



American Journal of Educational Research and Reviews
(ISSN:2474-9265)



Servant leadership, Institutional Health and Effectiveness in Ethiopian Teacher Training Colleges

Fentahun Mengistu Bitew

Wollo University, Dessie, Ethiopia

ABSTRACT

The study was aimed to examine the practices and correlates among servant leadership, institutional health and effectiveness in Ethiopian Teacher Training Colleges. It was descriptive survey and correlation study conducted in sample teacher training colleges. In sum, 160 participants consisted of 52 academic staff (male=38; female=14), 54 administrative staff (male=23; female=31) and 54 students (male=43; female=11) were participated. Stratified and simple random sampling methods were employed to select samples. Mean, t-test, correlations and regressions were used to analyze data. In addition, the results were significant at $p < 0.05$. As a result, the mean value for the practice of servant leadership in colleges understudy showed 'middle' or 'sometime' level. Besides, the Pearson correlation coefficient analysis indicated moderate positive relationships between servant leadership and organizational health ($r = 0.663$). The regression analysis result also showed that the contribution of servant leadership to institutional (college) health was found to be $R^2 = 0.440$, $F = 123.924$, $P < 0.05$ indicating that 44% of the health of the institution (College) was explained by servant leadership practices and behaviors exhibited by leaders and staff in their respective work units. On top of this, Pearson correlation analysis was made between institutional health and effectiveness. As a result, it has showed statistically significant and strong positive correlation ($r = 0.723$). It was also found out that 52.27% of institution's (college's) effectiveness or goal achievement was explained by healthy working conditions and environments created in each work unit. Moreover, the correlation between servant leadership and institutional (college) effectiveness also indicated statistically significant and moderate positive correlation ($r = 0.612$). Thus, among other factors, 37.45% of institution's (college's) effectiveness in goal achievement was determined by the application of servant leadership principles and behaviors. Therefore, to have conducive and healthy working institutions that give due care for their employees with service-oriented mindsets and enhance goal attainment as well as develop employees' commitments for the job, leaders in sample colleges and others are advised to behave as servants for their constituents and apply servant leadership approach in their respective work contexts.

Keywords:

Institutional Effectiveness, Institutional Health, Servant Leadership.

*Correspondence to Author:

Fentahun Mengistu Bitew
Wollo University, Dessie, Ethiopia
Phone number: +251963560864
Postal Code: 1145

How to cite this article:

Fentahun Mengistu Bitew. Servant leadership, Institutional Health and Effectiveness in Ethiopian Teacher Training Colleges. American Journal of Educational Research and Reviews, 2018,3:18.



eSciPub LLC, Houston, TX USA.

Website: <http://escipub.com/>

Introduction

Social organizations in due process of achieving pre-defined goals and missions are influenced by many factors which can have direct or indirect sway on them. For instance, the presence or absence of the required resources, the type of leadership style and leaders' behaviors, the nature of relationship between employees and leaders, and the ability of the organization(s) to thrive to change can have direct bearing on the success or failure of organizations' missions and goals (Douglas & Fredendall, 2004; Gupta et al., 2005; Chien, 2004). Above of all, the type of leadership style and leader's behavior have pivotal impacts in determining the destiny of social organizations (Kim, Kim, K., & Choi, 2014; Sendjaya, 2015).

Studies also indicate that leadership approaches or styles and people's thinking towards leadership largely determine the healthiness or sickness of organizations; which is linked to their success or failure (Jenaabadi, 2014). Hence, according to Korkmaz (2007), organizational health refers to:

An organization which is trustworthy in information exchange, flexible and creative for making necessary changes based on the data obtained, has unity and commitment toward its goals; and has internal support and free from any fear and threat since threat damages a good and healthy relationship, decreases flexibility and instead of interest in the whole system, stimulates self-protection (p.5).

