43-92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Authentic Happiness Inventory (Peterson, 2005) score was calculated by adding together the points for the 20 questions on the assessment. Scores were based on a five-point Likert scale with a negative (1) response to an extremely positive (5) response with no reverse scored items (Peterson, 2005; Shepherd et al., 2015; Zabihi et al., 2014). Total scores on the Authentic Happiness Inventory can range from 20 to 120 on the assessment with higher scores indicating a higher level of authentic happiness.
The mean total for the Authentic Happiness Inventory was 70.28 with a median score of 71.00 and a mode of 74.00. The standard deviation for the Authentic Happiness Inventory was 8.634 with a range of scores from 43 to 92. The descriptive statistics for the Authentic Happiness Inventory are available in Table 3. The histogram for the Authentic Happiness Inventory is displayed in Figure 2.

Results

After completing data collection and before uploading data into the IBM Statistical Analysis Software Package (SPSS), incomplete surveys were removed from the dataset. Eliminating incomplete data sets decreased the possibility of Type I and Type II errors (Warner, 2013). Assumption tests for Pearson’s r were completed in SPSS to evaluate if the predictor, or x variable, of servant leadership and the outcome, or y variable, of authentic happiness were both normally distributed and quantitative (Warner, 2013). The assumption testing included evaluating histograms, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, scatterplots, and a box-and-whisker plots, and p-p plots.

Assumption Testing for Pearson’s r

Normality of each variable was assessed using histograms and the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test because the sample was greater than 50. Although Likert-scale data does not represent exact equal differences, it is normal to use Pearson r to evaluate scores where true equal intervals do not exist (Warner, 2013) which includes the assessment scores collected via SurveyMonkey®. The histograms for the Happiness Inventory (Figure 2) and the Servant Leadership Profile-Revised (Figure 1) show the data are normally distributed with both histograms displaying a superimposed normal curve which allowed for the use of parametric statistics including correlation (Warner, 2013). The Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests for the Authentic Happiness
Inventory, \( p (71) = .106, \ p = .048, \) and for the Servant Leadership Profile-Revised, \( p (71) = .142, \ p = .001, \) showed neither score was significant and, therefore, the data met the requirements for a normal distribution (Field, 2013).

*Figure 1.* Histogram of servant-leadership.

[Histogram of servant-leadership]

*Figure 2.* Histogram of authentic happiness.

[Histogram of authentic happiness]
Linearity of the data was tested by reviewing the scatterplot in Figure 3 to evaluate the potential relationship between authentic happiness and servant leadership. The line of best fit on the scatterplot (Figure 3) shows a weak-to-moderate linear relationship between the variables of authentic happiness and servant leadership.

*Figure 3. Scatterplot of authentic happiness and servant leadership.*

The scatterplot shows four extreme outliers with one falling above the line of best fit and three falling below the line of best fit. Box-and-whisker plots (Figures 4 and 5) were also completed to assess the data for outliers. The box-and-whisker plot for the Authentic Happiness Inventory (Figure 4) showed four outliers on authentic happiness scores. The box-and-whisker plot for the Servant Leadership Profile-Revised (Figure 5) showed four outliers on servant leadership scores. P-P plots (Figures 6 and 7) were also assessed, and a curvilinear relationship was present for both authentic happiness and servant leadership.
Figure 4. Box and whisker plot authentic happiness.

Figure 5. Box and whisker plot servant leadership.
Figure 6. P-P plot for authentic happiness.

Figure 7. P-P plot for servant leadership.
After completing Pearson’s $r$ assumption tests for the data, both the criterion variable of authentic happiness and the predictor variable of servant leadership were not tenable. Based on the information obtained during the completion of assumption testing, the decision was made not to conduct a Pearson’s $r$ correlation with Spearman’s $\rho$ being the appropriate correlation to run for the data set (Warner, 2013). Outliers were kept in the data after running the Pearson $r$ assumption testing since scores from the assessments were self-reported and authentic happiness levels and propensity of individuals to follow servant leadership styles might vary drastically based on a variety of factors not being evaluated by the study. Two of the outliers scored extremely low on both authentic happiness and servant leadership levels which might be related to the potential relationship between the two factors. Additionally, non-parametric statistical analysis converts scores to ranks which eliminates the impact outliers have on test results (Warner, 2013).

**Assumption Testing for Spearman’s $\rho$**

When the strength of a relationship between two variables does not meet assumption testing for Pearson’s $r$ due to violations of linearity and normality, Spearman’s $\rho$ is an appropriate assessment (Warner, 2013). Non-parametric statistical analysis still requires specific assumptions to be met; however, the tests are not as robust for non-parametric statistics as for parametric statistics (Warner, 2013). The first assumption for Spearman’s $\rho$ requires variables to be measured at the ordinal level or higher (Laerd Statistics, 2015). The first assumption was met because both variables are scale-level variables. The second assumption was the existence of a monotonic relationship, which means as one variable increases, the other variable increases (Laerd Statistics, 2015). The relationship was assessed using a scatterplot matrix (Figure 8) which showed a monotonic relationship and a weak-to-moderate linear relationship existing
between the two variables. Because the variables passed the assumption testing for Spearman’s rho, this statistical analysis was used to determine the results of the study.

*Figure 8.* Scatterplot matrix of authentic happiness and servant leadership.

**Results**

**Null Hypothesis One**

H₀¹: There will be no statistically significant relationship between servant leadership as measured by the Servant Leadership Profile-Revised and happiness levels as measured by the Authentic Happiness Inventory.

Due to the assumptions of normality and linearity being violated, a Spearman’s rho was utilized to analyze the data. Performing the analysis allowed the researcher to determine the strength of a relationship between the predictor variable of servant leadership and the outcome variable of authentic happiness. College faculty (N=71) connected with Indiana Campus Compact member campuses participated in the study. Servant leadership scores were determined by scores from the Servant Leadership Profile-Revised (Wong & Page, 2003) and
authentic happiness scores were determined by scores from the Authentic Happiness Inventory (Peterson, 2005). Both assessments involved participants self-reporting scores on a Likert scale.

