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ABSTRACT

Catholic Jesuit education has always been anchored to a historical tradition of educating the whole student—educating to serve and be served by the society, and to make them better citizens and contributors to the community and the society at large. The purpose of this quantitative research study is to examine the extent to which servant leadership characteristics and cultural sensitivity are developed through the experience of participating in a university course-related service-learning project/class in a Catholic Jesuit institution in higher education. The independent variable (treatment) in this study is the experience of undergoing a service-learning project/class by students. The dependent variables (probable outcomes) are student servant leadership characteristics as measured by the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) authored by Barbuto and Wheeler in 2006, and cultural-sensitivity as measured by the survey instrument used by Lopes-Murphy and Murphy in 2016, the Cultural Sensitivity Assessment Tool (CSAT). This study employs pre- and posttests methodology comparing student servant leadership and cultural sensitivity both before and after undergoing a service-learning project/class. In addition, this study utilizes statistical analysis to better understand the relationship between the independent and dependent variables (outcomes). Specifically, the study uses Statistics with Microsoft Excel Fifth Edition (Dretzke, 2005/2013) to provide analysis of group difference scores based on the whole sample pre- and post-, and broken out according to demographic variables’ group difference on pre- and posttests scores. Participants in this study hail from a Catholic Jesuit university that emphasizes servant leadership in its vision and mission statements. The central hypothesis is that there is a significant positive relationship between student servant leadership characteristics and cultural sensitivity, and the experience of participating in a
university course-related service-learning project/class.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND RESEARCH DESIGN

“Consider what comes first, then what follows, then act.”

- Epictetus

Introduction

Since the late seventies naturalized and non-naturalized families from different parts of the world have been immigrating to the United States in search of stable life and formal education. Currently, large numbers of refugees or non-naturalized children and families are escaping the violence and cruelties of war from their homeland, coming to the United States, and about three million refugees have been resettled in the U.S. since Congress passed the refugee act of 1980 (Krogstad & Radford, 2017). According to the authors, the United States admitted 84,995 refugees in the fiscal year ending in September 2016, and in fiscal year 2016, the highest number of refugees from any nation came from Democratic Republic of Congo (p. 3). The Congo accounted for 16,370 refugees followed by Syria (12,587), Burma (aka Myanmar, with 12,347, Iraq (9,880), and Somalia (9,020). Over the past decade, the largest numbers of refugees have come from Burma (159,692) and Iraq (135,643) (p. 3). In addition, Gomez (2016) reported that 54,052 migrant children from El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala flooded the U.S. border in the fiscal year 2016; 68,541 in fiscal year 2014, and 18,411 in the fiscal year 2010. Migrants from El Salvador are fleeing a high level of violence from their country, in contrast to migrants from Honduras and Guatemala, who are entering the United States for economic reason (Gomez, 2016). This trend of immigration, especially from Central America, creates a serious challenge to the United States’ legal system as well as how it navigates its humanitarian values
(Negroponte, 2014), as the country is not well-equipped to deal with such an influx of child migrants (Lind, 2014). Specifically, this immigration crisis creates difficulties and critical educational issues to the American educational system in the United States.

**Statement of the Problem**

Addressing the above issue creates a need to train teachers, staffs, and administrators in the appropriate pedagogical approach serving this immigrant population in public school systems. In teacher education program, consideration for implementing an appropriate method of instruction in training pre-service teachers to be able to teach this immigrant population is necessary. It is important for students to understand the value of servant leadership and cultural sensitivity in their teacher training courses. Recent studies have shown that servant leadership has a significant positive effect on teaching students to develop awareness of multicultural classroom issues (Guda & Deanna, 2006); and to effective teaching in the classroom from Pre-K to 12th (Metzcar, 2008). Increasing diversity in schools requires teachers to recognize the importance of students’ heritage, and the influence heritage has on participation in school. To address this need, a class on multiculturalism can give future teachers a knowledge about different cultures (Olson, 2011). Based on this rationale, the research question of this study is:

How does the experience through participating in a service-learning project/class impact student servant leadership characteristics and cultural sensitivity?

Guda and Deanna’s (2006) study investigated problems relating to the implementation of multicultural education in the United States. For example, one study revealed that typically elementary school teachers are White middle-class women (Gallavan, 1998). Guda and Deanna (2006) reiterated that many teachers resist integrating multicultural education methods in their
teaching because of discomfort associated with the perception that topics on cultural issues are too sensitive. They explained that many teachers feel students do not need multicultural education. Also, the teachers feel the additional work to take multicultural and diversity courses is too much work. In addition, the authors reported on studies revealing a lack of preparation in integrating multicultural content courses, a lack of a clear definition of multiculturalism, and an inadequacy in training teachers to teach diverse classrooms (p. 48).

In other research, Metzcar (2008) sought to determine relationship between effective teaching and servant leadership, as demonstrated by the National Board Certified Teachers (NBCTs) educators who are certified by the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards and their teaching styles. The results divulged that a positive relationship between servant leadership and effective teaching exists. The servant leadership construct on provides leadership identified by Laub (1999) was the greatest strength displayed by NBCTs.

The above literature’s findings and results support the rationale of the research question of this quantitative study. The research question influences the construction and conceptualization of the purpose statement of this study, correlating probable positive relationships between the dependent variables (servant leadership characteristics and cultural sensitivity outcomes) and the independent variable (the experience of participating in a university course-related service-learning project/class) in this research.

Research Question

The research question in this study is: Do students in a teacher education program develop servant leadership characteristics and cultural sensitivity through the experience of participating in a university course-related service-learning project/class?
Rationale of the Study

Similarly, immigrant students who came to the U.S. in the late 1970s and early 1980s have experienced challenges in their pursuit of American formal education. Teaching culturally- and linguistically diverse students continually creates a challenging task for educators and the American educational system. During those decades of continuous flow of immigration in the 70s and 80s, I acquired a valued experience of being a schoolteacher to those least fortunate young children and adolescents in public school in California. In those years, I observed a critical shortage of qualified credentialed teachers, a problem that still exists and reverberates today (Aragon, 2016). Moreover, Aragon (2016) reported that shortages are mostly “confined to certain areas such as math, science, and special education,” and since 1999-2000 these challenges have diminished but stayed in math and special education (p. 5). The current shortages are specifically in science, mathematics, and bilingual or English-Language-Learner education (Camera, 2016). This discrepancy in the teaching profession inspires me to address the issue of credentialed or certificated teacher shortages for this unique student population through research.

The question of this quantitative cross-sectional survey study is to determine whether participation in a university course-related service-learning project/class in teacher education positively affects student success in developing servant leadership and cultural sensitivity. Servant leadership (SL) and cultural-sensitivity (CS) are measured using the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006), and Cultural Sensitivity Assessment Tool (CSAT) (Lopes-Murphy & Murphy, 2016). Participants in this study are students in a teacher
The university has its mission to be of service to its students and to the community as declared in the Mission Statement of the Jesuit Community of Gonzaga University (2003), and this mission statement emphasizes that:

As a collaborative effort, the Jesuit mission can only attain its purpose by preparing all those enrolled in Jesuit educational institutions to be men and women in the service of others. Jesuit themselves, their co-laborers, and their students are urged to work ceaselessly for those to whom justice has been denied or whose poverty have closed off for them the necessities of life. (p. 2)

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this quantitative cross-sectional survey study was to examine the extent to which participation in a university course-related service-learning project/class affects student success in developing servant leadership characteristics and cultural sensitivity in a teacher education program.

**Hypotheses**

H1: There is a statistically significant increase (or difference) in the pre-posttests of servant leadership characteristics in university students that participate in a service-learning project/class.

H2: There is a statistically significant increase (or difference) in the pre-posttests of cultural sensitivity (or cultural competency) in university students that participate in a service-learning project/class.
H3: There is a positive and statistically significant relationship between servant leadership and cultural competency.

**Conceptual Framework**

This quantitative research study focuses on the importance of service in leading and managing organizations in today’s uncertain trend in the global economy (Spears, 2002). The conceptual framework is based on the discussion of existing literature on the efficacy of servant leadership and cultural competence to student’s achievement through engagement in higher education. This conceptual framework includes the following: (1) It exhibits an energy-flow of thoughts in a flowcharting format, (2) It serves as miniature mirror of the literature review, (3) It illustrates a brief expression of the substantial review of pertinent literature on this topic, (4) It consists of fifty-three constructs of concepts that fall under four major headings. The major headings titles are as follows: Major Heading #1—Understanding the Evolution of Leadership and Servant Leadership Paradigms; Major Heading #2—Understanding the Realm of Catholic Higher Education; Major Heading #3—Understanding Servant Leadership in Higher Education in Contemporary Times; and Major Heading #4—Understanding Intercultural Competence in Higher Education. In addition, Major Heading #1 explains the constructs on leadership, servant leadership, students, and teacher education program; Major Heading #2 contains the constructs on Catholic Jesuit Education in Higher education, cultural sensitivity, culturally responsive, and cultural competence; Major Heading #3 includes the constructs on active learning or discussion method, participating, service learning, servant teaching, non-lecture method, increase (or difference), and servant leadership and cultural sensitivity characteristics; and Major Heading #4 delineates the constructs on intercultural competence, intercultural international education,
intercultural training templates, principles for enhancing curiosity, Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity, and Essential Intercultural Competencies as shown on the tables below.

**Table 1.1**
Constructs and Concepts on Servant Leadership Teaching and Learning Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Heading #1: Constructs and Concepts of Servant Leadership</th>
<th>Major Heading #2: Constructs and Concepts of Higher Education</th>
<th>Major Heading #3: Constructs and Concepts of Service-learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership, Servant Leadership</td>
<td>Catholic Jesuit education in higher education</td>
<td>Active learning or discussion method, Participating, Service-learning, Servant-teaching, non-lecture method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students, teacher education program</td>
<td>Cultural sensitivity, culturally responsive, cultural competence</td>
<td>Increase (or difference) servant leadership and cultural sensitivity characteristics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Heading #4:**

**Table 1.2**
Constructs and Concepts of Intercultural Competence/Sensitivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intercultural Competence</th>
<th>Intercultural International Education</th>
<th>Intercultural Training Templates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Competence</td>
<td>Cognitive learning styles, communication styles, Kolb’s Cycle of Experiential Style Model</td>
<td>Intercultural adaptation, ethnic identity, gender issues, culture privileges, context of power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles for Enhancing Curiosity</td>
<td>Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity</td>
<td>Essential of Intercultural Competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions, value judgement, cultural humility, multiple perspectives, tolerance or ambiguity, culturally appropriate</td>
<td>Ethnocentric Stages: denial, defense, minimization Ethnorelative Stages: acceptance, adaptation, integration</td>
<td>Learners’ culture, non-native speakers, multicultural groups, “Code-Shift” in communication style, paraphrasing, enthusiasm, culture-specific, multiple frame of reference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The energy-flow of thoughts on the above tables run as follows:
Understanding the Evolution of Leadership and Servant Leadership Paradigms

The current global demand for a change in organizational leadership from traditional autocratic, and hierarchical modes of leadership have led to the emergence of a new model of leadership called servant leadership (Spears, 2002). A review of the literature on leadership points to the reality that leadership styles in leading and managing organizations looks differently in so many ways. Contemporary leadership is conceptualized and operationalized within multiple organizational contexts (e.g., Burns, 1978; Greenleaf, 1977/2002; Grint, 2005; House et al., 2004; Jackson & Parry, 2011; Northouse, 2013; Phillips, 1992). For example, James MacGregor Burns (1978) defined leadership as leaders inducing followers to act for certain goals representing the “values and the motivations—the wants and needs, the aspirations, and expectations—of both leaders and follower, and the genius of leadership lies on how leaders see and act on their own, and their followers’ values and motivations” (p. 19). In addition, Greenleaf (1977/2002) defined leadership and followership as equally responsible roles because it means that the individual must take the risk to empower the leader and to say, in the matter at hand, “I will trust your insight” (p. 299). Grint (2005) defined leadership in traditional four different ways: (1) Leadership as a person, (2) as results, (3) as a position, and (4) as a process.
Moreover, House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, and Gupta (2004) defined leadership based on the Global Leadership and Organizational Behaviour Effectiveness’s (GLOBE) research program definition of leadership in Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies. The GLOBE research program suggested that culture takes the place of primacy in their academic work on leadership (p. 55). The theory that guided the GLOBE research has been an “integration of three schools of leadership” theory: (1) Implicit leadership theory and value-belief theory of culture, (2) Implicit motivation theory, and (3) Structural contingency theory of organizational form and effectiveness (House, et al., 2004, p. 59).

In Jackson and Parry’s (2011) view, leadership meant vision, cheerleading, enthusiasm, love, trust, verve, passion, obsession, consistency, the use of symbol . . . creating heroes at all levels . . . leadership must be present at all levels in the organization with the presence of trust, vision, and basic beliefs. Northouse (2013) defined leadership as a process which denotes that a leader affects and is affected by the followers, which emphasizes that leadership is an interactive event to achieve a common goal. Interestingly, Phillips (1992) illustrated the meaning of leadership based on the human rights leadership style of Abraham Lincoln as President of the United States and the Commander-in-Chief in the military. According to Phillips (1992), this human rights leadership style is similar with the leadership definition of James McGregor Burns in 1978 in his landmark book Leadership.

Spitzer (2000) added there exists a spirit in leadership that differentiates an inspired leader (with spirit) from a driven leader. Also, this author described the spirit construct as energy which gives rise to well-being, opens creativity . . . Spirit magnifies our capacity for self-transcendence . . . gives rise to peace, enthusiasm, inspiration, clear through, good judgement,
and efficient action. Moreover, Max De Pree (1992) perceived leadership as servanthood; he said that “the servanthood of leadership needs to be felt, understood, believed, and practiced if we’re to be faithful” (p. 8).

Spitzer’s (2000) conceptualization of a spirited servant leader has led to the emergence of reworded constructions and conceptualizations of servant leadership by contemporary scholars in the leadership paradigm (e.g., Frick, 2004; Spears, 2003; van Dierendonck & Patterson, 2014). For example, according to Frick (2004), servant leadership was constructed and conceptualized by Robert K. Greenleaf (1977/2002) which was inspired by his father’s leadership style in the family as a servant leader. Frick (2004) added that the three themes that defined Bob Greenleaf’s life and work are: servant, seeker, and leader. Pertinently, Frick (2004) explained that in Greenleaf’s view, a servant is neither a service provider nor a martyr, but one who consciously nurtures the mature growth of self, other people, institutions, and communities; and this is in response to the deepest guidance of the spirit, not for personal grandeur. Servanthood is a function of motive, identity, and right action (Frick, 2004). Greenleaf also described servants as spirit carriers who are prepared to connect workers of the world with vision from both past and contemporary prophets (as cited in Frick, 2004). Moreover, Greenleaf (1977/2002) genuinely believed that the “servant-leader is a servant first, it begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first. Then the conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead” (p. 27). He emphasized there are shadings and blends between the leader-first and the servant-first, and these exist in the care taken by the servant-first to assure other people’s most critical needs are being served (p. 27). With this view, Greenleaf (1977/2002) asked these questions:
Do those served grow as persons? Do they, while being served become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely to themselves to become servant? What is the effect on the least privileged? Will they benefit or at least not deprived? (p. 27)

It is the tone and substance of these questions that drives this study.

Recent research and thoughts on servant leadership strongly described the effectiveness of servant leadership as a model (van Dierendonck & Patterson, 2014). This model included compassionate love, and servant leadership. Compassionate love encompasses: (1) Virtuous traits (humility, gratitude, forgiveness, altruism); (2) Servant leader behavior (empowerment, authenticity, stewardship, providing direction); and (3) Follower well-being (optimal humans functioning, sense of community, meaningfulness (p. 120). Ferch (2012) also explained how servant leadership is particularly attuned “above-the-line” level of thought (p. 129). Attuned “above-the-line” thinking in servant teaching involves a transcendent desire and responsibility to help, serve, and make a difference in the lives of those people entrusted to us to educate, serve, and care. Another leading thinker on servant leadership, Spears (2003), generated a set of ten characteristics of a servant-leader after careful consideration of Greenleaf’s writings that he thought are important critical aspects to the development of a servant. These characteristics were: listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people and building community.

To understand the emergence of servant leadership in education, Greenleaf (1977/2002) articulated that the liberal arts education offers the best context to prepare young students for the complexities of adult life, with an important operational goal to equip students to serve and be served by the present society. To implement this goal, Greenleaf (1977/2002) suggested that a
potential servant leader who is committed to helping students grow to meet certain tests when he said:

He or she is deeply committed to the goal of helping prepare a few students to serve and be served by the present society . . . they have prepared themselves by thoroughly understanding the basic needs, learning to cope with the inevitable ambiguity, and faith in the dependability of one’s creative resources to produce, in the situation, answers to one’s going-on questions as one venture into new experience. They are prepared to make their way through the faculty-decision process and to keep their colleagues informed and at least acquiescent. (p. 204)

The above quote vividly described the faculty’s servant leadership styles and cultural sensitivity as new experiences that we should focus on effective educational leadership.

Recent studies on the impact of servant leadership (SL) in leading and managing public school, and other educational institutions have shown emerging and overlapping servant leadership characteristics through instrumental and operational definitions of servant leadership (i.e., Anderson, 2006; Crabtree, 2014; Hannigan, 2008; Herbst, 2003; Iken, 2005; Irving, 2005; Jacobs, 2011; Metzcar, 2008). In addition, Anderson’s (2006) mixed-design study examined a servant leader’s impact on public education (K-12) using the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) by Laub (1999). Findings revealed positive results—provides and shares leadership showing the strongest relationship. Crabtree’s (2014) study tested servant leadership characteristics of school principals in relation to student achievements using the self-assessment of Servant Leadership (SASL). Findings revealed a positive relationship between the two variables and validated servant leadership (SL) as an effective leadership approach in educational
organization. However, Hannigan’s work did not show relationship between SL and college performance, but his study inspired him to do further study on the topic.

Herbst’s (2001) investigation on the relationship between organizational servant leadership (SL) and school effectiveness showed a positive relationship between SL and ethnicity, but there was no significant relationship between other contextual variables and SL in the study. The positive alignment of servant leadership and ethnicity in Herbst’s (2001) study indicated the potential that servant leaders are also sensitive towards the cultures of their students.

Moreover, Iken (2005) compared perceptions among educators and staff of the practice of servant leadership (SL) on an institution-wide basis at a private Christian university in the Midwest. In this sample, educators agreed that servant leadership is being practiced on campus. Furthermore, staff somewhat agreed that SL was being practiced on campus, and they perceived a need to continue to develop skills in shared leadership. In addition, Irving (2005) investigated the relationship between servant leadership and the effectiveness of teams. The results revealed a positive correlation between servant leadership and job satisfaction when analyzed in relations to team effectiveness.

Jacobs (2011) investigated the relationship between the level of perceived servant leadership and effective teaching. The author examined the effect of years of teaching, experience, age, and gender on the level of perceived servant leadership. Results revealed no significant relationships between the dependent and independent variables in the study. On the contrary, Metzcar’s (2008) study examined the effect of SL upon effective teaching; and explored the strongest and weakest qualities of servant leadership. The author surveyed a group
of 764 National Board Certified Teachers (NBCTs) educators from pre-school to 12th grade, using the modified OLA called Teachers Leadership Assessment (TLA). Results revealed a positive relationship between servant leadership and effective teaching.

**Understanding the Realm of Catholic Higher Education**

*When we make the effort to move ourselves away from self and begin to concentrate on the needs of others and how to serve them, we begin to heal. Service is a balm to both the spirit and body.*

-Betty J. Eadie

To understand effective teaching in liberal arts education, it calls for a thorough analysis of the philosophies of Catholic higher education. Deferrari (1947/1948) describes how Catholic higher education is about service for the others at its very core; and that Catholic education is grounded a liberal arts experience that was built based on the proceedings of the following seminars and their summaries held at the Catholic University of America from June 13th to June 24th in 1947, namely as: (1) Seminar on training for the development of skill; (2) Seminar on the practical application of Catholic social principles in Catholic college life; (3) Seminar on religious integration of studies and life in the college; (4) Seminar on education and the Holy Ghost; and (5) Seminar on the content and methodology of the religious program.

To explain Franciscan and Dominican Philosophy in higher education, O’Mahony (1930) said that it is unthinkable to speak of Franciscan philosophy without any reference to the philosophy of Thomas Aquinas; that Franciscan philosophy is based on “ultimate and consistent outlook in life” (p. 2), an attitude towards life dictated by the example of St. Francis. In addition, O’Mahony (1930) stated that “knowledge is simply a life coming to consciousness of itself, and
when men had lived the Franciscan life in all its fullness, it is inevitable that they should seek to
give to the world the intellectual expression of that life” (p. 2).

To understand Thomism in relation to Franciscan philosophy, O’Mahony (1930) asked this question: What is to be our method of approach to an understanding of the ultimates of a Franciscan philosophy? The answer to this question is Thomism which afford the best approach based on Christian thinkers’ perspective, because “the ‘integral system’ of St. Thomas is sufficiently wide and embracive to allow sympathetic contact with the ultimate viewpoints of Franciscans” (O’Mahony, 1930, p. 4). In addition, O’Mahony (1930) added that Franciscan philosophy does not exist these days, and “St. Thomas has been recognized as the first of modern philosophers because for the first time in the history of Christian thought, he distinguished clearly between reason and faith and marked off the precise frontiers of philosophy and theology” (p. 5). This perspective explains the reason why Franciscan philosophy is based on Thomistic philosophy to this days.

To understand St. Thomas Aquinas’s philosophy pertaining cultural differences among people on earth, Pope John XXII, in his work *Pacem in Terris—Peace on Earth in 1963*, explained that St. Thomas Aquinas believed that the natural law gives men the right to share the benefits of culture, and therefore the right to basic education, technical, and professional training in keeping with the stage of educational development in the country which he/she belongs, that every person be enabled to go onto higher studies on the basis of merit so that these persons may occupy posts and take on responsibilities in human society in accordance with their natural gifts, and the skills they have acquired (Sigmund, 1988). In my view, the perspective of St. Thomas Aquinas strongly supports the idea of students participating in a university course-related
service-learning project/class to be able to develop and increase their servant leadership characteristics and cultural sensitivity in teacher education programs in a Catholic Jesuit university.

Catholic Jesuit philosophy in higher education can be a bridge to servant leadership. As good example is the connectivity between (1) the context of the latest release of Pope Francis encyclical *Laudato Si’*, (2) the mission statement of Gonzaga University, and (3) the speech of Reverend Adolfo Nicolas, the Superior General of the Society of Jesus, in a meeting in Chicago on October 12, 2013, calling for spiritual leaders for higher education, collaboration, and service to others (Nicolas, 2013). The connectivity between these three Catholic Jesuit paradigms at Gonzaga community, which is to be of service to others through promoting human dignity, collaboration, and social justice in the community and society, has encouraged me to choose Gonzaga University as my site to conduct my research in this dissertation endeavor.

Weis (2016) explained that *Laudato Si’* emboldens every Jesuit university with a purpose and vision toward serving justly and humanely in a sustainable world. According to Weis (2016) this document is remarkably visionary, comprehensive, and prescient—a truly path-breaking call to action as it invites our human creativity in the service of protecting our Earth through promoting human dignity and social justice. Weis (2016) added, as Jesuit institutions are strongly based, anchored, and nurtured on noble ideals, and now being called to role model leadership by Pope Francis—that Jesuit universities can and should find their ways to integrity on climate change, and social justice—in both words and actions. From this perspective, Gonzaga University, a Catholic Jesuit institution of higher education, created *Sustainability of Gonzaga* with a mission statement that complies with its Jesuit Catholic and humanistic mission
According to Deferrari (1947/1948), Catholic higher education is about service for the others at its very core and is grounded a liberal arts experience. Based on this principle, Gonzaga University takes seriously its solemn responsibility to safeguard the integrity of our natural world for present and future generations, and this institution is committed to leading, being a leader in a responsible environment stewardship (Gonzaga University, 2016). The Cataldo Project is a concrete example of Gonzaga University’s liberal arts educational experience initiative that demonstrates its commitment to Sustainability of Gonzaga’s mission.

The “Cataldo Project” initiative is inspired by the Jesuit founder of Gonzaga University, Fr. Joseph, S. J. (1837-1928) (Cataldo Project, 2017, p. 1). The Cataldo Project initiative has a goal “to provide Gonzaga graduates with a fundamental awareness and understanding of the importance of the natural environment to life, an understanding of how all human activities affect the environment, and an ethic for responsible stewardship of the Planet” (The Cataldo Project, 2017, p. 1). The Cataldo Project of Gonzaga University also aims (1) to encourage students to get involved and engaged to outdoor activities, and in group discussion in workshops, seminars, and other programs, and (2) to develop and augment the environment knowledge and skills of Gonzaga faculty members, as well as to assist them in revising their courses to include sustainability concepts (The Cataldo Project, 2017). According to Norman (2017), for a student to get involved and engaged in a diverse group discussion and outdoor activities, one has to work cooperatively with the other members (that includes students from different cultures) in a group, and in doing so, the individual is perceived as culturally sensitive towards the other participating students in the group.
The Mission Statement of the Jesuit Community at Gonzaga University (2003) states that the Jesuit Community of Gonzaga University loyally resumes the commitment of Gonzaga’s founding Jesuits, members of the Society of Jesus, who from the start in 1887 offered higher education with the faith tradition of the Catholic Church and the ideal of St. Ignatius of Loyola to all students enrolled at Gonzaga. This commitment to education originates from the first Jesuit college which St. Ignatius himself established in Mesina, Sicily, in 1548 (p. 1). It also emphasizes that the Jesuit Community works tirelessly with the University and the Catholic Church to bring the reign of Jesus Christ in justice, love, and peace to our world, and promotes the University’s humanistic, Catholic, and Jesuit character by fostering the intellectual and spiritual traditions of the Society of Jesus (p. 1).

The Jesuit Community also exerts a collaborative effort with enthusiasm to enlist Jesuits from all over the world to share with the responsibilities of apostolic service at Gonzaga (p. 1). This effort is carried on in the spirit of God’s call to every Jesuit to build the kingdom of God on Earth through obedience to the mission of the Society of Jesus in which higher education and the intellectual apostolate are key components of this mission (p. 1). Most importantly, as a collaborative effort, the Jesuit mission can only achieve its purpose to preparing all those enrolled students in Jesuit educational institutions to be men and women in the service of others (p. 2). As Jesuit themselves, their co-laborers, and their students are encouraged to work tirelessly for those to whom justice has been denied or whose poverty have closed off from the necessities of life (p. 2). This mission statement vividly supports the purpose of the university’s Center of Community Action and Service Learning (CCASL) course-related Service-learning programs which includes service to others in the community.
The themes of Reverend Adolfo Nicolas, S. J.’s speech emphasized *spiritual* and *heroic*, leadership, contemporary leadership behavior of Catholic Jesuit universities and pre-requisites for good decision-making. The speech closed with some specific questions for the attendees to study as decision-makers in the school entrusted to them in their capacities as the leaders of Jesuit higher education in the United States (Nicolas, 2013). These themes vividly connect to the purpose of this study, that is, to examine the extent to which participation in a university course-related service-learning project/class affects student success in developing servant leadership and cultural sensitivity in a teacher education program at a Catholic Jesuit university.

**Understanding Servant Leadership for Higher Education**

Wheeler’s (2012) model in the context of teaching in higher education is servant leadership (SL). His book titled *Servant Leadership for Higher Education: Principles and Practices* is about empowering people to lead and follow depending on their assignments and skills and its central message is to convey that we are all on a critical mission to serve the highest needs of those we serve (p. xv). Wheeler (2012) illustrates the following servant leadership principles that provide guidance in leading and making the decision in higher education:

1) Principle One: Service to others is the highest priority
2) Principle Two: Facilitate meeting the needs of others
3) Principle Three: Foster problem-solving and taking responsibility
4) Principle Four: Promote emotional healing in people and organization
5) Principle five: Means are as important as ends
6) Principle Six: Keep an eye on the present and one on the future
7) Principle Seven: Embrace paradoxes and dilemmas
8) Principle Eight: Leave a legacy to society
9) Principle Nine: Model Servant leadership
10) Principle Ten: Develop more leaders

The above list of principles has inspired the construction and conceptualization of the purpose of my research study, that is to examine the extent to which participation in a university course-related project/class affects students’ success in developing and enhancing servant leadership and cultural sensitivity qualities in a teacher education program.

Understanding the concept of teachers as servant leaders denotes more of a vocation than a profession to serve others first rather than serving the self. In this respect, the teacher must be a servant-first—as the teacher serves his or her students, he or she becomes a servant leader and a steward to the students, parents, and families, colleagues and school administrators, and community (Nichols, 2011). Additionally, Nichols (2011) explained that as a servant teacher, one not only serves the students and the school community, but also strategically builds and develops a democratic classroom, and encourages a life of democratic living and principles among the students. Nichols (2011) described that in a “democratic classroom teachers develop their role as servant, teacher, and leader of a community of learners where everyone is served, and every student has an equal voice and opportunity for development and accomplishments” p. 27).

From another point of view, Drury (2003) theorized that faculty who exercise servant leadership would be more likely to have a learning-focused classroom: that a servant leader mindset enables teachers to redirect energy toward collaborative inquiry. In other words, a servant-leader mindset enables to redirect energy toward collaborative inquiry. The author
developed a new faculty model, the “teacher as a servant leader” to fit the demand of our global contemporary new global economy (Drury, 2005, p. 13). Moreover, Kouzes and Posner (1995) added that when leaders are at their best, they challenge the process, inspire shared vision, enable others to act, model the way, and encourage the hearts of others. These leadership characteristics are clearly aligned with contemporary servant leadership qualities (Wheeler, 2012).

There exists some literature on the effect of servant leadership styles of professors and administrators toward students’ engagement and achievement (as in service-learning) in secondary and higher education that revealed significant results (e.g., Celio, Durlak, & Dymnicki, 2011; Garza, 2015; Noland & Richards, 2015; O’Meara & Nichaus, 2009; Scardino, 2013). For example, Celio, Durlak, and Dymnicki (2011) argued that despite the increased presence of service-learning in the education world, it is still unclear what student outcomes are associated with service-learning (S-L) programs and what factors are related to more effective programs. With this view, Celio et al. (2011) found out in their meta-analysis of 62 studies involving 11,837 students that, compared to controls, the students participating in S-L programs demonstrated significant gains in five outcome areas: (1) attitudes toward self, (2) attitudes toward school and learning, (3) civic engagement, (4) social skills, and (5) academic performance. The mean effects ranged from 0.27 to 0.43. Furthermore, as predicted, there was empirical support for the position that following certain recommended practices—such as liking to curriculum, voice, community involvement, and reflection—was associated with better outcomes. The authors concluded that current data should be gratifying for educators who incorporate S-L in their courses, and they should encourage more S-L research to understand
how service-learning is beneficial to students, and what conditions foster their growth and development (p. 164).

Moreover, Garza’s (2015) qualitative phenomenological study explored the service-learning (S-L) experiences for Hispanic high school students on the U.S-Mexico border as how these S-L experiences relate to transfer of knowledge, student motivation, students’ perception of their civic responsibility and role in their community, and student empowerment. Results revealed the overarching themes based upon the participants experiences which included: (1) better understanding and application of knowledge, (2) enjoyment of working with the community, (3) enhanced confidence when problem solving and working with diverse people, and (4) the development of positive relationships (p. iii).

In Noland and Richards’s (2015) research study, these authors sought to understand the relationship between servant teaching and the student outcomes of motivation, learning, and engagement. Results revealed a positive relationship between servant teaching and students’ outcomes on indicators of learning and engagement. The researchers also found a negative association between servant teaching, and student motivation, and affect. Despite of this discrepancy, Noland and Richards (2015) recommended both continued theoretical and empirical work on servant leadership to explore the broader picture of how servant teaching relates to instructor behaviors and student outcomes (p. 29).

In another study, O’Meara and Nichaus (2009) explored faculty engagement in service-learning. Their purpose was to understand the dominant discourses used by faculty to explain service-learning. This inquiry included nomination of 109 exemplary faculty who were recipients of the Thomas Ehrlich award. The findings revealed that faculty use four dominant discourses
regarding “the purpose and significance of service-learning: a model of teaching, an expression of personal identity, and expression of institutional context and mission, or embedded in a specific community partnership” (O’Meara & Nichaus, 2009, p. 1). The study affirmed other research on faculty attraction to and motivation for involvement in service-learning, but also pointed to continuing challenges in institutionalizing service-learning in higher education.

Furthermore, Scardino (2013) examined the success of the Franciscan tradition of educating to make better citizens. The author investigated the relationship between faculty’s servant leadership (SL) style and higher levels of engagement with their students. Participants in this study included full-time professors of three Franciscan universities who completed the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) which measures participants’ level of SL, and the Faculty Study of Student Engagement (FSSE) which measures the engagement of students with faculty (p. ii). The results revealed a significant statistical relationship between servant leadership and deep approaches to learning with strong correlation to healing. The author explained that deep approaches to learning would better prepare college students not just in the classroom but also in life (p. 46). Scardino also explained deep approaches to learning based on Tagg’s (2003) definition that “deep learning is learning that takes root in our apparatus of understanding, in the embedded meanings that define us and that we use to define the world” (p. 70).

Whereas Scardino (2013) used deep learning to identify student outcomes, so, too, this dissertation utilizes a similar approach, using service-learning experiences of participants to explore student outcomes of servant leadership (SL) and cultural sensitivity (CS). The participating professors in this study seem to display SL-like and CS-like qualities as expressed
in their course syllabus and choice of teaching service-learning teacher education courses. For example: (1) The Department of Education Mission statement is stated in the syllabi as follows:

As faculty and staff of the Department of Teacher education, we commit ourselves to facilitate the development of exemplary education through the integration of knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary for teaching and learning as a global society. We further commit ourselves, in the tradition of Jesuit education, to foster leadership and ethical behavior by stimulating intellectual vitality, advocating for justice, promoting a spirit of service, and developing life-long learning. (p. 1)

And (2) The Department of Teacher Education Dispositions are emphasized in the faculty syllabi listed as follows:

1. Commits to Learning and Acquiring Knowledge as evidenced by (1) Engaging in reflective and maintaining a positive openness to growth, (2) Actively pursues new concepts and valid ideas, (3) Developing critical thinking and problem-solving skills, (4) Openness and willingness to examine own assumptions and biases, (5) takes advantage of opportunities for professional development.