Quick, Macik-Frey and Cooper (2007) place the type of leadership being applied and leaders' roles at the heart of every healthy organization and surpassed performances. As a result, the 21st century social organizations such as educational institutions need leaders with non-repressive mentality, absence of heroic thinking, and leaders not easily trapped by a rapid pace of environmental chaos and caught in a storm of stress. In this regard, Greenleaf (1997), Spears (2004), Goleman (1995), Kountze & Posner (1987), and Heiftz

(1994) have stressed that contemporary organizations need leaders with the ability to understand the nature of human dignity, foster a deep sense of community and inspire others through integrity, trust, and honesty to a higher vision of what it means to be human. Thus, this also implies that healthy organizational leadership practices do mean healthy organizations that lead to promising success and growth. In favor of this, Jenaabadi (2014) explained that educational institutions characterized by "healthy and supportive organizational climate leads to more trust of people; and high morale [that] naturally leads to increase in teachers' efficiency" (p.311) and productivity. Therefore, for contemporary organizations to realize their vision, create healthy and productive as well as profitable institutions, scholars like Spears (2004) strongly recommend a shift towards a leadership model or approach of putting people first as a necessary step. Spears & Lawrence (as cited in Black, 2010), Lubin (2001), Yukl (2002) and Spears (2004) also capitalized that moving towards and implanting servant leadership model which is characterized by a more meaningful, ethical and moral leadership thinking in all social organizations is considered as a legitimate measure for creating a positive and productive work environment.

The concept of a leader as servant was primarily coined and philosophized by Robert Greenleaf in 1970's. It is a leadership theory guided by the principle of service prior to leadership practices. Servant leadership also gives special emphasis to personal and professional growth of followers, apply moral principles, "encourage self-actualization, positive job attitudes, high performance, and a stronger organizational focus and sustainability" (Van Dierendonck as cited in Borecka, 2014, P.26). Besides, it is a converse to traditional top-down, self-centered, and individualized forms of leadership where the interest of the followers and others are left behind to the interest of the leader and organizations.

The purpose of servant leadership approach is not merely serving in the sense of doing things for others and not to create non-thinking, obedient, controlled and reliant followers, but to make them bring their intellect and dynamism to the organization, and encourage self-learning, critical thinking and encourage a real two-way exchange of ideas for the leader to learn from followers (Western, 2013; Greenleaf, 1970). Thus, organizations with servant leaders and leadership cultures are healthy, efficient; and leader- employee relationships are smooth and synchronized (Xenidis and Theocharous, as cited in Toprak, Inandi & Colak, 2015). Just like the health of human beings and other living creatures on earth, educational institutions can also be either healthy or sick. Healthy institutions are characterized by their ability “to function [and attain their goals] effectively, to cope [environmental dynamisms or changing scenarios] adequately, to change and grow from within” (Fairman as cited in Hill, 2003). Whereas, leaders with excessive use of top-down processes or with authoritative/power-driven approaches characterized by officious, command and control leadership practices often create troubles and chaos in colleges which ultimately lead them to be unhealthy (sick) and weaken their ways to goal achievements (Alqarni, 2016; Korkmaz, 2007; Toprak, Inandi & Colak, 2015).

Statement of the Problem

Often, social organizations such as educational institutions become sick or unhealthy and perform less because of poor and unethical leadership practices characterized by enhanced self-importance, power-driven focus, officious and authoritative behaviors (Keith, 2013; Campbell, 2006; Muriisa, 2014). Besides, the highest share of havoc and wild scenarios (such as destructive and hostile students' behaviors), deteriorated quality of education, incompetent and unethical graduates as well as lots of nefarious deeds in educational institutions are attributed to leadership failures (Russel & Stone, 2002; Sendjaya et al., 2008).

In addition, sizeable number of educational institutions such as colleges are grappling from various types of leadership calamities and snags that have daunting effects on employees and customers, and make them fail to meet their purposes-i.e., producing competent graduates with the required knowledge, skills and attitudes for middle level work force demands.

