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The lack of success in nonprofit organizations often is due to challenges in management (Drucker, 2008). Faith-based organizations are not immune to these problems. The church struggles to live out its mission, often due to ineffective practices (Barna & Jackson, 2004). Chand (2011) asserted that it is the culture of an organization that builds or erodes its effectiveness. In the context of the church, servant leadership practices are considered to be a contributing factor to organizational effectiveness. The purpose of this study was to examine organizational culture and servant leadership as perceived by the leadership team of an African American church. Although past studies have investigated organizational culture and servant leadership, this study specifically centers on these two constructs in the context of the church. The initial quantitative phase measured the self-perceptions of a church leadership team on the constructs of servant leadership using Page and Wong’s (2003) Servant Leadership Profile – Revised (SLPR). These data were combined with data gathered in a second quantitative phase using Human Synergistics International’s Organizational Culture Inventory (OCI). The results indicated that the church in the study has a constructive culture, in which individuals are encouraged to interact with one another and approach tasks in ways that meet their needs for self-actualization. The survey data also revealed that the leadership team members in this study perceives themselves to be servant leaders, placing high
value on empowering and developing others. In addition, this study helps to identify relationships between servant leadership perceptions and OCI cultural styles. The significance of this study lies in its contribution to the effective leadership practices of church leaders.
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

The Problem

Across sectors and cultures, the types of management/leadership and effective organizations that have been successful in the past are now obsolete (Bolman & Deal, 2003). Cultures are built upon a shared system of beliefs, values, and norms; thus, often are undoubtedly resistant to change (Trice & Beyer, 1993). However, change is inevitable in our societies, our organizations, and our lives. Times have changed, societal culture has changed, rules have changed, and the expectations of leaders have changed (Kraft, 2010). Taking the initiative to implement changes within organizations is a difficult decision. Many leaders are more willing to deal with problems than to work toward eliminating them. Currently, it is challenging to determine the way in which to frame organizations and carry out effective practices (Kraft, 2010). Kraft (2010) suggested that leaders have been required to fight battles that cause them to plateau, quit, or become disqualified. Schein (1994) defined organizational effectiveness as an adaptive cycle, in which an organization is effective when it adapts to the changes in its environment. According to Schein, all organizations face two types of problems regardless of size or type: continuous external adaptation to a rapidly changing environment and the corresponding internal integration that supports the success of the external adaptation.

Individual morale, teamwork, effectiveness, and outcomes are ultimately shaped by the culture within an organization (Carter, 2001). A review of the literature on the culture within organizations revealed that writers have defined Organizational Culture as: the taken-for-granted values, the underlying assumptions, collective memories, and
definitions that characterize organizations and their members (Cameron & Quinn, 2011; Schein, 2011). Kotter and Heskett (1992) espoused that, when individuals examine a culture other than their own, the culture’s most visible and unusual qualities appear to be striking. Examples of this can be observed in the casual dress and informality of an Apple store, Chick-fil-A restaurants closing on Sundays, and Japanese restaurants closing between lunch and dinner. However, one’s own culture is difficult to observe until implementing new strategies that are resistant to the organization’s norms and values, at which time the power of the culture becomes clear (Kotter & Heskett, 1992).

While culture can be seen as the heartbeat of an organization, the greatest mistake that is made when attempting to change organizations is to plunge ahead without establishing an adequate sense of urgency and imparting a shared vision (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). Kotter and Heskett (1992) proposed that the vision of an organization plays a key role in producing useful change by helping to direct, align, and inspire actions on the part of large numbers of individuals. Based on the views of these researchers, major change is impossible without active support from a visionary leader. Alan Keith, chief accounting officer and comptroller for the Turner Distribution Company, explained that individuals cannot be forced to trust change and to trust the system; but, rather, a system needs to be created that is trustworthy (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). When the system is considered trustworthy, individuals will move much faster when eliciting change.

Unfortunately, accountability in many organizations has become an event that merely happens to a person during a negative occurrence (Connors & Smith, 2011). Connors and Smith (2011) suggested that the creation of an organizational culture where
people begin to embrace accountability toward one another and toward the organization is the key to creating successful change. Accountability should be the strongest feature of an organization. The researchers prescribed three components to explain the manner in which organizational culture produces results: experiences, beliefs, and actions. Experiences foster beliefs, beliefs influence actions, and actions produce results. Leaders are responsible for their impact on organizational culture. In order to be effective, leaders must make a cognizant effort to create an atmosphere that is conducive to the culture they shape within an organization (Cameron & Quinn, 2011).

The mantle of responsibility that accompanies leadership often stretches leaders to reach and adapt in order to meet goals. Leaders are expected to affect and to execute (Drucker, 2002). Drucker (2002) posited that intelligence and knowledge is useless if results do not occur. Leadership is difficult, as leaders are expected to provide and maintain momentum. Momentum results from a clear vision of the organization, a strategy to achieve that vision, and carefully conceived and communicated directions and plans that enable participation and accountability of achieving those plans (De Pree, 2004). Drucker noted that efficiency is doing things correctly, but effectiveness is doing the correct things. Leaders ultimately are responsible for the effectiveness of an organization (De Pree, 2004).

According to Drucker (2008), nonprofit organizations are becoming America’s management leaders, which is a direct result of practicing the correct strategy and effectively utilizing executive boards. While nonprofit organizations offer a great deal to society, and the nonprofit sector is steadily growing, some nonprofits are struggling. The lack of success, even in the nonprofit organization, is due to management challenges.
Faith-based organizations are not immune to these problems. In a structure such as a church, which often is set in many traditions and cultures, struggle exists in reaching individuals in an ever-changing society, yet meeting the culture head-on in radical ways (Young, 2006).

While the mission of the church stands apart from public schools, corporate offices, or hospitals, the organizational structure of the church is very similar to other types of organizations (Drucker, 2008). Many large churches operate with a full-time staff and a chain of command that provides employees with a systematic approach for the continuous growth of the church (Powers, 2008). As an autonomous organization, the local church’s framework has been established by the New Testament of the Bible (Acts 2:42-47). This spiritual and moral imperative differentiates the church from other types of organizations. However, as any other organization, the church is held accountable for its mission. If church leaders are to live out the challenging mission that lies before the local church, a certain level of adaptation and change that must be unleashed. While Northouse (2007) discussed numerous theories and models of leadership that support the way in which individuals lead, Blanchard and Hodges (2003) noted that servant leadership is the primary force currently seen in many churches.

Servant leadership, which was conceptualized by Greenleaf, has its roots in serving first as a servant (Greenleaf & Spears, 2002). Greenleaf, in his 1970 essay, "The Servant as Leader," shared that servant leadership begins with a natural feeling of desiring to serve, following through on that desire, and then a conscious choice that brings one to aspire to lead (Greenleaf & Spears, 2002). The research further explained that servant leaders put others’ needs before their own. The outcome often influences
those being served to become servants. By its nature servant leadership is transformational, rather than transactional (Baron, 2010). Baron (2010) opined that servant leadership is people driven, rather than project driven. Servant leadership is grounded in a moral imperative, in which one leads sacrificially for the sake of others.

**Background for the Study**

In addressing the organizational culture and leadership of the church, it is important to understand the context of this particular study takes its view. The distinctiveness lies within the confounds of the culture of the African American church. Watkins (2014) suggested that the African American church is diverse in its worship styles, mission priorities, and ministry strengths. Some African American churches are steeped in great preaching and powerful worship, while others excel at outreach, feeding programs, and addressing the social issues of the community (Watkins, 2014). No church is one true type; rather, it is a mixture of various strengths (Watkins, 2014).

The African American community exists as a potpourri of socioeconomic realities (Barna & Jackson, 2004). Within many African American congregations, issues prevail relative to poverty, sexism, underfunded public schools, healthcare, the prison industrial complex, and socioeconomic divide (Watkins, 2014). Individuals attend church seeking hope and a solution to their problems.

The church in this study is the second largest African American church within its city with over 2500 disciples. The size of this congregation is remarkable compared to an average of 400 attendees among congregations in the National Congregations Study (Chaves, Anderson, & Eagle, 2014). Subsequent to its founding 29 years ago, this church has sought to change the corner on which it is located. Evangelism, Christian Education,
Family Ministry, and the Ministry of Social and Economic Empowerment have been the hallmarks of this church. Many who observe the church are unfamiliar with the struggle and sacrifice of the congregation in order to continue its impact on the community. The church was organized in 1983 from a decision of 97 individuals to follow a vision and to take an enormous leap of faith. Although they had no actual place of worship and no plate with which to receive an offering, they had God, faith, and one another. That was enough for those 97.

The church is now comprised of individuals from various denominational backgrounds, a full-time staff, and over 40 areas of ministry that are sustained through volunteer leadership. The church prides itself in being dedicated; and rather than making the congregation feel good, the church helps them to have better lives.

Statement of the Problem

Many churches are in a culture crisis. The church is thought of as a place in which transformation occurs. However, too often it is a place of stagnation (Stetzer & Rainer, 2010). The culture of the congregation has changed, but many times the congregation continues to remain with old practices that have no intrinsic value and are ineffective for growth and development (Flake, Flake, & Reed, 2005). Some pastors give the impression that leading a dynamic church ministry is easy, until they begin to deal with multiple staff, hundreds of congregants, media pressure, and the complacency that impedes the success of the ministry (Barna, 1999). Many churches fail to grow due to the congregation’s unwillingness to change, despite the constantly changing world around them (Flake et al., 2005). Christ gave an evangelistic mandate to all who would follow him, but the reality is that many in this nation are quick to quit. The US society has
become commitment phobic (Barna, 1999). In many ways, the church has lost its momentum and needs a motivation to continue moving forward. The members do not want their comfortable ideas and practices challenged, and many times they are willing to do anything rather than make a relevant change (Barna, 1999). Change is a necessity; when an organization experiences agitation, it experiences elevation.

The fifth chapter of Matthew instructs readers that the church is to be the light of the world, a city on a mountain, glowing in the night for all to see (Matthew 5:14 New Living Translation). If the church is to be the salt of the earth, it cannot become stagnant. Many churches have not grown, are hesitant to change, and the leadership fails to pause and reflect on the effectiveness of the mission (Barna, 1999). In 2 Corinthians, Paul’s sentiments match much of what is visible today. Paul expressed: “I have the daily burden of my concern for all the churches” (2 Corinthians 11:28 New Living Translation). In this passage, Paul expresses his concern to the multitude of churches that had plateaued, relative to the methods that no longer worked, but were still in use. If repetitions of past habits do not satisfy the needs of the church and do not help to fulfill her mission, the church must evaluate and seek change efforts (Welch, 2005). For clarification, this does not translate into a need to conform to secular antics that will merely gain a crowd and popularity. However, effective leadership practices within the church should center around serving like Christ, connecting to people, making well thought out decisions, and implementing the vision of the organization (Kraft, 2010). Individuals occasionally can get caught up in titles and self-gratification and fail to lead by serving (Wilkes & Mumma, 1998). The church needs some insight and new ideas to move forward; similar
to other organizations that fail to be effective, the major proclivity of the church is its resistance to change (Kraft, 2010).

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to examine the organizational culture and perception of servant leadership among the leadership team of the church chosen for this research. The participants include both paid staff and volunteer leaders. This church is a thriving ministry; however, the pastoral leadership is open to change and continues to pursue ways to improve both efficiency and effectiveness (Malone, 2013). The core objective is to attain a clear depiction of the culture of the leaders within the church, in order that the pastor can make any necessary changes to develop a more highly effective ministry.

Organizations should never lose sight of their identity. More specifically, churches should have an uncompromising commitment to integrity, as well as to understand its role as a change agent for the community in which it serves (Warren, 1995). Previous studies have examined organizational culture, servant leadership, and African American Churches individually; however a lack of research exists that has investigated the relationship between the three (Carder, 2012; Chu, 2011; Davis, 2007; Hall, 2012; McEachin, 2011; Roper, 2009; Ward, 2011). Churches strive to be the best they can be, to reach full potential, to better serve, and to glorify God (Warren, 1995). In order to accomplish that, intentionality is crucial, with perpetual assessment to engagement and effectiveness. Intentionality is applied though innovation and commitment to education and continuous improvement (Nelson & Toler, 1999). Powers (2008) suggested that all churches, as any other organization, should regularly evaluate their work. Evaluation calls for the measure of performance against purpose. A
continuous evaluation cycle is needed to monitor, review, and correct (Powers, 2008). Toler (1999) stated, “The quality improvement process is progressive. A church doesn’t go from terrible to wonderful in a single week! Improving quality requires an overall culture change” (p. 42).

