THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SECONDARY SCHOOL

PRINCIPALS' SERVANT LEADERSHIP IN LOWER ACHIEVING

AND HIGHER ACHIEVING SECONDARY SCHOOLS

_____

A Dissertation presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School

University of Missouri-Columbia

_____

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctorate of Education

_____

by

TRACI R. PATTISON

Dr. Cynthia MacGregor, Dissertation Supervisor

DECEMBER 2010

pick up the girls whenever we needed extra help. You are such an important part of my life and I thank you for letting me be a part of your family. To my precious girls, Megan Taylor and Kelci Grace, thank you for understanding when mommy had to be gone to do homework. You are both the light of my life and I am so very proud of you. I want you to always know that you can accomplish anything you want. Nothing comes easy but it is worth it! My husband, Shane Pattison, deserves to have his name written on my degree next to mine. You have been my encourager and motivator throughout this journey. You have taken care of the house, laundry, and girls without ever complaining. In fact you were more than willing to do anything to help so I could finish this goal. You will never know how much your support has meant to me. Thank you! I cannot wait to celebrate this accomplishment with you!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER THREE

CHAPTER FOUR

CHAPTER FIVE

LIST OF TABLES

The Difference Between Secondary School Principals' Servant Leadership in

Lower Achieving and Higher Achieving Secondary Schools

Traci R. Pattison

Dr. Cynthia MacGregor, Dissertation Supervisor

ABSTRACT

School leaders are the driving force of their organization (Brunner & Schumaker, 1998). School leadership has become even more important as leaders are being held accountable for the success of each student. National and state mandates provide a challenging atmosphere for building administrators. NCLB hold schools and school districts accountable for assessment results. The purpose of the study was to develop an understanding of the relationships between secondary school principals' servant leadership in lower achieving and higher achieving schools and student achievement as determined by the end of course exams in Algebra I, Biology, and English II. Data on servant leadership was collected from 70 teachers from five higher achieving schools and five lower achieving schools during the fall of 2010.

The data analysis for the study included independent samples *t*-tests and open coding. The results of the study found the two constructs of humility and vision have a significant difference in principals between the higher and lower achieving schools. Principals at higher achieving schools put a greater emphasis on being humble leaders. These principals also encourage participation in creating a shared vision.

Results concluded with a diagnosis of open ended questions focused on the principal's philosophy of leadership and impact on student achievement. This qualitative data was open coded and categorized into thematic patterns. The responses for the higher achieving schools

revealed shared decision making and principal compassion and positive attitude as additional data to consider. The lower achieving schools had different themes emerge. Two of the themes had a more negative response. These were teacher autonomy and teacher input but principal decisions. The last theme to emerge with the lower achieving schools principals was positive and supportive in relation to student achievement.

Several implications for future practice can be drawn from this research. First, preparation programs for administrators should include instruction and practice of building a shared vision within a school. School districts need to provide professional development opportunities for principals and administrators in the area of creating a shared vision. Finally, the effects of national and state mandates provide a challenging atmosphere for building administrators. This study may be useful for school boards and superintendents as they screen for secondary school principal candidates.

From this study, recommendations for further study became apparent. A study of transformational leadership and student achievement would provide a different look at leadership styles. Another area of research to be considered is the importance of servant leadership and instructional leadership on student achievement. The last areas of research to be recommended include a more in-depth look at culture on student achievement and to also study how a shared vision would increase student achievement.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Background

School leaders are faced with more demands and higher expectations than ever

before (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004). Successful leadership

includes not only daily administrative duties but also impacting student learning. In order

for this to happen, leaders must be able to set directions and goals for students and staff

members. Leaders must be able to develop people to take on leadership roles which

require the school leader to articulate a vision and create high performance standards

(Covey, 2002; Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Walstrom, 2004, Taylor, 2007). School

leaders have to change their way of thinking to better meet the demands for student

accountability, instructional leadership, and day-to-day operations of the school. The

requirements of school leadership continues to change by now requiring school leaders to

provide focus and direction to curriculum and teaching, as well as manage the

organization efficiently to support student and adult learning (Hallinger & Heck, 1996;

Sergiovanni, 2006). Leaders are required to know and understand curriculum,

assessment, instruction, legal issues, personnel issues, professional development, and

much more (Erlandson, 1994; Hoy & Miskel, 2001). *No Child Left Behind* (2002) has

added pressure to school leaders since funding is affected by the performance of the

students on the Missouri Assessment Program (MAP). This directly relates to the

leadership in the building and the role of the building principal.

Many labels are used in literature to signify different forms of leadership

(Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004). Leadership is described in literature

using adjectives such as instructional, participative, democratic, transformational, moral, and strategic. The essential objective to leadership is helping the organization set a defensible set of directions and influencing members to move in those directions (Hallinger & Heck, 1996; Miller, 2003). Organizational leaders must be committed to the organization and the people of the organization (Covey, 2002; Greenleaf, 2002; Sendjaya, Sarros, & Santora, 2008; Spears, 1996). Leadership involves setting the direction and not aimlessly wandering with the expectation that something will get done (Page & Wong, 2000). A strong component of leadership includes a commitment to common values and attitudes (Covey, 1998; Kouzes & Posner, 2002; Schein, 1992; Taylor, 2007). Honesty and integrity are integral parts of good leadership and "leadership isn't a position; it's a process" (Kouzes, 1998, p. 322). This description of leadership, the emerging approach to leadership, is called servant leadership.

Conceptual Underpinnings of the Study

Robert Greenleaf (2002) wrote about servant leadership in 1970 in his first essay *The Servant Leader*. Greenleaf (2002) coined the term servant leadership after reading Herman Hesse's book entitled, *Journey to the East*, where journeymen discovered that the servant who helped them along the journey actually turned out to be the leader of the organization that sponsored the journey, thus the term servant leadership. Greenleaf (2002) described a servant leader as one who has a natural feeling "to serve, to serve first" (p. 7).

Servant leadership is a leadership model that has been successfully applied in some business, religious, and education contexts (Greenleaf, 2002; Spears, 1995; Taylor, 2007; Wong & Davey, 2007). This framework ensures that "other people's highest

priority needs are being served" (Greenleaf, 2002, p.13). Servant leadership describes

great leaders as those who serve first (Greenleaf, 2002; Spears, 1998). The servant

leader's principles, values, and beliefs are the motivational sources for the leader's

behavior (Greenleaf, 2002; Spears 1995). Due to the growing popularity of servant

leadership, it is imperative to take steps to explore its meaning and to examine the

effectiveness this leadership provides.

Patterson (2003) developed a working theory of servant leadership that created a

platform for more specific research by defining the values on which servant leadership is

based. These values were called constructs (Patterson, 2003). Dennis (2004) created the

Servant Leadership Assessment Instrument (SLAI) to measure the constructs of

Patterson's theory of servant leadership. This instrument has the ability to predict or give

measurement to the concepts of Patterson's theory of servant leadership so a leader can

measure his or her effectiveness as a servant leader. The SLAI is comprised of 42

questions; each question includes a likert scale with 6 choices. Each teacher was asked to

respond to each statement depicting how the leader would think, act, or behave. The four

constructs of the instrument include agapao love, vision, empowerment, and humility

(Dennis & Bocarnea, 2005).

Agapao love measures the degree to which a servant leader demonstrates love in a

social and moral sense (Dennis, 2004; Patterson, 2003). This love is shown by leaders

who consider each person as a total person, one with needs, wants, and desires (Patterson,

2003). Russell and Stone (2002) described agapao love as considering the whole person,

the needs, wants, and desires. Leaders genuinely care and are interested in the life of

others. Servant leaders are gentle and compassionate, showing strength and self-control,

remaining calm and peaceful in the midst of turmoil, and possessing tact and graciousness that inspires others to retain their self-esteem and dignity (Herndon, 2007; Swindoll, 1981).

In servant leadership theory, vision refers to the idea that the leader looks forward and sees the person as a viable and worthy person, believes in the future state for each individual, and seeks to assist each one in reaching that state (Patterson, 2003). Vision measures the degree to which a servant leader incorporates the participation of all involved players in creating a shared vision for the organization (Dennis, 2004; Patterson 2003). This visionary aspect also provides the means towards empowerment, knowing what is needed and why.

Empowerment is one of the most important characteristics of servant leadership (Buchen, 1998; Russell & Stone, 2002). Empowerment measures the degree to which a servant leader empowers information to others such as positive emotional support, actual experience of task mastery, observe models of success, and words of encouragement (Dennis, 2004; Patterson, 2003). Empowerment changes the rights, responsibilities, and duties of leaders as well as followers (Ciulla, 1998). The core of empowerment is entrusting power to others, effective listening, teamwork, valuing of love, and equality (Russell & Stone, 2002). Buchen (1998) explained there is no servant leadership where there is no sharing of power. Empowering people is at the heart of servant leadership (Russell & Stone, 2002; Buchen, 1998).

Humility measures the degree to which a servant leader keeps his or her own accomplishments and talents in perspective, which includes self-acceptance, and further includes the idea of true humility as not being self-focused but rather focused on others

4

(Dennis, 2004; Patterson 2003). Leaders who view oneself as no better or worse than others do and leaders who show respect for others demonstrate humility (Russell & Stone, 2002). Pielstick (2000) stated the servant leader is fair and humble, which is in agreement with Swindoll (1981) who stated a major characteristic of servant leaders is their ability to be vulnerable and humble. Swindoll explained servant leaders are those who do not center attention on their own accomplishments but rather on other people.

Leadership requires continual work and evaluation (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). Servant leadership stresses that credibility is the foundation of leadership (Kouzes & Posner, 2002) and a commitment to the growth of people (Spears, 1998). Leaders generate and sustain trust (Bennis, 2002; DePree, 2002) through the behavior of the leader.

Statement of the Problem

Leaders have been described as the driving force of their organizations (Brunner & Schumaker, 1998). There are many different types of leadership styles and behaviors leaders exhibit (Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 2000). For organizations to prosper, leaders should be able to make decisions, exhibit moral behavior, and create forward movement. Leadership encompasses many qualities and requires leaders to deal with complex problems involving many variables through relationship with others (Kouzes & Posner, 2002; Yukl, 2002). Servant leadership emphasizes the relationship with others and the desire to serve (Greenleaf, 2002). A leader controls the culture of the organization, which includes the decision making, communication, and the symbolic nature of the organization (Tierney, 1988).

By examining extensive research studies, Hallinger and Heck (1999) found leadership does enhance school effectiveness. Leadership is pivotal in determining the effectiveness and success of an organization (1999). Servant leadership has gained popularity over the past decade and is increasingly being studied for its effectiveness in a variety of organizations (Black, 2007; Bowman, 1997; Russell & Stone, 2002; Sendjaya & Sarros, 2002). Recent studies have found servant leadership to be an effective form of leadership in schools (Black, 2007; Dennis, 2005; Herndon, 2007; Patterson, 2003; Taylor, 2007).

Good school leaders have a distinct leadership style and focus on achievement in schools (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Miller, 2003; Reback, 2009). School leadership becomes even more important as leaders are being held accountable for the success of each student. Given the increasing interest in servant leadership, the servant leadership profile for secondary principals in higher achieving and lower achieving schools and the critical importance of student achievement, and the exploration of the relationships among the three should provide meaningful results for servant leadership theorists and school leaders. Recent research on servant leadership has focused on the constructs of servant leadership (Dennis, 2004; Patterson, 2003) but not on the link between servant leaders and school accountability.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to develop an understanding of the relationships between secondary school principals' servant leadership in lower achieving and higher achieving schools and student achievement as determined by the end of course exams in Algebra I, Biology, and English II. These were the only three end of course exams given

in the 2008-2009 school year. The primary method of analysis was quantitative with survey data being used to determine (a) the typical servant leadership profile for secondary principals of higher achieving and lower achieving schools; (b) the differences in servant leadership for principals in higher achieving schools and lower achieving schools; and (c) the teacher perceptions of servant leadership in principals of higher achieving and lower achieving schools.

Research Questions

The following research questions were examined during this study:

1.   What is the typical servant leadership profile for secondary principals in:

     a.   higher achieving schools?

     b.   lower achieving schools?

2.   What are the differences in servant leadership for principals in higher achieving schools and lower achieving schools using the four constructs of the SLAI?

     a.   Agapao love

     b.   Empowerment

     c.   Humility

     d.   Vision

3.   What are the teacher perceptions of servant leadership in principals of higher and lower achieving schools?

     a.   Leader's philosophy

     b.   Impact of leader on student achievement

Limitations

Hallinger and Heck (1999) stated that until the 1980s, leadership became a domain frequently referenced in research without empirical evidence. They mentioned several respected scholars who warned against this assumption. Hallinger and Heck found, "Despite the potential impact of this leadership function, there remains considerable ambiguity in how leaders shape the school's purposes to foster student learning" (p. 180). Different background assumptions provided different frames for viewing a problem (Bolman & Deal, 1997). Limitations were the items that put boundaries on the meaning of the results from the survey. The following were the limitations of this study.

The study is limited to the sample size of 150 teachers from five higher achieving and lower achieving high schools and to the perceptions of those it surveys. Teachers were asked to rate the leadership perceptions of their principal. Teachers were asked questions about how their principal interacted with teachers, parents, and students. The survey also had questions about the administration of daily tasks. The survey was not given to the principals, parents, or students. Personal interpretations can be subjectively dependent on the level of confidence or ego of the participant (Merriam, 1998).

The state in which the study takes place is a limitation as well. The reader should take into consideration that the information gained from this study represents a specific location in the United States. There may be some cultural, ethnic, and demographic influence which is inherent to the Midwest and not necessarily a universal representation of the entire United States.

Another limitation of this study is it measured only the servant leadership characteristics of secondary school principals in medium sized schools. Schools were selected by using the Class 3 Football District Assignments from the Missouri State High School Athletic Association (MSHSAA). The schools ranged in size from 456 to 759. School demographics were also a limitation. Schools in this study all were similar to the state averages in poverty, mobility, and per pupil expenditure.

The number of schools included in this study is also a limitation. Based on the schools with similar demographics, five higher achieving schools and five lower achieving schools were chosen based on the MAP Index score of the end of course tests in Algebra I, Biology, and English II scores from the 2009 state assessments.

Finally, quantitative research is limited to the assessment instrument involved. The Servant Leadership Assessment Instrument (SLAI) was developed by Robert Dennis (Dennis & Bocarnea, 2005). This research instrument has the ability to predict or give measurement to the concepts of Patterson's theory of servant leadership so that a servant leader can measure his or her effectiveness as a servant leader. There are other measures of servant leadership but in this study the SLAI was the only measure used.

Definition of Key Terms

The following definitions are grouped by category. Each category has a short explanation of the topic.

Servant Leadership

For the purpose of this study, the term servant leadership signifies those leaders who have the natural feeling to serve, to serve first. Then the conscious choice to serve brings one to aspire to lead (Greenleaf, 2002).

9

Servant Leadership Constructs

Patterson (2003) has developed a theory of servant leadership that creates a platform for more specific research by defining the values on which servant leadership is based. These values are labeled as constructs. Dennis (2004) developed the Servant Leadership Assessment Instrument (SLAI) based on Patterson's theory of servant leadership. The four constructs used in this instrument are agapao love, empowerment, humility, and vision.

Agapao love. The servant leader demonstrates love in a social and moral sense. The leader provides meaning and purpose on the job where the employee has the ability to realize his or her full potential as a person and feels like he or she is associated with a good and/or ethical organization. It is also the degree to which the servant leader is emotionally, physically, and spiritually present for the followers. The servant leader is forgiving, teachable, shows concern for others, is calm during times of chaos, strives to do what is right for the organization, honors people, has a genuine interest in others, and has integrity (Dennis, 2004).

Empowerment. The degree to which a servant leader empowers information to others: positive emotional support, actual experience of task mastery, observing models of success, and words of encouragement. The servant leader allows for employee self-direction. Leaders encourage professional growth. The leaders let people do their jobs by enabling them to learn (Dennis, 2004).

Humility. The servant leader keeps his or her own accomplishments and talents in perspective, which includes self-acceptance, and further includes the idea of true humility as not being self-focused but rather focused on others. The servant leader does not

overestimate his or her own merits, talks more about employees' accomplishments rather than his or her own, is not interested in self-glorification, does not center attention on his or her accomplishments, is humble enough to consult others to gain further information and perspective, and has a humble demeanor (Dennis, 2004).