Moreover, in many instances, colleges and universities are engulfed with inefficient, authoritative and undemocratic leaders and leadership cultures that strive for fulfilling own needs over service recipients' and institutional needs. In line to this, Greenleaf (as cited in Scardino, 2013) stated that “leadership in higher education is ineffective, and embraces individual needs over those of the institutional whole” (p.30). Likewise, in many tertiary education institutions of Ethiopia, leader-employee relationships are patriarchal, authoritative and undemocratic which rather promote employees' disengagement, aloofness and divorce from their tasks. According to studies conducted by Yalew (2004), and Lerra (2015), public higher education institutions are largely characterized by centralized command and control management and leadership practices whereby power is concentrated on few people at the top management echelon. On top of this, a study conducted by Frew, Mitiku and Mebratu (2016) indicated that most public higher education institutions in Ethiopia lack ethical and moral leaders and leadership cultures which have adverse effects on organizations' health and effectiveness.

Besides, it is unlikely to observe leaders in higher education who assume themselves as servants to their followers or who can take responsibilities for instructional failures in their respective colleges and for the whole education system. And yet, colleges and universities lack leaders who respond to followers' issues and challenges positively, value and validate their perspectives, and show genuine concerns for their needs, interests and abilities in their work

contexts (Saint, 2004; Lerra, 2015; Zerihun & Tesfay, 2014; Kassahun, 2015). As a result, many of higher education institutions are unhealthy and ineffective, followers are bored of and less dedicated to their profession, restrict/refrain themselves from innovation and change orientations as well as less motivated to come up with progressive ideas and insights that help improve the system.

Above all, leadership failures which make educational colleges unhealthy and weak in their performances are reflected in the form of poor governance such as corruption, importunate hunger for power and material benefits (World Bank, 2012). They are also witnessed in lack of leadership integrity and trust, subordination of organization's interest to self-interests, violation of professional code of ethics, belittling organization's missions and goals, and declined attentions to organizational growth and development (CIHE, 2003; Hellsten, 2006; ICBSS, 2008).

Thus, the purpose of the study was aimed to examine the practices and correlates among servant leadership, organizational health and effectiveness in Ethiopian Teacher Training Colleges. It was also guided by the following research questions:

- 1) To what extent are servant leadership behaviors being manifested in colleges understudy?
- 2) Is there any significant relationship between servant leadership and health of institutions?
- 3) Is there any significant relationship between servant leadership and college effectiveness?
- 4) Is there any significant relationship between institutional health and effectiveness?

Research Methodology

This study employed quantitative approach of descriptive survey and correlation study. It was conducted in sample teacher training colleges of Ethiopia. In sum, 160 participants were involved in providing data for the study. The participants included; 52 academic staff (male=38; female=14), 54 administrative staff (male=23; female=31) and 54 students (male=43; female=11). Besides, stratified and simple random sampling methods were employed to select samples from each study context.

Closed-ended questionnaires with 5-point Likert Scales (1=Never; 2= Rarely; 3= Sometimes; 4=Often; and 5=Always) were used to gather data from respondents. Besides, the questionnaires were adapted from Laub's (1999) 6 dimensional assessment model with 20 items and Cronbach Alpha level between 0.90-0.93 to measure servant leadership; and Miles (1969) standardized questionnaires to measure organizational health with 20 items as well as Cameron's (1978) standard questionnaire for organizational effectiveness. Moreover, the data were analyzed using mean, t-test, Pearson's Correlation Coefficient, linear regressions; and the significant alpha level was set at $P < 0.05$.

Results

A total of 160 participants of which 54 students, 52 academic and 54 administrative staffs were involved in providing data for this study. Closed ended questionnaire were also used to gather data from all respondents. With regard to the rate of return of questionnaire 54 (100%) students, 49(94.23%) academic staffs, and 51(94.4%) administrative staffs filled in and returned the questionnaires. Thus, the total response rate was 154 (96.25%).