Through this study, the selected church will discover the specific areas of focus in order to remain on an intentional progressive path. The church will be able to use the results from this study to identify targets for changing and improving engagement and organizational effectiveness. In addition, the results may generate ideas that could be useful to other churches. By discovering various levers for change, this church will position itself to continue operating with a standard of excellence.

**Significance of the Study**

Researchers have studied and sought to better understand the culture of organizations. Many years of research have provided great insight into the corporate setting (Bolman & Deal, 2003; Cameron & Quinn, 2011; Carter, 2001; Connors & Smith, 2011; De Pree, 2004; Drucker, 2002; Kotter & Heskett, 1992; McGregor & Gershenfeld, 2006; Ouchi, 1993; Peters & Waterman, 2004; Schein, 1994, 2011; Selznick, 1984; Trice & Beyer, 1993). While these studies have been beneficial, much needs to be added to the literature in order to better understand and measure the organizational culture of the Christian church. Barna’s (2013) work polled the areas of faith identity, beliefs, and practices for given areas. This study will uncover the cultural motives for behavioral norms within the church leadership team and promises to add to the literature on organizational culture in the African American church. By examining the church within
this study, findings will offer insight into potential levers for change that impact productivity, effectiveness, and retention within the leadership of a church laity.

**Overview of Methodology**

A quantitative design was chosen as the means with which to investigate the role of culture in the organizational context of an African American Church. This method will provide insight into, and collect data about, the relationship among the various lay volunteers and other staff members that comprise the leadership team of the church. The approach was chosen in an attempt to define the culture of this specific church and to identify a means for change.

The Organizational Culture Inventory (OCI) and the Servant Leadership Profile Revised (SLPR) was administered to assess the current culture of the church. The OCI assessment measures shared values and beliefs and assesses the strength of 12 behavioral norms. The SLPR is a 62-item scale that measures the seven dimensions of servant leadership. The outcomes measured by both the OCI and SLPR were used to answer the research questions that guide this study.

**Research Questions**

The primary research question for this study follows:

1. What are the shared beliefs and behavioral norms of the leadership team at the church being studied?

The following supporting research questions guided this study:

2. In what way does the leadership team of the church perceive themselves as servant leaders based on the SLPR?
3. What is the relationship between servant leadership perceptions and the OCI outcomes?

4. Do differences exist between the demographic sub classifications within the leadership team in the OCI outcomes?

5. In what way does this church’s leadership team compare to various OCI historical cultural norms?

**Limitations**

In order to maintain the pragmatism and veracity of this research, the following limitations guide this study.

This study was limited to church organizational culture; therefore, this research is not generalizable to other types of organizations. This study also was limited to the measurement of leadership within the church that was chosen. As such, measurement has been excluded of any subculture outside of the leadership team.

**Definition of Terms**

*Circumplex* – Breaks down the factors underlying effectiveness into 12 specific styles that are grouped into three general clusters and arranged by similarity in a circular manner based on the Organizational Cultural Inventory.

*Leadership* – A process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal (Northouse, 2013).

*Leadership Team* – A group of administrators, staff, and other leaders who make important decisions and coordinate initiatives.

*Organizational Culture* – Schein (2011) defined culture as the taken-for-granted values, the underlying assumptions, collective memories, and definitions that characterize
organizations and their members.

*Organizational Culture Inventory* (OCI) – Provides a point-in-time picture of the culture of an organization in terms of 12 specific types of behavioral norms.

*Quantitative Research* – A means by which to test objective theories through an examination of the relationship among variables.

*Servant Leadership* – Greenleaf defined servant leadership as the natural feeling of desiring to serve, following through on that desire, and then a conscious choice brings on to aspire to lead (Greenleaf & Spears, 2002).

*Servant Leadership Profile - Revised (SLPR)* – The SLPR is a survey that measures self-perception of servant leadership. The survey yields a continuous interval mean score (possible range of 1.0 to 7.0) for overall self-perception as well as a mean score for each of the seven servant leadership categories.

*Servant leadership Factors* – Page and Wong (2003) created the Seven Servant leadership Factors: Empowering and Developing Others; Power and Pride; Serving Others; Open, Participatory Leadership; Inspiring Leadership; Visionary Leadership; and Courageous Leadership.

**Organization**

Chapter I included an introduction to the problem and background to the study, purpose of the study, research questions, significance of the study, limitations, and definitions of key terms central to the topic. Chapter II examines current literature related to the African American church, servant leadership and organizational culture. Chapter III includes research design elements, validity and reliability of the instrumentation, and data collection strategies and methods of analysis. Chapter IV analyzes the quantitative
data that was collected. The data were utilized to assess and further analyze patterns and themes across organizational culture, as well as servant leadership characteristics and practices reported by the church leadership team. Chapter V contains an explanation of the results. It also presents conclusions of the study, implications based on strengths and limitations, and recommendations for future research derived from the conclusions and implications.
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The African American church experience, Biblical foundations, servant leadership, and organizational culture are examined in this chapter to provide a theoretical backdrop and understanding for this research. Ample literature in these areas has been generated in recent decades guided this study. These three areas directed the study toward an exploration on the effect of culture on norms and outcomes within an organization such as the African American church.

Religious History of African Americans

The religion of the descendants of the Africans who were brought to the Western world as slaves was more than what is presently regarded as Christianity. Under the circumstances, nothing less was expected. Wilmore (1983) expounded that the religious beliefs and rituals of a group of individuals are inevitably and inseparably bound by the psychological realities of their daily lives. In the early 1600s in the Mediterranean world, Africans were one of many races trapped in slavery (Raboteau, 2001). However, slavery in the Atlantic world assumed a racial definition that identified slave status with Africans and the black color of their skin. Over three centuries, approximately 10 to 12 million Africans survived the misery of the middle passage, only to toil in the mines, plantations, factories, and households of the Western Hemisphere (Raboteau, 2001).

As a result of this massive movement of people, Africans contributed far more than just their labor. The culture, music, dance, language arts, and religion of the African descendants added to the multiracial and multicultural societies that constituted this new world being formed. Similar to Catholics, many Protestant Europeans claimed that the
conversion of slaves to Christianity justified the enslavement of Africans (Raboteau, 2001). The Protestant Europeans often argued in sermons, letters, and pamphlets that the Bible supported the slave system. Using Paul’s epistle to the Ephesians, in which he proclaimed slaves be obedient to their masters, in addition to other biblical texts, they attempted to overcome any suspicions by presenting Christianity as a system of slave control.

The conversion of large numbers of slaves to Christianity was a product of a period of religious revivals that swept through parts of the Colonies beginning in 1739 (Woodson, 1985). The emotional fervor of the revivals compelled those who attended to be free to express their religious beliefs. During these revivals, black and white converts wept, shouted, fainted, and danced in ecstatic trances. In these types of emotionally charged atmospheres, slaves encountered a form of Protestant worship that resembled the religious celebrations of their African homelands (Raboteau, 2001). The similarity between the African and revival styles of worship made Christianity appear to be more familiar to the slaves. This familiarity helped them make sense of this new religion in terms of their old religion.

By Western standards, slaves were uneducated, but they were by no means ignorant. They recognized, almost immediately, the gross inconsistency between the claims that this all-powerful God would care about the eternal salvation of Caucasians, but would remain indifferent about the powerlessness and wretchedness of their condition (Washington, 1986). As Baptists and Methodists were willing to license black men to preach, a significant number of black preachers began to pastor black people during the
1770s and 1780s (Raboteau, 2001). These pioneering black preachers were paramount in the development of African American Christianity.

From a historical perspective, the church was integral to the lives of most African American people in the United States. It satisfied the spiritual needs of the African American community through that which historian WEB. Du Bois described as the core of the historic African American church, “the Preacher, the Music, and the Frenzy” (Floyd-Thomas, Floyd-Thomas, Duncan, Ray, & Westfield, 2007). Moreover, the church provided African Americans with the opportunity, free from Caucasian surveillance, to discuss, plan, organize, and lead the African American community (Washington, 1986). Congregations in the African American church were comprised of individuals, who had little money to spare, but who regularly tithed and contributed to helping the sick, the bereaved, and other benevolent causes (Barna & Jackson, 2004). The faith of African Americans gave them the courage to prevail when everything in their lives was contradistinctive to overcoming. This tenacity allowed African American congregations to help thousands of young persons attend college through scholarship fund drives and care packages (Floyd-Thomas et al., 2007). Washington (1986) aptly noted that the African American church tradition could be defined as a church with the soul of a nation.

The church was a place in which African Americans gained a sense of empowerment; an individual who was a bondsman throughout the week, took on the role of trustee, deacon, or steward at church (Flake et al., 2005). While time has brought a great deal of change, many of the influences of African American history remain alive in the church. The African American church was birthed in times of slavery and oppression. In the face of discrimination and injustice individuals were in search of hope
and inspiration (Raboteau, 2001). The church became the cornerstone of the African American community, as it was a place in which they were empowered and received guidance (Whelchel, 2011). Many issues have changed, but several contemporary African American churches continue to focus on, and minister to, those who are experiencing oppression (Flake et al., 2005).

The African American Church Experience

The African American church of today is vastly different from the first African American churches begun in the 1700s and 1800s, with a focus on merely liberation and empowerment. African American Pastors are now far more educated, and many have attained their master’s or doctoral degree (Flake et al., 2005). The actualization of educated leaders and parishioners within the African American church is a great contrast to the era in which the African American church experience was one of liberation and empowerment. At the beginning of the last decade, African American churches generally were still vibrant and healthy institutions and remained the central institutional sector in most African American communities (Lincoln & Mamiya, 1990).

Traditionally, these churches have been characterized by an emphasis on the spontaneous moving of the Holy Spirit and provide some explanation as to the reason the sermon and service are not bound by time in other Christian worship traditions (Barna & Jackson, 2004). Barna and Jackson (2004) explained that within the African American church, good preaching and good singing often are the base of a successful ministry. The preached word is the main focal point of the service, and the singing is second only to the preaching (Lincoln & Mamiya, 1990). According to Flake et al. (2005), pastors spend their time on a weekly basis working to deliver a quality and substantive message, with
the goal of encouraging and empowering individuals to live better lives. As African American churches continue to grow, multiple services each weekend are common (Flake et al., 2005).

The African American church has been one of few institutions that could reach beyond class boundaries and provide a semblance of unity in black communities (Watkins, 2014). The challenge for the future is whether this type of transcendence can continue in the solidification of class lines and demographic changes in the African American communities. African Americans many times regard their pastor as the single most important leader they follow (Lincoln & Mamiya, 1990). Effective pastors in the African American church become visionary team builders (Barna & Jackson, 2004). Team orientation is yet another distinction and legacy of the African American church. African American churches work hard to remain contemporary and culturally relevant. Musical diversity and a multigenerational leadership team yield great dividends (Barna & Jackson, 2004).

Talented black men and women developed their leadership skills within the church (Whelchel, 2011). This knowledge was used as a launching pad for professional careers, society, education, music, and entertainment (Lincoln & Mamiya, 1990). With a steady increase in black college graduates, a greater number of individuals have been able to achieve far more than in former years. As a continuation of growth in African American achievements has been observed, individuals have distanced themselves from the church. However, the church continues its efforts to be the cornerstone and meet the needs of diverse communities (Watkins, 2014).
Many African Americans exist who make decisions based upon their belief in God’s commandments (Flake et al., 2005). The African American understanding of God’s requirements is largely shaped by the message that parishioners hear from the preacher on Sunday mornings (Barna & Jackson, 2004). Barna and Jackson (2004) explained that black pastors continue to be regarded with a level of esteem that exceeds that of most individuals in positions of leadership. The wives of many black pastors are known as “first ladies” and, as a greater number of first ladies accept the call to preach, they become co-pastors (Flake et al., 2005). African American parishioners take pride in their faith; upon being introduced, many assert with honor the name of their church and pastor (Barna & Jackson, 2004).

Barna and Jackson (2004) asserted that one of the most striking differences between worship in black and white churches is the manner of preaching. In most Caucasian churches, preaching is analytic and directed at the head; whereas, preaching in the African American church directed at the head and the heart. The worship experience comprised of energetic music and spellbinding oration drives the African American church. Lincoln and Mamiya (1990) suggested that the faith of the African American church also is an overt distinction from other cultures. African Americans turn to their faith for guidance (Barna & Jackson, 2004).

Many African American churches fail to grow due to the membership, and occasionally the Pastoral leadership is resistant to change, although the world around them is constantly changing (Floyd-Thomas et al., 2007). Moving beyond what is comfortable and customary is laborious to ensure the effectiveness of the church. In any church, effective management and leadership are directly related to successful church
ministry (Powers, 2008). A strong and vibrant culture stimulates individuals to be and do their best and to reach their highest goals (Chand, 2011). Chand (2011) stated that spiritual leaders point the way, but it also is their responsibility to invite meaningful participation from every person at all levels of the organization. In the African American context, this has been an area of weakness. Many African American churches are successful in attracting individuals to come to church, but are unsuccessful in assimilating them into church operations (Flake et al., 2005).