Vision. The servant leader incorporates the participation of all involved players in creating a shared vision for the organization. The servant leader seeks others' visions for the organization, demonstrates that he or she wants to include employees' vision into the organization's goals and objectives, seeks commitment concerning the shared vision of the organization, encourages participation in creating a shared vision, and has a written expression of the vision of the organization (Dennis, 2004).

Accountability

Accountability is the term used by government agencies to evaluate schools' performance. Schools are held responsible for student achievement via standardized tests.

Missouri Assessment Program. MAP is the Missouri mandated testing under the *No Child Left Behind* legislation. The Missouri Assessment Program has created a performance based test in language arts, mathematics, and science. At the secondary level, there are end of course tests in Algebra I, Biology, and English II.

No Child Left Behind. NCLB was passed by Congress in 2001 and by President George W. Bush on January 8, 2002. The policy requires annual testing of students and forces schools whose students do not improve at a steady rate to take remedial action. Schools that continue to underperform could ultimately lose funding. "NCLB is built on four principles: accountability for results, more choices for parents, greater local control

and flexibility, and an emphasis on doing what works based on scientific research" (U.S. Department of Education, 2007, p. 1).

Student Achievement

School districts and school administrators are continually looking at ways to help teachers improve student achievement. Students in high school began taking end of course tests during the 2008-2009 school year in Algebra I, Biology, and English II. The State of Missouri evaluates schools based on the percentage of students in a particular grade who score proficient or advanced on the end of course tests.

Achievement level. There are four achievement levels – below basic, basic, proficient, and advanced that are used to define student performance.

End of course tests. Are given at the end of a course to allow students to demonstrate their knowledge gained from an entire course. End of course tests enable schools to use students' performance on the tests as a factor in awarding final grades.

Higher achieving schools. Research has found that high performing schools tend to have a combination of common characteristics. The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) in the state of Washington has established nine characteristics. These characteristics include: "a clear and shared focus; high standards and expectations for all students; effective school leadership; high levels of collaboration and communication; curriculum, instruction, and assessments aligned with state standards; frequent monitoring of learning and teaching; focused professional development; a supportive learning environment; high levels of parent and community involvement" (Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, 2007, p. 1). Five higher achieving schools were

included in this study. These five schools had a MAP composite score between 783 and 795.

Lower achieving schools. Lower performing schools are schools that do not meet the standards established by the state board of education (Corallo & McDonald, 2002). Five lower achieving schools were included in this study. These five schools had a MAP composite score between 713 and 742.

MAP index score. The MAP index score is a weighted measure that represents the sum of the percentage of students at each level multiplied by the weighted point value (Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2005).

Summary

Schools continue to face difficult decisions in regards to curriculum, finance, and many other important areas of education. Principals in public education today are faced with the mounting pressures of accountability. Student achievement is a critical component to a school's success. If students are doing well in class and performing well on state standardized tests, then the schools are doing what is needed for kids. The purpose of the study was to develop an understanding of the relationships between secondary school principals' servant leadership in lower achieving and higher achieving schools and student achievement as determined by the end of course exams in Algebra I, Biology, and English II. Schools who are led by servant leaders have students who perform higher on state standardized tests such as the end of course tests.

In Chapter Two, the literature supporting servant leadership, student achievement, and secondary schools is discussed. The servant leadership factors are also presented. In Chapter Three, the research questions are stated and samples examined. A discussion of

t-tests and the reasons this analysis suited this study is discussed. Chapter Four contains the results of the analysis. Chapter Five includes the discussion of the results and suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

At the midpoint of the twentieth century, major societal changes impacted schools and led to a call for school reform and a new model of principal leadership. The American landscape continues to change dramatically and accompanying this change is a transformation to schools and to the roles of their leaders (Beck and Murphy, 1993). Writers such as Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan, and Lee (1982), Heck, Larsen, and Marcoulides (1990), Heck and Marcoulides (1993), and Hallinger and Heck (1998) wrote of the importance of principal leadership as a component of successful schools. Finn (1987) asserted, "The principalship is probably the single most powerful fulcrum for improving school effectiveness" (p. 20).

In order to become effective instructional leaders, principals were expected to be more knowledgeable about and more involved in their school's instructional practices than they had been in the past. Research has focused on instructional leadership behaviors and their resulting impact on student performance (Beck and Murphy, 1993; Hallinger, 1992; Herndon, 2007). Student performance on assessments such as standardized testing became identified as the preferred measure of school effectiveness, and principals were expected to facilitate success on such measures.

The purpose of the study was to develop an understanding of the relationships among secondary school principals' servant leadership in higher achieving schools and lower achieving schools and student achievement as determined by end of course

assessment scores in Algebra I, Biology, and English II. This chapter will focus on leadership, servant leadership, student achievement, and secondary schools.

Leadership

Leaders are the driving force of organizations (Brunner & Schumaker, 1998). There are many different types of leadership styles and behaviors leaders exhibit (Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 2000; Parolini, 2007). Leaders should be able to make decisions, exhibit moral behavior, and help the organization thrive.

The topic of leadership has been the subject of many research studies (Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 2000). Human nature naturally gravitates toward leadership (Brunner & Schumaker, 1998; Heifetz, 1994). In order to discuss leadership, leadership requires a definition. Literature defines leadership in a variety of definitions depending upon the context and perception of the individual (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Davis, 2003; Leithwood & Duke, 1999; Morgan, 1997; Yukl 2002). Leadership behavior encompasses many qualities and requires leaders to deal with complex problems involving many variables including relationships with others (Kouzes & Posner, 2002; Yukl, 2002). Despite no consensus, "most definitions of leadership reflect the assumption that it involves a process whereby intentional influence is exerted by one person over other people to guide, structure, and facilitate activities and relationships in a group or organization" (Yukl, p. 2).

Margaret Wheatley (1994) suggests "effective leadership involves communicating simple governing principles: guiding vision, strong values, organizational beliefs…." (as cited in Davis, 2003). A leader controls the culture of the organization, which includes the decision making, communication, and the symbolic nature of the organization

(Tierney, 1988). Participatory and distributive leaders create a climate of collaboration and teambuilding facilitating a democratic approach toward utilizing the strengths of diverse individuals to include different perspectives, ideas, and solutions in all aspects of leadership, while maintaining a common path toward a unified purpose (Furman, 2003; Katzenbach & Smith, 1993; Yukl, 2002).

Leadership influence through a group process is the next type of leadership theory to be discussed. In addition to social exchange theories and participative leadership, cultural, symbolic, and cognitive theories fall into this category. Culture, a major component of cultural and symbolic and cognitive theories, suggests that participants create shared meanings through interactions to influence perceptions and activities (Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989). Leadership is viewed as a social explanation that observers use to find meaning in the organization. Leadership effectiveness relies upon follower perception. While research agrees that leaders influence culture, no agreement exists upon the way the culture is managed (Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum). Managing the culture through groups leads the way toward participative leadership.

Participative leadership, also called shared leadership, stresses how the decisions are made within the group with the perspective of the leader on sharing power (Leithwood & Duke, 1999; Yukl, 2002). Vroom and Yetton's (1973) and Vroom and Jago's (1988) model of participative leadership helps leaders identify the appropriate procedures to come to a decision dependent on the situational variables of relevant information, follower acceptance of decision, follower cooperation, amount of disagreement, and decision quality (as cited in Yukl). Participatory leadership has four

17

varieties: autocratic decision, consultation, joint decision, and delegation (Yukl). Three of the varieties allow people in the organization to have some type of involvement in the decision making process. Leaders thrive in an organization where participation in decision making is promoted and expected (Kezar, 2000). Ownership increases follower motivation to implement the decision, and followers demonstrate a higher rate of satisfaction, while developing complex decision-making skills.

Distributed leadership allows the management to be spread among many people within an organization (Furman, 2003). Copland states distributed leadership results in a collective activity more than the sum of individuals. Ogawa and Bossert (1995) and Hallinger and Heck (1999) support the concept of leadership flowing through the networks of roles and people throughout the organization. Tasks, responsibility, and power span between the boundaries of traditional roles of an organization relies more on expert power rather than positional power, residing in a larger community of professionals (Copland, 2003).

Leadership is always affected by the power within an organization. Power and influence theories, social exchange theories, and charismatic leadership exist within most organizations. Power and influence theories analyze leader's use of formal and informal social power to influence organizational processes (Bensimon, Neuman & Birnbaum, 1989; Davis, 2003; Yukl, 2002). Yukl discusses two basic categories of power, positional and personal. Positional power includes legitimate power, reward power, and coercive power. Personal power includes referent, expert, information, and ecological power. Research studies indicate leaders who use more personal power than positional power are more effective leaders with more follower performance and satisfaction. However,

positional power cannot be totally extracted from personal power as the leader influences followers (Yukl). Leader success is determined through the manner of exercising power. Whereby social power theories demonstrate a one-way influence of power, social exchange theories show a two-way mutual influence (Bensimon, Neumann & Birnbaum, 1989; Yukl).

Social exchange theories demonstrate a reciprocal relationship of the mutual influence of leaders and followers (Bensimon, Neumann & Birnbaum, 1989). Transactional and transformational leadership are examples of social exchange theories. Transactional leadership, as stated by Burns (1978) and Bass (1985), involves a reciprocal bargaining process that may result in follower compliance with requests made by the leader, but loyalty and commitment to a vision or task may not occur (as cited in Bensimon, Neumann & Birnbaum; Leithwood & Duke, 1999; Yukl, 2002). Transformational leadership extends beyond an exchange, with followers engaged in a new vision, motivation, and level of morality. (Bensimon, Neumann & Birnbaum; Yukl). The transformational leader "invents, introduces, and advances new cultural forms" (Bass, 1985, as cited in Bensimon, Neumann & Birnbaum, p. 11). Lowe, Kroeck, and Sivasubramaniam (1996, as cited in Yukl) suggests charisma, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation are related to leader effectiveness and are important components of transformational leadership.

Transformational leaders are seen as directing and having a personal impact on their followers; they are looked upon as a source of motivation and inspiration (Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989). These leaders are able to inspire others to look beyond self-interest and focus on organization goals (Copland, 2003; Parolini,

2007). Transformational leadership facilitates a renewal in the mission, vision, and commitment of the people of the organization (Leithwood, 1992). Transformational leaders facilitate change in the organization. Facilitation gives the leader the ability to adapt, solve problems, and improve performance (Conley & Goldeman, 1994). Followers feel trust, admiration, loyalty, and respect toward the leader with transformational leadership (Yukl, 2002). Bass (1996) explained the leader transforms and motivates followers by addressing the importance of outcomes, works for the best interest of the team, and activates their higher order needs. Transformational leaders provide support, encouragement, and coaching to their followers. Providing motivation allows the leader to communicate a vision and model the appropriate behaviors they wish to see in employees (Bass & Avolio, 1990). Transformational leadership includes inspirational motivation because it includes relating an appealing vision to follower values and ideals (Yukl, 2002). According to Bass (1996), transformational leadership is considered effective in any situation or culture. Transformational leaders do more to empower followers and make them less dependent on the leader, such as delegating significant authority to individuals, developing self-confidence, and building a strong culture to support empowerment (Yukl, 2002). Transformational leaders follow these guidelines to help them be strong leaders and help their organizations grow (Parolini, 2007). A vision is an important component to a strong organization. Transformational leaders strengthen or build the commitment to a unified vision (Yukl, 2002).

Charismatic leadership seems to mirror transformational leadership; however, charismatic leaders do more to create a vision of super competence (Yukl) and follow perception of powers that cannot be explained by ordinary means (Davis, 2003).

Charismatic leaders can "see the big picture, communicate their ideas, lay out a vision, and model it" (Davis, p. 13). Charismatic leaders often emerge during a crisis and can be overrated as an effective leader.

The complexity of leadership has resulted in a variety of leadership theories (Yukl, 2002). Through the utilization of multiple theories to perceive, interpret, and address situations confronted in leadership, the leader would obtain a broader perspective. As leaders interpret and address situations, they are always being monitored and observed. A vital component to leadership is how the leader demonstrates and promotes ethical and moral behavior within the organization.

Educational leaders must have the capacity to use multiple lenses in order to be effective. They are able to analyze and act on every problem using multiple perspectives (Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989). Leaders are an important part of any organization. They perform certain tasks or functions that are essential for the group to accomplish its tasks (Gardner, 1990).

In previous centuries, the leadership paradigm was based on three particular beliefs: leaders were born and not made, good management made successful organizations, and avoid failure at all costs (Bennis & Goldsmith, 1997; Block, 1993; Hickman, 1998). Leadership was defined in literature as patriarchal, hierarchical, coercive, and related to wealth and influence (Bennis, 1997; Block, 1993, Elshtain, 1990; Hickman, 1998; Sergiovanni, 1992). In a hierarchical leadership the power of the leader was visible and obeyed by those in the organization (Hasselbein, Goldsmith, Beckhard, & Shubert, 1998; Senge, 1990) whereas, in servant leadership a leader is identified by the people as a leader among equals (DePree, 1989; Depree, 1992; Greenleaf, 1977).

Leaders significantly influence organizations; ethical leadership impacts every theory of leadership with no neutral ground (Yukl, 2002). Both ethical and moral behavior affects the organization (Furman, 2003, Yukl). Moral leadership focuses on the "values and ethics of the leaders themselves" (Leithwood, Jantzi, and Steinbach, 2000, p. 10). Ethical leadership strives to raise the levels of morality and motivation (Yukl). Researchers suggest integrity as an important component to ethical leadership. Unethical behavior may hurt and tear apart an organization (Yukl). Utilization of power, such as control of access to information, resources, and timing of information, all provide leaders exposure to ethical dilemmas (Yukl).

Through shared leadership and making decisions based on the purpose, social justice and equity among all members of the organizations, followers are empowered through trust instead of domination (Davis, 2003; Yukl, 2002). Grogan (2003) and Willower and Licata (1997) describe resolution of dilemma through the use of deliberation and reflection to solve complex ethical issues. Ethical behavior requires a leader to have open communication and trust with all stakeholders in the organization. Trust will not be present in an organization if ethical leadership is not practiced (Davis; Yukl). An organization's decisions are also impacted by the behavior a leader exhibits; whether it is ethical or unethical, it impacts decisions.

One element of leadership that has been studied is effective decision-making. As leaders continually respond to a variety of problems and diverse individuals, effectiveness in decision making depends on varied and appropriate leader responses (Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 2000). Through the application of frames, lenses, images, or models, the interpretation of the meaning of leadership is viewed in greater

complexity to allow for different perspectives and greater understanding (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Morgan, 1997). Decision making is a daily occurrence for leaders in any organization. It is up to the leader to decide how decisions will be made. A leader who has trust in others will invite people to share in the authority and make decisions (Schlechty, 2000). This could be through collaboration, working in teams, or empowerment (Yukl, 2002) which allows for consultation, open and democratic decision making (Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 2000). Empowerment provides "intrinsic motivation and self-efficacy and are influenced by leadership behavior, job characteristics, organization structure, and their own needs and values" (Yukl, p. 107). Empowering employees to make decisions allows for a stronger acceptance of decisions and less resistance (Yukl).

Leadership involves relationships, consequently, effective decision-making involves collaboration with others, working in teams, and solving problems as a group (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Davis, 2003; Lencioni, 2002; Preskill & Torres, 1995). To implement decisions, leaders need to be aware of the organization's culture (Tierney, 1988). Organizations strive to create a climate of teamwork and openness (Schein, 2000).

Over the last ten years there has been a shift in the organizational structure in schools (Murphy & Louis, 1999). These include educational leadership shifts in roles, relationships, and responsibilities; the alteration of traditional patterns of relationships; and the fact that authority tends to be less hierarchical (Crippen, 2005). Senge (1990) believes systems that change require a variety of leadership types at different times in organizational development. Servant leadership is a transformational, democratic form of leadership that requires time to implement in the learning community (Crippen, 2005).

Leadership must be about service (Spears, 1998). Greenleaf (1991) states in the first

essay he wrote,

> The servant-leader is servant first. It begins with the natural feeling that one wants
>
> to serve. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead. The difference
>
> manifests itself in the care taken by the servant: first, to make sure that other
>
> people's highest priority needs are being served. The best test is: do those served
>
> grow as persons; do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more
>
> autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants? And what is the effect
>
> on the least privileged in society; will they benefit, or at least, not be further
>
> deprived? (p. 7)

Servant leadership provides the promise of an effective educational leadership and

management model (Crippen, 2005).