The results in the scatterplot matrix in Figure 8 suggested a weak-to-moderate positive relationship (Warner, 2013) between the scores on the Servant Leadership Profile-Revised (Wong & Page, 2003) and the Servant Leadership Inventory (Peterson, 2005). A weak-to-moderate positive linear relationship indicates authentic happiness levels increase slightly as servant leadership scores increase. Because the direction of the relationship was known, a one-tail Spearman’s rho was completed (Field, 2013). There was a weak-to-moderate positive, statistically significant correlation, $p(71) = .203, p = .045$, between the variables of authentic happiness and servant leadership (See Table 4). Null hypothesis one was rejected.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Servant Leadership Profile-Revised</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.203*</td>
<td>367.87</td>
<td>34.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Authentic Happiness Inventory</td>
<td>.203*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>70.28</td>
<td>8.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p = .045*
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS

Overview

To investigate the relationship between servant leadership and authentic happiness, faculty from Indiana Campus Compact member institutions were administered the Servant Leadership Profile-Revised (Wong & Page, 2003) and the Authentic Happiness Inventory (Peterson, 2005) via SurveyMonkey®. On the survey, participants were also asked demographic questions related to age, biological sex, race, role at the university, type of institution, and if servant leadership was supported by the university. In the final chapter, the discussion, implications, limitations, and recommendations for future research serve to explain the meaning behind the data analysis of Chapter Four and how that analysis connects to the broader research literature.

Discussion

The research study built upon the initial knowledge base related to the relationship between the variable of servant leadership and authentic happiness. With initial results showing a weak to moderate positive relationship between the variables of authentic happiness and servant leadership, it was worth evaluating the relationship more in depth through future research. The discussion portion of the study explains the results found during the study as well as the value of those results compared to other research within the fields of authentic happiness and servant leadership. Additionally, this section builds a framework for the importance of completing further research related to the variables of authentic happiness and servant leadership.

The purpose of the descriptive, correlational study was to evaluate the relationship between the servant leadership levels and the authentic happiness levels of college faculty in a
Midwestern state drawn from a convenience sample of faculty connected with Indiana Campus Compact. The study consisted of one research question and one null hypothesis. **RQ1:** Is there a relationship between Servant Leadership and Authentic Happiness in college professors? **H₀₁:** There will be no statistically significant relationship between servant leadership as measured by the Servant Leadership Profile-Revised and happiness levels as measured by the Authentic Happiness Inventory.

Although the researcher was initially going to utilize a Pearson’s *r* for the correlational study, the assumptions tests for Pearson’s *r* showed a violation of linearity and normality (Warner, 2013). Due to these violations discovered during assumptions testing, a Spearman’s *rho* correlation was completed. The Spearman’s *rho* correlational analysis was conducted in SPSS with a *p*-value of .045 and a *p* of .203. Because the *p*-value of .045 was less than .05, the correlation was statistically significant (Warner, 2013). Based on the Spearman’s *rho* correlation, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis meaning a weak to moderate positive relationship existed between levels of servant leadership and levels of authentic happiness in college faculty in a Midwestern state.

Happiness theory discusses the combination of net pleasure, obtaining what you want, and achieving worthwhile results (Royzman & Seligman, 2003; Seligman, 2002) whereas servant leadership focuses on putting the follower first (Greenleaf, 1970). Although putting the needs of followers first (Greenleaf, 1970) might help educators to achieve worthwhile results (Royzman & Seligman, 2003; Seligman, 2002), there is a chance the process might not result in educators obtaining the desired outcomes (Royzman & Seligman, 2003; Seligman, 2002). Additionally, net pleasure (Royzman & Seligman, 2003; Seligman, 2002) might vary for individuals based on a variety of different constraints within the classroom as well as potential
conflicts within the individual educator’s personal and professional life. Because the research study was correlational in nature, cause and effect relationships cannot be determined (Gall et al., 2007); however, additional research might evaluate more about classroom environment, faculty self-identification as a servant leader, and how students view the leadership style of the faculty member.

A positive relationship between servant leadership and authentic happiness was found to exist. Authentic happiness includes emotions such as confidence, contentment, faith, hope, optimism, pride, satisfaction, and trust (Seligman, 2002). Servant leadership embodies the traits of caring for others, developing others, empowering others, goalsetting, humility, integrity, leading, modeling, servanthood, shared decision-making, team-building, and visioning (Page & Wong, 2000). Servant leadership and authentic happiness theories contain some overlapping concepts which might explain the weak to moderate positive relationship between the two variables. In particular, six core virtues form a cross-cultural list that positive psychologists use to guide research (Seligman, 2000). The inventory of virtues includes (a) courage; (b) wisdom and knowledge; (c) love and humanity; (d) temperance; (e) justice; and (f) spirituality and transcendence (Seligman, 2000). The concepts of (a) love (Patterson, 2003); (b) justice (Hicks et. al, 2013); and (c) transcendental spirituality (Van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2010) are underlying traits related to both servant leadership and positive psychology. With authentic happiness comprising part of the positive psychology movement (Achor, 2010), it is understandable a positive correlation between the variables of authentic happiness and servant leadership exists.

Because of the belief both the words serve and lead have negative connotations (Greenleaf, 1970), happiness levels of educators utilizing a servant leadership style could
potentially be impacted in a negative manner. A weak to moderate positive correlation between happiness levels of faculty members and the tendency to be a servant leader might improve the negative connotation related to serving followers. After all, if putting the needs of followers first (Greenleaf, 1970) might ultimately lead to a higher level of authentic happiness, it is possible educators might be more willing to embrace a servant leader style within the classroom. Because student engagement levels increase (Noland & Richards, 2015) and students feel a stronger connection to educators utilizing a servant leadership methodology in the classroom (Hays, 2008), results from the study might be utilized to adjust teaching styles within the college classroom. A change in teaching styles might improve the overall classroom environment, as a study by Eryilmaz (2014) found when students viewed educators as unhappy the faculty were seen as lacking classroom management skills and behaving in a narcissistic, or self-serving, manner.