Literature on African American churches in relation to leadership and organizational culture, provides the impetus for this study. Hall (2012) evaluated the demographic characteristics and leadership practices of African American ministers at predominantly African American churches. The purpose of the study was to evaluate their self-assessed transformational leadership practices. Kouzes and Posner’s Leadership Practices Inventory was utilized in the study, and the results revealed that the scores for the ministers were high in regard to modeling behavior as well as encouraging behavior (Hall, 2012).

McEachin (2011) explored the perceptions of laity in African American churches relative to the practice of servant leadership of their pastors. An exploratory case study provided insight into two African American churches. Small rural churches were selected, ranging from 50-100 members, for participation in this study. The participants were able to identify factors that influenced the practice of servant leadership of the pastors. The main theme that emerged from this study indicated that the servant leadership model offers characteristics that are beneficial to the survival of small African American churches.
Providing a new perspective, Davis (2007) explored the relationship between organizational culture, pastoral leadership style, and worship attendance growth. In order to measure these relationships, Davis designed a survey to assess the presence of eight cultures within 12 churches. A significant and high relationship was found between transformational behavior that exhibited high-performance expectations and worship attendance growth.

The African American church continues to be a beacon of light and guidance to communities (Watkins, 2014). Watkins (2014) expounded that those in the African American community deal with a number of issues, to varying degrees, and are experiencing defeat and setbacks. The church maintains its role in the African American community, as it speaks to these needs and becomes more than simply a congregational fellowship, but rather an extended family (Barna & Jackson, 2004). The metaphorical beacon of light of which Watkins (2014) spoke is centered in the reality, that for the church, religion is the heart of culture and raises the core values that ultimately legitimate the church (Lincoln & Mamiya, 1990).

**Biblical Foundations**

The church is vastly different from any other organization in the world. Christ founded the church; yet, its mission is advanced through the work of humans. In a study on church organizational culture, Ward (2011), stated that, due to its unique history, nature, and purpose, church organizational culture will be a unique construct, borrowing from concepts in the organizational studies literature, yet acknowledging the spiritual elements of the church as agents of Christ’s kingdom. While the term *organizational culture* is not specifically mentioned in the Bible, it is continually demonstrated within it.
Throughout the Old Testament of the Bible, the nation of Israel received a great number of instructions and commands from God. Organizational values, not only declare what needs to be accomplished, but also speak to the values that should undergird those tasks (Ward, 2011). The book of Deuteronomy sheds light on some of the guiding principles for the people of God. Through Moses, God gave the people of Israel the Ten Commandments, which provided the most concise guide for the way in which the children of Israel were to relate to both God and one another (Deuteronomy 5:1-21). The New Testament offered relevant examples of organizational culture in the book of Acts regarding Paul’s writings to the early church.

While the mission of the church is a theological spectrum, the values of the early church communities provided a great deal of insight on the organizational culture of the day. The core value of the early church was unity. In the book of Acts, the writer spoke of a “giving people” who had a commitment to communal living, making sure everyone’s needs were met (Acts 4:34-35). The book of Romans is the platform on which Paul spoke of Christians as one body in Christ, where each is likened to a body part helping the whole to function (Romans 12:4-5). John went a step further in his letters to the church, in which he used the metaphor of a family (1,2,3 John).

The Bible speaks of unity in the New Testament, and also the flexibility to change. Throughout the life of Christ, various examples are included relative to the willingness of Jesus to change His plans and His methods in order to meet the needs of His followers. Along His path of teaching the gospel, Jesus made contact with multitudes of people. Many would interject, in the midst of his teaching, exercising faith with a plea for healing. In one instance, men brought a man to Christ who was in great need; with no
other route, they lowered him from the housetop in order for Christ to do the miraculous (Luke 5:17-26). Leading examples of change efforts abound in order to impact the mission of Christ.

The church today maintains much of the culture of the early church, as many of the shared beliefs have persisted through the decades (Barna, 1999). The church and organizational culture are within, not alongside, one another (Tillich, 1959). Tillich expounded that religion provides substance to the culture of the church; simultaneously, the culture is the totality of forms in which religion expresses itself. As scholars continue to examine the existential concept of the church, they do so with the understanding that the cultural premise was established in the early church.

**Servant Leadership**

A vast array of theories exists surrounding leadership and best practices for leading individuals and organizations (Northouse 2007). Greenleaf blazed a trail in the area of leadership, with a more paradoxical approach in the early 1970’s, which was significantly different from many other previous methods (Northouse, 2007). Servant leadership emphasizes that leaders should be attentive to the concerns of their followers and should be able to empathize and nurture them. Greenleaf argued that leadership was bestowed upon one who was, by nature, a servant (Greenleaf & Spears, 2002). This branch of leadership theory holds a strong ethical imperative. The essential quality that sets servant leaders apart from others is that they live by their conscience, an inward moral sense of right and wrong (Greenleaf & Spears, 2002). According to Greenleaf and Spears (2002), a servant leader focuses on the needs of the followers and helps them to become more knowledgeable, free, autonomous, and to develop into servants.
Stephen Covey noted that moral authority is the core of servant leadership (Greenleaf & Spears, 2002). Covey related moral authority to one’s conscience and shared four dimensions to moral authority: sacrifice, commitment, principle, and relationship. These dimensions help to create empowerment and high trust cultures to produce servant leaders and environments that nurture the heart mind and spirit (Greenleaf & Spears, 2002). Servant leadership in its most simple form is power applied with a moral imperative (Baron, 2010). This type of leadership requires a level of intimacy with the needs and aspirations of those being led (Blanchard & Hodges, 2003). When one seeks to influence the behavior, thinking, or development of a group toward accomplishing a goal in their personal or professional lives, that person assumes the role of a leader (Blanchard & Hodges, 2005). Blanchard and Hodges (2005) prescribed a method of leading that restores health and effectiveness to organizations and relationships: to serve, rather than be served.

Covey suggested that America is becoming a nation dominated by large institutions that serve poorly (Greenleaf & Spears, 2002). The terms serve and lead are overused, and often have negative connotations; however, the concept of servant leadership is derived from the positive meaning carried by both words. Servant leadership was inspired through Herman Hesse’s 1956 novel, *The Journey to the East*. Hesse told the story of a group of travelers on a mythical journey who were accompanied by a servant who performed menial chores for the travelers and sustained them with both his spirit and song (Greenleaf & Spears, 2002). The story unfolded to show the extraordinary impact of the servant’s presence on the group, in such a way that, when he disappeared, they fell into disarray and abandoned the journey (Northouse, 2007). The
servant had emerged as a leader by caring for the travelers. Greenleaf and Spears (2002) placed a great deal of emphasis on listening, empathy, and unconditional acceptance, which are far from other leadership practices.

As a servant leader, one uses less institutional power and control, and rather, shifts the authority to those who are being led. A high value is placed upon the involvement of everyone and the creation of a culture in which each individual fully experiences respect, trust, and individual strength (Northouse, 2007). Servant leaders frequently are viewed as individuals who help the process of healing by helping others to a nobler vision and purpose than they would have attained alone. The church is needed in order to steward its service, to heal alienation, and to become a major force in a new society that is just and loving (Greenleaf & Spears, 2002).

In its initial stages, the concept of servant leadership was prescriptive and focused on the ideal meaning of servant leadership, rather than descriptive and focused on the meaning of servant leadership is in practice (Northouse, 2013). Larry Spears in 2002 helped to clarify servant leadership for practitioners by identifying 10 characteristics in Greenleaf’s writings that are central to the development of servant leadership (Greenleaf & Spears, 2002). These ten characteristics comprised what would become the first model of servant leadership.

“1. Listening. Communication between leaders and followers is an interactive process that includes sending and receiving messages (i.e., talking and listening). Servant leaders communicate by first listening. They recognize that listening is a learned discipline that involves hearing and being receptive to
what others have to say. Through listening, servant leaders acknowledge the viewpoint of followers and validate these perspectives.

2. Empathy. Empathy is “standing in the shoes” of another person and attempting to view the world from that person’s perspective. Empathetic servant leaders demonstrate that they truly understand what followers are thinking and feeling. When a servant leader shows empathy, it is confirming and validating for the follower. It makes the follower feel unique.

3. Healing. To heal means to make whole. Servant leaders care about the personal well being of their followers. They support followers by helping them overcome personal problems. Greenleaf argued that the process of healing is a two-way street — in helping followers become whole, servant leaders themselves are healed.

4. Awareness. For Greenleaf, awareness is a quality within servant leaders that makes them acutely attuned and receptive to their physical, social, and political environments. It includes understanding oneself and the impact one has on others. With awareness, servant leaders can step aside and view themselves and their perspectives in the greater context of the situation.

5. Persuasion. Persuasion is clear and persistent communication that convinces others to change. As opposed to coercion, which utilizes positional authority to force compliance, persuasion creates change through the use of gentle, nonjudgmental argument.

6. Conceptualization. Conceptualization refers to an individual’s ability to serve as a visionary for an organization, providing a clear sense of its goals.
and direction. This characteristic goes beyond day-to-day operational thinking to focus on the “big picture.” Conceptualization also equips servant leaders to respond to complex organizational problems in creative ways, enabling them to deal with the intricacies of the organization in relation to its long-term goals.

7. Foresight. Foresight encompasses a servant leader’s ability to know the future. It is the ability to predict future events based on occurrences in the present and in the past. For Greenleaf, foresight involves an ethical dimension, as he believed that leaders should be held accountable for any failures to anticipate what reasonably could be foreseen and to act on that understanding.

8. Stewardship. Stewardship is about taking responsibility for the leadership role entrusted to the leader. Servant leaders accept the responsibility to carefully manage the individuals and organization they have been entrusted to lead. In addition, they hold the organization in trust for the greater good of society.

9. Commitment to the Growth of People. Greenleaf’s conceptualization of servant leadership places a premium on treating each follower as a unique person with intrinsic value that goes beyond his or her tangible contributions to the organization. Servant leaders are committed to helping each individual in the organization grow personally and professionally.

10. Building Community. Servant leadership fosters the development of community. A community is a collection of individuals who have shared interests and pursuits and who feel a sense of unity and relatedness.
Community allows followers to identify with something greater than themselves that they value. Servant leaders build community to provide a place in which individuals can feel safe and connected with others, but are still allowed to express their individuality. “ (Northouse, 2013, p. 221).

These 10 characteristics of servant leadership represent Greenleaf’s seminal work on the servant as leader.

Researchers recently have begun to examine the conceptual underpinnings of servant leadership in an effort to build a theory surrounding it. Multiple models have been developed to describe servant leadership, with an effort to develop and validate instruments with which to measure the core dimension of the servant leadership process (Northouse, 2013). Page and Wong (2003) created the Servant Leadership Profile-Revised (SLPR), which is a self-assessing survey composed of 62 items. The SLPR is derived from the Self-Assessment of Servant Leadership Profile (SASLP), which also was created by Page and Wong. The SASLP is one of the earliest servant leadership assessment tools and was developed as a valid and reliable measure of servant leadership.

The SASLP was made up of 99 descriptors of servant leadership, which were classified into 12 categories:

1. Integrity
2. Humility
3. Servanthood
4. Caring for Others
5. Empowering Others
6. Developing Others
7. Visioning
8. Goal Setting
9. Leading
10. Modeling
11. Team Building
12. Shared Decision Making

These categories are conceptualized into four orientations: Character-Orientation, People-Orientation, Task-Orientation, and Process-Orientation (Page & Wong, 2000). This 99-item survey employed a Likert scale of (1) Strongly Disagree to (7) Strongly Agree.

The pilot of the SASLP was administered to a sample of 24 leaders in a Christian education setting. The mean scores within the 12 categories ranged from 5.32 to 6.14. The total Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was 0.937, and individual coefficients for the 12 categories were as follows: Integrity (.796), Humility (.656), Servanthood (.761), Caring for Others (.714), Empowering Others (.765), Developing Others (.916), Visioning (.569), Goal Setting (.768), Leading (.837), Modeling (.763), Team Building (.815), Shared Decision Making (.802). A coefficient of .70 or higher indicated acceptable levels of internal reliability. All sub-scales had acceptable reliability, with the exception of humility and visioning (Page & Wong, 2000).