Servant Leadership

The term servant leadership was named by Robert Greenleaf in 1970 in a book

entitled *The Servant as Leader*. Greenleaf spent most of his life working in management

research, development, and education at AT&T. The servant as leader came from a novel

by Herman Hessel *Journey to the East.* This story was about a great leader who was a

servant first. The leader had a true desire to help others. The central character in this story

is a man named Leo, a servant who accompanies a band of men on a mythical journey,

which Greenleaf postulates, is Hesse's personal journey. Leo serves two vital functions

for the group first, as a servant who provides for the needs of these men and as one who

nourishes the party through spirit and song. The journey proceeds well until Leo

disappears leaving the men void of his exceptional presence. The group of men becomes

disillusioned and disorganized resulting in the abandonment of the journey. After a long

period of searching, the narrator finds Leo and is accepted by the Order that sponsored

the journey. The narrator discovers that Leo, who he knew only as the servant of the band

of men on the journey, was actually the leader of the Order. Greenleaf's interpretation is,

"a great leader is seen as servant first, and that simple fact is the key to his greatness"

(Greenleaf, 2002, p. 21). This book was the beginning of a study of servant leadership by

Greenleaf (Spears, 2002).

Many organizations are led by servant leaders. Servant leadership crosses all

boundaries and is applied by a wide variety of people working in churches, universities,

health care, and in education (Spears, 1998). The primary purpose of servant leadership is

to create a positive impact on it employees and community. Servant leadership is

providing a framework from which many thousands of known and unknown individuals

are helping to improve how we treat those who do the work within our companies and

schools (Spears, 1998).

Servant leadership has been described as building a sense of community and

sharing the power in decision making (Spears, 2002). To become a servant leader, a

leader must desire "to serve, to serve first" (Greenleaf, 2002, p. 23). Servant leadership

allows leaders to unify the values of respect and service to enable the organization to

grow (Covey, 2002a). The prime motivation for leadership should be a desire to serve

(Baggett, 1997; Block 1993; Greenleaf, 1977).

Servant leadership is one that does not just work, it endures (Covey, 2002b). The

conscience of the leader is what sets this leadership apart from others. These leaders have

the moral sense of what is right and what is wrong. "Moral authority is another way to

define servant leadership because it represents a reciprocal choice between leader and follower" (Covey, 2002b, p. 5). Moral authority has been used to define servant leadership because it represents a choice between leader and follower. Leaders who are principle centered will develop moral authority. Covey (2002b) described moral authority or conscience in four dimensions. The first dimension is sacrifice. Sacrifice may take many forms but the essence of sacrifice is subordinating one's self to a higher purpose. Conscience is still that small voice within that guides our daily decisions. A leader's conscience sees life in terms of service and contribution and wants others to feel secure and fulfilled (Covey, 2002b). The second dimension of conscience is commitment. When our focus changes from "what is it we want to what is being asked of us" (Covey, 2002b, p. 7) the conscience is opened up, and a person is allowed to grow. The third dimension teaches us that ends and means are inseparable. Servant leaders realize the means used to accomplish the ends are as important as those ends. Leaders know who is honest with them and keep their promises and commitments; they also know who is deceitful and dishonest. The last dimension of conscience is relationships and compassion. In order for the vision and values to be shared by the entire organization, there has to be a relationship built and sustained (Covey, 2002b).

Covey (2002b) described servant leaders as the most humble, most reverent, the most open, the most teachable, the most respectful, the most caring, and the most determined. These leaders use their moral authority to get things accomplished. A servant leader always accepts and emphasizes. The servant as leader always empathizes, always accepts the person but sometimes refuses to accept some of the person's effort or performance as good enough (Covey, 1998; Greenleaf, 2002).

26

Trust

Relationships built on trust and service are the basis for the influence of servant leadership (Sarkus, 1996; Tatum, 1995). Supportive climates provide for creativity and change in an environment in which people trust each other (Bennis, 1999; Freeman, Isaksen &Dorval, 2002). Greenleaf (1977) believed trust was central to servant leadership when leadership begins with trust. The most important ingredient to effective leadership is trust (Cassel & Holt, 2008). Leaders have to be candid in their communications and show they care. No matter what they have to be seen as trustworthy (Bennis, 1999). Servant leadership looks at two forms of trust, trust in the leader and trust in the organization (Joseph & Winston, 2005). Leaders generate and sustain trust (Bennis, 2002; DePree, 2002) through the behavior of the leader. A leader's communication practices affect followers' trust in the leader (Joseph & Winston, 2005). Trust in a leader is a product of the leader's behavior. A leader is determined to a great extent by various aspects of the behavior of that leader (Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995). The leader's behavior is thus more important than that of anyone else in determining the level of trust that exists within a group or organization (Offerman, 1998). Establishing trust is one of the most essential parts of good leadership, especially servant leadership (Bennis, 1989, 1997; Covey, 1990; DePree, 1997; Greenleaf, 1977; Maxwell 1998; Neuschel, 1998; Taylor, 2007). Servant leaders are trusted because they emphathize with and fully accept followers. Russell and Stone's (2002) model of servant leadership presented trust as one of the functional attributes of servant leadership. Servant leaders build trust by genuinely empowering workers, involving employees early, honoring commitments and being consistent, developing coaching skills and fostering risk taking, an appropriate

27

management style, and through trustworthiness that is built on integrity and competence (Covey, 1991; Melrose, 1998; Spears 1998). "Trust given and received creates the climate for service at the deepest level" (Tatum, 1995, p. 312). Research has established a strong relationship between servant leadership and leader and organizational trust (Joseph & Winston, 2005). Servant leadership is an important variable in understanding, development, and maintenance of organizational trust (McGee-Cooper, 1998). Trust theory has established the important role of trust in organizational effectiveness (Nyhan, 2000; Shockley-Zalabak, Ellis, & Winograd, 2000) including job satisfaction, organizational commitment, belief in information provided by the leader, and commitment to decisions (Dirks and Ferrin, 2002). Trust holds together servant-led organizations.

The Greenleaf concept is that not only is the leader a servant, but the organization also is a servant (Covey, 1998). A leader must develop high trust and lead people by coaching, empowerment, persuasion, example, and modeling. Spears (1998) studied Greenleaf's writings and found ten characteristics of the servant leader: listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building a community. Contee-Borders's (2003) case study confirmed these characteristics as being critical to servant leadership.

Listening

Servant leaders must have a deep commitment to listen intently to others (Cassel & Holt, 2008; Spears, 1998). The servant leader identifies the will of the group and seeks to listen receptively to what is said and not said. A leader must have a deep commitment to listening to others (Autry, 2001; Frick & Spears, 1996; Greenleaf 1991; Bennis &

Goldsmith, 1997). Listening is also a key way through which leaders demonstrate respect and appreciation of others (Greenleaf, 1977; Kouzes & Posner, 1993; Miller, 1995; Nix, 1997; Sanders, 1994). Effective leaders are great communicators and must be good listeners. The servant leader seeks to identify the will of the group and helps clarify that will (Spears, 1998). Another component to listening is getting in touch with one's own inner voice (Crippen, 2005). The best communication forces you to listen (DePree, 1989).

Empathy

Empathy requires the servant leader to understand and empathize with others (Spears, 1998). Trust should be developed through the use of empathy (Greenleaf, 1991). The leader always assumes the good intentions and never looks down on people for their behavior or performance (Spears, 1998). The most successful servant leaders are those who become empathetic listeners (Spears, 1998).

Healing

Healing is one of the greatest strengths of servant leaders. This characteristic has the potential for healing one's self and others (Spears, 1998). Gardiner (1998) suggests healing can come through by just quietly being and that a quiet presence is an act of renewal. Learning to heal is a powerful force for transformation (Spears, 1998). Servant leaders realize they have the opportunity to help those they come in contact with (Greenleaf, 1991).

Awareness

Awareness aids one in understanding issues involving ethics and values. General awareness and self-awareness strengthens a servant leader (Spears, 1998). One develops awareness through self-reflection, through listening to what others tell us about ourselves,

through being continually open to learning, and by making the connection from what we know and believe to what we say or do (Crippen, 2005).

Persuasion

A servant leader uses persuasion to convince others instead of using positional authority or coerce compliance (Spears, 1998). The servant leader is effective at building consensus within groups. This element is the largest difference between traditional authoritarian model and that of servant leadership.

Conceptualization

Servant leaders seek to nurture their abilities to dream big. They are also called to seek a healthy balance between conceptual thinking and a day-to-day focused approach (Spears, 1998). Conceptualization allows leaders the ability to see the whole in perspective to the past and future. Leaders are able to state and adjust goals, to evaluate, and to analyze all situations. The conceptualizer is a persuader and a relationship builder (Frick & Spears, 1998). The manager who wishes to also be a servant leader must stretch his or her thinking to encompass broader based conceptual thinking. This characteristic requires discipline and practice (Crippen, 2005).

Foresight

Closely related to conceptualization is the ability to foresee the outcome of a situation (Greenleaf, 1991). As leaders look at the outcome of a situation, it is important to have foresight to understand the lessons of the past and direction of the future (Spears, 1998). Foresight is said to be the one characteristic a leader is born with, the others can be developed (Greenleaf, 1991; Spears, 1998).

Stewardship

The most important characteristic according to Greenleaf is stewardship. Stewardship assumes leaders have a commitment to serving the needs of others. Block (1993) suggests stewardship is accountability without control. Leaders have the desire to serve without pressure and not in response to someone's request or demand but because they are internally motivated to do so (Crippen, 2005; Herndon, 2007). Stewardship emphasizes the use of openness and persuasion rather than control of the situation or person.

Commitment

When leaders work with others, it is vital to have a commitment to the growth of each individual within the organization. This growth will encompass personal, professional, and spiritual growth (Spears, 1998). DePree (1989) wrote, "The signs of outstanding leadership appear primarily among the followers. Are the followers reaching their potential? Are they learning? Serving?" (p. 12). Fullan (2003) specified one responsibility of the school administrator is to encourage others to assume leadership positions.

Building Community

The last characteristic is building a community within the institution or organization. Sergiovanni (1994) stated caring is an integral part of shared community. Servant leaders seek to identify some means for building community among those who work within the organization. A sense of community can be built in any business or organization (Spears, 1998). Approaches to building community include giving back

through service to the community; investing financially into the community; and caring about one's community (Crippen, 2005). *Servant Leadership*

Factors

Sergiovanni (1992) stated "servant leadership is more easily provided if the leader understands that serving others is important, but that the most important thing is to serve the values and ideas that shape the school" (p. 125). Servant leadership may provide a foundation for healing, listening, dialogue, and problem solving during school conflicts (Crippen, 2005). Servant leadership provides institutions a way to improve what it is becoming and producing by building capacity in others to do the same (Grizzell, 2008). Dennis (2004) created Servant Leadership Assessment Instrument (SLAI) to measure the four constructs of agapao love, vision, empowerment, and humility. These constructs were developed from a working theory of servant leadership (Dennis & Bocarnea, 2005; Patterson, 2003).

Agapao love. A leader with this quality seeks the fulfillment of others with behavior directed toward the benefit of others (Sosik, 2000). A servant leader demonstrates love in both a social and moral sense (Dennis, 2004; Patterson, 2003). Servant leaders visibly appreciate, value, encourage and care for their employees (Autry, 2001; Batten, 1997; Covey, 1990; Greenleaf, 1977; Russell & Stone, 2002; Winston, 1999). Kouzes and Posner (1993) found these leaders inspire hope and courage in others, facilitate positive change, and give love and encouragement. These actions reflect unconditional love in the workplace and build relationships (Batten, 1997; Covey, 1990; Kouzes & Posner, 1993). Showing concern for others and making needs and interests a priority, demonstrates empathy and trust (Bennis, 1997; Greenleaf, 1977).

Vision. One of the important ways leadership differs from management is leaders establish a vision for the future (Kotter, 1990). The vision must be compelling, inspiring, and empowering (Bennis, 1997). An important component in servant leadership is creating a shared vision. Senge (1990) stipulated a shared vision is vital for establishing and maintaining a learning organization. The most important commitment a leader makes in relation to a vision is "the commitment to model the vision through one's own behavior in a visible and consistent manner" (Synder, Dowd, & Houghton, 1994). Servant leaders utilize shared-vision through personal example and appealing to higher ideals such as serving the community (Page & Wong, 2000). An organization with a shared vision inevitably uses teamwork to accomplish tasks. In effective teams, leaders empower others and foster collaborative teams (Reichman, 1992). The leader's vision encourages the confidence and the belief that everyone can improve, step forward, and reach goals. When it comes to setting and maintaining the vision for the organization, input must be sought from others in the organization who must come to own them. The visionary servant leader also knows the followers and helps them develop clear feelings of purpose, direction, dignity, as well as provides the followers with direction (Batten, 1997). Melrose (1995) found servant leaders enrich lives, build better human beings, and encourage people to become more than they ever believed. This deep rooted leadership is about mission, the mission to serve. The visionary aspect also provides the means toward empowerment, knowing what is needed and why (Patterson, 2003).

Empowerment. "Servant leaders multiply their leadership by empowering others to lead" (Wilkes, 1996, p. 25). Empowerment emphasizes teamwork and reflects the values of love and equality (Russell and Stone, 2002). In order to achieve empowerment,

a leader's behavior must pull rather than push people along (Bennis & Nanus, 1997). The goal of empowerment is to create many leaders at all levels of the organization (Bennis & Nanus, 1997; Kotter, 1990). In essence, servant leadership involves turning the traditional organizational pyramid upside down (Blanchard, 1997; Turner, 2000). Miller (1995) suggested servant leaders should establish vision and direction but delegate decisions about how to reach goals. Delegation is not abandonment; it involves both trust and accountability (Russell & Stone, 2002). Empowerment is a central element in excellent leadership, especially servant leadership (Bennis, 1997; Bennis & Nanus, 1997; Block, 1993; Covey, 1990; DePree, 1989; Maxwell, 1998; Miller, 1995). Servant leaders empower their employees by providing opportunities for them to do their best (Oster, 1991).

Humility. A leader shows humility by viewing oneself as no better or worse than you would of others (Dennis, 2004). "Effective leaders are those that maintain their humility by showing respect for employees and acknowledging their contributions to the team" (Crom, 1998, p. 6). Leaders who show humility are able to acknowledge one's mistakes, imperfections, gaps in knowledge, and limitations. The most important characteristic of humility is to keep one's abilities and accomplishments in perspective (Tangney, 2000).

Bennis (1999) stated every good leader has had a willful determination to achieve a set of goals and a set of convictions about what they want the organization to achieve. People and process will always be more important than tasks and organizational structure in accomplishing goals and productivity (Page & Wong, 2000). Leadership begins from

within (Bender, 1997). In servant leadership, this means a fundamental commitment to serving others with integrity and humility.

When the going gets tough or when difficult decisions have to be made, as is inevitable in all leadership situations, the servant leader must be just as tough-minded and resilient as other kinds of leaders (Anderson, 2009; Page & Wong, 2000). What distinguishes servant leaders from others is not the quality of the decision but who they consult in reaching these decisions.

Student Achievement

In 1983, the publication, *A Nation at Risk,* stirred a new education reform movement. Leaders of this movement argued that dramatic changes in school structures and school culture were needed in order to improve student achievement (Newmann & Wehlage, 1995). The principal was now assuming a new role of facilitator and structural change. Since this publication, there have been two other major legislations that have changed the way schools do business. In 1993, the Outstanding Schools Act part of Senate Bill 380, created the Show Me Standards which required students to acquire knowledge and be able to communicate and apply their knowledge in a variety of settings. The development of Show Me Standards led to the creation of the Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) (Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 1998). Assessments began in the spring 1997. In 2001, *No Child Left Behind* (NCLB) Act was passed which affected the way public educators at all levels conduct daily business. School principals now find themselves held accountable for student achievement and the requirements to meet adequate yearly progress (AYP) requirements.

In September 2007, Missouri decided to change the secondary level assessment procedures from MAP to end of course (EOC) testing.

Accountability

School and district leadership has been the focus of intense scrutiny in recent years to improve the impact of leadership on the operation of schools and on student achievement. "Leadership is second only to classroom instruction among all school-related factors that contribute to what students learn at school" (Leithwood, Seashore-Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004, p. 7). Leaders who set a clear sense of direction have the greatest impact. Research has found that it is difficult for schools to make progress without goals in which to focus (Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2009).