Table1. Status of SL, IH and IE in the study contexts

Variables	One-Sample Statistics					
	N	Mean	Sd. Deviation	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)

Servant Leadership	160	3.0935	.46472	16.154	159	.000
Institutional Health	160	3.1400	.60217	13.444	159	.000
Institutional Effectiveness	160	2.5682	.40488	2.132	159	.035

* SL=Servant Leadership; IH= Institutional Health; IE= Institutional Effectiveness

Table1 shows that there was statistically significant practice of the variables (SL, IH & IE) in colleges understudy with mean values of 3.09, 3.14 and 2.56 respectively. And the mean value of each variable was above the test-value indicating that leaders in sample colleges exhibit servant leadership behaviors, 'sometimes'. In addition, the state of institutional health and effectiveness in colleges understudy were found to be at 'middling levels' indicating that on the average colleges were found to be healthy and effective in their performances.

Table2. Correlation between Servant Leadership and Institutional Health

Dimensions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1. Valuing People	1.00															
2. Developing people	.597*	1.00														
3. Building Community	.455*	.579*	1.00													
4. Displaying Authenticity	.459*	.515*	.505*	1.00												
5. Providing Leadership	.483*	.615*	.517*	.617*	1.00											
6. Sharing Leadership	.412*	.495*	.514*	.490*	.626*	1.00										
7. Goal Focus	.318*	.543*	.730*	.463*	.712*	.491*	1.00									
8. Communication Adequacy	.586*	.659*	.710*	.571*	.544*	.463*	.451*	1.00								
9. Optimal Power Equalization	.689*	.602*	.340*	.317*	.458*	.377*	.325*	.389*	1.00							
10. Resources Allocation	.488*	.581*	.793*	.699*	.556*	.511*	.549*	.587*	.338*	1.00						
11. Cohesiveness	.461*	.830*	.443*	.365*	.489*	.397*	.475*	.405*	.668*	.437*	1.00					
12. Morale	.433*	.481*	.449*	.727*	.797*	.651*	.508*	.508*	.374*	.489*	.373*	1.00				
13. Innovativeness	.343*	.502*	.447*	.466*	.579*	.715*	.414*	.427*	.319*	.460*	.406*	.446*	1.00			
14. Autonomy	.87*	.526*	.438*	.455*	.438*	.347*	.280*	.545*	.467*	.489*	.384*	.422*	.303*	1.00		
15. Adaptation	.465*	.529*	.521*	.716*	.558*	.709*	.456*	.516*	.362*	.566*	.388*	.494*	.450*	.405*	1.00	
16. Problem Solving capacity	.663*	.694*	.448*	.425*	.446*	.422*	.372*	.520*	.394*	.424*	.475*	.344*	.410*	.461*	.485*	1.00

*1-6=SL dimensions; 7-16=IH dimensions; Correlation is significant at $p < 0.05$

The Pearson correlation coefficient in Table2 shows that all dimensions used to measure servant leadership practices in colleges were positively correlated with dimensions used to measure institutions' health. Besides, strong correlations were observed between the following dimensions: valuing people in colleges with optimal power equalization, autonomy and colleges' problem solving capacity; developing college people with communication adequacy, optimal power equalization, cohesiveness and colleges' problem solving capacity; building college community with goal focus, communication adequacy and resource allocation; displaying authenticity with resource allocation, morale and adaptation; providing leadership in colleges with goal focus and morale; and sharing

leadership to college community with morale, innovativeness and adaptation. The Pearson correlation between servant leadership practices in colleges and the health of their working environment showed statistically significant and moderate positive relationships ($r=0.663$). Besides, the regression analysis showed that the contribution of servant leadership to institutional health was found to be $R^2=0.440$, $F=123.924$, $P<0.05$ indicating that there was statistically significant predictive power of the practice of servant leadership on the health of colleges. Thus, the result of the

regression analysis indicated that 44% of colleges' health was explained by servant leadership practices and behaviors exhibited by leaders and staffs in their respective colleges. The direct effect of each independent dimension of servant leadership on institutions' (colleges) health was also determined using Beta coefficients. Thus, the Beta coefficient values of all servant leadership dimensions showed statistically significant and positive effects on colleges' healthy working environment.