Page and Wong (2003) redeveloped the model to take into account the motivational forces of authoritarian hierarchy and egotistical pride as opposing forces of servant leadership. The SLPR’s 62 items were divided into seven new categories:

1. Empowering and Developing Others
2. Vulnerability and Humility
3. Serving Others
4. Open, Participatory Leadership
5. Inspiring Leadership
6. Visionary Leadership
7. Courageous Leadership

These seven factors, based upon a leader’s actions, allowed Page and Wong to better operationalize servant leadership by exploring specific actions that leaders relative to their servant leadership beliefs. Four of the seven categories comprise a leader’s personal character and actions (Humility, Serving Others, Courageous Leadership, and Visionary Leadership). The remaining three encompass a leader’s interaction with others (Empowering and Developing Others, Open/Participatory Leadership, and Inspiring Leadership). The SLPR measures the profile of an individual’s servant leadership.

The modern church had previously been the dominant influence in individuals’ lives outside the home, however it no longer is the prominent force shaping and sustaining the influence of the home (Greenleaf & Spears, 2002). Churches must accept the opportunity to build leadership strength. Effective leadership begins on the inside when an individual considers leadership to be an act of service (Blanchard & Hodges, 2003). The 10 characteristics that Spears extracted are vital to the development of a servant leader (Spears & Lawrence, 2005). By nature, servant leadership is people driven and transformational (Baron, 2010). It allows, not only a select few, but everyone to win, grow, and develop.
Jesus and Leadership

In Matthew’s Gospel, Jesus stated that His work on earth was to serve others and give His life for many (Matthew 20:28). Agosto (2005) pointed out that the concept of servant leadership illuminated the teachings of Jesus. Wilkes and Mumma (1998) noted that the essential lesson Jesus taught on leadership is that He embodied leadership as service. Jesus was a servant leader in every sense of the concept. His model of leadership was servant hood, and he placed others above self-interest (Agosto, 2005).

When Jesus stood before the disciples to define greatness and the meaning of serving as a leader in the Kingdom of God, he offered these words: 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 (Mark 10:45). Jesus was clear about the manner in which he desired Christians to lead; He asked that individuals make a difference in the world by being effective servant leaders (Blanchard & Hodges, 2005).

Through an examination of the servant leadership model and its relationship to the church, culture and leadership practices within the church are better understood. In the Gospel of Matthew 20:25-28, Jesus said:

You know that the rulers of the Gentiles lorded over them, and their high officials exercise authority over them. Not so with you. Instead, whoever wants to be great among you must be your servant, and whoever wants to be first among you must be your slave — just as the Son of Man did not come to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many. (Matt 20:25-28 New International Version)
Jesus was not unclear in His instructions; leadership was to be first and foremost an act of service. He placed no restrictions or limitations that would allow individuals to be exempt from His command; servant leadership is a mandate for followers of Jesus. Leadership is first a matter of the heart in ministry. When heart, head, hands, and habits are aligned, extraordinary levels of loyalty, trust, and productivity result (Blanchard & Hodges, 2003).

The world is in desperate need of a different type of leadership role model (Kraft, 2010). Current church leaders experience crises of integrity, which compromise their churches. Pride and fear dominate the leadership landscape by way of self-promotion and self-protection (Blanchard & Hodges, 2005). Serving, rather than being served, is a way in which to lead that honors God and will restore health and effectiveness to organizations and relationships (Blanchard & Hodges, 2005). In Luke’s Gospel, Jesus taught that individuals must humble themselves in order for true servant leadership to occur (Luke 14:7-11). Another example is found in John, in which Jesus stepped down from His place at the Passover meal and washed the feet of those He had recruited to carry out His mission (John 13:4-11). Jesus’ model of leadership aligns with that of Greenleaf, in that leadership is first a matter of the heart (Blanchard & Hodges, 2003).

**Organizational Culture**

The literature on organizational culture is as relevant to the church as it is to any organization that strives to be effective. It has been noted that the power of an organization abides in the ability of a strong, unique culture to reduce collective uncertainties, create social order, create continuity, create a collective identity and commitment, and elucidate a vision of the future (Cameron & Quinn, 2011). Most
organizational observers and scholars recognized that the organizational culture of an organization has a powerful impact on the performance and long-term effectiveness of organizations. Schein (2011) suggested that culture relates to a group in the same manner that personality or character relates to an individual. He defines organizational culture as:

A pattern of shared basic assumptions learned by a group as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, which has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to these problems. (p. 17)

Organizational culture, as any other culture, develops as groups of individuals struggle to make sense of, and cope with, their world (Trice & Beyer, 1993). Cultural forces are powerful, as they usually operate outside of one’s awareness. They need to be understood, as they help to explain one’s experiences in social and organizational life (Schein, 2011).

From a general standpoint, culture can be defined as “the totality of socially transmitted behavior patterns, arts, beliefs, institutions, and all other products of human work and characteristics of a community or population” (Kotter & Heskett, 1992, p. 4). This definition presents culture as group fundamental beliefs about the world and the way in which it functions (Teegarden & Hinden, 2011). Trice and Beyer (1993) suggested that cultures emerge from individual’s struggles to manage uncertainties and to create some degree of order in social life. Culture also is created within groups for the same reasons: to manage uncertainty and to create meaning (Teegarden & Hinden, 2011). Schein (2011) surmised that organizational culture is a pattern of basic assumptions that are developed within a given group as it learns to cope with its problems of external
adaptation and internal integration. These assumptions, once considered valid, are taught to new members as the correct way in which to perceive, think, and feel relative to problems within the group (Teegarden & Hinden, 2011).

Kotter and Heskett (1992) proposed the concept to think of organizational culture as having two levels that differ in terms of visibility and resistance to change. At less visible levels, culture refers to values shared that persist over time; at the more visible levels, culture represents the behavior patterns of a group. Organizational culture is best understood as the force that operates outside of one’s awareness (Schein, 2011). The culture of an organization unleashes or dampens creativity, which determines the receptivity of staff and volunteers to new ideas, builds or erodes enthusiasm, and creates a sense of pride or deep discouragement within those who are part of an organization (Chand, 2011).

In the beginning of the 1980s organizational scholars began to pay serious attention to the concept of culture (Cameron & Quinn, 2011). However, the first systematic attempt to understand work organizations in terms of culture occurred during the last phase of the Hawthorne studies in the early 1930s. The Hawthorne studies began at Western Electrical Company in Chicago through experiments on the relationship between physical work and productivity (Trice & Beyer, 1993). When these studies were seen as inexplicable in technical terms, the company turned to behavioral science for ongoing research.

Western Electric hired Elton Mayo, a faculty member in the Harvard Business School, and W. Lloyd Warner, a young anthropologist, as consultants. Through observation, Mayo and Warner began to examine the influence of the behavior, values,
and attitudes that had shaped the culture on those same traits of the employees who worked within the culture (Trice & Beyer, 1993). This study introduced anthropological research, by which observations and interviews are used to describe the ideological, social relations occurring within the company. Their findings revealed that work cultures had a direct effect on worker behavior and productivity in a specific setting (Trice & Beyer, 1993).

McGregor, a faculty member of Sloan School of Management at MIT, was an epochal figure in the field of management. From the outset, McGregor believed that all professionals are concerned with the use of knowledge in the achievement of objectives (McGregor & Gershenfeld, 2006). Focusing on the professional workforce, McGregor became known for the contrasting Theory X and Theory Y relative to management. Theory X suggested that workers are lazy and need to be driven; alternatively, Theory Y posed that workers are creative and should be given responsibility. These opposing views of management style became the premise of McGregor’s research. The study’s goal was to substantiate that the human side of an enterprise is a piece of the collective whole, where management style determines the culture of the workplace (Peters & Waterman, 2004).

Schein (1994) stated that openness, teamwork, and responsibility are all touted values of today’s workforce. However, they cannot be exercised in an environment created by Theory X managers (McGregor & Gershenfeld, 2006). These two theories for years were viewed mutually exclusive, although in reality, successful leaders are neither and both at the same time (Peters & Waterman, 2004). McGregor’s work has extended to other studies. Ouchi’s (1993) Theory Z sought to incorporate quality-focused
management styles that have been perfected by many Japanese corporations. Ouchi believed that involved workers are the key to productivity. Theory Z was centered in a holistic orientation, in which loyalty, trust, and commitment are at the forefront of both management and the organization as a whole (Ouchi, 1993).

While Mayo and McGregor are highly noted theorists relative to the social theory of organizations, Barnard and Selznick offered great insight and influence concerning organizational culture (Trice & Beyer, 1993). Barnard, the former president of New Jersey Bell, retired to Harvard, where he wrote about many of his experiences. He was the first to sense the unconventional and critical role of the executive in making things occur within the workplace (Peters & Waterman, 2004). Barnard surmised that the primary role of the chief executive is to shape and manage the core values in an organization. He concluded that the leadership within an organization must secure commitment and actively manage the organization. Selznick, a professor at the University of California, Berkeley and author of Leadership in Administration, dared one to imagine that working within an organization can create group integrity (Selznick, 1984). Selznick used the terms institution, distinctive competence, and organizational character to speak to the successful path of companies. He believed that the term organization was too bare and stated that organizations become institutions when they are infused with values and develop a distinct identity.

Though the study of organizational culture was not new, the 1980s research made major contributions. Peters and Waterman (2004) extensively researched organizational effectiveness in relation to culture. Their work showed that intelligent approaches to organizing had to encompass at least seven variables: structure, strategy, staff, style,
systems, shared values, and skills. Their model became known as the McKinsey 7-S. The premise of their work is that effective organizations achieve a fit between these seven elements. The works of Ouchi (1993), and Pascale and Athos (1986) also triggered this phenomenon.

The combined research has suggested that Japanese business success can be attributed in large part to corporate culture (Ouchi, 1993; Pascale & Athos, 1986).

Pascale and Athos (1986) contributed to the work of the McKinsey 7-S model. Comparing Japanese management and US approaches, these studies created a platform for revelation. The West tended to focus on the more feasible, such as strategy, structure and systems while the Japanese focused on the more difficult, such as skills, staff, shared values, system, and style. Differing views of management impact the effectiveness of management. Western managers were constrained by their lack of vision, while Japanese managers had dynamic visions (Pascale & Athos, 1986).

Organizational culture has been an area in which conceptual work and scholarship have provided guidance for leaders who have searched for ways to improve their organization’s effectiveness (Cameron & Quinn, 2011). According to Cameron and Quinn (2011), an organization’s culture is reflected by its values, the dominant leadership styles, the language and symbols, the procedures and routines, and the definitions of success that make an organization unique. Schein (2011) broke this down into three distinct levels: the level of a culture’s artifacts, the level of a culture’s espoused beliefs and values, and the level of a culture’s basic underlying assumptions. A grounded understanding of the basic assumptions is critical; otherwise, the artifacts cannot be correctly interpreted, and it will be unknown as to the amount of credence of the
espoused beliefs and values. The foremost issue for leaders is an understanding of the deeper levels of culture, and the ability to correctly assess it (Schein, 2011).

Researchers eventually began to examine the relationship between organizational culture and performance. Kotter and Heskett (1992) made a compelling case that organizational culture impacts performance. Over a span of four years, Kotter and Heskett (1992) analyzed the impact of organizational culture on performance metrics for hundreds of organizations. They found that the best performing organizations were those in which the culture values the leadership, and the leadership reciprocally must value the core constituencies of the organization. They found that higher performing organizations placed a significantly greater value on excellent leadership than those in lower performing organizations (Kotter & Heskett, 1992).

More recent studies have investigated other mediators that influence the relationship of organizational culture and performance (Balthazard, Cooke, & Potter, 2006). Research by Cooke and Rousseau (1988) suggested that behavioral norms within an organization are reflective of that organization’s culture, and its values and assumptions can have a major impact on performance. Balthazard et al. (2006) surveyed over 60,000 participants using the Organizational Culture Inventory® (OCI®). The OCI instrument assesses 12 behavioral norms that, either consciously or unconsciously, may be required in order for members to fit in and meet an organization’s expectation. Similar to other research, the authors found that organizations that focus outwardly on customers and internally on employee fit and communication exhibit stronger performance1 (Balthazard et al., 2006).

---

1 Organizational Culture Inventory and OCI are copyrighted and trademarked by Human Synergistics. All rights reserved.
While a great deal of research has been conducted on organizational culture, little information can be found on organizational culture in the church. The research is even more rare when considering the African American church. This study will add to this area of literature, as it will allow one to observe the applicability of organizational culture to the church and the way in which behavioral norms of the African American church relate to expectations.
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

Research has indicated that the study of organizational culture has provided guidance for leaders in search of organizational effectiveness (Teegarden & Hinden, 2011). Leaders are expected to affect and execute and are responsible for their impact on organizational culture (Drucker, 2002). As the review of literature revealed, servant leadership is a worthwhile and effective construct for organizations (Baron, 2010; Blanchard & Hodges, 2003; Greenleaf & Spears, 2002; Northouse, 2007; Page & Wong, 2000). Therefore, it is beneficial to examine both the organizational culture and servant leadership of organizations.