Although limited past studies related to the nascent and exploratory research topic exist, one study did evaluate various virtuous leadership styles, such as servant leadership, and happiness level (Wang & Hackett, 2016). The study found a positive relationship between virtuous leadership and happiness and life satisfaction levels of both leaders and followers (Wang & Hackett, 2016). Another study looked at the impact of positive behaviors, including those utilized by servant leaders, creating potential negative results for those leaders exhibiting positive qualities (Koopman et al., 2016). By utilizing positive behaviors at work which are supportive of others, some areas of well-being were found to be impacted negatively including emotionally exhausted employees (Koopman et al., 2016) which might lead to lower authentic happiness scores. The combined results of the Koopman et al. (2016) and Wang & Hackett
(2016) studies align with the weak to moderate positive correlation found between the variables of servant leadership and authentic happiness in this research study.

Another issue with servant leadership occurs with the idea of selflessness. When people are asked to consider the needs of others over the needs of self, concern might arise. With servant leadership, people put the followers first. By taking action and following a servant leader philosophy, self-interests might need to be sacrificed (Crippen, 2009), workplace support might not be present (Savage-Austin & Honeycutt, 2011), and the leader might be viewed as lacking authority (Douglas, 2014). These concerns must be addressed by administrators trying to encourage educators to follow a servant leadership model in the classroom.

During the data collection period, information was also gathered about perceived institutional support of servant leadership. Although these results were self-reported and might be biased by the experiences of individual faculty, perception is often reality when it comes to projects supported by the university. Of the 71 respondents, 60.6% of the respondents either agreed or strongly agreed to institutional support of servant leadership whereas only 12.7% of the respondents either disagreed or strongly disagreed about the level of institutional support of servant leadership (See Table 2). Since those in non-supportive environments might find practicing servant leadership to be more of a risk (Savage-Austin & Honeycutt, 2011), it is possible the relationship between authentic happiness levels of those in non-supportive environments would be lower than authentic happiness levels of those in supportive environments. On the other hand, those faculty identifying as servant leaders and having institutional support, might find increased authentic happiness due to the ability to use personal strengths in the chosen career field of education (Seligman, 2002).
Based on the results of the study, it is possible embracing the style of a servant leader might lead to increased authentic happiness levels for faculty. Even if the authentic happiness levels for faculty do not increase, it is important to consider the value of putting followers first (Greenleaf, 1970) within the college classroom. With essentially no improvement in retention rates over the past 50 years (Digest, 2015; Tinto, 2012) and the loss of a student costing universities approximately $14,000-17,000 (O’Keefe, 2013), it is more important than ever for colleges to evaluate what changes might be beneficial for student achievement. With student-centric behaviors such as the ones utilized by servant leaders leading to lower stress levels for students (Eagan & Garvey, 2015; Noland & Richards, 2015), it is important to continue to research servant leadership and the impact it might have on authentic happiness levels of faculty.

Implications

The study developed an initial framework to research the potential impact utilizing servant leadership practices might have on authentic happiness levels of individuals. Because no prior research had been completed before utilizing both the Authentic Happiness Inventory (Peterson, 2005) and the Servant Leadership Profile-Revised (Wong & Page, 2003), the study added to the base of knowledge related to servant leadership theory and authentic happiness theory by building a correlational study between those two variables. The results of the study showed a weak-to-moderate positive correlation between servant leadership and authentic happiness, which means that as servant leadership increases, so does authentic happiness. Although the correlation between the variables was not strong for the study, the result of a positive relationship could be utilized as a baseline for further research. With student engagement increasing in servant-led environments (Noland & Richards, 2015) and students preferring educators who exhibit happiness behaviors (Eryilmaz, 2014), the topic would be
valuable to research further. This topic is especially relevant with Moody recently downgrading the outlook for the field of higher education from stable to negative (Harris, 2017).

Although authentic happiness levels of faculty might not increase based on utilizing servant leadership practices, research shows following a servant leader philosophy does impact students in a positive manner. Paul and Fitzpatrick (2015) found a significant positive relationship between servant leadership characteristics and student satisfaction with advising. In the classroom environment, teaching in the capacity of a servant increased learning (Noland & Richards, 2015). Servant teaching also increased the student’s feelings of connection to the educator (Hays, 2008). As a servant leader, the educator is better equipped to be present in the moment and create a big picture view of the classroom experience (Crippen, 2010). Even if authentic happiness levels of all educators do not increase through the use of a servant leadership methodology, Greenleaf’s paradigm of servant leadership might serve as a valuable guide for instruction with the move toward experimental teaching and servant learning in higher education (Douglas, 2014). Therefore, developing training for faculty and administrators about servant leadership within the classroom would be valuable.

Kuh et al. (2010) found faculty development impacts student persistence and academic achievement rates. Additionally, by being able to role model positive behaviors and emotional intelligence, faculty might be able to influence the behavior of students in challenging situations (Rebore, 2014) and help students grow as passionate and dedicated leaders (Jones, 1995). Because servant leadership and the concept of putting followers first (Greenleaf, 1970) might be a different mindset or approach to education for faculty to embrace, it is important for colleges and universities to provide training and development opportunities to help faculty build a servant led classroom.
The training provided for educators would likely vary based on a variety of different factors including the size of the institution, institutional and departmental support of servant leadership practices, and make-up of the faculty including information about full-time versus adjunct faculty. Additionally, the willingness of faculty to embrace servant leadership practices would be important to consider since some faculty might need additional information about the benefits of servant leadership in the classroom. It might be beneficial to have faculty read Greenleaf’s books *The Servant as Leader* (1970) and *Teacher as Servant: A Parable* (1979) to form a framework for understanding servant leadership. Books might be discussed in full-time faculty meetings and adjunct faculty could be invited to attend those meetings. Full-time faculty could also be encouraged to learn the practices of servant leadership first before mentoring adjunct faculty. Because it might be a shift in mindset for some faculty, learning to put the follower first (Greenleaf, 1970) might be a learning process for some and the trainer needs to utilize the same compassion of follower first (Greenleaf, 1970) with the faculty.