Table3. Correlation between Servant Leadership and Institutional Effectiveness

Dimensions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Valuing People	1.00										
2. Developing People	.597*	1.00									
3. Building Community	.455*	.579*	1.00								
4. Displaying Authenticity	.459*	.515*	.505*	1.00							
5. Providing leadership	.483*	.615*	.517*	.617*	1.00						
6. Sharing leadership	.412*	.495*	.514*	.490*	.626*	1.00					
7. Student Career Development	.328*	.394*	.319*	.257*	.327*	.288*	1.00				
8. Ability to Attract Resources	.233*	.320*	.240*	.266*	.293*	.280*	.465*	1.00			
9. Student dissatisfaction	.126	.186*	.066	.135	.169*	.121	.329*	.386*	1.00		
10. System openness	.033	.234*	.181*	.185*	.201*	.247*	.287*	.321*	.398*	1.00	
11. Professional Development & Quality of college	.295*	.268*	.190*	.159*	.276*	.226*	.383*	.398*	.497*	.313*	1.00

*1-6=Servant Leadership dimensions; 7-11= Institutional Effectiveness dimensions; $p<0.05$

The Pearson correlation coefficient in Table3 above illustrates that all dimensions used to measure servant leadership practices showed statistically significant and positive relationships with dimensions used to measure institutions' (colleges') effectiveness in their performances. Besides, all servant leadership dimensions showed better rigor in their relationships with students' career development, colleges' ability to attract resources and their professional development as well as quality aspects. In addition, the Pearson correlation between

servant leadership and institutional (college) effectiveness also indicated statistically significant positive correlations ($r= 0.296$). On top of this, the result of regression analysis indicated that the contribution of servant leadership to institutional effectiveness was found to be $R^2=0.088$, $F=5.993$, $P<0.05$ indicating statistically significant predictive power of the practice of servant leadership on institutional effectiveness. Thus, 8.8% of college effectiveness was explained by servant leadership practices and behaviors exhibited by

leaders and staffs in colleges. The direct effect of each independent dimension of servant leadership on institutions' (colleges) effectiveness was also determined using Beta coefficients. Thus, the Beta coefficient values of all servant leadership dimensions showed statistically significant and positive effects on colleges' effectiveness.

The result of multiple regression analysis indicated that the contribution of institutional health to institutional effectiveness was found to be $R^2=0.129$, $F=4.562$, $P<0.05$ indicating statistically significant predictive power of the independent variable (institutional health) on dependent variable (institutional effectiveness). Thus, 12.9% of institutional effectiveness was explained by healthy organizational situations and working environments established and experienced by college communities. In addition, the direct effect of each independent dimensions of institutional health on colleges' effectiveness was also determined using Beta coefficients. Thus, the Beta coefficient values of six institutional health dimensions showed positive effects of which four of them were

observed as statistically significant positive effects on colleges' effectiveness. Whereas, the remaining four dimensions used to measure institutional health showed negative or reverse effects of which two of them were observed as statistically significant negative effects on institutions' (colleges') effectiveness.

As shown in Table4, the Pearson correlation coefficient indicated that institutions' (colleges') health and effectiveness indicated positive relationships for all dimensions except the negative correlation between organizations' optimal power equalization and system openness and community interaction ($r= -0.016$). Besides, the correlation was statistically significant for the relationships between all colleges' health dimensions and two of their effectiveness dimensions (i.e., student career development and professional development and quality of faculty). Moreover, the Pearson correlation coefficient between institutional (college) health and effectiveness also showed statistically significant and positive relationships ($r= 0.356$).

Table4. Correlation between Institutional Health and Effectiveness

Dim ensi ons	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1	1.00														
2	.451*	1.00													
3	.325*	.389	1.00												
4	.549*	.587	.338	1.00											
5	.475*	.405	.668	.437	1.00										
6	.508*	.508	.374	.489	.373	1.00									
7	.414*	.427	.319	.460	.406	.446	1.00								
8	.280*	.545	.467	.489	.384	.422	.303	1.00							
9	.456*	.516	.362	.566	.388	.494	.450	.405	1.00						
10	.372*	.520	.394	.424	.475	.344	.410	.461	.485	1.00					
11	.226*	.261	.258	.278	.309	.265	.310	.289	.312	.375	1.00				
12	.238*	.179	.209	.284	.347	.261	.277	.171	.279	.302	.465	1.00			
13	.097	.146	.107	.043	.227	.158	.043	.130	.207	.151	.329	.386	1.00		
14	.192*	.149	.016	.119	.185	.189	.269	.071	.217	.230	.287	.321	.398	1.00	
15	.164*	.255	.230	.132	.265	.286	.155	.347	.178	.143	.383	.398	.497	.313	1.00