2. Respects Diversity as evidenced by (1) Respecting students as individuals with differing personal and family backgrounds and various skills, talents, interests, and identified disabilities, (2) Modeling behaviors that oppose racism and sexism while respecting differences, and (3) Maintaining a belief that each child can learn.

3. Exhibits Professionalism as evidenced by (1) Accepting personal professional responsibility, (2) Demonstrating ethical behavior and maintains confidentiality, (3) Following Gonzaga University, School of education, and school placement procedures
and policies, (3) Engaging productivity in collaborative situations, (4) Professional and written communication, and (5) Demonstrates and models reliability and responsibility.

4. Commits to Social Justice and Service as evidenced by (1) Understanding of teaching as a service profession, and (2) Committing to confronting inequity in classroom, schools, and society.

**Understanding Intercultural Competence in Higher Education**

“Cross-cultural leadership recognizes the moderating effect that culture have on leadership processes.”

-Jackson and Parry

To understand cross-cultural pedagogy in higher education, Lopes-Murphy and Murphy (2016) believed that increasing cultural and linguistic diversity in academic requires cultural competence on the part of faculty, administrators, staff, and pre- and in-service teachers. They argued that specific experiences enhance cultural competence. Lopes-Murphy and Murphy (2016) measured cultural competence in teacher educators and pre- and in-service teachers from two geographic regions in the United States, using a cultural competence instrument the authors developed themselves. Findings revealed cultural competence scores to be higher in the Mid-Atlantic location than in the Midwest. Cultural competence scores were higher for participants who had one or more of three cross-cultural experiences: speaking a foreign language, having been abroad, and have friends from other cultures (p. 57). The results reinforced the importance of cross-cultural experiences in the development of cultural competence, and the importance of the location from where institutions of higher education who value cultural competency draw their students (p. 57).
Moreover, Bennett (2011) defined intercultural competence as a “set of cognitive, affective, and behavioral skills, and characteristics that supports effective and appropriate interactions in a variety of cultural contexts” (p. 4). The author emphasized that culturally responsive institutions welcome individuals to honor different values, beliefs, behaviors whether the cultural differences are domestic or global.

Bennett (2011) also clarified that intercultural competence is demonstrated in three ways: (1) cognitively including cultural-awareness, cultural-general knowledge, and interaction analyses; (2) affectively encompassing curiosity, cognitive flexibility, motivation, open-mindedness; and (3) behavioral skills including relationship building skills on listening, empathy, problem-solving, and information gathering skills. To understand all these factors, Bennett (2011) recommended the integration of Kolb’s Cycle of Experiential Learning Style Model in the intercultural context through concrete and reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation. Similarly, Gonzaga University’s Service-Learning education courses in a teacher education program also include experiential learning in the intercultural context as stated in the professors’ course syllabus.

In training toward intercultural competence, Bennett (2011) recommended a package inclusive of examples of domestic cultural differences items to provide a foundation for diversity training. These items include culture, perception, language use, cultural stereotypes, non-verbal communication, communication styles, value constraints, problem-solving strategies, intercultural adaptation with emphasis on the development of cultural sensitivity, and cultural marginality. According to Bennett (2011), intercultural competence must also include these
factors: (1) intercultural adaptation with emphasis on ethnic development, (2) gender issues, (3) culture privilege, and race in U.S. America, and (4) power.

**Explaining Curiosity: Principles of Enhancing Curiosity**

To acquire cultural competence domestically and globally and develop our own sense of intercultural curiosity, Bennett (2011) advised that as teachers we need to focus on certain factors. These factors include: (1) suspending our assumptions and value judgements, (2) practicing cultural humility, (3) enhancing our perception skills, (4) developing multiple perspectives, (5) increasing tolerance, (6) asking questions as culturally appropriate, (7) becoming participant observers as appropriate, (8) becoming analytically inquisitive, and (9) assessing the credibility of our intercultural sources.

**Defining the Development of Intercultural Sensitivity**

As part of this intercultural process, Bennett and Bennett (1993/2004) developed the Developmental Model of Intercultural sensitivity (DMIS) as a framework that explains how people navigate differences. The model starts with three ethnocentric stages in which culture is experienced as central to reality in some detailed and specific ways. The other three stages of the model are described as ethnorelative which refers to viewing one’s own culture within the context of other cultures. To analyze the DMIS before undergoing intercultural competence training, Bennett, and Bennett (1993/2004) suggested to consider intercultural competencies that are essential for teaching across cultures in higher education in both domestic and global settings.
Intercultural Competencies Essential for Teaching Across Cultures

From Bennett’s (2011) perspective, an effective intercultural educator possesses the following attributes: (1) Comprehends the role of teaching in the learner’s culture, (2) Communicates clearly in non-native speakers of the language used in teaching, (3) Facilitates multicultural groups including turn-taking, participation, use of silence and others, (4) Code-Shifts from one communication style to another, (5) Paraphrase circular or indirect statements respectively for linear and direct group members, (6) Expresses enthusiasm for topic in culturally appropriate ways, (7) Suspends judgement of alternative norms, (8) Recognizes and addresses culture-specific risk factors for learners—loss of face, identity, and so forth, (9) Develops multiple frames of reference for interpreting intercultural situations, (10) Demonstrates good judgement in selecting the most appropriate interpretation in a transactional situation, (11) Asks sensitively phrased questions while avoiding premature closure, (12) Avoids ethnocentric idioms, slang, and aphorisms, (13) Recognizes ethnocentrism in goals, objectives, content, process, media, and materials, as well as group interaction, (14) Motivates learners based on their own values, (15) Delivers courses in a variety of methods, (16) Interprets non-verbal behavior in culturally appropriate ways, (17) Monitors the use of humor for cultural appropriateness, (18) Displays cultural humility, and (19) Is culturally-aware.

Recent Research on Intercultural Competency in Higher Education

In today’s globalized world, the need for cross-cultural understanding of the relationship between faculty and students in higher education is very important due to changing cultural climate both in the classroom and society at large. Promoting cross-cultural understanding through intercultural learning and teaching (1) would encourage intercultural awareness-raising
through reflective practices, (2) would positively impact the students’ higher success in acquiring English Language fluency, social support satisfaction, and social connectedness, and (3) would lessen acculturative stress among diverse domestic and international students in higher education (e.g., Fritz, Mollenberg, & Chen, 2001; Gu, Schweisfurth, & Day, 2010; Ippolito, 2007; McAllister & Irvine, 2000; Nieto, 2008; Omidvar & Tan, 2012; Yeh & Inose, 2010; Penbek, Yurdakul, & Cerit, 2009; Robinson, 2012; Salisbury, 2011, Sakurachi, 2014). For example, Fritz, Mollenberg, and Chen (2001) tested the Intercultural Sensitivity scale instrument developed by Chen and Starosta (1996) with a sample of German business students by using confirmatory factor analysis. Results revealed that the instrument is valid through which a culture free scale for measuring intercultural sensitivity can be developed. The results also suggested that the operationalization of the concepts in Chen and Starosta’s (1996) study can be improved.

In another study, Gu, Schweisfurth, and Day (2010) explored the complexities of international students’ transitional experiences both in terms of their maturation and human development and their intercultural adaptation within a different educational environment and different culture and society. The findings challenged the psychological model of international students’ linear intercultural adaptation and the successful configuration of identity. The research results revealed that personal, pedagogical, and psychological factors are as important as organizational and social cultures in influencing student’s adaptation, identity change and ultimate success (p. 1). The author concluded that the extent and nature of successful change and development can be restricted by the availability of support and the conditions of contact with the environments in which they are engaged (p. 1).
Ippolito (2007) evaluated a module designed to facilitate intercultural learning within and international, multicultural student group. The author explained that intercultural learning is a desired outcome of an international curriculum, but it is difficult to achieve due to persistence of deficit models used to frame both international student assimilation and widening participation, and failure to recognize how home students’ increasingly diverse nature results in interconnectedness of home and international students’ multiple identities, position, and needs when translating educational policy in practice. Based on these factors, Ippolito (2007) explored how students operate in this international learning environment, and whether they value curricular adjustments designed to draw mutual value from their diversity. Results revealed that participants’ narratives showed that obstacles included linguistic inequalities and unchallenged conceptions of privileged knowledge.

McAllister and Irvine (2000) reviewed literature on cross-cultural competency and multicultural teacher education and examined three process-oriented models that were used to describe and measure the development of racial identity and cross-cultural competence. The models included the Helm’s model of racial identity development, Banks’ Typology of Ethnicity, and Bennett’s Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity. The authors reported that this review of these three models provided insights: (1) for multicultural teacher education in assessing on how to learn designing effective learning opportunities, and (2) for providing appropriate support and challenge for teachers.

Nieto (2008) investigated the extent to which one’s level of cultural competence influences the teaching and learning process for both instructor and students at the university level. The author examined whether there is difference in the level of intercultural sensitivity
Findings revealed a significant difference between ESL instructors and non-ESL instructors on interaction, engagement, and that females scored higher levels of cultural sensitivity than males (p. ii). The author concluded that while students’ cultural and linguistic differences were the challenges most faced by university instructors in teaching international students, these same cultural and linguistic differences were not deemed as challenges within the larger student population (p. ii).

Omidvar and Tan (2012) contended that the increasing trend of the multicultural mixture of students in the classroom necessitates an understanding of the cross-cultural relationship between cultural and learning styles of students. The authors reviewed relevant literature on culture and learning style as variables and summarized results of the existing research. The prominent theme that came out from the review was that learners from different cultures have different preferences for learning styles (Omidvar & Tan, 1996).

Penbek, Yurdakul, and Cerit (2009) explored the intercultural sensitivity levels of university students, the contribution of education, and the intercultural experience of a sample of population from two universities in Izmir, Turkey. The researchers used Chen and Starosta’s (2000) Intercultural Sensitivity instrument to measure the variables in the study. The results revealed respect for different cultures improve with the students’ level of engagement in international interactions.

In another study, Robinson (2012) sought to determine if a relationship exists between teachers’ cultural competency and students’ engagement. The study included sample of
population of 70 selected school teachers and 520 high school students from two international schools in Hong Kong. Using the Multicultural Awareness Questionnaire (Culhane-Pera et al., 1997), the researcher measured cultural competence including the three sub-constructs of knowledge, skills, and attitude. The researcher also measured engagement using the Student Engagement Survey (Skinner, 1993). Results revealed that the students’ perception of their teachers’ cultural competency had a strong positive correlation with student engagement.

Sakurachi (2014) investigated college students’ intercultural sensitivity development through an intentional course design using Kolb’s (1984) learning style cycle and Hammer’s (2009) Intercultural Development Continuum. Both quantitative and qualitative data were collected to investigate both domestic and international students’ intercultural learning experiences, and to identify teaching approaches that facilitates students’ intercultural competence. Despite experiencing intercultural courses, results revealed a wide gap in intercultural development between American students and Japanese exchange students because of the groups vastly different intercultural experiences.

Research by Salisbury (2011) explored the effect of the study abroad experience on intercultural competence among 1,593 participants from the Wabash National study on Liberal Arts education. This was a longitudinal study of undergraduates that gathered pre- and posttests measures on numerous educational outcomes, an array of institutional and self-reported pre-college characteristics and host of college experiences. Findings revealed that the study abroad experience generated statistically significant positive effect on intercultural competence and on students’ diversity of contact but studying abroad had no statistically significant effect on relativistic appreciation of cultural diversity or comfort with diversity (p. 1).
Furthermore, Yeh, and Inose (2003) explored age, gender, reported English fluency, social support satisfaction and social connectedness as predictors of acculturative stress among sample of 359 students. The results in this study divulged that international students from Europe experienced lesser acculturative stress than their counterparts from Asia, Central/Latin America, and Africa; and findings revealed that English fluency, social support satisfaction, and social interconnectedness are predictors of acculturative stress (p. 1).

Methodology

This investigation examined the extent to which servant leadership (SL) and cultural sensitivity (CS) characteristics are exhibited by students, and how their participation in a university course-related service-learning (UCRSL) project/class affects servant leadership and cultural-sensitivity levels. Comparing the pre- and posttests survey scores on SLQ and CSAT at the beginning and end of the semester determines whether the students in a teacher education program achieve higher success in developing servant leadership and cultural sensitivity through the experience of participating in a UCRSL project/class or not. This chapter on methodology includes and briefly explains the sections on; (1) Research Methods, (2) Research Design, (3) Population and Sampling, (4) Instrumentation, (5) Variables in the Study, (6) Data Collection, (7) Data Analysis, (8) Limitation of the Study, and (9) Ethical Considerations.

I chose the quantitative survey method plan in conducting this research study because of this method’s advantages—such as the economy of the design and the rapid turnaround in data collection (Creswell, 2014). The method of the survey would be cross-sectional based on the limited timeframe, and the size and nature of the sample drawn from the population within the semester period of conducting the research. Data was collected at two points in time, at the
beginning and end of Spring or Fall semesters of the designated school year (e.g., Spring 2018), using the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) by Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) to measure servant leadership, and the Cultural Sensitivity Assessment tool (CSAT) created by Lopes-Murphy and Murphy (2016) to measure cultural sensitivity. I discussed the details of this section in Chapter III Methodology of this dissertation.

**Definitions of Terms**

1) Active learning as a discussion method: Mayer (2008, p. 17) explains active learning as “paying attention to relevant information, organizing it into coherent mental representations, and integrating representation with other knowledge” (as cited in Svinicki & McKeachie, 2008, p. 28). The prototype teaching method for fostering active learning has always been discussion which can be use in all class sizes (Svinicki & McKeachie, 2011/2014).

2) Cultural Sensitivity: To be culturally sensitive, students become culturally responsive. To be culturally responsive, Gay (2002) stated that teachers:

   - Should acquire a knowledge base on ethnic and cultural diversity to transform into a culturally responsive curriculum design and instructional strategies.
   - Are critically conscious of the power symbolic curriculum as an instrument of teaching, and use it to convey important information, values, and actions about ethnic and cultural diversity.
   - Demonstrate cultural caring and building learning communities by creating classroom climates that are conducive to learning for ethnically diverse students and use cultural scaffolding in teaching these students.
3) Leadership: Leadership means that one individual has a better than average sense of what should be done now and is willing to take the risk to say, “Let us do this now.” The process of consensus is followed up to the point where some individual must take this risk—this leap of faith. Spontaneous consensus rarely goes to the point of clearly indicating action. Inspiration is usually received by the best prepared individual who, for this immediate act, is the leader (Greenleaf, 1977/2002, p. 256).

4) Students: Undergraduate students enrolled in the certification or credentialing program in the teacher education program who are participating in a university course-related service-learning project/class at Gonzaga University.
5) Servant Leadership: Servant Leadership is not a set of techniques or activities. It is a way of being, a philosophy of living and influencing. To even consider servant leadership, administrators should examine their goals and determine whether they have a commitment to modeling and practicing leadership as a service (Wheeler, 2012, p. 13).

6) Service-learning: Community service with instruction and reflections to enrich the learning experience, teach civic responsibility and strengthen communities it is integrated into, and enhances the academic, or the educational components of the community service program in which the participants are enrolled (Gonzaga University, 2016).

7) Servant-teaching: Servant leadership style of teaching wherein instructor demonstrates servant leadership characteristics and cultural sensitivity towards his or her students. Applying servant leadership to classroom contexts serves as an opportunity to improve education by positively impacting student learning, development, and deepening the student-centeredness of instruction (Noland & Richards, 2013).

**Overview of Dissertation**

Chapter I clarifies and explains the following constructs and concepts in framing this study such as the following: (1) Introduction, (2) Statement of the Problem, (3) Rationale of the Study, (4) Purpose of the Study, (5) Research Question, (6) Hypotheses, (7) Conceptual framework, (8) Methodology, (9) definitions of Terms, and (10) Overview of Dissertation.

Chapter II reviews pertinent literature in the following order: (1) defined leadership and explained the spirit of leadership, (2) illustrated the history of leadership (3) described the evolution of servant leadership, (4) defined servant leadership, (5) explained servant leadership in education, (6) reviewed recent studies on servant leadership, (7) discussed the philosophy of
Catholic higher education, (8) clarified Dominican and Franciscan higher education to highlight St. Thomas Aquinas’s beliefs pertaining moral and cultural values, (9) illuminated Catholic Jesuit higher education as a bridge to servant leadership, (10) illustrated servant leadership for higher education and reviewed recent literature on servant leadership in higher education, (11) explained teachers as servant-leaders, cultural sensitivity in a servant-teaching environment, and (12) explicated intercultural competence in higher education.

Chapter III describes the methodology of the study including: (1) Research Methods, (2) Research Design, (3) Population and Sampling, (4) Instrumentation, (5) Variables in the Study, (6) Data Collection, (7) Data Analysis, (8) Limitations of the Study, and (9) Ethical Assurances. Also, discussed in this chapter the reliability and validity of the instruments selected for variable measurement, and used to control for extraneous variables.

Chapter IV reports the results from the data analysis. This survey study utilizes Statistics with Microsoft Excel Fifth Edition (Dretzke, 2005/2013) to determine the differences between servant leadership and cultural sensitivity levels of students before and after the service-learning experience.

Chapter V includes the discussion, interpretations of findings, and results from the collected data, recommendations, and conclusion.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

“Wisdom is revealed through action, not talk.”

-Epictetus

Introduction

At the end of the twentieth century there was a crucial clamor for change in organizational leadership, specifically, in the educational institutions that train workers, to satisfy the leadership demands of globalization in postmodern times (Eitzen & Zinn, 2006/2012). This change process in leadership should be inclusive of collaboration and service to others (Spears, 2002), and interculturally competent (Lopes-Murphy & Murphy, 2016) in both domestic and global organizational settings. This trend triggered a shifting of paradigms (Kuhn, 1962/1970) in leading and managing organizations, from traditional, autocratic, and hierarchical modes of leadership to a newly emerging model (Spears, 2002). This emerging leadership model is: 1) based on teamwork and community that encourages to involved others in decision-making, 2) highly based on ethical and caring behavior, and 3) attempts to develop the personal growth of followers while enhancing the caring and quality of many institutions (Greenleaf, 1977/2002; Spears, 2002). In addition, Spears (2002) and Greenleaf (1977/2002) called this currently emerging leadership and service approach servant leadership.

The focus of this study is on how service-learning connects to student servant leadership and cultural sensitivity in teacher education at a Catholic Jesuit university. In this perspective, this review of literature seeks to highlight the history of servant leadership, the emergence of a culturally sensitive servant-leader, and the efficacy of servant leadership in leading and
managing organizations. In doing so, (1) I define leadership and explain the spirit of leadership; (2) Illustrate the history of servant leadership and describe a servant-leader; (3) define servant leadership and explain servant leadership in higher education; (4) review recent research on servant leadership; (5) illustrate the philosophy of Catholic higher education, and explain Dominican and Franciscan philosophies in higher education to clarify Thomistic moral and cultural values (Sigmund, 1988); (6) illuminate Catholic Jesuit higher education as a bridge to servant leadership and explain servant leadership for higher education; (7) describe teachers as servant-leaders, and review recent research on servant leadership in higher education; (8) clarify cultural competence as intercultural competence, and explain the development of Intercultural Sensitivity; and (9) review recent literature on intercultural competence/sensitivity.

**Understanding the Evolution of Leadership and Servant Leadership Paradigms**

“*Emulate worthy role models; invoke the characteristics of the people you admire most and adopt their manners, speech as our own.*”

- Epictetus

**Defining Leadership**

The definition and construct of the *leadership* concept interestingly varies from one leader’s leadership style to the others (i.e., Burns, 1978; Greenleaf, 1977/2002; Grint, 2003; House et al., 2004; Jackson & Parry, 2011; Northouse, 2013; Phillips, 1992). However, Leadership scholar, James MacGregor Burns (1978) remarked: “Some define leadership as leaders making followers do what *followers* would not otherwise do, or as leaders making followers do what the *leaders* want them to do” (p. 19). He added, “I define leadership as leaders inducing followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and the motivations—the
wants and needs, the aspirations, and expectations—of both leaders and followers” (Burns, 1978, p. 19). This author also believed that the genius of leadership lies in the manner, in which leaders see and act on their own and their followers’ values and motivations (p. 19). Moreover, James MacGregor Burns (1978) reiterated that the essence of the relationship between leader and followers is the “interaction of persons with different levels of motivations and of power potential, including skill, in pursuit of a common or at least joint purpose” (p. 19).

Robert K. Greenleaf (1977/2002) defined leadership in the contexts of Servant leadership in Education, Foundations, and Churches as follows:

*Leadership* means that one has a better than average sense of what should be done now and is willing to take the risk to say, ‘Let us do this now,’ The process of consensus is followed up to the point where some individual must take this risk—this leap of faith. Spontaneous consensus rarely goes to the point of clearly indicating action. Inspiration is usually received by the best prepared individual who, for this immediate act, is the leader. (p. 256)

Moreover, Greenleaf (1977/2002) remarked that followership is an “equally responsible role” as the leadership role because it means that the follower must take the risk to empower the leader and to say, in the matter at hand, “I will trust your insight.” Followership implies another preparation in order that trusting, empowering the leader, will be a strength-giving element in the institution (p. 256).

Additionally, Grint (2005) defined leadership in traditional four different ways: (1) Leadership as a person, (2) as results, (3) as a position, and (4) as a process. The Global and Leadership and Organizational Behaviour Effectiveness (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman &
Gupta, 2004) defined leadership as the ability of an individual to influence, motivate, and enable others to contribute toward the effectiveness and success of the organizations of which they are members.

In another perspective, Peters and Austin as cited in Jackson and Parry’s (2011) review in their book *A Very Short, Fairly Interesting and Reasonably Cheap Book about Studying Leadership*, defined leadership as:

Leadership means vision, cheerleading, enthusiasm, love, trust, verve, passion, obsession, consistency, the use of symbols, paying attention as illustrated by the content of one’s calendar, our-and-out drama (and the management thereof), creating heroes at all levels, coaching, effectively wandering around, and numerous other things. Leadership must be present at all levels in the organization. It depends on a million little things done with obsession, consistency, and care, but all those million little things add up to nothing if the trust, vision, and basic belief are not there. (pp. 12-13)

Moreover, Jackson and Parry’s (2011) review clarified that Grint (2005a) described leadership is traditionally perceived in four different ways: (1) Leadership as a Person: WHO ‘leaders’ that makes them leaders. (2) Leaders as Results: is it WHAT ‘leaders achieve that makes them leaders. (3) Leadership as a Position: is it WHERE ‘leaders’ operate that makes them leaders. (4) Leadership as a Process: is it HOW ‘leaders’ get things done that makes them leaders.

House et al. (2004) explained their work on *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies* that the title of their work, also referred to as CL and O or GLOBE, suggests that culture takes place of primacy in their work on leadership. The GLOBE is an acronym for the “Global Leadership and Organizational Behaviour Effectiveness” research
program (House et al., 2004, p. 55). The program consists of three phases, and phases 1 and 2 are reported in CL and O. The CL and O examines culture as it relates to leadership in all major regions of the world; and is more than a summary of data gathered from around the world (p. 55). Most importantly, as a landmark work, “CL and O is also a statement: a foundational sift in leadership thinking from individual leadership theory (ILT) to cultural leadership theory (CLT)” (House et al., 2004, p. 55).

Northouse (2013) defined: “Leadership is a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a goal” (p. 5). This author emphasized that defining leadership is a process means that it is not a “trait or characteristic that resides in the leader, but rather a transactional event that occurs between the leader and the followers” (p. 5). Northouse (2013) reiterated that a “process” denotes that a leader affects and is affected by the followers—which emphasizes that leadership is not a linear, one-way event, but rather an interactive event. When leadership is defined as such, it is accessible to everyone; and it is not restricted to the formally designated leader in a group. Leadership involves influence in groups and it includes attention to common goals (pp. 5-6).

Phillips (1992) described in his book Lincoln on Leadership: Executive Strategies for Tough Times that the foundation of Abraham Lincoln’s leadership as the President of the United States was an “unshakable commitment to the rights of the individual” (p. 3). Phillips (1992) also explained that this concept of human rights is closed to definition of leadership by James MacGregor Burns in his landmark book Leadership. The author did extensive research on Abraham Lincoln’s life as a leader after reading Carl Sandburg’s Lincoln: The War Years, and discovered in his reading that Abraham Lincoln, as President of the United States seemed to use
many leadership methods that are being taught today (p. 18). Phillips (1992) explained Lincoln’s leadership style as follows: (1) Leading People: Get out of the office and circulate among the troops, build strong alliance with followers, persuade rather than coerce; (2) Leader’s Character: Honesty and integrity are the best policies, never act out of vengeance or spite, have the courage to handle unjust criticism, be a master of paradox; (3) Leaders’ Endeavor: Exercise a strong hand—be decisive, lead followers by being led; set goals and be results-oriented, keep searching until you find your “grant”, encourage innovation; (4) Leader on Communication: Master the art of public speaking, influence people through conversation and storytelling, preach vision and continually reaffirm it.

To understand Lincoln’s leadership style, Phillips (1992) added: “Abraham Lincoln’s eminent integrity was reflected in his ability to make tough decisions. He knew that character is the very foundation of leadership and that, if the foundation has cracks in it, the entire structure can come tumbling down” (p. 177). Additionally, Phillips (1992) said that leadership is an elusive concept embodied with vagueness and ambiguity, thus, there are only concepts, perceptions and ideas, abstracts and generalities; and that we need to look for role models to recognize as successful leaders like Abraham Lincoln. Abe Lincoln was a visionary and highly spirited leader who led by being led by his followers (Greenleaf, 1977/2002).

The Spirit of Leadership

Spitzer (2000) explained that the difference between an inspired leader and a driven leader is the inspired leader’s possession and communication of spirit. Spitzer (2000) emphasized that inspired leaders “imparts common cause, hope, resilience, creativity, energy, synergy, and optimal fulfillment of optimal goals . . . the word ‘spirit’ used in a variety of
contexts . . . connotes energy, enthusiasm, psychic surge that goes beyond the laws of physics” (pp. 32-33). Moreover, Spitzer (2000) explained that spirit affects individuals, assuming that spirit is present in every human being:

Spirit imparts heightened energy. Spirit gives rise to sense of well-being. Spirit opens the way to creativity. Spirit heightens our ability to connect with one another, commit to a common cause, and achieve unity beyond material boundaries. Spirit magnifies our capacity for self-transcendence or self-sacrifice beyond normal physical limitations. Spirit embraces the future as if it were the present. Spirit gives rise to peace, enthusiasm, inspiration, clear thought, good judgement, and efficient action. (pp. 33-36)

In another viewpoint, Max De Pree (1992) wrote in *Leadership Jazz*, “The servanthood of leadership needs to be felt, understood, believed, and practiced if we’re to be faithful” (p. 8). The best description of this kind of leadership is found in the book of Luke, “the greatest among you should be the youngest, and the one who rules, like the one who serves” (Max De Pree, 1992, p. 8). Max De Pree (1992) also suggested that in the active pursuit of a common good in leadership provides us the right to ask leaders and managers of all sorts to be not only successful, but faithful as well. Also, De Pree (1992) named the five criteria in faithfulness as follows:

*Integrity in all things* precedes all else; the *servanthood of leadership* needs to be felt, understood, believed, and practiced if we’re to be faithful; *accountability for* others, especially on the edges of life and not yet experience in the ways of the world, is the one of the great directions leaders receive from the prophet Amos. Amos tells us that leaders should encourage and sustain those on the bottom rung first and then turn to those of on
the trickle-up theory. Leaders have to be vulnerable, have to offer others the opportunity to do their best. (pp. 7-9)

Furthermore, leadership without the spirit of a leader is empty and devoid of the true and genuine characteristics of a servant-leader (e.g., Frick, 2004; Fry & Matherly, 2005; Nichols, 2011; Nicolas, 2013). For example, Frick (2004) recalled Bob Greenleaf’s belief on spirituality as leadership:

During the final years at Crosslands, Bob increasingly concerned himself with universal issues, especially spirituality. Bob usually preferred the word spirit over spirituality, but he did write an essay in 1982 titled Spirituality as Leadership. When Teacher as Servant was published in 1979, he still believed universities could be the major leavening force toward a more caring society. (p. 299)

Pertinently, Fry and Matherly (2005) defined Spiritual leadership theory as a casual theory for organizational transformation designed to create intrinsically motivated learning organization. Spiritual leadership includes “the values, attitudes, and behaviors” required to intrinsically motivate one’s self and others in order to have a sense of “spiritual” well-being through “calling and membership,” i.e., they experience meaning in their lives, have a sense of making a difference, and feel understood and appreciated (Fry & Matherly, 2005, p. 2).

Moreover, Nichols (2011) quoted in his book’s, Teachers as Servant Leaders, dedication to his wife and his children, “To get her love, support, and sustaining spirit remain as my constant inspiration. She is a true servant leader. And to Manna, Micah, and Bethany, three wonderful kids who serve without knowing” (p. iii).
Furthermore, the Reverend Adolfo Nicolas’s (2013), Superior General of the Society of Jesus, reached out to enlist spiritual leaders for higher education to serve in his speech in a meeting in Chicago in October 12, 2013 with the board chairs and presidents of 28 Jesuit colleges and universities in the United States. Nicolas (2013) pointed out in his speech that the principal function of a leader is to help the members of the community grow based on the Ignatian concept of service and growth leading to transformation, and emphasized that the lack of transformation, the school or parish is not Jesuit.

**Historical Background of Servant Leadership**

Robert K. Greenleaf (1977/2002) coined the term *servant leadership*, constructed, and conceptualized servant leadership through practice in his lifetime. Greenleaf’s (1977/2002) idea of the servant leader came out from his reading of Herman Hesse’s *The Journey to the East* and this narrative is described as follows:

In this story we see a band of men on a mythical journey, probably Hesse’s own journey. The central figure is Leo, who accompanies the party as the *servant* who does their menial chores, but who also sustains them with his spirit and his song. He is a person of extraordinary presence. All goes well until Leo disappears. Then the group falls in disarray and the journey was abandoned. They cannot make it without the servant Leo. The narrator, one of the party, after some years of wandering, finds Leo and is taken into the Order that had sponsored the journey. There he discovers that Leo, whom he had known as servant, was in fact the titular head of the Order, its guiding spirit, a great and noble *leader*. (p. 21)
According to Frick (2004), Bob Greenleaf had experienced the role-modeling of servant leadership from his childhood experiences of doing things with his father; and observing his father’s ways and style of handling responsibilities to his family and to the community where they lived. Frick (2004) clarified that there are three themes that define Greenleaf’s life and work as servant, seeker, and leader. Greenleaf did not use these concepts in their traditional sense. Frick (2004) explained that for Greenleaf, “a servant is not a ‘service provider,’ a martyr or a slave, but one who consciously nurtures the mature growth of self, other people, institutions, and communities” (p. 5). To a servant, this is accomplished in response to deepest guidance of spirit, not for personal grandiosity, and servanthood is a function of motive, identity, and right action (p. 3).

Additionally, a seeker is different from a mere achiever—one who sets goals and attains them in a straightforward fashion (Frick, 2004). According to Frick (2004), an authentic seeker is open and receptive to experience from all quarters of uncertainties; and is determined to venture to unknown paths with strong determination in his horizon. Frick (2004) explained that Greenleaf believes that an authentic leader is one who chooses to serve, and serve first, and then chooses to lead. This type of leader, a servant-leader, demonstrates reflection, listening, persuasion, foresight, and statesmanship to act ethically and go out ahead and show the way to his followers (p. 5). Frick (2004) also remarked that a servant leader may operate quietly or publicly, but his or her title as President or CEO of an organization is not the major point. Robert K. Greenleaf believes the important point is “to serve and serve-first” and the janitor of a school may be a more powerful servant-leader to students than the principal (as cited in Frick, 2004, p. 5).
To grasp Greenleaf’s servant leadership characteristics, Frick (2004) described and explained Greenleaf’s life as a Servant-Leader. The Servant section traces youthful Robert K. Greenleaf’s experience from childhood through graduation from Carleton College (Frick, 2004). At an early age, Bob Greenleaf first learned about servanthood from his father, a parent worthy of recognition and his own biography as a servant-leader. By the time young Bob Greenleaf graduated from Carleton in 1926, he had gracefully embraced servant at the core of his identity, values, and beliefs (p. 6).

The Seeker section traces Greenleaf’s career with AT&T, ending in 1964 when he took early retirement to start a new chapter in his life as seeker (Frick, 2004). During this period in his lifetime, Greenleaf and his wife ventured in the unknown and “learned from an incredible variety of famous and no-so-famous ministers, writers, thinkers, doctors, theologians, activists, business, luminaries, psychiatrists, and even psychics” (Frick, 2004, p. 6). The conceptualized theme of seeking was formalized when Greenleaf became a Quaker, and when he realized he should prepare for usefulness in old age (p. 6). During this period, Greenleaf made valuable significant “contributions at AT&T, was present at the founding of National Training Laboratories, began teaching at MIT and other schools, traveled for the Ford foundation, and struggled to accept his own destiny as someone other than an AT&T executive” (Frick, 2004, p. 6).

The Leader section starts with Greenleaf’s retirement and founding of the Center from Applied Ethics establishment (now Robert k. Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership) and traces his peripatetic travels and consultancies as his ideas and vision as a natural servant leader brewed and matured (Frick, 2004). The emergence of the “servant-leader philosophy” into public view came about with the publication of his first essay on the subject in 1970 and continued
evolving via multiple variety of his writings until his death in 1990 (Frick, 2004, p. 6). Robert K. Greenleaf with his shyness, an introvert, did not aspired to become a public figure. Frick (2004) explained that Greenleaf’s life would not come to a full circular whole not until he chose an aggressive leadership role in advocating his own ideas. In relation to paraphrasing Kant, Greenleaf might have said that “leadership without servanthood is empty; seeking without leadership is dead” (Frick, 2004, p. 6).

