



SCHOOL of  
GRADUATE STUDIES  
EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

East Tennessee State University  
**Digital Commons @ East  
Tennessee State University**

---

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Student Works

---

5-2011

# Teachers Perception of Elementary School Principals Leadership Characteristics in Elementary Schools in Rural Southwest Virginia.

Lynn B. Metcalfe  
*East Tennessee State University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), and the [Elementary and Middle and Secondary Education Administration Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Metcalfe, Lynn B., "Teachers Perception of Elementary School Principals Leadership Characteristics in Elementary Schools in Rural Southwest Virginia." (2011). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 1277. <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd/1277>

This Dissertation - Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Works at Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. For more information, please contact [digilib@etsu.edu](mailto:digilib@etsu.edu).

Teacher's Perceptions of Elementary School Principal's Leadership Characteristics in  
Elementary Schools in Rural Southwest Virginia

---

A dissertation  
presented to  
the faculty of the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis  
East Tennessee State University

In partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree  
Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership

---

by  
Lynn B. Metcalfe  
May 2011

---

Dr. Virginia Foley, Chair

Dr. Cecil Blankenship

Dr. James Lampley

Dr. Pamela Scott

Keywords: Servant Leadership, Title I, Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire

## ABSTRACT

### Teacher's Perception of Elementary School Principal's Leadership Characteristics in Elementary Schools in Rural Southwest Virginia

by

Lynn B. Metcalfe

The characteristics of servant leaders as perceived by teachers who evaluated the leadership excellence of principals were the focus of this study. The essential ingredient of a leader was examined in all participating schools; the role of the principal was crucial to a school's effectiveness and was widely acknowledged.

Ten characteristics were discussed in the literature review. This dissertation was a quantitative study of teachers' perceptions, as well as principals' self-perceptions, of principals in rural Title I Schools located in southwest Virginia.

The exploratory question that originated from this study was: Was there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principals for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, awareness, healing, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) for schools 1 through 17? In an attempt to answer this question, a Likert 5 scale survey was given to each principal regardless of years experience and teachers with at least 3 years of experience. This group of teachers was selected with the assumption that experienced teachers could better identify influential relationship that described true patterns in Title I

schools. A one sample *t*-test was used to determine if differences existed between teachers' means and their principal's self-ratings.

The results showed a significant difference in the teachers' perceptions of their principal and the self-analysis by the principal in the servant-leadership characteristics as defined by Robert Greenleaf (1977). The null hypotheses relating to healing and persuasion were retained in more schools than rejected. The remaining 8 null hypotheses were rejected in more schools than retained. In most cases principals' self-ratings were higher than the means of teachers rating them. In at least two schools, principals generally rated themselves lower than their teachers.

## DEDICATION

I have been blessed with this opportunity. This research is dedicated to the Lee County Cohort with whom I have worked and to whom I have grown very close while attempting this endeavor. Their supportive words of encouragement are appreciated, and our true friendships are cherished.

On a more personal level, this study is dedicated to my husband, who has supported, without complaint, my lifelong learning. My lifetime achievements are in part inspired by his belief in me and his infinite and unconditional love.

Finally, to my daughter Adriane, I can never thank you enough. You have been my most constant encourager and supporter. I thank you for your expertise in helping me with my many technology challenges. I will forever cherish the time we spent together reading, discussing, and writing. I encourage you to pursue those dreams that seem impossible, to maintain perseverance, and believe in God and his awesome power; realizing life has much to offer to those who are up for the challenge.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I acknowledge my committee who have made this journey such an incredible reality; Dr. Foley, Dr. Blankenship, Dr. Lampley, and Dr. Scott, my thanks to you for your encouragement and commitment to see me through from the beginning. Our professional friendships will never be forgotten.

Also, I acknowledge the Faculty and Staff at Rose Hill Elementary School who have stood beside me through this process and always showed concern and offered the most sincere encouragements.

I acknowledge Dr. Phyliss Noah for her guidance and wisdom. Dr. Noah's valuable feedback and helpfulness has been remarkable.

I acknowledge Heather Moore, a new acquaintance, who guided me during the analysis of my research data.

I acknowledge and have much appreciation for Travis Scott who was the first class editor of my work.

# CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT .....	2
DEDICATION .....	4
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	5
LIST OF TABLES .....	10
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION .....	11
Purpose of Study .....	13
Research Questions .....	14
Significance of Study .....	18
Definition of Terms .....	18
Delimitations .....	20
Limitations .....	20
Overview of Study .....	20
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE .....	22
History of Servant Leadership .....	22
Listening .....	23
Empathy .....	24
Healing .....	27
Awareness .....	30
Persuasion .....	33
Conceptualization .....	38

Chapter	Page
Foresight .....	40
Stewardship .....	43
Commitment to the Growth of People .....	46
Building Community .....	48
Summary .....	50
<b>3. METHODS AND PROCEDURES .....</b>	<b>51</b>
Research Design .....	51
Procedure .....	52
Population .....	53
Research Questions and Null Hypotheses.....	54
Data Analysis .....	74
Summary .....	75
<b>4. ANALYSIS OF DATA .....</b>	<b>75</b>
Descriptive Statistics .....	75
Analysis of Research Question 1 .....	75
Analysis of Research Question 2 .....	79
Analysis of Research Question 3 .....	82
Analysis of Research Question 4.....	85
Analysis of Research Question 5 .....	88
Analysis of Research Question 6 .....	91
Analysis of Research Question 7 .....	94

Chapter	Page
Analysis of Research Question 8 .....	97
Analysis of Research Question 9 .....	100
Analysis of Research Question 10 .....	103
Analysis of Research Question 11 .....	106
Analysis of Research Question 12 .....	109
Analysis of Research Question 13 .....	112
Analysis of Research Question 14 .....	115
Analysis of Research Question 15 .....	118
Analysis of Research Question 16 .....	121
Analysis of Research Question 17 .....	124
Summary .....	127
<b>5. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>128</b>
Introduction .....	128
Summary of Findings .....	128
Recommendations for Practice .....	138
Recommendations for Further Research .....	138
Conclusions .....	139
<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>140</b>
<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>148</b>
Appendix A: Letter to Superintendent of Schools .....	148
Appendix B: Letter to Principals of Schools .....	149

Chapter	Page
Appendix C: Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire (Principal) .....	150
Appendix D: Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire (Teacher) .....	152
VITA .....	154

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Summary of One Sample $t$ -Test for School 1 .....	78
2. Summary of One Sample $t$ -Test for School 2 .....	81
3. Summary of One Sample $t$ -Test for School 3 .....	84
4. Summary of One Sample $t$ -Test for School 4 .....	87
5. Summary of One Sample $t$ -Test for School 5 .....	90
6. Summary of One Sample $t$ -Test for School 6 .....	93
7. Summary of One Sample $t$ -Test for School 7 .....	96
8. Summary of One Sample $t$ -Test for School 8 .....	99
9. Summary of One Sample $t$ -Test for School 9 .....	102
10. Summary of One Sample $t$ -Test for School 10 .....	105
11. Summary of One Sample $t$ -Test for School 11 .....	108
12. Summary of One Sample $t$ -Test for School 12 .....	111
13. Summary of One Sample $t$ -Test for School 13 .....	114
14. Summary of One Sample $t$ -Test for School 14 .....	117
15. Summary of One Sample $t$ -Test for School 15 .....	120
16. Summary of One Sample $t$ -Test for School 16 .....	123
17. Summary of One Sample $t$ -Test for School 17 .....	126
18. Tally of 10 Dimensions from 17 Schools .....	137

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

Debruyn's (1997) studies on proactive leadership led to various questions. Arguments have been made for centuries regarding the exact definition of a leader with no firm definition being agreed upon. What defined leadership? What made an effective leader? While these questions continued to be researched, answers remained widely disputed. Specifically, attempts have been made to find definite answers that educators have adapted to the school setting. One thing that can be agreed upon is that the actual effectiveness of leadership is the only true standard by which leaders should be judged.

Northouse's (2007) definition of leadership focused on individual influences and the desire to obtain a common goal. Bennis and Thomas (2002) agree leadership was a reflection of one's character and revolved around three components: a leader, followers, and a common goal. Sergiovanni (1999) concluded that character was the defining characteristic of authentic leadership, and all authentic leaders displayed character. Johnson (2005) supported the following concept: although extensive investigations into the realm of educational settings have been conducted, there has been no uniform description of successful, identifiable, and effective leaders and their employable strategies. In other words, one size did not fit all.

Other researchers analyzed leadership through benefits to the follower; Fullan's (2001) final conclusion indicated the effectiveness of the leader as an individual was not as important as the leadership one produced in others. Maxwell's (1993) proposed ingredients of a successful leader included the ability to be influenced, created positive change, acquired and cultivated problem solving skills, displayed a positive attitude, provided vision, practiced self-discipline,

treasured integrity, maintained priorities, and expanded relationships. Maxwell insisted one's leadership skills marked the degree of a successful organization and the band of workers within.

Just as our global society has been comprised of many leaders, it has also been met with many leadership approaches and styles. Heathfield (2009) suggested one's leadership style was the result of exercised, on-going professional training, mentors, and instinctive characteristics that have been continually developed and nurtured. Leading, learning, and educational professional development coincided with school improvement and student success (Gray & Bishop, 2009). During that moment of successful school recognition, the chain reaction depicted most certainly filtered from leader, to teacher, to student.

Despite numerous challenges and uncontrollable circumstances, the leader (or principal) of a school has been held accountable for the performance and academic achievement of students (Fisher & Prey, 2002). *No Child Left Behind*, as cited in United States Department of Education (2001), set a goal for Academic Yearly Progress (AYP) and held principals, teachers, and students accountable for academic progress and the closing of achievement gaps. School success and the student's academic performance were considered indicators of effective leadership (Gray & Bishop, 2009).

According to Marzano (2003) the most important aspect of effective school reform was leadership. Kouzes and Posner (1998) claimed the difference between an effective and an ineffective leader was the degree of concern the leader showed for those around him or her. Rost (1991) indicated that a principal influenced teacher effectiveness through certain qualities that built relationships and motivated teachers to impact learning for all students. Bradley (2007) declared the influence of a leader directly affected the outcome of an organization and its members. She was adamant that a principal's empowerment of his or her cohorts was just as

powerful as the teachers' empowerment of their students. Bradley (2007) also emphasized that effective leaders rendered high student performance and school reform. Volumes of research available on leadership and leadership styles indicated that effective leaders have been readily recognized as successful when observable characteristics were obtained within a striving school organization (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003).

Servant leadership was a paradigm first discussed by Greenleaf (2004) in the 1970s and has remained popular today, partly due to its impact on organizational success. After he composed his essay, *Essentials*, Greenleaf's philosophy refocused the academic and business world when he proclaimed that a leader had to first be a servant. After empirical research, Greenleaf concluded that an organization led by a person who prioritized the needs of others was seen as having a positive effect on the success of that group. Shugart (1997) explained further that servant leaders are characterized by six additional traits. These are the use of persuasion over coercion, sustaining spirit over ego, foresight over control, listening over directing, acceptance over judgment, and systematic neglect over perfectionism. Servant leadership required the development of a passion for what you did and how you did it. Servant leaders had a defined vision and desired to build relationships which empowered others to grow and lead. The ultimate aim in a school setting was to create an environment where the whole population agreed, "I need you as much as you need me." Servant leaders incorporated this belief and strived to produce higher levels of performance for all students and the entire organization (Johnson, 2005).

### *Purpose of Study*

This study focused on successful Title I schools and their principals' characteristics, with the purpose of developing continuous and practical knowledge about the make-up of effective

schools. Through this research, a better understanding of leadership style(s) practiced in Title I disadvantaged schools in rural southwest Virginia was pursued. Finally, the purpose of this study was to determine self-perception of principal leadership characteristics in relation to teacher perception of the principals' leadership skills.

This study challenged the belief that educational institutions performed more when headed by principals who possessed servant leadership characteristics as defined by Greenleaf (1996) and listed as: listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community. The relationship between teachers' and their principal's perceptions was undertaken to determine if a significant difference did exist.

#### *Research Questions*

The following research questions were analyzed for each of the 17 participating schools.

1. Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, awareness, healing, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) for school 1?
2. Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, awareness, healing, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) for school 2?

3. Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, awareness, healing, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) for school 3?
4. Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, awareness, healing, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) for school 4?
5. Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, awareness, healing, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) for school 5?
6. Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, awareness, healing, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) for school 6?
7. Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, awareness, healing, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight,

stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) for school 7?

8. Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, awareness, healing, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) for school 8?
9. Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, awareness, healing, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) for school 9?
10. Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, awareness, healing, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) for school 10?
11. Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, awareness, healing, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) for school 11?

12. Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, awareness, healing, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) for school 12?
13. Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, awareness, healing, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) for school 13?
14. Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, awareness, healing, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) for school 14?
15. Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, awareness, healing, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) for school 15?
16. Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, awareness, healing, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight,

stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) for school  
16?

17. Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership  
Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables  
(listening, empathy, awareness, healing, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight,  
stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) for school  
17?

### *Significance of the Study*

This study could be beneficial to principals in other rural or urban counties. Positive implications could be rendered from the questionnaire if the teachers' and principals' perceptions show a link between effectiveness of leadership and teacher performance. In the case of negative implications, areas of improvement could be made available to principals who attempt to improve their institution. This study could be beneficial to school directors who implement school policy and programs related to leadership and sustainability and could assist in the creation of a formal leadership development plan to increase higher student academic performance in rural poverty stricken systems. This study examined the 10 characteristics of servant leadership. Principals will compare their leadership skills to specific characteristics and determine if adjustments are needed in areas of weakness. This study will serve as a guide for school districts that plan professional development activities.

### *Definition of Terms*

*Economically Disadvantaged:* Students considered economically disadvantaged have been identified by the United State Department of Education as those who lived in poverty and received either free or reduced breakfast and lunch at school. Because these students were

determined to be at risk academically, programs were established to provide support towards achievement.

*Servant Leadership:* Servant leadership was displayed when the leader acted for the good of others over his or her own interest. The disposition of a servant leader was one in which the role of values, beliefs, ethics, and principles were incorporated into the work environment with the expected results directly benefiting the entire organization (Stone & Winston, 1999). Servant leadership was identified by 10 servant leadership characteristics: listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community (Spears, 1998).

*Standards of Learning (SOL):* The Commonwealth of Virginia maintained certain subject matter expectations and objectives for the public schools that related to student learning and achievement in grades K-12. The expectations were identified as Standards of Learning in the core subjects of reading, mathematics, science, social studies, and history (VDOE, 2009).

*Successful Title I School:* Any school that achieves state standards as well as No Child Left Behind guidelines.

*Title I:* A Title I school was supplemented by federal funds to help children in high poverty areas who struggled academically or were at risk of failing behind. These schools had 40% or more students who qualified for free or reduced lunch and provided school wide programs in which the remaining 60% of students received the same aid.

*Survey Monkey:* The online tool Survey Monkey provided users with a format for creating questionnaires. The tool was used to administer, analyze, and calculate the responses to the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire. It was given to all teachers and principals in the set populations.

### *Delimitations*

This study was delimited to 17 school-wide Title I elementary schools located in rural southwest Virginia. These schools received funding based on the percentage of students who received free and reduced breakfasts and lunches; however, Title I remedial services were provided to all students. The study may be generalized in states and counties with similar demographic characteristics.

The final scores of the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire were averaged figures. Only teachers with a minimum of 3 years teaching experience took the survey in an attempt to obtain the most accurate information about the leader's characteristics. All principals regardless of years of experience participated in the survey.

### *Limitations*

Limitations to the study included newly employed principals. Surveyed teachers may not have had an accurate judgment on a new principal's characteristics. Likewise, newly employed principals may not have been able to identify within themselves certain leadership characteristics due to lack of experience. As with all questionnaires, another limitation was the veracity of the teacher's answers. Some questions may not have been answered truthfully, if at all.

### *Overview of Study*

This study is arranged and presented in 5 chapters. Chapter 1 contains an introduction, purpose of the study, the research question, and the significance of the study. Also included in Chapter 1 are the delimitations, limitations, and definition of terms. Chapter 2 contains a review of literature that focuses on servant leadership characteristics as perceived by principals and teachers. Chapter 3 provides an explanation of the methodology and data collection procedures

for this study. This chapter also supplies specific information about the on-line questionnaire created with the tool Survey Monkey. Chapter 4 includes the data and analysis of the obtained information. Chapter 5 provides a summary and recommendations for future practice and research.

## CHAPTER 2

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This literature review is centered on the history of servant leadership, 10 characteristics of a servant leader, and the effectiveness of servant leadership characteristics of principals as perceived by teachers. Each of the 10 characteristics is discussed at length.

#### *History of Servant Leadership*

In 2007 Northouse (2007) explained how Greenleaf developed the now popular and desirable style known as “servant leadership” in the 1970s. Greenleaf developed his idea after he absorbed the distinguished ethical principles of a character he encountered in a book by Herman Hesse entitled *The Journey to the East* (1956). Greenleaf’s first book, *The Servant as Leader* (1977), focused on serving others holistically to inspire overall improvement of one’s self and subsequently one’s team. Greenleaf’s concept has been constantly studied and implemented in many successful organizational settings today. The Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership is a nonprofit institution founded by Robert K. Greenleaf in 1964 and provides resources and opportunities to explore principles and practices of servant leadership.

Spears (1998) listed 10 characteristics of servant-leadership: listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, growth of people, and building community. An effective servant leader sought to serve solely for the benefit of others through built relationships and stirred motivation (Autry, 2001). Unlike traditional leadership with a top down hierarchical style, servant leadership came from the heart and required putting others first while interpersonal skills were nurtured and teamwork and personal involvement were increased (Serrat, 2009).

## *Listening*

The cornerstone of servant leadership is listening (Cassel & Holt, 2008). Members of any organization want to be heard and to feel their input is important to the daily practices and success of the workplace. A leader must employ active listening skills and must be attentive and receptive to what is or is not being said (Mind Tools, 2011). Robertson (2005) proclaimed a successful listener was in tune with verbal as well as nonverbal communication such as body language. He wrote effective listening could and had appeared in either or both of these forms. This skill requires time, patience, energy, and concentration. Leaders who are engaged with what is happening in the lives of those around him or her acquire pertinent information that explains staff members' actions and contributions within the work environment (Anthony, 2002). A good listener displays genuine intent to hear what others have to say and clarifies their understanding of the dialogue (Degraaf, Tilley, & Neal, 2001). Listening intently promises the speaker that what he or she has to say is important and provides encouragement for further involvement in organizational tasks (Cassel & Holt, 2008).