*1-10= IH; 11-15=IE; $p<0.05$

Discussions

As indicated in purpose statement and basic questions, this study was aimed at examining servant leadership practices in sample public colleges and its correlation with institutional health and effectiveness. The mean values for both study variables showed above the test values indicating that there were middling (or sometimes) level practices observed in sample colleges. Another purpose of the study was to investigate the relationship that servant leadership has with institutional health and effectiveness. Thus, the Pearson correlation coefficient results concerning servant leadership and institutional health showed statistically significant and moderate positive correlations ($r=0.663$). Besides, the dimensions used to measure both servant leadership practices and institution health also indicated statistically significant and positive relationships (See Table 2). And it is true that organizations with heightened values for employees, empower and build strong sense of communities, display trust as well as promote integrity with shared decision making cultures exhibit servant leadership practices and thereby able to create healthy and productive organizations. Such organizations are also characterized by harmonious and concord relationships between leaders and employees, and among employees themselves. In line to this, a study conducted by Ziapour, Sharafi, Kianipour, & Moradi (2015) explained that colleges and universities with people-focused, collegial and considerate leadership as well as respectful relationships than formal stringent bureaucratic rules and control systems are healthy and characterized by better goal achievements, higher employee morale and commitment to work.

In addition, as indicated in the result of multiple linear regression analysis, the health of an institution is largely determined or explained by servant leadership approach ($R^2= 0.440$, $F=123.924$, $P<0.05$). As a result, 44% of institutions' (colleges') health was explained by

servant leadership practices exhibited by leaders and other members of the institution (colleges). Besides, because servant leadership showed a huge impact upon the health of organizations, there are numerous demands and interests arising from many social organizations to apply such leadership philosophy. Servant leadership is also practical and altruistic leadership that puts support, encouragement and services first and exercises leadership later with unique mindsets for the very purpose of leadership and leaders roles (Greenleaf, 1977; Spears, 2004; Laud, 1999).

Another important purpose of this study was examining the relationship between servant leadership and institutional (college) effectiveness. Thus, the Pearson correlation coefficient result showed that there was statistically significant and moderate positive relationships observed between the two variables ($r= 0.296$). The correlation among the dimensions used to measure servant leadership and institutional effectiveness were also found to be significant and positive (see Table3). Besides, servant leadership practices carried out in organizations (colleges) showed significant effect on organizations' (colleges') effectiveness ($R^2= 0.88$). Thus, 8.8% of institutions' effectiveness was determined by servant leadership practices exhibited by leaders and other staff members in institutions (colleges). In favor of this, a study by Parolini (as cited in Irving, 2005) pointed out that servant leadership and leaders have paramount contributions for enhancing organizational performance and ensure effectiveness by prioritizing the needs and interests of staffs and service recipients or customers.

Moreover, the study was aimed at examining the relationship between institutions' (colleges') health and effectiveness. As a result, Pearson's correlation coefficient analysis showed that there was statistically significant and moderate relationships between the two variables ($r= 0.356$). In addition, all dimensions except two (see Table4) that are used to measure