Nation at Risk

The release of *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) gave rise to a tremendous number of state initiatives to improve secondary education that came to be known collectively as the standards-based reform movement. By 1995, Iowa was the only state that did not have mandatory achievement standards for its students (Williamson and Johnston, 2004, p. 37). Following the publication of *A Nation at Risk*, there was heightened demand to reform America's schools. There was concern American schools were producing students who were incapable of competing in the emerging global economy (Beck & Murphy, 1993). According to Fowler (2004), this continued discontent with America's schools in the late 80's led to a call for greater accountability and standards-based education with high stakes testing as a major component.

Missouri Assessment Program (MAP)

MAP testing began in 1997 with mathematics testing at grades 4, 8, and 10. Over the next few years, communication arts, science, social studies, and health/physical education were implemented. After all tests were implemented, students in grades 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 were being tested. Originally the MAP test was designed to assess proficiency in mathematics, science, communication arts, and social studies at each level in elementary, middle, and high school. This test was comprised of three types of test questions: multiple choice items, constructed response items, and performance events. MAP testing required all teachers to be held accountable for student achievement. Teachers of all grade levels are responsible for student performance, not just the teachers of grade levels at which the MAP is administered.

The Outstanding Schools Act also called for a way to recognize "exemplary" or "academically deficient" schools. The Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) used the MAP results to determine district academic performance. MSIP teams periodically evaluate districts for classification and accreditation. One of the important components of an MSIP review is student performance (Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 1998).

No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB)

The 2001 NCLB law is one of the broadest mandates to be issued by the federal government to local public schools (Hardy, 2003). NCLB was passed overwhelmingly with support from Republicans and Democrats in Congress. One of the main key facts was accountability. NCLB holds schools and school districts accountable for assessment results. Schools are responsible for making sure each child is learning. NCLB requires

tests to be developed by the state for children to take in grades 3-8 and at least one in high school. These assessments will allow states to compare schools to each other. This act also created adequate yearly progress (AYP) to determine if each school has met state reading and math goals. This information is reported on the school district's report card. By 2014, the goal of NCLB is that all students will be proficient. Supporters of NCLB say this goal may be unrealistic.

NCLB has continued to place pressure on schools (Hardy, 2003). The first year of NCLB, schools were required to show gains for grade levels. The second year schools were required to show improvement in various subgroups: special education students, English-language learners, and also by race and ethnicity. The supporters of NCLB say it is an "excellent opportunity to improve schools" (Hardy, 2003, p. 5) even though the timeline may be unrealistic.

End of Course Tests

The Missouri State Board of Education identified five reasons for replacing the MAP with End of Course (EOC) tests: (a) measuring and reflecting student mastery toward post- secondary education; (b) identifying students' strengths and weaknesses; (c) communicating expectations for all students; (d) serving as the basis of state and national accountability plans; and (e) evaluating programs. The goal of the Commissioner of Education is for Missouri students to rank in the top 10 as measured by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) and other national and international measures of accountability (Missouri State Board of Education, 2009)

In 2007, the Missouri Department of Education hired Riverside Publishing to design, publish, and score end of course tests for Algebra I, Biology, and English II for

the 2008-2009 school years (Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2007). These tests replaced the MAP tests used in grades 10 and 11. End of course tests are designed to measure what students know related to Missouri's Course Level Expectations (CLEs) for these three specific courses. For the 2009-2010 school year, Government was added as a required test. Schools could elect to also test in American History, English I, Geometry, Algebra II (Missouri State Board of Education, 2009).

There are four levels of student performance: below basic, basic, proficient, and advanced. These are the same levels as used on the MAP. Scores were determined by "cut scores" (Missouri State Board of Education, 2009, p. 1). Cut scores are based on what students are expected to know from the Show Me Standards and the CLEs, the frameworks around which the EOCs are built.

Achievement levels were set by using the Angoff method. This method utilized the collective judgment of a panel of experts. The Angoff method is "efficient and straightforward, and yields reasonable, reliable, and replicable standards" (Missouri State Board of Education, 2009, p. 3).

Characteristics of Higher Achieving Schools

Lashway (1995) contended it was evident "high achieving schools have principals who boldly lead the academic program, set goals, examine curriculum, evaluate teachers, and assess results" (p. 1). The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) in Washington has spent a substantial amount of time analyzing research studies to find common characteristics of high performing schools. The OSPI found there were nine characteristics most often found among high performing schools. These nine

characteristics are (a) a clear and shared focus; (b) high standards and expectations for all students; (c) effective school leadership; (d) high levels of collaboration and communication; (e) curriculum, instruction, and assessments aligned with state standards; (f) focused professional development; (g) a supportive learning environment; and (h) high levels of parent and community involvement (Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, 2007).

A clear and shared focus is a vital component to any organization. A school's core purpose should be on student learning. This purpose should include a vision and specific goals and should also involve the school and community. When a school is focused on student learning, it creates a common direction (Shannon, 2007). This common direction also provides an improvement cycle to analyze goals and objectives and to evaluate improvement. School leaders are also able to establish and maintain a focus within the school system (Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, 2007; Shannon, 2007).

Research has found schools that set high standards and expectations for all students are high performing schools. These schools have content standards, performance standards, and expectations in place and used to plan instruction on a daily basis (Taggart & Celio, 2001). Teachers are also taught effective questioning strategies and are fair and equitable in the treatment of students. Teachers are also given the opportunity to collaborate with other teachers to plan common lessons, assessments, and grading student work (Lake, Hill, O'Toole, & Celio, 1999; Reback, 2007; Taggert & Celio, 2001; Shannon, 2007).

Effective school leadership is another characteristic of higher performing schools. The term leadership means administrators, teachers, and others who work in schools

(Shannon, 2007). Effective leadership depends upon relationships and shared goals (Schein, 1992). Relational trust is key for school improvement; it will change attitudes, beliefs, and values about student learning (Mayer, Mullens, & Moore, 2000).

Collaboration and communication is another important characteristic. Effective staff collaboration includes discussing teaching practices, observing other teachers in the classroom, revising curriculum, and teaching each other new instructional strategies. Schools that see the importance of family, community, and school collaboration may be a higher performing school. A school district is also responsible for ensuring two-way regular, clear communication. Building administrators need to listen to the public and create a dialogue. The most important component of collaboration and communication is building a partnership to promote the well being of students.

The alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessments adds coherence and levels the playing field for all students. Effective instruction has greatest influence on student achievement. In order for effective instruction to happen, teachers must participate in the curriculum planning process of knowing the course level expectations, designing the curriculum, and aligning assessments with learning targets and purposes (Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2009). Assessments may include selected response, essay, or performance assessments.

Teachers who frequently monitor learning and teaching are a critical component of high performing schools. To monitor effectively, teachers must continually analyze what they are doing against what the results are (Schmoker, 1996). Teachers are continually monitoring and communicating student learning. This requires teachers to advise students on grading practices in advance, keep students and parents informed of

student achievement, and continually collecting information from students. Administrators should conduct walk-throughs designed to support best practices.

Continual learning is not just for students. A focused professional development program is essential to school success. High standards require teachers to develop deeper knowledge and new skills. Effective professional development should be evaluated in relation to its impact on student learning and improvement of teaching (Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, 2007). Professional development programs should be focused on what students are to learn and should be continuous, on-going, with follow-up and support (Reback, 2007).

A supportive learning environment is recognized by a positive school climate and culture. These schools have reasonable expectations for behavior, consistent and fair application of rules and regulations, and there is a caring, responsive relationship among adults and students. Effective classroom management contributes to positive climate and makes classroom learning possible. Classroom management strategies include teaching and reinforcing positive behavior and skills, appropriate physical layout, specific and clear classroom routines and procedures, and consistent standards across the school.

The last identified characteristic of high performing schools is a high level of family and community involvement. The importance of this characteristic is overwhelming. Education is the shared responsibility of all stakeholders, and family involvement is a key factor in students' improved learning. Schools need to offer multiple ways for stakeholders to participate including two-way communication, promoting and supporting family skills, assisting student learning, and using community resources. "Schools have the responsibility to take the lead and help parents and families to

understand they should be involved, know they are capable of making a contribution, and feel invited by the school and their children" (Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, 2007, p. 2)

Characteristics of Lower Achieving Schools

There is very little literature in regards to characteristics of lower performing schools. Lower performing schools refer to those schools that do not meet the standards establishes by the state board of education (Corallo & McDonald, 2002). Reasons for lower performance can vary from school to school (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991).

Common conditions have been found in schools where student achievement is low (Corallo & McDonald, 2002). Conditions include community poverty and stress on the organization of the school (Puma, Karweit, Price, Ricciutti, Thompson, & Vaden-Kiernan, 1997). The stress is based on low expectations for student achievement, high teacher absenteeism, and high rates of teacher turnover (Corallo & McDonald). The stigma that surrounds designation as a school with low student achievement can also place stress on the school.

Lower performing schools may also have other deficiencies. These deficiencies may include a lack of focus on and the cohesion of the instructional program, isolation of the teaching staff, and a lack of planning focused on improving student achievement (Corallo & McDonald, 2002). Fiscal resources may also be a component for lower performing schools (Holcomb, 1999). Schools must have money to support programs which help students who struggle in the classroom. School leadership may also play a role in lower performing schools (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991). District leaders drive the focus on student achievement and set the expectations that all students will achieve

(Levine & Lezotte, 1995). Without this drive, schools may not meet state expectations. School district administrators, therefore, play a key role in developing school leaders and supporting their work (Elmore, 2000; Wallace, 2008).

<center>*Secondary Schools*</center>

Culture

Secondary schools have a culture unique to their atmosphere and expectations. Secondary school principals work to create a climate of teamwork and openness (Schein, 2000). Cunningham and Gresso (1993) assert that schools as organizations must recognize that their structure, behavior, and performance all flow from the culture of the school. The culture of a school is embedded in the values and assumptions of the school (Schein). Schools are influenced by powerful, external factors such as demographic and economic conditions (Tierney, 1988). Schein (1992) asserted that the true and primary task of the organizational leaders lies in creating, managing, and shaping the organization's culture, and that the distinguishing characteristic of leadership (as opposed to management) is its ability to understand and then work productively with organizational culture.

High schools are known for their culture. Looking around a building, you see symbols of the culture. A symbol is a powerful indicator of organizational life (Rafaeli & Worline, 2000; Wallace, 2008). These organizational symbols are "visible, physical manifestations of organizations and indicators of organizational life" (Rafaeli & Worline, 2000, p. 74). These symbols may include athletic banners, academic trophies, homecoming posters, or FFA competition results. Symbols continue to provide an expression of a shared reality in any secondary school.

Principals must have a full understanding of the organization's culture in order to mold and change the culture of the school (Culver, 2009). Understanding the culture helps administrators better articulate and address the needs for improving student performance (Tierney, 1988). Principals who effectively utilize symbols articulate the school's values and goals and help garner support from staff and students. The existence of an academic culture will help nurture academic excellence and effectiveness (Reback, 2007; Tierney, 1998). Lant and Mezias (1990) hold that "an organizational learning model suggests that the impetus for organizational change is triggered by performance below aspiration level" (p. 432). Any leadership efforts aimed at encouraging continuous school improvement must be aimed primarily at the culture, rather than the structure of the school (Deal & Peterson, 1999).

Achievement Issues

Heck (1993) determined school context and student achievement were important variables of principal leadership. Bamburg and Andrews (1991) studied both higher and lower achieving schools and found principals in higher achieving schools placed greater emphasis on instructional activities. LaPointe and Davis (2006) viewed school leadership as influencing student success through two pathways: first, through the support of effective teachers and second, through the implementation of effective organizational processes. Principals allocate resources to instruction and to the professional development of their teachers making sure their teachers are aware of current research and best practices, and that they are knowledgeable about and actively involved in the school's curriculum (Reback, 2007).

Leadership Issues

Covey (2002) has described four roles of leadership: model, pathfinding, alignment, and empowerment. One of the most important roles of a leader is to model the behavior you want to be followed. Modeling, in the form of a visible personal example, is an important part of servant leadership (Batten, 1997; Covey, 1990; Kouzes & Posner, 1993; Miller 1995; Schein, 1992). Setting an example and continuing to be an example is a characteristic of a true leader. Respect must be earned and leaders who show humility "model the foundation of true leadership" (Covey, 2002, p. 28). The second role of leadership is pathfinding. Pathfinding is the vision role. Leaders must involve all people in forming a mission and values of the organization. The mission will not be operative and powerful if there is no commitment by the people in the organization. Vision unites organizational members and inspires greatness (Miller, 1995). Alignment is the third role of leadership. This role of leadership requires a leader to align all parts of the organization – the vision, mission, and values all have to come together and be integrated into the organization. An organization will not grow until it has institutionalized its values. The alignment component is a critical piece to becoming an effective leader (Covey, 2002). Empowerment is the fourth role of leadership. A leader is able to connect everything together including the common purpose and values. The principal enables the empowerment of teachers through the shaping of a positive school culture (Maher, 2000). The true test of leadership is for a leader to model these four roles of leadership so others around them are empowered to find their own paths and are inspired to help others (Covey, 2002).

Effective Secondary Schools

Principals in effective schools provide support to teachers as they deal with the increasing standards placed upon teachers in the classrooms. School leaders are expected to be more knowledgeable about and more involved in their school's instructional practices than they had been in the past. Blumberg and Greenfield (1980) noted instructional leaders were characterized by goal setting behavior that motivates staff, a high degree of self-confidence, and openness to others. Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan, and Lee (1982) saw the effective principal as one who continually strove to improve the quality of the staff's performance and to improve teacher morale, both of which would have an impact on student achievement. According to Alvy and Robbins (2005), teachers will value leaders who have a focus on student success. It has been asserted that the professional culture of a school is the best predictor of its success (Culver, 2009; Little, 1982; Rosenholtz, 1991; Schein, 1992).

Summary

Schools are unlike any other organization. The demands of a school administrator are extensive. Educational leaders must develop their organizations and create an environment where students succeed. Servant leadership provides a medium to create an environment of staff empowerment and growth.

This literature review provided a historical perspective of the development of leadership as it relates to organizations. The development of ten servant leadership characteristics was provided through an outline of the work of Greenleaf and other distinguished authors. The culture of secondary schools and characteristics of higher and lower achieving schools was also discussed. The literature review regarding servant

47

leadership and its impact on secondary schools is fairly limited. Therefore, the need to study the impact of servant leadership in secondary schools and its impact on student achievement is extremely important as educational leaders seek to provide organizational conditions conducive to educational excellence.

Servant leadership may or may not influence student achievement on end of course tests. Therefore, a study must be completed to determine whether a relationship exists between servant leadership in principals and student achievement.

In Chapter Three, the research questions are stated and samples examined. A discussion of t-tests and the reasons this analysis suited this study is discussed. Chapter Four contains the results of the analysis. Chapter Five includes the discussion of the results and suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Throughout the review of literature, it became evident servant leadership was an important leadership style for educational institutions (Greenleaf, 2002; Herndon, 2007; Taylor, 2007). Despite the growth and support of servant leadership, there is little empirical evidence to maintain its support of academic achievement (Reback, 2009; Taylor, 2007). Though both researchers and leaders have written extensively about the concept of servant leadership, very limited research has been conducted in relation to academic achievement in a systematic, quantitative manner (Black, 2007).

The purpose of this study was develop an understanding of the relationships among secondary school principals servant leadership in higher achieving and lower achieving schools as determined by the end of course testing in Algebra I, Biology, and English II. This study examined the typical servant leadership profile for principals in higher achieving schools and lower achieving schools; the differences in servant leadership for principals in higher achieving schools and lower achieving schools; and the relationship between servant leadership in principals and student achievement.

Through the scientific method, determinations can be made which might add to the body of literature regarding servant leadership and student achievement. The following review of methodology reaffirms the purpose of the study and research questions. Through the examination of methodology rationale, research setting, participants, data collection, instrumentation, and analytic measures, the scientific procedures of the study can be explained.

Problem and Purposes Overview

In hierarchical leadership, the power of a leader was visible and obeyed by those in the organization (Bennis & Goldsmith, 1997; Block, 1993; Senge, 1990; Sergiovanni, 1992). Servant leadership focuses on service and stewardship (Greenleaf, 1977; DePree 1989). The personal values of leaders have very significant effects on leader-follower relationships (Burns 1978; Kouzes & Posner, 1993). Servant leadership provides the promise of an effective educational leadership and management model (Anderson, 2009; Crippen, 2005). Recent studies have found servant leadership to be effective in school leadership (Dennis, 2005; Herndon, 2007; Patterson, 2003).