Crippen (2009, p. 33) wrote, “A servant-leader wants to make a difference for others and to have an impact on their lives. They will sacrifice their own self-interests for the sake of others.” Within the classroom environment, it is important for the faculty member to address information in a manner which works for the students. Over the years, the college classroom environment has changed. More students were attending college with an increase of approximately 5.7 million students since 2000 (U.S. Department of Education, 2014); however, enrollment at colleges and universities declined for the fourth year in a row (Marcus, 2015). With attrition rates hovering between 30-50% at a cost of approximately $14,000-17,000 per student (O’Keefe, 2013), the classroom environment needs to also adjust. With Moody downgrading the outlook for the field of higher education from stable to negative (Harris, 2017),
something needs to change to improve long-term growth in the industry of higher education. Although limited research exists about the impact classroom facilitation style has on retention rates with no current research on the use of servant leadership in the classroom and retention rates at colleges and universities, switching to a servant leadership philosophy in the classroom and putting the follower first (Greenleaf, 1970) might be the change higher education needs to rebound to a stable industry.

**Limitations**

Several weaknesses can be identified in the study. Although 106 people consented to the study, only 71 individuals finished the SurveyMonkey® assessment with 13 potential participants not being members of Indiana Campus Compact institutions and the other 21 not answering all of the questions in the survey. Anytime fewer people than the number surveyed complete an instrument or questionnaire, non-response bias is present and likely prominent (Leedy & Ormrod, 2016). All one can analyze and report with confidence are the perspectives of those who completed the survey, not the 35 who did not; thus, the validity and reliability of the results from survey research are diminished anytime non-responses comprise even part of the data collection and analysis protocol. Adjusting survey length might help decrease the level of non-response bias with people reporting a preferred survey length of ten minutes or less (Revilla & Ochoa, 2017).

Non-response bias was just one issue with the allocated responses. Of the usable data, the majority (67.2%) of the participants were white females, meaning the data might not accurately represent the experiences of ethnic minorities and males. On a national level 73% of faculty are white and 49% of faculty are women (Flaherty, 2016), meaning females might actually be overrepresented in the sample for this study. A significant problem with social
science research, in general, and educational research, in particular, is the spate of individual research studies conducted that leaves out crucial constituents or demographic groups (Gall et al., 2015). Not allowing or having all voices heard often creates one-sided pictures of reality, with essential perspectives silenced, not intentionally but because of sampling error. To prevent this error, a stratified random sample could be used (Warner, 2013).

Other limitations with the study resulted from the data analysis process. One of the weaknesses with correlational research is that cause-and-effect relationships cannot be determined (Gall et al., 2007). Although experimental research in education is rare and not always desirable (Thomas, 2016), experimental research is the only kind of inquiry that allows researchers to claim, with confidence, that one variable causes another. Any time correlational research is used, one is left with at least the post-hoc conundrum: Which came first: Servant Leadership or Authentic Happiness?

Another limitation with the study was the inability to determine linearity and normality of the statistical data, this resulted in the use of the non-parametric Spearman’s rho instead of the parametric Pearson’s r for the data analysis. Because outliers existed in the dataset and the sample size (N=71) was fairly small, the use of Spearman’s rho decreased the impact extreme outliers had within the data set because the variables were ranked (Field, 2013). Although a Spearman’s rho statistical analysis was not the one initially planned for the study, it is common for Spearman’s rho to replace Pearson’s r when assumption testing shows abnormality in the data set (Field, 2013). With the nature of the study and the lack of predictability and consistency with human subjects, it was not surprising the data lacked linearity and normality.

Additionally, self-reported scores on authentic happiness could potentially vary based on a variety of human factors a research study would not be able to control including current level
of stress and what types of situations someone might be currently facing in life and the workplace. One research study found faculty reported higher job satisfaction levels as rank increased at the university and opportunities to publish research occurred (Hesli & Lee, 2013). Faculty might have also been happier due to Thanksgiving break falling at the end of the data collection period or more stressed out due to the end of the semester approaching with grading deadlines looming. Because the study was based on a survey which provided self-reported data from one point in time (Kridel, 2010), it is difficult to know if faculty might be happier if surveyed at a different point in the year.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Because the variables of servant leadership and authentic happiness have not been researched together before this study, further research would be beneficial to increase the body of knowledge for the field of education. Suggestions for future research include:

1. Recreate the study with a larger sample size and an evaluation of additional demographic information including education level, number of years taught, and subject taught.

2. Create an experimental design study where authentic happiness levels are evaluated before and after having faculty utilize servant leadership practices for a semester.

3. Absent an experimental design, which might be difficult to organize or get approved, use a more sophisticated multivariable analysis such as multiple regression or structural equation modeling to determine relationships with control variables or causal paths between or among multiple variables.
4. Evaluate the relationship between servant leadership and authentic happiness levels in a variety of different groups inclined to use servant leadership including business leaders and clergy.

5. Study the impact having a self-identified servant leader has on the authentic happiness levels of students enrolled in the course.

6. Explore authentic happiness levels and servant leadership by completing case study research with faculty utilizing servant teaching practices in the classroom.

7. Collect servant leadership scores at one point in time and complete a long-term study to evaluate happiness levels of faculty at various points during the academic year.

8. Evaluate the impact servant leadership within the classroom has on the retention and attrition rates at the university level using a combination of case study and longitudinal research.