To understand Greenleaf’s view of a servant, Frick (2004) shared Greenleaf’s perception of the world. For Greenleaf, there are people in the world whom he would call spirit carriers. According to Frick (2004) Greenleaf believed that “servants who nurture the human spirit are spirit carriers” (p. 11). Spirit carriers serve to connect those who do the work of the world, or who are being prepared for that role, with vision from both past and contemporary prophets (p. 11). These servants always work hard to find the resources and exert intensive effort to be an effective influence in the work environment (p. 11). They neither make speeches nor write books as the prophet does; they are spirit carriers and always connect the prophecy with the people so that it changes their lives (Frick, 2004). In addition, Frick (2004) stated that Greenleaf also agreed that “the spirit is power, but only when the spirit carrier, the servant as nurturer of the human spirit, is a powerful and not a casual force” (p. 11).

To clarify Greenleaf’s point on a servant being a servant, seeker, leader, and a spirit carrier, Frick (2004) created a concise timeline of Robert K. Greenleaf’s life as a servant-leader from the day he was born in July 14, 1904 until the day he died in September 29, 1990 as listed below.
Describing the Life of a Servant-Leader

- Step #1: The Source of Spring of the Servant-Leader: Fed by primal religious awe, the mystery of spirit.
- Step #2: The Servant
- Step #3: Values: Love, Serve first, Congruent integrity, Deep. Loyal friendship
- Step #4: Attitudes—I will: Accept persons with unlimited liability; Create life of distinction; Demand accountability; Be open to novelty; Develop strength based on entheos; Lead as a servant; Not follow non-servants; Remember that everything begins with the individual “in here, not out there.”
- Step #5: Skills and Capacities: Listening, Persuasion (ethical use of power), Consensus building (persuasion in group), technical competence in discipline, Foresight, research, Conceptualizing, (using language openly and imaginatively), Reflection and meditation, Assessment.
- Step #6: Habits: Listen first; Daily heightened awareness; Withdraw to access intuition; Ask first, “Who do you want to be?” and “What are you trying to do?”; Understand history; Have fun; Make time count; Lifelong learning; Seeking (“adventuresomeness”).
- Step #7: The “best test” of a Servant-Leader: Are those being served, while being served, healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, and more likely to become servants? And what is the effect on the least privileged in society?

The above list of steps or stages in the development of a servant-leader described the evolution of Robert K. Greenleaf’s life of Servant leadership as a Servant and the journey started from the
"Source of Spring of the Servant-Leader" climbing up the ladder to the pre-destined goal—The "best test" of a Servant-Leader (Frick, 2004. p. 348).

**Defining Servant Leadership**

Recent interest and thinking on servant leadership supported the proposed servant leadership model by van Dierendonck (2011) in terms of its potential efficacy (van Dierendonck & Patterson, 2014). This model included *compassionate love* and servant leadership.

Compassionate love included: (1) Virtuous traits (humility, gratitude, forgiveness, altruism); (2) Servant leader behavior (empowerment, authenticity, stewardship, providing direction); and (3) Follower well-being (optimal human functioning, sense of community, meaningfulness) (p. 120).

Additionally, van Dierendonck and Nuijten (2011) conducted an extensive review to describe the development and validation of a multi-dimensional instrument to measure servant leadership. In this review, the authors formulated 99 items, using eight samples totaling 1571 persons from the Netherlands and the UK with diverse occupational background, used combined exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis approach; and this process was followed by criterion-related validity analysis (p. 249). The findings divulged an eight-dimensional measure of 30 items: (1) the eight dimensions being: standing back, forgiveness, courage, empowerment, accountability, authenticity, humility, and stewardship; and (2) the interval consistency of the subscales are good. The result revealed that Servant Leadership Survey (SLS) has convergent validity with other leadership measures and adds unique elements to the leadership field. The evidence for criterion-related validity were found from studies relating the eight dimensions to well-being and performance (p. 249).
Moreover, van Dierendonck et al. (2013) investigated environmental uncertainty as a moderator of the effects of servant leadership (SL) and transformational leadership (TFL). The researchers concluded that both SL and TFL were related to organizational commitment and work engagement based on the results of two experimental studies and one field study but differed in the manner they exerted their influence (p. 1). Servant leadership worked primarily through follower need satisfaction, whereas transformational leadership worked mainly through perceived leadership effectiveness, and the moderating influence of uncertainty was inconsistent across the studies (p. 1).

Asag-Gau and van Dierendonck (2011) tested a model in which the challenging work conditions of employees at work and empowerment mediated the influence of servant leadership (SL) on organizational commitment, aimed to provide additional insight into the relevance of leadership for talent management. The study used a sample of 174 highly talented employees; and challenging work conditions and empowerment mediated the relationship of SL to organizational commitment (p. 1) The results indicated that the conceptual model tested with a structured equation modeling fitted perfectly; challenging work conditions were related to three out or four psychological empowerment dimensions, and an additional variance in the meaning aspect of psychological empowerment had emerged (p. 1).

Furthermore, Greenleaf (1977/2002) constructed and conceptualized a servant-leader by combining the two roles of a servant and a leader in one real person, in all levels of status or calling, believing that a person can live and be productive in the real world today. Greenleaf’s idea of a servant as a leader had emerged from his reading of Herman Hesse’s (1956/1960) *The Journey to the East*. In Greenleaf’s (1977/2002) perspective, this story had convinced him that
that the great leader is a “servant first,” a simple fact that described Leo, the main character (p. 21). In the story, Leo joined the band of men on a mythical journey as the servant who did the group’s chores, and sustained them with his spirit and song, until Leo vanished, and the group found out that Leo was truly “the titular head of the Order” and its spiritual guide and noble leader (Greenleaf, 1977/2002, p. 21).

Greenleaf (1977/2002) also stated that Leo was the implicit leader all the time, but he was a “servant first” because that was his nature deep down inside him (p. 21). The author believed that leadership was endowed upon a person who was by nature a servant. “It was something given, or assumed, that could be taken away. His servant nature was the real man, not bestowed, not assumed, and not be taken away. He was a servant first” (Greenleaf, 1977/2002, pp. 21-22).

Moreover, in addressing issues of power and authority, Greenleaf (1977/2002) explained that people are beginning to learn how to relate to one another more cooperatively and with less coercion. Pertinent to this, Greenleaf (1977/2002) explicated the emergence of a new moral principle which holds that “the only authority deserving one’s allegiance is that which is freely and knowingly granted by the led to the leader in response to, and in proportion to, the clearly transparent evident servant stature of the leader” (pp. 23-24). Also, Greenleaf (1977/2002) emphasized that those who adhere to the above principle do not easily accept the authority of existing institutions. Instead, they will only recognize and follow individuals who are chosen as leaders because they proved themselves as trusted servants (p. 24). In addition, Greenleaf asserted that as the above-mentioned principle prevails, the only truly viable institutions that will survive in the future will be those that are solely servant led (p. 24).
Greenleaf (1977/2002) also stated that: “The servant-leader is a servant first; it begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead” (p. 27). Greenleaf further explained a servant leader is different from a leader first because the leader-first and the servant-first are two extreme types (p. 27). There are shadings and blends between the “leader-first and the servant-first” that exist which are part of the infinite complexities of human nature (Greenleaf, 1977/2002, p. 27). He said the difference exists in the care taken by the servant first to assure other people’s most critical needs are being served (p. 27). Greenleaf (1977/2002) asked the following questions:

Do those served grow as persons? Do they, while being served became healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely to themselves to become servant? What is the effect on the least privileged to society? Will they benefit or at least not be further deprived? (p. 27)

To understand the above questions, Greenleaf (1977/2002) clarified as “one begins to serve, one cannot assure that those questions will produce positive results” (p. 28). He reiterated that the one who sets out to serve has “to research, experience, and hypothesize about the probable outcomes” but the hypothesis must be left under “a shadow of doubt and the servant leader must always re-investigate hypotheses and their outcomes” (Greenleaf, 1977/2002, p. 28).

Moreover, Greenleaf (1977/2002) described the most dependable part of a true servant is when one chooses the “most noble” hypothesis repetitively (p. 28). He said the hypothesis is always fresh for further exploration. In addition, Greenleaf (1977/2002) believed that “faith is the choice of the nobler hypothesis and not the noblest, since one may never know what that actually is” (p. 28) He explained this belief as follows:
But the nobler, the best one can see when the choice is made. Since the test results of one’s actions is usually long delayed, the faith that sustains the choice of the nobler hypothesis is psychological self-insight. That is the most dependable part of the true servant. (Greenleaf, 1977/2002. p. 28)

Furthermore, this author explained that a natural servant is the servant-first, who perseveres and is resilient to re-developing a specific hypothesis on what serves another’s highest priority needs than a leader-first who always serves out of promptings of conscience or in conformity with normative expectations (p. 28).

As a consultant to organizations, Greenleaf (1977/2002) believed that a servant (i.e., a servant leader in an educational organization) always accepts, emphasizes, and does not reject people but sometimes refuses to accept some of the other person’s assertiveness or performances as good enough. To understand these servant leadership characteristics, Greenleaf (1977/2002) gave an example of a college president’s belief that the instructor may be “rejected” by students and must “not object” to such rejection, but one must not, under any circumstance regardless of whatever they do, ignore, or reject a single student (p. 34).

In additional perspective, Ferch (2012) sought to explain the spiritual depth and conceptualization of servant leadership; and explained that servant leadership is specifically attuned to “above-the-line” levels of thinking (p. 129). In my perspective, attunement to “above-the-line” is—servant leadership is a transcendent desire and responsibility to help and heal. Ferch (2012) also discovered his description of servant leadership consciousness and the character of a servant leader through Larry C. Spears who helped collect, edit, and publish much of Greenleaf’s work posthumously. Moreover, Ferch (2012) emphasized that Spears’s content analysis of
Greenleaf’s writings led in the distillation of ten characteristics of servant leadership, and these characteristics provided a distinctive look at servant leadership “above-the-line” (p. 129). According to Ferch (2012), Greenleaf “put forth a leadership ethos in total opposition to the traditional command- and control model” (p. x). Ferch (2012) also explained that Greenleaf proposed the revolutionary idea that people, organizations, and nations are designed to be servant-first and that their servanthood, if truly formed, succeeds in “gathering personal, communal, and global responsibility” (p. x). The natural results are greater health, wisdom, freedom, and autonomy, and greater individual and collective servant leadership (p. x).

In another research, Barbuto and Wheeler’ (2006) integrated the construct of servant leadership (SL) generated from review of literature from which subscale items were developed to measure eleven potential dimensions of servant leadership. These SL dimensions included calling, listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, growth, and community building. Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) used data from 80 leaders and 388 raters to test the internal consistency, confirm factor structure, and assess convergent, divergent, and predictive validity. The results produced five SL factors such as: altruistic calling, emotional healing, persuasive mapping, wisdom, an organizational stewardship—with significant relationship to transformational leadership, leader-member exchange, extra effort, satisfaction, and organizational effectiveness (p. 300). The strong factor structures and good performances in validity criteria revealed that the instrument offers value for future research (p. 300). Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) created the servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) instrument from this research which I decided to use in my dissertation to measure variables on servant leadership characteristics of the participants in my study.
Explaining Servant Leadership in Education

To understand the emergence of servant leadership in education, Greenleaf (1977/2002) stated that liberal arts education offers the best context to equip young people to venture into the unknown, and to face the intricacies of life with assurance. He added, “But, having said that the conventional liberal arts curriculum is the best context for such preparation, I must also say that if usually does not contain the preparation—and it should” (Greenleaf, 1977/2002, p. 202). As a consultant, Greenleaf would not recommend the above operational goal to replace one that is already in placed in an organization, but he would, rather, suggest for the institution to consider adopting it for a limited program and limited number of students who are strongly magnetized by it, and for faculty who are enthusiastic to participate or get involved in it (p. 203-204).

Greenleaf (1977/2002) emphasized that to implement the above-mentioned operational goal we need, at the start, a strong educator (i.e., a potential servant leader who is committed to helping students grow) who is guided and supported by a consultant to meet the following tests:

He or she is deeply committed to the goal of helping prepare a few students to serve and be served by the present society . . . They have prepared themselves by thoroughly understanding the two basics needs, learning to cope with the inevitable ambiguity, and faith in the dependability of one’s creative resources to produce, in the situation, answers to one’s going-in questions as one venture into new experience. They are prepared to make their way through the faculty-decision process and to keep their colleagues informed and at least acquiescent. (p. 204)

To understand the above analyses of servant leadership in education, the following review of recent literature on servant leadership in the context of leading public schools
illustrates important characteristics of the servant leadership model of leading within educational settings.

**Review of Recent Research on Servant Leadership**

Recent research on servant leadership in the paradigm of leading and managing public schools has shown emerging and overlapping characteristics through instrumental and operational definitions of servant leadership (i.e., Anderson, 2006; Crabtree, 2014; Hannigan, 2008; Herbst, 2003; Iken, 2005; Irving, 2005; Jacobs, 2011; Metzcar, 2008; Miears, 2004; Svoboda, 2008). For example, Anderson’s (2006) mixed-design study examined a servant leader’s impact on public education (K-12) organization by identifying and articulating specific leadership behaviors, and the influence of these behaviors upon the organization in its entirety and the individuals within the school organization. This study used the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) (Laub, 1999) on staff members in a rural, Midwest public school district to investigate a servant leader’s impact in the organization. The rank items were: values and develop people, displays authenticity, builds community, and provides and shares leadership (p. iii). Findings revealed the behavior rank of “provides and shares leadership” as the highest rank practice which means most participants favored leaders who share leadership the most; and “builds community and displays authenticity” were second and third (Anderson, 2006, p. iii). The lowest ranking was values and develops people. Results divulged four themes to be investigated: (1) defining the organization through process, (2) connecting purpose and people, (3) power versus power over, and (4) walking the talk (p. iii).

Crabtree (2014) sought to examine servant leadership (SL) theory that relates the servant leadership characteristics of school principals to student achievement in Southwest Virginia
schools. In data collection, the Self-Assessment of Servant Leadership (SASL) was used which included the ten Greenleaf SL descriptors from Spears (1998): listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment, and building community (p. 54). The SASL instrument also included descriptors from Page and Wong’s (1998) Self-Assessment of Servant Leadership Profile (SASLP) instrument that is composed of the following descriptors: integrity, humility, caring for others, empowering others, developing others, visioning, goal setting, leading, modeling, team building, and shared decision-making (p. 54). Findings revealed a moderate statistically significant relationship between servant leadership characteristics of school principals and student achievement in reading, but not in mathematics. Crabtree (2014) stated that the study provides insight into a possibility for principal relationships with student achievement due to a moderate positive relationship existence in the data analysis. This study showed that a positive relationship does exist, and it would encourage school leaders to consider servant leadership as a validated approach to effective leadership in educational organizations.

Interestingly, challenges in implementing servant leadership motivated Hannigan (2008) to review studies that failed to show relationships between servant leadership (SL) and college performance. To explain this, Hannigan’s (2008) study sought to “gain a deeper understanding of the level of servant leadership in five California community colleges; and to identify if any relationship exists between SL and college performance” (p. ii). The study sought to answer two research questions such as: (1) Is there a significant level of servant leadership in five of the California community colleges? and, (2) Is there a relationship between servant leadership and performance in five of the California Community Colleges (p. 64)? Hannigan (2008)
hypothesized that there is a “statistically significant level of servant leadership at the organizational level, and a “statistically significant and positive correlation between servant leadership at the organizational level and each college’s performance index” (p. 13).

Hannigan (2008) used the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) by Laub (1999) and a standardized or normalized performance index score to measure servant leadership (SL) at the organizational level. This standardized performance index score was based on the seven SL traits as: values people, develops people, builds community, displays authenticity, provides leadership, and job satisfaction (p. ii). Results were not statistically significant (p. ii). This study included 3,402 participants which were demographically represented as: 69% females, 30% males, 1% preferred not to identify a gender preference, 2% identified themselves as Top Leaders (Chancellor, Superintendent, President, etc.); 17% as Management (Dean, Division Chair, Shared Governance Chair, etc.) and 80% Work Force (Faculty and Staff) (pp. 65-66).

In data collection, five community colleges were invited to participate in a URL web-based survey which included basic demographic questions such as gender, college and leadership level, and the OLA servant leadership at the organizational level (p. 66). The findings divulged that servant leadership “did not exist at the organizational level in the five colleges sampled,” and results revealed that “as leadership scores approached the servant leadership level, there was an improved leadership score, and a probable meaningful value to correlate with” (Hannigan, 2008, p. 68). He clarified that this outcome might add “support to the literature that perhaps participatory values have not transcended from the established participatory structures” (Hannigan, 2008, p. ii). While Hannigan (2008) concluded the “null hypothesis correlating the performance index and servant leadership could not be rejected,” he remained optimistic, as the
results also showed a positive relationship between servant leadership and student who earned awards and certificates (p. ii).

In another perspective, Herbst’s (2003) investigated organizational servant leadership and its relationships to school effectiveness to determine if schools that practice higher degrees of servant leadership performed better than those showing lower degrees of servant leadership (SL). Herbst (2003) defined servant leadership as: “the understanding and practice of leadership characteristics that places the good of those led over the self-interest leader” (p. vi). The instruments used to measure SL and school effectiveness included:

- The Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), test scores in reading, writing, and mathematics, annual learning gains in reading, writing, and mathematics, annual gains made by the lowest 25th percentile of students, attendance, drop-out rates, and critical incidents. (Herbst, 2003, p. vi)

In data collection, the study sampled 24 high schools in Broward County, Florida using the OLA. Findings showed an aligned relationship between servant leadership and ethnicity, but there was no significant relationship between other contextual variables and servant leadership in the study (p. vii). The study concluded that principals who embed SL’s characteristics throughout their organization may expect high levels of student achievement specifically in mathematics, reading, and annual learning gains (p. viii).

Iken (2005) investigated and compared the perceptions among educators and staff of the practice of servant leadership (SL) on an institution-wide basis at a private Christian university in the Midwest. The study conducted two separate studies. The first study examined the perceptions of the teaching faculty at the university (p. ix). The second study examined the perceptions of
servant leadership among staff across a spectrum of positions and for varying degree of exposure to the servant leadership model. The OLA was used to gather data on perception of servant leadership along its dimensions of values people, develop people, builds community, displays authenticity, provides leadership, shares leadership, and job satisfaction (p. ix). Participants included 92 employees, and the employees represented in this sample included 33 full-time faculty, 23 corporate staff, and 8 administrators (p. ix).

The results revealed the educators agreed that servant leadership (SL) was being practiced on campus (Iken, 2005). The author explained that while results revealed that job satisfaction was rated most highly by educators, the SL dimension on job satisfaction had shown no significant effect on how SL was displayed when including the other servant leadership dimensions used in the study (p. ix). Findings supported the development of a “programming on a university-wide basis as a method of developing and enriching the potential for behaviors to be displayed on specific areas of develops people, displays authenticity, and shares leadership” (Iken, 2005, p. ix). Results involving staff showed an average agreement that SL is being practiced on campus, and that staff perceived a need to continue to develop people and skills in shared leadership (pp. ix-x). Results in these two studies revealed that length of employment has no significant impact on perceptions of servant leadership.

In another study, Irving (2005) investigated the relationship between servant leadership (SL) and the effectiveness of teams. To investigate the research question, Irving (2005) conducted the study in a U.S. division of international nonprofit organization (p. iii). The study used the OLA (Laub, 1999), Servant Leadership Assessment Instrument (SLAI) (Dennis, 2004), and the Effectiveness Questionnaire (TEQ) (Larson & Lafasto, 1989) to collect data surrounding
the following variables: (1) SL on the organizational level, (2) job satisfaction at the individual participant level, (3) team effectiveness at the team level, and (4) the SL variables on love, empowerment, vision, humility, and trust at the individual leader level (p. iii). The results showed a statistically significant and positive correlation for all the servant leadership dimensions as well as job satisfaction when analyzed in relation to team effectiveness.

Jacobs (2011) investigated the relationship between the level of perceived servant leadership and effective teaching. The study examined the effect of years of teaching experience, age, and gender on the level of perceived servant leadership. The participants were 325 instructors who taught in four university education centers in Texas and the survey instrument used was The Teacher Leadership instrument (Jacobs, 2011). Results revealed that the servant leadership scores and effective teaching had no significant relationship and there was no significant difference in the level of servant leadership in terms of years of teaching, age, and gender as well. The researcher concluded that the study added to the limited literature on servant leadership and recommended future research within different educational settings in public or private universities.

In another research study, Metzcar (2008) examined the effect of servant leadership (SL) upon effective teaching and, also, explored the strongest and weakest qualities of SL. Research supported a positive correlation between National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) certified teachers and effective teaching (p. iv). The study surveyed a group of 764 National Board Certified Teachers (NBCTs) educators from pre-school to 12th grade using a modified OLA instrument called the Teacher Leadership Assessment (TLA) to collect data (p. iv). Results implicated a positive relationship between SL and effective teaching, specifically on
the SL characteristic of provides leadership. A weak relationship appeared on SL dimension on building community.

In another inquiry, Miear (2004) aimed first to establish that OLA-Educational Version by Laub (1999) survey instrument is an effective tool for measuring the level of servant leadership (SL) and job satisfaction in a public school organization. Second, the study also examined the relationship between the level of SL perceived and the level of job satisfaction felt in the public school organization. The variables measure in this study were: (1) the level of servant leadership present within a public school organization, and (2) the level of job satisfaction felt by the teaching professionals within a public school organization. Miear (2004) reported that the results revealed that OLA-Educational Version showed the same strong internal reliability as the original version of the instrument, and this instrument could be used by school leaders in assessing their entire organization.

Svoboda’s (2008) research study examined the strength of correlation between the perceived presence of servant leadership (SL) and elementary principal job satisfaction in Ohio public school districts. According to Svoboda (2008), principals are leaving the administrative profession before retirement at a very alarming rate despite the proven existence of a positive relationship between SL and job satisfaction (Anderson, 2006, Drury, 2005; Laub, 1999). However, Svoboda’s (2008) research on this relationship was conducted to answer the following research questions: (1) To what extent does the level of servant leadership revealed in Ohio public school districts implement the principles of servant leadership, and (2) to what extent does the level of servant leadership revealed in Ohio public school districts correlate with Ohio elementary principals’ level of job satisfaction? This study used the Organizational Leadership
Assessment-Educational Version by Laub (1999) to survey 25 superintendents, 38 elementary school principals, and 475 elementary teachers. Results divulged a strong relationship between perception level of servant leadership and perceived level of elementary principal job satisfaction. Svoboda (2008) concluded that the result implicated that further research on servant leadership is needed to counter the exodus of principals leaving the field of educational administration.

The above review of literature defined servant leadership (SL) for its purposes and reviewed recent SL studies that revealed a trend showing servant leadership attributes. Despite the availability of empirical research, continued exploration is necessary to understand SL as an effective leadership and teaching style in educational environments in higher education because of the mixed findings in the recent studies.

**Understanding the Realm of Catholic Higher Education**

“I would argue that, in a good society, every person who is capable of being educated at all should be liberally educated first, without direct reference to any specific societal role but with general reference to all of them.”

-Robert K. Greenleaf

**The Philosophy of Catholic Higher Education**

Catholic higher education is all about service to the others at its very core (Greenleaf, 1977/2002). To explain this, Greenleaf (1977/2002) echoed that he would find it pretentious to talk about the subject *Liberal Arts Education and the World of Work* if the common assumption is between one’s experience as a student in a liberal arts college and the subsequent events in the
course of any role in society—whether in one’s income-earning vocation, or as a parent, or as a citizen. Greenleaf (1977/2002) remarked:

I do not see such a relationship, and I am glad that I live in a world where it does not seem possible. I am not speaking of professional education . . . obviously the student expects an explicit rationale, for most of what is learned; it is directly anticipating some later vocational need. (pp. 196-197)

In addition, Greenleaf (1977/2002) argued that in a good society, every person who is “capable of being educated at all should be liberally educated first, without direct reference to any specific societal role but with general reference to all of them. Professional or vocational would be added to that” (p. 197). By this Greenleaf (1977/2002) meant that a college operating through the program, its faculty chooses (1) to do this in a way that helps them find their own legitimate needs, psychic and material, better served than if they had not participated in the college program. Connectively, Greenleaf’s (1977/2002) view supports Deferrari’s (1947/1948) explanation of liberal arts education in Catholic higher education in the following seminars.

Catholic higher education is based on the liberal arts, and its colleges are called liberal arts colleges (Deferrari, 1947/1948). To understand the philosophy of Catholic higher education as *Liberal Arts Education*, Deferrari (1947/1948) explained the proceedings of the workshop on the philosophy of Catholic higher education held at the Catholic University of America from June 13th to Jun 24th, 1947 based on the principles of liberal arts education. The workshop included the following seminars to clarify its theme question on why Catholic colleges are called *liberal arts colleges*: (1) Seminar on training for the development of skill; (2) Seminar on the practical application of Catholic social principles in Catholic college life; (3) Seminar on
religious integration of studies and life in the college; (4) Seminar on education and the Holy Ghost; and (5) Seminar on the content and methodology of the religion program. These seminars concluded with the following summaries.

**Seminar on the Development of Skill**

The theme of the workshop was based on the question: Why Catholic colleges are called liberal arts colleges? Based on this question, the meaning of *liberal, art, and science* had to be deduced. Deferrari (1947/1948) stated that various meanings attached to the word *art* were suggested:

Art is skill in making things; art is fixed set of habits that belong to the individual, etc.

Skill in applying sound principles of knowledge was noted to be the common element of the definition of *art*. *Liberal*, meaning free, implied freedom from economic and political slavery. *Liberal arts* were, therefore, those arts prosecuted with leisure by free men which helped them in the attainment of happiness and, also, added them to lead others to the same end. *Science* has to do with the discovery or pursuit of some truth. If principles are learned with no thought for their application, it would be more correct to call colleges which give this type of training *science colleges*. (p. 175)

It was also stated that their object in teaching should be: to teach the student what he or she needs to know to live a happy life and to acquire some knowledge of the principles that are basic to all the arts. The student should be taught what actions he or she should know how to perform to serve a patron, and the means of *sacramentalizing* these actions. He or she should recognize the artistic point of view and the God-like point of view and diffuse good in forms that will satisfy the needs of others (p. 175).
Practical Application of Catholic Social Principles Seminar

In this seminar, Deferrari (1947/1948) explained that the seminar group had for its theme the practical application of Catholic social principle in Catholic college life and in this perspective, these were the topics of discussion: (1) The Catholic attitude towards money and materials things; (2) Catholic Action from the standpoint of its forms of organization; (3) The teacher as a Catholic actionist; (4) Catholic principles underlying student recreation; (5) Interracial relations; (6) Student government and political action; (7) The works of mercy; (8) Catholic action in extra-classroom activities on the campus; and (9) Participation in national and international organization (p. 182). Deferrari (1947/1948) also summarized a few of the general ideas that might be considered a summary of the discussion as follows:

Practically to the lay person, living in the world, the principle of detachment from material things means giving up whatever may lead him into sin; that is, whatever comes between him and the God he loves—dishonesty, intemperance, etc. Secondly, it means unselfishness to the extent of avoiding extravagance, waste, needless destruction of property, buildings, materials, clothes. Finally, the true follower of Christ should have the spirit of giving. (p. 183)

Seminar on Religious Integration and Life in College

Deferrari (1947/1948) declared that this seminar focused on the current movements in those days toward greater integration on Catholic life: (1) the renewed emphasis on the doctrine of the mystical body of Christ; and (2) the liturgical movement and specialized Catholic Action. In this seminar, the revision of the religion course was considered with a view to making it the integrating factor in a fully Catholic education. In addition, Deferrari (1947/1948) explained the
seminar preferred to depart from the year-by-year outline in the Maredsous course, adapting it by means of an unpublished catechetical outline by the Very Reverend Martin B. Hellriegel of St. Louis as follows: (1) The study in the first year would be on the life of Christ, with emphasis of Christ’s Headship over regenerate mankind; (2) the second year, the life of grace would be studied, with special emphasis on solidarity of Christ’s members with Him and with one another in reliving His Mysteries, (3) the third year would be devoted to the study of morality in relation to the doctrine of the mystical body, and as a guide for this the Seminar suggests *Morality and the Mystical Body* by Reverend Emile Mersch, S.J., and (4) the fourth year, the principles of the lay apostolate would be taught, and training would be given in Apologetics and other apostolic instruments (pp. 189-190).

The discussions were designed to motivate the students toward a realization of the doctrines taught them and toward active participation in the Church’s life. Moreover, projects were considered as well such as the apostolate of the press, student recreation, student counseling, student government and others. The main point of the seminar was: “In all that would be done in a full Catholic College, the aim would be the building up of a dynamic community, the edification of the Mystical Body of Christ” (Deferrari, 1947/1948, p. 190). The meaning of the theme of the seminar is for a Catholic College to *build a dynamic community* (building community as a servant leadership characteristic) which is of service to others inside-out of the college or university.

**Seminar on Education and the Holy Ghost**

This seminar emphasized in depth detail the doctrine outlined in the general lecture on the Gifts of the Holy Ghost, the Beatitudes, and the Fruits of the Holy Ghost, and the discussion
concentrated around the major concept of the Gifts as the model, *servatis servandis*, of what a truly Catholic education should be. In this model in the Gifts, the seminar members stressed on the fact that no course should be considered as outside of the spiritual orbit and independent of it (Deferrari, 1947/1948).

1. For instance, the Gift of Fear of the Lord suggests that the teacher of any course could well uphold the idea of assignments prepared not merely for the sake of marks or to please a teacher, but as offerings Most High God.

2. The filial love of God as our father, with which the Gift of Piety is concerned, suggests the observation and recognition of His Providence in the unfolding of human history.

3. The nature of the Gift of Knowledge reminds us that all things in life, including failures and disappointments, can be the occasions of grace and should be viewed as such.

4. The Gift of fortitude can be the model for our preparation of students to uphold Christian principles in a neo-pagan world and demands that we make clear the never-ceasing warfare between the moral law which all men are bound and the subtly demoralizing principles and practices which have become ‘fashionable’ and are taken for granted by large segments of modern society.

5. The Gift of Counsel recalls what should be the guiding principle of action inculcated by Catholic educators: ‘Is this good or bad in the sight of God?’

6. In connection with the Gift of Understanding, it was pointed out by participants in the seminar that some instruction on the nature of mental prayer and opportunity for its practice are highly desirable as features of a Catholic education.
7. The Gift of Wisdom, the Gift *par excellence* of the clarity of Contemplation, suggested the need—the primary need—of clear, precise, and accurate teaching on the intellectual as well as the moral content of the Faith (pp. 191-192)

Such principles will not lose by repetition. Students themes and assembly talks by students might well have frequent reference to them. It was felt that many concrete ways of bringing them to the attention of the students will suggest themselves to a faculty fully convinced of their importance (p. 192).

**Seminar on the Content and Methodology of the Religion Program**

“*Religion is seen in the root meaning of that term—religion, ‘to rebind.’ The thing to be done with religious concern is to rebind humankind to the cosmos, to heal pervasive alienation.*”

-Robert K. Greenleaf

Greenleaf (1977/2002) explained his view on religion as a seeker as non-theological, he said:

My view of religion is non-theological . . . I do not feel called upon to reinvent explanation of the mystery. I meet with others, whose religious concerns are expressed differently, at the level of the mystical. In this mood there is much common ground with those of quite differing theological positions. I view the churches . . . as the institutionalization of humankind’s religious concern . . . In addressing the subject of servant leadership and the churches, I am bringing to bear my wider concern for institutions and their *service* to society. Churches are needed *to serve* the large numbers of people who need mediative help if their alienation is to be healed and wholeness of life achieved . . . but for the most part, churches do not seem to be serving well. They can be
helped to do much better. And they can be helped to become servant-leaders—by being exemplars for other institutions. (pp. 230-232)

In relation to the above, Greenleaf’s (1977/2002) view on religion clarifies Deferrari’s (1947/1948) perspective on the seminar on the Catholic Religion Program.

Pertinently, Deferrari (1947/1948) explained that the seminar on the Religion Program concluded the need of a religion course which has primacy among the studies covered in a college education, which would require a course that is on the same educational level as the other courses. Thus, this religion course must be scientific in the proper sense of that term and be truly capable of being a principle of unification for the other studies in terms of the end for which Catholic education exists (Deferrari, 1947/1948).

In addition, Deferrari (1947/1948) stated that the second step resulted from the consideration of ways and means to fulfill the above need and the conclusion reached were:

A. Such a course must be dogmatic in the strict sense of that word and this would be an accurate and exact theological expression of the articles of faith contained in Christ’s revelation and proposed by the Church for belief.

B. The course would also call for an accurate conception and knowledge of the sources from which these truths are drawn.

C. The course would also call for an understanding of these truths of faith that is in keeping with their divine character, and the only source of such an understanding is the very science which the Church itself has developed for this purpose—theology.

D. Of utmost importance in such a course would be the presentation to the student of an accurate knowledge and real appreciation of the living magisterium of the Church. This
would include a scientific and a pedagogic use of the teaching of the Church as found in
the papal definitions, the teaching of the great Councils and the Creeds. Especial attention
should be given to the ordinary way the Church teaches through liturgy, the encyclicals,
and the work of the theologians.

E. In practice, the course would cover the defined teaching to the Church, the certain
teaching of the Pope and the theologians and the common teaching of the theologians.

F. In this field, the crying need is the text book that will satisfy these requirements, and,
also, be on the same level and have the same respect from the students as their other
textbooks. (p. 194)

The third major point discussed in this seminar was the office of the religious course in
unifying the other studies, both from the point of view of the essential Catholic aim, and from the
educational aim of studies themselves. The general result of this discussion was: That a proper
college religion course should give direction and order to the other subjects so that they were not
simply separate compartments of information but actively contribute to the whole education of
the student/learner or play a realistic integral part in the making of a Catholic who is truly
educated (Deferrari, 1947/1948).