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between secondary school principals who utilize servant leadership and student achievement as determined by the end of course testing in Algebra I, Biology, and English II. The primary method was quantitative, with survey data being used to determine (a) the typical servant leadership profile of secondary school principals in higher and lower achieving schools; (b) the differences in servant leadership for secondary principals in higher achieving school is compared to lower achieving schools; (c) the teacher perceptions of servant leadership in principals of higher achieving and lower achieving schools.

Research Questions

The following research questions were examined during this study:

1.   What is the typical servant leadership profile for secondary principals in:

    a. higher achieving schools?

    b. lower achieving schools?

2. What are the differences in servant leadership for principals in higher achieving schools and lower achieving schools using the four constructs of the Servant Leadership Assessment Instrument (SLAI)?

    a. Apagao love

    b. Empowerment

    c. Humility

    d. Vision

3. What are the teacher perceptions of servant leadership in principals of higher achieving and lower achieving schools?

    a. Leader's philosophy

    b. Impact of leader on student achievement

Population and Sample

The population was principals in medium sized secondary schools. These schools were identified based on the Missouri State High School Athletic Association (MSHSAA) Class 3 Football District Assignments. The size range for Class 3 is schools ranging from 456 to 759. The National Center for Education website was utilized to download all high schools with grades 9-12. This data were then sorted to include those schools with students ranging from 456 to 859. Once these schools were identified, data for free and reduced lunch percentage, per pupil expenditure, and minority percentage were collected from the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) website. This data were used to identify the outliers.

The school districts that had high or low numbers in free and reduced lunch, per pupil expenditure, and minority percentages were removed from consideration. A MAP composite score was then calculated for the remaining schools. The five schools with the

lowest MAP composite score and the five schools with the highest MAP composite score were identified. Table 1 presents the description of the higher and lower achieving schools.

Table 1

Description of Higher Achieving and Lower Achieving Schools

	Free and Reduced Lunch Percentage	Per Pupil Expenditure	Minority Percentage	MAP Composite Score
Higher Achieving Schools	28.0% - 54.8%	$6,751 - $8,069	1.9% - 7.3%	783.1- 795.7
Lower Achieving Schools	33.8% - 49.3%	$7,609 - $8,832	1.9% - 6.4%	713.1- 742.7

Five higher achieving and five lower achieving schools were included in this survey. Fifteen teachers from each school were surveyed. There were approximately 100 teachers from the higher achieving schools and 100 teachers from the lower achieving schools. A total of 200 teachers from both the lower achieving and higher achieving school were sampled. This is a cluster sample which divides the total population into groups, a random sample of the groups is selected (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003).

Data Collection and Instrumentation

Superintendents from the ten schools selected were contacted and a signed permission form was returned. The signed permission form allowed their high schools to be included in this study. A list of high school teachers and their email addresses were

52

obtained from the superintendent's office at each school district. The survey was then emailed to teachers in these ten high schools, and the teachers completed the Servant Leadership Assessment Instrument (SLAI). The survey was returned to the researcher along with demographic data, an open ended response, and the informed consent form. The survey took approximately 10 minutes to complete. Questionnaires were stored in the researcher's home office and destroyed at the culmination of the study to ensure confidentiality.

The SLAI was utilized as the primary instrument in collecting data. Dennis (2004) created the instrument as a result of studying Patterson's (2003) constructs of servant leadership. The questions focused on four factors of agapao love, vision, empowerment, and humility (Dennis & Bocarnea, 2005). This survey addressed the teacher's perceptions of the principal's leadership style. There are 24 items on the questionnaire; each question includes a likert scale with 6 choices. There are six items that directly relate to each sub-scale. Each factor measures a unique aspect of the servant leadership of the leader (Barbut & Wheeler, 2006). It is the intent that this instrument has the ability to predict or give measurement to the concepts of Patterson's theory of servant leadership so that a servant leader can measure his or her effectiveness as a servant leader (Dennis, 2004; & Dennis & Bocarnea, 2005). The instrument was developed based on servant leadership literature. Items were constructed in collaboration with the jury of experts, a questionnaire was then sent to a pool of participants, and a factor analysis with correlation matrices and scale reliability tests determined which items to keep for each construct.

The SLAI was tested for reliability using PASW version 18 software program (formerly known as SPSS). Both a factor analysis and scale reliability analysis was conducted using oblimin rotation of items (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006; Dennis & Bocarnea, 2005). The loadings were set at (0.70) and were examined for principal components. DeVellis (1991) and Nunnally (1978) suggest a loading value of 0.70 as a lower acceptable boundary for α. A higher α minimizes covariation due to chance. The oblique factor rotation identifies the extent to which each of the factors is correlated (Hair & Anderson, 1998). Face and content validity was built into the test development process, following methods from DeVellis' (1991) scale development guidelines. The criterion related validity and construct related validity were established empirically (Dennis & Bocarnea, 2005).

Demographic information was assessed via five questions ranging from gender to experience. Two open-ended questions were also administered subsequently after the SLAI. The open-ended questions summarized the principal's philosophy of leadership and what they do to create a school where students succeed. This analysis was used in conjunction with the quantitative data to give a greater picture of the results from the study.

Data Analysis

The results of the SLAI were collected and analyzed using PASW version 18 (formerly known as SPSS). The four factors of servant leadership were identified from highest to lowest for the higher achieving schools and lower achieving schools.

Independent samples *t*-tests were completed to determine the relationship between servant leadership for principals in higher achieving schools and lower achieving schools. "The independent *t*-test for independent means is used to compare the mean scores of two

different or independent groups" (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003, p. 241). The groups for this test were the higher achieving schools and the lower achieving schools. The four dependent variables were the four factors of servant leadership: apagao love, empowerment, humility, and vision. An alpha level of .05 will be used for these analyses.

This study utilized a basic qualitative component (Merriam, 1998). The qualitative research included description and interpretation of the teachers in regard to the principals leadership style. An open ended question was administered subsequently after the SLAI. The open ended question summarized the teacher perceptions of servant leadership in principals of higher achieving and lower achieving schools. (See Appendix). Teachers were asked about the secondary principal's leadership style and their perceptions of how the principal dealt with issues in the building. Due to the quantitative predominance of the study, the qualitative assessment will be highlighted as additional data for reflection and as a spring board for future examination. The qualitative research will "elicit understanding and meaning" (Merriam, 1998, p. 11).

Summary

The methods of the study were guided by the research questions and research purpose to discover the relationship between servant leadership and student achievement. In particular the research questions focused on the leadership profile of secondary school principals in higher achieving schools and lower achieving schools.

The SLAI was the focal instrument of the study. Participants were given the SLAI to determine leadership characteristics from the four factors examined by the SLAI. Demographic data were also collected as well as two open-ended questions to provide a

qualitative reflection. The data collected from the SLAI were entered into SPSS for analysis.

  The following chapters of the dissertation are organized to analyze the data in chapter four and draw conclusions from the analysis in chapter five. These chapters offer researchers implications for future investigation. Inferences may be drawn which might contribute to administrative practices in secondary schools.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of the study was to develop an understanding of the relationships between secondary school principals' servant leadership in lower achieving and higher achieving schools and student achievement as determined by the end of course exams in Algebra I, Biology, and English II. Included in this chapter are the findings and a synopsis of the statistical analyses administered to understand the data as it relates to the three essential research questions of the study. In order to understand the constructs of servant leadership (agapao love, empowerment, humility, and vision) on student achievement, independent samples *t*-test were administered (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003).

Demographic and descriptive information is presented to establish the background of the 70 participants. The independent samples t-test was utilized to understand whether the lower achieving schools or higher achieving schools principals utilized servant leadership. The data were entered, processed, and analyzed via PASW version 18 software program (formerly known as SPSS). Finally, through open coding, qualitative data were analyzed for thematic patterns.

Demographic and Descriptive Information

The questions on the demographic section asked teachers about gender, age, highest degree earned, years in education, years at their current building, and primary teaching responsibility. In this section, results of teachers' responses were reviewed to develop a lens of the participants' background through which to view their responses.

The study was comprised of 70 teachers out of the 200 sampled from ten high schools in Missouri, giving the study a return rate of 35%. The higher achieving schools had 42 (60%) participants, 20 (47.6%) were female while 22 (52.4%) were male. The lower achieving school had 28 (40%) participants, 17 (60.7%) were female and 11 (39.4%) were male. Over 64% of the teachers held masters degrees while 30% held bachelors degrees. Displayed in Table 2 is a depiction of the frequency and percentage of the highest degree earned.

Table 2

Descriptives of Highest Degree Earned by Teachers

Variable	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Bachelors	21	30.0	30.0	30.0
Masters	45	64.3	64.3	94.3
Specialist	2	2.9	2.9	97.1
Doctorate	2	2.9	2.9	100.0

Note. N = 70.

The teachers were also asked about their primary teaching responsibility. Teachers in core areas (language arts, math, social studies, and science) comprised 67% of the respondents. The remaining 33% of teachers were in practical arts, fine arts, or other areas. Table 3 displays the frequency and percentage of the primary teaching responsibilities.

Table 3

Descriptives of the Primary Teaching Responsibility

Variable	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Core Area	47	67.1	67.1	67.1
Practical Arts	8	11.4	11.4	78.6
Fine Arts	2	2.9	2.9	81.4
Other	13	18.6	18.6	100.0

Note. N = 70.

Represented in Table 4 are data that details the various ages and experiences held by the teachers. The range of teaching experience was 33 years. The youngest teacher to complete the survey was 25 years. The maximum number of years in education was 35 years and the maximum years in their current school was 28 years. The mean score for teachers' years in current building was 8.76 with a standard deviation o f 6.751.

Table 4

Teachers Age and Experience in Education and Current Building

	Minimum	Maximum	*M*	*SD*
Age of Teacher	25	59	41.56	8.18
Years in Education	2	35	14.86	7.37
Years at Current School	2	28	8.76	6.75

Note. N = 70.

The following organized data relate to the three research questions that have guided the study. Question one focused on the servant leadership profile for secondary school principals in lower and higher achieving schools. Question two centered on the differences in servant leadership for principals in lower achieving and higher achieving schools using the four constructs of the Servant Leadership Assessment Instrument (SLAI). Question three was designed to gather qualitative information about the teachers' perceptions of principal's leadership philosophy and impact of principal on student achievement.

Research Question One (Servant Leadership Profile)

In order to analyze the leadership profile of secondary school principals the means were compared for the four constructs (apagao love, empowerment, humility, and vision) of the SLAI. The first analysis looked at the lower achieving school separately from the higher achieving schools. The mean indicates the center of the distribution of scores (Fields, 2005). The SLAI had a scoring range of one to six with one being zero agreement and six the maximum amount possible. There were 24 questions pertaining to servant leadership; each construct had six questions. The four constructs of the SLAI are apagao love, empowerment, humility, and vision. In order to understand the servant leadership profile of the lower achieving and higher achieving schools the means of each construct were compiled.

Lower achieving schools. The lower achieving schools had means ranging from 3.06 to 4.04. This range is based on the scale of one to six. A one represented zero agreement, two represents strongly disagree, three represented disagree, four represented

agreement, five represented strongly agree, and six represented the maximum amount possible. The highest construct for leaders from the lower achieving schools was empowerment (Mean=4.04; s.d.=1.25). Empowerment is the degree to which the principal empowers others. This includes words of encouragement, positive emotional support, and allowing for employee self direction. The second highest construct for leaders from the lower achieving schools was apagao love (Mean=3.76; s.d.=1.44). A leader who demonstrates apagao love exhibits love in a social and moral sense. The leader is forgiving, teachable, shows concern for others, honors people, has a genuine interest in others, and has integrity. The third highest construct for leaders from the lower achieving schools was humility (Mean=3.60; s.d.=1.52). A leader who shows humility is not interested in self glorification, does not center attention on his or her accomplishments, and has a humble demeanor. For principals from low achieving schools the construct with the lowest mean was vision (Mean=3.06; s.d.=1.28). Based on the mean score these leaders do not incorporate the participation of all involved players, encourage participation in creating a shared vision, or seeks others' vision for the organization (Dennis, 2004).

Higher achieving schools. The higher achieving schools had a mean ranging from 4.16 to 4.34. The range is based on Likert scale of one to six. A one represented zero agreement, two represents strongly disagree, three represented disagree, four represented agreement, five represented strongly agree, and six represented the maximum amount possible. The highest construct for leaders for principals from higher achieving schools was humility (Mean=4.34; s.d.=1.16), followed by empowerment (Mean=4.32; s.d.=1.14), apagao love (Mean=4.24; s.d.=1.15), and lowest mean was vision

(Mean=4.16; s.d.=1.00). All 42 participants answered the questions regarding apagao love and humility. Only 38 of the participants answered the questions regarding empowerment and 37 participants answered the questions about vision. The participants at higher achieving schools indicated their principals had qualities of a servant leader based on the higher mean scores. This is represented by the mean scores of the SLAI were above four and in the range of overall agreement to the items.

Profile summary. The order of the constructs for principals from lower achieving and higher achieving schools are completely different except for the lowest score. Leaders from lower achieving and higher achieving schools had vision as their lowest construct. The other three constructs are rated in different orders in the two groups. Higher achieving schools rated their principals highest in humility. A leader who shows humility is not interested in self glorification, does not center attention on his or her accomplishments, and has a humble demeanor. The second highest score for principals from higher achieving schools was empowerment. Empowerment is the degree to which the principal empowers others. This includes words of encouragement, positive emotional support, and allowing for employee self direction. The third construct for leaders from the higher achieving schools was apagao love. A leader who demonstrates apagao love exhibits love in a social and moral sense. The leader is forgiving, teachable, shows concern for others, honors people, has a genuine interest in others, and has integrity. The lowest construct for principals from higher achieving schools was vision. A leader with vision incorporates the participation of all involved players, encourages participation in creating a shared vision, and seeks others' vision for the organization. The lower achieving schools participants rated their principals highest in empowerment, second

apagao love, third humility, and the last construct was vision. Table 5 provides the mean

score, number of participants, and the standard deviation of each score.

Table 5

Servant Leadership Profile

Higher or Lower Achieving		Apagao Love	Empowerment	Humility	Vision
Lower Achieving School	*M*	3.76	4.04	3.60	3.06
	SD	1.44	1.25	1.52	1.28
	N	27	27	26	23
Higher Achieving School	M	4.24	4.32	4.34	4.16
	SD	1.15	1.14	1.16	1.01
	N	42	38	42	37

Note. Scale based on 1=zero agreement, 2=strongly disagree, 3=disagree, 4=agreement, 5=strongly agree, 6=maximum agreement

Research Question Two (Differences in Servant Leadership)

The second research question examined the differences in servant leadership for

principals in lower achieving schools and higher achieving schools using the four

constructs of the SLAI (apagao love, empowerment, humility, and vision). Independent *t*-

tests were used as the analyses which establish whether two means collected from

independent samples differ significantly (Field, 2005). The Levene's Test for Equality of

Variances showed that the assumption of equal variances for these analyses is valid. This

was determined by the significant level ($p>.05$) for all four constructs on the Levene's

test.

On average, teachers responded that principals at higher achieving schools had

visibly greater apagao love ($M = 4.24$, $SE = .17$) than principals at lower achieving

schools ($M = 3.76$, $SE = .27$). This difference was not statistically significant ($t(67) =$

-1.52, $p = .13$). Principals at higher achieving schools were described as utilizing a

noticeably greater amount of empowerment ($M = 4.32$, $SE = .18$) than principals at lower

achieving schools ($M = 4.04$, $SE = .24$). This difference was not statistically significant

($t(63) = -0.95$, $p = .34$). Teachers reported principals at higher achieving schools utilized

humility ($M = 4.34$, $SE = .17$) greater than principals at lower achieving schools ($M =$

3.60, $SE = .29$). This difference was statistically significant ($t(66) = -2.24$, $p = .02$). The

last construct analyzed was vision. Principals were found to have greater vision at higher

achieving schools ($M = 4.10$, $SE = .16$) than principals at lower achieving schools ($M =$

3.06, $SE = .26$). This difference was statistically significant ($t(58) = -3.69$, $p = .001$).