institutions' (colleges') health showed significant and positive relationships with institutions' (colleges') effectiveness. Moreover, the result of simple linear regression analysis also indicated that 12.9% of organizations' (colleges') effectiveness was explained by institutions' (colleges') healthy working environments (or $R^2=0.129$, $F=4.562$, $P<0.05$). In this regard, a study conducted by Hoy and Hannum (as cited in Alqarni, 2016) also emphasized that healthy educational institutions such as colleges and universities are characterized by "comparatively effective professional practices, better emphasis on students learning outcomes, and higher [staffs'] commitment" (p.329) accompanied by overall effectiveness. Institutions (colleges) with comfortable and open working environments, that promote trust and cohesive relationships among employees as well as collaborative working cultures as credo and daily practices are termed as healthy organizations. Such organizational practices are also precursors for overall organizations' goal achievements and effectiveness. However, this is impossible with the absence of leaders and leadership cultures installed in organizations which place and capitalize the good of followers over the self-interest of leaders. Such leaders and leadership culture also promote the valuing and development of followers, the building of community, the practice of authenticity and provision of leadership as well as sharing of power and status for common good of each individual, the organization and people served by the organization (Greenleaf, 1977; Laub, 1999).

Conclusion and Reflections

The result of this study showed that the type of leadership in organizations such as educational institutions play key roles in making them healthy and effective. The study also showed that in colleges understudy, leaders and staffs exhibit servant leadership practices at middling or moderate level which calls for better applications. It was also indicated that

Pearson's correlation coefficient showed very strong relationships between servant leadership practices and institutional health. That is, healthy working environments accompanied by collaborative and enhanced employee job commitment, shared-decision making, and harmonious relationships among staffs are largely attributed to servant leadership approach. Besides, the result of this study indicated that 44% and 8.8% of organizations' health and effectiveness were accounted by servant leadership practices manifested by leaders and other staff members in colleges understudy. In addition, based on the results of Pearson correlation coefficient analysis, institutional health and effectiveness showed significant relationships ($r=0.356$). Above all, the results of the study showed that servant-led organizations are characterized by healthy working environments and effective performances.

Therefore, having learned from the contributions of servant leadership for healthy and effective organizations, college leaders are advised to create the necessary awareness about the practice and benefits of such leadership approach, make staffs and others play significant roles with the mindset of serving others as a top priority over self-interests. In addition, healthy institutions are foundations for positive and collaborative attitudes as well as collegial relationships among staffs. This will also serve as preconditions for enhanced performances and effectiveness. As a result, leaders in educational institutions are advised to model themselves in creating healthy institutions through open communications and discussions, promoting collaborations and cohesiveness among staffs, acculturating trust and taking care of employees' wellbeing and needs.

References

- 1 Abdulrahim, M. (1985). Organizational effectiveness of universities in Malaysia. Retrieved from
- 2 <http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd>