Additionally, such a unification would not mean that simply because the subject is a
Catholic in the state of grace it follows that he or she is basically educated. Rather this
unification leads to the evolution of an accurate and extensive knowledge of the truths of the
faith thus it might order and illuminate the other fields of knowledge which are important
integral parts in a college education (Deferrari, 1947/1948).
According to Deferrari (1947/1948), arriving to the above general conclusion, significant amount of time was spent to only two subjects—philosophy and history: (A) Philosophy: Philosophy and its relation to religious knowledge and to education itself was discussed in the light of the encyclical *Aeterni Patris* of Leo XIII. Two basic conclusions evolved on: (1) The real and essential place philosophy has in Catholic higher education; and (2) Philosophy reaches its true educational level when it is completed in terms of the supreme wisdom of salvation and enters into the service of that highest truth and wisdom (p. 194). And (B) History: In discussing history both as an element of education and in relation to religious knowledge these points were determined: (1) The tremendous educational importance of history in the college course; (2) that to separate history from the history of the Church, and in a broad sense from the history of theology is even on the historical level to teach the history of our own civilization and culture. Such separation is likely to make impossible the integration of history with the educational process; and (3) the history of the Church is very largely the history of Western man. It offers one of the best ways to give to the student real awareness of the vital place Catholicism has had in the life of the West, in the life of society, in the educational order itself (Deferrari, 1947/1948).

Also, Deferrari (1947/1948) explained that the fourth (4) major point concerned the faculty, and discussion it was either explicit or implicit throughout all the seminars. What was majorly overlooked during the discussion was the *primacy of the teacher*. This connotes that aside from textbooks, a detailed syllabus, and careful planning of course, the most essential part is a qualified teacher. *Qualified* in this sense would be considered as one who is an expert in his
or her own field and has an integral knowledge of the truths of faith so that he or she may solidly look through the relation between the parts and the whole of a Catholic education (p. 195).

According to Deferrari (1947/1948), beneath this general heading the religious teacher and the lay teacher were discussed, and the end results of the discussion was finalized as: (1) Religious teachers: a real need for a well-rounded theological training of the religious teacher for these reasons: a) for the competent teaching of religion on the college level; b) for the ordering and integrating of the particular courses they teach in the light of Catholicism and its divine truth; and c) for their own spiritual development in keeping with their educational development; (2) The lay teacher: The need for a theological course that will enable them to order properly and integrate the course they teach in the light of faith. This calls for a knowledge of Catholic truth that will be on the same level as their knowledge; and (3) from this general proposition emerged the conclusion that there is call for a closer knitted cooperation between the religious and the lay members of the college faculty. This requires the discussion of the aims and efforts of the institution on a level of equality rather than a relation between employer and hired help, and from this follows the granting of a more active voice, and the development of a mutual interest in the ultimate aim of the college (p. 196).

Furthermore, Deferrari asked that, in practice, it was the general thought that the lay teachers be included in workshops like this one. Some important points of general interests might be added and these were: (1) The conviction that the religion should have primacy in a college education and the desire to come to grips with the problems that such a conviction entails both in the order of thinking and in the order of the very real practical problem this entails; and (2) This effectiveness of informal pooling of experience, information, mistakes, and ideas on the part of
representative of different institutions which both encourages and inspires the participants (pp. 196-197).

Understanding the above seminars illustrated by Deferrari (1947/1948) would clarify the rationale of this study in choosing its participants who are students in a teacher education program at Gonzaga University, a Catholic Jesuit university in Spokane, Washington. Gonzaga University is a servant university, and its mission is to be of service through servant leadership to its students and to the community.

**Franciscan and Dominican Philosophy in Higher Education**

In his reflection paper entitled *The Franciscan School of Philosophy*, James O’Mahony (1930) wrote: To speak of a Franciscan Philosophy without any reference to the philosophy of St. Thomas was unthinkable, and it was possible that my remarks might prove displeasing to Thomists and Franciscan alike” (p. 1). In his reflection, the following questions were asked:

- Is there such a thing as a Franciscan School of Philosophy? Is there a known system of thought which may be characterized as philosophy and as Franciscan? Is there such an accord between outstanding Franciscan thinkers that they may be said really to form a Franciscan school of Philosophy? Where is this system of Franciscan philosophic thought to be found? (O’Mahony, 1930, p. 1)

In addition, O’Mahony (1930) reiterated: “Before we can put before the world a Franciscan System of Philosophy we must have . . . the unifying theme, the real *motif* that governs the Franciscan quest for truth,” which is the characteristically Franciscan attitude to the ultimate and elemental things of reality, of life and of knowledge must shape and form itself before we can have a Franciscan School of Philosophy (p. 2).
Explaining Franciscan Philosophy in a Wide Sense

To understand Franciscan philosophy in a broader sense, O’Mahony (1930) explained: If we take philosophy in its widest sense as an “ultimate attitude to life” we shall have little difficulty in speaking of a Franciscan philosophy (p. 2). In addition, O’Mahony (1930) described that every Franciscan is in this sense, whether he knows it or not, a philosopher; he has or ought to have, an “ultimate and consistence outlook in life” (p. 2). Also, this author emphasized that Francis possessed such an attitude; unerringly and with swift rapidity of vision and envisioned the unity and intelligibility of things in God and in Jesus Christ and in that St. Francis was a truly authentic type of Christian philosopher (p. 2).

Moreover, O’Mahony (1930) reiterated that it was easy to see that a genuinely true Franciscan philosophy would be simply the escalating of this instinctive Franciscan attitude to the heights of consciousness. Also, it would be a “soul-attitude” emerging alive in the mind and consciousness of a living Franciscan philosopher, and releasing expression in a thought system which influence so many possible points in the complex systems of reality and life itself (O’Mahony, 1930, p. 2).

Franciscanism First a Form of Life than a Philosophy

In addition, O’Mahony (1930) illuminated that before Franciscanism became a philosophy, it was first a form of life, an attitude towards life dictated by the example of St. Francis. This author explained: “knowledge is simply life coming to consciousness of itself, and when men had lived the Franciscan life in all its fullness, it was inevitable that they should seek to give the world the intellectual expression of that life” (O’Mahony, 1930, p. 2). Also, O’Mahony (1930) remarked that the development of Franciscan life into Franciscan philosophy
is normal and natural; that life endlessly evolves and struggles to express itself in thought. Thus, the dark unconscious side of the “life process tends to become limpid and lightsome in the minds of men. Franciscan philosophy is merely Franciscan poetry grown conscious of itself, and Franciscan life viewing itself in the mirror of its own limpidity” (O’Mahony, 1930, p. 3).

Furthermore, O’Mahony (1930) clarified that there were numerous written documents of the “Franciscan attitude towards science and learning,” but when we recall this “inherent urge of life towards consciousness,” we are prepared to recognize that the instinctive life-poetry of the followers of St. Francis was not a more natural expression of the Francis, was not the *Itinerarium Mentis ad Deum* of Bonaventure (p. 3).

**Explaining the Attitude of St. Francis towards Science**

To understand the attitude of St. Francis towards science, O’Mahony (1930) explained that there is an important conclusion that emerges from these discussions on St. Francis and science which cannot be questioned and disputed, that is, for the follower of St. Francis, the intellectual life of thought—is not an end-in-itself, it is an end-in-chief. To clearly understand this conclusion, O’Mahony (1930) remarked that those philosophers versed in the philosophy of St. Thomas will remind them with enthusiasm on how he speaks of “thought and of intellect as the characteristic of human faculty and contemplation as the final-end of man” (p. 3). O’Mahony further exhorted that besides illustrating the Aristotelian influence on his system of philosophy, St. Thomas was seeing things in the abstract. On the one hand, it is only in the abstract that thought and knowledge can be determined for their own sakes, and on the other hand, in the concrete, St. Thomas was well aware of the fact that there is something greater in human living that in thought or knowledge: there is “love,” whereby the whole soul is carried on towards the
only end which is one and obligatory for all—that is the “vision of God” (O’Mahony, 1930, p. 3).

**Explaning Knowledge not an End but an Instrument**

Based on the above perspective, O’Mahony (1930) explained that St. Francis naturally kept before his mind “man’s actual destiny to a supernatural end,” and never thought of the “abstractions” of philosophers (p. 3). In addition, this author believed that what St. Francis knew and cared to learn, was that man’s life must prove itself by action, and that knowledge in our present life is an instrument, not an end-in-itself (p. 3). Moreover, O’Mahony (1930) described St. Francis was also aware the knowledge without love, might prove dangerous—that too many prided themselves on knowledge in his day, and obsessed in its possession, that he thought to sacrifice it was preferable to follow Christ in the poverty of an unadorned mind.

Furthermore, O’Mahony (1930) described St. Francis humanity as follows: Humanely speaking, St. Francis was “cultured,” and from a “mental point of view he possessed no mean resources; a life so full as that of St. Francis was a time bound to express itself not only in poetry of word or action,” as with Francis himself, not only, in preaching by word and example as with his first followers, but also in that “high form of intellectual expression” which is to be found in the writings of an Alexander of Hales, a St. Bonaventure, a Scotus, or the many other Franciscan writers who have added pages of the common book of Christian wisdom (p. 4).

**Thomism the Best Approach to Franciscan Philosophy**

To understand Thomism in relation to Franciscan philosophy, O’Mahony (1930) asked the following question: (1) What is to be our method of approach to an understanding of the ultimates of Franciscan philosophy? This author maintained that the best approach was
Thomism, and this philosophy affords the best approach based on Christian thinkers’ perspective. Moreover, O’Mahony (1930) explained that many thinkers know something of the philosophy of St. Thomas for whom the philosophy of Franciscan is almost non-existent. In addition, O’Mahony (1930) added: “For the uninitiated Thomistic philosophy represents an effort to give a systematic account of reality in a purely rational basis, whereas Franciscan philosophy seems to them to be merged in Christian theology” (p. 4). O’Mahony (1930) clarified that Thomism offers an admirable approach to the thought of Franciscan writers, it is because the “integral system” of St. Thomas is sufficiently wide, and embracive to allow sympathetic contact with the ultimate viewpoints of Franciscan (p. 4). The author also underlined the word *integral* as applied to the system of St. Thomas because there are more things integral in Thomism than any admirers of St. Thomas seem to realize (pp. 4-5).

O’Mahony (1930) reiterated that is why many do not agree when there is an explicit question of a Franciscan Philosophy as such. In this author’s viewpoint, if we are looking for a Franciscan school of Philosophy in the sense that is acceptable today, it is obvious it does not exist. In addition, O’Mahony (1930) explained that St. Thomas has been recognized as the “first modern philosopher,” because for the first time in the history of Christian thought he distinguished clearly between reason and faith and marked off the precise frontiers of philosophy and theology (p. 5). To satisfy the quest of modern thinkers in this perspective, O’Mahony (1930) remarked:

> On the one hand, to meet the requirements of modern thinkers who reject both faith and the supernatural, it was rather inevitable for Catholic philosophers to emphasize the fact that their philosophy stood on its own basis, with an autonomy of its own. On the other
hand, in our desire to meet our adversaries on their own ground, it has scarcely occurred to us that where St. Thomas placed a *distinction* we have been introducing a chasm in *separation* between reason and faith and between philosophy and theology. The net result has been that we are left with a completely ‘laicized’ philosophy on our hands. (p. 5)

**Modern Separation of Philosophy from Technology**

In his reflection, O’Mahony (1930) argued that modern Catholic philosopher find themselves rigidly trapped to the strict domain of reason that even to hypothetically include *Faith* in the lecture-room of philosophy will not be acceptable to student of philosophy. In this scenario, O’Mahony (1930) explained: “It is comparatively easy to forget the debt of Christian philosophy to theology, to forget also that the mind of Aquinas was not the laicized mind of philosopher in *statu naturae purae*” (p. 5). Moreover, O’Mahony (1930) pointed out to look upon philosophy as an organic and autonomous “whole”, a system which can be completed within the “sphere of pure and natural reason” (p. 6).

The author clarified that for those who teaches moral philosophy, they have to speak of the final end of all human action, and of a *natural end* prescribe by the ethics of natural reason. The author also emphasized that whoever teaches moral philosophy “must have frequently found themselves in the very embarrassing position of having to speak of an ultimate end (i.e., the vision of God) unattainable by reason, yet “naturally desired” by the human soul” (O’Mahony, 1930, p. 6). Additionally, O’Mahony (1930) concluded that the intelligent teacher of moral philosophy must realize soon enough that in the “sphere of human action the natural frontiers of human thought, which autonomously philosophy seeks to make so rigid, are very fluctuating indeed” (p. 6).
St. Thomas and the Insufficiency of Philosophy

Furthermore, O’Mahony (1930) added that St. Thomas envisioned, not only in the sphere of human action, but also in the sphere of human thought, that these natural frontiers of human reason are not fixed but rigid. With these in mind, St. Thomas never made the mistake of looking philosophy as autonomous under every aspect, or as of itself can be completed within its own sphere. In O’Mahony’s (1930) perspective, philosophy declares its own insufficiency and betrays the antinomy that is part of the human soul. This author emphasized that the “finite character of mind’s natural acquisition of being cannot, and should not, blind us to the quasi-infinite of intellect, the proper object of which is the transcendental and illimited object, being as such” (O’Mahony, 1930, p. 6). The author also explained that the effort to philosophy to find in God is the intelligible “unity of all multiplicity” gives the human mind a definite orientation towards the infinite mystery of God, and leaves mankind wondering as to its final destiny which is hidden in the sanctuary of God’s Mind and Will (O’Mahony, 1930, p. 6).

Inadequacy of Philosophy the First Principle of Franciscan Philosophy

In view of the above, O’Mahony (1930) stressed the reason be proposed Thomism as the ideal approach to the study of Franciscan philosophy because St. Thomas, who is known as the modern philosophers, clearly shows the “incomplete and insufficient character of philosophy in its own domain . . . as it were, has always been the source of Franciscan thought. The inadequacy of pure philosophy is . . . the first principle of Franciscan philosophy” (pp. 6-7). The author pointed out that Franciscan philosophy asserts the “insufficiency of philosophy as a purely rational attempt to grasp reality, and this explains why, though admitting the distinction of
philosophy and theology, Franciscan thought has always deprecated the separation of these two disciplines of the human mind” (O’Mahony, 1930, p. 7).

**The Franciscan Philosopher a True Philosopher**

To understand the Franciscan philosopher as a true philosopher, O’Mahony’ (1930) asked these questions:

> But then the difficulty arises, is such a system of thought entitled to be termed *philosophy*? Obviously, if we accept a very narrow and ultimately unjustifiable, concept of philosophy, we shall have to admit that a Franciscan philosophy is non-existent. But is it so? What modern thinker, for instance, will refuse to St. Augustine the title of philosopher? (p. 7)

The above analyses of O’Mahony’s perspective on the inseparableness of Franciscan philosophy from Thomism vividly clarify the intertwined relationship between Franciscan and Dominican philosophies in higher education of today.

**Thomism on Rights Pertaining to Moral and Cultural Values**

To understand Thomism on cultural differences among peoples on earth, Pope John XXII, in his work *Pacem in Terris—Peace on Earth* in 1963 explained that St. Thomas Aquinas believed that:

> By the natural law every human being has the right to respect for his person, to his good reputation; the right to freedom in searching for truth and in expressing and communicating his opinions, and in pursuit of art, within the limits laid down by the moral order and the common good; and he has the right to informed truthfully about public events. The natural law gives man the right to share in the benefits of culture, and
therefore the right to a basic education and to technical and professional training in keeping with the stage of educational development in the country to which he belongs. Every effort should be made to ensure that persons be enabled, on the basis of merit, to go on higher studies, so that, as far as possible, they may occupy posts and take on responsibilities in human society in accordance with their natural gifts and the skills they have acquired. (Sigmund, 1988, p. 170)

To understand the above quote in postmodern perspective, Norman (2016) explained that to understand, and respect individual’s or group of peoples’ cultural values, there are moral and ethical issues facing people and leaders of nations in contemporary times. In the field of higher education, specifically, the increasing cultural and linguistic diversity in academic settings in higher education demands cultural competency on teacher educators. To enhance the cultural competence of teachers requires a higher understanding of both level of cultural-sensitivity (or culturally responsive) (Gay, 2002) among teachers, and the experiences that enhance cultural competence (Lopes-Murphy & Murphy, 2016).

To address the above, it takes to rally the whole village to educate the young in both domestic and global educational settings (Comer, Haynes, Joyner, & Bon-Avie, 1996). The authors emphasized in their School Development Program (SDP) that, as educator, we must “develop curricula and pedagogical approaches that are sensitive and responsive to the diverse needs of children from various cultures, racial groups, and ethnic groups, and to those children with special physical, cognition, or psychological needs” (Comer et al., 1996, p. 24).

In addition, these authors stressed the point that “educators must pay attention to child development issues and must incorporate child development knowledge into teacher preparation
program and the in-service training practicing teachers” (Comer et al., 1996, p. 24). The SDP authors added that schools of education have failed in large part to prepare teachers who are sufficiently knowledgeable about child development issues and sensitive to the influence of experience in learning (p. 24). The SDP model partnerships with universities and school districts has sought to garner an impact on the curriculum and educational experiences the universities provide to their perspective teachers, professional support, staff, and other school personnel training (p. 24).

Catholic Jesuit Higher Education as a Bridge to Servant Leadership

In a recent publication of the Jesuit Higher Education: A Journal of an article titled *Jesuit Universities Should Be Taking the Lead in Modeling the Lessons of Laudato Si’*, the author William Weis (2016) described this document as *Laudato Si’* emboldens every Jesuit university to become an institutional leader with a purpose and a vision toward serving justly, and humanely a sustainable world. Weis (2016) explained that the encyclical is remarkably visionary, comprehensive, and prescient document—a truly path-breaking call to action as it invites our human creativity in the service of protecting our Earth in such a way that promotes human dignity and social justice.

Moreover, Weis (2016) remarked: In the end, we embrace and consecrate the document through “action” not through “protracted debate” as *Laudato Si’* calls us to take steps that foster both survival and just sharing in a world of seven billion inhabitants (p. 97). Weis (2016) clarified that as Jesuit institutions are strongly based, anchored, and nurtured on noble ideals, and now being called to role model servant leadership by Pope Francis, Jesuit universities can and should find their ways to integrity on climate change and social justice—in both words and
actions. **Laudato Si’** is a call for institutional leadership to model and promote individuals’ actions. **Laudato Si’** is a call for institutional leadership to model and promote individuals’ behaviors that demonstrate one’s moral commitment to a just and sustainable world through service to others in the society and the environment (Weis, 2016).

**Laudato Si’ and the Cataldo Project**

To put into practice what **Laudato Si’** values, Gonzaga University, a Catholic Jesuit university, created *Sustainability at Gonzaga* with a mission statement—that in keeping with its Jesuit, Catholic, and humanistic mission, Gonzaga University takes seriously its solemn responsibility to safeguard the integrity of our own natural world for present and future generations, and is committed to lead, being a leader in responsible environment stewardship.

The Cataldo Project, an initiative inspired by the Jesuit founder of Gonzaga University, Fr. Joseph Cataldo, S. J. (1837-1838), has a goal to provide Gonzaga graduates with a fundamental awareness and understanding of the importance of the natural environment to life, how all human activities affect the environment, and ethic for responsible stewardship of the planet. To achieve this goal, the Cataldo Project conducts workshops, seminars, and other programs “to develop and augment the environmental knowledge and skills of Gonzaga faculty members, as well as to assist them in revising their courses to include sustainability concepts” (Cataldo Project, 2016, p. 1). In addition, the project facilitates the process of faculty development by providing financial and intellectual support, as well as access to resources, information, and environmental experts (p. 1).

The work of the Cataldo Project (2016) amplifies and enriches the revised Core Curriculum by facilitating inclusion of “environment and sustainability issues” in First Years seminars, Social Justice designated classes, and Core Integration seminars (p. 1). The project
also emphasizes supports several other strategic initiatives of the university, including “Gonzaga’s Climate Action Plan” and the Lily Endowment funded Francis Youth Institute (Cataldo Project, 2016, p. 1).

Lastly, the Cataldo Project is actualized and implemented through funding from the College of Arts and Sciences, School of Engineering and Applied Science, School of Education, School of Business Administration, Center for Global engagement, the Office of the Vice President of Mission, and most especially, the Office of the Academic Vice President (p. 1).

A Call for Spiritual Leaders: The Jesuit Superior General on Higher Education

The Reverend Adolfo Nicolas, S. J. Superior General of the Society of Jesus, calls for spiritual leaders for higher education in a meeting in Chicago in October 12, 2013 with the board chairs and presidents of 28 Jesuit colleges and universities in the United States (Nicolas, 2013). Attendees in the meeting included the superiors of nine regional provinces of the Society of Jesus in the United States and other Jesuit officials. All the board chairs are laymen and lay women, a common arrangement in the U. S. but rare in the rest of the Catholic World. America’s editors collaborated with the Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities to make this official, edited text available to our readers and other interested in Jesuit Catholic higher education (Nicolas, 2013). The Rev. Adolfo Nicolas (2013) delivered his speech as follows:

My goal today is to present some over-all thoughts about exercising spiritual and heroic leadership, some more specific thoughts about what a leader does at a Jesuit Catholic college or university in the United States at this point in history, and a consideration of the prerequisites for good decision-making. I will close with some particular questions
for you to study as the decision-makers at the schools entrusted to you in your capacities as the leaders of Jesuit higher education in the United States.

**On Spiritual Leadership**

Spiritual Leadership is a crucial dimension of the service that everyone gathered here today is called to exercise. This kind of leadership is not relegated to a special clerical or religious caste. There can be no doubt that leaders at professedly religious institutions like the colleges and universities you represent, and lead must exercise spiritual leadership.

First, all leaders of a Jesuit institution must reinforce and motivate their members and communities in the values and attitudes that are based in the sacred Scriptures of the Judeo-Christian tradition. Leadership at a Jesuit institution is about evangelization—for Jesuit institutions exist only because of the particular scripturally based faith perspective that led to their establishment. Thus, the primary function of leadership is the reinforcement and animation of these perennially relevant attitudes and values. God loves the world, God dwells among us, God empowers us to make the world worthy of God’s children.

Second, service is the basic concept of understanding authority. Pope Benedict’s resignation from the papacy has been the last and perhaps the greatest lesson of the great teacher Josef Ratzinger, showing how pope is in service of the Church and not the other way around. The pope is not the most important person in the Church. The most important person is Christ. So, when Benedict saw he could no longer serve the Church as he thought he should be, he stepped aside, because the Church, which is the body of
Christ is much more important than the pope. The lesson for us is that the authority exercised at a Jesuit Catholic institution is always a form of service.

And third, in the understanding of St. Ignatius, the principal function of a leader is to help the members of a community grow to become the living presence of God in the world. In the Ignatian concept of service, growth leads to transformation. If there is no transformation, then the school or the parish is not Jesuit. The ultimate objective is an individual’s transformation and through individuals, the transformation of society. There are no instantaneous transformations, even though sometimes we are attracted to the idea of sudden, painless, effortless change. We like to imagine that St. Paul was struck from his horse and immediately became an effective apostle. But in the Acts of the Apostles, there is no horse, and after his conversion Paul went to Arabia for three years of intense prayer and study before eventually journeyed to Jerusalem to test if what he understood was in line with the apostles. Transformation is a long complex process that involves much hard work.

**Prerequisites for Making Decisions**

Let me now say a few things about how leaders like those I have just described—that is, leaders like you—engage in decision-making. St. Ignatius organized a process so that decisions would be less subject to human whim and impulse; unhampered by human bias, partisanship, and prejudice; more open to freedom; deeply rooted in the experience of dying to what is passing and ephemeral so as to enjoy greater life. Thus, seeking God’s will is a process of asking ourselves what we really want, what is most important to us
and what we desire most fundamentally, the pearl of great price hidden in the field that we will give everything to possess.

Leaders who make good decisions can do so only when four prerequisites are present: a community of shared values, freedom, generosity, and selflessness.

The first prerequisite is a community committed to shared values. God’s will is best found in a group of people, not inside someone’s head or individual consciousness. Whether it is a church, a religious congregation, or an apostolic work, whether it is a board of directors, a faculty or a group of students, the community is a crucial ingredient. You need to have community to be able to discern. Decision-makers need to be surrounded by people who provide input, who give advice, who suggest alternatives. A single person cannot decide what is most important for an institution. A community of committed colleagues who work together is necessary. The people in this community need not all think alike, because whenever everyone easily agree, probably not everyone is thinking. But the members of community need to have the same fundamental values, because if they don’t have the same values, they cannot arrive at the same objectives.

You are all blessed to share the terms American, Catholic, Jesuit and institution of higher learning, but many different understandings surround these key terms. Being an American, for example, is based on the pledge to embrace the abstract ideals of liberty, equality, and popular sovereignty, but liberty and equality frequently conflict with each other. And both can be threatened by a popular majority. Not everything that wraps itself in an American flag is worthy of the great ideals of your nation, so having discussions of what it means to be an American institution, especially in these days of globalization is
important for you. Catholic is another word important word that is used in all kinds of
different ways. The internet is full of examples of conflicting understandings of what it
means to be Catholic. Jesuit is another word that gets all kinds of interpretations. Phrases
like “men and women for and with others,” cura personalis, and “finding God in all
things” say something about what it means to be a Jesuit school, but words like spiritual
indifference and detachment need to be part of the real understanding of what it means to
be Jesuit educated. We don’t want to settle for a shallow understanding of what it means
to be a Catholic and Jesuit institution in the United States.

The second prerequisite is freedom. The one responsible for the final decision
cannot predetermine the outcome. The process must be open and free. Furthermore, those
who contribute to a valid decision must be free to say what is on their minds without fear
of recrimination or deleterious consequence. The participants in the discerning
community must be committed to doing all they can to make sure that all positive and
negative dimensions of a decision are carefully considered. At the same time, these
people must dedicate themselves in freedom to the outcome of the process. I have seen,
when I was provincial, individual who would not enter into the process of institutional
discernment, for example, but later, if the vote did not favor their own plans, they would
come to say, “As provincial, you can’t permit this.” In that moment, you have to tell
them, “You have had your opportunity to participate but did not want to, and now you
want to use your power. This power is illegitimate.”

The third prerequisite is generosity. St. Ignatius wanted his followers and, in fact,
anyone who made the Spiritual Exercises, to put all their gifts and talents at the service of
God who has given everything. Generosity was crucial to Ignatius, as we know from that prayer, ‘Lord teach me to be generous to give and not to count the cost, to fight and not to heed the wounds, to toil and not to seek for rest, to labor and not to seek any reward other than knowing. I am doing your will.’ Generosity is necessary if a good decision is going to be made.

Finally, selflessness is necessary, a humble altruism that surrenders my own preferences to a greater good. For Ignatius, ‘the greater need’ always stands out. Surrendering what I personally think of as important to a bigger, more important transcendental value puts everything into proper perspective; it also makes possible all the smaller and less important choices that go into accomplishing a great goal.

**Request for Your Help**

I want to emphasize that you are the heroic and spiritual leaders of Jesuit higher education in the United States, who are rightly placed to make important decisions. In the past, there might have been a mystique that some of my predecessors had all the answers so that all they had to do was write a letter to a provincial who would write letter to president, who would tell everyone what was going to happen because there was an attitude that ‘Father knows best.’ I don’t think that was ever actually true, even if some people might have acted as though it were. In any case, my purpose today is to make sure everyone knows that the future of Jesuit higher education in the United States is in the hands of board of directors, and that I am very happy that is the case because I know looking at you, that it is, indeed, in-good-hands.
Through what I say today, I want to initiate a long-term discussion about a topic we do not often articulate. The 28 colleges and universities you represent have been in a close relationship with the Society of Jesus and its members since your country began. Perhaps without much realization on anyone’s part, those defining relationships have changed a great deal over time, especially in the years that followed the Second World War in the Second Vatican Council. Nearly all the institutions have substantially in size, complexity, and wealth; budgetary pressures and the need for increased fundraising have become enormous, models of administration and leadership have changed extracurricular and co-curricular programs have grown in importance.

At the same time, the roles of Jesuit superior and university president have been separated. Today one does not have to be a Jesuit or a priest or even a Catholic to be the president of a Jesuit college or university in the United States. In fact, universities were identified early as places where lay professional could increasingly assume leadership position and become their guardians in number of important ways, for instance as trustees. Indeed, the church and the Society of Jesus have recognized and welcomed—perhaps rather begrudgingly at first but now with confidence and great enthusiasm—the role of the laity in many dimensions that were formerly reserved to clerics or vowed religious.

While extraordinarily fine things have happened in Jesuit higher education in the past 60 years, other changes have taken place that we have ignored or avoided discussing. In 1973, there were about 212 million, but the number of Jesuits in the United States has
declined from 6,616 to 2,547. Since the supply of Jesuits is increasingly limited while the demand for more Jesuits seems to always expand, some changes are in order.

What might this demographic situation mean for the service we want to provide for those who suffer disadvantages like those that led to the establishment of the first Jesuit schools in the United States? What might it mean for the warm and familial relationship that has existed between Jesuits and the Jesuit colleges and universities for over two centuries? We must ask ourselves how much longer the two trend lines can go in opposite directions before the traditional relationship between the Society of Jesus and A.J.C.U. institutions—a relationship that has always been based on personal, one-on-one direct human contact—I stretched so thin that it becomes impersonal and meaningless.

I have no doubt that you are the right group to consider those questions. You have the talents and temperament, the head and heart, to do what needs to be done.

I ask that you consider these questions not just as individuals but also as members of an important network of schools. I ask these questions, knowing that it is the Lord who will show us the way if we are bold enough to ask for direction, if we are humble enough to listen to our most fundamental desires for serving the good of his people, if we are committed to being generous that we do not count the cost or heed the wounds or seek any reward other than knowing that we have given all we can to Him.

As I come to the end of what I want to say this morning, I would like to ask your help in recruiting Jesuits. I would appreciate the help of all the board chairs in the room. Could you please have a serious conversation sometime with your provincial about the kinds of resource your institutions or company uses to recruit a new generation of
employees? Could you talk to your president about what more could be done on campus
to recruit Jesuits? Could you please make some suggestions to the local Jesuit community
about what they might do to make themselves better known and recognized as a viable
and vital option for young men today? Jesuits may not always listen to superiors, but I
think they will listen carefully if you call them aside!

Finally, let me return to where I began, thanking you again for all you do, Jesuit
Catholic institutions of higher education would not be the important apostolic instruments
they have become without you. They will flourish in the future in without your
commitment and hard work. Thank you for being part of this important apostolate of the
Society of Jesus.

Analyzing the above speech, it is transparently clear that the encyclical from Pope Francis’s
Laudato Si’, and the Reverend Adolfo Nicolas, S. J.’s speech calling to enlist spiritual leaders in
Jesuit higher education, have clarified the vision, mission, and goals of Catholic Jesuit higher
education institutions to achieve for the next generations, that is, to be of service to others and to
the young who are the future contributors in the society.

In my study, I decided not to paraphrase the above speech to be able to precisely impart
to the readers the sincerity and integrity of the divine message—a calling for spiritual leaders in
Catholic Jesuit higher education.

Understanding Servant Leadership in Higher Education in Contemporary Times

“Servant leaders live their lives according to their values and principles.”

-Daniel W. Wheeler
The Servant Leadership for Higher Education Model: 10 Principles

The current trend in teaching higher education level, especially in Catholic schools is servant leadership (Wheeler, 2012). Wheeler’s (2012) servant leadership for higher education model used Robert K. Greenleaf’s definition of servant leadership which starts with the desire to serve and sees leadership as part of the service—as a prerequisite to leading. The author’s focus is to empower people to lead and follow depending on their assignments and skills, and its central message is to convey that we are all on a critical mission to serve the highest-priority needs of those we serve (p. xv). In addition, Wheeler (2012) emphasized that the following servant leadership principles (based on values) provide guidance in leading and making decision in higher education: (1) Service to others is the highest priority; (2) Facilitate meeting the needs of others; (3) Foster problem solving and taking responsibility; (4) Promote emotional healing in people and organization; (5) Means are as important as ends; (6) Keep one eye on the present and one in the future; (7) Enhance paradoxes and dilemmas; (8) Leave legacy to society; (9) Model servant leadership, and (10) Develop more leaders.

Furthermore, Wheeler (2012) clarified that the points to consider in these principles are: (1) Principles form the basis for a servant leader’s decision making; (2) Principles are based on values that provide guidance to leaders; (3) Some of the proposed principles are unique to servant leadership and others to effective leadership; and (4) Organizations that operate by their principles is the ultimate goal. Additionally, the development aspects to explore on these principles are:

What principles presently guide my leadership? What are the values embedded in these principles? Are any of your principles similar to those described in this chapter on servant
leadership? If so, how are they similar? Do you see any conflict between any of your principles and those described in servant leadership? If so, what is the conflict? Do any of these differences provide insight into your leadership challenges? If so, in what ways? (Wheeler, 2012, p. 13)

Moreover, Wheeler (2012) stated that the strategies to address these ten principles are: (1) Which principles do you see as relevant to your leadership? (2) What are the values that guide your administrative work? (3) are there any principles described that create issues for your leadership philosophy?

**Principle 1: Service to Others is the Highest Priority**

Wheeler explained that the term *service* has many meanings as: (1) to defer to or wait on, (2) to aid, help, or assist, and (3) other dimension is ministering or fulfilling other (p. 35). Wheeler (2012) also described the service-first as “a *calling*, a long-standing concept often used to describe a pull or even a magnetic attraction to a profession” (p. 36). This author explained that there are common features on varied definitions of the term calling: (1) the importance of listening to one’s life and surrendering to a deep sense of mission; (2) energy and passion on aligning our action with our deepest talents and strengths; and (3) touching and inspiring others when we lead with an authenticity rooted in our best gifts (p. 37). In addition, oftentimes, faculty members talk about their teaching, research, and service as a *calling to serve*, they refer to their work as a “commitment to a higher purpose” and there is an “intensity in their efforts” that their work is much beyond a job or even a career (Wheeler, 2012, p. 37).

Wheeler (2012) clarified the points to consider in this principle as: (1) Commitment to service is the first step in servant leadership; (2) Callings are central to servant leaders; (3)
Callings can come in many forms and from various sources; (4) Callings generate the passion and commitment to overcome everyday frustration and roadblocks; (5) servant leaders understand that the leadership work is not about them. The development aspects to explore in this principle are: Do I have a calling to serve? Where does it come from? How strong is the calling? Whom do I know who has a strong calling? What should I hope to learn in conversation with him or her? What could strengthen my calling? Do I see love as part of my service to others? If so, what does love entail? Additionally, the strategies to meet highest-priority needs in this principle are: (1) listen actively, (2) Understand faculty member and staff expectations in terms of the organization, (3) Read some of the literature on generational differences, (4) Use Maslow’s hierarchy of needs to place needs in a developmental format, (5) Project light, not darkness to others, and 6) consider love as a fundamental need (p. 47).