**Conclusion**

After completing the research for this study, a weak-to-moderate correlation was found between servant leadership and authentic happiness among college faculty in a Midwestern state. Although the study had some limitations, the researcher was able to fill a gap in the research related to servant leadership and authentic happiness. To build knowledge in this area of research, it is important to continue completing research utilizing these two variables as well as adding in additional variables related to how servant leadership impacts retention rates. Additional research might help college administrators and college faculty to build an understanding of additional steps to complete to increase overall retention rates of college students.
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APPENDIX A

Authentic Happiness Inventory

© Christopher Peterson, 2005

A copy of the Authentic Happiness Inventory can be obtained by signing up for an account at the following website:  https://www.authentichappiness.sas.upenn.edu/testcenter

1. Group #1
   - I feel like a failure.
   - I do not feel like a winner.
   - I feel like I have succeeded more than most people.
   - As I look back on my life, all I see are victories.
   - I feel I am extraordinarily successful.

2. Group #2
   - I am usually in a bad mood.
   - I am usually in a neutral mood.
   - I am usually in a good mood.
   - I am usually in a great mood.
   - I am usually in an unbelievably great mood.

3. Group #3
When I am working, I pay more attention to what is going on around me than to what I am doing.

When I am working, I pay as much attention to what is going on around me as to what I am doing.

When I am working, I pay more attention to what I am doing than to what is going on around me.

When I am working, I rarely notice what is going on around me.

When I am working, I pay so much attention to what I am doing that the outside world practically ceases to exist.

Group #4

My life does not have any purpose or meaning.

I do not know the purpose or meaning of my life.

I have a hint about the purpose in my life.

I have a pretty good idea about the purpose or meaning of my life.

I have a very clear idea about the purpose or meaning of my life.

Group #5

I rarely get what I want.

Sometimes, I get what I want, and sometimes not.

Somewhat more often than not, I get what I want.

I usually get what I want.

I always get what I want.

Group #6

I have sorrow in my life.
I have neither sorrow nor joy in my life.
I have more joy than sorrow in my life.
I have much more joy than sorrow in my life.
My life is filled with joy.

Most of the time I feel bored.
Most of the time I feel neither bored nor interested in what I am doing.
Most of the time I feel interested in what I am doing.
Most of the time I feel quite interested in what I am doing.

I feel cut off from other people.
I feel neither close to nor cut off from other people.
I feel close to friends and family members.
I feel close to most people, even if I do not know them well.
I feel close to everyone in the world.

By objective standards, I do poorly.
By objective standards, I do neither well nor poorly.
By objective standards, I do rather well.
By objective standards, I do quite well.
By objective standards, I do amazingly well.
106

I am ashamed of myself.
I am not ashamed of myself.
I am proud of myself.
I am very proud of myself.
I am extraordinarily proud of myself.

Group #11
Time passes slowly during most of the things I do.
Time passes quickly during some of the things that I do and slowly for other things.
Time passes quickly during most of the things that I do.
Time passes quickly during all of the things that I do.
Time passes so quickly during all of the things that I do that I do not even notice it.

Group #12
In the grand scheme of things, my existence may hurt the world.
My existence neither helps nor hurts the world.
My existence has a small but positive effect on the world.
My existence makes the world a better place.
My existence has a lasting, large, and positive impact on the world.

Group #13
I do not do most things very well.
I do okay at most things I am doing.
I do well at some things I am doing.
I do well at most things I am doing.
I do really well at whatever I am doing.
14. Group #14
I have little or no enthusiasm.
My enthusiasm level is neither high nor low.
I have a good amount of enthusiasm.
I feel enthusiastic doing almost everything.
I have so much enthusiasm that I feel I can do most anything.

15. Group #15
I do not like my work (paid or unpaid).
I feel neutral about my work.
For the most part, I like my work.
I really like my work.
I truly love my work.

16. Group #16
I am pessimistic about the future.
I am neither optimistic or pessimistic about the future.
I feel somewhat optimistic about the future.
I feel quite optimistic about the future.
I feel extraordinarily optimistic about the future.

17. Group #17
I have accomplished little in life.
I have accomplished no more in life than most people.
I have accomplished somewhat more in life than most people.
I have accomplished more in life than most people.
I have accomplished a great deal more in my life than most people.

18. Group #18
I am unhappy with myself.
I am neither happy nor unhappy with myself—
I am neutral.
I am happy with myself.
I am very happy with myself.
I could not be any happier with myself.

19. Group #19
My skills are never challenged by the situations I encounter.
My skills are occasionally challenged by the situations I encounter.
My skills are sometimes challenged by the situations I encounter.
My skills are often challenged by the situations I encounter.
My skills are always challenged by the situations I encounter.

20. Group #20
I spend all of my time doing things that are unimportant.
I spend a lot of time doing things that are neither important nor unimportant.
I spend some of my time every day doing things that are important.
I spend most of my time every day doing things that are important.
I spend practically every moment every day doing things that are important.
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A copy of the Servant Leadership Profile-Revised can be obtained by visiting the following website: http://www.drpaulwong.com/documents/wong-scales/servant-leadership-profile-revised.pdf
2. I listen actively and receptively to what others have to say, even when they disagree with me.

3. I practice plain talking—I mean what I say and say what I mean.

4. I always keep my promises and commitments to others.

5. I grant all my workers a fair amount of responsibility and latitude in carrying out their tasks.

6. I am genuine and honest with people, even when such transparency is politically unwise.

7. I am willing to accept other people's ideas, whenever they are better than mine.

8. I promote tolerance, kindness, and honesty in the workplace.

9. To be a leader, I should be front and center in every function in which I am involved.

10. I create a climate of trust and openness to facilitate participation in decision making.

11. My leadership effectiveness is improved through empowering others.

12. I want to build trust through honesty and empathy.

13. I am able to bring out the best in others.

14. I want to make sure that everyone follows orders without questioning my authority.

15. As a leader, my name must be as associated with every initiative.

16. I consistently delegate responsibility to others and empower them to do their job.

17. I seek to serve rather than be served.
To be a strong leader, I need to have the power to do whatever I want without being questioned.