Barbuto and Wheeler (2007) suggested a welcoming attitude as well as a commitment to listening, supporting, and finding importance in the suggestions or concerns of the group for the characteristic of listening. Burbules (1993) added that a group gains value when it contributes ideas that affect the outcome of situations. Spears (2004) explained that growth is sustained in servant leadership by implementing regular periods of reflection or feedback. Listening, according to Stueber (2000), reassures that future conflicts have been eliminated.

Hoy and Miskel (2008) emphasized that communication and relationships suffer when listening skills are undeveloped; on the other hand, attributes declared worthwhile such as respect, trust, concern, and interest emerge as a result of genuine listening. Hunsaker and

Allessandra (1986) agreed that listening to each individual leads to a boost of an individual's self-worth that left a feeling of empowerment and pleasure. Maxwell (1993) warned the biggest mistake made in gaining support from team members is giving precedence to one's own vision. Listening and cultivating a shared vision provides more motivation and support for the accomplishment of results and advancements.

Atwater (1992) declared listening and providing feedback are the determining factors of success in any organization. Effective listening, according to Hoy and Miskel (2008), is necessary to promote understanding, develop ideas, nurture relationships, increase interpersonal values, and enhance overall development in individuals and organizational settings. Finally, Cohen (1998) suggested listening is an essential and undervalued skill that leaders recognize as an important fundamental aspect of successful leadership.

### *Empathy*

Empathy is the ability to identify and understand another's situation, feelings, or motives, as well as the human capacity to recognize the concerns of others. In others words, empathy is the ability to *put yourself in the other person's shoes, or see life through someone else's eyes*. Empathy allows an individual to have insight into the feelings and thinking of others so bonds of trust are created. Helping us understand how and why individuals react to certain situations, empathy hones our *people acumen* and leads to more informed decisions (Martinuzi, 2006).

To prove that empathy is an important component of effective relationships, Damasio (2006) performed studies on medical patients who possessed damage to the specific part of the brain associated with empathy. These patients showed no lack in reasoning and learning abilities. However, when their relationship skills were examined, the patients showed significant deficits.

Goleman (2004, p.9) explained that leaders with empathy “do more than sympathize with people around them; they use their knowledge to improve their companies in subtle, but important ways.” Empathy should not be confused with leaders who have made an attempt to agree with everyone’s opinions, or with trying to please each and every employee. Rather these leaders thoughtfully consider employees’ feelings, along with other factors, in the process of making intelligent decisions. Empathy leads to tangible results when recognized as an abstract tool in the toolkit of a leader. A leader must make a valid attempt to consider the other person’s perspective. In doing so, the leader understands from where the speaker is coming and responds in a manner that acknowledges his or her thoughts, feelings, or concerns. The bonds built through empathy are catalysts that lead to the creation of positive communities for the greater good. Successful empathy retains the option of being selective but becomes a daily habit in every leader’s life. Confidence is given to leaders who make it a point to empathize with the circumstances and problems of others with understanding, regardless of the situation. While the ability to possess this characteristic comes more naturally to some, empathy is a pertinent skill obtained by all who aspire to be a servant leader. Empathy is accomplished through the creation of knowledge and the discovery of how to release the power of innovation through this knowledge (Barbuto, 2007).

For the servant leader, empathy is maintained to protect the humanity of other people. This task is accomplished even in circumstances in which the acts of others are not accepted by the leader. When dealing with an individual the leader likes or identifies with, empathy is easier to practice. In situations where the individual disagrees or creates problems, empathy becomes more difficult (Bennis & Goldsmith, 2003). The good intentions of coworkers are assumed, even in circumstances in which the leader rejects or calls into question the coworkers’ behavior

or performance. A servant leader accepts and recognizes each person's special and unique spirit. Leaders who cultivate empathetic listening are ultimately the most successful (Spears, 2004).

Nonetheless, showing empathy and attempting to see another's point of view is not always an easy task and requires courage, patience, and inner sources of security. The leader is open minded to new ideas and changes, listens to others, and actually hears what they are expressing through the context of their own orientation, needs, and perceptions. Empathy is accomplished by offering feedback, inquiring about problems, and repeating back what a person has stated. A successful leader understands another's point of view and refrains from judging the person's responses, to avoid stifling another with the leader's own agenda. A leader listens in attentive silence to others, allows space for their reactions, and affirms they have been heard. Most people are extremely attracted to those with empathy. Others recognize this attitude keeps an individual open, flexible, and capable of learning. In other words, in order to have influence with others, others must perceive they have influence with you (Bennis & Goldsmith, 2003).

More importantly knowledge and skills regarding communication are obtained once an individual learns how to empathize. This knowledge often includes the philosophy that the mind does not dominate the heart. More specifically, a leader has learned two languages: the language of logic and the language of emotion. This correlates with the concept that people behave more based on how they feel than how they think. Emotional barriers often prevent people from reasoning amongst themselves until positive feelings are exchanged between these individuals. A successful leader considers fear a "knot of the heart" (Covey, 1990 p. 117); improved relationships are the only possible way to untie this knot.

Before a servant leader is able to develop an individual, he or she must first care for and develop self (Maxwell, 1993). According to Fullan (2001), who shared the commanding

message given by Kouzes and Posner (1998), an effective leader is separated from an ineffective leader by how much compassion is shown to those being led. Acceptance and respect must be demonstrated by the servant leader; while at the same time care and concern are fostered, allowing everyone in the school faculty to experience the love of others. A servant leader who possesses these characteristics understands the point of view of others and the challenges they face (Stueber, 2000). Indeed, a culture of care is imperative for successful performance and a prerequisite to an organization's success (Von Krogh et al., 2000).

### *Healing*

The third characteristic of a servant leader is healing, the process of making broken people whole. Successful servant leaders are those individuals people approach when trauma occurs in their lives. Servant leaders are approached because they develop a remarkable appreciation for the emotional health and spirit of others. Others gravitate toward these leaders when emotional needs arise because servant leaders are skilled at facilitating the healing process. Successful servant leaders create an environment that encourages mending (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2007).

Greenleaf (1970) stated the potential for healing one's self and others is one of the admirable strengths of servant leaders. At some point most people have broken spirits and suffer from a variety of emotional hurts. A servant leader recognizes these experiences as an opportunity to help make whole those with whom they come in contact. A servant leader considers staff's history and present in order to assist them in building a future together (Lichtenwalner, 2008).

Sturnick and Joblonski (1998) also wrote extensively about stages of healing leadership. Before the task of healing, one must have an understanding of personal and/or institutional

health. Sturnick and Joblonski stated that “sick organizations really do contaminate” (p. 191) and that it is not always possible to find followers. “Words have the capacity to raise or dash each other’s spirits. We can make organizations inviting or sickening to our soul” (p.101), reminded Secretan (1996).

Masle (2008) suggested the servant leaders exert daily effort to make at least one person they care about happy. By making an effort to be thoughtful and caring towards at least one person every day, this behavior becomes a spontaneous habit that eventually spreads to peers. Furthermore, personal happiness is fed by making another individual happy.

A servant leader invests time in each and every team member. The leader builds a connection based on trust, honesty, and respect, as well as creates opportunities for team members to connect. By establishing this personal and professional connection, team members are drawn closer together and work more effectively to improve efficiency and increase performance and accountability (Gorham, 2010).

Sturnick and Joblonski agreed healing leadership restores leaders emotionally, spiritually, intellectually, and through physical health. In addition, the implementation of wisdom and insight also produces another level of healing and transforms the value of the workplace. Basically, one needs to be healthy in order to lead effectively. Promoting wholeness is the ultimate goal of effective leadership (Sturnick & Joblonski, 1998).

As a lifelong servant, Greenleaf viewed his meditation as service because one is taking adequate time to reflect on healing issues. He wrote in Gardiner (1998), “I prefer to meditate; I have come to view my mediating as serving” (p.123). Gardiner also suggested that healing comes through just quietly being and that a “quiet presence is an act of renewal” (p. 122).

Another focal point of healing includes some of society's toughest issues: race, poverty, immigration, and changes in the American family. Many individuals have been hurt through experiences in the school system. In order for healing to occur, districts that truly serve students, staff, and community confront some of the tough issues that create collateral damage (Cassel & Holt, 2008). Goodlad (1979) wrote at length about the health of schools: "Schools are like living organisms, with characteristics that can be described in varying degrees as healthy or unhealthy. Schools' cultures must assume responsibility for their health and be held accountable" (p.72). According to Starratt (2004) the leader's responsibility is to sustain and to develop a healthy environment for authentic learning and teaching. The leader becomes responsible for democratic working relationships among principals, teachers, parents, and school officials, as well as promotes learning and the practice of civic virtues (Crippen, 2005).

Jackson and Leduc (2002) agreed people's organizational lives are not isolated from their larger existence as members of families, groups, and communities. Service appeals to people in their entirety, hence their energies and capacities evoke their desire to serve. If the capacity to serve is diminished in one realm of life, it affects the ability to serve in the other realms, including the organizational realm. As recognized by the servant leader, caring is the best way to encourage people to give their utmost trust in organizations.

Broken spirits and emotional pain are resolved through resolution or healing after hopes, dreams, or relationships fail or end in disappointment (Spears, 1995). It is widely believed and suggested that healing is one of the most powerful skills necessary for effective leadership (Dacher, 1999; Sturnick, 1998). Leaders are empathetic and provide a forum for people to express their feelings during hard times (Emmerich, 2001). A primary purpose of leadership

influences feelings and emotions that create the emotional heart of the organization (Weymms, 2003).

### *Awareness*

The fourth characteristic of a servant leader is awareness. All types of awareness, including general and self-awareness, aid in the strengthening of the servant leader as well as understanding issues involving ethics and values (Posser, 2007). As the leader picks up cues in the environment, awareness is operationalized (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2002). Keen awareness allows the leader a fuller sense of what is truly happening around him or her (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006). These cues help inform their options and decisions while inner security is maintained. By being informed and aware of situations around him or her, the leader is not absorbed by problems of others, nor is he or she surprised (Greenleaf, 1977). Awareness allows a leader to view most situations from a more integrated holistic position. Historically, the importance of great leaders seeking awareness is described as one of the key attributes of wisdom (Kant, 1978; Plato, 1945).

Awareness was developed through self-reflection and listening to what others tell us about ourselves. A leader is continually open to learning and makes the connection between what one knows and believes to what we say or do. Bennis and Goldsmith (1997) referred to the expression, *walking your talk*. According to Palmer (1997) a leader finds every possible way to listen to his or her inner voice and take its counsel seriously. Palmer's advice is exceptionally helpful to teachers who struggle with a challenging student. Palmer stated that a person whose presence is ignored either gives up and stops speaking or becomes more and more violent in the attempt to gain attention (Crippen, 2005).

As previously stated, awareness aids understanding of the many layers involved with ethics and values. Through anticipation and preparation, self-awareness strengthens individuals. When defining another's integrity, self-knowledge is essential. Part of being a servant leader requires a view from a more integrated, holistic position. An individual possesses courage when making a commitment to foster awareness, as the servant leader is placed into a relationship with vulnerability and openness. Awareness alerts leaders to ways of serving others (Spears, 2004).

Many recent studies have examined the role of self-awareness as well as the awareness of others who hold leadership positions. While studying self-awareness and the perceptions of others, Sosik and Megerian (1999) found a relationship between perceptions and transformational leadership. Most behavioral models of emotional intelligence show awareness as one of the key components (Barling, Slater, & Kelloway, 2000; Caruso, Mayer, & Salovey, 2002).

Greenleaf (1977) explained awareness to include the examination of oneself and others by using diverse assessment techniques. He first noted awareness is not a giver of solace; instead it is just the opposite, a disturber and an awakener. Capable leaders are usually sharply awakened and reasonably disturbed by their findings through various techniques practiced. They are not seekers of solace but instead possess their own inner serenity (Spears, 2004). Making a commitment to foster awareness seems scary because one never knows what may be discovered (Greenleaf, 1970).

A successful leader possesses more than just academic and technical abilities. Self-awareness is one of the most valuable yet least recognized competencies. Before a leader is able to inspire or influence individuals, he or she must first look within and examine who he or she is, what are his or her values, beliefs, and expectations, and where he or she wants to go and how he

or she wants to get there. According to Graham (2006), self-awareness is where true success begins because it is difficult to understand the world and how one responds to certain stimuli without it. Leaders who pretend to know it all do not benefit organizations as much as leaders who take responsibility for what they do not know. While having been one of the least discussed leadership competencies, self-awareness remains one of the most valuable.

The first step in the process of learning to lead oneself is the mastery of self-awareness. Self-awareness is defined as simply knowing who you are and understanding why you think, feel, and behave the way you do. Without self-awareness a person is doomed to repeat mistakes. Without it one has not broken through the internal barriers essential for personal growth. Self-awareness is the most important ingredient in emotional intelligence, which is directly proportional to great leadership performance. Harnessing the power of self-awareness leads to better decisions, high productivity, and effective communication. Self-awareness also increases prospects for career advancement and reduces stress. Leaders are more successful who embrace this philosophy, that self-improvement is not only possible but also absolutely crucial in this age of unreason. Jaworski (2010) once said that discovering yourself is the first step in leading or helping others. Increasing self-awareness fosters continuous growth and improvement.

Through emotional awareness the servant leader is fully self-expressed. He or she places a premium on self-awareness, transformational introspection, and empathy as sources of information. When considering emotional intelligence and leadership, one remembers that self-awareness is the foundation on which all other competencies of emotional intelligence are based. In short, a leader cannot understand the emotions of others until he or she becomes aware of his or her own emotions and how to manage them (Cadman, 2004).

Awareness and perception are both shown in servant leaders. These attributes allow a principal an accurate perception of the current strengths and weaknesses of his or her school. This leader is also aware of and knowledgeable about the most effective educational practices. The servant leader is able to see obligations and responsibilities in a way that permits sorting the urgent from the important in order to deal with the most pressing issues (Stueber, 2000). All types of awareness engage the mind, body, and emotions in a way that make it possible to experience one's self through others' eyes. Leaders acknowledge one's life is created according to beliefs, both conscious and subconscious. Unfortunately, the happiness and success a person seeks to create in life could be interrupted by self-sabotage and negativity. Unless these negative invasions are addressed, recognized, and brought under control, a person only continues to repeat mistakes and reap the same results.

### *Persuasion*

Persuasion has always been used as an ability to influence others by means outside of formal authority. The servant leader is effective in building consensus within groups through persuasion rather than forcing positional authority to make decisions within an organization (Posser, 2007). Several types of persuasion exist. To convince people they have the capacity to achieve what they want to accomplish, verbal persuasion is widely used. Verbal persuasion also promotes the development of skills (Hoy & Miskel, 2008). When used alone social persuasion has limited power to create a lasting increase in self-efficacy. However, social persuasion has contributed to successful performance if the heightened appraisal is within realistic bounds.

Power is used ethically by servant leaders with the preferred mode of action requiring persuasion. One arrives at a feeling of rightness about a belief or action through intuitive sense and persuasion. The act of persuasion helps order logic and favors an innate step. This step is

taken alone by the person being persuaded, untrammelled by coercive or manipulative strategies of any kind. Greenleaf (1977) reported times when manipulation or even coercion is in order. This practice protects the well-being of others an institutional survival and is not abused to inflate one's ego. Persuasion is not an easy task; the most challenging of human skills, persuasion is a difficult, time consuming process (Frick, 2004).

Successful servant leaders seek to convince rather than coerce and remain effective in consensus building. Reliance on persuasion when making decisions, not on positional authority, is an approach that taps ethos (authentic Spirit) rather than enthusiasm, which can sometimes be misleading or fake. One of the clearest distinctions between the traditional authoritarian model and that of servant leadership is in the area of persuasion (Spears, 2004). Stories of identity constitute the single most powerful weapon in any servant leader's arsenal (Gardiner, 1995). Frick (2004) recommended not holding back if one feels strongly about an issue, especially if it is a situation that will ultimately benefit one's immediate environment. One of the clearest distinctions between the traditional authoritarian model and that of servant leadership is offered by this particular element.

A leader must ask himself or herself whether or not he or she is persuading by appealing more to emotion than logic. Leaders who are emotionally intelligent easily influence others by appealing to emotion. Other questions a leader should ask include: Am I effective at influencing people? Am I focused on people's emotions? Am I inspired toward goals by emotionally engaging people? The Brain Science of Persuasive Powers, as cited in Brusman (2010) insists that appealing only to logic and reason when attempting to influence others will not unlock the full potential of our persuasive powers.

Individuals respond to persuasive attempts either analytically or automatically. A reasoned evaluative approach to a decision requires an enormous amount of energy and is used by those who respond analytically. When evaluating the brain uses reserves of glucose and calories. Because it is human nature to conserve energy, most individuals will not respond with the extra effort required to be analytical. Most individuals slip into automatic-response mode whenever possible. Cognitive evaluation is avoided simply because it is hard work. This is a primitive survival instinct and does not mean humans are, as individuals, lazy. This automatic response conserves energy in case one is attacked or threatened. Most people do not act on logic and reason; instead emotional decisions are made then justified with logic and reason (Brusman, 2008).

Rost (1991) contended that leadership is a multi-directional influential relationship concerned with the process of developing mutual purposes. It is essential for today's leaders to realize the need for persuasion. Many people define persuasion as synonymous with influencing or selling. Persuasive rhetoric is used by leaders to convince, encourage, and energize superiors, peers, and subordinates. A leader is capable of persuasion when faced with the inherent complexities of leading his or her organization through transformational change. When rallying others to support difficult or potentially controversial decisions, persuasion plays an even more important role (McGuire, 2002).

Every person has the potential to influence others; and part of being a leader is convincing people to work for you when they are not obligated. While it is not possible for each and every person to become a great leader, every person could become a better leader. Influence and persuasion could be developed and practiced by equals even though we never know precisely who or how much we influence others. People do not follow a positional leader

beyond his or her stated authority. Individuals will only do what they have to do when they are required to do it. However, influence toward excellence is a skill that can be developed. A leader must bring other influencers within the group with him or her to these higher levels of expectations in order for his or her leadership to remain effective (Maxwell, 1993).

According to Bass (1981) persuasion is seen as a form of leadership and remains a powerful tool for forming both expectations and beliefs in others. In fact, leadership is dependent on the person's ability to persuade in one form or the other (Haas, 1999). This point of view is supported by Koontz and O'Donnell (1968). They agreed that leadership is the "activity of persuading people to cooperate in the achievement of a common objective" (p.15). Copeland added his theory that leadership is the art of influencing a body of people by persuasion or example to follow a certain line of action (Bass, 1981).

Based on these statements, persuasion is absolutely about communication. It takes form in discussion or discourse between advisors, concerned groups, and even opponents. Participants promote their own views and interest and are encouraged to adjust their view of reality or even to change their values as a result of the process in a free debate or two way discourse. The success of a leader depended upon his or her ability to appeal to key groups and constituencies in order to gain support (Majone, 1989).