**Principle 2: Facilitate Meeting the Needs of Others**

To understand this principle, Wheeler (2012) started his analysis with Leo’s role in Greenleaf’s servant leadership model wherein Leo was other-centered who believe that his role was to facilitate the work of the group; and Leo was the glue or *spirit* that “held things together, provided a sense of fellowship, and kept things working smoothly” (p. 48). Wheeler (2012) explained that oftentimes in higher education, this glue or spirit is recognized when it is gone or missing; this spirit is a metric that is “hard to qualify in a time when everyone is seeking metrics and concreter returns on investments” (p. 49). Servant leaders are intent on doing whatever is necessary to meet the “highest-priority” needs of those in and affected by the institution; when focused on students, “the goal is to provide the best learning experience possible and to equip and support the faculty members and staff to make this happen” (Wheeler, 2012, p. 49).
According to Wheeler (2012), regarding spiritual expectations, the role of the servant-leader in addressing these high-priority needs are: (1) Acknowledge the expectations, (2) Open to discussing the expectations, and how they are part of the work environment, (3) Work to have the organization reflect expected values, and (4) Understand the power of in-groups and out-groups. Points to consider in this principle are as follows: (1) Highest-priority needs involve the professional, personal, and spiritual; (2) Servant-Leaders are powerful listeners and provide unconditional love; (3) Servant-Leaders understand the power of the spiritual in the workplace; (4) The more we understand associates’ motivations and background the more helpful we can be as leaders; and (5) The effort involved in priority-needs understanding builds commitment and trust (pp. 61-62). Wheeler (2012) explained the developmental aspects to explore in this principle are: How do I take a holistic perspective to associates’ or followers’ lives? In what ways do I encourage a synergy in their professional and personal lives? How comfortable am I discussing personal and spiritual dimensions? In what ways do I see these as beneficial to the organization as well as to the individual? How do my supervisors view this broader orientation toward needs? In what way do they have a holistic perspective? In what way do I understand the difference between facilitating and taking on problems as my own?

Furthermore, Wheeler (2012) explained that the strategies to promote meeting the needs of others include: (1) Encourage the integration of the professional and personal by asking questions that facilitate that perspective; (2) Model holistic living and working in your own life; (3) Let people talk their issues through. Sometimes that is all that is required; (4) Practice asking the questions, ‘Is there anything you want me to do? What do you need to do to solve the
problem?’, and (5) Protect each other’s reputations. Don’t badmouth people outside the unit or institution (p. 62).

**Principle 3: Foster Problem Solving and Taking Responsibility at All Needs**

To have a deeper understanding of the third principle, Wheeler (2012) clarified on how work can get accomplished in an institution. According to Wheeler (2012), to be successful requires understanding of the “values, vision, and strategic plan at the institutional level and cascading down through the various units” (p. 64). Also, well-integrated institutions should discuss and reinforce how various levels and functions of work to accomplish present and future goals otherwise it will be chaos and confusion to the clientele served (p. 64). In addition, Wheeler (2012) emphasized that when individuals are given “clear purpose, an enabling structure, and supportive environment, individuals (staff, faculty members, or students) can flourish” (p. 65).

The points to consider in this principle are: (1) Involvement and decisions go hand in hand; (2) Whenever possible have people involved in decisions that affect them and where they have expertise; (3) Take responsibility for decisions. Don’t use higher-ups to protect yourself from unpleasantness or because you don’t like the decisions; and (4) Whenever possible, clarify decision and seek input (pp. 76-77). Moreover, Wheeler (2012) detailed the developmental aspects to explore include:

- What is your rational for coming to decisions? Ask someone you trust and will provide straightforward feedback to share his or her thoughts on your rationale for decisions.
- Does your decision making involve others? Reflect on a decision you had to make quickly. How was it received? Was there any way you could have provided forewarning
to gain input and trust? What process do you use to gather input from your associates in your decision making? (p. 79)

The strategies to address taking responsibility at all levels in this third principle are: (1) Recognize the importance of staff as the first contact and the front door of your unit or institution, (2) Treat staff as equal members of the leadership-management team, (3) Help faculty members to see that they will play a range of leadership and followership roles, (4) Make sure work groups have a clear directive and the support necessary to be successful, (5) Hold groups to a high level of accountability, (6) As the administrative leader frame decisions to be made and define who needs to be involved, (7) For decisions that affect the work of the whole group use conscious decision making or at least work toward near-consensus decisions (pp. 79-80).

**Principle 4: Promote Emotional Healing in People and the Organization**

Administrators, staff, faculty, members, students in an institution are all humans prone to disappointments and lost dreams in life. In addressing these negative aspects, administrators should attend to these situations as “investments” in the person in providing a caring culture and protecting the “integrity” of the institution (Wheeler, 2012, p. 83). Emotional healing is an effective practice because it develops commitment and a sense of community, keeps people grounded, develops resourcefulness by helping and guiding others, look at the alternatives, and demonstrate caring in a time of need (p. 83). Wheeler (2012) defined healing (from the Greek to make a whole) was a medical and religious concept and emotional healing addresses when people have hopes, and dreams that for some reasons are not realized. How we deal with disappointments such as broken dreams majorly affect our performance. Emotional healing also concerns finding ways to address these difficulties via reflection an understanding; without
emotional healing, an issue can continue to color perceptions and affect the ability to handle risky challenges (p. 84).

The points to consider in this fourth principle are: (1) We must recognize those in need of emotional healing; (2) Understand that being without emotional healing is costly to individual and organizational effectiveness; (3) It takes courage to intervene—it is easier to do nothing and to expect that individuals will work things out by themselves; and (4) The ideal is to create or further develop a culture that encourages civility and attention to emotional healing (pp. 91-92).

In Wheeler’s (2012) perspective, the development aspects to explore in this principle involve the following questions:

In what ways do you see that a part of your role is to help associates emotionally heal from broken hopes and dreams? Who else can be a resource in individual emotional healing? In a unit of emotional healing? What is your role in developing unit or collegiality? What are the consequences of not having collegiality? What role do your colleagues have in developing the unit collegiality? (p. 92)

In addition, Wheeler (2012) explained that the strategies to promote emotional healing in this principle are: (1) Recognize the inter-relationship of the professional and personal; (2) Understand the importance of emotional healing for individuals and groups; (3) Be hard on the problem and easy on the people; (4) Consider the use of outside expert resources to promote emotional healing in groups or units; and (5) Institute rules of engagement in groups and units to encourage appropriate ways to interact.
Principle 5: Means are as Important as Ends

In restructuring an institution, the initial process is always chaotic in which leaders may consider means to achieve results that are questionable and counterproductive with long-term effects. In this case scenario, Wheeler (2012) suggested that servant leaders are patient and believe that colleagues are partners in the change process through accumulated trust, exchange of views, and seeing the important reason, why do restructure and make the change. Once the stage is set, the reversible exchange with others should focus on the appropriate “means” to accomplish the “ends” or outcomes (Wheeler, 2012, p. 93). The points to consider in this fifth principle include: (1) Servant leaders understand the difference between means and ends; (2) The understanding that using inappropriate means, even to accomplish a worldwide goal, has a high price tag in terms of trust and development; and (3) Servant leaders are not afraid to face the difficult decision with those affected because they are willing to make a sacrifice just like everyone else (pp. 100-101).

In addition, Wheeler (2012) explained that the developmental aspects to explore in this principle involve around the following questions: (1) What is the best example you have seen in terms of appropriate means for the ends expected? (2) What message did it send? (3) What is the worst case you have seen? (4) What message did it send? (5) How do you deal with a situation in which the decision is made but the means are open to interpretation? (6) How do you see using appropriate means as important to your work?

The recommended strategies to promote means in this fifth principle are: (1) Ask others to suggest appropriate means for the outcomes expected; (2) Don’t hesitate to reconsider the means when feedback suggests modification is necessary; (3) When a decision has been made
and handed down, use the ideas and suggestions of those affected to find the best way to carry
the decision out; (4) Understand the importance of modeling sacrifice as a leaders when you ask
others to make sacrifices; (5) Emotional healing (described in Principle Four) may be an
important aspect of addressing difficult decisions in which the means are involved (p. 101).

**Principle 6: Keep an Eye on the Present and One on the Future**

Wheeler (2012) also suggested that administrators in higher education institutions should
always focus on addressing current and future challenges facing their institutions. Specific
elements of these challenges in higher education are: (1) providing the course list, (2) registering
students, (3) staffing the courses, and (4) advising the students; and must be addressed or else all
those associated with the institutions will get frustrated and not respond in a timely fashion.
Servant leaders should be able to deliver their nurtured grand ideas, vision, mission, and goals
for their institutions through action.

According to Wheeler (2012), the good administrators are recognizable by how they
handled paper work requests. In handling the requested paperwork, one administrator divided the
chairs into three groups: (1) those who would complete their paperwork and it would be well
done; (2) those who would submit the material but often it wasn’t complete and required staff to
take care of omissions or errors, and (3) those who had to be badgered by staff, often didn’t
complete the work by the deadline, or required additional staff time to correct. And time is
money and delay will negatively impact the future position of the institution.

The points to consider in this sixth principle include: (1) Ignoring either the present or the
future is administrative suicide; (2) Structures and processes can be put in place to encourage a
balance of attention to the present and the future; (3) Transformations require empowering others
to achieve needed commitment and actions; (4) Institutional cultural change requires innovative structures and constant reinforcement of expected behaviors; and (5) Cultural change takes time and patience (pp. 111-112).

Additionally, Wheeler (2012) stated that the developmental aspects to explore in this principle emphasize the following questions:

How am I balancing taking care of the everyday operations and keeping attention on the future? What is in place to take care of the present—ongoing tasks, processes, and so on? What is in place to address the future? Visioning? Planning? Assessments? What percentage of time does the organization spend in important-but-not urgent development activities? Whom do I know who does this present-future balance well? (p. 112)

The recommended strategies to promote a balance of present and the future in this sixth principle encapsulate these factors: (1) Think about and discuss openly the preferred future for the institution and unit; (2) Set aside times and ongoing means to sharpen the preferred picture of the future; and (3) Make sure appropriate processes and staff are in place to ensure things run smoothly (Wheeler, 2012).

**Principle 7: Embrace Paradoxes and Dilemmas**

Wheeler (2012) reiterated that servant leaders seek to understand and embrace paradoxes and dilemmas, e.g., the term *servant as leader* is paradoxical with two contradictory ideas—servant and leader. According to Wheeler (2012), McGee-Cooper and Looper (2001) suggested servant leaders understand the power in paradoxes to inform and make good decisions: (1) two opposing perspectives can be true at the same time, (2) we arrive at better answers by learning to ask thoughtful questions rather than providing solutions, and (3) we often gain a greater
understanding of a situation through fewer words (a metaphor or story) and learn to build unity valuing differences. Wheeler (2012) added that the best insights one can gain from paradoxes, and dilemmas is: there is at least one side of the story that should be understood before taking any action; and if the other side remains unaddressed in the problem discussion, servant leaders should take responsibility to exploring it to find the best decision and action.

Wheeler (2012) encapsulated the points to consider in this seventh principle as: (1) Paradoxes are situations in which two alternatives may be equally valid; (2) There is always at least one other side of a situation to be explored and servant leaders take the time to do so; (3) Not exploring the other side of the issue may lead to a poor decision; (4) Listen carefully to those who are adept at raising the equal alternatives. Wheeler (2012) also said that the developmental aspects to explore in this principle address the following questions: In what ways, do you deal with situations in which there maybe two equally plausible possibilities? Whom do you know who is particularly good at exploring the possibilities and doesn’t ignore an important dimension of a decision? What is an example of a situation in which you learned from exploring the other side of a paradox? How did it help you in your decision making? What is an example of a situation in which you learned from exploring the other side of a paradox? How did it help you in your decision making? Can you identify a situation in which you didn’t explore the other side and it had bad consequences?

Moreover, the strategies to address paradoxes in this seventh principle are: (1) Discuss with associate the importance of paradoxes in decision making; (2) Ask people to look at the other side of things in decision formulation before getting into actual decision making; (3) Cite examples in public decisions when the other side was not explored and describe the
consequences of not doing so; (4) Make sure associates understand what is meant by unintended consequences; and (5) Provide examples and encourage them to make this part of their thinking (Wheeler, 2012).

Principle 8: Leave a Legacy to Society

The servant leadership explained in this 8th principle is stewardship, and the term steward is defined in the dictionary as manager, custodian, caretaker, and administrator, and these words are synonyms denoting taking care of something for the future (Wheeler, 2012). According to Wheeler, Block (1993) researched on the importance of empowerment in organizations and defined stewardship as choosing service over self-interest. To succeed on this service, focus endeavor needs employees to be committed stakeholders in the organization’s purpose, power, and wealth. This orientation has less emphasis on control in the organization and concentrate more on attention on service and accountability, which strengthen commitment rather than compliance (p. 127).

Wheeler remarked that a successful administrator’s typical characteristics are honesty, fairness, consistency, caring, and frugality which are consistent with the description of a servant leader who is committed to living by his or her code and serving the needs of others (p. 127). Wheeler (2012) emphasized for leaders to keep an eye on the future. For him, stewardship is about long-term goals and commitments, saying that organizational members must keep an eye on the future to that they are not being short sighted. He added: “A meaningful vision for the future has merit only if resources are allocated and people are rewarded for moving in that direction” (Wheeler, 2012, p. 138). And this entails that servant leaders keep the preferred
collective vision in front of people and get them involved in dialogue about the vision and goals of the organization and how to successfully get there (p. 138).

Wheeler (2012) recommended points to consider in this 8\textsuperscript{th} principle as: (1) Being a good steward involves small actions every day to ensure that resources are effectively used; (2) Stewardship requires keeping an eye on the future and working toward a preferred vision; (3) Effective stewards are leaders and followers; and (4) Leader succession is critical to stewardship. Wheeler (2012) also explained that the pertinent developmental aspects to explore in this principle are; What does stewardship mean to you in your unit? What is the best example of stewardship you have seen in your institution? What strategies do you use to keep a preferred future in front of your faculty and staff? What is the worst example of stewardship you have seen? Who are the people in your unit who are the best stewards? What do they do? What steps could you take to raise the level of stewardship?

Moreover, Wheeler (2012) suggested the following strategies to promote stewardship in this 8\textsuperscript{th} principle and these are: (1) Clarify what your legacy will be in terms of the unit or institution; (2) Promote the use of sustainable resources; (3) Discuss what it means to be service oriented; (4) dialogue about what your unit’s contribution to society are; (5) Encourage discussion of how you are preparing students for their role as citizens in a complex society; (6) discuss what is in place to encourage leadership; (7) Think about how you will leave things better than when you found them; and (8) What activities are you using to keep the future in the forefront of planning?
Principle 9: Model Servant Leadership

Servant leaders are consciously aware that they are role models and want to lead a life that contributes to the greater good because it is an intrinsic desire for them. Servant leaders genuinely practice what they preach and always humbly walk the talk. In other words, they live their lives in accordance with their values and beliefs; and expect that they should be held accountable in their words and action (Wheeler, 2012). Also, servant leaders possess “strong commitment to reciprocity, believing that a positive, caring behavior is the standard and will encourage others to act in the same manner” (Wheeler, 2012, p. 141). Moreover, servant leaders desire to be consistent with the way they have to be; when they do make mistakes, servant leaders take responsibility, learn from them, and help others learn from the situation. In contemporary times, wherein too many people unwilling to take responsibility for their actions, this is refreshing and liberating and encourages to others to do the same (p. 142).

Wheeler (2012) also recommended the following points to consider in this 9th principle of modeling servant leadership: (1) Servant leaders live their values and principles; (2) They understand that leadership is not about them but about serving the highest-priority; (3) Servant leaders provide opportunities for others to grow as servants; and (4) These leaders are morally outrageous. In addition, Wheeler’s (2012) suggested developmental aspects to explore in this principle are: (1) What do I model in my everyday interactions and decisions? (2) Do associates feel comfortable questioning whether there is a match between rhetoric and action in the administration team? (3) Do I know others who model aspects of servant leaders? (4) Do we talk about what we are modeling and what we want to model?
The recommended strategies to promote modeling servant leadership in this 9th principle are as follows: (1) Model the values and practices you believe are critical; (2) Encourage other to do the same; and (3) Articulate the values that are behind the practices and behaviors (pp. 148-149).

**Principle 10: Develop More Servant Leaders**

In general, genuine servant leaders are naturally endowed with the servant tendencies and leader’s characteristics that sometimes they themselves are not even aware of as how Robert K. Greenleaf (1977/2002) described a servant leader in his work. In another perspective, Wheeler (2012) described a departmental culture of servant leadership as one in which it is expected that service is a prerequisite of leadership. The notion is: if others are living service, it is contagious, modeled and reinforced by administrators and colleagues (p. 149). Servant leadership is seldom understood by all members in a department as described in this scenario, as one chair who described himself as a servant leader said: “My dean is okay with servant leadership as long as I get results and people seem to find the department a good place to work. The dean doesn’t understand what servant leadership is but so far so good” (Wheeler, 2012, p. 149). The dean doesn’t understand what servant leadership is but so far so good” (p. 149).

The points to consider in this principle of developing servant leadership are: (1) Modeling the servant leadership philosophy in one-way others can catch the servant leadership desire: (2) Formal and informal teaching and experience with servant leadership can be helpful in building associations with others interested in developing those attributes and behaviors; (3) Evaluations can be used to identify and encourage collegiality, which builds better interactions and unit culture (p. 154). Wheeler (2012) explained that the developmental aspects to explore
germane to modeling servant leadership in this principle are: How is collegiality important in my unit or work? What can I do to raise the level of collegiality? Who are those I can highlight as models of collegiality? How does our structure enhance collaborative work? In addition, Wheeler (2012) suggested these strategies to promote developing more servant leaders, namely: (1) Model servant leadership and discuss what it is; (2) Encourage rules of engagement to level the playing field for everyone; (3) Include leadership development as part of professional development discussion and planning; and (4) evaluate leadership, with an emphasis on service in the evaluation.

The above analyses of Wheeler’s (2012) model on servant leadership for higher education would provide an insight; and inspire and substantiate the construct and conceptualization of this emergent social paradigm on teachers as servant leaders in higher learning. And this model would promulgate the furtherance of empirical studies on the topic of teachers as servant leaders in higher education.

**Teachers as Servant Leaders**

“As servant teachers, not only do we serve our students and our immediate school community, but we also strategically build and develop democratic classrooms and encourage a life of democratic living and principles among students.”

-Joe D. Nichols

Teaching students of any age is more of a vocation to serve the others than serving the self as a for-profit profession. In this perspective, the teacher must be a servant first—as the teacher serves his/her students, he/she becomes a servant-leader and a steward to the students, parents, and families, colleagues and school administrators, and community (Nichols, 2011).
According to Nichols (2011), as a servant teacher, one not only serves the students and the school community, but also strategically builds and develops a democratic classroom, and encourages a life of democratic living and principles among the students. Nichols (2011) explained a democratic classroom in this manner:

Although the direct definition of democracy might be one of a government in which the supreme power is vested in the people and exercised by them directly or indirectly through a system of representation, democratic classrooms can borrow from this definition as teachers develop their role as servant, teacher, and leader of a community of learners where everyone is served, and every student has an equal voice and opportunity for development and accomplishments. (p. 27)

Furthermore, Nichols (2011) reiterated that based on Dewey’s perspective, the implications for service that integrates democracy in daily life include the practice of nurturing in students the following factors: (1) The tendency to encourage equal opportunity for the development of everyone, (2) The predisposition to support freedom of lifestyle for everyone, (3) The inclination to promote open communities among like- and unlike-minded people, (4) The bent to develop cooperative activities for the common good, (5) The disposition to seek resolution of disagreements by discussion and interactions, (6) The willingness to work toward the basic needs of each person, (7) The penchant to consider the interests and aspirations of everyone. And (8) The proclivity to support the growth of common good and interests (LW 14:226-228; MW 9:7-9).

Moreover, Nichols (2011) defined stewardship in the educational community “as the willingness to be accountable for the well-being of our constituents by operating in service,
rather than in control of those around us” (p. 33). Thus, stewardship is to hold something in trust for another . . . when we choose “stewardship” and “service” over self-interest, we build the capacity of the next generation (our students) to govern themselves (Nichols, 2011, p. 33).

In another perspective, Drury’s (2005) study theorized that faculty who exercise the characteristics of servant leadership will be more able to have a learning-focused classroom; that a servant leader mindset enables teachers to redirect energy toward collaborative inquiry. In this study, Drury (2005) presented the need for a new faculty model, designing the teachers as servant-leader that flows energetically as the follows:

1) Parent and student expectations: New economy in higher education→Expectations of College Teachers←Servant Leaders Mindset: values people, develops people, builds community, displays authenticity, provides leadership→Learner-Focus constructivist learning theory, action research designs, problem-based learning, “Guide on the side,” collaborative research with students→Most Effective as perceived by the students.

2) Tradition in higher education; institutional expectations for research→Expectations of College Teachers←Experience, Ego, and Status: experience as a researcher in graduate school, ego and image, status as research institution→Lecture-Focus: content-oriented classes, covering the material focus, ‘Sage on the Stage,’ faculty-owned research→Least Effective as perceived by students.

The above Drury’s (2005) servant leadership model included Laub’s (1999) operational definition of servant leadership such as: (1)Values People: by believing in people, serving others’ needs before his or her own, receptive, non-judgmental; (2) Develops People: by providing opportunities for learning and growth, modeling appropriate behavior, building up other through
encouragement and affirmation; (3) Builds Community: by building strong personal relationships, working collaboratively with others, valuing differences of others; (4) Displays Authority: by being open and accountable to others, a willingness to learn from others, maintaining integrity and trust; (5) Provides Leadership: by envisioning the future, taking initiative, clarifying goals; (6) Shares Leadership: by facilitating a shared vision, sharing power and releasing control, sharing status and promoting others.

In another point of view, Kouzes and Posner (1995) explained, when leaders are at their best, these exemplars in leadership challenge the process, inspire a shared vision, enable others to act, model the way, and encourage the hearts of others. In my view, these leadership characteristics are vividly present in an authentic servant-leader faculty in higher learning as aligned with Wheeler’s (2012) description of the ten servant leadership principles for higher education in his work.

**Review of Recent Research on Servant Leadership in Higher Education**

Limited literature on the effect of servant leadership styles of instructors and administrators toward student’s engagement and achievement in higher education revealed significant results (e.g., Noland & Richards, 2015; O’Meara & Nichaus, 2009; Scardino, 2013). For example, Noland and Richards’s (2015) study sought to understand the correlation between servant leadership and student outcomes such as motivation, learning, and engagement. The empirical results provided evidence that a positive correlation exists between servant leadership and student outcomes on indicators of learning and engagement; and a negative association was found between servant teaching and student motivation and affect (p. 28). Noland and Richards added that the combination of these results is not hypothetically expected since servant teaching
is more focused on student development and putting their needs ahead of that of the teacher (p. 28).

The authors expressed that extraneous variables may have caused the negative outcome between servant teaching and motivation and affect; and recommended further research is necessary to understand how servant teaching functions in conjunction with other instructor’s behaviors and student characteristics (p. 28). Overall, this inquiry called for furtherance of research on teachers as leaders particularly in exploring servant leadership as a model for instruction, and this research’s results has demonstrated a new area of research. Noland and Richards also recommended both continued theoretical development and measurement work is necessary on servant teaching; and the most logical next step is exploring the broader picture of how servant teaching fits within models that includes instructor behaviors and student outcomes (p. 29).

In another research, O’Meara and Nichaus (2009) explored faculty engagement in service learning; its purpose was to understand the dominant discourse used by faculty to explain service-learning. This inquiry included nomination files of 109 exemplary faculty nominated for the Thomas Ehrlich Award to analyze. The findings revealed that faculty use four dominant discourses regarding “the purpose and significance of service-learning: a model of teaching and learning, an expression of personal identity, and expression of institutional context and mission, or embedded in a specific community partnership” O’Meara & Nichaus, 2009, p. 1). The findings affirmed other studies’ results regarding faculty attraction to and motivation for involvement in service-learning, but also point to continuing challenges in institutionalizing service-learning in higher education (p. 1).
Importantly, Scardino’s (2013) quantitative research study examined the success of the Franciscan education tradition of educating the whole student—educating to make better citizens. This study investigated the relationship between servant leadership of faculty members and higher levels of engagement with their students. Participants in the study included full-time professors of three Franciscan higher education institutions who completed the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) which measures participating professors’ level of servant leadership and the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) which measures the engagement of the students with faculty (p. ii).

Additionally, Scardino’s (2013) investigation sought to answer to research questions: (1) To what extent do faculty in these institutions exhibit the qualities of servant leadership? (2) Among full-time professors teaching at Franciscan institutions of higher education, what is the relationship between servant leadership and deep approaches to learning? This investigation also encapsulated “the effect of self-identified faculty ‘servant’ leaders and their potential to encourage deeper approaches to learning to students, with the expectations of creating an environment more squarely within the boundaries of the Franciscan institutions of this learning community” (Scardino, 2013, p. ii). The results revealed a significant positive relationship between servant leadership and deep approaches to learning with a strong correlation to emotional healing.

**Defining Cultural Competence as in Intercultural Competence**

To understand cross-cultural pedagogy in higher education, Lopes-Murphy and Murphy (2016) surveyed teacher educators and pre- and in-service teachers from two geographic regions in the United States to construct a cultural competence score. The authors believed that
increasing cultural and linguistic diversity in academics requires cultural competence on the part of faculty, administrators, and pre- and in-service teachers, and enhancing the cultural competence of teachers requires a greater understanding of both the level of cultural competence among teachers, and the experiences that enhance cultural competence. Findings revealed cultural competence scores were higher in the Mid-Atlantic location than in the Midwest location, and the scores of participants were positively related to the extent of three cross-cultural experiences: (1) speaking a foreign language, (2) having been abroad, and (3) having friends from other cultures. The ANCOVA revealed an independent effect for teacher group and cross-cultural experiences but not for location.

The results revealed (1) cultural competence scores for participants expressed as percentage of the highest score were relatively high, (2) cross-cultural experience scores varied across locations and teacher groups, (3) cross-cultural experiences were positively related to cultural competence scores (pp. 60-63). The results also reinforced the importance of cross-cultural experiences in the development of cultural competence, and the importance to institutions of higher education of understanding the cross-cultural experiences typical of the locations from where they draw their students. Moreover, Lopes-Murphy and Murphy (2016) reported that one probable explanation for the differences they observed between locations in the extent of cross-cultural experiences could be that the two locations differ in the extent to which frequent interactions with individuals from diverse cultures occur.

To understand cultural competence, Bennett (2011) emphasized that intercultural competence provides an overarching perspective for weaving together primary concepts for interacting across both global and domestic differences. Bennett (2011) defined intercultural
competence as “a set of cognitive, affective, and behavioral skills and characteristics that supports effective and appropriate interaction in a variety of cultural contexts” (p. 4). Moreover, this author explained that being able to identify and recognize our role in the global community, allows us to see the interconnectedness among other contexts, recognizing that people from diverse cultures have much to contribute to local dialogue on culture, race, and gender (p. 4).

Bennett (2011) echoed that the culturally responsive institution welcomes individuals to honor different values, beliefs, and behaviors, whether the cultural differences are domestic or global. This author recommended that we can and must carefully construct a complex, multilayered wide contextual framework, that is grounded on both/and, and not either/or (p. 4).

Moreover, Bennett (2011) stated that what we share domestically and globally includes the necessity of the following factors: (1) Knowing our own cultural identities, (2) communicating effectively with others, (3) developing knowledge, skills, and attitudes that foster understanding, (4) managing inevitable contact with others, (5) solving problem together, (6) engaging our own learning, and (6) working will with culturally-different others. Also, Bennett (2011) explained that there are few items we know about cultural competence such as: (1) Cultural knowledge does not necessarily lead to competence, (2) cultural contact does not lead to competence, (3) cultural contact may lead to reduction of stereotypes, and (4) language learning may not be sufficient for cultural learning. To address these inadequate factors, the author suggested for us to consider the following items to understand “what does lead to intercultural competence?” as follows: (1) Intentional and developmentally sequenced program design, (2) balancing challenge and support anxiety reduction, (3) facilitating learning before, during, and after intercultural experiences, (4) depth of intercultural experience, language immersion, (5)
Intercultural competence training, and (6) cultivating curiosity and cognitive flexibility (Bennett, 2011, p. 5).

**Interculturalizing Education in Higher Education**

Pertinent to its definition, Bennett (2011) explained that intercultural competence is manifested in three ways: (1) Cognitively: It includes cultural self-awareness, cultural general knowledge, culture-specific knowledge, and interaction analyses; (2) Affectively: It includes curiosity, cognitive flexibility, motivation, open-mindedness; (4) Behavioral skills: It includes relationships building skills, behavioral skills, listening, problem-solving, empathy, and information gathering skills. The intercultural competence (ICC) on behavioral skills and characteristics are precisely aligned with Spear’s (2003) distilled servant leadership (SL) dimensions from Greenleaf’s writings such as: listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to growth of people, and building community. The overlapping characteristics between ICC and SL are: (1) relationships on building skills and building community, (2) behavioral skills on listening and SL listening, and (3) SL empathy and intercultural empathy (Greenleaf, 1977/2002; Bennett1986/2011).

Furthermore, by comparing intercultural competence approach with the traditional approach, Bennett (2011) clarified these sets of skills and characteristics in the following list of styles:

1) Cognitive styles describe as individual interacts with his or her environment, extract information from it, and organize personal knowledge, and then apply that knowledge. Traditional education often privileged cognitive styles that demonstrated critical thinking
in terms of linear logic, separate ways of knowing . . . and the intercultural approach includes with this perspective spiral logic, connected ways of knowing (p. 6).

2) Learning styles describe learner preferences for different types of learning styles and instructional activities. The traditional education often privileged learning styles that reflected a preference for abstraction, reflection, and precision. The intercultural approach includes with this perspective concrete, experiential, and metaphorical learning.

3) Communication styles describe the patterns of expression and rules for interaction that reflect the values and norms of a culture. Traditional education often privileged learners who participated in class with statements that were linear, direct, emotionally restrained and intellectually confrontive. The intercultural approach includes with this perspective engagement that is circular, indirect (even silent), non-confrontive, and emotionally expressive (p. 6).

To comprehend the above styles in intercultural approach perspective, Bennett (2011), illustrated the integration of Kolb’s Learning Style in the intercultural context through concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation.

Pertinently, Omidvar and Tan (2012) described Kolb’s Cycle of Experiential Learning Style Model’s circular, and cyclical clockwise directed energy-flow as demonstrated in the following illustration:

**Figure 2.1**

*Kolb’s Cycle of Experiential Learning Style Model Energy-flow*

Concrete experience: Engaging directly in authentic situation ➔ Reflective observation ➔ Noticing what happened and relating to past experiences and conceptual understanding ➔ Abstract conceptualization: Distilling perceptions into abstract concepts ➔ Active experimentation: Testing ideas honing skills in an experience.
Furthermore, Bennett (2011) remarked that through concrete experience we have many opportunities for real life situation experiences such as homestays, diverse workgroups, “service learning” etc., what we miss is seldom have “structured opportunities” for sharing participants’ reactions and feelings to the differences they encountered, the stress they feel, the discoveries they have made (p. 7). Thus, we “need to provide preplanned meetings, scheduled group discussion sessions, informal meals” as premeditated occasions for concrete learners to enjoy their learning style, and for other learners to practice their concrete experiences skills (Bennett, 2011, p. 7).

To understand intercultural approach through reflective observation (Bennett, 2011) expressed that we have lots of perplexed observations (“what did that mean”), with a fair degree of difficulty in making connection, and not enough time to reflect, and what is lacking is we seldom provide guided reflective observation situations and time (p. 7). Thus, we need to provide “frameworks for learners to make connections,” and the “time to develop the reflections” which can include “reflection questions for journal activity,” planned time for absorption of complex new learning and so forth (Bennett, 2011, p. 7). In my perspective, these suggestions can start with planning having a dialogue circle session with all the participants and the professor, which is a traditional practice in Asian business settings in Asia (Norman, 2016).

To understand intercultural approach through abstract conceptualization, Bennett (2011) reiterated that in the context, we have lots of information on culture specific matters (history, politics, arts, etc.) and learners very accustomed to classroom lectures. What is lacking is “we seldom educated learners about their own developmental processes including their own learning styles,” and “comprehension of certain culture general concepts and theories is also missing”
(Bennet, 2011, p. 8). In my view, service-learning in higher education can fulfill what is lacking in this perspective, wherein students can participate and gain experience by concretely immersing themselves in the culture of interest with passion and enthusiasm to learn (Norman, 2017).

To understand active experimentation in an intercultural learning context, Bennett (2011) explained that in this context, we have a potential for active experimentation learners to sample experience and create spontaneous learning projects, free from classroom constraints. And what is lacking is: “Frequently, the basis for educational active experimentation is missing, since it may not emerge from a healthy comprehension of abstract conceptualization. Experience needs the necessary frameworks for construal to become educational” (Bennett, 2011, p. 8). The author also emphasized that in active experimentation, we, as teachers, need to provide a solid set of concepts for the active experimentation learner to work from (information on ethnographic, interviewing, participant observation, etc.) and a safe and supportive climate for the non-active experimentation learners to try out these skills (p. 8).

**Describing the Basic Content Areas for Intercultural Training: Templates**

To train pre-service teachers to develop intercultural competence, Bennett (2011) recommended the following package to provide a foundation for diversity training which includes examples of domestic cultural differences. In addition, Bennett (2011) reiterated that this package must either accompany or precede training, and this package is inclusive of the following items: culture, perception, language use, cultural stereotypes, nonverbal communication, communication styles, value constraints, problem-solving strategies, intercultural adaptation (with emphasis on development of intercultural sensitivity, and cultural
marginality). Also, included is diversity supplement which must be preceded by basic intercultural training such as: (1) intercultural adaptation with emphasis on ethnic identity development, (2) gender issues, (3) culture privilege and race in U. S. America, and (4) context of power.