Table 6 includes the mean and standard error mean for the lower achieving schools and

higher achieving schools in each construct.

The independent sample *t*-tests show there was a significant difference in how

teachers perceived the principals at the higher achieving schools in regards to humility

and vision. Principals at higher achieving schools put a greater emphasis on being a

humble leader. Teachers at higher achieving schools perceive their principals as working

hard to create a shared vision in their schools.

Research Question Three (Leaders Philosophy and Impact on Student Achievement)

Qualitative data were gathered from two open ended questions about participants'

personal feelings of their principal's philosophy of leadership and the impact of their

leader on student achievement. Of the 70 participants, 45 (64.3%) teachers answered the

open ended questions, 27 (60%) were from higher achieving schools, and 18 (40%) were

from lower achieving schools. A common thread among the higher achieving schools is

the participation in Professional Learning Communities (PLC). Teachers from twelve

schools who responded to the open ended questions specifically stated they were a PLC

school. The ideas were categorized based on commonality and patterns between other

participants' responses. The data were then reassembled and divided into the following

thematic perspectives of leadership philosophy and impact on student achievement:

higher achieving schools used shared decision making and principal behavior and

attitude; the lower achieving schools had different comments regarding philosophy and

impact on student achievement.

Table 6

Means and Standard Error Means for SLAI Constructs

	Lower or Higher Achieving High School	*N*	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Apagao Love	Lower Achieving School	27	3.76	1.44	.27
	Higher Achieving School	42	4.24	1.15	.17
Empowerment	Lower Achieving School	27	4.04	1.25	.24
	Higher Achieving School	38	4.32	1.14	.18
Humility*	Lower Achieving School	26	3.60	1.52	.29
	Higher Achieving School	42	4.34	1.16	.17
Vision*	Lower Achieving School	23	3.06	1.28	.26
	Higher Achieving School	37	4.16	1.00	.16

Note: *Indicates significant difference at .05. Scale based on 1=zero agreement, 2=strongly disagree, 3=disagree, 4=agreement, 5=strongly agree, 6=maximum agreement

Higher Achieving Schools

The answer to the open ended questions provided important insight into the principals at the higher achieving schools. The participants discussed the importance of shared decision making and the compassion and positive attitude of the principal. There was overwhelming support that principals in higher achieving schools valued and included the input of teachers in decision making. Principals were also found to be compassionate and portrayed a positive attitude in regards to students and school personnel.

Shared decision making. A common pattern to participant responses from the higher achieving schools was an acknowledgement of shared decision making. Of the 27 teachers responding to the open ended questions, 16 respondents included shared decision making as a philosophy of their principal. One teacher wrote, "He wants all teachers to have a vested role in decisions." When considering shared decision making, the idea of teacher input was apparent. For example, a teacher wrote, "She is very open and gives teachers a chance to provide a lot of input on decision making." Another teacher described shared decision making as "our teachers discuss issues, formulate solutions to problems, and work collaboratively." The general feedback centered on input and collaboration. One teacher wrote, "He includes others in decision making whenever possible." Other teachers mentioned leadership is a shared responsibility.

Principal compassion and positive attitude. Twelve participants in the higher achieving schools responded the principal's behavior and attitude had a positive effect on student achievement. In particular, the principal has the ability to lead by example and with compassion. One teacher stated, "She is genuinely concerned about me and the

students in our building." Another aspect of a positive environment included "teachers should be educated and informed to make decisions so that we are modeling for our students good leadership qualities." A teacher responded, "My principal has a good heart and is willing to listen." Student achievement is affected by the principal's leadership ability. One teacher stated, "My principal encourages students' academic and athletic/extracurricular achievements." A common thread found in the higher achieving schools were "the principal talks a lot with the students and enjoys their presence; he is truly interested and generally attends their activities."

Lower Achieving Schools

The teachers who answered the open ended questions provided a better understanding of the lower achieving schools principals' philosophy and how they promote student achievement. Teachers discussed teacher autonomy, how principals asked for teacher input but made their own decisions, but yet they also saw their principal as positive and supportive. Teachers at higher achieving schools also found their principals to be positive and supportive.

Teacher autonomy. The respondents from the lower achieving schools discussed the freedom and teacher autonomy in the schools. One teacher stated, "As long as things are going smoothly, a near-total freedom is permitted." Another teacher responded, "He trusts his employees to perform their jobs and gives them control." Of the 18 participants who answered the open ended questions, 7 mentioned having almost complete freedom to run their classrooms as they wanted. For example, one teacher wrote, "Just keep your head down, don't do anything that creates a fuss and nothing else really matters."

Teacher input but principal decisions. Teachers from the lower achieving schools commented on the principals wanting input from the teachers. The common theme was "he does what he planned in the first place." Eight teachers had similar comments regarding the decision making progress. One teacher stated, "He definitely will take over if he sees a problem." Another teacher stated, "She believes that leadership comes from the top down. We do what is told and should not question decisions." Another response stated, "She will ask for staff input on most all issues but will take responsibility and make necessary decisions for school improvement."

Positive and supportive. The responses from the questions concerning student achievement had a different tone than those regarding the philosophy of the leader. When the teachers were asked about the principal's philosophy, they had a more negative response. These responses concerning student achievement were mainly positive and supportive of the leader. One teacher stated, "He truly cares enough about them to want them to succeed." Another teacher wrote, "He encourages teachers; he likes to be proactive instead of reactive." Several responses pointed the importance of training and professional development for teachers. A teacher stated, "My principal creates a school where students can succeed by ensuring that quality teachers are in the classrooms and are accountable for their duties." Another teacher wrote, "There is a focus on Positive Behavior Support at our school to create a good environment for learning."

Summary

The purpose of the study was to develop an understanding of the relationships between secondary school principals' servant leadership in lower achieving and higher achieving schools and student achievement as determined by the end of course exams in

Algebra I, Biology, and English II. Servant leadership was analyzed using the four constructs of the SLAI (apagao love, empowerment, humility, and vision).

The analysis began with an examination of demographic and descriptive information. The data were analyzed by comparing means of lower achieving schools and higher achieving schools to the four constructs of the SLAI (apagao love, empowerment, humility, and vision). The lower achieving schools means ranged from highest to lowest: empowerment, apagao love, humility, and vision. The higher achieving schools means ranged from highest to lowest: humility, empowerment, apagao love, and vision. Both the lower achieving schools and higher achieving schools ranked vision as the lowest construct in their principals.

The results of the study found that of all of the constructs two had a difference that was significant. The independent sample *t*-test shows there is a significant difference in principals at the higher achieving schools in regards to humility and vision. The leaders at the higher achieving schools were rated significantly higher than the leaders at the lower achieving schools. Humility can be seen in leaders who are not interested in self glorification, do not center attention on his or her accomplishments, and have a humble demeanor. Vision incorporates the participation of all involved players, encourages participation in creating a shared vision, and seeks others' vision for the organization.

Statistical analyses of the data and findings of the study were presented in this chapter. Possible reasons for the results are discussed in Chapter Five. In addition, conclusions, implications, and recommendations for further study are found in the final chapter.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

School leaders are faced with more demands and higher expectations than ever before (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004). Successful leadership includes not only daily administrative duties but also impacting student learning. Leaders must be able to develop people to take on leadership roles which require the school leader to articulate a vision and create high performance standards (Covey, 2002; Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Walstrom, 2004, Taylor, 2007). Servant leadership has been described as building a sense of community and sharing the power in decision making (Spears, 2002). Leadership begins from within (Bender, 1997). In servant leadership, this means a fundamental commitment to serving others with integrity and humility.

By examining the four constructs of servant leadership (apagao love, empowerment, humility, and vision) in both the principals of lower achieving and higher achieving school, insight was gained that could relate to other school districts. The purpose of the study was to develop an understanding of the relationships between secondary school principals' servant leadership in lower achieving and higher achieving schools and student achievement as determined by the end of course exams in Algebra I, Biology, and English II. Patterson's (2003) constructs of servant leadership were used as the test variables. The study's design allowed for investigating predictive qualities of principals' leadership style on student achievement determined by the end of course exams in Algebra I, Biology, and English II at the high school level.

Summary of Findings

The sample of the study was obtained from high schools with a student population of 456-759. A MAP composite score was calculated for all schools and those with high or low numbers in free and reduced lunch, per pupil expenditure, and minority percentages were removed from consideration. The five higher performing schools and the five lower performing schools were included in this study. Of the ten schools, 200 teachers were sampled, 70 teachers participated in the study, giving a return rate of 35%. These teachers varied in age, gender, and experience. Participants were asked to complete the Servant Leadership Assessment Instrument (SLAI), demographic information, and two open ended questions.

The data were gathered and analyzed through independent samples *t*-tests (Field, 2005). Demographics and descriptive statistics were also reviewed. The qualitative information was open-coded to develop emergent themes to provide description about the principal's philosophy of leadership and what they do to create a school where student succeed (Merriam, 1998).

Findings demonstrated the two constructs humility and vision have a significant difference in principals between the higher and lower achieving schools. Principals at higher achieving schools put a greater emphasis on being humble leaders. Leaders who show humility are able to acknowledge their mistakes, imperfections, gaps in knowledge, and limitations. These principals also encourage participation in creating a shared vision. The school with a shared vision inevitably uses teamwork to accomplish tasks.

Qualitative results illustrated additional information to analyze the principal's philosophy of leadership and impact on student achievement. Shared decision making

and principal compassion and positive attitude emerged as the reoccurring pattern to the open ended questions for teachers at higher achieving schools. The principal wants "all teachers to have a vested role in decisions." A common thread among the higher achieving schools was the participation in Professional Learning Communities (PLC). The lower achieving schools had different themes emerge. Two of the themes had a more negative response. These were teacher autonomy and teacher input but principal decisions. The qualitative findings supported the survey findings especially in the area of empowerment. The teachers reported they were given freedom and autonomy in their classrooms, and this directly relates to the highest mean score on the SLAI which was empowerment. The last theme to emerge with the lower achieving schools was the positive and supportive principals in relation to student achievement. The first two themes to emerge from the lower achieving schools were negative and not supportive of the principals. In regards to student achievement, the teachers at the lower achieving schools found the principals positive and supportive.

Discussion

The results provided fascinating and to some degree unexpected findings. The profile summary reported both the lower achieving and higher achieving schools scored the vision of their principal as the lowest construct of the SLAI. The other three constructs are rated in different orders in the two groups. The higher achieving schools rated humility the highest, and the lower achieving schools rated empowerment as their highest construct. These results demonstrated the need for principals at all level to spend more time creating and implementing a shared vision in the school (Senge, 1990).

72

The independent sample *t*-test shows there was a significant difference in principals at the higher achieving schools in regards to humility and vision. The principals at higher achieving schools put a greater emphasis on being a humble leader. These principals also encourage participation in creating a shared vision.

The results of the study imply there is a difference in principals' leadership style at lower achieving and higher achieving schools. The independent sample *t*-test showed a significant difference in the areas of humility and vision between the higher achieving and lower achieving schools principals. Servant leadership signifies those leaders who have the natural feeling to serve, do serve first (Greenleaf, 2002). Covey (2002b) described servant leaders as the most humble, most reverent, the most open, the most teachable, the most respectful, the most caring, and the most determined. There was a relationship between these two factors, humility and achievement in that the higher achieving schools had leaders whose teachers rated them as more humble. The findings from the study suggest the principals who utilize qualities found in servant leadership have higher student achievement in their schools.

Finally, the open ended responses yielded an alternative way to draw understanding from the data. A common thread among the higher achieving schools was the participation in Professional Learning Communities (PLC). A reoccurring trend in the higher achieving schools was the shared decision making and the principal's behavior and attitude in regards to philosophy of leadership and impact on student achievement. The lower achieving schools stated teacher autonomy was prevalent in their schools. From the SLAI, the highest construct for lower achieving schools was empowerment. Empowerment is the degree to which the principal empowers others in the classroom and

in the school (Dennis, 2004; Patterson, 2003). Teacher responses to the survey agreed with the open ended questions stating they were given freedom in their classrooms. Another theme to emerge was the principal encouraged teacher input but still made the decision he wanted. The last part of the qualitative data concerning the lower achieving schools was supportive of the servant leadership constructs. Teachers responded how principals cared for their students and staff.

Implications

Several implications for future practice can be drawn from this research. First, preparation programs for administrators should include instruction and practice of building a shared vision within a school. Vision unites and inspires organizational members (Miller, 1995). A leader should be able to connect everything including the purpose and values of the organization. The SLAI reported the deficiency in the ability to create a shared vision in both the lower achieving and higher achieving schools. Principal preparation programs would both enhance their program and better prepare future leaders if they spent time in the vision process. Leader preparation programs also need to include the importance of humility and being a humble leader. Page and Wong (2000) stated people and process are always more important than tasks. Leaders who learn the importance of humility and model these behaviors will show a characteristic of a true leader.

Secondly, school districts need to provide professional development opportunities for principals and administrators in the area of creating a shared vision. Organizations which provide professional development must be realistic, hands-on learning

opportunities for administrators. If the time away from the building is not valued as time well spent, the administrator will not be able to implement a vision in their schools.

Finally, the effects of national and state mandates provide a challenging atmosphere for building administrators. NCLB hold schools and school districts accountable for assessment results. This act also created adequate yearly progress (AYP) to determine if each school has met state reading and math goals. The act stated by 2014 all students will be proficient. The State of Missouri implemented End of Course (EOC) tests in Algebra I, Biology, and English II during the 2008-2009 school year. These three mandates put continual pressure on building administrators. AYP results for 2009 indicated the five lower achieving schools did not meet AYP and four of the five higher achieving schools did meet AYP. This study may be useful for schools boards and superintendents as they screen for secondary principal candidates. These school districts could develop hiring practices that screen for leadership style tendencies, in particular servant leadership qualities.

Recommendations for Further Study

The completion of the study allows for an examination of ways to proceed with future research. The data presented in this research were elicited from teachers in regards to their building level administrators. A design utilizing a complete assessment of the principal would provide more information to the leadership style beyond the SLAI. By involving teachers, administrators, board members, and parents/community members, a greater representation of the school leader may be attained.

Another recommendation for further research could include the study of transformational leadership and servant leadership. Transformational leadership has

similar characteristics and components of servant leadership. A transformational leader inspires others to look beyond self-interest and focus on organizational goals (Copland, 2003). Transformational leadership includes inspirational motivation because it includes relating an appealing vision to follower values and ideals (Yukl, 2002). This research would also provide another explanation of leadership and student achievement by utilizing a different instrument. By increasing the sample demographic and size, a greater representation could be utilized.

This study only focused on servant leadership and student achievement based on the MAP index score. Another beneficial area of research would be to study the importance of both servant leadership and instructional leadership. Leadership is second to classroom instruction among all school related factors that contribute to what students learn at school (Leithwood, Seashore-Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004). The importance of strong instructional leaders is a vital component to increasing student test scores.

Moreover, some researchers could benefit from qualitatively studying the culture of schools. The open ended questions provide insightful feedback relating to the culture of the building. An in-depth look into culture in a school with a servant leader and school without a servant leader could provide specific characteristics that could benefit other districts. Understanding culture helps administrators address the needs for improving student achievement (Tierney, 1988). The research could offer thick and rich descriptions of servant leadership that relate to Patterson's (2003) constructs of servant leadership. Certainly, more research is needed in the area of servant leadership in lower achieving and higher achieving schools.

Finally, a deeper look at the vision of a school and student achievement would provide a greater understanding of the impact a vision had on student performance. Teachers will value leaders who focus on student success (Alvy & Robbins, 2005). Leaders need to focus attention on building a shared vision within the school (Covey, 2002). The results of this study showed vision as a lower priority than the other three constructs of the SLAI. An important issue in this recommendation is looking at how working together on a shared vision as a staff would increase student achievement.

This study demonstrated how components of servant leadership may impact student achievement. From this study, recommendations for further study became apparent. A study of transformational leadership and student achievement would provide a different look at leadership styles. Another area of research to be considered is the importance of servant leadership and instructional leadership on student achievement. The qualitative component to this study brought about the question of culture in both lower achieving and higher achieving schools. This research could provide an understanding of the impact of culture on student achievement. The last area of research to be recommended is to study how a shared vision would increase student achievement.