The research problem for the current study was approached using a primarily descriptive quantitative design. This chapter is divided into the following categories: research questions, design overview, instrumentation, procedure, and data analysis. In order to examine the conceptualization and perceived culture and the servant leadership behavior among paid staff and volunteer lay leaders in an African American church, five research questions guided the current inquiry.

Research Questions

The following is the primary research question for this study:

1. What are the shared beliefs and behavioral norms of the leadership team at the church being studied?

The supporting research questions for the current study are:

2. In what way does the leadership team of the church perceive themselves as servant leaders based on the Servant Leadership Profile Revised?
3. What is the relationship between servant leadership perceptions and the Organizational Culture Inventory outcomes?

4. Do differences exist between the demographic sub classifications within the leadership team in the Organizational Culture Inventory outcomes?

5. In what way does this church’s leadership team compare to various Organizational Culture Inventory historical cultural norms?

**Design Overview**

A quantitative design was utilized to examine the organizational culture and servant leadership perceptions of the leadership team of the church being studied. Two survey instruments based on a Likert response scale were used to answer the research questions. The Organizational Culture Inventory (OCI) is a 120-item survey that was used to measure the operating culture of the organization in terms of the expectations of its members. The Servant Leadership Profile Revised (SLPR) is comprised of 62 items that identify seven distinct dimensions of servant leadership. A brief set of demographic questions accompanied the two surveys to provide further data for quantitative analysis.

**Instrumentation**

Gathering and classifying research data for this study required the use of two instruments to gather information from both the paid staff as well as the volunteer leaders. Although other instruments have been designed for similar research, each survey was distinctly related to the specific line of inquiry for the study. It was determined that the other instruments would not provide adequate data.

**OCI**

The instrument selected to measure organizational culture is the Organizational
Culture Inventory developed by Cooke and Lafferty (Cooke and Szumal, 2000). The OCI is a self-report diagnostic instrument designed to measure normative beliefs and shared behavioral expectations in organizations (See Appendix E). This inventory measures 12 sets of normative beliefs and shared behavioral expectations that may influence the thinking and behavior of organizational members, along with their motivation, performance, satisfaction, and stress. Cooke and Szumal (2000) suggested that the normative beliefs and shared behavioral expectations are associated with the following 12 cultural styles:

**Constructive Norms** (Cultural Styles Promoting Satisfaction Behaviors)

**Achievement**

An Achievement culture characterizes organizations that do things well and value members who set and accomplish their own goals. Members are expected to set challenging but realistic goals, establish plans to reach these goals, and pursue them with enthusiasm. (Pursue a standard of excellence; Openly show enthusiasm)

**Self-Actualizing**

A Self-Actualizing culture characterizes organizations that value creativity, quality over quantity, and both task accomplishment and individual growth. Members are encouraged to gain enjoyment from their work, develop themselves, and take on new and interesting activities. (Think in unique and independent ways; Do even simple tasks well)

**Humanistic/Encouraging**
A Humanistic-Encouraging culture characterizes organizations that are managed in a participative and person-centered way. Members are expected to be supportive, constructive, and open to influence in their dealings with one another. (Help others to grow and develop; Take time with people)

Affiliative

An Affiliative culture characterizes organizations that place a high priority on constructive interpersonal relationships. Members are expected to be friendly, open, and sensitive to the satisfaction of their work group. (Deal with others in a friendly, pleasant way; share feelings and thoughts)

Passive/Defensive Norms (Cultural Styles Promoting People/Security Behaviors)

Approval

An Approval culture describes organizations in which conflicts are avoided and interpersonal relationships are pleasant--at least superficially. Members feel that they should agree with, gain the approval of, and be liked by others. ("Go along" with others; Be liked by everyone)

Conventional

A Conventional culture is descriptive of organizations that are conservative, traditional, and bureaucratically controlled. Members are expected to conform, follow the rules, and make a good impression. (Always follow policies and practices; Fit into the “mold”)

Dependent
A Dependent culture is descriptive of organizations that are hierarchically controlled and do not empower their members. Centralized decision making in such organizations leads members to do only what they are told and to clear all decisions with superiors. (Please those in positions of authority; Do what is expected)

**Avoidance**

An Avoidance culture characterizes organizations that fail to reward success but nevertheless punish mistakes. This negative reward system leads members to shift responsibilities to others and avoid any possibility of being blamed for a mistake. (Wait for others to act first; Take few chances)

**Aggressive/Defensive Norms (Cultural Styles Promoting Task/Security Behaviors)**

**Oppositional**

An Oppositional culture describes organizations in which confrontation and negativism are rewarded. Members gain status and influence by being critical and thus are reinforced to oppose the ideas of others. (Point out flaws; Be hard to impress)

**Power**

A Power culture is descriptive of nonparticipative organizations structured on the basis of the authority inherent in members' positions. Members believe they will be rewarded for taking charge, controlling subordinates and, at the same time, being responsive to the demands of superiors. (Build up one's power base; Demand loyalty)
Competitive

A Competitive culture is one in which winning is valued and members are rewarded for outperforming one another. Members operate in a "win-lose" framework and believe they must work against (rather than with) their peers to be noticed. (Turn the job into a contest; Never appear to lose)

Perfectionistic

A Perfectionistic culture characterizes organizations in which perfectionism, persistence, and hard work are valued. Members feel they must avoid any mistakes, keep track of everything, and work long hours to attain narrowly defined objectives. (Do things perfectly; Keep on top of everything)

Note: Research and Development by: Robert A. Cooke, Ph.D. Style names, descriptions and items are copyrighted © and used by permission. Adopted from Organizational Culture Inventory by Robert A. Cooke and J. Clayton Lafferty, 1987, Plymouth, MI: Human Synergistics International. Copyright © 1987, 2013 by Human Synergistics, Inc. Reproduced by permission. The OCI style descriptions and items may not be reproduced without the express and written permission of Human Synergistics.

The 12 sets of behavioral norms are related to three general types of organizational cultures: Constructive, Passive/Defensive, and Aggressive/Defensive (Cooke & Szumal, 2000). The items are ranked on a 5-point Likert scale indicating the extent to which the behavior is expected or implicitly required for individuals to fit in and meet expectations. Individual scores are aggregated and plotted onto a circumplex, which provides a method to display the scores from the OCI as they compare to the normative responses of 900 organizations. As a result, Canaan’s leadership team will be able to
convert their raw scores into percentile scores, thus providing a clearer picture of their organization. The OCI also consists of eight items that will be used to collect demographic data from respondents.

Cooke and Szumal (1993) compared reliability and validity estimates of multiple versions of the OCI, using approximately 4,890 cases. Data sets from various studies were collected in diverse populations within the Chicago metropolitan area. Cronbach alpha coefficients for the OCI were reported ranging from .67 to .95. This particular research also suggested that the OCI was equally reliable for an organization’s members whose experience ranged from little to sizeable.

According to Cooke and Rousseau (1988), the OCI has been used in a vast array of organizations in order to assess cultural norms. Approximately 20,000 people in numerous firms, agencies, and associations have completed the OCI. Approximately 1,800 individuals’ OCI scores have been used to establish a normed "benchmark" profile.

**SLPR**

The SLPR was utilized in this study to measure self-perception of servant leadership (See Appendix C). Page and Wong (2003) introduced the Servant Leadership Profile Revised (SLPR), 62-item instrument measuring seven dimensions of servant leadership as follows:

1. Empowering and Developing Others
2. Power and Pride
3. Serving Others
4. Open, Participatory Leadership
5. Inspiring Leadership
6. Visionary Leadership
7. Courageous Leadership

These dimensions were measured on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (7) strongly agree. Scores for each dimension were generated by calculating the mean total for groups of responses, as directed in the instrument, which directly related to each dimension of servant leadership.

Page and Wong (2003) developed the SLPR instrument as an abbreviated version of the SASLP created by Page and Wong in 2000. The SASLP consisted of 99 items grouped into 12 categories based upon Spears’ 10 servant leadership characteristics (Page & Wong, 2003). A pilot study of the SASLP was conducted, in which Page and Wong (2000) found an alpha coefficient of 0.70 or higher for 10 of the 12 categories. The pilot study demonstrated the SASLP to have acceptable internal reliability. The SLPR yielded a total Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of 0.937, indicating an acceptable level of internal reliability (Page & Wong, 2003).

Procedure

The procedure for this study included three steps: preliminary activity, collection of data from the participants, and analysis of the collected data. Each step is explained in detail in the following sections.

Preliminary Activity

Several preliminary actions occurred prior to the collection of data from participants. Permission for use of the SLPR from Dr. Paul Wong, Founding Director of the Graduate Program in Counseling Psychology at Trinity Western University (See Appendix B). Permission for use of the OCI also was obtained from Dr. Cheryl
Boglarsky, Human Synergistics (See Appendix D). The researcher’s dissertation committee from Western Kentucky University approved the initial research proposal. Approval was secured from the Western Kentucky University Internal Review Board (IRB) in order to begin collection of data (See Appendix A). Other preliminary work included determining the participants, collecting permission to conduct a study within the selected African American church, and communicating with Human Synergistics to set up an online survey.

**Collection of Data**

Quantitative data collection procedures began with permission from the Pastor and Head Trustee to present this study during the church’s bimonthly leadership team meeting. At that meeting, participants were familiarized with the study and provided with documentation for each individual who was willing to participate. The documentation contained an explanation of the study and assurance of confidentiality, a consent request, and directions for completing the two surveys. The SLPR was completed at the leadership team meeting; the OCI was administered online and sent out the following week via email to participants (See Appendix F). All survey information was numerically coded to assure anonymity when submitted. The SLPR was conducted in 10 minutes at the leadership team meeting, following completion of the study’s introduction. The participants were asked to complete the 20-minute OCI web-based assessment within one week of the leadership team meeting.

**Data Analysis**

The statistical analysis of data for this study was conducted using the OCI Circumplex and the Statistical Analysis Software (SAS). The circumplex is an integrated,
multi-level set of measures as well as the provision of a common language that can be used to describe and redirect the cultures of their organizations. While the Circumplex is exclusive to the OCI instrument, the SAS software was used to analyze the results of both the OCI as well as the SLPR survey.

Figure 1. The OCI Circumplex. Adapted from Research and Development by Robert A.Cooke, Ph.D. and J. Clayton Lafferty, Ph.D. Copyright © 1973-2014 by Human Synergistics. Used by permission.

Multiple stages of analysis allowed the researcher to answer the research questions.

1. What are the shared beliefs and behavioral norms of the leadership team at the church being studied? To answer this question, the results were analyzed
according to the OCI Circumplex in order to determine the type of culture present within the organization.

2. In what way does the leadership team of the church perceive themselves as servant leaders based on the SLPR? Self-perceptions of servant leadership were measured utilizing SAS to generate descriptive statistics and measures of central tendency based on Page and Wong’s (2003) SLPR and using a total mean score for each of the Seven Factors of Servant Leadership, as prescribed by Page and Wong.

3. What is the relationship between servant leadership perceptions and the OCI outcomes? Descriptive and correlational analyses were performed to identify the relationships between demographic variables, servant leadership perceptions, and organizational culture variables.

4. Do differences exist between the demographic sub classifications within the leadership team in the OCI outcomes? To examine the differences between these groups, an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted for the responses from each instrument.

5. In what way does the church’s leadership team compare to various OCI historical cultural norms? An analysis was performed on the gaps or discrepancies between the Circumplex outcomes for the Church leadership team and the OCI historical benchmarks.

**Summary**

The purpose of this study was to examine the organizational culture and the perceptions of servant leadership within the church leadership team. While significant
research findings exist on organizational culture, servant leadership, and African American churches, a lack of research was seen relative to the relationship between these three phenomena. The current study was conducted in order to address this void in the literature. A quantitative method was utilized to analyze the findings from the two instruments that were used in the study. The OCI assessment tool developed by Human Synergistics measured the organizational culture portion of the study. The servant leadership component was measured by administration of Page and Wong’s (2003) SLPR.

Chapter IV presents the Circumplex from the OCI, and will continue to provide in-depth statistical analysis for both the OCI and SLPR instruments. Chapter V presents an analysis and synthesis of the research findings. It also provides answers to the research questions that guide this study. Conclusions and implications for further research are included.
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to examine organizational culture and servant leadership, as perceived by the leadership team of an African American church. This chapter summarizes the data collected and explains the methods employed for analysis of those data.