I am able to inspire others with my enthusiasm and confidence in what can be accomplished.

I am able to transform an ordinary group of individuals into a winning team.

I try to remove all organizational barriers so that others can freely participate in decision-making.

I devote a lot of energy to promoting trust, mutual understanding and team spirit.

I derive a great deal of satisfaction in helping others succeed.

I have the moral courage to do the right thing, even when it hurts me politically.

I am able to rally people around me and inspire them to achieve a common goal.

I am able to present a vision that is readily and enthusiastically embraced by others.

I invest considerable time and energy in helping others overcome their weaknesses and develop their potential.

I want to have the final say on everything, even areas where I don’t have the competence.

I don’t want to share power with others, because they may use it against me.

I practice what I preach.

I am willing to risk mistakes by empowering others to “carry the ball.”
1. I have the courage to assume full responsibility for my mistakes and acknowledge my own limitations.

2. I have the courage and determination to do what is right in spite of difficulty or opposition.

3. Whenever possible, I give credits to others.

4. I am willing to share my power and authority with others in the decision making process.

5. I genuinely care about the welfare of people working with me.

6. I invest considerable time and energy equipping others.

7. I make it a high priority to cultivate good relationships among group members.

8. I am always looking for hidden talents in my workers.

9. My leadership is based on a strong sense of mission.

10. I am able to articulate a clear sense of purpose and direction for my organization's future.

11. My leadership contributes to my employees'/colleague's personal growth.

12. I have a good understanding of what is happening inside the organization.

13. I set an example of placing group interests above self-interests.

14. I work for the best interests of others rather than self-interests.

15. I consistently appreciate, recognize, and encourage the work of others.

16. I always place team success above personal success.

17. I willingly share my power with others, but I do not abdicate my authority and responsibility.

18. I consistently appreciate and validate others for their contributions.
When I serve others, I do not expect any return.

I am willing to make personal sacrifices in serving others.

I regularly celebrate special occasions and events to foster a group spirit.

I consistently encourage others to take initiative.

I am usually dissatisfied with the status quo and know how things can be improved.

I take proactive actions rather than waiting for events to happen to me.

To be a strong leader, I need to keep all my subordinates under control.

I find enjoyment in serving others in whatever role or capacity.

I have a heart to serve others.

I have great satisfaction in bringing out the best in others.

It is important that I am seen as superior to my subordinates in everything.

I often identify talented people and give them opportunities to grow and shine.

My ambition focuses on finding better ways of serving others and making them successful.
Factor 7: 3, 4, 24, 32, 33

Factor 1: Empowering and developing others

Factor 2: Power and pride (Vulnerability and humility, if scored in the reverse)

Factor 3: Serving others

Factor 4: Open, participatory leadership

Factor 5: Inspiring leadership

Factor 6: Visionary leadership

Factor 7: Courageous leadership (Integrity and authenticity)
Statement of Consent: I have read and understood the statement of consent form emailed to me. I have asked questions and have received answers. I consent to participate in the study.

(NOTE: DO NOT AGREE TO PARTICIPATE UNLESS IRB APPROVAL INFORMATION WITH CURRENT DATES HAS BEEN ADDED TO THIS DOCUMENT.)

Please click on the button below to confirm your willingness to participate in the study.

○ Proceed to Survey
Page 2—Survey Qualification Page

2. Do you teach at least one college course each year at an Indiana Campus Compact member institution?

Member institutions of Indiana Campus Compact include:
Anderson University
Ball State University
Butler University
Calumet College of St. Joseph
DePauw University
Hanover College
Franklin College
Indiana State University
Indiana University
Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana
Marian University
Purdue University
Saint Mary’s College
Taylor University
University of Indianapolis
University of Notre Dame
University of Southern Indiana
Valparaiso University

- Yes (Proceed to Demographics)
- No (Proceed to Disqualification)
Part 3—Demographics

3. What is your gender?
   Male
   Female
   Other

4. What is your age?
   18-19
   20-29
   30-39
   40-49
   50-59
   60 and Over

5. Which of the following most adequately describes your role as a Faculty member?
   Part-Time Adjunct Faculty
   Full-Time Adjunct Faculty
   Full-Time Faculty (Tenure Track)
   Full-Time Faculty (Non-Tenure Track)
   Contract Employee
   Other

6. My ethnicity is:
   White
   Black
   Hispanic
   Native American or American Indian
   Asian or Pacific Islander
   Other

7. I am employed by a:
   Private University
   Public University

8. My institution supports servant leadership.
   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Neutral
   Disagree
   Strongly Disagree
Leadership matters a great deal in the success or failure of any organization. This instrument was designed to measure both positive and negative leadership characteristics. Please use the following scale to indicate your agreement or disagreement with each of the statements in describing your own attitudes and practices as a leader. If you have not held any leadership position in an organization, then answer the questions as if you were in a position of authority and responsibility. There are no right or wrong answers. Simply rate each question in terms of what you really believe or normally do in leadership situations.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly Disagree Undecided Strongly Agree

For example, if you strongly agree, you may circle 7, if you mildly disagree, you may circle 3. If you are undecided, circle 4, but use this category sparingly.

1. To inspire team spirit, I communicate enthusiasm and confidence.
2. I listen actively and receptively to what others have to say, even when they disagree with me.
4. I always keep my promises and commitments to others.
I grant all my workers a fair amount of responsibility and latitude in carrying out their tasks.

I am genuine and honest with people, even when such transparency is politically unwise.

I am willing to accept other people's ideas, whenever they are better than mine.

I promote tolerance, kindness, and honesty in the workplace.