**Describing Curiosity: Principles for Enhancing Curiosity**

To achieve cultural competence either domestically or globally, and develop our own sense of intercultural curiosity, Bennett (2011) suggested that, as teachers, we need to focus on the following factors to consider: (1) Suspending our assumptions and value judgements, (2) practicing cultural humility, (3) enhancing our perception skills, (4) developing multiple perspectives, (5) increase tolerance of ambiguity, (6) asking questions as culturally appropriate, (7) becoming participant observers as appropriate, (8) becoming analytically inquisitive, and (9) assessing the credibility of our intercultural sources.


**The Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity**

The authors of DMIS defined this model as a framework that explains the development of increasing sophistication in our experience and navigation of differences (Bennett, 1993; Bennett & Bennett, 2004). Based on my understanding, this model assumes that leaders’ intercultural competence (ICC) is directly proportional to their level of intercultural sensitivity (ICS), so that one must be culturally sensitive to be culturally competent either domestically or globally.
Based on the authors perspective, the DMIS model starts with three *ethnocentric* stages, in which our own culture is experienced as central to reality in some specific ways, and the other three stages of the model are identified as *ethnorelative*, in which our own culture is viewed in the context of other individuals’ cultures as illustrated below.

**DEVELOPMENT OF INTERCULTURAL SENSITIVITY**

\[ \text{Denial} \rightarrow \text{Defense} \rightarrow \text{Minimization} \rightarrow \text{Acceptance} \rightarrow \text{Adaptation} \rightarrow \text{Integration} \]

**EXPERIENCE OF DIFFERENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denial</th>
<th>Defense</th>
<th>Minimization</th>
<th>Acceptance</th>
<th>Adaptation</th>
<th>Integration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ETHNOCENTRIC STAGES (ECS) = A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C or A + B + C; Therefore**

\[ \text{ECS} = A + B + C \]

**ETHNORELATIVE STAGES (ERS) = C \rightarrow D \rightarrow E \rightarrow F or C + D + E + F;**

\[ \text{ERS} = D + E = F \]

**Figure 2.2 The Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity by Bennett (1986/2011)**

Note: In the Minimization (D) stage, Intercultural Sensitivity is achieved, wherein the polarized experience of Ethnocentric Defense (B) stage has given way to a recognition of the common humanity of all people regardless of culture, and it intersects with the Ethnorelative Acceptance (D) stage. This intersectionality between C and D has given way to the Adaptation (E) stage—the application of Acceptance (D), and D is likely to become the predominant experience when there is a need to actively interact effectively with people of another culture.
The Denial of Difference Ethnocentric Stage

In the Denial of Difference (DOD) stage, Bennett (1986/2011) explained that people with this predominant experience are in denial about cultural difference, that is, they are unable to experience differences in other than extremely simple ways; also, people may appear confused when asked about their own culture, as they have not considered how culture affects their own or others’ lives. Bennett (1986/2011) explained that in some cases, people undergoing the denial stage may dehumanize others, assuming that behavior is a deficiency in intelligence or personality. Bennett (1986/2011) said that the DOD stage consists of two categories: (1) Denial/Disinterest: Isolation in homogeneous groups fails to generate either the opportunity or the motivation to construct relevant categories for noticing and interpreting cultural differences; and (2) Denial/Avoidance: Intentional separation from cultural differences protects worldview from change by creating the conditions of isolation, and some awareness of cultural difference may yield undifferentiated broad categories, such as foreigners, or Asian, or people of color.

The Defense Against Difference Ethnocentric Stage

In the Defense against Difference (DAD) stage, Bennett (1986/2011) stated that people with a predominant experience of Defense go through cultural difference in a polarized way—us and them, and they feel under siege by people that they stereotype in simplistic and negative ways, while protecting themselves with a hardened boundary between themselves and the others. Oftentimes, one’s own culture is exalted, and other cultures are denigrated with negative stereotypes. Bennett (1986/2011) explained that this hierarchical view of culture may lead people to assume type of social Darwinism wherein they place their own culture at the acme of development and civilization. In this sense, Bennett (1986/2011) said that a common variation is
a Reversal of the two poles, so that one’s own culture is denigrated, and that other cultures are uncritically lauded. While Reversal may superficially seem to be more culturally sensitive, it is nevertheless still dualistic and overly simplistic.

Furthermore, Bennett (1986/2011) explained that the DAD stage includes three categories, namely: (1) Defense Denigration: The existing cultural worldview is protected by negatively evaluating persons with different cultural behavior or values, (2) Defense Superiority: The existing cultural worldview is protected by exaggerating its positive aspects compared to all other cultures. Any neutral or positive statement about another culture may be interpreted as an attack, (3) Defense Reversal: The tendency to see another culture as superior while maligning one’s own, exemplified by going native among long-term sojourners or the false ally among some dominant-culture seekers of minority approval (Bennett, 1986/2011).

**The Minimization of Difference Arrived at Intercultural Sensitivity Stage**

At the peak of the DMIS’s journey, Bennett (1986/2011) optimistically described the Minimization of Difference (MOD) predominant experience as of having arrived at intercultural sensitivity wherein the polarized experience of Defense has given way to a recognition of the common humanity of all people regardless of culture; and the familiar cultural worldview is protected by believing that deep down we are all alike, either physically and psychologically, or spiritually and philosophically. In addition, Bennett (1986/2011) clarified that this assumption of similarity is then invoked to avoid recognizing one’s own patterns, understanding others, and eventually making necessary adaptations; and the assumed commonality with others is typically defined in ethnocentric terms: since everyone is essentially like us, it is sufficient in cross-cultural situations to just be yourself.
According to Bennett (1986/2011) the MOD stage is of two categories: (1) the Minimization/Human Similarity: Recognition and appreciation of superficial cultural differences such as calling customs, etc., while holding that the more important fact is that all humans are essentially the same in their physiology, such as the need to eat. Emphasis is on commonality of human beings in terms of physiological similarity as a way of approaching different cultures (e.g. “After all, we’re all human.”); and (2) Minimization/Universal Values: Emphasis is on the similarity of people in terms of some basic values, typically those of the one’s own worldview. In this category, Bennett (1986/2011) explained that all human beings may be viewed as subordinate to a particular supernatural being, religion, or social philosophy (e.g. “We are all children of God, whether we know it or not.”).

The Acceptance of Difference of Ethnorelative Stage

Pertinently, Bennett (1986/2011) added that when the Acceptance of Difference (AOD) stage is the predominant experience, people experience cultural difference in context, and they accept that all behaviors and values, including their own, exist in distinctive cultural contexts and that patterns of behaviors and values can be discerned within each context. Bennett (1986/2011) reiterated that people see cultures as offering alternative viable solutions to the organization of human existence, and they are curious about what are the alternatives to their own culture, thus, Acceptance does not mean agreement or preference for alternative values, but rather, acceptance of the distinctive reality of each culture’s worldviews.

The AOD ethnorelative stage included two categories: (1) The Acceptance/Behavioral Relativism: The perception that all behavior exists in cultural context and the pursuit of understanding complex interaction within and between cultural contexts, and (2) the
Acceptance/Value Relativism: The perception that beliefs, values, and other general patterns of assigning goodness and badness to ways of being in the world all exist in cultural context, and that cultural worldviews can be understood in terms of these values (Bennett, 1986/2011).

**The Adaptation to Difference Ethnorelative Stage**

Bennett (1986/2011) clarified that the ethnorelative experience of Adaptation to Difference (ATD) is one of consciously shifting perspective and intentionally altering behavior; and Adaptation is the application of Acceptance, and it is likely to become the predominant experience when there is a need to actually interact effectively with people of another culture. Bennett (1986/2011) also emphasized that with the acceptance of another culture’s organization of reality, Adaptation can proceed by allowing one to reorganize experience in a way more like that of the other culture, and this is *intercultural empathy*. The ability to empathize with another worldview in turn allows modified behavior to flow naturally from that experience. It is this natural flow of behavior that keeps code-shifting from being fake or not authentic (Bennett, 1986/2011).

Connectively, the ATD ethnorelative stage demonstrates two categories according to Bennett (1986/2011) and these are: (1) the Adaptation/Cognitive Frame-Shifting: The conscious shift of perspective into an alternative cultural worldview, thus creating access to a facsimile of the alternative cultural experience, Cognitive empathy, and (2) the Adaptation/Behavioral Code-Shifting: acting in culturally appropriate ways based on an intuitive feel for the alternative worldview, *Intuitive empathy*. The most effective code-shifting occurs in conjunction with conscious frame-shifting. That is, it is best to first know how things generally work in another
culture, and then allow your behavior to shift into those patterns when appropriate (Bennett, 1986/2011).

Lastly, Bennett (1986/2011) emphasized that the experience of Integration of Difference (IOD) is of being a person who is not defined in terms of any one culture—typically a person who is bicultural or multicultural, and the experience of Integration may occur when individuals intentionally make a significant, sustained effort to become fully competent in new cultures. Bennett (1986/2011) also explained that Integration may become the predominant experience for nondominant group members who have adapted (not assimilated) to a dominant or colonial culture, or it may characterize persons who grew up or lived for extended periods in other cultures. A marginal cultural identity allows for lively participation in a variety of cultures, but also for an occasional sense of never really being at home. People with this orientation experience themselves as in process, and they generally have a wide repertoire of cultural perspectives and behavior to draw on (Bennett, 1986/2011).

The IOD ethnorelative stage is demonstrated by two categories, namely: (1) Integration/Constructive Marginality: Maintenance of a personal or organizational identity that is not primarily based in anyone culture, combined with a tendency to facilitate constructive contact between cultures. Participation to some extent in a marginal reference group where other marginals rather than cultural compatriots are perceived as similar, and (2) Integration/Ethical Commitment: Construction of an ethical system that allows for commitment in relativism.

In relation to the DMIS model, based on my experience as a schoolteacher to culturally- and linguistically diverse learners, these students tended to be silent and listen more to others than talking in the ethnocentric stages, and they started communicating with gradual confidence,
and verbalizing what they learned from listening in their learning environment at the beginning of the Minimization and continually progress to the ethnorelative stages of the DMIS. The practicality of this model is that its energy-flow (Norman, 2015) of changes from one stage to the next stage can be mathematically formulated to make meaning of it, and relate to the physical sciences and real-life situations, as a wholistic cultural social process of integration in the global settings in peoples’ lives.

**Describing the Intercultural Competencies Essential for Teaching Across Cultures**

In Bennett’s (1993/2004, 2011) perspective, an effective intercultural educator possesses the following abilities: Comprehend the role of teaching in the learner’s culture, communicate clearly to non-native speakers of the language used in teaching, facilitate multicultural groups (including turn-taking, participation, use of silence, etc.), “Code-Shift” from one communication style to another, paraphrase circular or indirect statements respectively for linear and direct group members, express enthusiasm for the topic in culturally appropriate ways, suspend judgement of alternative cultural norms, recognize and address culture-specific risk factors for learners (loss of face, identity, etc.), develop multiple frames of reference for interpreting intercultural situations, demonstrate good judgement in selecting the most appropriate interpretation in a transcultural situation, ask sensitively phrased questions while avoiding premature closure, avoid ethnocentric idioms, slang, and aphorisms, interview a cultural informant to obtain needed information on subjective culture, recognize ethnocentrism in goals, objectives, content, process, media, and course materials, as well as group interaction, motivate learner based on their own values, deliver courses in a variety of methods, interpret non-verbal behavior in culturally appropriate ways,
monitor the use of humor for cultural appropriateness, display cultural humility, and be culturally self-aware.

Moreover, Bennett (2016) reiterated that “intercultural competence refers to set of cognitive (thinking), affective (feeling), and behavioral (doing) skills and characteristics that support affective and appropriate interaction in a variety of cultural contexts” (p. 2). She added that the three keys to intercultural competence are: (1) Curiosity (exploring what we don’t understand), (2) Cognitive complexity (seeing through many perspectives), and (3) Empathy (understanding and adapting to different cultural styles) (p. 2). *Cognitive complexity* refers to the “characteristics that indicates to what degree a person has complex constructs for making meaning and interpreting an event. Someone who is cognitively complex usually sees more degree of subtle differences than a person who has more limited constructs” (Bennett, 2016, p. 3). *Empathy or Perspective taking* refers to the “skill of being able to take another person’s perspective, and understand without judgement, that person’s frame of reference (It is not ‘walking in their shoes’ with your own perspective, merely changing positions.)” (Bennett, 2016, p. 2).

Bennett (2016) also recommended activities which she found effective for inspiring cognitive complexity, empathy, and curiosity, and these are: (1) Photo Voice (for teaching empathy and curiosity), (2) Teaching Code-Switching (for cognitive complexity, curiosity, and empathy), (3) Transformative Culture-Learning Journal (for teaching cognitive complexity, curiosity, and empathy), (4) the Intercultural Notebook (for teaching curiosity), (5) A Life Without Questions, Please (for teaching curiosity, empathy), and (6) Fascinating and Fun Framegames.
Review of Recent Literature on Intercultural Competence/Sensitivity

In today’s globalized millennium age, the need for cross-cultural understanding of the relationship between faculty and students in higher learning is progressively of great importance because of the changing cultural climate both in the classroom and the society at large in domestic and global settings (e.g., Fritz, Mollenberg, & Chen, 2001; Nieto, 2008; Omidvar & Tan, 2012; Penbek, Yurdakul, & Cerit, 2009; Robinson, 2012; Sakurachi, 2014; Salisbury, 2011). For example, Fritz, Mollenberg, and Chen’s (2001) study tested the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale instrument developed by Chen and Starosta (1996) with a sample of German students of business administration by using confirmatory factor analysis. Fritz et al. (2002) reported that the results of the confirmatory factor analysis in the study using the German sample showed that the basic structure of the Chen and Starosta’s model was confirmed as the 5 factors were reproduced on the whole structure, which indicated the validity of the overall structure of Chen and Starosta’s instrument on the measurement of intercultural sensitivity. Additionally, the authors reported that according to the criteria for model evaluation used in confirmatory factor analysis, the overall fit of Chen and Starosta’s model is acceptable in the German context (p. 169).

Additionally, Fritz et al. (2002) said that detailed inspection of the parts of the model revealed some minor weaknesses in the operationalization of the concepts which can only be resolved by using more subtle instruments of confirmatory factor analysis. For example, the reliability of the several indicators was not substantially high and the discriminant validity of the factors “Interaction Enjoyment” and the “Attentiveness” was rather low, and the lack of independence for the two factors might be caused by the low Eigenvalue in Chen and Starosta’s
Fritz et al., 2002, p. 172). Overall, the results indicated that the instrument is a valid one through which culture-free scale for measuring intercultural sensitivity can be developed. Although results suggested that the operationalization of the concepts in Chen and Starosta’s (1996) study can be further improved (p. 172).

In another perspective, Nieto (2008) investigated the extent to which one’s level of cultural competence impacts the teaching and learning process for both instructor and students at the university level. Also, Nieto (2008) examined whether there is a difference in the level of intercultural sensitivity between university instructors and ESL students, whether ESL instructors and non-ESL vary in their levels of intercultural sensitivity, and the extent to which gender impacts cultural competence. Additionally, Nieto (2008) explored the relationship between the instructors’ level of intercultural sensitivity and the challenges they face in instructing international students, and the relationship between students’ level of intercultural sensitivity and the challenges they face while pursuing a college degree in the United States. The study used mixed methodology, utilizing Chen and Starosta’s (1996) Intercultural Sensitivity scale.

Findings revealed that university instructors reported a higher level of intercultural sensitivity than college students in the same institution. In addition, findings divulged a significant difference between ESL instructors and non-ESL instructors on interaction engagement, and that females scored higher than males (p. iii). Results indicated that while instructors revealed that students’ culture and language were the challenges they most faced in teaching international students, but the same students’ scores did not indicate culture and language as significant challenges for them (p. iii).
In other study, Omidvar and Tan’s (2012) research work contended that the increasing trend of multicultural mixture of students in the classroom necessitates understanding cross-cultural relationship between culture and learning styles of students in the classroom environment. The authors reviewed pertinent literature on culture and learning style as variables to measure which were mostly quantitative inquiries. This review summarized results of the existing research on cultural variations in learning styles. Reported results by the authors revealed the common theme in all reviewed studies that the “learners from different cultures have different preferences for learning styles” (Omidvar & Tan, 2012, p. 279). The authors added that since the findings confirmed the relationship between some dimensions of culture and learning styles, being aware of the relationship between these two aspects of learning can improve the student and classroom outcomes extensively (p. 279).

Penbek, Yurdakul, and Cerit (2009) analyzed the intercultural sensitivity level of university students, the contribution of education, and the intercultural experience. The study included sample population from two universities in Izmir, Turkey; and used Chen and Starosta’s (2000) Intercultural sensitivity scale instrument in data collection. The five major factors the instrument included are: (1) Interaction Engagement of respondents, (2) Respect for Cultural Differences of respondents, (3) Interaction Confidence of respondents, (4) Interaction Enjoyment of respondents, and (5) Interaction Attentiveness of respondents. Also, Penbek et al. (2009) emphasized that the survey was meant to identify the effects of demographics, education, personal traits, and intercultural experience comparatively between the two groups of respondents on the level of intercultural sensitivity. The results revealed respect for different cultures improve with the students’ level of engagement in international interactions.
Robinson’s (2012) study sought to determine if a relationship exists between teachers’ cultural competency and their students’ engagement. The sample population included 70 high school teachers and 520 high school students from two international schools in Hong Kong. The study used two instruments in data collection, namely: (1) The Multicultural Awareness Questionnaire (Culhane-Pera et al., 1997) to measure cultural competency along three subconstructs: knowledge, skills, and attitude; and (2) The Student Engagement Survey (Skinner, 1991) that measures four factors model of engagement (p. iii). Data analysis revealed salient findings that international school teachers’ perceptions of their cultural competency are ethnorelative primarily, and their self-reported cultural competency does not have a significant correlation with students’ engagement (Robinson, 2012). However, the results indicated that the students’ perceptions of their teachers’ cultural competency have a strong positive relationship with student engagement. The author recommended additional research is required to further explore the influence of teachers’ cultural competency on student success.

In Sakurachi’s (2014) research study, this author investigated college students’ intercultural sensitivity development through an intentional course design using Kolb’s (1984) Learning Styles Cycle and Hammers’ (2000) Intercultural Development Continuum (IDC). In this study, quantitative and qualitative data were collected to investigate domestic and international students’ intercultural learning experiences, and to “potentially identify teaching approaches that facilitate students’ intercultural competence” (Sakurachi, 2014, p. 1). Findings revealed that the four instructional strategies associated with Kolb’s Learning Styles were effective and critical when designing an intercultural course to develop college students’ intercultural competence (p. 1). The results revealed wide gap in intercultural development
through intentional intercultural course between American students and Japanese exchange students because of the two groups very divergent, and different intercultural experiences (p. 1).

Salisbury’s (2011) dissertation work sought to examine the effect of study abroad on intercultural competence among 1,593 participants of the 2006 cohort of the Wabash National Study on Liberal Arts Education. The Wabash National Study is a longitudinal study of undergraduates that gathered pre- and posttests measures on numerous educational outcomes, an array of institutional and self-reported pre-college characteristics and host of college experiences. This investigation utilized both propensity score matching and covariate adjustments methods to account for pre-college characteristics, college experiences, the selection effect, and the clustered nature of the data to both cross-validate findings and provide guidance for future research (p. 1).

Findings revealed that study abroad generated a statistically significant positive effect on intercultural competence; an effect that looks to be general rather than conditional; and both covariate adjustment, and propensity score matching methods produced similar results (p. 1). Analyzing the effect of study abroad across the three constituent subscales of the overall measures of intercultural competence, the results revealed that study abroad influences students’ diversity of contact but has no statistically significant effect on relativistic appreciation of cultural differences or comfort with diversity (p. 1). The author concluded that the results of this study suggested that the “relationship between study abroad and intercultural competence is one selection and accentuation,” holding important implications for postsecondary policy-makers, higher education institutions, and college impact scholars (Salisbury, 2011, p. 2).

This review of literature on the effectiveness and development of intercultural competence to both teachers and students divulged positive outcomes that can inspire researchers
to do further exploration in the field of intercultural communication competence, sensitivity, awareness, and other emergent dimensions in the paradigm of cultural competence in domestic and global educational settings. In this review, I discovered overlapping characteristics or dimensions of servant leadership and cultural competence/sensitivity such as empathy, listening, awareness, building community as in working well with culturally different others, stewardship like of service to the community and other, conceptualization as in developing knowledge, skills, and attitudes that foster understanding, and others. Specifically, in Catholic higher education, the student should be taught what actions her or she should know how to perform to serve a *patron*, and the means of sacramentalizing these actions. He or she should recognize the artistic point of view and the God-like point of view and diffuse good in forms that will satisfy the *needs of others* (Deferrari, 1947/1948). The Catholic social principle in Catholic College life includes: (1) The teacher has to be a Catholic *actionist*, and (1) *interracial relations* (Deferrari, 1947/1948). These principles transparently mirror the strong relationships between servant leadership (SL) and cultural sensitivity (CS) in addition to St. Thomas Aquinas’s philosophy on rights pertaining moral and cultural values (Sigmund, 1988).

The above-mentioned positive relationships SL and CS ratifies the central hypothesis of this study, that students would develop their servant leadership and cultural sensitivity through the experience of participating in a university course-related service learning project/class in a teacher education program at Gonzaga University.

**Conclusion**

This review of literature sought to highlight the history of servant leadership, the emergence of a servant-leader, and the efficacy of servant leadership in leading and managing
organizations. In this chapter, I defined leadership and explained spirit of leadership, illustrated the history of servant leadership, described the evolution of a servant-leader, defined servant leadership, explained servant leadership in education, explained Franciscan and Dominican philosophy in higher education, discussed Thomism on rights pertaining to moral and cultural values, illuminated Jesuit higher education, illustrated leadership for higher education, and reviewed research on servant leadership in higher education.

The review revealed the effectiveness of servant leadership when practiced in leading and managing educational settings and other organizational environments. Additionally, servant leadership as a philosophy and a teaching strategy is an effective model in leading and teaching that benefited both instructors and students in educational institutions. Servant leadership style also appeared to be effective in inspiring, encouraging, developing, influencing, and enhancing student achievement, and role modeling for students as well.

Additionally, I defined cultural competence (cultural sensitivity is a component of cultural competence which I perceive as a servant-leader teacher characteristic) as intercultural competence, explained interculturalizing international education in higher education, described the basic content areas for intercultural training and its templates, defined and explained the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity, described the intercultural competencies essential for teaching across cultures, and reviewed recent literature on intercultural competence and sensitivity.

In addition, this literature review discovered overlapping characteristics of servant leadership and cultural competence or sensitivity such as empathy, listening, building community, and so forth. It appeared that servant leadership and intercultural competence
approaches in teaching students in higher education neatly intersect each other on empathy, listening, and building community, so that a servant-leader teacher is also culturally competent or sensitive teacher to students in my study. Therefore, students can increase or enhance their cultural sensitivity and servant leadership qualities through their experience of participating in a university course-related service-learning project/class in my study. Based on these findings, I can genuinely assure and visualize the effectiveness of these students in this study as they take leadership roles in the future, and the contributions they will make as teachers, stakeholders, and decision-makers in the American education system of the next generation in this postmodern era of complexities in the global society.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

“Cultivate the habit of surveying and testing a prospective action before undertaking it.”

- Epictetus

Introduction

The purpose of this quantitative research was to examine the extent to which participation in a university course-related service-learning (UCRSL) project/class affects student success in developing servant leadership and cultural sensitivity qualities at a Catholic Jesuit institution of higher learning. The research question in this study was: Do students in a teacher education program develop servant leadership and cultural sensitivity through the experience of participating in a university course-related service-learning project/class?

Research Methods

The study attempted to explore relationship between dependent and independent variables through empirical analyses. The study is embedded in the post-positivist philosophical approach to research (Crotty, 1998). Positivism is understood today as positive science, “what is posited or given in direct experience is what is observed, the observation in question being scientific observation carried out by the principles of scientific method” (Crotty, 1998, p. 20). Positivism exists in many different forms, and the form of positivism known today is post-positivism. Postpositivist researchers “recognize that observation and measurement cannot be as purely as the ideal image of science implies, but they still attempt to anticipate and minimize the impact potential unobjective influences” (Rubin & Babbie, 1989/1997, p. 39). Prominent examples are stemming from the positivist philosophy that come from the works of physicists.
Werner Heisenberg (1907-76) and Niels Bohr (1885-1962) and demonstrated the absoluteness and dogmatism of positivist science. In the 20th century, more scientists challenged the objectivism inherent in positivism, because research “talks more of probability rather than certainty, claims a certain level of objectivity rather than absolute objectivity, and seeks to approximate the truth rather than aspiring to grasp it in its totality or essence (Crotty, 1998, p. 29).

Additionally, Crotty (1998) suggested two questions in developing a research proposal. (1) What methodologies and methods will we be employing in the research we propose? (2) How do we justify this choice and use of methodologies and methods? The author argued that “justification of our choice and particular use of methodology and methods is something that reaches into the assumptions about reality that we bring to work. To ask these assumptions is to ask about our theoretical perspectives” (Crotty, 1998, p. 2). In Crotty’s view (1998), the preceding questions entail asking ourselves about what kind of knowledge do we believe will be uncovered through research. According to Crotty (1998), the answer should lead us to more epistemological questions such as: (1) What methods do we propose to use? (2) What methodology governs our choice and use of methods? (3) What theoretical perspective lies behind the methodology in question? (4) What epistemology informs this theoretical perspective?

Epistemology is the study of knowledge, is a venue to understanding and explaining “how we know and what we know” as researchers (Crotty, 1998, p. 2). Rubin and Babbie (1989/1997) defined epistemology as the “science of knowing” and methodology—subfield of epistemology as the “science of finding out” (p. 5). Moreover, Tavory and Timmermans (2014) added that abductive analysis provides researchers with a coherent epistemological position that is centered on the relationship among theory, method, and observation. Tavory and Timmermans
(2014) explained that since epistemology infuses research design, this approach helps researchers create stronger research. Pertinently, in *Philosophy in the Field*, Frodeman (2004) explained:

Twenty-five hundred years ago the Greeks began a search for *logos*—a rational pattern to the world . . . the Greek search for logos became a quest for a very particular type of order—one that was distant, regular, immutable, and certain. The motivation behind this is clear. As Plato notes, our knowledge of things in the sensible world is always questionable. How can we claim to truly know something that is constantly changing? Temporality was seen as the enemy of rationality, rendering every claim to truth inconclusive and suspect. Knowledge must be grounded in those realms beyond the corrosive effect of temporality. Only in the realm of thought to be beyond material corruption—could we find the continuous suitable for truth. (pp. 149-150)

In addition, Frodeman (2004) explained that the creation of mathematics and the identification of the cosmological celestial order with the order of reason were turning points of events in the unfolding of human rationality. Moreover, Frodeman (2004) lamented: “By defining the reality as the rational—and identifying the rationality with the regular, immutable and certain—reality of the sensuous world was denigrated or even denied” (p. 150). Frodeman (2004) further explained that through its long history our culture has sided with this view, and our society have valorized (1) the enduring over the transient, and the celestial over the earthly, down to present-day priority our culture has given to mathematics and the mathematically based sciences, and (2) quantity and objectivity—the former understood as the deep essence of things, and the latter defining knowledge in terms of those things that we can turn into objects—remain the tokens of the real.
In my understanding, the above quote ratifies the legitimacy of the quantity and objectivity of reality. *Experiential reality* consists of things that we know as a function of our direct experience. *Agreement reality* consists of things we consider real because we have been told they are real, and majority of people seem to agree they are real (Rubin & Babbie, 1989/1997). Moreover, Frodeman (2004) echoed that Newton’s work is our paradigm of *scientific knowledge*, powerful, mechanistic, and certain . . . and existing in an ideal, mathematical space. Frodeman (2004) also explained that “Newtonian mechanics thus fulfills both science’s and society’s dream of scientific truth that does not entangle us in the complications of our social lives” (p. 15).

To understand the paradigm of scientific knowledge which includes quantitative method of inquiry (which I used in my dissertation) in research, let us look at McKeon and Reeve’s (2001) translation of Aristotle’s philosophy on *Physica (Physics)* the concept of scientific knowledge as quoted below:

When the object of inquiry, in any department, have principles, conditions, or elements, it is through acquaintance with these knowledge that is, to say scientific knowledge is attained. For we do not think that we know a thing until we are acquainted with its primary conditions or first principles and have carried our analysis as far as its simplest elements. Plainly therefore in the science of Nature, as in other branches of study, our first task will be to try to determine what relates to its principles.

The natural way of doing this is to start from the things which are more knowable and obvious to us and proceed towards those which are clearer and knowable by nature; for the same things are not ‘knowable relatively to us’ and ‘knowable’ without
qualification. So, in the present inquiry we must follow this method and advance from what is more obscure by nature, but clearer to us, towards what is more clearer and more knowable by nature . . . If it is asserted that all things are quality or quantity, then whether substance exists or not, an absurdity results . . . substance alone is independent, or everything is predicated of substance as subject. Being is infinite. It is then a quantity. For the infinite is in the category of quantity, whereas substance or quality or affection cannot be infinite except through a concomitant attribute, that is if at the same time they are also quantities. For to define the infinite you must use quantity in your formula, but not substance or quality. If then being is both substance and quantity, it is two, not one, if only substance, it is not infinite and has no magnitude, for that it will have to be a quantity. (pp. 218-220).

The above Aristotelian quote explains the origin and logic of contemporary research method such as: the (1) qualitative, (2) quantitative, and (3) mixed-methods approaches in research (Creswell, 2014). Strategies of inquiry associated quantitative research in the late 19th and throughout the 20th century embraced the “post-positivist worldview” which originated mainly from psychology; and quantitative research which originated from anthropology, sociology, the humanities, and evaluation became more prominent during the 1990s and into the 21st century (Creswell, 2014, p. 12-13). To understand the philosophical perspective of this phenomenon in social research, Crotty (1998) emphasized that whereas objectivism, which is related to interpretivism, is the epistemological view that an object does not contain inherent meaning but requires human experiences for meaning to exist. In this perspective, I decided to use the quantitative method of research in my dissertation.
The emergence of the mixed-method approach was the influence of the *Great Divide* model, referred to as—the distinction between the objective/positivist research and the constructionist/or subjectivist for research (Crotty, 1998). The author explained that this model suggests that this divide—objectivist research associated with quantitative methods against constructionist or subjectivist research associated with qualitative methods—is far from justified (Crotty, 1998). Moreover, Crotty (1998) explained that various forms of qualitative research methodologies have in the past used empiricist, positivist approaches in research and this is true based on the history of ethnography. Additionally, Crotty (1998) remarked:

Quantification is by no means ruled out within non-positivist research. We may consider ourselves utterly devoted to qualitative research methods. Yet, when we think about investigations carried out in the normal courses of our daily lives, how often measuring, and counting turn out to be essential to our purposes. The ability to measure and count is a precious human achievement and it beholds us not to be dismissive of it. We then accept that, whatever research we engage in, it is possible for either qualitative or quantitative methods, or both, to serve our purpose. For one research can be qualitative or quantitative, or both qualitative and quantitative, without this being in a way problematic. (p. 15)

Based on Crotty’s (1998) assertion, a quantitative investigation can be explored further qualitatively. Continuous observations and interviews (mixed-methods) can be carried out to gather more data to uncover themes for analysis. A good example of this type of research is exploring classroom strategies that might positively affect English Language Learners (ELLs) academic and social success in public school.
In the field of education, qualitative research tends to be more common since “the field is limited by neither the variety of strategies nor the range of topics, and it takes many forms and is conducted in many settings” (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982/1998, p. 2). The authors explained that qualitative research in education is used as an umbrella, referring to several research strategies that share certain characteristics. This is described specifically that “data collected are called soft, that is rich in description of people, places, conversations, and not easily handled by statistical procedures” (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982/1998, p. 2). Also, research questions are not framed as operational variables, rather, they are formulated to investigate topics in all their complexity, in context, and while qualitative researchers may develop a focus as they collect data, they do not approach the research with specific questions to answer or hypothesis to test (p. 2). In addition, Bogdan and Biklen (1982/1998) emphasized that educational researchers are more concern with (1) understanding behavior from the subject’s own frame of reference, (2) external causes are of secondary importance, and (3) they tend to collect their data through sustained contact with people in settings where subjects normally spend their time—classroom, cafeterias, teachers’ lounges, dormitories, and street corners.

The above literature analyses have given me the opportunity to choose between quantitative, qualitative, and mixed-method research to use in framing the research design in my study. I choose the quantitative cross-sectional survey method due to the limited timeframe, funding, and space available to bring this investigation to its successful completion; interested in finding the relationship between servant leadership and cultural sensitivity; and my strong enthusiasm to see if the students develop and increase their servant leadership and cultural sensitivity qualities that can be generalizable to a larger target population.
Research Design

The research design, which is research question driven, includes the administration of the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) by Barbuto and Wheeler (2006), and the Cultural Sensitivity Assessment Tool (CSAT) (Lopes-Murphy & Murphy, 2016) at the start and end of a semester (e.g. Spring 2018) to measure students’ levels of servant leadership and cultural sensitivity. Differences in scores between the two times points uncover the potential relationship between the independent variable of participation in a university course-related service-learning project/class and the dependent variables of servant leadership and cultural sensitivity.

Participants in this study are described as nonprobability or convenience samples (Creswell, 2014) which will include 50 to 60 students enrolled in teacher education service-learning courses EDTE 101 and EDTE 201 under three different professors. The hope of this study is to generalize from a sample to a greater population to be able to infer some characteristics, attitudes, or predictors of behavior (Creswell, 2014). The nature of the survey is cross-sectional quantitative method of data collection.

The form of data collection is group administration (Creswell, 2014), and there are two options. The first option consists of the researcher personally administering the survey. The second option is to administer the survey through the Center for Community Action and Service Learning (CCASL) at the beginning and end of the semester.

Population and Sampling

The sample in my quantitative study consists of enrolled students in the teacher education program of Gonzaga University’s Department of Teacher Education, School of Education. For background information regarding the probable potential population sampling for my research, I
found out from Gonzaga University’s Title II Instructional Report 13-14 for the year 2015 reporting that an enrolled student is defined as a student who has been admitted to a teacher education preparation program, but who has not completed the program during the academic year being reported. A student who completed the program during the academic year being reported is counted as a program completer and not enrolled student (Title II Instructional Report 13-14, 2015). Moreover, the Gonzaga’s Title II reporting for 2015 stated that the population is stratified and broken down into: twenty-six males, and eighty-eight females enrolled in 2013-2014, and the ethnicity of the population is composed of one Hispanic or Latino, one American Indian or Alaska Native, two Asians, one Black or African-American, 103 Whites, and two biracial students.