Overview of the Study

By exploring leadership team perceptions, this study answered the following research questions:

1. What are the shared beliefs and behavioral norms of the leadership team at the church being studied?
2. In what way does the leadership team at the church perceive themselves as servant leaders based on the SLPR?
3. What is the relationship between servant leadership perceptions and the OCI outcomes?
4. Do differences exist between the demographic sub classifications within the leadership team in the OCI outcomes?
5. In what way does the church’s leadership team compare to various OCI historical cultural norms?

This study employed a descriptive quantitative design to analyze the data attained through two survey instruments. This quantitative study specifically measured the self-perceptions of the church leadership team on the construct of servant leadership by administering the Page and Wong (2003) Servant Leadership Profile Revised (SLPR). The SLPR was coupled with the Human Synergistics Organizational Culture Inventory,
which measured the behavioral norms and expectations currently communicated and reinforced within the church.

**Participants and Demographics**

The participants of this study were a part of the leadership team of the church. The total number of participants was 43. All invited participants returned each survey, yielding a response rate of 100% for both the SLPR and the OCI. Seven demographic variables were used to describe the participants: age, gender, ethnic background, education, leadership position, years of church membership, and years of leadership.

**Age, Gender, and Ethnicity**

Tables 1 and 2 provide an overview of the age and gender of the 43 participants. Participants were asked to choose from six age ranges in order to identify their age: under 20 years, 20-29 years, 30-39 years, 40-49 years, 50-59 years, and 60 years or over. The largest number of respondents was between the ages of 40-49 (27.91%); whereas, the smallest percentage of those who self-reported was between the ages of 20-29 (9.30%). The gender distribution was 29 women (67.44%) and 14 men (32.56%). All participants were African American. The analyses revealed that participants of this study were predominantly African American women between the ages of 40-49.
Table 1

*Age of Participants within the Church Leadership Team*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or Over</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

*Gender of Participants within the Church Leadership Team*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>67.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Education and Leadership Position**

Over half of the participants served in leadership in a volunteer capacity (51.16%) and responded having education at or above the high school level (93.03%). Tables 3 and 4 illustrate the education background and the leadership position of the participants. Of the total population, 86.05% indicated some college education or above; whereas, only 6.98% indicated only a high school diploma. In terms of leadership position, 9.31% did not respond; however, of those who responded, the largest percentage reported serving as volunteer lay leaders (51.16%). The remaining participants reported serving as paid staff (39.53%).
Table 3

*Education of Participants within the Church Leadership Team*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s/Technical</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Graduate Work</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

*Leadership Position of Participants within the Church Leadership Team*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>51.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Staff</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Years of Membership and Leadership

Many of the participants had been members of this particular church for more than 15 years (41.86%) and had served in a leadership capacity between 4 to 15 years (53.48%). Tables 5 and 6 illustrate the participants’ years of membership within the church and within the leadership team.
Table 5

*Years of Membership of Participants with the Church Leadership Team*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Membership</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months to 1 year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 4 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 15 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6

*Years of Leadership of Participants within the Church Leadership Team*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Leadership</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 months to 1 year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 4 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 6 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 15 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis of Survey Instruments**

The SLPR and the OCI were used to gather data regarding servant leadership perceptions and behavioral norms and expectations within one African American church leadership team. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the study achieved an overall response rate of 100%. Of the 2,666 possible data entries related to servant leadership
perceptions (43 participants x 62 items), the response rate on the SLPR was 99.9%. Only 2 SLPR items were missing from the overall responses related to servant leadership perceptions. Of the 5,504 possible entries within the OCI (43 participants x 128 items), the response rate was 99.6%. Only 20 items were missing from the overall responses related to perceived subcultures. The data collected from the SLPR and the OCI are analyzed in the next section.

**Analysis and Discussion of Research Questions**

Using Statistical Analysis Software (SAS), the responses derived from the SLPR and OCI were analyzed. The following section discusses the analysis of the data within the scope of the research questions.

**RQ 1.** What are the shared beliefs and behavioral norms of the leadership team at the church being studied?

The OCI was administered to 43 members of the church leadership team to assess its current culture. The OCI measured the behavioral norms and expectations, which reflected the shared beliefs of the leadership team. The inventory assessed the strength of 12 behavioral norms associated with three general types of cultures: Constructive, Passive/Defensive, and Aggressive/Defensive. The strongest type of culture, based on the responses of the participants, was the Constructive culture. The percentile scores indicated the intensity of each of the cultural styles based on the mean scores of the respondents. With respect to the specific cultural norms, the primary style seen in the Constructive culture was the Humanistic-Encouraging style (98%). The secondary style was the Affiliative style (97%). Within these culture styles people are expected to encourage others, show concern for the needs of others, be supportive of others, be
pleasant, and treat people more important than things. Figure 2 displays the current culture of the church on the circumplex of the Human Synergistics International. Table 7 explains the church leadership team’s shared beliefs and behavioral norms.

**Figure 2.** Circumplex of Current Culture for All Respondents. Adapted from Research and Development by Robert A. Cooke, Ph.D. and J. Clayton Lafferty, Ph.D. Copyright © 1973-2014 by Human Synergistics. Used by permission.
Table 7

*Current OCI Leadership Styles within the Church Leadership Team (N = 43)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Styles</th>
<th>Group Percentile Score</th>
<th>Group Raw Score</th>
<th>Group Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constructive Culture</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanistic Style</td>
<td>98.00%</td>
<td>44.81</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliative Style</td>
<td>97.00%</td>
<td>45.28</td>
<td>4.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving Style</td>
<td>88.00%</td>
<td>40.51</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Actualizing Style</td>
<td>91.00%</td>
<td>38.02</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passive/Defensive Culture</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval Style</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>25.28</td>
<td>7.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional Style</td>
<td>37.00%</td>
<td>26.33</td>
<td>7.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Style</td>
<td>83.00%</td>
<td>33.91</td>
<td>6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance Style</td>
<td>26.00%</td>
<td>17.98</td>
<td>6.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aggressive/Defensive Culture</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppositional Style</td>
<td>33.00%</td>
<td>20.53</td>
<td>5.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Style</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>21.79</td>
<td>6.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Style</td>
<td>19.00%</td>
<td>18.67</td>
<td>6.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfectionist Style</td>
<td>49.00%</td>
<td>29.02</td>
<td>7.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RQ 2.** In what way does the leadership team at the church perceive themselves as servant leaders based on the SLPR?

The Servant Leadership Profile – Revised (SLPR) self-assessment instrument created by Page and Wong (2003) was specifically designed to measure participants’ perceptions of servant leadership using 62 items. Page and Wong grouped these items into seven categories, which they referred to as the Factors of Servant Leadership. A frequency distribution for each of these factors was created using SAS. The most prominent factor from the participant responses was Factor 4: Participatory Leadership. The least prominent was Factor 2: Power and Pride, which exemplifies humility. Table 8 illustrates the rank order of the seven factors derived from the SLPR. The servant
leadership factors are ranked highest to lowest based on the mean responses of the 43 participants. A higher ranked factor indicates that participants perceived that particular factor as a more prominent leadership style of the collective group.

Table 8

*Rank Order of the Factors of Servant Leadership within the Church Leadership Team*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Factor Mean</th>
<th>Std.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Factor 4: Participatory Leadership</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Factor 7: Courageous Leadership</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Factor 3: Serving Others</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Factor 5: Inspiring Leadership</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Factor 1: Empowering &amp; Developing Others</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Factor 6: Visionary Leadership</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Factor 2: Power and Pride</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>10.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RQ 3.** What is the relationship between servant leadership perceptions and the OCI outcomes?

Pearson Product-Moment Correlations were used to examine the linear relationship between the two sets of data. Simple statistics were computed for the four styles of the Constructive culture and the seven factors of servant leadership. The data for the total group revealed three moderate correlations. One correlation of 0.42 was noted between Serving Others and Self-Actualizing, another correlation of 0.31 between Participatory Leadership and Self-Actualizing, and a third of 0.32 between Visionary Leadership and Affiliative. Table 9 reports the Pearson Correlation Coefficients for the total group.
Table 9

*Pearson Correlation Coefficient of SLPR Factor Scores with OCI Constructive Styles of Leadership for the Total Group of Participants (N = 43)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLPR Factors</th>
<th>OCI Constructive Styles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1: Empowering/Developing Others</td>
<td>0.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2: Power and Pride</td>
<td>-0.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3: Serving Others</td>
<td>0.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4: Participatory Leadership</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 5: Inspiring Leadership</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 6: Visionary Leadership</td>
<td>0.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 7: Courageous Leadership</td>
<td>0.170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at p < 0.05.

In addition to the total group, the data were analyzed for the volunteers as well as the paid staff. The data for the volunteers revealed four moderate correlations. One correlation of 0.48 was noted between Empowering and Developing and Achievement, a second correlation of 0.49 between Visionary Leadership and Achievement, a third of 0.46 between Courageous Leadership and Achievement, and a fourth correlation of 0.39 between Visionary Leadership and Affiliative. The data for the paid staff indicated one positive correlation of 0.61 between Serving Others and Self-Actualizing. Tables 10 and 11 illustrate the Pearson Correlation Coefficients for the volunteer leaders and the paid staff.
Table 10

Pearson Correlation Coefficient of SLPR Factor Scores with OCI Constructive Styles of Leadership for the Volunteer Leader Participants (N = 25)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLPR Factors</th>
<th>OCI Constructive Styles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1: Empowering/Developing Others</td>
<td>0.475*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2: Power and Pride</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3: Serving Others</td>
<td>0.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4: Participatory Leadership</td>
<td>0.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 5: Inspiring Leadership</td>
<td>-0.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 6: Visionary Leadership</td>
<td>0.485*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 7: Courageous Leadership</td>
<td>0.458*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at p < 0.05.

Table 11

Pearson Correlation Coefficient of SLPR Factor Scores with OCI Constructive Styles of Leadership for the Total Group of Participants (N = 43)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLPR Factors</th>
<th>OCI Constructive Styles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1: Empowering/Developing Others</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2: Power and Pride</td>
<td>-0.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3: Serving Others</td>
<td>0.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4: Participatory Leadership</td>
<td>-0.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 5: Inspiring Leadership</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 6: Visionary Leadership</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 7: Courageous Leadership</td>
<td>-0.088</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at p < 0.05.

**RQ 4.** Do differences exist between the demographic sub classifications within the leadership team in the OCI outcomes?

A t-test was utilized to examine the mean outcomes of the demographic sub-classifications within the leadership team for each of the 12 OCI outcomes. The following sub classifications were examined: Leadership Position, Years of Church
Membership, and Years of Leadership. The data revealed no significant difference between the variables for Leadership Position or Years of Church Membership. However, for the oppositional style, the Years of Leadership classification yielded a significant difference (-2.20, \( p < .05 \)). The outcome in the oppositional style was significantly higher for those with 6 or more years in leadership, as compared to those with 1-5 years of tenure. Tables 12 and 13 display the OCI outcomes for each of the demographic sub classifications.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Sub-classifications</th>
<th>OCI Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humanistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Staff</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Membership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8+</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6+</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13
### OCI Outcomes 7-12 By Selected Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Sub-classifications</th>
<th>OCI Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oppositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Staff</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Membership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8+</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6+</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**RQ 5.** In what way does the church’s leadership team compare to various OCI historical cultural norms?

Descriptive statistics were performed for all three cultural styles of the OCI. The results allowed comparison of the church leadership team’s percentile scores along each of the 12 cultural norms, as compared to the OCI historical cultural norms. The data revealed that the largest gaps between the leadership team’s current culture and the ideal cultural norms were found in the Passive/Defensive cluster. The primary gap was found within the Dependent style, and the secondary gap was found within the Perfectionist style. The leadership team’s percentile for the Dependent style was at 83%, while the ideal percentile was 11%. This yielded a percentile gap of 72%. The leadership team’s percentile for the Perfectionist style was at 49%, while the ideal percentile was 13%. This yielded a percentile gap of 36%. Figure 3 displays the Circumplexes for both the current culture of the church and the Human Synergistics historical ideal culture. Tables 14, 15, and 16 show the church leadership team’s current culture in comparison to the Historical Ideal Culture.
Figure 3. Current Culture and Historical Ideal Culture. Adapted from Research and Development by Robert A. Cooke, Ph.D. and J. Clayton Lafferty, Ph.D. Copyright © 1973-2014 by Human Synergistics. Used by permission.