To be a leader, I should be front and center in every function in which I am involved.

I create a climate of trust and openness to facilitate participation in decision making.

My leadership effectiveness is improved through empowering others.

I want to build trust through honesty and empathy.

I am able to bring out the best in others.

I want to make sure that everyone follows orders without questioning my authority.

As a leader, my name must be associated with every initiative.

I consistently delegate responsibility to others and empower them to do their job.

I seek to serve rather than be served.

To be a strong leader, I need to have the power to do whatever I want without being questioned.

I am able to inspire others with my enthusiasm and confidence in what can be accomplished.
I am able to transform an ordinary group of individuals into a winning team.

I try to remove all organizational barriers so that others can freely participate in decision-making.

I devote a lot of energy to promoting trust, mutual understanding and team spirit.

I derive a great deal of satisfaction in helping others succeed.

I have the moral courage to do the right thing, even when it hurts me politically.

I am able to rally people around me and inspire them to achieve a common goal.

I am able to present a vision that is readily and enthusiastically embraced by others.

I invest considerable time and energy in helping others overcome their weaknesses and develop their potential.

I want to have the final say on everything, even areas where I don’t have the competence.

I don’t want to share power with others, because they may use it against me.

I practice what I preach.

I am willing to risk mistakes by empowering others to “carry the ball.”

I have the courage to assume full responsibility for my mistakes and acknowledge my own limitations.

I have the courage and determination to do what is right in spite of difficulty or opposition.
Whenever possible, I give credit to others.

I am willing to share my power and authority with others in the decision making process.

I genuinely care about the welfare of people working with me.

I invest considerable time and energy equipping others.

I make it a high priority to cultivate good relationships among group members.

I am always looking for hidden talents in my workers.

My leadership is based on a strong sense of mission.

I am able to articulate a clear sense of purpose and direction for my organization's future.

My leadership contributes to my employees'/colleague's personal growth.

I have a good understanding of what is happening inside the organization.

I set an example of placing group interests above self-interests.

I work for the best interests of others rather than self.

I consistently appreciate, recognize, and encourage the work of others.

I always place team success above personal success.

I willingly share my power with others, but I do not abdicate my authority and responsibility.

I consistently appreciate and validate others for their contributions.

When I serve others, I do not expect any return.

I am willing to make personal sacrifices in serving others.

I regularly celebrate special occasions and events to foster a group spirit.

I consistently encourage others to take initiative.
I am usually dissatisfied with the status quo and know how things can be improved.

I take proactive actions rather than waiting for events to happen to me.

To be a strong leader, I need to keep all my subordinates under control.

I find enjoyment in serving others in whatever role or capacity.

I have a heart to serve others.

I have great satisfaction in bringing out the best in others.

It is important that I am seen as superior to my subordinates in everything.

I often identify talented people and give them opportunities to grow and shine.

My ambition focuses on finding better ways of serving others and making them successful.
A copy of the Authentic Happiness Inventory can be obtained by signing up for an account at the following website: https://www.authentichappiness.sas.upenn.edu/testcenter

21. Group #1
   I feel like a failure.
   I do not feel like a winner.
   I feel like I have succeeded more than most people.
   As I look back on my life, all I see are victories.
   I feel I am extraordinarily successful.

22. Group #2
   I am usually in a bad mood.
   I am usually in a neutral mood.
   I am usually in a good mood.
   I am usually in a great mood.
   I am usually in an unbelievably great mood.

23. Group #3
When I am working, I pay more attention to what is going on around me than to what I am doing.

When I am working, I pay as much attention to what is going on around me as to what I am doing.

When I am working, I pay more attention to what I am doing than to what is going on around me.

When I am working, I rarely notice what is going on around me.

When I am working, I pay so much attention to what I am doing that the outside world practically ceases to exist.

My life does not have any purpose or meaning.

I do not know the purpose or meaning of my life.

I have a hint about the purpose in my life.

I have a pretty good idea about the purpose or meaning of my life.

I have a very clear idea about the purpose or meaning of my life.

I rarely get what I want.

Sometimes, I get what I want, and sometimes not.

Somewhat more often than not, I get what I want.

I usually get what I want.

I always get what I want.

I have sorrow in my life.
I have neither sorrow nor joy in my life.
I have more joy than sorrow in my life.
I have much more joy than sorrow in my life.
My life is filled with joy.

Most of the time I feel bored.
Most of the time I feel neither bored nor interested in what I am doing.
Most of the time I feel interested in what I am doing.
Most of the time I feel quite interested in what I am doing.
Most of the time I feel fascinated by what I am doing.

I feel cut off from other people.
I feel neither close to nor cut off from other people.
I feel close to friends and family members.
I feel close to most people, even if I do not know them well.
I feel close to everyone in the world.

By objective standards, I do poorly.
By objective standards, I do neither well nor poorly.
By objective standards, I do rather well.
By objective standards, I do quite well.
By objective standards, I do amazingly well.
I am ashamed of myself.
I am not ashamed of myself.
I am proud of myself.
I am very proud of myself.
I am extraordinarily proud of myself.

Time passes slowly during most of the things I do.
Time passes quickly during some of the things that I do and slowly for other things.
Time passes quickly during most of the things that I do.
Time passes quickly during all of the things that I do.
Time passes so quickly during all of the things that I do that I do not even notice it.

In the grand scheme of things, my existence may hurt the world.
My existence neither helps nor hurts the world.
My existence has a small but positive effect on the world.
My existence makes the world a better place.
My existence has a lasting, large, and positive impact on the world.

I do not do most things very well.
I do okay at most things I am doing.
I do well at some things I am doing.
I do well at most things I am doing.
I do really well at whatever I am doing.
34. Group #14
I have little or no enthusiasm.
My enthusiasm level is neither high nor low.
I have a good amount of enthusiasm.
I feel enthusiastic doing almost everything.
I have so much enthusiasm that I feel I can do most anything.