Based on the above information, I have yet to find out exactly the number of students who are going to be enrolled in the Service Learning classes or courses in the Teacher Education Program at Gonzaga University’s School of Education for the designated semester. In my study, the sampling design is a single-stage sampling procedure (Creswell, 2014). The sample is drawn by including all class sets of students who are registered in the EDTE 101 and EDTE 201 courses to take the pre- and posttests surveys at two points during the semester period.

**Instrumentation**

The quantitative cross-sectional survey study uses two instruments, the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006) and the Cultural Sensitivity Assessment Tool (CSAT) by Lopes-Murphy and Murphy (2016). Both instruments use the Likert scale, a type of composite measure developed by Rensis Likert to improve levels of measurement in social research (Babbie, 2010/2013). The Likert scale uses the standardized
response categories in survey questionnaires to measure the relative intensity of different items ranging from “Strongly Agree” to “Strongly Disagree” (Babbie, 2010/2013), p. 554).

The Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ)

The Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) was constructed by Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) and began with the following eleven servant leadership subscales derived from the literature: calling, listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, growth, and community building. Data from 80 leaders and 388 raters were utilized to test the internal consistency, confirm factor structure, and assess convergent, divergent, and predictive validity. The results revealed five servant leadership factors: (1) altruistic calling, (2) Emotional healing, (3) Persuasive mapping, (4) Wisdom, and (3) Organizational stewardship, with significant relations to transformational leadership, leader-member exchange extra effort, satisfaction, and organizational effectiveness. In addition, strong factor structure and good performance in all validity criteria indicated that the instrument offers value for future research (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006).

The Servant Leadership Questionnaire (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006) items produced from the statistical analysis are as follows, wherein all the coefficient alphas along diagonals were calculated and all correlations significant at $p < .01$:

**Altruistic calling (alpha = .82)**

- 01 This person puts my best interests ahead of his/her own.
- 03 This person does everything he/she can to serve me.
- 35 This person sacrifices his/her own interests to meet my needs.
- 46 This person goes above, and beyond the call of duty to meet my needs.
Emotional Healing (alpha = .91)

05 This person is one I would turn to if I had a personal trauma.
16 This person is good at helping me with my emotional issues
27 This person is talented at helping me to heal emotionally.
38 This person is one that could help me mend my hard feelings.

Wisdom (alpha = .92)

06 This person seems alert to what’s happening
09 This person is good at anticipating the consequences of decisions.
17 This person has great awareness of what is going on.
28 This person seems in touch with what is happening.
30 This person seems to know what is going to happen.

Persuasive Mapping (alpha = .87)

07 This person offers compelling reasons to get me to do things.
08 This person encourages me to dream “big dreams” about the organization.
18 This person is very persuasive.
29 This person is good at convincing me to do things.
40 This person is gifted when it comes to persuading me.

Organizational stewardship (alpha = .89)

21 This person believes that the organization needs to play a moral role in society.
34 This person believes that our organization needs to function as a community.
43 This person sees the organization for its potential to contribute to society.
45 This person encourages the organization to make a positive difference in the future. (pp. 322-323)

The above SLQ instrument consists of two separate forms, one for the self (individual scoring sheet) and the other for rater (for the followers to complete). In addition, the SLQ has been used by Scardino (2013), using the first person (I) to suit his study’s data collection, Scardino’s modification on SLQ runs as follows:

Altruistic calling:

1. I put others’ interest above my own.
2. I do everything I can to serve others.
3. I sacrifice my own interests to meet others’ needs.
4. I go above, and beyond the call of duty to meet others’ needs.

Emotional healing:

1. I am someone that others will turn to if they have a personal trauma.
2. I am good at helping others with their emotional issues.
3. I am talented at helping others heal emotionally.
4. I can help others mend hard feelings.

Wisdom:

1. I am alert to what’s happening around me.
2. I am good at anticipating the consequences of decisions.
3. I have great awareness of what is going on.
4. I am in touch with what is going on.
5. I know what is going to happen.
Persuasive mapping:

1. I offer compelling reasons to get others to do things.
2. I encourage others to dream “big dreams” about the organizations.
3. I am very persuasive.
4. I am good at convincing others to do things.
5. I am gifted when it comes to persuading others.

Organizational stewardship:

1. I believe that the organization needs to play a moral role in society.
2. I believe that our organization needs to function as a community.
3. I see the organization for its potential to contribute to society.
4. I encourage others to have community spirit in the workplace.
5. I am preparing the organization to make a positive difference in the future.

In addition, Scardino’s (2013) SLQ survey instrument in his study exhibited a Likert scale as: (1) for rating scale zero—Not at all, (2) rating scale 1—Once in a while, (3) rating scale 2—Sometimes, (4) rating scale 3—Fairly often, (5) rating scale 4—Fairly, if not often.

Pertinent to survey instrument authors’ permission to use the SLQ in this study, in February 13, 2017, I emailed Dr. Daniel W. Wheeler, and Dr. John E. Barbuto (CSU-Fullerton, CA) to get their permission to use the SLQ. In February 18, 2017, Dr. Daniel W. Wheeler positively responded, giving me the permission to use the instruments. In September 8, 2017, Dr. John E. Barbuto gave me his permission to use the SLQ.
The Cultural Sensitivity Assessment Tool (CSAT)

The Cultural Sensitivity Assessment Tool (CSAT) is designed by Solange A. Lopes-Murphy and Christopher G. Murphy (2016) to measure cultural competence of teacher educators in the United States. The authors argued that the shifting of paradigm in American education from traditional classroom practices to culturally sensitive contexts that value and welcome students’ diverse cultural perspective requires teacher to be culturally competent (Skippie, 2014, Villegas & Lucas, 2002). This means teachers increasingly need to possess the skills to function effectively across cultures. With the permission of Lopes-Murphy and Murphy (2016), I reworded the name of the instrument from instrument measuring cultural competence of teachers (Lopes-Murphy & Murphy, 2016) to Cultural Sensitivity Assessment Tool (CSAT).

The CSAT instrument uses a Likert scale without designating numbers to measure the level of cultural competence, ranging from “Fully Agree” to “Fully Disagree” (Lopes-Murphy & Murphy, 2016). The researcher assigned numbers to indicate the level of intensity of the items in this Likert scale to measure the level of cultural competence of the participants in this dissertation, wherein (1) rating scale 1—Fully Disagree, (2) rating scale 2—Disagree, (3) rating scale 3—Agree to some extent, (4) rating scale 4—Agree, and (5) rating scale 5—Fully Agree.

In addition, the CSAT is reliable to use as Lopes-Murphy and Murphy (2016) explained: Previous administration of the survey indicated reasonable reliability of 0.77-0.80 for questions on cultural competency. In the current study, the reliability of the overall was reliable (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.78) and was increased to .79 by omitting two questions (Appendix A). To allow comparisons with previous work and to make cultural competence scores more easily interpretable, the authors converted the scores to a percentage of the maximum score (p. 59).
Moreover, the authors gave me their permission to use the cultural competence instrument (CSAT) in February 12, 2017.

**Variables in the Study**

For the purpose of this study, the independent variable is the participation in a university course-related service-learning project/class at Gonzaga University. The dependent variables in this quantitative cross-sectional survey are (1) Servant Leadership characteristics such as: altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, organizational stewardship; (2) and Cultural Sensitivity. The following energy-flow diagram illustrates the relationships between these variables:

**Figure 2.3**

*Note: Service-Learning Class = Independent Variable; Participation in a Service-Learning Class Project = Mediating Variable; Servant Leadership Characteristics and Cultural Sensitivity = Dependent Variables*
In this section, Creswell’s (2014) method requires the importance of relating the variables to the specific research questions or hypotheses, and sample items on the survey instrument to determine how the data collection connects to the variables and questions or hypotheses. The table below illustrates such relationships in this survey study.

**Table 3.1a**  
*Variables, Sample Items, and Research Question or Hypotheses Relationships*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Research Question; Hypotheses</th>
<th>Items on Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant Leadership</td>
<td>Hypothesis #1: There is statistically significant increase (or difference) in the pre-posttests of servant leadership characteristics in university students that participated in a service-learning project/class.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruistic calling</td>
<td></td>
<td>Items # 1, 2, 16, &amp; 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional healing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Items # 3, 8, 12, &amp; 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td></td>
<td>Items # 4, 7, 9, 13, &amp; 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive mapping</td>
<td></td>
<td>Items # 5, 6, 10, 14, &amp; 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational stewardship</td>
<td></td>
<td>Items # 11, 15, 19, 20 &amp; 23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.1b
Continuation of Table 3.1a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Research Question; Hypotheses</th>
<th>Items on Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Sensitivity</td>
<td>Hypothesis #2: There is statistically significant increase (or difference) in the pre-posttests of cultural sensitivity (or competency) in university students that participate in a service-learning project/class.</td>
<td>See all CSAT Items on APPENDIX A and APPENDIX B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variable: Participation in a Service-Learning Course</td>
<td>H#3: There is a positive and significant relationship between servant leadership and cultural sensitivity.</td>
<td>See all CSAT Items in APPENDIX A and APPENDIX B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Collection

The strategy that I use to collect data for this cross-sectional survey study is the group administration form of administering the survey instruments (SLQ and CSAT) in class at the beginning and end of the semester with the permission of the professors.
Table 3.2  
Data Collection Timetable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 2017:</td>
<td>Initial contact of Gonzaga University’s IRB Committee to get their approval and consent. Initial contact via email of the Department of teacher Education Chair to get her permission to administer the survey in her department; and the EDTE 101 and EDTE 201 Service-Learning professors to get their written permission to administer the survey instruments in their classes and provide a background information about the study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2018:</td>
<td>Administer the Pre-test survey to participants in class with their informed consent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April/May 2018:</td>
<td>Administer the Post-test survey to participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2018:</td>
<td>Completion and submission of Final Dissertation paper.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Analysis

This section covers information about the sequential steps involved in analyzing the collected data, explaining the data analysis procedure (Creswell, 2014).

The first step involves reporting the response rate. In this step, Creswell (2014) recommends reporting information about the number of members of the sample who did and did not return the survey, and a table with numbers and percentages describing respondents and non-respondents is a useful tool to present this information. In this study, the researcher influences the probability of non-respondent occurrences using a form of group administration of the survey instrument by personally administering the instruments with one group of class sets of participating students in class with permission from the professors.
The second step is to discuss the method by which response bias would be determined or controlled. Response bias is the effect of nonresponses on survey estimates (Fowler, 2009; Creswell, 2014). Bias means that if non-respondents had responded, their responses would have substantially changed the overall results. There are two procedures to check response bias: (1) wave analysis, or a respondent/non-respondent analysis. In wave analysis, the researcher examines returns on select items week by week to determine if average responses change (Leslie, 1972; Creswell, 2014). With the assumption that those who return surveys in the final weeks of the response period are nearly all non-respondents. If the responses begin to change, a potential exists for response bias. Another option to addressing response bias is (2) to contact a few non-respondents by phone and determine if their responses differ substantially from respondents. This constitutes a respondent and non-respondent check for response bias (Creswell, 2014). In my study, I will consider the second option. For the study to be culturally sensitive, I decided not to include personal and cultural demographic predictors, instead, I used nondemographic variables as intervening, mediating, or moderating variables (Creswell, 2014) to protect the privacy of the participating students in the university course-related service-learning project or class in this study. These nondemographic items/variables are stated in the CSAT instrument in Appendix B as follows: (1) Do you speak a foreign language? (2) If you speak an additional foreign language, how well do you speak it? (3) Total amount of time you have visited, lived, and/or studied in another country. And (4) I have friends from different cultures.

In this study, the probability of response bias to occur is low because the survey is administered in a group administration form at the beginning and at the end of one semester. The
potential participants are given the choice of participating or not in the survey study at the beginning of the semester during the pre-survey discussion.

In the third step, Creswell (2014) suggests a plan to provide a descriptive analysis of the data for all independent and dependent variables in the study. This analysis should indicate the means, standard deviations, and range for these variables. In some quantitative projects, the analysis stops here with descriptive analysis, especially if the number of participants is too small for more advanced, inferential analysis. To measure the level of significance of the outcomes, I calculated the alpha value which is the level of probability at which the null hypothesis can be rejected with confidence, and the research hypothesis can be accepted with confidence. This study would use Statistics with Microsoft Excel (Dretzke, 2005/2013) to provide descriptive analysis once data collection is completed or I will do the math calculation myself using Levin and Fox (1994) statistics book titled *Elementary Statistics in Social Research.*

The fourth step is to identify the statistics and the statistical computer program for testing the major inferential research question/s or hypotheses of the study. The inferential questions or hypotheses relate variables or compare groups in terms of variables so that inferences can be drawn from the sample to a population. Provides this rationale for the choice of statistical tests and mention the assumptions associated with the statistics (Creswell, 2014). In the fifth step, in this survey study, I used the Chi-Square, and Pearson Product Moment Correlation wherein:

1) Chi-Square criteria are: (1) Nature of question is association between groups; (2) Number of independent variable is one; (3) Number of dependent variables is one; (4) Number of control variables (covariates) is zero; (5) Type of scores for independent and dependent variables is categorical/continuum; (6) Distribution of scores is normal; (7) Statistical test
is Chi-Square; and (8) The test yields an association between two variables measure by categories.

2) Pearson Product Correlation criteria includes: (1) Relate variables; (2) Number of independent variable is one; (3) Number of dependent variable is one; (4) Number of control variables (covariates) is zero; (5) Type of score for independent variable and dependent variables are continuous; (6) Distribution of score is normal; (7) Statistical test is Pearson Product Moment Correlation; and (8) What the test yields; Tells the magnitude and direction of association between variables measure in an interval (ratio) scales.

3) t-test includes: (a) Nature of question is group comparison; (b) Number of independent variable is one; (c) Number of dependent variable is one; (d) Number of control variables (covariates) is zero; (e) Type of score for independent and dependent variables is categorical/continuous; (f) Distribution of scores is normal; (g) Statistical test is t-test; and (h) What is the test yields—A comparison of two groups in terms of outcomes.

Noting that the number of control variables is zero for both t-test and Pearson Product Correlation Criteria, Creswell (2014) explained:

‘Unless the study intentionally employs demographic variables as predictors, use nondemographic variables (i.e. attitudes or behaviors) as mediating variables or moderating variables or they moderate the influences of the independent variable on the dependent variable. Because quantitative studies attempt to verify theories, demographic variables (e.g., age, income level, educational level) typically enter these studies as intervening (or mediating) or moderating variables instead of major independent variables. (p. 146)
The fifth step, this study presents the results in tables or figures and interpret the results from the statistical test used in the study. An interpretation in quantitative research means that the researcher draws conclusions from the results for the research question/s, hypotheses, and the larger meaning of the results (Creswell, 2014). This interpretation involves several steps:

1) Report how the results answered the research question or hypothesis. The Publication of the American Psychological Association (American Psychological Association [APA], 2010) suggests that the most complete meaning of the results come from reporting extensive description, statistical significance testing, confidence intervals, and effect sizes.

2) Discuss the implication of the results for practice or for future research on the topic which requires drawing inferences and conclusion from the results. Additionally, focus should be on whether, or not the research question/hypotheses were supported (Creswell, 2014).

Limitations of the Study

The brevity of the intervention process (a semester period of implementation) is a concern in this study. Thus, does one semester of experience in a university course-related service-learning project/class makes a difference in the development of servant leadership (SL) and cultural sensitivity characteristics (CS) of the participants? It is probable some participants may require longer period of participation than the others to develop the measure traits. Another limitation is the number of enrolled students (59) during the semester when the intervention and the pre- and post-surveys are going to be implemented (tentative schedule is Spring 2018 semester). The question of is the number of 59 students sufficient to make inferences to a larger
population? Additionally, there are also limitations of a cross-cultural survey study and the use of student only sample that should be noted in this study.

**Ethical Consideration**

The four main ethical considerations to survey research that this study recognizes and is on watch throughout the research are: (1) potential harm to participants, (2) anonymity and confidentiality, (3) informed consent, and (4) the right to results (Babbie, 2010/2013).

Gonzaga University, the chosen site to conduct this study, would be given a concise outline which is required by its IRB as well as the Department of Teacher Education and the Center for Community Action and Service Learning (CCASL). All forms and data required are to be submitted to the university in addition of the Informed Consent Form and survey tools and other documents required for full review. Each process in this IRB application would be fully completed and approved.

All security measures such as informed consent, confidentiality, anonymity, and the participants’ right to privacy are considered thoroughly to ensure the participants are to be treated with the principle of respect of peoples’ privacy and justice.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this cross-sectional survey quantitative study was to examine the extent to which participation in a university course-related service-learning project/class affects student success in developing and enhancing servant leadership characteristics and cultural sensitivity in a teacher education program. This study examined the relationships between levels of servant leadership characteristics as measured by the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006), with levels of cultural sensitivity as measured by the Cultural Sensitivity Assessment Tool (CSAT) (Lopes-Murphy & Murphy, 2016) among students who are participating in a university course-related service-learning project/class in a teacher education program at Gonzaga University in Spokane, Washington.

Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) used data collected from 80 leaders and 388 raters to test the internal consistency, confirm factor structure, and assess convergent, divergent, and predictive validity of the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) instrument. The SLQ items from their statistical analysis wherein all the coefficient alphas along diagonals were calculated and all correlations are significant at \( p < .01 \) as illustrated in Chapter III Methodology of my study. The Cultural Sensitivity Assessment Tool’s (CSAT) (Lopes-Murphy & Murphy (2016) overall instrument reliability is reliable with Cronbach’s alpha of .78 and increased to .79 by omitting one question by the authors. The goal of this chapter is to report the findings and results of the present study. The chapter includes information pertaining to participant selection, a description of the sample drawn from the study, and a presentation of hypotheses testing.
For this study, the sampling design is a single-stage sampling procedure (Creswell, 2014), wherein 59 students are selected as nonprobability or convenience sample by including all class sets of students who are fully enrolled in university course-related Service-Learning Education courses (e.g. EDTE 101 and EDTE 201) in a teacher education program at Gonzaga University. The demographic information collected about the sample in the study included gender, religious affiliation, race or ethnicity, teacher education level, study major. Participants also indicated whether they have taken servant-leadership classes or not, have service-learning experience or not, have taken multicultural education classes or not, and have attended multicultural activities or not. The following tables below illustrate the sample population demographics.

**Table 4.1**
*Summary of Participants Demographics on Gender, Religious Affiliation, and Race*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>#F(%)</th>
<th>#M(%)</th>
<th>#Christian (%)</th>
<th>#White</th>
<th>#Non-White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50(85%)</td>
<td>9(15%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>43(73%)</td>
<td>16(27%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46(78%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: F = Females; M = Males*

Table 4.1 describes the gender of the participants for this study included 16 males and 43 females, which showed that 27% of the sample are males and 73% are females. The religious affiliation of the participants included 44 Christians, 1 non-religious, 1 non-practicing, 2 Agnostic, 5 did not answer, 1 Lutheran, 1 Atheist, 2 other none, 2 Catholic. The data showed that 78% of the sample are Christians as majority group for religious affiliation category. The race or
ethnicity included 2 Asian, 4 Hispanic, 50 White, 1 White-Asian, 1 Native-American, 1 Pacific Islander. The data showed 85% of the sample are White which is the majority for the race or ethnicity category. The unequal sizes of the race groups within the sample is a limitation to this study. Because of this imbalance the results are not generalizable to races other than White, since the other groups are outside the parameter of the convenience sample chosen for this study (Babbie, 2004).

Table 4.2
Summary of Sample Demographics on Teacher Education Level, Servant Leadership Course, Service-Learning Experiences, Multicultural Education, Multicultural Activities Experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLQ Item Questions</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has taken Servant Leadership (SL) courses</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has not taken SL courses</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has Service-Learning (S-L) experiences in high school</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has no S-L experiences</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has taken Multicultural Education classes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has not taken Multicultural Education classes</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has attended multicultural activities on campus</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has not attended multicultural activities on campus</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 illustrates the teacher education level of all 59 participants are undergraduates.

Study Major of the participants included: 2 Music Education, 4 English, 8 Special Education, 4 Undecided, 3 Spanish, 1 Accounting, 2 Biology, 2 Physical Education, 1 Business Administration, 4 Mathematics, 5 Psychology, 2 Kinesiology & Physical Education, 1 Business; 4 Blank, 1 History Education, 1 Sociology & Philosophy, 1 Sociology & Criminal Justice, 1
Physics; 4 History, 1 Religious Studies, 1 Political Science; 1 Not declared, 1 Chemistry, 2 Psychology, 1 Psychology Elementary Education, and 1 Education English. Twenty-nine (29) participants have taken service servant-leadership (SL), and 30 participants have not taken SL which showed that 49% of the sample have taken SL and 51% have not taken SL. Forty-three (43) participants have service-learning experience, and 16 participants have none. This data showed that 73% of the sample have service-learning experiences and 27% do not have service-learning experiences. Twenty (20) have taken multicultural education (MED) classes, and 39 have not taken MED classes. This data showed that 34% of the sample have taken MED classes, and 66% have not taken MED classes. Twenty-eight (28) participants have attended multicultural activities (MAC) on campus, and thirty (30) participants have not; 1 participant (2%) did not answer the question. This data showed that 47% of the sample have attended MAC on campus, 51% have not attended MAC on campus and 2% has not answered.

**Table 4.3**
*Summary of Demographics on Sample Cultural Sensitivity items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSAT Item Questions</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speak foreign language + English</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not speak foreign language</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total amount of time visited, lived, or studied abroad</td>
<td>20 one month or less; 9 have less than 1 year</td>
<td>34%; 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have never been abroad</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do they have friends from different cultures</td>
<td>30 agree; 17 Strongly agree</td>
<td>51%; 29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 illustrates the additional data collected from the survey included the following items: (1) Do they speak foreign language in addition to English; (2) How well they speak the additional language; (3) Total amount of time visited, lived, or studied in another country; and
(4) Do they have friends from different culture. The information or collected data are analyzed as follows: Twenty-seven (27) participants (46% of the sample) speak foreign language in addition to English and 32 participants (54%) do not speak foreign language. Eight (8) participants (14% of the sample) are proficient; Ten (10) participants (17%) can understand and make themselves understood; Ten (10) participants (17%) know few words and phrases; and Thirty-one (31) participants (53%) do not speak a foreign language.

One (1) participant (2% of the sample) has more than 3 years total amount of time visited, lived, or studied in another country; Four (4) have participants (7%) have 1 to 3 years total amount of time visited, lived, or studied in another country; Nine (9) participants (15%) have less than one year total amount of time visited, lived, or studied in another country; Twenty (20) participants (34%) have one month or less total amount of time visited, lived, or studied in another country; and Twenty-five (25) participants (42%) have never been abroad. Thirty (30) participants (51% of the sample) agree having friends from different culture; seventeen (17) participants (29%) strongly agree having friends from different culture; Five (5) participants (8%) neither agree or disagree having friends from different culture; Three (3) disagree participants (5%) having friends from different culture; and two (2) strongly participants (3%) disagree having friends from different culture.

The unequal sizes of the gender groups within this convenience sample presents a limitation to this study. Based on this imbalance, the results are not generalizable to all gender other than female, as such other gender groups are beyond the parameter of the convenience sample chosen for this study (Babbie, 2004).
Results

For hypotheses 1-2, we used two-sample t-tests to examine differences in servant leadership and cultural sensitivity before and after a service learning experience. For hypothesis 3, we used hierarchical regression analysis to test a model in which servant leadership characteristics predict cultural sensitivity. We controlled for gender, course section, time spent abroad, friendships with peoples of different cultures, and whether they speak a foreign language. Gender and the ability to speak a foreign language showed significant correlations with servant leadership and cultural sensitivity (See Table 4.4), so we included them in the model.
#### Table 4.4
Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations between Control Variables, Servant Leadership, and Cultural Competency ($N = 118$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.225*</td>
<td>.224*</td>
<td>.390**</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.191*</td>
<td>.271**</td>
<td>.205*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Speak Foreign</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.225*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.242**</td>
<td>.200*</td>
<td>.355**</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.273**</td>
<td>.224**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Altruistic</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.224*</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.504**</td>
<td>.296**</td>
<td>.343**</td>
<td>.578**</td>
<td>.710**</td>
<td>.257**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Emotional</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.390**</td>
<td>.242**</td>
<td>.504**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.405**</td>
<td>.492**</td>
<td>.449**</td>
<td>.785**</td>
<td>.367**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Wisdom</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.200*</td>
<td>.296**</td>
<td>.405**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.354**</td>
<td>.482**</td>
<td>.692**</td>
<td>.258**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Persuasive</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.355**</td>
<td>.343**</td>
<td>.492**</td>
<td>.354**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.380**</td>
<td>.718**</td>
<td>.269**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Org.</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.191*</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.578**</td>
<td>.449**</td>
<td>.482**</td>
<td>.380**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.774**</td>
<td>.309**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewardship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Total SLQ</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.271**</td>
<td>.273**</td>
<td>.710**</td>
<td>.785**</td>
<td>.692**</td>
<td>.718**</td>
<td>.774**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.399**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCORE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Total CSAT</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.205*</td>
<td>.224**</td>
<td>.257**</td>
<td>.367**</td>
<td>.258**</td>
<td>.269**</td>
<td>.309**</td>
<td>.399**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCORE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$*
Table 4.5 illustrates the results of the statistical examination of each hypothesis in the study.

### Table 4.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1: There is statistically significant increase or difference in the pre-posttests of servant leadership characteristics in university students that participate in a service-learning project/class.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: There is statistically significant increase or difference in the pre-posttests of cultural sensitivity or cultural competency in university students that participate in a service-learning project/class.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3: There is positive and statistically significant relationship between servant leadership and cultural competency in university students that participate in a service-learning project/class.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Service-Learning and Servant Leadership**

*Walk the walk,” as they say. Keep at it. Do it every day. People will notice and will ask you what motivates you. What a fantastic opportunity to open conversation about servant-leadership.*

- Robert K. Greenleaf

The statistical analysis of a two-tailed t-Test, Paired Two Sample for Means (Dretzke, 2005/2013) did not indicate a significant increase or difference between before (M = 3.88, SD = .41) and after (M = 3.76, SD = .52) the service-learning experience in terms of servant leadership; t(58) = 1.95, p = .057. Thus, H1 was not supported. Table 4.2 illustrates the summary of the overall statistical analyses of service-learning and servant leadership in this study.
Table 4.6
Summary of Statistical Analyses of Service-Learning and Servant Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-cal</th>
<th>t-crit</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. No difference between before and after the service-learning experience in terms of servant leadership.*

According to Dretzke (2005/2013), a two-tailed test is significant if the two-tailed probability is less than alpha. Also, a two-tailed test is significant if obtained *t* is greater than the two-tailed critical *t*.

**Service-Learning and Cultural Competency**

*Culture is the behaviors and belief systems that characterize a long-standing social group. One’s cultural background influences the perspectives and values one acquires, the skills one masters and finds important, and the adult roles to which one aspires.*

-Joe D. Nichols

A two-tailed test in this study did not show a significant increase or difference in the pre-posttests in terms of cultural sensitivity as measured by the Cultural Sensitivity Assessment Tool (CSAT) (Lopes-Murphy & Murphy, 2016) in this study. Thus, H2 was not supported.

Table 4.7 illustrates the results of a two-tailed t-Test showing no statistically significant increase or difference between before and after the service-learning experience in terms of the overall cultural competency. As shown in Table 4.3, the two-tailed t-test below did not reveal a statistically significant increase or difference between the pretest (*M* = 3.98, *SD* = .31) and posttest (*M* = 3.98, *SD* = .35) of the CSAT; *t*(58) = -0.035, *p* = .97.
Table 4.7

Summary of Statistical Analyses of Service-Learning and Cultural Competency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-cal</th>
<th>t-crit</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* No difference between before and after the service-learning experience in terms of cultural competency as measured by the CSAT instrument.

**Servant Leadership and Cultural Competency**

Hypothesis 3 stated that there is a positive and a statistically significant relationship between servant leadership and cultural competency in university students that participate in a service-learning project/class. Servant leadership as measured by the SLQ showed a positive relationship with cultural sensitivity ($r = .40, p < .001$). To test these predictive nature of the servant leadership on cultural sensitivity, a two-step hierarchical regression was conducted with cultural sensitivity entered as the dependent variable. In the first block, gender and the ability to speak a foreign language were entered as control variables. These were entered as control variables because both were significantly related to servant leadership and cultural sensitivity. The five dimensions of servant leadership were entered into step two.

In the first step, the ability to speak a foreign language, $\beta = .18, t = 2.04, p < .05$, exerted a significant effect on cultural sensitivity. In the second step, altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship together had a significant effect on cultural sensitivity. Results suggest that servant leadership predicts cultural sensitivity when controlling for gender and the ability to speak a foreign language. Thus, H3 is supported. The complete results for this hierarchical regression appear in Table 4.8.
Table 4.8

*Hierarchical Regression Predicting Cultural Sensitivity (N = 118)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak Foreign Language</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak Foreign Language</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruistic Calling</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Healing</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive Mapping</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org. Stewardship</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes.* Total $R^2 = .19$, adjusted $R^2 = .13$, $F(7, 110) = 3.59, p < .01$. *p < .05, **p < .01.

Summary

This chapter reports the results of three hypotheses. The data analysis was performed on 59 responses of students who participated in a service-learning project/class in a teacher education program at Gonzaga University before and after the service-learning experience intervention within a semester timeframe. H1 and H2 were evaluated to determine any statistical differences between pre- and posttests using t-Tests. H3 was tested using hierarchical multiple regression analysis (Dretzke, 2005/2013). The key findings revealed no statistical significant increase or difference in terms of both servant leadership and cultural sensitivity (or competency) between before and after the service-learning experience (intervention). However, findings
revealed a positive and statistically significant relationship between servant leadership and cultural sensitivity (or competency) in this quantitative research study.
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION

In this research study, a quantitative survey methodology was utilized to examine whether service-learning experiences can impact servant leadership and cultural competency development. The instruments used in this quantitative study were the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006), which measures the servant leadership characteristics such as: (1) Altruistic Calling, (2) Emotional Mapping, (3) Wisdom, (4) Personal Mapping, and (5) Organizational Stewardship, and the Cultural Sensitivity Assessment Tool (CSAT) developed and used by Lopes-Murphy and Murphy in 2016, which measures the cultural competency via the CSAT statements #1 to #18 stated as follows:

1. I have an interest in learning about different cultures.
2. When I meet people different from me, I compare how my cultural identity is similar with theirs.
3. The way we do things in my culture is better than the way people do things in other cultures.
4. What people in other cultures believe is as valuable as what people in my culture believe.
5. I am likely to go to an event on campus that features the music, dance, and art of another culture.
6. Classroom activities that involves interaction with people from different cultures help a person develop cultural sensitivity towards others different from me.
7. I tend to observe people different from me and reflect on how they make me feel.
8. I think of myself as culturally sensitive towards others different from me.
9. Being around people from other cultures makes me uncomfortable.
10. I like to tell people from other cultures about my own culture.

11. When I talk to a person who does not speak my language well, I change how I speak so they can understand me.

12. People in my culture have better values than people in other cultures.

13. I enjoy talking with people from different cultures.

14. It is fair to allow students from different cultures to complete assignments in different ways.

15. If I am around people from other cultures, I try to behave like they do.

16. I find it difficult to discuss subjects with people who have an opinion different than I do.

17. I like to try foods from other cultures.

18. We learn a lot from interacting with people who are different from me.

Moreover, this chapter explains the critical implications behind the results within Chapter Four, emphasizing specifically on the insignificant findings where statistical analyses revealed probability values with significance level of $p > .05$ in this study. The discussion starts with: (1) an overview of the potential contributions from this study and a brief summary of the research question and the hypotheses, (2) connecting relevant recent research on the relationship between service-learning, servant leadership, and cultural competency to the results of this dissertation study. Then follows a discussion of the implications of the findings in this study. The last section of this chapter includes recommendations for future research on the topic and limitations of this quantitative study.

The results of this quantitative study may contribute in three key areas. First, the study influences the expansion of empirical research with respect to the exploration of the concepts of
service-learning in relation to servant-leadership, and cultural competency in higher education. Secondly, although many researchers have examined relationships between service-learning and cultural competency, there currently is a scarcity in the research analyzing the relationships between service-learning, servant leadership, and cultural competency (e.g., Boyle-Baise, 2006, Goldberg & Coufal, 2009; Rossi, 2002; Wehling, 2008). For example, Boyle-Baise (2006) emphasized that teacher education for multicultural education centers and focuses around learning about cultural diversity, examining relations of power and inequality, and responding affirmatively to sociocultural differences in schools and classroom; and this author suggested that community-based service learning is an important part of this process. Goldberg and Coufal (2009) also believed that in this present days multiculturality in society, students need to be prepared for the global work they are facing in their lives and the critical thinking skills essential to acquiring cultural competence in their career. Goldberg and Coufal (2009) also remarked that service-learning could improve students’ critical thinking abilities when focused on community involvement, deep reflections, and civic engagement, thus contribute to students’ intellectual development and cultural competence. This thinking has inspired my study.

Pertinent to service-learning (S-L) in relation to servant leadership, Rossi (2002) explained the Service-Learning Model in his dissertation based on the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993, that service learning is a method whereby students learn and develop through active participation in thoughtfully organized service that is conducted in and meets the needs of communities such as: (1) S-L is coordinated with an elementary, secondary school, institution of higher education or community service program and the community; (2) S-L helps foster civic responsibility; (3) S-L integrated into and enhances the academic curriculum of the
students, or the education components of the community service program in which the participants are enrolled; and (4) S-L provides structured time for students or participants to reflect on the service experience. Additionally, Rossi (2002) added that there are other categories of service that are oftentimes associated with S-L such as: (1) Direct service activities that put students on face-to-face helping someone (e.g. teaching homeless persons to read, doing home visits to the elderly, etc.); (2) Indirect service activities that performed “behind-the-scenes” channeling resources to alleviate a problem (e.g. walkathons, raising money for homes for the homeless, etc.); and (3) advocacy service projects requiring students to lend their voices and talents to the disenfranchised or to correct injustice (e.g. advocating for a new city, for a change in the law, promoting a youth case, etc.).