Table 14

Percentile Gaps for OCI Constructive Culture Styles (N = 43)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructive Culture</th>
<th>Leadership Team Percentile</th>
<th>Ideal Percentile</th>
<th>Percentile Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanistic Style</td>
<td>98.00%</td>
<td>98.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliative Style</td>
<td>97.00%</td>
<td>88.00%</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Style</td>
<td>88.00%</td>
<td>96.00%</td>
<td>-8.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Actualizing Style</td>
<td>91.00%</td>
<td>97.00%</td>
<td>-6.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15

*Percentile Gaps for OCI Passive/Defensive Culture Styles (N = 43)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passive/Defensive Culture</th>
<th>Leadership Team Percentile</th>
<th>Ideal Percentile</th>
<th>Percentile Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approval Style</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>11.00%</td>
<td>19.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional Style</td>
<td>37.00%</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>32.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Style</td>
<td>83.00%</td>
<td>11.00%</td>
<td>72.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance Style</td>
<td>26.00%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>16.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16

*Percentile Gaps for OCI Aggressive/Defensive Culture Styles (N = 43)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aggressive/Defensive Culture</th>
<th>Leadership Team Percentile</th>
<th>Ideal Percentile</th>
<th>Percentile Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oppositional Style</td>
<td>33.00%</td>
<td>42.00%</td>
<td>-9.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Style</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>17.00%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Style</td>
<td>19.00%</td>
<td>33.00%</td>
<td>-14.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfectionist Style</td>
<td>49.00%</td>
<td>13.00%</td>
<td>36.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

The quantitative results from this study were derived using SAS statistical software to generate descriptive statistics, along with specific statistical methods used to answer the research questions that guided this study. Discussion of results, conclusions, implications, and recommendations are presented in Chapter V.
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of Study

The purpose of this study was to examine organizational culture and servant leadership, as perceived by the leadership team of an African American church. Although past studies have researched organizational culture and servant leadership, this study specifically centered on these two constructs in the context of an African American church. The significance of this study lies in its potential to contribute to the effective leadership practices of church leaders.

A descriptive quantitative design was utilized to provide a better understanding of organizational culture and servant leadership perceptions in relation to effective leadership practices. Two survey instruments were used to attain data. The first was the Page and Wong (2003) Servant Leadership Profile-Revised. The second was the Human Synergistics Organizational Culture Inventory, which measures behavioral norms and expectations. By exploring the perceptions of servant leadership and the practices of organizational culture within an African American church, this study sought to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the shared beliefs and behavioral norms of the leadership team at the church being studied?
2. In what way does the leadership team at the church perceive themselves as servant leaders based on the SLPR?
3. What is the relationship between servant leadership perceptions and the OCI outcomes?
4. Do differences exist between the demographic sub classifications within the leadership team in the OCI outcomes?

5. In what way does the church’s leadership team compare to various OCI historical cultural norms?

This chapter includes a discussion of the results that were presented in Chapter IV. The discussion provides findings and conclusions to the aforementioned research questions, identifies significance and implications, and recommends ideas for further study.

Findings

The research questions were based upon the research on organizational culture and servant leadership. Findings and conclusions presented for each research question are based on the quantitative data derived from this study.

Research Question 1

What are the shared beliefs and behavioral norms of the leadership team at Canaan Christian Church? The organizational culture inventory provides a point-in-time picture of the culture of an organization in terms of 12 specific types of behavioral patterns that members believe are required within the organization (Cooke & Szumal, 1993). The 12 sets of norms measured by the OCI are categorized into three general clusters: Constructive, Passive/Defensive, and Aggressive/Defensive. The quantitative results from the OCI data analysis in this study suggested that the overall strongest culture style was within the Constructive cluster. Constructive cultures are those in which members are encouraged to interact with others and to approach tasks in ways that will help them meet their higher-order satisfaction needs for affiliation, self-esteem, and
self-actualization (Cooke & Szumal, 2000).

Based on Cooke’s framework on organizational culture (Balthazard et al., 2006), Constructive cultural norms are evident in environments in which quality is valued over quantity, creativity is valued over conformity, and cooperation is valued over competition. This organization exhibited higher levels of motivation, satisfaction, and teamwork. The constructive cultural styles are Achievement, Self-Actualizing, Humanistic, and Affiliative. With respect to specific cultural norms, the primary style seen in this study was Humanistic, and the secondary was Affiliative. A humanistic culture characterizes organizations that are managed in a participative and person centered way. The results from this study show that members of the leadership team were expected to be supportive, constructive, and open to ideas when interacting with one another. A humanistic culture leads to effective organizational performance by providing for the growth and active involvement of members who, in turn, report high satisfaction with, and commitment to, the organization (Balthazard et al., 2006). An affiliative culture characterizes organizations that place a high priority on positive interpersonal relationships. Based on the findings from this study, members of the leadership team were expected to be friendly, open, and sensitive to the satisfaction of the whole. An affiliative culture can enhance an organization’s performance by promoting open and clear communication, positive cooperation, and the effective coordination of activities (Cooke & Rousseau, 1988). These two styles were found to have the highest mean scores. These findings suggested that this organization’s culture is healthy. The constructive culture within this church valued development, empowerment, and the practices that guide and direct the activities and behaviors. The results show that this
church was effective in helping individuals realize their potential, and the leadership team had a high level of commitment to the organization. These are positive outcomes that are ideal for most organizations.

Research Question 2

In what way does the leadership team at the church perceive themselves as servant leaders based on the SLPR? The quantitative results from the data analysis suggested that the members of the leadership team perceived themselves to be servant leaders. The SLPR self-assessment instrument created by Page and Wong (2003) was designed to measure participants’ perceptions of servant leadership using 62 items to assess servant leadership characteristics on a 7-point Likert scale. As the SLPR scale score increases, participants’ agreement increases with the characteristics that describe their personal attitudes as servant leaders. In order to gain a deeper understanding of the servant leader perceptions of this leadership team, the data from the SLPR were analyzed in a categorical fashion, based on the seven factors of servant leadership (Page & Wong, 2003). The results produced mean scores for each factor. Chapter IV presented the mean scores in rank order from greatest to least. With a mean SLPR score of 6.59, Factor 4 was the most prominent of the seven. Factor 4 consisted of the questions relative to participatory leadership. Factor 7 was related to courageous leadership and ranked second, with a mean SLPR score of 6.52. In contrast, the members of the leadership team largely agreed that Factor 2 related to power and pride was indicative of opposing forces to servant leadership characteristics. These findings suggested that the leadership team of this church viewed themselves as servant leaders who were inclusive and valued integrity and authenticity.
Research Question 3

What is the relationship between servant leadership perceptions and the OCI outcomes? The data from both the OCI and SLPR were analyzed to determine whether any correlations existed between the findings of the two instruments. The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation was used to analyze the two data sets, and three moderate correlations were found. The first was a correlation of 0.42 between Factor 3, Serving Others, from the SLPR instrument and the Self-Actualizing style from the constructive cluster of the OCI results. Page and Wong (2003) defined servanthood as seeking to serve rather than to be served, and willingness to make personal sacrifices for others. Cooke and Rousseau (1988) termed the Self-Actualizing culture as organizations that value creativity, quality over quantity, and both task accomplishment and individual growth. A moderate relationship was noted between persons who exhibited a Self-Actualizing culture and perceived themselves to demonstrate servanthood.

A second correlation of 0.31 was found between Factor 4, Participatory Leadership, from the SLPR instrument and the Self-Actualizing style. Page and Wong (2003) defined participatory leadership as leading by example, demonstrating for others the way in which to make decisions, and never asking anyone to do something they would not do themselves. A moderate relationship was noted between those who exhibited a Self-Actualizing culture and perceived themselves to model the way for others. A third correlation of 0.32 was found between Factor 6, Visionary Leadership, from the SLPR instrument and the Affiliative style. Page and Wong (2003) defined visioning as leadership based on a strong sense of mission, leadership driven by values that transcend personal interest, and the ability to articulate a clear sense of purpose and
direction. Cooke and Rousseau (1988) termed the Affiliative culture as one that places a high priority on positive interpersonal relationships and employees who are loyal to their organizations. A moderate relationship was seen between those who exhibited an Affiliative culture and perceived themselves to have a strong sense of vision and mission.

In an effort to examine in more depth the relationship between the OCI and the SLPR, the data were broken down and analyzed for both the volunteer and paid staff respondents. The data for the volunteer respondents revealed four moderate correlations. A correlation of 0.39 was found between Factor 6, Visionary Leadership, from the SLPR instrument and the Affiliative style. This relationship has been explored previously. A correlation of 0.48 was found between Factor 1, Empowering/Developing Others, from the SLPR instrument and the Achievement style. Page and Wong (2003) defined empowering and developing others as investing in others, contributing to the growth of others and being committed to developing potential leaders. Cooke and Rousseau (1988) termed the Achievement culture as one who does things well and values those who set and accomplish their own goals. A moderate relationship was noted between volunteers who exhibited an Achievement culture and perceived themselves to contribute to the growth of others. A correlation of 0.49 between Factor 6, Visionary Leadership, from the SLPR instrument and the Achievement style. A moderate relationship was found between volunteers who exhibited an Achievement culture and perceived themselves to have a strong sense of vision and mission. The last volunteer respondent correlation of 0.46 was found between Factor 7, Courageous Leadership, from the SLPR instrument and the Achievement style. A moderate relationship was found between volunteers who exhibited an Achievement culture and perceived themselves to be innovative and who
pursued the proper opportunities. The data for the paid staff revealed a positive correlation of 0.61 between Factor 3, Serving Others, from the SLPR instrument and the Self-Actualizing style. A relationship was noted between paid staff persons that exhibited a Self-Actualizing culture and perceived themselves to demonstrate servanthood. These determined relationships between servant leadership perceptions and the OCI outcomes suggested that servant leadership practices are seen more often in organizations with constructive cultures.

**Research Question 4**

**Do differences exist between the demographic sub classifications within the leadership team in the OCI outcomes?** The quantitative data analysis determined that, overall, no significant differences existed between the demographic sub classifications within the leadership team in the OCI outcomes. A t-test statistical examination was utilized to examine the mean outcomes of the demographic sub classifications within the leadership team for each of the 12 OCI outcomes. The following sub classifications were analyzed: Leadership Position, Years of Church Membership, and Years of Leadership. The data indicated no significant difference between the variables for Leadership Position or Years of Church Membership. However, for the oppositional culture within the Aggressive/Defensive cluster, the Years of Leadership classification yielded a significant difference ($t = -2.20, p < .05$). The outcome in the oppositional style was significantly higher for those with 6 or more years in leadership, as compared to those with 1-5 years. When combined with Humanistic culture, which was the most prominent constructive norm in this study, expectations for oppositional behavior can result in constructive criticism and can be effective. These findings suggested no major differences between
the demographic sub classifications; however, those who had served in leadership for a longer period of time felt free and open to give feedback on improvements within the church.

**Research Question 5**

In what way does the church’s leadership team compare to various OCI historical cultural norms? Descriptive statistics were run for the three cultural styles of the OCI. The results allowed comparison of the church leadership team’s percentile scores along each of the 12 cultural norms to the OCI historical cultural norms. The data revealed that the largest gaps between leadership team’s current culture and the ideal cultural norms were found in the Passive/Defensive cluster. The primary gap was within the Dependent style, and the secondary gap was found within the Perfectionist style. The leadership team’s percentile for the Dependent style was at 83%, while the ideal percentile was 11%. This yielded a percentile gap of 72%. The items for this area that had the largest gaps were being a good follower, checking decisions with superiors, and willingly obeying orders. The leadership team’s percentile for the Perfectionist style was at 49%, while the ideal percentile was 13%. This yielded a percentile gap of 36%. The items for this area that had the largest gaps were being precise when unnecessary, personally taking care of every detail, and keeping on top of everything. Analyzing the gaps or discrepancies between the current and ideal cultures helped to identify the behavioral norms in which the greatest need for change was seen. As the largest gaps were found in the Passive/Defensive cluster, the church leadership team would benefit from a decrease in expectations for behaviors associated with dependent and perfectionist styles.
Significance and Implications

This study contributes to the limited body of existing literature on organizational culture, servant leadership, and the African American Church. First, this study identified the shared beliefs, behavioral norms, and expectations of this particular church. Second, this study provided evidence of a relationship between constructive leadership styles as defined by the OCI and servant leadership perceptions. Third, this study allowed for the body of research on organizational culture and the African American church to be more focused and applicable.