Additional recommendations include researching the demographics of the principals of the higher achieving and lower achieving schools and the demographics of the teachers who responded to the survey. This study did not survey the principals of the higher achieving and lower achieving schools. The demographics, specifically number of years in education, number of years in administration, and where they received their administration degree would provide additional insight into the principal's leadership

style. Comparing the demographics of the teachers from the higher achieving and lower

achieving schools would provide additional support to the research.

REFERENCES

Anderson, J. A. (2009). When a servant leader comes knocking. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 30*(1), 4-15.

Autry, J. (2001). *The servant leader: How to build a creative team, develop great morale, and improve bottom line performance.* Roseville, CA: Prima.

Baggett, B. (1997). *Power serve: 236 inspiring ideas on servant leadership.* Germantown, TN: Saltillo.

Bamburg, J. D., & Andrews, R. L. (1991). School goals, principals, and achievement. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 2*(3), 175-191.

Barbuto, J. E., & Wheeler, D. W. (2006). Scale development and construct clarification of servant leadership. *Group and Organization Management, 31*(3), 300-326.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations.* New York: Harper.

Bass, B. M. (1996). *A new paradigm of leadership: An inquiry into transformational leadership.* Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for Behavioral and Social Sciences.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990). Developing transformational leadership: 1992 and beyond. *Journal of European Industrial Training, 14,* 21-27.

Batten, J. (1997). Servant leadership: A passion to serve. In L. C. Spears (Eds.), *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant leadership* (pp.38-53). New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Beck, L., & Murphy, J. (1993). *Understanding the principalship: Metaphorical themes 1920s-1990s.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Bender, P. (1997). *Leadership from within.* Toronto: Stoddart.

Bennis, W. (1989). *On becoming a leader.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Bennis, W. (1997). *Managing people is like herding cats*. Provo, UT: Executive

    Excellence.

Bennis, W. (1999). Five competencies of new leaders. *Executive Excellence*, *16*(7), 4–5.

Bennis, W. (2002). Become a tomorrow leader. In L. C. Spears (Ed.), *Focus on*

    leadership: Servant leadership for the 21st century (pp. 101-110)*.* New York, NY:

    Wiley.

Bennis, W., & Goldsmith, J. (1997). *Learning to lead*. Reading, MA: Perseus Books.

Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1997). *Leaders strategies for taking charge.* New York:

    HarperCollins.

Benismon, E. M., Neumann, A., & Birnbaum, R. (1989). Making sense of administrative

    leadership: The L word in higher education. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education*

    Report.

Black, G. L. (2007). *A correlational analysis of servant leadership and school climate*.

    Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Phoenix.

Blanchard, K. (1997). Servant leadership revisited. In L. C. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on*

    leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant leadership (pp. 21-37). New

    York: John Wiley and Sons.

Block, P. (1987). *The empowered manager: Positive political skills at work.* San

    Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Block, P. (1993). *Stewardship: Choosing service over self-interest*. San Francisco:

    Jossey-Bass.

Blumberg, A., & Greenfield, W. D. (1980). *The effective principal: Perspectives on school leadership.* Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1997). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bossert, S., Dwyer, D., Rowan, B., & Lee, G. (1982). The instructional management role of the principal. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 18*, 34-64.

Bowman, M. A. (1997). Popular approaches to leadership. In P.G. Northhouse (Ed.) *Leadership theory and practice* (pp. 239-260). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Brunner, C. C., & Schumaker, P. (1998). Power and gender in the "new view" public schools. *Policy Studies Journal*, 26(1), 30-45.

Buchen, I. H. (1998). Servant leadership: A model for future faculty and future institutions. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 5*, 125.

Buchen, I. H. (2002). The discipline and ritual of forecasting: Greenleaf's vision. *Foresight, 4*(2), 4-6.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.

Cassel, J., & Holt, T. (2008). The servant leader: Mature and thoughtful board members work for the common good not for individual gain. *American School Board Journal, 195*(10), 34-35.

Ciulla, J. (1998). *Ethics: The heart of leadership.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Conley, D. T., & Goldman, P. (1994). *Facilitative leadership: How principals lead without dominating.* Eugene, Oregon: Oregon School Study Council.

Contee-Borders, A. K. (2003). A case study defining servant leadership in the workplace. *Dissertation Abstracts International.* (UMI No. 3069348).

Copland, M. A. (2003). Leadership of inquiry: Building and sustaining capacity for school improvement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*. *25*(4), 375-395.

Corallo, C. C., & McDonald, D. H. (2002). *What works with low performing schools: A review of research*. Charleston, WV: AEL.

Covey, S. R. (1990). *The seven habits of highly effective people*. New York: Fireside.

Covey, S. R. (1991). *Principle centered leadership*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Covey, S. R. (1998). Servant leadership from the inside out. In L. Spears, ed. *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, and servant leadership* (pp. xi-xvii). New York, NY: John Wiley.

Covey, S. R. (2002a). Servant leadership and community leadership in the twenty-first century. In L. Spears, (Eds). *Focus on leadership: Servant Leadership for the 21st century*. (pp. 27-34), New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Covey, S. R. (2002b). Foreward. In. R. Greenleaf, (Eds). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. (pp. 1-13). New York: Paulist.

Crippen, C. (2005). Servant-leadership as an effective model for educational leadership and management: First to serve, then to lead. *Management in Education, 11*(6), 18.

Crom, M. (1998). The leader as servant. *Training, 35*(7), 6-10.

Culver, M. K. (2009). *Applying servant leadership in today's schools*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

Cunningham, W. G., & Gresson, D. W. (1993). *Cultural leadership: The culture of excellence in education*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Davis, J. R. (2003). Leadership and administration: Building practical definitions.

Learning to lead: A handbook for postsecondary administrators. Westport, CT:

American Council on Education and Praeger.

Deal, T. E., & Peterson, K. D. (1999). *Shaping school culture: The heart of leadership.*

San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Dennis, R. S. (2004). Development of the servant leadership assessment instrument.

Dissertation Abstracts International, 65(05), 1857. (UMI No. 3133544).

Dennis, R. S., & Bocarnea, M. (2005). Development of the servant leadership assessment

instrument. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 26*(8), 600-615.

DePree, M. (1989). *Leadership is an art*. New York: Dell Publishing Group.

DePreee, M. (1992). *Leadership jazz.* New York: Dell Publishing Group.

DePress, M. (1997). *Leading without power: Finding hope in serving community.* San

Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

DePree, M. (2002). Servant leadership: Three things necessary. In L. C. Spears (Ed.),

Focus on leadership: Servant leadership for the 21st century (pp. 89-100). New

York, NY: Wiley.

DeVellis, R. (1991). *Scale development: Theory and applications*. London: Sage

Publications.

Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2002). Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and

implications for research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(4), 611-

628.

Elmore, R. F. (2000). *Building a new structure for school leadership*. Washington, D.C.:

The Albert Shanker Institute.

Elshtain, J. (1990). *Power trips and other journeys: Essays in feminism as civic discourse*. Madison: University of Wisconsin.

Fields, A. (2005). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Finn, C. (1987). How to spot an effective principal. *Principal,* 20.

Fowler, F. C. (2004). *Policy studies for educational leaders: An introduction.* Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Pearson Education.

Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2003). *How to design and evaluate research in education.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Freeman, T. L., Isaksen, S. G., & Dorval, K. B. (2002). Servant-leadership and creativity. In L. C. Spears (Eds). *Focus on leadership: Servant leadership for the twenty-first century.* (pp. 257-268). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Frick, D., & Spears, L. (1996). *The private writings of Robert K. Greenleaf: On becoming a servant leader*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fullan, M. (2003). *The moral imperative of school leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Fullan, M., & Stiegelbauer, S. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Furman, G. (2003). The 2002 UCEA Presidential Address. *UCEA Review, XLV* (1), (1-6).

Gardiner, J. (1998). Quiet presence: The holy ground of leadership. In L. Spears (Ed.). *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant-leadership* (pp. 116-125). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Gardner, J. (1990). The nature of leadership. In Gardner, J. (Ed.). *On leadership.* New York: The Free Press.

Greenleaf, R. (1977). *The institution as servant*. Indianapolis: The Robert K. Greenleaf Center.

Greenleaf, R. (1991). *The servant as leader*. Indianapolis: The Robert K. Greenleaf Center.

Greenleaf, R. (2002). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness* (25th ed.). Mahway, NJ: Paulist.

Greenslade, P. (1984). *Leadership, greatness, and servanthood.* Minneapolis: Bethany House.

Grizzell, B. C. (2008). Institutional servant leadership: A catalyst for urban community sustainability. *Academic Leadership*, *6*(2), 5.

Grogan, M. (2003, July). *Ethical leadership.* Presented at the University of Missouri, Columbia, MO.

Habecker, E. (1990). *Leading with a follower's heart.* Wheaton, IL: Scripture.

Hair, J., & Anderson, R.E. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hallinger, P. (1992). The evolving role of American principals: From managerial to instructional to transformational leaders. *Journal of Education Administration, 30*(3), 35-48.

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. (1996). Reassessing the principal's role in school effectiveness: A review of empirical research, 1980–1995. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *32*(1), 5–44.

Hallinger, P., & R. Heck. (1998). Exploring the principal's contribution to school

    effectiveness: 1980-1995. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, *9*, 157-

    191.

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. (1999). Can leadership enhance school effectiveness? In Bush

    et al. (Eds.) *Educational management: Redefining theory, policy and practice,*

    (pp. 178-190). London: Paul Chapman.

Hardy, L. (2003). No child left behind? Show me the money! *American School Boards*

    Journal, 190, 29-32.

Heck, R. H. (1993). School context, principal leadership, and achievement: The case

    study of secondary schools in Singapore. *The Urban Review, 25*(2), 151-166

Heck, R. H., Larsen, T. J., & Marcoulides, G. A. (1990). Instructional leadership and

    school achievement: Validation of a causal model. *Educational Administration*

    Quarterly, 26, 94-125.

Heck, R., & Marcoulides, G. (1993). Organizational culture and performance: proposing

    and testing a model. *Organizational Science*, *4(*3), 68-74.

Heifetz, R. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers.* Cambridge and London: The

    Belknap Press of Harvard University.

Herndon, B. C. (2007). An analysis of the relationships between servant leadership,

    school culture, and student achievement. *Dissertation Abstracts International,*

    69(07). (UMI No. 3322701)

Hesselbein, F., Goldsmith, M., Beckhard, R., & Schubert, R. (1998). *The community for*

    the future. New York: The Peter K. Drucker Foundation.

Hickman, G. (1998). *Leading organizations: Perspectives for a new era*. London: Sage

    Publications.

Hildebrand, H. P. (1990). *The model of servant leadership*. Burlington: Welch.

Holcomb, E. L. (1999). *Getting excited about data: Combining people, passion, and

    proof*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Hoy, W.K., & Miskel, C.G. (2001). *Educational Administration: Theory, Research, and

    Practice* (6th Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Joseph, E. E., & Winston, B. E. (2005). A correlation of servant leadership, leader trust,

    and organizational trust. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal,

    26(1/2)*, 6- 22.

Katzenbach, J. R., & Smith, D. K. (1993). *The wisdom of teams: Creating the high

    performance organization.* Boston: Harvard Business School.

Kezar, A. (2000). Pluralistic leadership: Incorporating diverse voices. *Journal of Higher

    Education, 71*(6), 722-743.

Kotter, J. P. (1990). *A force for change: How leadership differs from management.* New

    York: The Free Press.

Kouzes, J. M. (1998). Finding your voice. In L. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on leadership:

    Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant leadership* (pp. 322-325). New York,

    NY: John Wiley.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1993). *Credibility: How leaders gain and lose it, why

    people demand it*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2002). Five practices of leadership. In *Leadership

    challenge,* (pp. 2-39). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Lake, R., Hill, P., O'Toole, L., & Celio, M. B. (1999). *Making standards work: Active voices, focused learning.* Seattle, WA: Center on Reinventing Public Education.

Lant, T., & Mezias, S. (1990). Managing discontinuous change: A simulation study of organizational learning and entrepreneurial strategies. *Strategic Management Journal*, *11,* 147-149.

LaPointe, M., & Davis, S. H. (2006). Effective schools require effective principals. *Leadership, 36*(1), 16-19.

Lashway, L. (1995). *Can instructional leaders be facilitative leaders?* Clearing House on Educational Management, College of Education, University of Oregon. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED381893)

Leithwood, K. (1992). The move toward transformational leadership. *Educational Leadership, 49*(5).

Leithwood, K., & Duke, D. L. (1999). A century's quest to understand school leadership. In J. Murphy and K. Seashore-Louis (Eds.) *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration* (pp. 91-104). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Steinbach, R. (2000). Changing leadership: A menu of possibilities. In *Changing leadership for changing times* (pp. 3-20). Philadelphia: Open University.

Leithwood, K., Louis, K.S., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning*. New York: The Wallace Foundation.

Lencioni, P. (2002). *The five dysfunctions of a team.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Levine, D. U., & Lezotte, L. W. (1995). Effective schools research. In J. A. Banks & C.

    A. McGee Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp.

    525-47). New York: Macmillan.

Little, J. W. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: workplace conditions of

    school success. *American Education Research Journal, 19*(3), 325-340.

Mayer, D., Mullens, J., & Moore, M. (2000). *Monitoring school quality: An indicators*

    report. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

McGee-Cooper, A. (1998). Accountability as covenant: The taproot of servant leadership.

    In L. Spears, ed. *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, and servant*

    leadership (pp. 77-84). New York, NY: John Wiley.

Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of

    organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review, 20*, 709-734.

Maxwell, J. C. (1998). *The 21 irrefutable laws of leadership: follow them and people will*

    follow you. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.

Melrose, K. (1995). *Making the grass greener on your side: A CEO's journey to leading*

    by serving. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Melrose, K. (1998). Putting servant leadership into practice. In L. Spears, (Ed.), *Insights*

    on leadership: Service, stewardship, and servant leadership (pp. 279-296). New

    York, NY: John Wiley.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education.*

    San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.

Miller, C. (1987). *Leadership*. Colorado Springs, CO: Navpress.

Miller, C. (1995). *The empowered leader: 10 keys to servant leadership.* Nashville, TN:

 Broadman & Holman.

Miller, K. (2003). *School, teacher, and leadership impacts on student achievement.*

 Aurora, CO: Mid-Continent Regional Education Lab.

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (1998). *Assessment*

 Standards for Missouri Public Schools. Retrieved March 21, 2009 from

 http://www.dese.mo.gov/divimprove/assess/assessmentstandards.pdf.

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2005). *Understanding*

 your APR. Jefferson City, MO: Author.

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2007). *DESE awards*

 contracts to develop end of course tests. Jefferson City, MO: Author.

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2009). *Missouri public*

 school accountability report. Jefferson City, MO: Author.

Missouri State Board of Education. (2009). *Standard setting for end of course exams in*

 English I, American History, Algebra II, Geometry, and Government. Jefferson

 City, MO: Author.

Morgan, G. M. (1997). *Images of organization* (2nd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Murphy, J., & Louis, K. S. (1999). *Handbook of educational administration* (Eds.). San

 Francisco: Jossey Bass.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The*

 imperative for education reform. Washington, D. C.: Author.

Newmann, F.M., & Wehlage, G.G. (1995). *Successful school restructuring*. A report to the public and educators by the Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Neuschel, R. P. (1998). *The servant leader: Unleashing the power of your people*. East Lansing, MI: Vision Sports Management.

Nix, W. (1997). *Transforming your workplace for Christ.* Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman.

Nunnally, J. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (Eds.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Nyhan, R. C. (2000). Changing the paradigm: Trust and its role in public sector organizations. *American Review of Public Administration, 30*(1), 87-109.

Offerman, L. R. (1998). Leading and empowering diverse followers. In G. Hickman (Ed.), *Leading organizations: Perspective for a new era* (pp. 379-403). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. (2007). *Nine characteristics of high performing schools*. Retrieved March 10, 2010 from http://www.maine.gov/education/ nclb/school_improvement/ninecharact.pdf

Ogawa, R. T., & Bossart, S. T. (1995). Leadership as an organizational quality. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 31*(2), 224-243.

Oster, M. J. (1991). *Vision-driven leadership*. San Bernardino, CA: Here's Life Publishers.