According to Pascarella (1998) three cornerstones of persuasion included establishing credibility, identifying shared ground, and developing compelling positions. These cornerstones enhanced a leader's capacity to persuade. Pascarella insisted persuasion was a far more effective approach to leadership than control, trickery, or manipulation. The second cornerstone of shared ground not only maintained commonalities with subordinates but also cultivated an important shared purpose. Shared values or beliefs between the parties were significant. Nevertheless, it

remained essential that the leader must have possessed and communicated valid facts and a compelling rationale for the advocacy of a specific plan of action. The perception of these facts must also have been influenced by the leader. Through persuasion the leader communicated and shared expectations and beliefs. The success of the endeavor was guaranteed by the leader's ability to connect with people emotionally and to convince them of the 'correctness' of the idea.

How the audience perceived the presentation of a given fact was just as important as the fact itself; in some cases, even more important (Ury, 1993). Persuasive leaders used conviction and reason to guide others to adopt an idea, attitude, or action. A high degree of authenticity when communicating wants and needs to others was insured by a leader's pleas, both personal and tangible. It was understood by these individuals that a well-defined problem and solutions grounded in experience would have gained higher acceptance and greater cooperation from others. Experience and understanding of the problem was a prerequisite before explaining or exploring the solution.

Heifetz, Burns, and Greenleaf, as cited in Northouse (2007) stated it is important to remember persuasive servant leaders always sought desired benefits for everyone involved and strived for the betterment of others over self. A consensus within groups was sought rather than forcing a minority judgment or decision on everyone. Actions and decisions in which one person or group benefited at the cost of another had to be avoided. Effective leaders knew when the timing was right to use persuasion to advance the mission of an organization, as well as on whom to use this tactic. Aristotle, as cited in Northouse (2007), held the belief concerning character that this is the most effective means of persuasion.

Persuasion is identified as a lifelong skill, a practice area constantly under development and in need of improvement. It becomes a daily activity for most leaders who labor to make progress through the cooperation of others (Emelo, 2008).

Interestingly, formal authority or legitimate power is not relied upon when using persuasion to influence others (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2002). A convincing rationale outweighs organizational rank in the influence process (Spears, 1995). Ping and Yuki (2000) tested perceived effectiveness of influence and tactics to find rational persuasion among the most effective in American cultures. More positive outcomes can be reached when rational persuasion is used rather than forceful influence strategies such as exchanges, pressure, coalitions, and legitimizing (Falbe & Yuki, 1992). In studies discussed by Bass and Steidlmeier (1999), the importance of persuasion as tied to ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership is always a better alternative than force.

### *Conceptualization*

Conceptualization is seeing *the big picture* (Degraaf et al., 2001). Abilities to conceptualize the world, events, and possibilities are nurtured by servant leaders (Barbuto, 2010). Personal direction, potential, and value are fostered by dreams. Sharing and prioritizing concepts heavily influence our future (Maxwell, 2002). In assessing a problem of an organization effectively, the leader must look beyond day-to-day routines to gain a conceptual perception. Conceptualization requires discipline and practice; servant leaders are called to strike a delicate balance between conceptual thinking and a practical day-to-day approach (Spears, 2004).

Conceptual skills include the ability to work with ideas, to form concepts, and to develop abstract reasoning. A leader who possesses conceptual skills is comfortable talking about the

ideas and the inherent intricacies that shape an organization. This individual is eloquent in expressing the group's goal in words any listener could understand, even expressing costly complex principles that definitely affect the organization. Abstraction and hypothetical notions come easily to a leader with conceptual skills that are fundamental in creating a vision and a strategic plan. This coincides with the mental work of shaping policy issues, and understanding an organization's missions and its current and future status (Northouse, 2007).

Conceptualization is characterized by being able to see holistically, being able to think about the complexities of the organization in systematic terms, and being able to think beyond existing actualities to future possibilities. The need for short-term discipline and practice consumes the traditional leader; on the other hand transformation into a servant leader, results from one having stretched his or her thinking to encompass broader-based conceptual thinking. A leader is discouraged from the engagement of daily operations, which leads to micromanagement and the failure to provide visionary concepts for an institution (Maxwell, 2002).

Vision is a necessity to lead organization effectively toward a goal. Staratt (2004) emphasized that those who lead schools need moral depth and a well-articulated platform for the moral work of learning in the school as well as a clear sense of how to proactively engage teachers and students in an authentic process of learning.

Leadership is considered more conceptual than operating because a leader must pioneer ahead to show the way, an ability that requires much more than just verbal skill. Greenleaf as cited in Frick and Spears (1996) described conceptual talent as the ability to see the whole in perspective of past and future, to state and adjust goals, to evaluate, to analyze, and to foresee contingencies. He declared conceptualizing the prime leadership talent.

The conceptualizer is seen as a persuader and a relationship builder. By contrast management is accomplished through the skills of those who have the ability to carry the enterprise towards its objectives and resolve issues that arose spontaneously. A successful organization requires skills of both workers and conceptualizers. Conceptualizers emerge when an organization makes a strong push for distinct progress (Frick, 2004).

In a school setting the classroom teacher who has the ability to conceptualize and communicate concepts sees beyond the day's lesson to the objectives for the unit and year. Communication with parents about schools goals and values comes often and clearly (Stuever, 2000). Maxwell (2003) explained that one does not have to be a mathematician or a scientist to embrace the big picture and benefit from it. When referring to big picture thinking, Maxwell (2003) described seeing the world beyond one's own needs and detailed how this thinking leads to great ideas. Big picture thinking advocates focused, creative, shared, and reflective thinking. A leader evaluates the past to gain a better understanding of the future and set high goals (Maxwell, 2003). Impressive breakthroughs are achieved by removing mental clutter and distractions. This helps individuals realize potential while thinking outside the box. Maxwell also conveyed the importance of working with others to compound results that help move forward an organization.

### *Foresight*

The sixth characteristic of leadership is foresight, a core skill for all leaders. Greenleaf (1977) stated this to be the innermost ethic of leadership. The failure or refusal of a leader who lacks the characteristic of foresight is an ethical inadequacy and is deemed a failure in the eyes of many. The assumption is that the right actions are not taken when there is freedom for

inventiveness or ingenuity. The label of unethical failure is due to the inability to foresee and act constructively. Those who do not act accordingly are denounced.

Short-term thinking and lack of foresight leads to team failures, malfunction of established policies, and group ruin. Greenleaf (1996) was one of many who reported prudent foresight saved at-risk systems. His view of foresight is considered traditional. Hypothetically, on a time line *now* is only one point on the line that moves ceaselessly towards the future. In his illustration of a flashlight beam focused on now, the light is most intense at the present moment, but parts of the past and future are also slightly illuminated. Greenleaf (1996) stated that the now includes all of history and all of the future. By knowing the history of a situation, one understands and foresees an outline of the future. Everyone is capable of learning the art of foresight; while an individual lives fully in the present, a high awareness of conscious and unconscious realities must be possessed to clarify imminent potentials (Frick, 2004).

Positive visions of the future are cultivated by leaders with foresight. Leaders who stand above the rest motivate and inspire others to make a difference and turn positive visions into reality. By combining lessons learned from the past with aspirations for the future, leaders who exercise foresight become effective leaders in the present. However, the forecasting of current trends or simply guessing about the future is not considered foresight. Instead, foresight is identified as relevant opportunities that constantly emerge and anticipate the impact of these trends. The leader passes to other individuals the larger vision or purpose for which to strive. Expected downturns are a given when times are good, while the next presumed growth trend resonates from eventful times (Emelo, 2008).

Emelo (2008) proclaimed foresight practiced effectively allows leaders freedom from entrapment in the past or present. They envision a preferred future with possibilities and then

successfully lead other individuals toward these opportunities. Numerous leadership domains such as decision making, enacting change, visioning, strategic planning, and motivational skills are directly impacted by the ability of a leader to effectively predict outcomes. By these standards, it is easy to see why foresight is such an integral quality in leadership.

One major benefit is that others willingly commit to an attractive future projected by a leader with productive foresight. These leaders look beyond to possible future opportunities and make real connections to meaningful work. Strategic foresight translates into workable plans. The work is consistently guided with a forward leaning posture focused on creating meaning and purpose. The inspiration and excitement that is felt by followers shapes and molds their preferred future that leads to a personal commitment and dedication to the leader's plans and decisions. The result is a resourceful, visionary, inspiring, and proactive leader (Emelo, 2008).

Emelo (2008) also described foresight as an abstract dynamic process that changes swiftly; hence most individuals oscillate in applying it productively. The ultimate goal is to exercise foresight when needed and to feel confident enough that an analysis can provide vital insights to lead effectively. Reflection on the past is inevitable when forecasting the future, including but not limited to deep truths and significant indicators.

Greenleaf as cited in Patterson (2003) viewed foresight as crucial in "helping others attain a larger vision or purpose as they otherwise might not be able to attain for themselves" (p.7). Spears (1995) agreed that foresight is "critical in helping organizations move from a survival outlook, reacting to the immediate events, to being proactive" (p. 245). Spears also stated that once a leader loses his or her ability to foresee events, he or she is a leader in name only. Young (2002) agreed when one who only reacts to immediate events, the longevity of effective leadership will be compromised. Spears explained in order to possess foresight one

must “understand the lessons from the past, the realities of the present, and a likely consequence of decision for the future” (p.22). This foresight is in regard to the well-being, vision, and productivity of the individuals and entire community (Spears, 1995).

Dennis and Bocarnea (2005) insisted that servant leaders “breathe life into their visions and get people to see the exciting possibilities for the future” (p.600). Leaders must generate talents to envision an establishment’s future or to “create a shared vision with meaning” (p. 600). These beliefs remain the source for the values that drive the theory and reveal a close tie between servant leadership and foresight. Riverstone (2004) acknowledged a social or cultural shift is emerging, allowing exploration into aspects that have previously been ignored. He viewed servant leadership as a manifestation of values and another way for individuals to fulfill their desire to develop settings, thus helping others and rendering long term success. Servant leadership allows individuals and enterprises to pursue preferred and aspired futures rather than simply meeting the forecasted demands of present trends. In the end, foresight remains a characteristic that enables servant-leaders to understand lessons from the past, the realities of the present, and the likely consequence of future decisions. As it is deeply rooted in the intuitive mind servant-leaders are born picking up patterns in environments to foresee what the future will bring (Greenleaf, 2004). Despite the difficulty to define foresight adequately, it is easy to identify in a great leader (Spears, 1995).

### *Stewardship*

Stewardship is defined in various ways. Conway (2007) is adamant in his belief that stewardship begins with the perception of ownership. His explanation suggests that a person has a valid claim and exclusive right to his or her own property. A steward, who may be a manager, supervisor, or administrator, is one who works on behalf of another. A steward is the owner,

making him or her responsible for the property of another, be it a company, department, team, or individual. Another definition of stewardship is described as one's accountability to meet the needs of others for outcomes without being in absolute control of a situation. Stewardship requires choosing to produce the greatest outcome, service over self-interest; it is the ability to reach the potential of those around you. One who possesses stewardship takes responsibility of making the organization successful (The Commonwealth Practice, LTD., 2002). However, Greenleaf (1977) added that all members of an organization play a significant role in holding their organization in trust for the greater good of society.

Going a step farther, Greenleaf (1970) discussed the biblical concept that there is no respect of persons and that collective equality prevails. His inspiration positions oneself in the midst of others and discourages one from thinking higher of self than others. Barbuto and Wheeler (2002) expressed the significance of organizational members to assess and concentrate on the prioritized needs within a society above those within the institution. Greenleaf (1996) focused on the connections between relationships of people, organizations, and society. His endorsement of individuality encourages growth in both the professional and personal life and fosters continued stimulation and overall progress within an organization.

Fullan (2003) suggested examination of the leadership role is pertinent to stimulating a difference within the learning environment; he invited principals and teachers to sponsor the framework that renders effective holistic outcomes. Depress (1989) accentuated the importance of leaders and teachers in making positive and substantial donations to society. Stewardship, according to Depree, encompasses the legacy, assets, momentum, and effectiveness of respectfulness and the consideration of morals and values. Purkey and Siefel (2002) proclaimed that by serving others one can obtain full meaning and an overwhelming desire to make a

difference in the lives of others. Sergiovanni (2000) and Block (1996) expanded stewardship to include an in-depth attempt or commitment to conduct the daily activities of one's life with consideration of what lay in the best interest of others.

Effective leadership and stewardship go hand in hand. Putting aside one's own self-interest in order to promote the interests of others and the organization eliminates controlling or coercive behavior as a deterrent of the group. Leaders displaying stewardship are identified as acquiring high levels of trust, sincerity, and dedication. Their goal is to further the growth of the group. Leaders entrusted to steward an organization are inspired to put the needs of others first and deny self. Leaders who practice stewardship develop a legacy for future generations by multiplying material, intellectual, emotional, and human resources to benefit the makeup of an organization (Triple Creek, July 2008).

McCall's (1997) affirmation of stewardship holds the leader accountable for the growth of an organization by operating in a service capacity rather than a controlling situation. Jablonski (2006) agreed that in an organization, force takes a backseat to patience and respect, which undeniably kindle solutions that work for everyone. Healthy and profitable organizations are dependent upon leaders who display stewardship within the organization by strategically developing and implanting actions that promote the well being of workers for a successful environment (Jablonski, 2006). Cadman (2004) maintained action is fundamental. It occurs as the inventive and idealistic expression of oneself is present while learning and individual potential enable and empower those within an organization to visualize their abilities indicative of a successful organization.

A leadership article from NebGuide University of Nebraska, asked "Do others believe you are preparing the organization to make a positive difference in the world" (2006 p. 2)?

Servant leaders are identified by a sturdy amount of stewardship. In medieval times a steward is held responsible for the skills and growth of a young prince to facilitate his sovereignty. The steward is accountable for establishing a kingdom that will be successful. Today, many of the same expectations are placed on those who lead. Within an organization the steward is responsible for the expansion and greater good of that organization and for the enhancement of society. It is necessary for a leader to embrace stewardship if the desire is to be a servant leader (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2007).

### *Commitment to the Growth of People*

Laub (1998) maintained there are many different styles of servant leadership; however, he supported Greenleaf's (1977) original thought that empowerment of faculty begins with a leader who provides the support and encouragement required to build community within the educational institute. Empowerment is naturally accepted and sought in the culture of today. Most enjoy providing tools and personal learning experiences to make a difference in the lives of other people (Tice, 1994). Through empowerment, individuals achieve greatness based on the servant leader's help, not his intimidation (Smolenyak & Majumday, 1992).

According to Covey (1994) the key in reaching many is through self-development. Each individual has a desire to be recognized for his or her value, contributions, and knowledge; therefore, the key to many requires one to look at the individual. A servant leader maintains focus on his or her followers as individuals and not as a whole, never using people for selfish desires. Kiechel (1995) stated, "The servant leader takes the individual seriously, valuing people and knowing the work exists for the person as much as the person exists for the work" (p. 121). People have not only present value but future potential. It was human nature to intuit the value

and trust of another, so this respect is given by the servant leader upfront. Trust is not a virtue that has to be earned, it is freely given.

A servant leader places the responsibility on his or her shoulders to assist others in reaching their full potential. The key is the creation of a dynamic learning environment and the encouragement of growth and development. For example, rather than to chastise an individual over mistakes, an error is viewed as an opportunity to learn. Furthermore, proper acknowledgement has to be given to acts performed correctly. Finally, creativity and accomplishments are celebrated (Laub, 1998).

When committing to the growth of people, the traditional work relationship pyramid is reversed, making the servant leader responsible to the people. There is no distinct line drawn between the leader and the follower (Gane, 2009). The cornerstone of success within any institution or organization is a leader's commitment to both the professional and personal growth of people. The importance of growth and development for each individual within an organization has to be recognized and accomplished through constant learning in structure development programs and activities that target a group rather than an individual. Listening skills also play a key role. Productivity emerges from commitment rather than control and domination; likewise, people work best towards accomplishing valued missions. In turn, these selfless actions inspire others to become leaders (Simms, 2008).

Only through a deep commitment to the personal, professional, and spiritual growth of others, does one successfully possess the attribute of servant leadership. Uniqueness must be affirmed, and nurture must be given to connect with others' developmental needs and how to meet those needs. Only once an individual sees his or her intrinsic value is recognized and not

only his or her tangible contributions, a servant leader receives trust and respect (Goodlad, 1979, 1994).

A foundation for success is for the servant leader to acknowledge the organization's capacity to liberate human potential. Education must remain never ending. One must encourage others to reach a level of leadership. Only at this point is organizational growth discovered as well as individuals by which it is created and for whom it thrives (Goodlad, 1979, 1994).

### *Building Community*

In order to inspire future servant leadership in others, one must have seek out means for building community such as investing financially, providing service, or simply caring about one's community. Novak (2002) suggests that educational institutions use service and real life problem solving to not only move into the population but also to move the community into the schools. By allowing parent groups and community members to become involved in school planning, caring become an integral part of a shared community (Sergiovanni, 1994).

The National Association of Elementary School Principals (2008) offered six objectives to increase this participation: relationship-building, communication, decision-making, advocacy, learning opportunities, and community partnerships. Positive experiences result when members of a community are allowed to serve others adding to and enhancing each individual student's educational experience (Commissioner's Parents Advisory Council of Kentucky, 2007).

Healthy organizations build community and create a sense that all are part of a loving, caring team with a shared vision. To simply get the job done is not typically seen; rather the concern rests more within the relationships between individuals completing the job. A successful servant leader recognizes that people are impacted more by the quality of relationships than the accomplishment of performed tasks. At the same time, a successful

community has to work together and learn to serve one another through the process. Leaders provide time and opportunity to those within their community to share, listen, reflect, and encourage friendships to emerge. Competitiveness between individuals should not be allowed to characterize the atmosphere of a group. Differences in ethnicity, gender, age, and culture should not only be respected and celebrated by leaders but also boldly protected to prevent members from feeling less valued or set apart from the team. This goal is accomplished by group and self-awareness of prejudices and biases (O'Donnell & Schumer, 1996).

While it is important to involve the outside community to achieve success in an organization, a servant leader must also accept the idea to include an inside organization as a community and allow it to function as such. Human history has seen a shift from local communities to larger institutions as the primary shaper of human lives. A servant leader with this awareness seeks to identify some means to build the inner community. Greenleaf (1970) stated building a community involves servant leaders who demonstrate an unlimited desire to develop unique societies. By building community throughout an organization, individuals build personal connections with one another that transcend the work roles and build trust throughout the organization.