35. Group #15
I do not like my work (paid or unpaid).
I feel neutral about my work.
For the most part, I like my work.
I really like my work.
I truly love my work.

36. Group #16
I am pessimistic about the future.
I am neither optimistic or pessimistic about the future.
I feel somewhat optimistic about the future.
I feel quite optimistic about the future.
I feel extraordinarily optimistic about the future.

37. Group #17
I have accomplished little in life.
I have accomplished no more in life than most people.
I have accomplished somewhat more in life than most people.
I have accomplished more in life than most people.
I have accomplished a great deal more in my life than most people.

I am unhappy with myself.

I am neither happy nor unhappy with myself— I am neutral.

I am happy with myself.

I am very happy with myself.

I could not be any happier with myself.

My skills are never challenged by the situations I encounter.

My skills are occasionally challenged by the situations I encounter.

My skills are sometimes challenged by the situations I encounter.

My skills are often challenged by the situations I encounter.

My skills are always challenged by the situations I encounter.

I spend all of my time doing things that are unimportant.

I spend a lot of time doing things that are neither important nor unimportant.

I spend some of my time every day doing things that are important.

I spend most of my time every day doing things that are important.

I spend practically every moment every day doing things that are important.
J. R. Jamison  
Executive Director  
Indiana Campus Compact  
1226 West Michigan Street  
Indianapolis, IN 46202

Dear Mr. Jamison:

As a graduate student in the School of Education at Liberty University, I am conducting research as part of the requirements for a doctoral degree. The title of my research project is The Relationship Between Authentic Happiness and Servant Leadership Among College Professors in Indiana and the purpose of my research is evaluate if following a servant leadership philosophy increases personal happiness.

I am writing to request your permission to utilize your membership list to recruit participants for my research.

Participants will be asked to go to and click on the link provided. Participants will be presented with informed consent information prior to clicking the link. Taking part in this study is completely voluntary, and participants are welcome to discontinue participation at any time.

Thank you for considering my request. If you choose to grant permission, please respond by email to mlclemons@liberty.edu.

Sincerely,

Michelle L. Clemons, Ed.S.
APPENDIX E

[Insert Date]

Dear [Recipient]:

As a graduate student in the School of Education at Liberty University, I am conducting research as part of the requirements for a doctoral degree. The purpose of my research is to evaluate the relationship between authentic happiness and servant leadership, and I am writing to invite you to participate in my study.

If you are a college professor within the state of Indiana and are willing to participate, you will be asked to provide demographic information and complete a survey consisting of 33 questions. It should take approximately 10-15 minutes for you to complete the procedure listed. Your participation will be completely anonymous, and no personal, identifying information will be required.

To participate, go to ______________ and click on the link provided. Consent will be implied by filling out the survey.

Sincerely,

Michelle L. Clemons, Ed.S.
APPENDIX F

CONSENT FORM

Relationship between Authentic Happiness and Servant Leadership Among College Professors in a Midwestern State
Michelle L. Clemons
Liberty University
School of Education

You are invited to be in a research study on the relationship between servant leadership and authentic happiness in college faculty. You were selected as a possible participant because you teach one or more courses at a member university of Indiana Campus Compact. Please read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the study.

Michelle L. Clemons, a doctoral candidate in the School of Education at Liberty University, is conducting this study.

Background Information: The purpose of this study is to evaluate if there is a relationship between Servant Leadership and Authentic Happiness in college professors. Participants will complete an online survey assessing servant leadership style using the Servant Leadership Profile - Revised and authentic happiness levels using the Authentic Happiness Inventory. The data will be analyzed to evaluate the relationship between authentic happiness levels of those identified as servant leaders based on their results from the Servant Leadership Profile - Revised and those not identified as servant leaders based on their results from the Servant Leadership Profile - Revised. The goal of this study is to evaluate the potential relationship between authentic happiness and servant leadership to build upon the field of study for further research related to well-being and leadership style.

Procedures: If you agree to be in this study, I would ask you to do the following things:

1. Take an anonymous online survey. This will take approximately 20 minutes.

Risks: The risks involved in this study are minimal, which means they are equal to the risks you would encounter in everyday life.

Benefits: Participants should not expect to receive a direct benefit from taking part in this study.

Benefits to society include potential implementation of leadership methodologies that might improve well-being of employees if the variables are found to be positively correlated.

Compensation: Participants will not be compensated for participating in this study.

Confidentiality: The records of this study will be kept private. In any sort of report I might publish, I will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a subject. Research records will be stored securely, and only the researcher will have access to the records.
• Surveys will be completed online and names will not be included in the survey information collected. Potentially identifying demographic information of individual participants will not be disclosed.
• Data will be stored on a password protected computer for three years after the completion of the study.
• The researcher and dissertation committee will have access to the data.

Voluntary Nature of the Study: Participation in this study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with Liberty University or Indiana Campus Compact. If you decide to participate, you are free to not answer any question or withdraw at any time prior to submitting the survey without affecting those relationships.

How to Withdraw from the Study: If you choose to withdraw from the study, please exit the survey and close your internet browser. Your responses will not be recorded or included in the study.

Contacts and Questions: The researcher conducting this study is Michelle L. Clemons. You may ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, you are encouraged to contact her at 818.624.3640 or mclemons@liberty.edu. You may also contact the researcher’s faculty advisor, Dr. Jeff Savage at jsavage2@liberty.edu.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study and would like to talk to someone other than the researchers, you are encouraged to contact the Institutional Review Board, 1971 University Blvd., Green Hall Ste. 1887, Lynchburg, VA 24515 or email at irb@liberty.edu.

Please notify the researcher if you would like a copy of this information for your records.

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

(Note: Do not agree to participate unless IRB approval information with current dates has been added to this document.)

Please click on the button on the first page of the SurveyMonkey® survey to confirm your willingness to participate in the study.