- 3 Alqarni, S. (2016). Linking organizational health in Jeddah secondary schools to students academic achievement. *Academic Journals*, 11(7), 328-338.
- 4 Ashraf, G. & Kadir, S. (2012). A review on the models of organizational effectiveness: A look at Cameron's model in higher education. *International Education Studies*, 5(2), 80-87.
- 5 Black, G. (2010). Correlational analysis of servant leadership & school climate. *Journal of Inquiry & Practice*, 13(4), 437-466.
- 6 Borecka, M. (2014). Developing the next generation of responsible leaders: Empirical insights and recommendations for organizations. PhD Dissertation, University of St. Gallen.
- 7 Chien, H. (2004). A study to improve organizational performance: A view from SHRM. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, 4(1/2) 289-291.
- 8 Council for Industry & Higher Education (CIHE) (2003). *Ethics matters: Managing issues in higher education*. London, UK: The Council for Industry & Higher Education Publications.
- 9 Douglas, J. & Fredendall, L. (2004). Evaluating the Deming management model of total quality in services. *Decision Sciences*, 35(3), 393-422.
- 10 Drucker, P. (1983). *Managing for business effectiveness*. In Richard, G. (ed.), *Strategic Management*. (Pp. 64-76). New York, N. Y: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.,
- 11 Frew, A. Mitiku, B., & Mebratu, T. (2016). The ethical behaviors of educational leaders in Ethiopian public universities: The case of western cluster universities. *European Scientific Journal*, 12(13), 359-379.
- 12 Gholamzadeh, D. & Khazaneh, A. (2012). Surveying the relationships between leadership styles, organizational health and workplace bullying. *Journal of Global Strategic Management*, 6 (2), 5-22.
- 13 Gupta et al. (2005). Quality management in service firms: Sustaining structures of total quality service. *Managing Service Quality*, 15(4), 389-402.
- 14 Hellsten, S. (2006). Leadership ethics and the problem of dirty hands in the political economy of contemporary Africa. Retrieved from <http://ethique-economique.net>.
- 15 Hess, E. (2013). Servant leadership: A path to high performance. The Washington Post. [Washingtonpost.com](http://www.washingtonpost.com).
- 16 Hill, G. (2003). Organizational health: Using an assessment tool to diagnose internal conditions and relationships before writing a prescription. Retrieved from www.organizationalhealth.com
- 17 International Centre for Black Sea Studies (ICBSS) (2008). Good governance and public administration reform in the Black Sea Economic Cooperation (BSEC) member states. Xenophon Paper series. Retrieved from www.icbss.org.
- 18 Irving, J. (2005). Servant leadership and the effectiveness of teams. Unpublished Dissertation, Regent University.
- 19 Jenaabadi, H. (2014). Study of the relationship between organizational health and establishment of school-based management in secondary schools of the city of chabahar city, Iran. *International Journal of Economy, Management and Social Sciences*, 3(6), 311-316.
- 20 Khademfar, M. & Idris, K. (2012). The relationship between transformational leadership and organizational health in Golestan Province of Iran. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(12), 218-229.
- 21 Kim, S., Kim, K. & Choi, Y. (2014). A literature review of servant leadership and criticism of advanced research. *International Journal of Social, Behavioral, Educational, Economic, Business and Industrial Engineering*, 8(4), 1154-1157.
- 22 Korkmaz, M. (2007). The effects of leadership styles on organizational health. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 30(3), 23-55.
- 23 Lerra, M. D. (2015). Leadership challenges to transformative change for quality education in public universities: A case of Wolayta Sodo University. *African Education Research Journal*, 3(3), 170-183.
- 24 Mirhadi, F. (2014). Assessment of organizational health at Islamic Azad University branch of Dehaghan based on demographic factors. *International Journal of Academic Research in Economics and Management Sciences*, 3(2), 224-232.
- 25 Nobahar, H. & Daneshfard, K. (2016). The identification of influential factors on organizational health in the Tehran municipality located in zone 9. *International Business Management*, 10(6), 1026-1032.
- 26 Quick, J., Macik-Frey, M. & Cooper, C. (2007). Managerial dimensions of organizational health: The healthy leader at work. *Journal of Management Studies*, 44(2), 189-205.
- 27 Sendjaya, S. (2015). Personal and organizational excellence through servant leadership: Learning to serve, serving to lead, leading to transform. Retrieved from <http://www.springer.com/978-3-319-16195-2>

- 28 Sial, A., Zulficar, S., AliKousar, S., & Habib, S. (2014). Impact of servant leadership on knowledge sharing intensions among employees. *European Journal of Business and Innovation Research*, 2(1), 1-11.
- 29 Siddique, A., Aslam, D., Khan, M., & Fatima, U. (2011). Impact of academic leadership on faculty's motivation, and organizational effectiveness in higher education system. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(8), 184-191.
- 30 Toprak, M., Inandi, B. & Colak, A. (2015). Do leadership styles influence organizational health? A study in educational organizations. *International Journal of Educational Methodology*, 1(1), 19-25. Doi: 10.12973/ijem.1.1.19
- 31 Yalew Endawoke (2004). Teachers' beliefs, knowledge and practices of learner-centered approach in schools of Ethiopia. *The Ethiopian Journal of Education*, xxiv (2), 1-106.
- 32 Yücel, A., Doganalp, B., & Kaya, D. (2013). The relation between organizational health and organizational commitment. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(10), 781-788.
- 33 Ziapour, A. Sharafi, K., Kianipour, H., Kianipour, N., & Moradi, S. (2015). The study of organizational health and social factors among Kermanshah University Medical Sciences and Health Services Staff. *Technical Journal of Engineering and Applied Sciences*, 5(2), 43-52.