History also indicates when people find a healthy community, loyalty is inspired. Real community is contagious. Gane (2009) reported being part of a community and doing a good job within it is seen by employees as more important than getting ahead in the organization or simply making a good living. Successful leaders identify a means for building community with the understanding that people work better within communities rather than as individuals. A servant leader should be actively involved in the life of the community by modeling personal skills,

setting examples, and expanding individual's comfort level within a participatory approach (Simms, 2008).

### *Summary*

Chapter 2 is a review of related literature. The review of literature was completed on the 10 characteristics of a servant leader. Greater knowledge of the servant leadership characteristics and the related affects and effects the characteristics could have on an educational setting were presented. Chapter 3 contains a description of the methodology for this study. Chapter 4 describes the data analysis, and Chapter 5 is a summary of findings, conclusions, and recommendations for future study.

## CHAPTER 3

### METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This quantitative study was designed to determine if a relationship existed between teachers' perceptions of their principal and the principal's self-perceptions. The 10 null hypotheses stating there was no significant difference in the perceptions of teachers versus the perceptions of their principal were tested in each of 17 schools. Chapter 3 describes the methodology and procedures used in this study. This chapter contains sections that address the areas of research design, populations, procedure, research questions and null hypotheses, data analysis, and a summary.

#### *Research Design*

According to Greenleaf (1996) individuals who chose to follow the servant leader freely responded only to individuals chosen as leaders because they were proven and trusted servants. Hence, the only truly viable institutions were those predominantly servant led (The Commonwealth Practice, 2002). This quantitative study compared teachers' perceptions of the school principal with the principal's self-perceptions to determine if a difference existed. The analysis of this study was conducted using the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaires which were given to teachers with at least 3 years of experience and 17 principals within nine counties in southwest Virginia. The Metcalfe Leadership Survey was administered through an online survey tool, Survey Monkey. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to calculate results of the surveys.

Data collected using the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire were applied by using a one-sample  $t$ -test. In this type of test a hypothesis was tested by comparing the mean of teachers with the score of the principal. Through a one-sample  $t$ -test a determination regarding the study's

hypotheses was made regarding rejection or retention. All data were computed using SPSS for Windows.

### *Procedure*

The purpose of this quantitative study was to examine the relationship between leadership characteristics as determined by teachers' perceptions and the self-analysis by their principals in 17 Title I elementary schools in rural southwest Virginia. Two questionnaires were developed (Babbie, 1998) and identified as the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and for principals. The questionnaires were given as a pilot test to students taking a research course at East Tennessee State University. The students gave an informal critique of the questionnaire, the notations were analyzed, and changes were made resulting in a more accurate questionnaire.

Questionnaires were designed for 53 principals and 1,648 teachers in 9 counties. The process of elimination began with the reduction of any school that employed a faculty of fewer than 20 teachers. Questionnaires were sent to 35 principals and 1,201 teachers. Surveys were eliminated based on several criteria: the teachers who had fewer than 3 years of experience, the questionnaire was not completed in full, or the questionnaire was not completed at all. All surveys from a school with fewer than 10 participating teachers were also eliminated. The population for the final analysis included data collected from 17 principals and 229 teachers. All schools remained anonymous and were identified by pseudonyms. All schools were identified as Title I schools as determined by having a 40% or higher number of students who received free and reduced price breakfast and lunch participation.

Principals and teachers of 17 elementary schools completed the questionnaires designed to identify leadership characteristics reflective of servant leaders as defined by Greenleaf (1977). A 5 point Likert type scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) undecided, (4)

agree, (5) strongly agree was used in the questionnaires, allowing both the teachers and principals to give accurate assessments of their beliefs or opinions. Questionnaires were completed and results calculated via Survey Monkey, an online survey tool. Each school was represented by a pseudonym to ensure anonymity.

This questionnaire consisted of 20 questions, 2 questions per characteristic, which revealed how each school's leadership practices and beliefs are perceived by teachers and principals. This questionnaire was distributed to both teachers and principals within the nine counties. The data were analyzed using the SPSS Version 15.0 software package. The difference between the principal's and teachers' scores was found using a one sample t-test. The significance value was compared to the predetermined significance level ( $<.05$ ) to determine if the null hypothesis is rejected and the conclusion made that the principal's score and the teachers' mean are different. If the calculated value is greater than the predetermined significance level ( $<.05$ ), the null hypothesis would be retained and the conclusion that the score of the principal and the teachers' mean are not different. Data summaries and data analysis results are presented in Chapter 4.

### *Population*

The population consisted of 17 schools, 17 principals, and 229 teachers in nine counties who had held their position as a teacher for at least 3 years. Each school had 1 principal employed at the time of the study in the same nine counties. These teachers and principals participated in the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire to determine each of the 17 school principal's servant leadership characteristics. Both populations were taken from Title I schools that had 40% or higher of students who received reduced and free priced meals.

### *Research Questions and Null Hypotheses*

Research Question 1: Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) at school 1?

H1<sub>1</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic listening.

H1<sub>2</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic empathy.

H1<sub>3</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic awareness.

H1<sub>4</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic healing.

H1<sub>5</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic persuasion.

H1<sub>6</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic conceptualization.

H1<sub>7</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic foresight.

H1<sub>8</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic stewardship.

H1<sub>9</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic commitment to the growth of people.

H1<sub>10</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic building community.

Research Question 2: Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) at school 2?

H2<sub>1</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic listening.

H2<sub>2</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic empathy.

H2<sub>3</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic awareness.

H2<sub>4</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic healing.

H2<sub>5</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic persuasion.

H2<sub>6</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic conceptualization.

H2<sub>7</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic foresight.

H2<sub>8</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic stewardship.

H2<sub>9</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic commitment to the growth of people.

H2<sub>10</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic building community.

Research Question 3: Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) at school 3?

H3<sub>1</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic listening.

H3<sub>2</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic empathy.

H3<sub>3</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic awareness.

H3<sub>4</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic healing.

H3<sub>5</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic persuasion.

H3<sub>6</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic conceptualization.

H3<sub>7</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic foresight.

H3<sub>8</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic stewardship.

H3<sub>9</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic commitment to the growth of people.

H3<sub>10</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic building community.

Research Question 4: Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) at school 4?

H4<sub>1</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic listening.

H4<sub>2</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic empathy.

H4<sub>3</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic awareness.

H4<sub>4</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic healing.

H4<sub>5</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic persuasion.

H4<sub>6</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic conceptualization.

H4<sub>7</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic foresight.

H4<sub>8</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic stewardship.

H4<sub>9</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic commitment to the growth of people.

H4<sub>10</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic building community.

Research Question 5: Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) at school

5?

H5<sub>1</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic listening.

H5<sub>2</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic empathy.

H5<sub>3</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic awareness.

H5<sub>4</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic healing.

H5<sub>5</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic persuasion.

H5<sub>6</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic conceptualization.

H5<sub>7</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic foresight.

H5<sub>8</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic stewardship.

H5<sub>9</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic commitment to the growth of people.

H5<sub>10</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic building community.

Research Question 6: Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10

survey variables (listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) at school 6?

H6<sub>1</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic listening.

H6<sub>2</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic empathy.

H6<sub>3</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic awareness.

H6<sub>4</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic healing.

H6<sub>5</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic persuasion.

H6<sub>6</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic conceptualization.

H6<sub>7</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic foresight.

H6<sub>8</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic stewardship.

H6<sub>9</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic commitment to the growth of people.

H6<sub>10</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic building community.

Research Question 7: Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) at school 7?

H7<sub>1</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic listening.

H7<sub>2</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic empathy.

H7<sub>3</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic awareness.

H7<sub>4</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic healing.

H7<sub>5</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic persuasion.

H7<sub>6</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic conceptualization.

H7<sub>7</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic foresight.

H7<sub>8</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic stewardship.

H7<sub>9</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic commitment to the growth of people.

H7<sub>10</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic building community.

Research Question 8: Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) at school 8?

H8<sub>1</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic listening.

H8<sub>2</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic empathy.

H8<sub>3</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic awareness.

H8<sub>4</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic healing.

H8<sub>5</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic persuasion.

H8<sub>6</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic conceptualization.

H8<sub>7</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic foresight.

H8<sub>8</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic stewardship.

H8<sub>9</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic commitment to the growth of people.

H8<sub>10</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic building community.

Research Question 9: Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) at school 9?

H9<sub>1</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic listening.

H9<sub>2</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic empathy.

H9<sub>3</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic awareness.

H9<sub>4</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic healing.

H9<sub>5</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic persuasion.

H9<sub>6</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic conceptualization.

H9<sub>7</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic foresight.

H9<sub>8</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic stewardship.

H9<sub>9</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic commitment to the growth of people.

H9<sub>10</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic building community.

Research Question 10: Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) at school 10?

H10<sub>1</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic listening.

H10<sub>2</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic empathy.

H10<sub>3</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic awareness.

H10<sub>4</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic healing.

H10<sub>5</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic persuasion.

H10<sub>6</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic conceptualization.

H10<sub>7</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic foresight.

H10<sub>8</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic stewardship.

H10<sub>9</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic commitment to the growth of people.

H10<sub>10</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic building community.

Research Question 11: Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) at school

11?

H1<sub>1</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic listening.

H1<sub>2</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic empathy.

H1<sub>3</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic awareness.

H1<sub>4</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic healing.

H1<sub>5</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic persuasion.

H1<sub>6</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic conceptualization.

H1<sub>7</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic foresight.

H1<sub>8</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic stewardship.

H1<sub>9</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic commitment to the growth of people.

H1<sub>10</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic building community.

Research Question 12: Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10

survey variables (listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) at school 12?

H12<sub>1</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic listening.

H12<sub>2</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic empathy.

H12<sub>3</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic awareness.

H12<sub>4</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic healing.

H12<sub>5</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic persuasion.

H12<sub>6</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic conceptualization.

H12<sub>7</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic foresight.

H12<sub>8</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic stewardship.

H12<sub>9</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic commitment to the growth of people.

H12<sub>10</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic building community.

Research Question 13: Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) at school 13?

H13<sub>1</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic listening.

H13<sub>2</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic empathy.

H13<sub>3</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic awareness.

H13<sub>4</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic healing.

H13<sub>5</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic persuasion.

H13<sub>6</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic conceptualization.

H13<sub>7</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic foresight.

H13<sub>8</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic stewardship.

H13<sub>9</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic commitment to the growth of people.

H13<sub>10</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic building community.

Research Question 14: Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) at school 14?

H14<sub>1</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic listening.

H14<sub>2</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic empathy.

H14<sub>3</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic awareness.

H14<sub>4</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic healing.

H14<sub>5</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic persuasion.

H14<sub>6</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic conceptualization.

H14<sub>7</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic foresight.

H14<sub>8</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic stewardship.

H14<sub>9</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic commitment to the growth of people.

H14<sub>10</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic building community.

Research Question 15: Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) at school 15?

H15<sub>1</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic listening.

H15<sub>2</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic empathy.

H15<sub>3</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic awareness.

H15<sub>4</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic healing.

H15<sub>5</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic persuasion.

H15<sub>6</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic conceptualization.

H15<sub>7</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic foresight.

H15<sub>8</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic stewardship.

H15<sub>9</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic commitment to the growth of people.

H15<sub>10</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic building community.

Research Question 16: Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) at school 16?

H16<sub>1</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic listening.

H16<sub>2</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic empathy.

H16<sub>3</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic awareness.

H16<sub>4</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic healing.

H16<sub>5</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic persuasion.

H16<sub>6</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic conceptualization.

H16<sub>7</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic foresight.

H16<sub>8</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic stewardship.

H16<sub>9</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic commitment to the growth of people.

H16<sub>10</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic building community.

Research Question 17: Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) at school

17?

H17<sub>1</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic listening.

H17<sub>2</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic empathy.

H17<sub>3</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic awareness.

H17<sub>4</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic healing.

H17<sub>5</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic persuasion.

H17<sub>6</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic conceptualization.

H17<sub>7</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic foresight.

H17<sub>8</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic stewardship.

H17<sub>9</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic commitment to the growth of people.

H17<sub>10</sub>: There is no difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic building community.

### *Data Analysis*

After contacting all participating school systems, the Metcalfe Leadership Survey was presented to the principals and teachers via email. The data were then collected and analyzed using SPSS using descriptive and inferential statistics. A one-sample *t*-test was used to compare the score of the principal and the mean score of teachers.

### *Summary*

Chapter 3 produced the research design of the study, the participating population, the procedure used for data collection, the research questions and null hypotheses, and data analysis. Quantitative procedures were used throughout the study to determine if differences existed between the teachers' perceptions of the school principal and their school principal's perception of servant leadership skills. The teacher population consisted of teachers with 3 years of more experience in the schools of the nine counties in rural southwest Virginia. Principals used in the study were derived from the same nine counties with no qualifying term. The study consisted of 17 research question with 10 null hypotheses each.

## CHAPTER 4

### ANALYSIS OF DATA

#### *Descriptive Statistics*

The research questions and hypotheses introduced in Chapter 1 and Chapter 3 are addressed in Chapter 4. The data were analyzed using a one-sample  $t$ -test; all gathered data were analyzed using SPSS for Windows. A one-sample  $t$ -test was conducted on teachers' perceptions of their elementary school principals for 17 participating Title I rural southwest Virginia elementary schools to evaluate whether teachers' mean scores were significantly different from their principal's score.

#### *Analysis of Research Question 1*

Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, awareness, healing, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) at school 1?

H<sub>1</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic listening.

H<sub>2</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic empathy.

H<sub>3</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic awareness.

H<sub>4</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic healing.

H1<sub>5</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic persuasion.

H1<sub>6</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic conceptualization.

H1<sub>7</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic foresight.

H1<sub>8</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic stewardship.

H1<sub>9</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic commitment to the growth of people.

H1<sub>10</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic building community.

Means, standard deviations, *t* values, *p* values, effect sizes (interpreted as small (0.2), medium (0.5), and large (0.8) regardless of sign), and confidence intervals for school 1 are displayed in Table 1. Results support the conclusion that the principal's scores were significantly different from those of teachers on some variables. In the case of research question 1, the teachers and principal showed a significant difference on 6 of the 10 dimensions. H1<sub>2</sub>, H1<sub>4</sub>, H1<sub>6</sub>, H1<sub>8</sub>, H1<sub>9</sub>, and H1<sub>10</sub> were rejected, with the principal showing a significantly higher score on all dimensions except 9 in which teachers scored higher. H1<sub>1</sub>, H1<sub>3</sub>, H1<sub>5</sub>, and H1<sub>7</sub> were

retained. The hypotheses relating to healing, persuasion, and foresight showed a small effect size. Listening, empathy, conceptualization, and stewardship showed a medium effect size. A large effect was shown in awareness, commitment to the growth of people, and building community.

Table 1

*Summary of One Sample t-Test for School 1*

Characteristic	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i> ***	95% CI
1. Listening	4.58 5.00**	.70	2.06	.064	-.59	-.86 to .03
2. Empathy	4.42 5.00**	.82	2.46	.032*	-.71	-1.11 to .03
3. Healing	4.30 4.50**	.94	.77	.459	-.22	-.81 to .39
4. Awareness	4.38 5.00**	.57	3.80	.003*	-1.10	-.99 to -.26
5. Persuasion	4.33 4.00**	.72	1.61	.136	.46	-.12 to .79
6. Conceptualization	4.63 5.00**	.53	2.46	.032*	-.71	-.71 to -.04
7. Foresight	4.54 4.50**	.62	.23	.820	.07	-.35 to .44
8. Stewardship	4.54 5.00**	.65	2.42	.034*	-.70	-.87 to -.04
9. Growth of People	4.58 4.00**	.60	3.39	.006*	.98	.20 to .96
10. Building Community	4.46 5.00**	.62	3.03	.012*	-.87	-.94 to -.15
Overall	4.48	.60	1.30	.218	-.38	-.60 to .15
Overall**	4.70					

\*significant at .05

\*\*Principal's Score \*\*\*effect size

### *Analysis of Research Question 2*

Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, awareness, healing, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) at school 2?

H2<sub>1</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic listening.

H2<sub>2</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic empathy.

H2<sub>3</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic awareness.

H2<sub>4</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic healing.

H2<sub>5</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic persuasion.

H2<sub>6</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic conceptualization.

H2<sub>7</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic foresight.

H2<sub>8</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic stewardship.

H2<sub>9</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic commitment to the growth of people.

H2<sub>10</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic building community.

The results of the second one sample *t*-test including means, standard deviations, *t* values, *p* values, effect sizes (interpreted as small (0.2), medium (0.5), and large (0.8) regardless of sign), and confidence intervals for school 2 are displayed in Table 2. Results support the conclusion that the principal's scores were significantly different from those of the teachers on some variables. In the case of research question 2, the teachers and principal showed a significant difference on 9 of the 10 dimensions. H2<sub>1</sub>, H2<sub>2</sub>, H2<sub>3</sub>, H2<sub>4</sub>, H2<sub>6</sub>, H2<sub>7</sub>, H2<sub>8</sub>, H2<sub>9</sub>, and H2<sub>10</sub> were rejected, with the principal showing a significantly higher score on all dimensions. H2<sub>5</sub> was retained. The hypothesis relating to persuasion showed a small effect size. Healing, awareness, foresight, and stewardship showed a medium effect size. A large effect was shown in listening, empathy, conceptualization, commitment to the growth of people, and growth of community.

Table 2

*Summary of One Sample t-Test for School 2*

Characteristic	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i> ***	95% CI
1. Listening	3.92 5.00**	1.27	3.05	.010*	-.85	-1.85 to -.31
2. Empathy	3.73 5.00**	1.30	3.52	.004*	-.97	-2.06 to -.48
3. Healing	3.58 4.50**	1.46	2.29	.041*	-.63	-1.80 to -.04
4. Awareness	3.81 4.50**	1.09	2.29	.041*	-.63	-1.35 to -.03
5. Persuasion	3.69 4.00**	1.23	.90	.386	-.25	-1.05 to .44
6. Conceptualization	3.85 5.00**	1.09	3.83	.002*	-1.05	-1.81 to -.50
7. Foresight	3.73 4.50**	1.25	2.22	.047*	-.62	-1.53 to -.01
8. Stewardship	3.96 5.00**	1.33	2.82	.016*	-.78	-1.84 to -.23
9. Growth of People	3.96 5.00**	1.25	3.00	.011*	-.83	-1.79 to -.28
10. Building Community	3.73 5.00**	1.20	3.81	.002*	-1.05	-2.00 to -.54
Overall	3.80	1.19	2.90	.013*	-.79	-1.67 to -.24
Overall**	4.75					

\*significant at .05

\*\*Principal's Score \*\*\*effect size

### *Analysis of Research Question 3*

Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, awareness, healing, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) at school 3?