Rossi (2002) used Sigmon (1994) four typologies of S-L: (1) Service-Learning, (2) Service-LEARNING, (3) SERVICE-Learning, and (4) SERVICE-LEARNING in his dissertation work. Rossi (2002) explained: (1) Service-Learning: this typology is a method whereby students learn and develop through active participation in thoughtfully organized service that is conducted in and meets the needs of communities; (2) Service-LEARNING: LEARNING goals are primary, service-outcomes are secondary; (3) SERVICE-learning: SERVICE outcomes are primary, learning goals are secondary; and (4) SERVICE-LEARNING: SERVICE and LEARNING goals of equal weight and each enhances the other for all participants.

In this typology, all parties in the arrangement are seen as learners and teachers as well as servers and served. In these programs, Sigmon (1994) explained that we are challenged to respect local situations for what they can teach; students are challenged to be their best, to listen, to explore, to learn, to share from their emerging capacities, and gain capacity for self-directed
learning. Analyzing these typologies, the salient features lie in the practice that all parties to the arrangement are seen as learners and teachers as well as servers and served. These salient features of the SERVICE-LEARNING approach of typology is vividly a reflection of Herman Hesse’s (1956/1960) *The Journey to the East* portrayal of a servant leader qualities and Robert K. Greenleaf’s notion of a servant-leader (Sigmon, 1994).

In another perspective, Wehling (2008) addressed the development of cross-cultural competency within the context of service-learning (S-L), asserting the need to integrate cross-cultural competency into the academic curriculum due to the dramatic rise with the significant increase in Hispanics residency and their families in the United States. Wehling (2008) explained that S-L addresses the demand for culturally competent graduates who can delve into addressing issues on inequality and invisibility as well as the language barrier; . . . and through S-L many university students could develop maturity and ingenuity that they would not feasibly acquire in the classrooms.

Thus, based on the above literatures’ perspective on service-learning, servant leadership, and cultural competency relationships, my dissertation study creates a more thorough and current understanding on how these three variables are related, as well as it creates a literature base for service-learning theory as it relates to servant leadership and cultural competency in higher learning. Finally, this study provides educational leaders with another pathway or avenue to investigate or explore servant leadership and intercultural competency through service-learning project or coursework in higher education.

This quantitative survey methodology implemented a nonprobability or convenience samples which included fifty-nine (59) students enrolled in a teacher education service-learning
courses (EDTE 101 and 102) under three different professors at Gonzaga University, a Catholic Jesuit university. The EDTE 101 Service-learning classes included freshmen undergraduate students in which majority of them also took EDTE 201 Service-learning taught by a different professor during the semester. The EDTE 201 students who took servant leadership course are undergraduate sophomores in the teacher education program. The researcher learned from one of the professors that EDTE 101 Service-learning course is not a pre-requisite course for the EDTE 201 Service-learning course of study.

The nature of the survey was cross-sectional and data collection was administered at two points at a time (at the beginning and end of the designated semester timeframe) (Creswell, 2014). In this study, the researcher was able to influence the probability of non-respondent occurrences via group administration of the survey instrument by personally administering the instrument with one group of class sets of convenience sample of participating students in class with the permission of the professors. In addition, the researcher was able to match the collected pre- posttest surveys through collected demographic information without knowing the personal identity of the students for confidentiality purposes.

On the one hand, this research study has determined that there are positive and statistically significant relationships between servant leadership and cultural competency. On the other hand, the results have shown no significant increase or difference in terms of students’ servant leadership and cultural sensitivity development between before and after the service-learning experiences of the students through participating in a university course-related service-learning project/class.
Research Question

The research question in this study is: Do students in a teacher education program develop servant leadership and cultural sensitivity (or cultural competency) through the experience of participating in a university course-related service-learning project/class?

H1 stated that there is statistically significant increase (or difference) in the pre-posttests of servant leadership characteristics in university students who participate in a service-learning project/class. However, the results of a two-tailed t-test revealed no evidence of significant increase or difference in the pre- and posttests scores between before and after the service-learning experience. Thus, H1 was not supported.

We thought service-learning experiences of students would influence servant leadership development. The literature on service-learning and servant leadership point to the idea that students’ participation in a course-related service-learning project/class would influence the success of students’ servant leadership development in a teacher education program (Brandt, 1998; Garza, 2015; Stewart, 2012). Yet findings in my study did not support such hypothesis. This discrepancy may be due to: (1) the brief one-semester service-learning experiences of the students, (2) lack of interests on the service-learning project, (3) learning styles of students, (4) teaching styles of professors, and (5) other extraneous variables that may have occurred during the semester that negatively influenced the students’ enthusiasm in the service-learning project they were involved with. It is also probable that the students are already servant due to their community service-learning experiences in high school (Rossi, 2002, Norman, 2018).

H2 stated that there is statistically significant increase (or difference) in the pre-posttests of cultural sensitivity (or competency) in university students who participate in a service-learning
class/project. The results of a two-tailed t-test showed no evidence for significant increase or
difference between before and after the service-learning experience in all the CSAT statements
from #1 to #18 cultural competency instrument. Thus, H2 was not supported.

Pertaining H2, scholars have argued service-learning should influence cultural sensitivity
(or competency) (Amerson, 2010; Boyle-Baise, 2006; Domangue & Carson, 2008; Flannery &
Ward, 1999; Meaney et al, 2008; Wehling, 2006). But my findings did not support that assertion.
There might be several factors to consider why H2 was not supported, but it is probable that
students are already culturally competent due to their community service-learning experiences in
diverse communities in the past, involvement in multicultural activities on campus at school and
in the community, multicultural education background, and strong belief on having friends from
different cultures which were revealed as positive results in this study. In my viewpoint, students
regardless of their cultural background who lived or grew up in diverse communities most of
their lives are more open, embracive, and welcoming to diversity (Norman, 2018).

H3 stated that there is statistically significant relationship between servant leadership and
cultural sensitivity (or competency) in university students who participate in a service-
learning/class. The results of a hierarchical regression analysis divulged a positive and
statistically significant relationship between servant leadership and cultural competency before
and after the service-learning experience. In other words, students who showed higher levels of
servant leadership also showed higher levels of cultural competency. Thus, H3 was supported.

These results may be related to students’ community service-learning experiences
(Boyle-Baise, 2006) in diverse community during high school that they brought in with them in
the service-learning project/class environment, the students’ participation in multicultural
activities, had taken multicultural education coursework, have strong beliefs in having friends from different cultures, possess strong enthusiasm to learn about diversity, long experience of studying, living, and visiting in other countries, etc. are strong factors that may influence any student cultural sensitivity development. As a schoolteacher to both mainstream and non- and limited-English speaking students in public school, I observed that students who joined multicultural clubs and participated in multicultural activities mostly developed greater interest in leading and participating in student body’s activities, school assemblies, especially multicultural assemblies/fundraising projects, enjoy working with students from different cultures in group research-based projects, and so on. I used school district recommended Multicultural Education model pedagogical approaches such as Sheltered-English (Krashen & Cummins)—Specially-Designed Academic Instruction in English (Rohac, 2013) and cooperative learning (Archie, 2010) in small diverse groups in teaching content math and science activities in a research-based curriculum in both mainstream regular and ESL classroom settings which I found very effective pedagogical strategies through the years (Norman, 2017).

This new knowledge is important in training preservice teachers, school administrators, and staff to better serve the increasing culturally- and linguistically diverse classrooms in public schools due to recent arrivals and continuous flow of influx of refugees and migrant workers entering the United States from their homeland, seeking for better life and formal American education (Camera, 2016; Gomez, 2016; Lind, 2014; Negroponte, 2014). Moreover, the increasing trend of multicultural mixture of students in the classroom requires understanding cross-cultural relationship between culture and learning styles of students in the classroom environment (Omidvar & Tan, 2012). Additionally, practitioners in the field of higher education
such as the professors, instructors, administrators, and staff in higher learning institutions should cultivate servant leadership and cultural sensitivity or competency to effectively relate and educate international students who are seeking American education in higher learning across disciplines in the United States (Nieto, 2008; Sakurachi, 2014; Salisbury, 2014).

Discussion

*We were filled with joy as we saw the growth we would have here on earth and the joyous bonds we would create with each other. Then we watched as the earth was created. We watched as our spirit brothers and sisters entered physical bodies for their turns upon the earth, each experiencing the pains and joys that would help them progress.*

- Betty J. Eadie

Servant Leadership

In H1, which stated that there is statistically significant increase (or difference) in the pre-posttests of servant leadership characteristics in university students who participate in a service-learning project/class, this hypothesis was not supported as a two-tailed t-test did not show a statistically significant increase or difference in the pre-posttests of the SLQ survey.

Although there is scarcity of literature pertinent to the efficacy of service-learning to student’s servant leadership development, some service-learning thinkers’ investigations divulged some promising results on this topic (e.g., Brandt, 1998; Garza, 2015; Stewart, T., 2012). For example, Brandt (1998) qualitative study sought to investigate into the efficacy of the integration of service-learning into the curriculum for emotionally disturbed students as a means of mastering social/emotional well-being was the focus of the study. Brandt (1998) reported that positive growth emerged in both social and emotional, and academic domains has occurred after
service-learning intervention. The result also showed that students in both case studies were positively affected by the service-learning intervention in the areas of school-related behaviors, locus-of-control, increase in group self-esteem, and academic performance (p. iv). Data were inconclusive and vague when measuring empathy. Findings revealed more dramatic changes pertinent to the questions of this inquiry in the individually tailored service-learning case study (p. iv).

The above-mentioned positive results of Brandt’s (1998) study contrasted the no show of significant increase or difference before and after the one-semester service-learning intervention in terms of servant leadership. A longitudinal study on the same topic might reveal a positive and significant relationship between service-learning and servant leadership. As a schoolteacher to high school students, I experienced that it takes time (one year at least) before students adapt to the new school/classroom learning environments, and for me as their teacher to win their trust. A semester period is always a period of adjustment and coming to know each other. The students’ period of adjustment and adaptation in the learning environment varies based on the personal cultural background—a comprehensible input (Krashen, 2003) the individual student bring in the classroom or in any learning/teaching environment. Mostly, students coming from relational cultures demonstrate resilience and openness instantaneously in their adaptation phases more than the individualistic students in the new classroom diverse settings (Norman, 2014).

Garza’s (2015) qualitative phenomenological study explored the service-learning experiences for Hispanic high school students on the U.S Mexico border as how these service-learning experiences relate to transfer of knowledge, student motivation, students’ perception of their civic responsibility, and role in their community, and student empowerment. Garza (2015)
used semi-structured focus groups to collect data with the primary goal of giving voice to students living along the U.S.-Mexico border to interpret phenomenon of their experience and gain insight into a specific phenomenon. Results revealed the overarching themes based upon the participants experiences which included: better understanding and application of knowledge, enjoyment of working with the community, enhanced confidence when problem solving and working with diverse people and the development of positive relationships (p. iii).

In contrast to Garza’s (2015) findings, the results of the present research showed no significant statistical increase or difference between before and after the service learning experiences in terms of servant leadership. The researcher suggests a longitudinal study (1-2 years period) in a service-learning project of interest may yield a positive and significant relationships between students’ service-learning experiences and servant leadership development in terms of serving the Latino immigrant student population in public schools (Norman, 2015).

As a teacher and club sponsor of the Latino Club in the school site at Galileo Academy of Science and Technology, SFUSD, I discovered cultural commonalities with the Latino immigrant students and their families which is our Spanish heritage which served as an avenue for an instant familiarity between me and the Latino students in the school site, thus learning and teaching occurred instantaneously through active participation in classroom and school activities. This student population is highly relational and inherently culturally sensitive as these students believe in the family and their core value is based on cohesiveness and strength of the family unit relationship. The Latino students and their families love to serve the family and the community through community multicultural involvement such as fundraisings, parades/celebrations like the Cinco de Mayo, parental involvement in the school site and in the Latino community at large;
and the Latino Club was highly supported by the parents and families of the students and embraced it as their second large family or the La Familia in the Latino community in San Francisco (Norman, 2014).

To understand Norman’s (2014) perspective, Juana Bordas echoed: “Authentic diversity will be realized only when the voices, values, and contributions of all Americans are integrated into mainstream leadership” (p. ix). Bordas (2012) explained her rationale in writing her book titled *Salsa, Soul, and Spirit Leadership for a Multicultural Age: New Approaches to Leadership from Latino, Black, and American Indian Communities* as follows:

People continue to ask why, I, as a Latina, wrote a book on multicultural leadership rather than leadership that springs from the community of my heritage. Although it is informative to look at Latino, or Black, or American Indian Leadership separately, such focus implies that leadership in each of these communities is pertinent only to that one group and is not relevant or generic enough for widespread application. Latino Leadership is commonly seen to be of interest only to people who are involved or work with this population. Black Leadership is not regarded as applicable to mainstream organizations. Likewise, American Indian spirituality is not understood as the very essence of their leadership that can enrich all cultures. (p. ix)

In other study, Stewart (2012) sought to determine how undergraduate teacher education students’ participation in service-learning activities would affect their teacher sense of efficacy (TSE) and servant leadership development. The researcher used a pre-test and post-test, quasi-experiment research design to determine to what extent changes would occur over time in the pre-service educators’ TSE and sense of servant leadership from participating in a service-
learning project. Results revealed participants’ scores on each sub-scale-dependent variable for both TSE and servant leadership increased over the two measure points, pre- and post-tests. Moreover, Stewart (2012) concluded that while significant results are promising, the low effect sizes and with the lack of a control group, cautioned the research about drawing conclusions. The effect sizes are from small to medium, which means that there are more than likely other variables or factors which may mediate the level of significance in future samples (p. 247). The author recommended that replication of this study would provide further insight into the variables/factors involved in the study (p. 247).

The above-mentioned increase on participants’ scores in Stewart (2012) study contradicted the results of my dissertation research’s results of none significant statistical increase or difference between before and after the service-learning experiences in terms servant leadership. Replicating a longitudinal study investigation for my study might support hypothesis 1 over a longer extended timeframe in its implementation and observation. For example, it took me years to do research, and pilot test my proposal of introducing Earth Science as a requirement for graduation during my tenure in the San Francisco Unified School District (Norman, 2017).

**Cultural Sensitivity (Competency)**

H2 stated that there is statistically significant increase (or difference) in the pre-posttests of cultural sensitivity (or cultural competency) in university students who participate in a university service-learning project/class. This hypothesis was not supported when a two-tailed t-test did not reveal a statistically significant increase or difference in the pre-posttests of the CSAT survey.
This study’s failure to show positive and statistically significant increase or difference between before and after the service-learning experiences of students in the teacher education program might be due to the brevity of the timeframe of implementing the service-learning experience intervention of one semester in the designated school year of conducting the study.

However, recent literature divulged overwhelming positive impact of service-learning on students’ cultural competence development (e.g., Amerson, 2010; Boyle-Baise, 2006; Domingue, & Carson, 2008; Flannery, & Ward, 1999; Meaney, Bohler, & Kopf; Wehling, 2008). For example, Amerson (2010), a service-learning thinker at Clemson University School of Nursing, Clemson, South Carolina, defined service-learning in her study as an excellent pedagogy for introducing students to clients of different cultural backgrounds, helping students become aware of the issues these clients face related to culture and healthcare, and teaching culturally appropriate care. In addition, Amerson (2010) evaluated self-perceived cultural competence in a convenience sample of 60 baccalaureate nursing students enrolled in a community health nursing following the completion of service-learning projects with local and international communities. Moreover, Amerson (2010) analyzed the pre-posttests based on total scores and subscale such as: cognitive, practical, and affective scores, and used a paired-samples t-test to compare the means pre-test score with the mean post-test score, which revealed a significant increase in each subscale.

Amerson’s (2010) study’s positive results contradicted my dissertation study’s lack of significant relationship between service-learning and cultural competency which might be due to the short period of one-semester timeframe of the students’ service-learning experiences in the community, absence of cultural diversity in the classroom and the service-learning environment,
lack of students’ experiences participating in multicultural activities, attitudes and students’
learning styles toward addressing diversity issues in the classroom; professors’ teaching styles on
diversity issues, and many other factors that might occurred that triggered some participants’
change of major as revealed in the post-test results.

In another study, Boyle-Baise (2006) explored the understandings developed by
preservice teachers from an experience in community service learning (CSL) for multicultural
teacher education. The research question that guided this study was: What meaning do preservice
teachers make from CSL for multicultural teacher education? This study was an interpretive case
study wherein 65 preservice elementary and secondary teachers in two sections of a multicultural
education course at a major midwestern university were involved in the case studied (p. 32). The
findings focused on consciousness-raising, and the discussion was in terms of getting exposed to,
becoming more aware of, and accepting cultural diversity. Also, this study examined the
development of a critical stance toward equality and considered the viability of CSL for
multicultural education (p. 32). The results revealed that the students gained from the experience
built on their prior experience (or lack of); and by the end of the semester, the students were not
ready in some finished sense to be excellent multicultural teachers, but rather most had gained
some experiences and insights upon which further learning could be built continually (p. 23). To
the extent that teacher education programs plan for a long-range developmental process, the
author recommended that community-based service learning should be consider a part of the
process (p. 23).

Comparing the findings and results in the present study with Boyle-Baise (2006) study’s
results, there is similarity as my study also revealed that the students gained from the experience
built on their prior service-learning experience (or lack of); and by the end of the semester, the students’ pre-posttests scores revealed no significant increase between before and after the service-learning experiences. But the hierarchical regression analysis revealed a statistically significant relationship between servant leadership and cultural competency which may be attributed to the students’ prior community-based service-learning in multicultural or culturally diverse service-learning projects in communities.

Domangue and Carson (2008) investigated how service-learning program shaped preservice teachers’ cultural competency in a service-learning program created following hurricane Katrina’s devastation. Domangue and Carson (2008) also used the reflective journals and interviews to identify significant elements of the service-learning program that elicited thoughts about the role of cultural competency teaching. The results suggested that the service-learning participants identified consistent engagement, exposure to another culture, and an engaged instructor as key contributors to cultural competency within the service-learning program. Similarly, participants in my study might developed a significant increase in developing cultural competency between before and after the service-learning intervention if the study is longitudinal.

In another study, Flannery and Ward (1999) explored the connection between multicultural education, service learning, and the development of professional competencies. Findings of the study revealed three major themes related to service-learning and cultural competence: (1) the development of ethnic consciousness, (2) the importance of both personal and intellectual development for cultural competence with regard to health issues, and (3) the role of service learning in empowering students to be contributing citizens to their community.
The authors concluded that community-based service learning moves students beyond cultural awareness toward the development of cultural competence that is anchored in both health education and in the realities and complexities of a multicultural community. Likewise, the participants in my study exhibited a significant relationship between servant leadership and cultural sensitivity between before and after the one-semester service-learning experiences, which I attributed to the students’ previous community-based service-learning in high school.

From other perspective, Meaney, Bohler, Kopf, Hernandez, and Scott (2008) drew from social-cognitive theory to serve as the framework to examine physical education service-learning program’s impact on pre-service educators’ cultural competence. Participants in this study included fifty-three undergraduates enrolled in two sections of Health and Physical Education for Children classes; and the course service-learning component provided preservice educators opportunities to teach physical education to African-American and Hispanic children from low socioeconomic backgrounds (Meaney et al., 2008). Findings showed that daily interaction with the children: (1) broadened participants’ understanding of under-served children, (2) changed their preconceived stereotypes, (3) improved their language and communication skills, and (4) impacted future teaching expectation. The results suggested service-learning programs may valuably enhance preservice educators’ cultural competence for teaching in diverse classroom environments.

Meaney et al. (2008) study’s findings contradicted the results of the present research in that there was no significant increase or difference in participants’ cultural competency development between before and after the service-learning experiences, which might be partially attributed to the brevity of the service-learning experiences intervention in my study. Otherwise,
if given enough time of involvement in the service-learning project, it may be possible for participants to increase their cultural competency level after undergoing service-learning experiences.

In another study, Wehling (2008) addressed the development of cross-cultural competency within the context of service-learning, asserting the need to integrate cross-cultural competency into the academic curriculum due to dramatic rise with the significant increase in Hispanics residency and their families in the United States. Wehling (2008) explained that service-learning addressed the demand for culturally competent graduates who can delve into addressing issue on inequality and invisibility as well as language barrier, and service-learning also develops cultural competency via weekly direct contact and journal writing exercises. The study concluded that working with a population that is culturally different from themselves (students) and the textbook knowledge they have received has served as a cornerstone of university language and teacher training programs.

In contrast to Wehling’s (2008) study, the present study’s results did not show significant increase or difference in cultural competency between before and after the service-learning experiences, which again may be due to the short one-semester timeframe of service-learning experiences in the teacher education program as I previously mentioned in this discussion.

The present study contrasts the extant literature on the development of cultural competence through service-learning experiences showed significant positive effect of service-learning experiences on students’ cultural competency development. However, with a longer timeframe, perhaps a more pronounced difference or increase in cultural competency qualities may be found between before and after the service-learning experiences.
Servant Leadership and Cultural Competency

H3 stated that there is positive and statistically significant relationship between servant leadership and cultural sensitivity (or competency) in university students who participate in a service-learning project/class. This hypothesis was supported with a positive and statistically significant relationship between servant leadership and cultural sensitivity using hierarchical regression analysis.

The significant relationship between servant leadership and cultural sensitivity or competency may be attributed to the participants previous service-learning experiences, servant leadership training, multicultural education, and multicultural activities before participating in the service-learning project in this study. Also, students, in general, indicated strong beliefs about the importance of having friends from different cultures.

The bodies of literature on servant leadership, cultural competency, and service-learning, showed overlapping characteristics of servant leadership and cultural competence. For example, these constructs emphasize service to others, empathy, listening, and building community. In other words, a servant-leader teacher is also likely to be culturally competent. According to Nichols (2011), in multicultural school and community settings, “being responsive teacher servants requires finding ways to reach families whose language and culture are different from the majority of school personnel; being responsive also may require that we find ways to reach families and parents with options other than traditional outreach programs” (p. 57). The author reiterated that immigrant families, especially those with limited English skills, are least involved in the school, partially because of difference in their cultural attitudes toward the role parents should play in their children’s education and development. Nichols argued that servant teachers
support academic success and cognitive skills but also the psychological and socioeconomical
growth and development of students in the classroom (p. 39).

Importantly, it is a natural law to be culturally sensitive towards our fellow human being as St. Thomas Aquinas (in John XXIII Pacem in Terris—Peace on Earth, Sigmund, ed., 1988) preached:

*By the natural law every human being has the right to respect for his person, and to his good reputation, the right to searching the truth . . . The natural law also gives man the right to a basic education and to technical and professional training in keeping with the stage of educational development in the country to which he belongs. Every effort should be made to ensure that persons be enabled, on the basis of merit, to go on to higher studies, so that, as far as possible, they may occupy posts and take on responsibilities in human society in accordance with their natural gifts and the skills they have acquired.* (p. 170)

Moreover, Beazley (2003), a servant leadership thinker and scholar, believed that servant leadership houses in the country are important educational settings in which young people could learn to appreciate the value of individual differences, embrace diversity as a means of growing wisdom and insight, and accept differences of opinion as empowering and enriching rather than toxic and destructive. From this perspective, a servant leadership school in a university could be established as an avenue to train future servant-leaders who are culturally competent as well to better serve growing multicultural societies in postmodern times.
Limitations

There are several limitations to this study. The primary limitation in this study is due to only a semester timeframe to implementing the service-learning intervention. The brevity of the service-learning intervention (a semester period of implementation) may be the cause of the no increase or difference findings in the pre-and posttests of the survey instrument (SLQ/CSAT) in terms of servant leadership and cultural competency.

Another limitation is the unequal sizes of the race groups within the convenience sample as the data showed a majority of 85% White. Because of this imbalance the results are not generalizable to races other than White, since the other groups are outside the parameter of the sample chosen for the study.

The number of fifty-nine participants as convenience sample in this study is also a limitation as this few number of students’ participation is not sufficient to make inferences to a larger population. In addition, the unequal sizes of the gender groups within the convenience sample presents a limitation to this study. Based on this imbalance, the results are not generalizable to all gender other than female in this study, as such other gender groups are beyond the parameter of the sample chosen for this study (Babbie, 2004).

Lastly, the wide gap on sizes between groups of participants who have and have none service-learning experiences posed a limitation in comparing the two groups for servant leadership and cultural competency to this study. The wide gap on sizes between groups of participants who have and have not taken multicultural education also posed a limitation in comparing the two groups as well.
Recommendation for Future Research

The following recommendations for future research are based upon the literature review and results of this study. Future research in this area of study should be inclusive of a broader sample population, that is, to include participants from a wider range of race and ethnicity, other disciplines, and other demographic factors, and to compare responses among the groups in the implementation process. Such research would encapsulate whether service-learning relates to servant leadership and cultural competency development across demographic boundaries and disciplines in higher education.

Another recommendation for future research is to conduct a longitudinal study, investigating the effect of service-learning on servant leadership and cultural competence development across disciplines in higher education. Such study may determine the efficacy of service-learning as an institutionalized coursework for servant leadership characteristics and cultural competency development in all field of interest or studies in higher education. Interesting example is conducting a similar study with students participating in a service-learning project like the Peace Corps, community ambassadors, and other community service projects.

I suggest the above, because, as a schoolteacher, I gained a valued experience of serving both mainstream and non-mainstream students as an authentic culturally sensitive servant-leader teacher (which I came to realize when I started in the DPLS program) to the students I served in the school site and districtwide in the Bay Area. As schoolteacher to those high school students, I observed both mainstream and diverse students involved in community services as a curriculum requirement for graduation, and multicultural activities in the school site, school districtwide, and the community at large. Also, I experienced mentoring, guiding, advising students as a
classroom and homeroom teacher, and as a club sponsor to mostly multicultural student clubs such as the Filipino-American Club, Latino Club, Cambodian-American Club, Samoan-American Club (which I helped those newcomer students organized) in the school sites that I served. Majority of those students graduated high school and joined the Navy, Air Force, and the Marine (military) as their career to serve the country they chose and embraced as their second home! Because of this amazingly transcendent experience of serving the least fortunate global young children in the Bay Area, I developed in me a natural desire and enthusiasm to help heal, educate, care, and be of service in so many ways especially to the least fortunate young children and their families in our global society to the best of my ability. Hopefully, as a researcher I could be continually of help in the lives of the least fortunate student population wherever they are in our global community (Norman, 2014).

**Conclusion**

This study sought to examine the extent to which servant leadership characteristics and cultural sensitivity (or competency) are developed through the experience of participating in a university course-related service-learning project/class in a Catholic Jesuit institution in higher education. Although two hypotheses exploring these relationships between dependent and independent variables were not supported, the findings divulged positive and statistically significant relationship between these variables showing a positive relationship between servant leadership and cultural competency. This research serves as an extension to the literature on service-learning, servant-leadership, and cultural competence areas of studies, adding to the knowledge available for the improvement of recruitment and teacher training education.
programs gearing toward the goal of effectively serving diverse and multicultural classroom environments in public schools and communities.

Nichols (2011) advocates for teachers as servant-leaders to encourage change to serve a community effectively. Wheeler (2012) described a servant-leader as how Greenleaf (1970) defined a servant leader that it begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first. The best test of the servant leader is: do those served grow as persons; do they while being served become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants (p. 7). And, what is the effect on the least privileged in society, will he benefit, or, at least, will he not further be deprived (p. 7). Wheeler (2012) explained that servant-leaders believe that success is within the community and determined by the commitment, responsibility, and effort of all those involved. Servant-leaders should demonstrate altruistic calling, emotional healing, persuasive mapping, wisdom, and organizational stewardship qualities (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006). These characteristics can be acquired through proper guidance and mentoring of the younger generations by servant-leader scholars in the field of servant leadership studies/education. Servant leadership education is worthy to consider as an independent field in leadership studies to better serve the learner, family, and community. To be a servant-leader is also to be culturally competent as Nichols (2011) echoed: “To serve a community effectively, schools, and teachers must understand the specific traditions, and cultural backgrounds of their specific neighborhood communities. . . and understanding our own assumptions about different groups of people in our communities becomes increasingly more important” (p. 80) in the international community. A thorough understanding of what is to be a culturally competent
servant-leader as a leader to one self and to the significant others will create more effective
servant-leaders to lead a more peaceful and conformed global society in this postmodern world.
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APPENDIX A

Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ) Form
(Authors: John E. Barbuto & Daniel W. Wheeler, 2006)

This questionnaire is to describe your leadership behaviors and attitudes as you perceive them. Please answer all the questions to the best you can. Please indicate below how well each of the following statement describes you.

Service Learning Course: Encircle one that applies.
   a. EDTE 101-Bouge
   b. EDTE 101-Segadelli
   c. EDTE 201-1 Cox
   d. EDTE 201-2 Cox

Please use the following rating scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Once in a while</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Fairly often</th>
<th>Frequently, if not always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

___ 1. I put others’ interest ahead of my own.
___ 2. I do everything I can to serve others.
___ 3. I am someone others will turn to if they have a personal problem.
___ 4. I am alert to what’s happening around me.
___ 5. I offer compelling reasons to get others to do things.
___ 6. I encourage others to dream “big dreams” about the organizations.
___ 7. I am good at anticipating the consequences of decisions.
___ 8. I am good at helping others with their emotional issues.
___ 9. I have great awareness of what is going on.
___10. I am very persuasive.
___11. I believe the organization needs to play a moral role in society.
___12. I am talented at helping others heal emotionally.
___13. I am in touch with what is going on.
___14. I am good at convincing other to do things.
___15. I believe that our organization needs to function as a community.
___16. I sacrifice my own interests to meet others’ needs.
___17. I can help others mend their hard feelings.
___18. I am gifted when it comes to persuading others.
___19. I see the organization for its potential to contribute to society.
___20. I encourage others to have a community spirit in the workplace.
___21. I go above, and beyond the call of duty to meet others’ needs.
___22. I know what is going on.
___23. I am preparing the organization to make a positive difference in the future.
APPENDIX B

Cultural Sensitivity Assessment Tool (CSAT) Form for Pre-Service and Teacher Educators
(Authors: Solange A. Lopes-Murphy and Christopher G. Murphy, 2016)

This questionnaire is to describe your cultural experiences, behaviors, and attitudes as you perceive them. Please answer all the questions and statements to the best you can. The first four questions address your cross-cultural experiences. Please include each of the following questions and statements that describes you.

Please encircle the letter correspondingly with your answer to the following first four items.

1) Do you speak a foreign language in addition to English?
   a. Yes
   b. No

2) If you speak an additional foreign language, how well do you speak it?
   a. I just know a few words and phrases (rating scale = 2)
   b. I can understand and make myself understood (rating scale = 3)
   c. I am proficient (rating scale = 4)
   d. Not applicable (rating scale = 1)

3) Total amount of time you have visited, lived, and/or studied in another country.
   a. Never been abroad (rating scale = 1)
   b. One month or less (rating scale = 2)
   c. Less than 1 year (rating scale = 3)
   d. 1-3 years (rating scale = 4)
   e. More than 3 years (rating scale = 5)

4) I have friends from different cultures.
   a. Strongly Agree (rating scale = 5)
   b. Agree (rating scale = 4)
   c. Neither Agree nor Disagree (rating scale = 3)
   d. Disagree (rating scale = 2)
   e. Strongly Disagree (rating scale = 1)
Use the following rating scale to answer the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fully Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree to some extent</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Fully Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_____1. I have an interest in learning about different cultures.
_____2. When I meet people different from me, I compare how my cultural identity is similar with theirs.
_____3. The way we do things in my culture is better than the way people do things in other cultures.
_____4. What people in other cultures believe is as valuable as what people in my culture believe.
_____5. I am very likely to go to event on campus that features the music, dance, and art of another culture.
_____6. Classroom activities that involves interaction with people from different cultures help a person develop cultural sensitivity towards others different from me.
_____7. I tend to observe people different from me and reflect on how they make me feel.
_____8. I think of myself as a culturally sensitive person towards others different from me.
_____9. Being around people from other cultures makes me uncomfortable.
_____10. I like to tell people from other cultures about my own culture.
_____11. When I talk to a person who does not speak my language well, I change how I speak so they can understand me.
_____12. People in my culture have better values than people in other cultures.
_____13. I enjoy talking with people from different cultures.
_____14. It is fair to allow students from different cultures to complete assignments in different ways.
_____15. If I am around people from different cultures, I try to behave like they do.
_____16. I find it difficult to discuss subjects with people who have an opinion different than I do.
_____17. I like to try foods from other cultures.
_____18. We learn from interacting with people who are different from me.
APPENDIX C

Participant Letter of Informed Consent

Dear survey participant,

Servant leadership is an attractive characteristic for leaders of educational organizations or institutions to discuss in relation to students’ success in teacher education program. However, no prior research has attempted to explore the relationship between servant leadership, cultural sensitivity, and students’ experience in participating in a university course-related service-learning project/class. As part of my graduate work at Gonzaga University, I am conducting a research study to assess such a relationship. You are invited to participate in this study.

Participation in the study requires completing two short surveys. No identifying information about you is required. The surveys should take less than 20 minutes to complete. There are no right or wrong answers.

The risks of participating in this study are minimal. There is the inconvenience of time for the 15 to 20 minutes needed to complete the surveys. There may be a slight possibility of minor discomfort as you reflect on your attitudes and experience; however, such feelings should be transient as the psychological risks of completing the surveys are minimal.

The benefits of participating in the study are an increased insight into your own attitudes gained from the self-examination required to complete the surveys and contributing to the knowledge about servant leadership and cultural competence/sensitivity. The findings of this research may help educate teachers as leaders, they will gain more insight into facilitating servant leadership and cultural sensitivity towards their students and to the educational organization they serve.

You can refuse to take part in this study or stop participation at any time. You and/or your participation will not be identified in any way. All data will be reported for groups of participants, but not for any individual participants.

If you have any questions or concerns arise, please feel free to call me, my Advisor, Shann Ferch, PhD, or the Gonzaga University Institutional Review Board at 509-313-3663.

Your contribution is very important. I hope you will participate.

Sincerely,

Zoncita D. Norman (PhD Candidate)