Page, D., & Wong, T. P. (2000). A conceptual framework for measuring servant leadership. In S. Adjibolosoo (Ed.), *The human factor in shaping the course of history and development*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Parolini, J. L. (2007). Investigating the distinctions between transformational and servant

leadership. (Doctoral Dissertation, Regents University, 2007). *Dissertation*

Abstracts International, 68(04). (UMI No. 3264263)

Patterson, K. (2003). Servant leadership: A theoretical model. Paper presented at the

2003 meeting of the Servant Leadership Roundtable, Virginia Beach, VA.

Pielstick, C. D. (2000). Formal vs. informal leading: A comparative analysis. *Journal of*

Leadership Studies, 7, 99.

Pollard, C. W. (1996). *The soul of the firm*. New York: Harper Business.

Preskill, H., & Torres, R. (1999). *Evaluative inquiry for learning in organizations*.

Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Puma, M. J., Karweit, N., Price, C., Ricciuti, A., Thompson, W., & Vaden-Kiernan, M.

(1997). *Prospects: Final report on student outcomes.* Washington, DC: U.S.

Department of Education, Planning and Evaluation Services.

Reback, R. (2009). Teaching to the rating: School accountability and the distribution of

student achievement. *Journal of Public Economics, 93*(2), 352-353.

Rafaeli, A., & Worline, M. (2000). Symbols in organizational culture. In N. M.

Ashkanasy, C. P. Wilderom, & M. F. Peterson (Ed.), *Handbook of organizational*

culture and climate (pp. 71-84). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Riechmann, D. (1992). High involvement, high performance teams in higher education:

The impact of leadership. In K. Clark, M. Clark, & D. Campbell (Eds.), *Impact of*

leadership (pp. 257-268). Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Rosenholtz, S. J. (1991). *Teacher's workplace: The social organization of schools.* New

York: Teachers College Press.

Russell, R. F., & Stone, A. G. (2002). A review of servant leadership attributes: Developing a practical model. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal, 23*(3/4), 145-147.

Sanders, J. O. (1994). *Spiritual leadership*. Chicago: Moody.

Sarkus, D. J. (1996). Servant leadership in safety: Advancing the cause of and practice. *Professional Safety, 41*(6), 26-32.

Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership* (2nd Ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Schein, E. H. (1996). Culture: The missing concept in organization studies. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 41*, 229-240.

Schein, E. H. (2000). Sense and nonsense about culture and climate. In N. M. Ashkanasy, C. P. Wilderom, & M. F. Peterson (Ed.), *Handbook of organizational culture and climate* (pp. xxiii-xxx). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Schlechty, P. C. (2000). Leading a school system through change: Key steps for moving reform forward. In *Educational Leadership* (pp. 182-201). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schmoker, M. J. (1996). *Results: The key to continuous school improvement.* Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Sendjaya, S., & Sarros, J. C. (2002). Servant leadership: Its origin, development, and application in organizations. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 9,* 57-64.

Sendjaya, S., Sarros, J. C., & Santora, J. C. (2008). Defining and measuring servant leadership behavior in organizations. *Journal of Management Studies, 45*(2), 220-238.

Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization.* New York: Doubleday/Currency.

Senge, P. M. (1985). Robert Greenleaf's legacy: A new foundation for twenty-first century institutions. In L. C. Spears (Ed.), *Reflections on leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's theory of servant leadership influenced today's top management thinkers* (pp. 217-240). New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). *Moral leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1994). *Building community in schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (2000). *The lifeworld of leadership: Creating culture, community, and personal meaning in our schools.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sergiovann, T. J. (2006). *Rethinking leadership: A collection of articles*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Shannon, G. S. (2007). *Nine characteristics of high performing schools*. Olympia, WA: OSPI.

Shockley-Zalabek, P., Ellis, K., & Winograd, G. (2000). Organizational trust: What it means, why it matters. *Organizational Development Journal, 18*(4), 35-48.

Sims, B. (1997). *Servanthood: Leadership for the third millennium.* Cambridge, MA: Cowley.

Snyder, N. H., Dowd, J. J., & Houghton, D. M. (1994). *Vision, values, and courage: Leadership for quality management*. New York: The Free Press.

Sosik, J. J. (2000). The role of personal meaning in charismatic leadership. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, *7*, 60.

Spears, L. (1995). *Reflection on leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's theory of servant leadership influenced today's top management thinkers*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Spears, L. (1996). Reflections on Robert K. Greenleaf and servant leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 17*(7), 33-37.

Spears, L. (1998). *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant leadership*. Toronto: John Wiley and Sons.

Spears, L. (2002). Tracing the past, present, and future of servant leadership. In. L. Spears (Eds.), *Focus on leadership: Servant leadership for the twenty-first century* (pp. 1-16). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Swindoll, C. R. (1981). *Improving your serve: The art of unselfish living.* Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Taggert, S., & Celio, M. B. (2001). *Making standards meaningful: High school efforts in Washington State.* Seattle, WA: Center for Reinventing Public Education.

Tangney, J. P. (2000). Humility: Theoretical perspectives, empirical findings. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 19,* 70-82.

Tatum, J. B. (1995). Meditations on servant leadership. In L. Spears (Ed.), *Reflections on leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's theory of servant leadership influenced today's top management thinkers* (pp. 308-312). New York: Wiley.

Taylor, T. (2007). Examination of leadership practices of principals identified as servant leaders. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 10*(4), 401-419.

Tierney, W. G. (1988). Organizational culture in higher education: Defining the

    essentials. *Journal of Higher Education*, *59*(1), 2-21.

Turner, W. B. (2000). *The learning of love: A journey toward servant leadership.* Macon,

    GA: Smyth and Helwys.

Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A. G. (1988). *The new leadership: Managing participation in*

    organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Vroom, V. H., & Yetton, P. W. (1973). *Leadership and decision making*. Pittsburgh:

    University of Pittsburgh.

Wallace, R. (2008). *Principal to principal: Conversations in servant leadership and*

    school transformation. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Wilkes, G. C. (1996). *Jesus on leadership: Becoming a servant leader*. Nashville, TN:

    LifeWay.

William, L. E. (1996). *Servant of the people: The 1960s legacy of African American*

    leadership. New York: St. Martin's.

Williamson, R. D., & Johnston, J. H. (2004). *Reforming middle level education:*

    Considerations for policymakers. Greenwich: CN: National Middle School

    Association.

Willower, D. J., & Licata, J. W. (1997). *Values and valuation in the practice of*

    educational administration. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Winston, B. (1999). *Be a manager for God's sake: Essays about the perfect manager.*

    Virginia Beach, VA: Regent University School of Business.

Wong, P. T., & Davey, D. (2007). Best practices in servant leadership. Paper presented at

    the 2007 meeting of the Servant Leadership Roundtable, Virginia Beach, VA.

Yukl, G. (2002). *Leadership in organizations* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice

    Hall.

Appendix A

September 1, 2010

Thank you for considering your school district's participation in the study "The Difference Between Secondary School Principals Servant Leadership in Lower Achieving and Higher Achieving Schools." This study is being conducted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Education degree in Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis at the University of Missouri-Columbia.

The purpose of this study is to develop an understanding of the relationships between secondary school principals' servant leadership in lower achieving and higher achieving schools and student achievement as determined by the end of course exams in Algebra I, Biology, and English II. This information will be useful to understand leadership styles and student learning.

Ten high schools in Missouri will be participating in this study. The teachers will be asked to complete the Servant Leadership Assessment Instrument (SLAI). There are 24 items on the questionnaire. There are also six demographic questions and two open ended response items.

If you are willing to allow your district to participate in this study please open the attached permission form, copy it onto your school letterhead, sign, and fax back to me. If you agree to allow your district to participate I will be emailing your teachers the week of September 15.

If you have additional questions please feel free to contact me at (417)537-8311 or email pattison@goldencity.k12.mo.us. Thank you for considering my request.

Sincerely,

Traci Pattison
University of Missouri-Columbia

September 1, 2010

This letter is giving permission for my district to participate in the study "The Difference Between Secondary School Principals Servant Leadership in Lower Achieving and Higher Achieving Schools."

School District _____

Superintendent _____

_____   _____
Superintendent Signature   Date

Appendix B

TRACI PATTISON

1907 Lakeview Drive   **(417) 682-2551/(417)262-3420**
Lamar, Missouri 64759   **pattison@goldencity.k12.mo.us**

September 15, 2010

Dear Teachers:

I'm a doctoral student at the University of Missouri and am inviting you to participate in a research study regarding, educational leadership, servant leadership, and academic achievement.

The title of my study is "The Relationship between secondary school principals' servant leadership in lower achieving and higher achieving secondary schools" Project #1166277. This study is being conducted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Education degree in Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis at the University of Missouri-Columbia.

The purpose of this study is to develop an understanding of the relationships between secondary school principals' servant leadership in lower achieving and higher achieving schools and student achievement as determined by the end of course exams in Algebra I, Biology, and English II. This information will be useful to understand leadership styles and student learning.

The benefits to the subject include reflective observation of their principal's leadership style. The benefits to society include new knowledge related to servant leadership of secondary principals and higher and lower achieving schools based on end of course testing. There is a minimal risk of taking time away from other activities for the completion of the instrument.

During the course of the study, confidentiality will be maintained in the following ways:
1. You are not to place any personally identifiable or school district identifiable information on the questionnaire.
2. No identifying data will be connected to your responses.
3. The questionnaire is being delivered on a secure server with only password access for the researcher.
4. As surveys are received email addresses will be removed and replaced with a code number, the master list linking the code number and email address will be destroyed at the conclusion of the study, and
5. All findings will be reported in the aggregate which means that no one person's answers or school district will be identifiable.

Any hard copy information will be maintained in a locked file and will be kept for three years after the study has been completed. The results of the study may be published in scientific research journals or presented at professional conferences. However, your name and identity will not be revealed and your record will remain confidential.

Your participation in the study will involve providing responses to several items contained in an electronic questionnaire and, then, submitting your responses. You may access the questionnaire that is available by clicking on the following address: http://intercom.virginia.edu/surveysuite/surveys/SLAI. Upon

completion, you will click on the "Done" button. It should take 5-10 minutes or less to complete the questionnaire.

You can choose not to participate. If you decide not to participate, there will not be a penalty to you or loss of any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You may withdraw from the study at any time.

Thank you for your time and consideration in answering each question and returning the questionnaire. **Please reply as soon as possible or no later than October 20, 2010.**

If you have questions or comments, or concerns you may contact Traci Pattison at (417) 537-8311 (work), (417) 682-2551 (home), or (417) 262-3420 (cell). You may also contact my dissertation advisor, Dr. Cindy MacGregor at (417) 836-6046, or the University of Missouri IRB office at (573) 882-9585.

Sincerely,

Traci Pattison

Appendix C

Demographic Question/Open Ended Questions

1. What is your gender? _____ Female _____ Male

2. What is your age? _____ years

3. What is your highest degree?

    _____ Bachelors

    _____ Masters

    _____ Specialist

    _____ Doctorate

4. How long have you been in education? _____ years

5. How long have you been at your current school? _____ years

6. What is your primary teaching responsibility?

    _____ Core Area (Language Arts, Math, Science, Social Studies)

    _____ Practical Arts (Agriculture, Business, FACS, Industrial

    Technology)

    _____ Fine Arts (Art or Music)

    _____ Other, Please Specify

Open Ended Response

1. Please summarize your principal's philosophy of leadership.

2. What does your principal do to create a school where students succeed?

Appendix D

Servant Leadership Assessment Instrument
Dennis, 2004

This anonymous and confidential survey asks you to evaluate your leader.

Please use the following 1-6 scale to indicate your agreement or disagreement with each of the items. Please provide your response to each statement by selecting one of the seven boxes, the higher the number the stronger the agreement with that statement. The selection is a continuum along which "1" equals zero amount or zero agreement and the highest number equals the maximum amount possible.

In this section, please respond to each statement, as you believe your leaders would think, act, or behave.

1.   My leader is genuinely interested in me as a person.
                        1   2   3   4   5   6

2.   My leader desires to develop my leadership potential.
                        1   2   3   4   5   6

3.   My leader creates a culture that fosters high standards of ethics.
                        1   2   3   4   5   6

4.   My leader talks more about employees' accomplishments than his or her own.
                        1   2   3   4   5   6

5.   My leader lets me make decisions with increasing responsibility.
                        1   2   3   4   5   6

6.   My leader does not overestimate her or his merits.
                        1   2   3   4   5   6

7.   My leader has sought my vision regarding the organization's vision.
                        1   2   3   4   5   6

8.   My leader has shown his or her care for me by encouraging me.
                        1   2   3   4   5   6

9.   My leader has shown compassion in his or her actions toward me.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

10.   My leader is not interested in self-glorification.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

11.   My leader makes me feel important.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

12.   My leader is humble enough to consult others in the organization when he or she may not have all the answers.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

13.   My leader gives me the authority I need to do my job.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

14.   My leader turns over some control to me so that I may accept more responsibility.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

15.   My leader shows concern for me.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

16.   My leader empowers me with opportunities so that I develop my skills.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

17.   My leader has encouraged me to participate in determining and developing a shared vision.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

18.   My leader entrusts me to make decisions.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

19.   My leader and I have written a clear and concise vision statement for our company.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

20.   My leader has asked me what I think the future direction of our company should be.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

21. My leader does not center attention on his or her own accomplishments.

     1   2   3   4   5   6

22. My leader's demeanor is one of humility.

     1   2   3   4   5   6

23. My leader has shown that he or she wants to include employees' vision into the firm's goals and objectives.

     1   2   3   4   5   6

24. My leader seeks my commitment concerning the shared vision of our company.

     1   2   3   4   5   6

Appendix E

Servant Leadership Assessment Instrument Explanations

The Servant Leadership Assessment Instrument provides insight about the servant leadership characteristics of a leader. Each factor measures a unique aspect of the servant leadership of the leader. The factor definitions are underlined; the additional sentences provide more detail about the concepts associated with each factor.

Agapao love (items 1, 3,8, 9, 11, 15) measures the degree to which a servant leader demonstrates meaning and purpose on the job where the employee has the ability to realize his or her full potential as a person and feels like he or she is associated with a good and/or ethical organization. The servant leader is forgiving, teachable, shows concern for others, is calm during times of chaos, strives to do what is right for the organization, and has integrity. This factor has a reported reliability coefficient (Chronbach's alpha) of .94 (Dennis, 2004).

Empowerment (items 2, 5, 13, 14, 16, 18) measure the degree to which a servant leader empowers information to others; positive emotional support, actual experience of task mastery, observing models of success, and words of encouragement. The servant leader allows for employee self-direction. Leaders encourage professional growth. The leader lets people do their jobs by enabling them to learn. This factor has a reported reliability coefficient (Chronbach's alpha) of .94 (Dennis, 2004).

Vision (items 7, 17, 19, 20, 23, 24) measures the degree to which a servant leader incorporates the participation of all involved players in creating a shared vision for the organization. The servant leader seeks others' vision for the organization, demonstrates that he or she wants to include employees' visions into the organization's goals and objectives, seeks commitment concerning the shared vision of the organization, encourages participation in creating a shared vision, and has a written expression of the vision of the organization. This factor has a reported reliability coefficient (Chronbach's alpha) of .89 (Dennis, 2004).

Humility (items 4, 6, 10, 12, 21, 22) measures the degree to which a servant leader keeps his or her own accomplishments and talents in perspective, which includes self-acceptance, and further includes the idea of true humility as not being self-focused but rather focused on others. The servant leader does not overestimate his or her own merits, talks more about employees' accomplishments rather than his or her own, is not interested in self-glorification, does not center attention on his or her accomplishments, is humble enough to consult others to gain further information and perspective, and has a

humble demeanor. This factor has a reported reliability coefficient (Chronbach's alpha) of .92 (Dennis, 2004).

The Servant Leadership Assessment Instrument was developed by Robert Dennis.

VITA

Traci R. Pattison was born December 12, 1975 in Nevada, Missouri. She graduated from Lamar High School in 1994. After this, she earned a bachelors degree in Business Education from Missouri State University (1998), a master's degree in Secondary Administration from Missouri State University (2001), a specialist degree in Educational Administration from Missouri State University (2004), and doctorate degree in Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis from the University of Missouri-Columbia (2010).

Traci served as a teacher at the Lake Career & Technical Center in Camdenton, Missouri for 9 years. Since then she has served as the principal and athletic director at Golden City High School in Golden City, Missouri.

Married to Shane Pattison, Traci is the mother of two daughters, Megan Taylor and Kelci Grace.