H3<sub>1</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic listening.

H3<sub>2</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic empathy.

H3<sub>3</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic awareness.

H3<sub>4</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic healing.

H3<sub>5</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic persuasion.

H3<sub>6</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic conceptualization.

H3<sub>7</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic foresight.

H3<sub>8</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic stewardship.

H3<sub>9</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic commitment to the growth of people.

H3<sub>10</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic building community.

The results of the third one sample *t*-test including means, standard deviations, *t* values, *p* values, effect sizes (interpreted as small (0.2), medium (0.5), and large (0.8) regardless of sign), and confidence intervals for school 3 are displayed in Table 3. Results support the conclusion that the principal's scores were significantly different from those of teachers on some variables. In the case of research question 3, the teachers and principal showed a significant difference on 5 of the 10 dimensions. H3<sub>1</sub>, H3<sub>6</sub>, H3<sub>7</sub>, H3<sub>8</sub>, and H3<sub>9</sub> were rejected, with the principal showing a significantly higher score on dimension 1 and teachers showing a significantly higher mean on dimensions 6, 7, 8, and 9. H3<sub>2</sub>, H3<sub>3</sub>, H3<sub>4</sub>, H3<sub>5</sub>, and H3<sub>10</sub> were retained. The hypotheses relating to empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, and building community (effect size less than 0.01) showed a small effect size. Stewardship showed a medium effect size. Listening, conceptualization, foresight, and commitment to the growth of people showed a large effect.

Table 3

*Summary of One Sample t-Test for School 3*

Characteristic	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i> ***	95% CI
1. Listening	4.36 5.00**	.50	4.18	.002*	-1.28	-.98 to -.30
2. Empathy	4.23 4.50**	.72	1.26	.237	-.37	-.76 to .21
3. Healing	4.18 4.50**	.72	1.47	.172	-.44	-.80 to .16
4. Awareness	4.09 4.00**	.89	.34	.742	.10	-.51 to .60
5. Persuasion	4.27 4.00**	.68	1.32	.216	.39	-.19 to .73
6. Conceptualization	4.36 4.00**	.45	2.67	.024*	.80	-.06 to .67
7. Foresight	4.32 3.50**	.60	4.50	.001*	1.36	.41 to 1.22
8. Stewardship	4.41 4.00**	.58	2.32	.042*	.70	.02 to .80
9. Growth of People	4.36 3.50**	.55	5.19	<.001*	1.56	.49 to 1.23
10. Building Community	4.50 4.50**	.45	.00	1.000	0.00	-.30 to .30
Overall	4.31	.53	.00	.346	.30	-.20 to .52
Overall***	4.15					

\*significant at .05

\*\*Principal's Score

\*\*\*effect size

*Analysis of Research Question 4*

Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, awareness, healing, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) at school 4?

H4<sub>1</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic listening.

H4<sub>2</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic empathy.

H4<sub>3</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic awareness.

H4<sub>4</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic healing.

H4<sub>5</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic persuasion.

H4<sub>6</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic conceptualization.

H4<sub>7</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic foresight.

H4<sub>8</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic stewardship.

H4<sub>9</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic commitment to the growth of people.

H4<sub>10</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic building community.

Results of the fourth one sample *t*-test including means, standard deviations, *t* values, *p* values, effect sizes (interpreted as small (0.2), medium (0.5), and large (0.8) regardless of sign), and confidence intervals for school 4 are displayed in Table 4. Results support the conclusion that the principal's scores are significantly different from those of teachers on some variables. In the case of research question 3, the teachers and principal showed a significant difference on 5 of the 10 dimensions. H4<sub>1</sub>, H4<sub>2</sub>, H4<sub>6</sub>, H4<sub>9</sub>, and H4<sub>10</sub> were rejected, with the principal showing a significantly higher score on all dimensions. H4<sub>3</sub>, H4<sub>4</sub>, H4<sub>5</sub>, H4<sub>7</sub>, and H4<sub>8</sub> were retained. The hypotheses relating to awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, and stewardship showed a small effect size. Empathy, healing, and commitment to the growth of people showed a medium effect size. Listening and building community showed a large effect.

Table 4

*Summary of One Sample t-Test for School 4*

Characteristic	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i> ***	95% CI
1. Listening	4.14	1.03	3.12	.008*	-.83	-1.45 to -.26
	5.00**					
2. Empathy	4.25	1.07	2.62	.021*	-.70	-1.37 to -.13
	5.00**					
3. Healing	4.43	1.07	2.00	.067	-.53	-1.19 to .05
	5.00**					
4. Awareness	4.14	1.03	1.30	.216	-.34	-.95 to .24
	4.50**					
5. Persuasion	4.29	.89	1.20	.252	.32	-.23 to .80
	4.00**					
6. Conceptualization	4.25	1.03	1.30	.216	-.34	-.95 to .24
	5.00**					
7. Foresight	4.12	1.06	1.39	.189	-.36	-1.00 to .22
	4.50**					
8. Stewardship	4.12	1.06	1.39	.189	-.36	-1.00 to .22
	4.50**					
9. Growth of People	4.21	1.17	2.51	.026*	-.67	-1.46 to -.11
	5.00**					
10. Building Community	4.11	1.00	3.33	.005*	-.89	-1.47 to -.31
	5.00**					
Overall	4.21	1.00	2.00	.067	-.54	-1.11 to .04
Overall**	4.75					

\*significant at .05 \*\*Principal's Score \*\*\*effect size

*Analysis of Research Question 5*

Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, awareness, healing, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) at school 5?

H5<sub>1</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic listening.

H5<sub>2</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic empathy.

H5<sub>3</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic awareness.

H5<sub>4</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic healing.

H5<sub>5</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic persuasion.

H5<sub>6</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic conceptualization.

H5<sub>7</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic foresight.

H5<sub>8</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic stewardship.

H5<sub>9</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic commitment to the growth of people.

H5<sub>10</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic building community.

Results of the fifth one sample *t*-test including means, standard deviations, *t* values, *p* values, effect sizes (interpreted as small (0.2), medium (0.5), and large (0.8) regardless of sign), and confidence intervals for school 5 are displayed in Table 5. Results support the conclusion that the principal's scores were significantly different from those of teachers on some variables. In the case of research question 5, the teachers and principal showed a significant difference on 4 of the 10 dimensions. H5<sub>1</sub>, H5<sub>2</sub>, H5<sub>9</sub>, and H5<sub>10</sub> were rejected, with the principal showing a significantly higher score on all dimensions. H5<sub>3</sub>, H5<sub>4</sub>, H5<sub>5</sub>, H5<sub>6</sub>, H5<sub>7</sub>, and H5<sub>8</sub> were retained. The hypotheses relating to healing, conceptualization, foresight, and stewardship showed a small effect size. Awareness, persuasion, and commitment to the growth of people showed a medium effect size. Listening, empathy, and building community showed a large effect.

Table 5

*Summary of One Sample t-Test for School 5*

Characteristic	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i> ***	95% CI
1. Listening	4.00 5.00**	1.15	2.74	.023*	-.86	-1.83 to -.17
2. Empathy	3.65 5.00**	1.23	3.48	.007*	-1.09	-2.23 to -.47
3. Healing	4.10 4.50**	1.15	1.10	.300	-.34	-1.22 to .42
4. Awareness	3.90 4.50**	1.15	1.65	.133	-.52	-1.42 to .22
5. Persuasion	3.70 4.00**	1.21	2.10	.065	-.66	-1.66 to .06
6. Conceptualization	3.90 4.00**	1.15	.28	.790	-.08	-.92 to .72
7. Foresight	3.90 4.00**	1.17	.27	.794	-.08	-.94 to .74
8. Stewardship	3.95 4.50**	1.21	1.44	.185	-.45	-1.42 to .32
9. Growth of People	4.05 5.00**	1.19	2.53	.032*	-.79	-1.80 to -.10
10. Building Community	3.35 5.00**	1.43	3.64	.005*	-1.15	-2.68 to -.62
Overall	3.85	1.14	1.95	.084	-.61	-1.51 to .11
Overall**	4.55					

\*significant at .05 \*\*Principal's Score \*\*\*effect size

*Analysis of Research Question 6*

Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables at school 6?

H6<sub>1</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic listening.

H6<sub>2</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic empathy.

H6<sub>3</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic awareness.

H6<sub>4</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic healing.

H6<sub>5</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic persuasion.

H6<sub>6</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic conceptualization.

H6<sub>7</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic foresight.

H6<sub>8</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic stewardship.

H6<sub>9</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic commitment to the growth of people.

H6<sub>10</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic building community.

Results of the sixth one sample *t*-test including means, standard deviations, *t* values, *p* values, effect sizes (interpreted as small (0.2), medium (0.5), and large (0.8) regardless of sign), and confidence intervals for school 6 are displayed in Table 6. Results support the conclusion that the principal's scores were significantly different from those of teachers on some variables. In the case of research question 6, the teachers and principal showed a significant difference on 2 of the 10 dimensions. The characteristics H6<sub>4</sub> and H6<sub>6</sub> were rejected, with the principal showing a significantly higher score on dimension 6 and teachers showing a significantly higher mean on dimension 4. H6<sub>1</sub>, H6<sub>2</sub>, H6<sub>3</sub>, H6<sub>5</sub>, H6<sub>7</sub>, H6<sub>8</sub>, H6<sub>9</sub>, and H6<sub>10</sub> were retained. The hypotheses relating to listening (less than 0.01 effect size), empathy, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community showed a small effect size. Awareness and persuasion showed a medium effect size. Conceptualization showed a large effect.

Table 6

*Summary of One Sample t-Test for School 6*

Characteristic	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i> ***	95% CI
1. Listening	4.00 4.00**	1.07	.00	1.000	<.01	-.68 to .68
2. Empathy	4.29 4.50**	.78	.92	.376	-.26	-.71 to .29
3. Healing	3.83 3.50**	1.29	.90	.388	.25	-.48 to 1.15
4. Awareness	4.25 3.50**	1.03	2.51	.029*	.72	.09 to 1.41
5. Persuasion	4.13 3.50**	1.17	1.85	.091	.53	-.12 to 1.37
6. Conceptualization	3.83 5.00**	1.23	3.28	.007*	-.95	-.195 to -.38
7. Foresight	4.04 4.00**	1.10	.131	.898	.03	-.66 to .74
8. Stewardship	4.17 4.50**	.94	1.23	.244	-.35	-.93 to .26
9. Growth of People	4.08 4.50**	1.02	1.42	.184	-.41	-1.06 to .23
10. Building Community	3.88 4.00**	1.13	.38	.709	-.11	-.84 to .59
Overall	4.05	1.04	.17	.865	-.04	-.71 to .61
Overall**	4.10					

\*significant at .05 \*\*Principal's Score \*\*\*effect size

*Analysis of Research Question 7*

Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) at school 7?

H7<sub>1</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic listening.

H7<sub>2</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic empathy.

H7<sub>3</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic awareness.

H7<sub>4</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic healing.

H7<sub>5</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic persuasion.

H7<sub>6</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic conceptualization.

H7<sub>7</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic foresight.

H7<sub>8</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic stewardship.

H7<sub>9</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic commitment to the growth of people.

H7<sub>10</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic building community.

Results of the seventh one sample *t*-test including the means, standard deviations, *t* values, *p* values, effect sizes (interpreted as small (0.2), medium (0.5), and large (0.8) regardless of sign), and confidence intervals for school 7 are displayed in Table 7. Results support the conclusion that principals' scores are significantly different from those of teachers on some variables. In the case of research question 7, the teachers and the principal showed a significant difference on 10 of the 10 dimensions. All characteristics were rejected, with principals showing a significantly higher score on all dimensions. This shows the principal-teacher relationship possessed strain. All 10 hypotheses showed a large effect.

Table 7

*Summary of One Sample t-Test for School 7*

Characteristic	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i> ***	95% CI
1. Listening	3.36	.98	-5.56	<.001*	-1.67	-2.29 to -.98
	5.00**					
2. Empathy	3.68	.81	-5.37	<.001*	-1.62	-1.87 to .77
	5.00**					
3. Healing	3.27	1.03	-5.54	<.001*	-1.67	-2.42 to -1.03
	5.00**					
4. Awareness	3.18	.96	-6.31	<.001*	-1.89	-2.46 to -1.18
	5.00**					
5. Persuasion	2.86	1.12	-6.33	<.001*	-1.93	-2.89 to -1.38
	5.00**					
6. Conceptualization	4.14	.81	-3.54	.005*	-1.06	-1.41 to -.32
	5.00**					
7. Foresight	3.50	.77	-6.42	<.001*	-1.94	-2.02 to -.98
	5.00**					
8. Stewardship	3.36	.74	-7.29	<.001*	-2.18	-2.14 to -1.14
	5.00**					
9. Growth of People	4.23	.82	-3.14	.011*	-.93	-1.32 to -.22
	5.00**					
10. Building Community	3.55	1.19	-4.04	.002*	-1.21	-2.26 to -.65
	5.00**					
Overall	3.51	.80	-6.19	.000*	-1.86	-2.02 to -.95
Overall**	5.00					

\*significant at .05 \*\*Principal's Score \*\*\*effect size

### *Analysis of Research Question 8*

Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) at school 8?

H8<sub>1</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic listening.

H8<sub>2</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic empathy.

H8<sub>3</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic awareness.

H8<sub>4</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic healing.

H8<sub>5</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic persuasion.

H8<sub>6</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic conceptualization.

H8<sub>7</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic foresight.

H8<sub>8</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic stewardship.

H8<sub>9</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic commitment to the growth of people.

H8<sub>10</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic building community.

Results of the eighth one sample *t*-test including the means, standard deviations, *t* values, *p* values, effect sizes (interpreted as small (0.2), medium (0.5), and large (0.8) regardless of sign), and confidence intervals for school 8 are displayed in Table 8. Results support the conclusion that the principal's scores were significantly different from those of teachers on some variables. In the case of research question 8, the teachers and principal showed a significant difference on 7 of the 10 dimensions. H8<sub>1</sub>, H8<sub>2</sub>, H8<sub>3</sub>, H8<sub>4</sub>, H8<sub>7</sub>, H8<sub>9</sub>, and H8<sub>10</sub> were rejected, with the principal showing a significantly lower score on all of the dimensions and teachers showing a significantly higher mean on all dimensions. H8<sub>5</sub>, H8<sub>6</sub>, and H8<sub>8</sub> were retained. The hypotheses relating to persuasion and conceptualization showed a small effect size. Stewardship showed a medium effect size. Listening, empathy, healing, awareness, foresight, commitment to the growth of people, and building community showed a large effect.

Table 8

*Summary of One Sample t-Test for School 8*

Characteristic	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i> ***	95% CI
1. Listening	4.57 4.00**	.68	3.24	.006*	.83	.19 to .94
2. Empathy	4.73 4.00**	.42	6.81	<.001*	1.73	.50 to .96
3. Healing	4.37 3.50**	.79	4.25	.001*	1.10	.43 to 1.30
4. Awareness	4.67 3.50**	.45	4.25	.001*	2.22	.92 to 1.42
5. Persuasion	4.67 4.50**	.36	1.78	.096	.47	-.03 to .37
6. Conceptualization	4.60 4.50**	.47	.82	.214	.21	-.16 to .36
7. Foresight	4.63 4.00**	.40	6.14	<.001*	1.57	.41 to .85
8. Stewardship	4.70 4.50**	.37	2.10	.054	.54	-.00 to .40
9. Growth of People	4.67 4.00**	.41	6.33	<.001*	1.63	.44 to .89
10. Building Community	4.80 4.00**	.37	8.41	<.001*	2.16	.60 to 1.00
Overall	4.64	.37	6.16	<.001*	1.59	.39 to .80
Overall**	4.05					

\*significant at .05 \*\*Principal's Score \*\*\*effect size

### *Analysis of Research Question 9*

Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) at school 9?

H9<sub>1</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic listening.

H9<sub>2</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic empathy.

H9<sub>3</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic awareness.

H9<sub>4</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic healing.

H9<sub>5</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic persuasion.

H9<sub>6</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic conceptualization.

H9<sub>7</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic foresight.

H9<sub>8</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic stewardship.

H9<sub>9</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic commitment to the growth of people.

H9<sub>10</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic building community.

Results of the ninth one sample *t*-test including the means, standard deviations, *t* values, *p* values, effect sizes (interpreted as small (0.2), medium (0.5), and large (0.8) regardless of sign), and confidence intervals for school 9 are displayed in Table 9. Results support the conclusion that the principal's scores are significantly different from those of teachers on some variables. In the case of research question 3, the teachers and principal showed a significant difference on 6 of the 10 dimensions. H9<sub>2</sub>, H9<sub>4</sub>, H9<sub>5</sub>, H9<sub>6</sub>, H9<sub>7</sub>, and H9<sub>9</sub> were rejected, with the principal showing a significantly higher score on dimension 9 and teachers showing a significantly higher mean on dimensions 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7. H9<sub>1</sub>, H9<sub>3</sub>, H9<sub>8</sub>, and H9<sub>10</sub> were retained. The hypotheses relating to listening, healing, stewardship, and building community showed a small effect size. Empathy, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, and commitment to the growth of people showed a large effect.

Table 9

*Summary of One Sample t-Test for School 9*

Characteristic	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i> ***	95% CI
1. Listening	4.64 4.50**	.45	1.00	.341	.37	-.17 to .44
2. Empathy	4.59 4.00**	.54	3.63	.005*	1.09	.23 to .95
3. Healing	4.59 4.50**	.54	.56	.588	.16	-.27 to .45
4. Awareness	4.55 4.00**	.57	3.18	.010*	.96	.16 to .93
5. Persuasion	4.59 4.00**	.44	4.49	.001*	1.34	.30 to .88
6. Conceptualization	4.50 4.00**	.59	2.80	.019*	.84	.10 to .90
7. Foresight	4.64 4.00**	.39	5.37	<.001*	1.64	.37 to .90
8. Stewardship	4.68 4.50**	.51	1.17	.267	.35	-.16 to .53
9. Growth of People	4.68 5.00**	.40	2.61	.026*	-.80	-.59 to -.05
10. Building Community	4.68 4.50**	.46	1.31	.221	.39	-.13 to .49
Overall	4.61	.42	2.49	.032*	.73	.03 to .59
Overall**	4.30					

\*significant at .05 \*\*Principal's Score \*\*\*effect size

### *Analysis of Research Question 10*

Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) at school 10?