The church in this study showed constructive cultural norms, which are evident in environments in which quality is valued over quantity and creativity is valued over conformity. While the church showed clear constructive cultural norms, the largest gap between the current church culture and the historic ideal culture was the dependent culture style, which was 72% higher than the ideal culture. This implied that the church may have had some power-oriented norms and expectations. This could result from the pastor being regarded as the single most important leader in the African American church (Lincoln & Mamiya, 1990). No other style in the passive/defensive cluster showed high results; therefore this should not hinder overall effectiveness. If this church leadership team persists in adopting servant leadership practices and cultivating constructive cultural norms, continued growth should occur. These efforts, combined with that which Barna and Jackson (2004) described as a heartfelt worship experience, will help this church to be an effective faith-based organization. This study also will encourage church leaders to take note of volunteer and staff perceptions of the organization’s culture.
The results of this study, although not generalizable to all Christian churches, are important to the African American church, in which lay leadership is critical to the overall operations and ministry. This study may be used to specify cultural change targets and goals in order to improve organizational effectiveness. The significance of this study lies in its ability to serve as a blueprint to understanding the impact of organizational culture on the African American church.

**Limitations**

The limitations of this study are as follows:

- The respondents were members of the leadership team of the church being studied; therefore, the results cannot be generalized beyond this leadership team.
- Responses were based on self-reported perceptions of the respondents and did not address any follower perceptions.
- The OCI provided a point-in-time picture of an organization, inferring that results may be different if the instrument was administered at another time.
- This study did not include qualitative data, which would have provided contextual information related to the findings.

**Recommendations for Further Study**

This study was limited to one African American church leadership team, and therefore, the results are not generalizable beyond that church. This study could be replicated with various church sizes, denominations, and ethnic backgrounds, and a comparison of the findings would allow for greater generalization of the research.
study examined servant leadership perceptions through self-assessment. A study of the relational aspects of the leader-follower dynamic in order to measure the value of servant leadership through the perspective of the follower may warrant consideration for future research. This study also could be revisited to test levers for change based on the gaps seen between the current church culture and the historic ideal culture. Additional qualitative research could be conducted to more fully understand the impact of organizational culture and servant leadership on the leadership of a church.

Summary

Organizations should not lose sight of their identity. This idea shaped this research: an uncompromising commitment to improving and increasing effectiveness. The goal of this study was to examine organizational culture and servant leadership as perceived by the leadership team of an African American church. In conclusion, the study achieved the outcome of providing insight on the critical impact of organizational culture and servant leadership on this specific church. A challenge for future researchers will be to use the results from this study to discover new facets of this paradigm as a viable construct for effective leadership practices within the context of the church and other faith-based non-profit organizations. The mantle of responsibility that accompanies leadership often stretches leaders to reach and adapt in order to meet goals. May this work be but an initial step of many future initiatives to explore effective leadership practices.
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APPENDIX C

Servant Leadership Profile - Revised

© Paul T. P. Wong, Ph.D. & Don Page, Ph.D.

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 (SD) Undecided Strongly Agree (SA)

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. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. I listen actively and receptively to what others have to say, even when they disagree with me. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3. I practice plain talking – I mean what I say and say what I mean. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4. I always keep my promises and commitments to others. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5. I grant all my workers a fair amount of responsibility and latitude in carrying out their tasks. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6. I am genuine and honest with people, even when such transparency is politically unwise. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7. I am willing to accept other people’s ideas, whenever they are better than mine.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. I promote tolerance, kindness, and honesty in the workplace.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. To be a leader, I should be front and centre in every function in which I am involved.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

10. I create a climate of trust and openness to facilitate participation in decision making.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. My leadership effectiveness is improved through empowering others.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

12. I want to build trust through honesty and empathy.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

13. I am able to bring out the best in others.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14. I want to make sure that everyone follows orders without questioning my authority.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. As a leader, my name must be associated with every initiative.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

16. I consistently delegate responsibility to others and empower them to do their job.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

17. I seek to serve rather than be served.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

18. To be a strong leader, I need to have the power to do whatever I want without being questioned.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

19. I am able to inspire others with my enthusiasm and confidence in what can be accomplished.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

20. I am able to transform an ordinary group of individuals into a winning team.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

21. I try to remove all organizational barriers so that others can freely participate in decision-making.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

22. I devote a lot of energy to promoting trust, mutual understanding and team spirit.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

23. I derive a great deal of satisfaction in helping others succeed.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

24. I have the moral courage to do the right thing, even when it hurts me politically.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

25. I am able to rally people around me and inspire them to achieve a common goal.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>I am able to present a vision that is readily and enthusiastically embraced by others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>I invest considerable time and energy in helping others overcome their weaknesses and develop their potential.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>I want to have the final say on everything, even areas where I don’t have the competence.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>I don’t want to share power with others, because they may use it against me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>I practice what I preach.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>I am willing to risk mistakes by empowering others to “carry the ball.”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>I have the courage to assume full responsibility for my mistakes and acknowledge my own limitations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>I have the courage and determination to do what is right in spite of difficulty or opposition.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Whenever possible, I give credits to others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>I am willing to share my power and authority with others in the decision making process.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>I genuinely care about the welfare of people working with me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>I invest considerable time and energy equipping others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>I make it a high priority to cultivate good relationships among group members.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>I am always looking for hidden talents in my workers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>My leadership is based on a strong sense of mission.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>I am able to articulate a clear sense of purpose and direction for my organization’s future.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>My leadership contributes to my employees/colleague’s personal growth.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>I have a good understanding of what is happening inside the organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>I set an example of placing group interests above self interests.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>I work for the best interests of others rather than self.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>I consistently appreciate, recognize, and encourage the work of others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>I always place team success above personal success.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>I willingly share my power with others, but I do not abdicate my authority and responsibility.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>I consistently appreciate and validate others for their contributions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>When I serve others, I do not expect any return.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>I am willing to make personal sacrifices in serving others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>I regularly celebrate special occasions and events to foster a group spirit.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>I consistently encourage others to take initiative.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>I am usually dissatisfied with the status quo and know how things can be improved.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>I take proactive actions rather than waiting for events to happen to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>To be a strong leader, I need to keep all my subordinates under control.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>I find enjoyment in serving others in whatever role or capacity.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>I have a heart to serve others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>I have great satisfaction in bringing out the best in others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>It is important that I am seen as superior to my subordinates in everything.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>I often identify talented people and give them opportunities to grow and shine.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>My ambition focuses on finding better ways of serving others and making them successful.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coding Key
Factor 1: 16, 21, 23, 27, 31, 37, 38, 39, 42, 46, 48, 49, 53, 59, 61, 62
Factor 2: 9, 14, 15, 18, 28, 29, 56, 60
Factor 3: 6, 17, 30, 44, 45, 47, 50, 51, 52, 57, 58
Factor 4: 2, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 34, 35, 36
Factor 5: 1, 13, 19, 20, 22, 25, 26
Factor 6: 40, 41, 43, 54, 55
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)
APPENDIX D

OCI Permission Letter

Walter Malone III
9905 Covered Bridge Rd
Prospect KY 40059

Dear Mr. Malone:

July 28, 2014

Your proposal, “The Assessment of Organizational Culture and Servant Leadership Within an African American Church: A Descriptive Study of Behavioral Norms and Expectations,” has been reviewed by Human Synergistics and I am pleased to inform you that permission is granted for use of the Organizational Culture Inventory® (OCI®).

Human Synergistics will provide you with up to 75 web-based versions of the OCI for $1.00 per survey. Additionally, we will provide one OCI Interpretation & Development Guide for $10.50 (a 30% discount). Completed inventories will be collected and housed by Human Synergistics. Human Synergistics will provide you with a Microsoft Excel file that includes item responses, demographics and any supplemental item responses. Additionally, we will provide an OCI Detailed Report. All other costs associated with this project (e.g. fees, scoring, postage, data analysis, profiles) will be incurred by you.

In exchange for the research discount that we are extending, you agree to the conditions outlined in the OCI “Research Applications” document and summarized below:

1. Human Synergistics will receive electronic copies of all working papers, presentations, reports to sponsors and manuscripts to be submitted for publication which present OCI results;

2. Human Synergistics has your permission to add these OCI data to its database to be used only for purposes of checking the norms, reliability, and validity of the inventory. Confidentiality of the data will be maintained;

3. Researchers may not reproduce any of the OCI items in their manuscripts or in any typewritten, typeset, computerized, or translated survey;

4. The following citation must be included in your manuscript where the OCI circumplex is displayed: Research and Development by Robert A. Cooke, Ph.D. and J. Clayton Lafferty, Ph.D. Copyright © 1973-2014 by Human Synergistics. Used by permission;

5. The following citation must be included in your manuscript where the OCI style descriptions are discussed or reproduced: From
Organizational Culture Inventory by R.A. Cooke and J.C. Lafferty,
2003, Plymouth, MI: Human Synergistics. Copyright ©2014 by Human
Synergistics®. Adapted by permission; and

6. More generally, you will use the OCI, conduct your research and report
your results in a manner that is consistent with the Publication Manual of
the American Psychological Association (2009) and that respects and
protects Human Synergistics® copyrights, trademarks, and proprietary
data and materials.

If the terms outlined in this letter are agreeable to you, please sign where indicated
below, retain a copy for your files, and return to me.

Please contact me if you have any questions. Best of luck with your research.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Cheryl A. Boglarsky, Ph.D.
Director of Research
Human Synergistics, Inc.
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OCI Product Information Sheet

Organizational Culture Inventory® (OCI®)

Identify your organization’s culture and learn how to turn it into a competitive advantage

WHAT IS THE OCI?
The Organizational Culture Inventory® (OCI®) is the most widely used and thoroughly researched tool for measuring organizational culture in the world. Developed by Drs. Robert A. Cooke and J. Clayton Lafferty, the OCI provides an assessment of the operating culture in terms of the behaviors that members believe are required to “fit in and meet expectations” within their organization.

Four of the behavioral norms measured by the OCI are Constructive and facilitate problem solving and decision making, teamwork, productivity and long-term effectiveness. Eight of the behavioral norms are Defensive and detract from effective performance.

HOW DOES THE OCI WORK?
The OCI can be administered in a group setting or on an individual basis. Results are plotted on the Human Synergistics Circumplex and reveal a person’s individual normative beliefs (when the perspective of only one person is plotted) or the shared behavioral expectations that operate within the organization (when the perspectives of different people are combined). A special form of the OCI—the OCI Ideal—can be used to define the culture that will maximize performance and long-term effectiveness.

The OCI takes approximately 20 minutes to complete. Surveys can be self-scored or scored by HSI and the results presented in a report.

APPLICATIONS
The OCI can be used to:
- Obtain reliable data on the behavioral norms of the organization and/or its sub-units
- Validate a need for cultural change on the part of participants
- Identify the areas where change needs to take place
- Develop a vision for culture change
- Create individual and organizational action plans for effecting cultural change
- Evaluate the impact of organizational change efforts

WHO SHOULD USE THE OCI?
The OCI is appropriate for all types of organizations.

*Accreditation is required to purchase the OCI Detailed Report. OCI paper self-scored forms can be purchased without accreditation.
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OCI AND ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

The OCI helps to explain why some organizations and their units are more effective than others, as illustrated by the profiles shown. The OCI profile to the left shows the culture of a government agency that was experiencing performance problems. The dominant extensions in the lower sectors of this profile indicate that members are expected to never make mistakes (Perfectionistic), shift responsibilities to others (Avoidance), and abide by rules even when it doesn’t make sense to do so (Conventional). In contrast, the profile below shows the culture of a government agency that performs well and is highly regarded by its peers. The dominant extensions at the top of this profile indicate that, unlike in the first agency, members are expected to be Constructive, cooperate with others, and work together to solve problems.
APPENDIX F

OCI Participant Invitation

Sent by Human Synergistics to each participant, this invitation email provides individual access information and instructions for the survey. A standard project includes 1 initial invitation and 1 re-send, if required.

Invitation for OCI

Email From: Human Synergistics, Inc.
Email Subject: Organizational Culture Inventory(s)

Body of Email:

From: Walter Malone

You are being asked to complete the Organizational Culture Inventory. The culture inventory asks you about “what’s expected” in your organization.

The survey is available at:
[URL]

This URL is intended exclusively for your use; therefore, please do not forward this invitation to others.

Please complete and submit the survey no later than close-of-business August 20, 2014. The survey takes approximately 20-25 minutes to finish and can be answered in a single or multiple sittings. (Click “Next” at the end of each page to save your responses.)

Your confidential responses will be reported only in combination with those of others.

For technical questions about accessing or using the web site, please contact survey@humsansynergistics.com. For other questions, contact Walter Malone at walt384@gmail.com.

The surveys will be scored in the European Union, New Zealand, Australia, or the United States by Human Synergistics, Inc., the company that created the inventory. Human Synergistics complies with the Safe Harbor Frameworks concerning issues such as the collection, security, integrity, and the transfer of data from other countries to the United States. For details, visit
http://www.humsansynergistics.com/site/HumanSynergisticsPrivacyPolicy.pdf. By submitting your completed survey, you are agreeing to the aforementioned use of your responses.

Thank you for your participation.