H10<sub>1</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic listening.

H10<sub>2</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic empathy.

H10<sub>3</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic awareness.

H10<sub>4</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic healing.

H10<sub>5</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic persuasion.

H10<sub>6</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic conceptualization.

H10<sub>7</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic foresight.

H10<sub>8</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic stewardship.

H10<sub>9</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic commitment to the growth of people.

H10<sub>10</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic building community.

Results of the 10<sup>th</sup> one sample *t*-test including the means, standard deviations, *t* values, *p* values, effect sizes (interpreted as small (0.2), medium (0.5), and large (0.8) regardless of sign), and confidence intervals for school 10 are displayed in Table 10. Results support the conclusion that the principal's scores were significantly different from those of teachers on some variables. In the case of research question 10, the teachers and principal showed a significant difference on 2 of the 10 dimensions. H10<sub>4</sub> and H10<sub>9</sub> were rejected, with the principal showing a significantly higher score on both dimensions. H10<sub>1</sub>, H10<sub>2</sub>, H10<sub>3</sub>, H10<sub>5</sub>, H10<sub>6</sub>, H10<sub>7</sub>, H10<sub>8</sub>, and H10<sub>10</sub> were retained. The hypotheses relating to listening, empathy, persuasion, conceptualization, and foresight showed a small effect. Healing, awareness, stewardship, and building community showed a medium effect size. Commitment to the growth of people showed a large effect.

Table 10

*Summary of One Sample t-Test for School 10*

Characteristic	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i> ***	95% CI
1. Listening	3.60	1.15	1.10	.300	-.34	-1.22 to .42
	4.00**					
2. Empathy	3.65	.82	1.35	.209	-.42	-.94 to .24
	4.00**					
3. Healing	3.35	1.20	1.71	.122	-.54	-1.51 to .21
	4.00**					
4. Awareness	3.25	1.03	2.29	.048*	-.72	-1.49 to .01
	4.00**					
5. Persuasion	3.45	1.04	.15	.882	-.04	-.79 to .69
	3.50**					
6. Conceptualization	3.75	.86	.92	.381	-.29	-.83 to .36
	4.00**					
7. Foresight	3.55	.80	.20	.847	.06	-.52 to .62
	3.50**					
8. Stewardship	3.45	.80	2.18	.057	-.68	-1.12 to .02
	4.00**					
9. Growth of People	3.15	.94	2.85	.019*	-.90	-1.53 to -.17
	4.00**					
10. Building Community	3.60	.77	1.63	.137	-.51	-.95 to .15
	4.00**					
Overall	3.48	.79	1.70	.125	-.53	-.98 to .14
Overall**	3.90					

\*significant at .05 \*\*Principal's Score \*\*\*effect size

### *Analysis of Research Question 11*

Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) at school 11?

H1<sub>1</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic listening.

H1<sub>2</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic empathy.

H1<sub>3</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic awareness.

H1<sub>4</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic healing.

H1<sub>5</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic persuasion.

H1<sub>6</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic conceptualization.

H1<sub>7</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic foresight.

H1<sub>8</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic stewardship.

H11<sub>9</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic commitment to the growth of people.

H11<sub>10</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic building community.

Results of the 11<sup>th</sup> one sample *t*-test including the means, standard deviations, *t* values, *p* values, effect sizes (interpreted as small (0.2), medium (0.5), and large (0.8) regardless of sign), and confidence intervals for school 11 are displayed in Table 11. Results support the conclusion that the principal's scores were significantly different from those of teachers on some variables. In the case of research question 11, the teachers and principal showed a significant difference on 6 of the 10 dimensions. H11<sub>2</sub>, H11<sub>3</sub>, H11<sub>4</sub>, H11<sub>6</sub>, H11<sub>7</sub>, and H11<sub>10</sub> were rejected, with the principal showing a significantly higher score on all dimensions except 2 in which teachers showed a significantly higher mean. H11<sub>1</sub>, H11<sub>5</sub>, H11<sub>8</sub>, and H11<sub>9</sub> were retained. The hypotheses relating to listening, persuasion, stewardship, and commitment to the growth of people showed a small effect size. Empathy showed a medium effect size. Healing, awareness, conceptualization, foresight, and building community showed a large effect.

Table 11

*Summary of One Sample t-Test for School 11*

Characteristic	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i> ***	95% CI
1. Listening	4.55 4.50**	.60	.38	.706	.08	-.24 to .34
2. Empathy	4.39 4.00**	.77	2.22	.039*	.50	.02 to .77
3. Healing	4.39 5.00**	.70	3.78	.001*	-.87	-.94 to -.27
4. Awareness	4.47 5.00**	.56	4.06	.001*	-.94	-.80 to -.25
5. Persuasion	4.42 4.50**	.63	.55	.591	-.12	-.38 to .22
6. Conceptualization	4.45 5.00**	.64	3.75	.001*	-.85	-.86 to -.24
7. Foresight	4.37 5.00**	.70	3.91	.001*	-.90	-.97 to -.29
8. Stewardship	4.47 4.50**	.56	.20	.841	-.05	-.30 to .25
9. Growth of People	4.55 4.50**	.50	.46	.650	.10	-.19 to .29
10. Building Community	4.42 5.00**	.65	3.88	.001*	-.89	-.89 to -.27
Overall	4.45	.57	1.90	.074	-.43	-.53 to .03
Overall**	4.70					

\*significant at .05 \*\*Principal's Score \*\*\*effect size

### *Analysis of Research Question 12*

Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) at school 12?

H12<sub>1</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic listening.

H12<sub>2</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic empathy.

H12<sub>3</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic awareness.

H12<sub>4</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic healing.

H12<sub>5</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic persuasion.

H12<sub>6</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic conceptualization.

H12<sub>7</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic foresight.

H12<sub>8</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic stewardship.

H12<sub>9</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic commitment to the growth of people.

H12<sub>10</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic building community.

Results of the 12<sup>th</sup> one sample *t*-test including the means, standard deviations, *t* values, *p* values, effect sizes (interpreted as small (0.2), medium (0.5), and large (0.8) regardless of sign), and confidence intervals for school 12 are displayed in Table 12. Results support the conclusion that the principal's scores were significantly different from those of teachers on some variables. In the case of research question 12, the teachers and principal showed a significant difference on 6 of the 10 dimensions. H12<sub>1</sub>, H12<sub>4</sub>, H12<sub>5</sub>, H12<sub>6</sub>, H12<sub>7</sub>, and H12<sub>8</sub> were rejected, with the principal showing a significantly higher score on all dimensions. H12<sub>2</sub>, H12<sub>3</sub>, H12<sub>9</sub>, and H12<sub>10</sub> were retained. The hypotheses relating to empathy, healing, and commitment to the growth of people showed a small effect size. Building community showed a medium effect size. Listening, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, and stewardship showed a large effect.

Table 12

*Summary of One Sample t-Test for School 12*

Characteristic	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i> ***	95% CI
1. Listening	4.00 5.00**	.65	5.92	<.001*	-1.53	-1.36 to -.64
2. Empathy	4.30 4.50**	.53	1.47	.164	-.37	-.49 to .09
3. Healing	4.30 4.50**	.68	1.15	.271	-.29	-.57 to .17
4. Awareness	4.20 5.00**	.49	6.29	<.001*	-1.53	-1.40 to -.66
5. Persuasion	3.97 5.00**	.67	6.00	<.001*	-1.53	-1.40 to -.66
6. Conceptualization	4.10 5.00**	.91	3.83	.002*	-.98	-1.40 to -.40
7. Foresight	4.27 5.00**	.62	4.56	<.001*	-1.17	-1.08 to -.39
8. Stewardship	4.23 5.00**	.53	5.60	<.001*	-1.45	-1.06 to .47
9. Growth of People	4.37 4.50**	.55	.94	.364	-.23	-.44 to .17
10. Building Community	4.40 4.00**	.74	2.10	.054	.54	-.01 to .81
Overall	4.21	.56	3.73	.002*	-.96	-.84 to -.23
Overall**	4.75					

\*significant at .05 \*\*Principal's Score \*\*\*effect size

### *Analysis of Research Question 13*

Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) at school 13?

H13<sub>1</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic listening.

H13<sub>2</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic empathy.

H13<sub>3</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic awareness.

H13<sub>4</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic healing.

H13<sub>5</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic persuasion.

H13<sub>6</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic conceptualization.

H13<sub>7</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic foresight.

H13<sub>8</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic stewardship.

H13<sub>9</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic commitment to the growth of people.

H13<sub>10</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic building community.

Results for the 13<sup>th</sup> one sample *t*-test including the means, standard deviations, *t* values, *p* values, effect sizes (interpreted as small (0.2), medium (0.5), and large (0.8) regardless of sign), and confidence intervals for school 13 are displayed in Table 13. Results support the conclusion that the principal's scores were significantly different from those of teachers on some variables. In the case of research question 13, the teachers and principal showed a significant difference on 9 of the 10 dimensions, with commitment to the growth of people being within .005 of showing significant difference. H13<sub>1</sub>, H13<sub>2</sub>, H13<sub>3</sub>, H13<sub>4</sub>, H13<sub>5</sub>, H13<sub>6</sub>, H13<sub>7</sub>, H13<sub>8</sub>, and H13<sub>10</sub> were rejected, with the principal showing a significantly lower score on any of the dimensions and teachers showing a significantly higher mean on all dimensions. H13<sub>9</sub> was the only retained hypothesis. The hypotheses relating to awareness, persuasion, and commitment to the growth of people showed a small effect. Conceptualization, foresight, and building community showed a medium effect. Listening, empathy, healing, and stewardship showed a large effect.

Table 13

*Summary of One Sample t-Test for School 13*

Characteristic	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i> ***	95% CI
1. Listening	4.50 4.00**	.54	5.06	<.001*	.92	.30 to .70
2. Empathy	4.33 3.50**	.51	8.88	<.001*	1.62	.64 to 1.03
3. Healing	4.37 3.50**	.60	7.90	<.001*	1.45	.64 to 1.09
4. Awareness	4.28 4.00**	.58	2.66	.012*	.48	.07 to .50
5. Persuasion	4.25 4.00**	.57	2.41	.023*	.43	.04 to .46
6. Conceptualization	4.33 4.00**	.50	3.67	<.001*	.66	.15 to .52
7. Foresight	4.33 4.00**	.50	3.67	.001*	.64	.14 to .53
8. Stewardship	4.38 3.50**	.50	9.62	<.001*	1.76	.70 to 1.07
9. Growth of People	4.25 4.00**	.65	2.10	.045	.38	.01 to .49
10. Building Community	4.35 4.00**	.56	3.43	.002*	.62	.14 to .56
Overall	4.34	.48	5.64	<.001*	1.02	.31 to .67
Overall**	3.85					

\*significant at .05 \*\*Principal's Score \*\*\*effect size

### *Analysis of Research Question 14*

Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) at school 14?

H14<sub>1</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic listening.

H14<sub>2</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic empathy.

H14<sub>3</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic awareness.

H14<sub>4</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic healing.

H14<sub>5</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic persuasion.

H14<sub>6</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic conceptualization.

H14<sub>7</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic foresight.

H14<sub>8</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic stewardship.

H14<sub>9</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic commitment to the growth of people.

H14<sub>10</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic building community.

Results of the 14<sup>th</sup> one sample *t*-test including the means, standard deviations, *t* values, *p* values, effect sizes (interpreted as small (0.2), medium (0.5), and large (0.8) regardless of sign), and confidence intervals for school 14 are displayed in Table 14. Results support the conclusion that the principal's scores were significantly different from those of teachers on some variables. In the case of research question 14, the teachers and principal showed a significant difference on 5 of the 10 dimensions. H14<sub>2</sub>, H14<sub>3</sub>, H14<sub>6</sub>, H14<sub>7</sub>, and H14<sub>8</sub> were rejected, with the principal showing a significantly higher score on dimensions 2 and 3 and teachers showing a significantly higher mean on dimensions 6, 7, and 8. H14<sub>1</sub>, H14<sub>4</sub>, H14<sub>5</sub>, H14<sub>9</sub>, and H14<sub>10</sub> were retained. The hypotheses relating to empathy, commitment to the growth of people, and building community showed a small effect size. Awareness and persuasion showed a medium effect size. Listening, healing, conceptualization, foresight, and stewardship showed a large effect.

Table 14

*Summary of One Sample t-Test for School 14*

Characteristic	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i> ***	95% CI
1. Listening	4.88 4.50**	.30	4.63	.001*	1.26	.20 to .57
2. Empathy	4.88 5.00**	.30	1.39	.190	-.40	-.30 to .07
3. Healing	4.65 5.00**	.38	3.32	.006*	-.92	-.57 to -.12
4. Awareness	4.69 4.50**	.38	1.81	.096	.50	-.04 to .42
5. Persuasion	4.73 4.50**	.44	1.90	.085	.52	-.03 to .50
6. Conceptualization	4.81 4.50**	.33	3.41	.005*	.93	.11 to .50
7. Foresight	4.73 4.00**	.48	5.45	<.001*	1.52	.44 to 1.02
8. Stewardship	4.81 4.50**	.33	3.41	.005*	.93	.11 to .50
9. Growth of People	4.77 5.00**	.48	1.72	.111	-.47	-.52 to .06
10. Building Community	4.88 5.00**	.30	1.39	.190	-.40	-.30 to .07
Overall	4.78	.26	1.84	.090	.50	-.02 to .29
Overall**	4.65					

\*significant at .05 \*\*Principal's Score \*\*\*effect size

### *Analysis of Research Question 15*

Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) at school 15?

H15<sub>1</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic listening.

H15<sub>2</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic empathy.

H15<sub>3</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic awareness.

H15<sub>4</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic healing.

H15<sub>5</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic persuasion.

H15<sub>6</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic conceptualization.

H15<sub>7</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic foresight.

H15<sub>8</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic stewardship.

H15<sub>9</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic commitment to the growth of people.

H15<sub>10</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic building community.

Results of the 15<sup>th</sup> one sample *t*-test including the means, standard deviations, *t* values, *p* values, effect sizes (interpreted as small (0.2), medium (0.5), and large (0.8) regardless of sign), and confidence intervals for school 15 are displayed in Table 15. Results support the conclusion that the principal's scores were significantly different from those of teachers on some variables. In the case of research question 15, the teachers and principal showed a significant difference on 8 of the 10 dimensions. H15<sub>1</sub>, H15<sub>2</sub>, H15<sub>4</sub>, H15<sub>5</sub>, H15<sub>6</sub>, H15<sub>7</sub>, H15<sub>8</sub>, and H15<sub>10</sub> were rejected, with the principal showing a significantly higher score on all dimensions. H15<sub>3</sub> and H15<sub>9</sub> were retained. A strain in the teacher principal relationship was shown. The hypothesis relating to healing showed a small effect size. Empathy, persuasion, conceptualization, and commitment to the growth of people showed a medium effect size. Listening, awareness, foresight, stewardship, and building community showed a large effect.

Table 15

*Summary of One Sample t-Test for School 15*

Characteristic	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i> ***	95% CI
1. Listening	3.46 4.50**	1.25	2.88	.015*	-.83	-1.84 to -.25
2. Empathy	3.29 4.00**	.92	2.68	.021*	-.77	-1.29 to -.13
3. Healing	3.50 4.00**	1.09	1.59	.139	-.45	-1.19 to .19
4. Awareness	3.08 4.50**	.95	5.17	<.001*	-1.49	-2.02 to -.81
5. Persuasion	3.29 4.00**	1.01	2.43	.033*	-.70	-1.35 to -.07
6. Conceptualization	3.63 4.50**	1.19	2.55	.027*	-.73	-1.63 to -.12
7. Foresight	3.50 5.00**	1.09	4.78	.001*	-1.37	-2.19 to -.81
8. Stewardship	3.58 4.50**	1.12	2.82	.017*	-.82	-1.63 to -.20
9. Growth of People	3.92 4.50**	1.10	1.83	.095	-.52	-1.29 to .12
10. Building Community	3.75 5.00**	1.12	3.87	.003*	-1.11	-1.96 to -.54
Overall	3.50	.98	3.36	.006*	-.96	-1.57 to -.33
Overall**	4.45					

\*significant at .05 \*\*Principal's Score \*\*\*effect size

### *Analysis of Research Question 16*

Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) at school 16?

H16<sub>1</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic listening.

H16<sub>2</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic empathy.

H16<sub>3</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic awareness.

H16<sub>4</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic healing.

H16<sub>5</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic persuasion.

H16<sub>6</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic conceptualization.

H16<sub>7</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic foresight.

H16<sub>8</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic stewardship.

H16<sub>9</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic commitment to the growth of people.

H16<sub>10</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic building community.

Results of the 16<sup>th</sup> one sample *t*-test including the means, standard deviations, *t* values, *p* values, effect sizes (interpreted as small (0.2), medium (0.5), and large (0.8) regardless of sign), and confidence intervals for school 16 are displayed in Table 16. Results support the conclusion that the principal's scores were significantly different from those of teachers on some variables. Teachers and principal showed a significant difference on 4 of the 10 dimensions for this question. H16<sub>1</sub>, H16<sub>2</sub>, H16<sub>5</sub>, and H16<sub>7</sub> were rejected, with the principal showing a significantly higher score in all dimensions except 7 in which teachers were higher. H16<sub>3</sub>, H16<sub>4</sub>, H16<sub>6</sub>, H16<sub>8</sub>, H16<sub>9</sub>, and H16<sub>10</sub> were retained. The hypotheses relating to healing, awareness, conceptualization, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community showed a small effect size. Listening, empathy, persuasion, and foresight showed a large effect.

Table 16

*Summary of One Sample t-Test for School 16*

Characteristic	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i> ***	95% CI
1. Listening	4.05 5.00**	.86	3.48	.007*	-1.10	-1.57 to -.33
2. Empathy	4.20 5.00**	.63	4.00	.003*	-1.26	-1.25 to -.35
3. Healing	4.15 4.50**	.82	1.35	.209	-.42	-.94 to .24
4. Awareness	4.20 4.50**	.75	1.26	.239	-.40	-.84 to .24
5. Persuasion	4.10 5.00**	.88	3.25	.010*	-1.02	-1.53 to -.27
6. Conceptualization	4.15 4.00**	.91	.52	.616	.16	-.50 to .80
7. Foresight	4.35 3.50**	.82	3.29	.009*	1.03	.26 to 1.44
8. Stewardship	4.50 4.50**	.62	0.00	1.000	.00	-.45 to .45
9. Growth of People	4.30 4.50**	.67	.94	.373	-.29	-.68 to .28
10. Building Community	4.45 4.50**	.80	.20	.847	-.06	-.62 to .52
Overall	4.25	.70	1.16	.278	-.37	-.75 to .24
Overall**	4.50					

\*significant at .05 \*\*Principal's Score \*\*\*effect size

### *Analysis of Research Question 17*

Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community) at school 17?

H17<sub>1</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic listening.

H17<sub>2</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic empathy.

H17<sub>3</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic awareness.

H17<sub>4</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic healing.

H17<sub>5</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic persuasion.

H17<sub>6</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic conceptualization.

H17<sub>7</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic foresight.

H17<sub>8</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic stewardship.

H17<sub>9</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic commitment to the growth of people.

H17<sub>10</sub>: There is no significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal for the characteristic building community.

Results of the final one sample *t*-test including the means, standard deviations, *t* values, *p* values, effect sizes (interpreted as small (0.2), medium (0.5), and large (0.8) regardless of sign), and confidence intervals for school 17 are displayed in Table 17. Results support the conclusion that the principal's scores were significantly different from those of teachers on some variables. In the case of research question 17, the teachers and principal showed a significant difference on 9 of the 10 dimensions. H17<sub>1</sub>, H17<sub>2</sub>, H17<sub>3</sub>, H17<sub>5</sub>, H17<sub>6</sub>, H17<sub>7</sub>, H17<sub>8</sub>, H17<sub>9</sub>, and H17<sub>10</sub> were rejected, with the principal showing a significantly higher score on all dimensions. H17<sub>4</sub> was retained. The hypotheses relating to awareness showed a medium effect. Listening, empathy, healing, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community showed a large effect.

Table 17

*Summary of One Sample t-Test for School 17*

Characteristic	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i> ***	95% CI
1. Listening	4.41	.66	2.95	.014*	-.89	-1.04 to -.14
	5.00**					
2. Empathy	4.32	.64	3.52	.006*	-1.06	-1.11 to -.25
	5.00**					
3. Healing	3.95	.47	7.35	<.001*	-2.23	-1.36 to -.73
	5.00**					
4. Awareness	4.23	.52	1.75	.111	-.51	-.62 to .08
	4.50**					
5. Persuasion	4.00	.59	2.80	.019*	-.84	-.90 to -.10
	4.50**					
6. Conceptualization	4.45	.52	3.46	.006*	-1.05	-.90 to -.19
	5.00**					
7. Foresight	4.23	.65	3.96	.003*	-1.18	-1.21 to -.34
	5.00**					
8. Stewardship	4.27	.56	4.28	.002*	-1.30	-1.11 to -.35
	5.00**					
9. Growth of People	4.36	.64	3.32	.008*	-1.00	-1.06 to -.21
	5.00**					
10. Building Community	4.45	.65	2.78	.019*	-.84	-.98 to -.11
	5.00**					
Overall	4.27	.48	4.33	.001*	-1.31	-.96 to -.31
Overall**	4.90					

\*significant at .05 \*\*Principal's Score \*\*\*effect size

### *Summary*

Chapter 4 was an analysis of the data related to this research study. Chapter 5 covers the summary of findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

## CHAPTER 5

### SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### *Introduction*

This chapter includes the summary of findings, conclusions, and recommendations for the use by those seeking to gain knowledge of servant leadership. Servant leadership is a current practice of school principals serving others to produce a valuable return. The purpose of this quantitative study was to examine relationships between leadership characteristics determined by teachers' perceptions and the self-analysis of their principal in an effort to widen the understanding of effective school leadership. The study consisted of teachers and principals in 17 Title I elementary schools in rural southwest Virginia who took questionnaires (Metcalf Leadership Questionnaires) focalized on 10 characteristics of a servant leader as defined by Greenleaf (1977). The questionnaires were completed and data gathered through Survey Monkey, an online survey tool (See Appendix C and D).

#### *Summary of Findings*

There were 17 schools in the study with 1 research question analyzed for each school. The research question for each school was: Is there a significant difference between the mean score on the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire for teachers and their school principal in each of the 10 survey variables (listening, empathy, awareness, healing, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community)? There were 10 null hypotheses following the research question related to the 10 survey characteristics of servant leadership. Each school's principal's and teachers' scores were analyzed after completing the Metcalfe Leadership Questionnaire by Survey Monkey and SPSS.

This is a summary of the results from the teachers' perceptions of principals' servant leadership characteristics. In the case of research question 1, the teachers and their principal showed a significant difference on 6 of the 10 dimensions. The hypotheses relating to listening, healing, persuasion, and foresight were retained with the significant difference being in empathy, awareness, conceptualization, stewardship, growth of community, and building community. The principal showed a significantly higher score on all of the rejected dimensions excluding commitment to the growth of people in which teachers showed a significantly higher mean. Results support the conclusion that the principal's scores were significantly different from those of teachers on some variables. The hypotheses relating to healing, persuasion, and foresight showed a small effect size. Listening, empathy, conceptualization, and stewardship showed a medium effect size. Awareness, commitment to the growth of people, and building community showed a large effect.

In the case of research question 2, the teachers and their principal showed a significant difference on 9 of the 10 dimensions. The hypotheses relating to listening, empathy, awareness, healing, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, and commitment to the growth of people were retained with the significant difference and rejection being in building community. The principal showed a significantly higher score on all rejected dimensions. Results support the conclusion that the principal's scores were significantly different from those of teachers on some variables. The hypothesis relating to persuasion showed a small effect size. Healing, awareness, foresight, and stewardship showed a medium effect size. Listening, empathy, conceptualization, commitment to the growth of people, and building community showed a large effect.

In the case of research question 3, the teachers and their principal showed a significant difference on 5 of the 10 dimensions. The hypotheses relating to empathy, awareness, healing,

persuasion, and building community were retained with the significant difference being in listening, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, and commitment to the growth of people. The principal showed a significantly higher score in listening with teachers showing a significantly higher mean in conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, and commitment to the growth of people. Results support the conclusion that the principal's scores were significantly different from those of teachers on some variables. The hypotheses relating to empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, and building community (less than 0.01 effect size) showed a small effect. Stewardship showed a medium effect. Listening, conceptualization, foresight, and commitment to the growth of people showed a large effect.

In the case of research question 4, the teachers and their principal showed a significant difference on 5 of the 10 dimensions. The hypotheses relating to awareness, healing, persuasion, foresight, and stewardship were retained with the significant difference listening, empathy, conceptualization, commitment to the growth of people, and building community. The principal showed a significantly higher score on all rejected dimensions. Results support the conclusion that the principal's scores were significantly different from those of teachers on some variables. The hypotheses relating to awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, and stewardship showed a small effect size. Empathy, healing, and commitment to the growth of people showed a medium effect size. Listening and building community showed a large effect.

In the case of research question 5, a significant difference was shown on 4 of the 10 dimensions. The hypotheses relating to awareness, healing, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, and stewardship were retained with the significant difference shown in listening, empathy, commitment to the growth of people, and building community. The principal showed a significantly higher score on all of the rejected dimensions. Results support the conclusion that

the principal's scores were significantly different from those of teachers on some variables. The hypotheses relating to healing, conceptualization, foresight, and stewardship showed a small effect size. Awareness, persuasion, and commitment to the growth of people showed a medium effect size. Listening, empathy, and building community showed a large effect.

In the case of research question 6, a significant difference was shown on 2 of the 10 dimensions. The hypotheses relating to listening, empathy, awareness, persuasion, foresight, stewardship, and building community were retained with the significant difference shown in healing and conceptualization. The principal showed a significantly higher score for the hypotheses conceptualization with teachers showing a significantly higher mean for awareness. Results support the conclusion that the principal's scores were significantly different from those of the teachers on some variables. The hypotheses relating to listening (less than 0.01 effect size), empathy, healing, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community showed a small effect size. Awareness and persuasion showed a medium effect size. Conceptualization showed a large effect.

In the case of research question 7, a significant difference was shown in all 10 of the dimensions. The principal showed a significantly higher score for all of the rejected dimensions. Results support the conclusion that the principal's scores were significantly different from those of the teachers on some variables. All 10 characteristics showed a large effect size.

In the case of research question 8, a significant difference was shown in 7 of the 10 dimensions. The hypotheses relating to persuasion, conceptualization, and stewardship were retained with the significant difference shown in listening, empathy, awareness, healing, foresight, commitment to the growth of people, and building community. The principal showed a significantly lower score on all of the dimensions with teachers showing a significantly higher

mean on all dimensions. Results support the conclusion that the principal's scores were significantly different from those of teachers on some variables. The hypotheses relating to persuasion and conceptualization showed a small effect size. Stewardship showed a medium effect size. Listening, empathy, healing, awareness, foresight, commitment to the growth of people, and building community showed a large effect.

In the case of research question 9, a significant difference was shown in 6 of the 10 dimensions. The hypotheses relating to listening, awareness, stewardship, and building community were retained with the significant difference shown in empathy, healing, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, and commitment to the growth of people. The principal showed a significantly higher score on the dimension commitment to the growth of people with teachers showing a significantly higher mean on dimensions empathy, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, and foresight. Results support the conclusions that the principal's scores were significantly different from those of teachers on some variables. The hypotheses relating to listening, healing, stewardship, and building community showed a small effect size. Empathy, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, and commitment to the growth of people showed a large effect.

In the case of research question 10, a significant difference was shown on 6 of the 10 dimensions. The hypotheses relating to listening, persuasion, stewardship, and commitment to the growth of people were retained with the significant difference being in empathy, awareness, healing, conceptualization, foresight, and building community. The principal showed a significantly higher score on all of the rejected dimensions excluding empathy in which teachers showed a significantly higher mean. Results support the conclusions that the principal's scores were significantly different from those of teachers on some variables. The hypotheses relating to

listening, empathy, persuasion, conceptualization, and foresight showed a small effect size.

Healing, awareness, stewardship, and building community showed a medium effect size.

Commitment to the growth of people showed a large effect.

In the case of research question 11, a significant difference was shown on 6 of the 10 dimensions. The hypotheses relating to empathy, awareness, commitment to the growth of people, and building community were retained with a significant difference shown in listening, healing, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, and stewardship. The principal showed a significantly higher score on all of the rejected dimensions. Results support the conclusions that the principal's scores were significantly different from those of teachers on some variables. The hypotheses relating to listening, persuasion, stewardship, and commitment to the growth of people showed a small effect size. Empathy showed a medium effect size. Healing, awareness, conceptualization, foresight, and building community showed a large effect.

In the case of research question 12, a significant difference was shown on 6 of the 10 dimensions. The hypotheses relating to listening, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, and stewardship were rejected while empathy, healing, commitment to the growth of people, and building community were retained. The principal showed a significantly higher score on all dimensions. The hypotheses relating to empathy, healing, and commitment to the growth of people showed a small effect size. Building community showed a medium effect size. Listening, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, and stewardship showed a large effect.

In the case of research question 13, a significant difference was shown on 9 of the 10 dimensions. The hypotheses relating to commitment to the growth of people was retained with the significant difference shown in listening, empathy, awareness, healing, persuasion,

conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, and building community. The principal showed a significantly lower score on all of the rejected dimensions with teachers showing a significantly higher mean on all dimensions. Results support the conclusion that the principal's scores were significantly different from those of teachers on some variables. The hypotheses relating to awareness, persuasion, and commitment to the growth of people showed a small effect size. Conceptualization, foresight, and building community showed a medium effect size. Listening, empathy, healing, and stewardship showed a large effect.

In the case of research question 14, a significant difference was shown on 5 of the 10 dimensions. The hypotheses relating to listening, awareness, persuasion, commitment to the growth of people, and building community were retained with the significant difference shown in empathy, awareness, conceptualization, foresight, and stewardship. The principal showed a significantly higher score in empathy and awareness with teachers showing a significantly higher mean in conceptualization, foresight, and stewardship. Results support the conclusion that the principal's scores were significantly different from those of teachers on some variables. The hypotheses relating to empathy, commitment to the growth of people, and building community showed a small effect size. Awareness and persuasion showed a medium effect size. Listening, healing, conceptualization, foresight, and stewardship showed a large effect.

In the case of research question 15, a significant difference was shown on 8 of the 10 dimensions. The hypotheses relating to healing and commitment to the growth of people were retained. Listening, empathy, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, and building community were rejected. The principal showed a significantly higher score on both rejected hypotheses. Results support the conclusions that the principal's scores were significantly different from those of teachers on some variables. The hypothesis relating to

healing showed a small effect size. Empathy, persuasion, conceptualization, and commitment to the growth of people showed a medium effect size. Listening, awareness, foresight, stewardship, and building community showed a large effect size.

In the case of research question 16, a significant difference was shown on 4 of the 10 dimensions. The hypotheses relating to awareness, healing, conceptualization, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community were retained with the significant difference shown in listening, empathy, persuasion, and foresight. The principal showed a significantly higher score on all rejected dimensions excluding foresight in which teachers showed a significantly higher mean. Results support the conclusions that the principal's scores were significantly different from those of teachers on some variables. The hypotheses relating to healing, awareness, conceptualization, stewardship (less than 0.01 effect size), commitment to the growth of people, and building community showed a small effect size. Listening, empathy, persuasion, and foresight showed a large effect.

In the case of research questions 17, a significant difference was shown in 9 of the 10 dimensions. The hypotheses relating to listening, empathy, awareness, healing, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, and commitment to the growth of people were retained with the significant difference shown in building community. The principal showed a significantly higher score on the rejected dimension. Results support the conclusions that the principal's scores were significantly different from those of teachers on some variables. All hypotheses excluding awareness which showed a medium effect size, rendered a large effect.

In looking at the variances in principals' self assessments and teachers' perceptions, it was noted that one school showed no significant difference in all 10 characteristics. No school showed a significant difference in all of the 10 characteristics, but 16 of the schools showed a

significant difference in at least 1 of the 10 characteristics. The attributes examined in this study and manifested within a servant leader expand from the inner values and beliefs of educational leaders within their environment. According to Russell (2001) a leader's personal values have an impressive impact on the productivity of the culture and performance of an organization.

In conclusion and to better visualize these results, the tally of all 10 dimensions of servant leadership is included in Table 18 showing facts supporting the analysis.

Table 18

*Tally of 10 Dimensions from 17 Schools*

Characteristic	Retained	Rejected	Principal with Significantly Higher Score
Listening	5	12	10
Empathy	5	12	9
Healing	10	7	6
Awareness	6	11	7
Persuasion	10	7	5
Conceptualization	4	13	9
Foresight	5	12	6
Stewardship	8	9	6
Commitment to The Growth of People	7	10	7
Building Community	7	10	8

### *Recommendations for Practice*

Servant leaders are comprised of those individuals who seek improvement and strive to make changes. Developing the servant within would allow for growth of leadership among faculty, staff, and school community. The expansion of knowledge about the 10 characteristics of servant leadership can be accomplished through professional development of self-accountability and modification of behavior based on feedback from others.

School leaders need feedback from their followers. It would be beneficial for principals to monitor perceptions of teachers on a regular basis to see if the principal is communicating as intended and leading as believed.

### *Recommendations for Further Research*

Servant leadership is included in the realm of prevalent styles of leadership. Research should be continued in order to discover the effectiveness it has on our school environment. In educational leadership the goal is to produce, stimulate, and educate leaders of the future by offering a more promising definition of success and effectiveness. Servant leadership is definitely in the midst of successful and effective leaders.

An in-depth study including interviews of teachers and principals of the 10 servant leadership characteristics in high and low performing schools could be compared against each other to determine if servant leadership characteristics prevailed in the successful schools. I suggest a qualitative study instead of quantitative study. A qualitative study would allow a closer connection to the participants with very little disruption of the natural setting perhaps rendering a more sustaining overall result.

Some results showed the principal's ratings were lower than the scores of their teachers. An investigation could be conducted to discover why and how this happened.

Laub is the President of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) group and the creator of the OLA. He created this assessment to specifically measure the characteristics of a servant leader. This study could be repeated using this specific instrument, which has been tested and proven. While this instrument may be more expensive to implement, the results would be much more comprehensive.

### *Conclusions*

Based on the data gathered and analyzed, the conclusion is drawn that there were significant differences between teachers' perceptions and those of their principal.

## REFERENCES

- Anthony, K. (2002). *Educational leadership*. Retrieved November 13, 2010 from <https://www.msu.edu/user/anthon38/Leadership%20Philosophy.htm>
- Atwater, E. (1992). *I hear you*. (Rev. Ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Walker.
- Autry, J. A. (2001). *Servant leader: How to build a creative team, develop great morale, and improve bottom-line performance*. New York, NY: Three Rivers Press.
- Babbie, E. (1998). *The practice of social research*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Barbuto, J., & Wheeler, D. (2002). Do you have what it takes? NEB-GUIDE GO2-1481-A. Lincoln University of Nebraska, Nebraska Cooperative Extension.
- Barbuto, J., & Wheeler, D. (2006). Scale development and construct-clarification of servant leadership. *Group and Organizational Management*, 31, 300-326.
- Barbuto, J., & Wheeler, D. (2007). *Becoming a servant leader: Do you have what it takes?* NebGuide-University of Nebraska-Lincoln Extension, Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources.
- Barbuto, Jr., J., & Wheeler, D. (2010). *Becoming a Servant Leader: Do you have what it takes?* Retrieved January 7, 2010 from [http://kentblumberg.typepad.com/kent\\_blumberg/files/servant\\_leadership\\_by\\_univ\\_of\\_nebraska.pdf](http://kentblumberg.typepad.com/kent_blumberg/files/servant_leadership_by_univ_of_nebraska.pdf)
- Barling, J., Slater, F., & Kelloway, E. K. (2000). Transformational leadership and emotional intelligence: An exploratory study. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 21, 157-161.
- Bass, B. (1981). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership*. New York, NY: The Free Press p. 15.
- Bass, B., & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 181-217.
- Bennis, W. G., & Goldsmith, J. (1997). *Learning to lead: A workbook on becoming a leader*. Bolder, CO: Perseus Books.
- Bennis, W. G., & Thomas, R. J. (2002). *Geeks and geezers*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School publishing, pp. 137-142.
- Bennis, W. G., & Goldsmith, J. (2003). *Basic books*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Books Group.

- Block, P. (1996). *Stewardship: Choosing service over self-interest*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Bradley, K. (2007, October 3). *Effective leadership and its impact on teacher retention-a personal perspective*. Retrieved February 6, 2010 from Educational Articles Website: <http://www.edarticle.com/essays-on-teaching/effective-leadership-and-its-impact-on-teaching>
- Brusman, M. (2008). Leadership Secrets for Emotional Persuasion – The Brain Science of Persuasion Powers. Retrieved March 11, 2010 from <http://www.exinearticles.com/?Leadership-Secrets-For-Emotional-Persuasion---The-Brain-Science-of-Persuasive-Power&id=1379252>
- Burbules, N.C. (1993). *Dialogue in teaching: Theory and practice*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Cadman, L. (2011) Retrieved on April 4, 2011 from [www.ezinearticles.com/?Leadership-and-Talent-Management---Follow-the-Leader?&id=4365268](http://www.ezinearticles.com/?Leadership-and-Talent-Management---Follow-the-Leader?&id=4365268)
- Caruso, D. R., Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (2002). Emotional intelligence and emotional leadership. In R. E. Riggion, S. E. Murphy. & F. J. Pirozzolo (Eds.), *Multiple intelligences and leadership*. pp 63-99. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- 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, 34-35.
- Cohen, A.D. (1998). *Strategies for learning and using second language*. New York, NY: Longman. Retrieved January 6, 2010 from <http://www.tesl-ej.org/ej12/r10.html>
- Commissioner's Parents Advisory Council of Kentucky, 2007. <http://cmpusblog.com.service/building-leaders-through-community-service-1/>
- The Commonwealth Practice Ltd. (2002). PowerPoint Retrieved December 21, 2009 from: [www.thecommonwealthpractice.com](http://www.thecommonwealthpractice.com) Minneapolis.
- Conway, D. (2007). Define stewardship, but keep it simple. Retrieved January 7, 2010 from [http://www.the-tidings.com/2007/091407/Conway\\_text.htm](http://www.the-tidings.com/2007/091407/Conway_text.htm)
- Covey, S. (1990). *Principal-centered leadership*. Paris: Fireside.
- Covey, S. (1994). *First things first*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.

- Crippen, C. (2005). *The democratic school: First to serve, then to lead*. Retrieved January 7, 2010 from *Canadian Journal of Education* 47, 7; [http://www.umanitoba.ca/publications/cjeap/pdf\\_files/crippen.pdf](http://www.umanitoba.ca/publications/cjeap/pdf_files/crippen.pdf)
- Dacher, E.S. (1999). Loving openness and the healing relationship. *Advances in Mind-Body Medicine*, 15. 32-43.
- Damasio, A. (2006). *What's empathy got to do with it*. Retrieved September 15, 2010 from [http://mindtools.com/pages/article/newLDR\\_75.htm](http://mindtools.com/pages/article/newLDR_75.htm)
- DeBruyn, R. L. (1997). *Proactive leadership in the 21<sup>st</sup> century*. Manhattan, NY: The Master Teacher.
- DeGraaf, D., Tilley, C., & Neal, L. (2001). *Voices of servant-leadership series*. Monograph Booklet 6, 2001 p.13.
- Dennis, R., & Bocarnea, M. (2005). *Leadership organization development journal*. Bradford, England: Emerald Group.
- DePree, M. (1989). *Leadership is an art*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Emelo, R. (Nov.2008). Persuasion as a leadership attribute from Triple Creek's Monthly Mentoring Newsletter. Retrieved April 3, 2010 from <http://www.3creek.com>
- Emmerich, R. (2001). Motivating employees during tough time. *Business Credit*, 103, 10-12.
- Encarta Dictionary. Retrieved December 6, 2010 from <http://www.encarta.msn.com>
- Falbe, C., & Yuik, G. (1992). Consequences for managers of using single influence tactics and combinations of tactics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35. 638-653.
- Fisher, D., & Prey N. (Nov. 2002). *5 Lessons for leaders*. Principal Leadership (Middle SchoolEd.) New York, NY: H.W. Wilson.
- Frick, D., & Spears, L. (1996). The private writing of Robert K . Greenleaf, *Becoming a Servant Leader*. 139-140, 211-217, 290.
- Frick, D. (2004). *Robert K. Greenleaf's: A life of servant leadership*, San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Fullan, M. (2003). *The moral imperative of school leadership*. 3-47, 70-71. Thousand Oaks, CA: Cowin Press.

- Gane, B. (June, 2009). Career connections seventh-day Adventist church in South Pacific Retrieved March 7, 2010 from <http://record.net.au/servant-leadership>
- Gardiner, J. (1998). Quiet presence: the holy ground of leadership. In L. Spears (ed.). *Insights on leadership services, stewardship, spirit and servant leadership*. New York, NY: Wiley and Sons.
- Gardner, H. (1995). *Leading minds: An anatomy of leadership*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Goleman, D. (January, 2004). What makes a leader, Harvard Business Review Article p. 9.
- Goodlad, J. (1979,1994). *What are schools for*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.
- Gorham, R. *Creative support*. Retrieved March 6, 2010 from: <http://www.netlistingsnow.com/self-healing/article5725.htm>
- Graham, S. (2006). *Diversity: leaders not labels: a new plan for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. New York, NY: Free Press of Simon & Schuster.
- Gray, C., & Bishop, Q. (2009). *Leadership development*. National study development council, vol. 30 no. 1 winter pp. 28-32.
- Greenleaf, R. (1970). *The Servant as Leader*. Retrieved March 11, 2010 from <http://www.butler.edu/volunteer/resources/principles-of-servant-leadership>
- Greenleaf, R. (1977). *The servant leader*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Greenleaf, R. (1977). *Servant leadership: a journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York, NY: Paulist Press.
- Greenleaf, R. (1996). *On becoming a servant leader*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Greenleaf, R. (2004). *A Life of Servant Leadership* by Don M. Frick and Larry C. Spears. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Haas, R. (1999). *The Bureaucratic Entrepreneur*. How to be effective in any unruly organization. Washington, DC: Brookings Institute Press.
- Heathfield, S. M. (2009). Secrets of leadership success. Retrieved December 4, 2009 from [http://humanresources.about.com/od/leadership/a/leader\\_success.htm](http://humanresources.about.com/od/leadership/a/leader_success.htm)
- Hesse, H. (1956). *The journey to the east*. London: P. Owen.
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2008). *Educational administration theory, research, and practice*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

- Hunsaker, P., & Alessandra, A. (1986). *The art of managing people*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Jablonski, T.(2006,June) Retrieved December 19, 2010 from Servant leadership blog. <http://www.safeleadership.co.uk?page+stlf>
- Jackson, P., & Leduc, L. (April,2002). *Servant Leadership Part I*. CA Magazine Retrieved April 4, 2010 from [http://www.camagazine.com/index.cfm/ci\\_id//.htm](http://www.camagazine.com/index.cfm/ci_id//.htm)
- Jaworski, J. (2010). *Self awareness for executives*. Retrieved November 13, 2010 from <http://www.executiveawareness.com/>
- Johnson, C.R. (2005). *Meeting the ethical challenge of leadership* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kant, I. (1978). *Anthropology from a pragmatic point of view*. (V. L. Dowdell, Trans.) Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press. (Original work published 1798).
- Kiechel, W. (1995). *The servant as leader*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Koontz, H., & O'Donnell, C. (1968). *Principals of Management: An analysis of managerial functions* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1998). *The leadership challenge: How to keep getting extraordinary things done in organizations* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Laub, J. A. (1998) , *Organization Leadership Assessment*, Retrieved on February 1, 2010, from <http://www.olagroup.com/documents/instrument.pdf>
- Leithwood, K., & Riehl, C. (2003). *What we know about successful school leadership*. Laboratory for student success, Philadelphia: Temple University.
- Lichtenwalner, B. (2008). *Servant leadership, an introduction to the power of leadership through service*. Retrieved February 10, 2010 from [http://modernservantleader.com/preso/ServantLeadership\\_Introduction.pdf](http://modernservantleader.com/preso/ServantLeadership_Introduction.pdf)
- Martinuzzi, B. (2006). *The leader as a mensch: Become the kind of person others want to follow*. San Francisco, CA: Six Seconds Emotional Intelligence Press.
- McCall, J. (1997). *The principal as steward: The leadership and management series*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.
- McGuire, M. (2002). *Persuasion: A leader's edge*. Retrieved May 22, 2010 from <http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-in/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA422043&Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf>

- Mascle, D. (2008). 8 steps toward becoming the leader you need to be to succeed Retrieved January 6, 2010 from <http://www.netlistingsnow.com/self-healing/article/2606.htm>
- Majone, G. (1989). Evidence argument and persuasion in the policy process. New Haven, CT:Yale University.
- Marzano, R. J. (2003). *What works in schools: Translating research into action*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Maxwell, J. C. (1993). *Developing the leader within you*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.
- Maxwell, J. (2002). *Your roadmap for success*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.
- Maxwell, J. (2003). *Thinking for a change*. New York: Warner Books.
- Mind Tools (2011) Retrieved on April 4, 2011 from [www.mindtools.com/CommSkill/ActiveListening.htm](http://www.mindtools.com/CommSkill/ActiveListening.htm)
- National Association of Elementary School Principals (2008) Retrieved September 30, 2009 from <http://www.naesp.org>
- Novak, J. (2002). Inviting educational leadership, *Leadership and Management for Effective Schools*. London: Financial Times.
- Northouse, P. G. (2007). *Leadership theory and practice* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- O'Donnell, D., & Schumer, E. (1996). Community Building and Community Organizing. Retrieved April 4, 2011 from [www.nhi.org/online/issues/85/combuild.html](http://www.nhi.org/online/issues/85/combuild.html)
- Palmer, P. J. (1997). The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life. San Francisco, CA: Josey Bass.
- Pascarella, P. (1998). Persuasion skills required for success. *Management Review* 87, no 8. September 1998. P. 68-69.
- Patterson, K. A. (2003). Servant leadership a theoretical model (Dissertation School of Leadership Studies, Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA) .
- Ping, P., & Yuki, G. (2000). Perceived effectiveness of influence tactics in the United States and China. *Leadership Quarterly*, 11, 251-266.
- Plato (1945). The republic of Plato. (F. M. Comford, Trans.) New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

- Posser, S. (2007). *To be a servant leader*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Purkey, W., & Siegel, B. (2002). *Becoming an invitational leader*. Lake Worth, FL: Humanics.
- Riverstone, L. (2004). Servant leadership: A manifestation of postmaterialism. *Global Virtue Ethics Review*, 5, 95-120.
- Robertson, K. (2005). *Active listening: More than just paying attention*. 34. 994-1061.
- Rost, J. C. (1991). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. New York, NY: Praeger.
- Russell, R. (2001). The role of values in servant leadership. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 22-(2), 76-83.
- Secretan, L. (1996). Reclaiming higher ground: creating organizations that inspire the soul. Toronto: MacMillan, Canada pp. 78-101; 240-244.
- Sergiovanni, T. (1994). *Building community in schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Sergiovanni, T. (1999). *The life world of leadership: creating culture, community and personal meaning in our schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Sergiovanni, T. (2000). *Leadership as stewardship*. In the Jossey-Bass reader on educational leadership. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons.
- Serrat, O. (Sept. 2009). Knowledge solutions “Exercising servant leadership” Vol 63.
- Shugart, S. (Feb1997). Servant leadership: Robert K. Greenleaf’s legacy and the community college. Proceedings of the Annual International Conference on the Chair Academy (6<sup>th</sup>, Reno, NV).
- Simms, M. (June 2008). Servant leadership wisdom, inspiration, and resources. Retrieved November 7, 2009 from <http://www.Simmsinternational.com>.
- Sosik, J. J., & Megerian, L. E. (1999). Understanding leader emotional intelligence and performance: The role of self-other agreement on transformational leadership perceptions. *Group & Organization Management*, 367-390.
- Smolenyak, M., & Majumdar, A. (1992). What is leadership?, *Journal for Quality and Participation*, 15. 28-32.
- Spears, L. (1995) *Reflections on leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf’s theory of servant leadership influenced today’s top management thinkers*, New York, NY: John Wiley.

- Spears, L. C. (1998). *The power of servant leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Brett-Koehler.
- Spears, L. C. (2004). *Practicing servant leadership*. *Leader to Leader*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass (34).7-11.
- Starratt, R. (Dec 2004). *Canadian Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy*. Ethical leadership. (47) 6-7.
- Stone, A., & Winston, B.E. (1999). *Servant leadership: setting the stage for empirical research*. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, (6), 49-72.
- Stueber, R. (2000). *Leadership perspectives: making a difference with servant leadership*. *Luthern Education* 136 (1) 49-55.
- Sturnick, J., & Joblonski, T. (1998). *Healing Leadership*. Retrieved November 17, 2009 from Servant Leadership Blog <http://www.servantleadershipblog.com>
- Tice, A. (1994). *Limitless leadership: Executive excellence*, 11(12). 11-18.
- Triple Creek (July 2008). *Stewardship as a leadership attributes* Retrieved April 7, 2010 from <http://www.3creek.com>
- United States Department of Education (2001). *No child left behind*. Retrieved June 22, 2009, from <http://www.ed.gov/nclb/landing.jhtml>
- Ury, W. (1993). *Getting past no: Negotiating your way from confrontation to cooperation*. New York, NY: Bantoom Books.
- Virginia Department of Education (2009). *Assessment data*. Retrieved January 5, 2010, from [http://www.doe.virginia.gov/testing/achievement\\_data/](http://www.doe.virginia.gov/testing/achievement_data/)
- VonKrogh, G., Ichijo, K., & Nonaka, I. (2000). *Enabling knowledge creation: how to unlock the mystery of tacit knowledge and release the power of innovation*. Oxford University Press.
- Weynmes, E. (2003). *Relationships not leadership sustain successful organizations*. *Journal of Change Management*, 3. 319-332.
- Young, D. S. (2002). *Foresight: the lead that the leader has in L. C. Spears & M. Lawrence (Eds.) Focus on leadership: Servant-leadership for the twenty-first century*, pp 245-255. New York, NY: Wiley.

## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX A

#### *Letter to Superintendent of School*

To Whom It May Concern,

I am a student at ETSU who is working on my dissertation entitled, "Teacher's Perceptions of Elementary School Principal's Leadership Characteristics in Elementary Schools in Rural Southwest Virginia."

I have a 5 point likert scale questionnaire for teachers to complete about their principal, and also one for the principal to complete on her/himself. It is an online questionnaire and the estimated time to complete it is approximately 5 minutes.

I respectfully and sincerely request your permission for teachers and principals at the counties' elementary schools to participate in these questionnaires. The name of the schools and the participants will be anonymous. (I have attached a copy of the questionnaires).

I thank you for your time and consideration, and I look forward to hearing from you in the near future.

Lynn B. Metcalfe

rufus2008@earthlink.net

276-445-4095 (work)

276-393-7336 (cell)

## APPENDIX B

### *Letter to Principals of Schools*

To Whom It May Concern:

Thank you for taking the time to participate in a research study of Teacher's Perceptions of Elementary School Principals in Rural Southwest Virginia. I am conducting research on the characteristics of principals, and your participation is very important for my study.

All the names of the participants, schools, and principals will remain anonymous. There will be no penalty for those who wish not to participate, and you may discontinue participation at any time by exiting the survey. However, your response will provide valuable information for my study.

By clicking next, you are agreeing to voluntarily participate in this research questionnaire.

You may contact me with any questions regarding this survey or regarding your rights as a participant. If you have any questions or concerns about the research and want to talk to someone independent of the research team, you may call an IRB Coordinator at (423) 439-6055 or (423) 439-6002.

Thank you in advance for your response.

Lynn B. Metcalfe  
Department of Educational Leadership & Policy Analysis  
East Tennessee State University  
Campus Box 70550  
Johnson City, TN 37614

rufus2008@earthlink.net  
(276)393-7336



	present decisions.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	I strive to make a positive difference in the organization.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	I work for the best interest of others rather than myself.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	I provide within the organization the opportunity for professional development.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	I believe an organization needs to function as a community.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	I work hard to foster community spirit within the organization.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX D

*Metcalf Leadership Questionnaire (Teacher)*

## Metcalf Leadership Questionnaire

Please use the following scale to indicate your agreement or disagreement with each of the statements in describing your principal’s attitudes and practices. There are no wrong or right answers, simply rate each question in terms of what you really believe or normally witness.

Strongly Disagree    Disagree    Undecided    Agree    Strongly Agree

1                                  2                                  3                                  4                                  5

1.	My leader displays a sense of instinctive interest in others’ input.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	My leader listens attentively to others’ ideas.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	My leader identifies with daily life events.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	My leader invests time in assisting others to overcome weakness.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	My leader shows appreciation for the emotional health of others.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	My leader is someone I would approach after a traumatic event for supportive healing.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	My leader demonstrates a strong awareness of the happenings within the organization.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	My leader uses cues from the environment to determine decisions.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	My leader offers compelling justification for their requests.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	My leader inspires others to achieve a common goal.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	My leader allows me to communicate ideas relating to the vision of the organization.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	My leader values the creative process.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	My leader recognizes the organization as a whole, more than a sum of its parts.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	My leader has the ability to anticipate future consequences.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	My leader adequately anticipates the future					

	consequences of present decisions.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	My leader strives to make a positive difference in the organization.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	My leader works for the best interest of others rather than him/her self.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	My leader provides within the organization the opportunity for professional development.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	My leader believes an organization needs to function as a community.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	My leader works hard to foster community spirit within the organization.	1	2	3	4	5

I have been a teacher for at least three years.      Yes\_\_\_\_\_      No\_\_\_\_\_

VITA

LYNN BAILEY METCALFE

Personal Data:                   Date of Birth: February 10, 1955  
  Place of Birth: Middlesboro, Kentucky

Education:                        Lincoln Memorial University, Harrogate, Tennessee  
  Associate of Science, 1975  
  Business

  Lincoln Memorial University, Harrogate, Tennessee  
  Bachelor of Science, 1988  
  Elementary Education

  Lincoln Memorial University, Harrogate, Tennessee  
  Master of Education, 1992  
  Administration and Supervision

  Lincoln Memorial University, Harrogate, Tennessee  
  Educational Specialist, 2005  
  Administration and Supervision

  East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee  
  Doctor of Education, 2011  
  Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis

Professional Experience:       Elementary Education Teacher  
  Flatwoods Elementary, Grade 4  
  Jonesville, Virginia 1989- 1993

  Elementary Education Teacher  
  Rose Hill Elementary, Grade 3  
  Rose Hill, Virginia 1993-1994

  Elementary Education Teacher  
  Ewing Elementary, Grade 1  
  Ewing, Virginia 1994-2001

  Elementary Principal  
  Rose Hill Elementary, Grades K-7  
  Rose Hill, Virginia 2001-Present