A Correlational Study of Servant Leadership and Elementary Principal Job Satisfaction in

Ohio Public School Districts

Dissertation

Submitted to Northcentral University

Graduate Faculty of the School of Education
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

by

SANDRA N. SVOBODA

Prescott Valley, Arizona
April 2008

Approval

A Correlational Study of Servant Leadership and Elementary Principal Job Satisfaction in

Ohio Public School Districts

by

Sandra N. Svoboda

Approved by:

_Wendy E Lambert, EdD_____   _05.01.2008_____

Chair: Wendy E. Lambert, Ed.D.   Date

Members: Shad Bailey, Ph.D.
                Julie Davis, Ed.D.

Certified by:

_Dr Angie Parker_____   _5/15/08_____

Agnes Parker, Ph.D., Dean   Date

Abstract

A Correlational Study of Servant Leadership and Elementary Principal Job Satisfaction in

Ohio Public School Districts

by

Sandra N. Svoboda

Northcentral University, April 2008

The purpose of this quantitative correlational study was to determine the strength

of correlation between the perceived presence of servant leadership and elementary

principal job satisfaction in Ohio public school districts. Principals are leaving the

administrative profession before retirement at distressing rates. Further research is needed

to identify approaches that would increase principal job satisfaction rates. Positive

relationships have been found between servant leadership and job satisfaction (Anderson,

2005; Drury, 2005; Girard, 2000; Hebert, 2004; Laub, 1999; Miears, 2005; Rude, 2006;

Stramba, 2003; Strickland, 2006; Thompson, 2004; VanTassell, 2007). However, servant

leadership and job satisfaction research has been very limited in public school settings

(Girard, 2000; Miears, 2005; Rude, 2006). Therefore, this study was intended to answer

the research questions: (a) To what extent do public school districts in Ohio implement

the principles of servant leadership, and (b) to what extent does the level of servant

leadership revealed in Ohio public school districts correlate with Ohio elementary

principals' level of job satisfaction? Laub's (1999) Organizational Leadership

Assessment – Educational Version was used to survey 25 superintendents, 38 elementary

principals, and 475 elementary teachers. A systematic random sample was conducted in

Ohio public schools. Participation rates were as follows: 89.3% superintendents, 77.6% elementary principals, and 38.6% elementary teachers. A significant positive correlation of $r = .889$, $p < .01$ (two-tailed) was found between the perceived level of servant leadership present in Ohio public schools and the perceived level of elementary principal job satisfaction. The significant positive correlation revealed in this study indicated the higher level of servant leadership perceived in Ohio public schools, the higher the level of perceived elementary principal job satisfaction. Based on the strong positive correlation revealed in this study, servant leadership appears to be an approach worth further exploration to counter the exodus of principals leaving the field of educational administration.

Acknowledgements

First, and foremost, it is with humble gratitude that I acknowledge God's hand in guiding me daily, as I have attempted to merely be an instrument to help Him accomplish His purposes through my life's work. When considering the thought of pursuing a doctoral degree, these profound words encouraged me to take the first step.

> God has created me to do Him some definite service; He has committed some work to me, which He has not committed to another. I have my mission – I never may know it in this life, but I shall be told it in the next. Somehow I am necessary for His purposes. I have a part in this great work; I am a link in a chain, a bond of connection between persons. He has not created me for naught. I shall do good, I shall do His work; I shall be an angel of peace, a preacher of truth in my own place, while not intending it, if I but keep His commandments and serve Him in my calling. Therefore, I will trust Him. (Newman, 2006, ¶12)
>
> (Venerable John Henry Newman 1801-1890)

I would like to express gratitude to my parents, grandparents, and incredible family members who instilled in me the value of life long learning. They taught me that many important lessons are learned inside and outside the walls of formal educational settings, and that immeasurable obstacles may be overcome by continuing to pursue one's dreams. In addition, they taught me to stand strong in my beliefs, pursue those things that are the most meaningful in life, and to speak at times when it is easier to be silent. Though they were not afforded the many opportunities I have enjoyed, I could never fully appreciate the magnitude of my blessings without having been grounded by these many amazing people.

I would also like to thank Cindy, my best friend, my constant supporter, and the person who made pursing this educational journey possible. Words could not possibly

express my sincere gratitude, and I am thankful every day for her presence in my life.

To my staff, students, and principal colleagues, I am grateful to them for inspiring me, challenging me, assisting me, and giving me the opportunity to pursue my life's dreams while walking with them on a daily basis. They have brought immeasurable meaning and joy to my life, and remind me daily of what an honor it is to be an educator.

I am also sincerely grateful for Dr. Kathryn Hollywood's constant encouragement, zeal for helping others pursue their life long dreams, and her contagious passion and hope, which reveals everything that is right about life. Her unfailing support has guided me to reach goals that I never believed were possible. She is a rare and gifted individual, and she exemplifies the best qualities of being a servant leader.

My sincerest heartfelt gratitude is also given to Dr. Wendy E. Lambert for serving as my chair, guide, coach, counselor, and confidant. She provided me with a mirror to reflect and challenge my beliefs and perceptions, while simultaneously providing me with a window to see future possibilities. As an extremely talented educator and a highly intelligent and passionate instructor, she reveals exceptional qualities that all educators should strive to attain. Through the many difficult challenges of this journey, her constant support and encouragement were immeasurable, as she remained a pillar of strength through even the most difficult of circumstances. I am proud to wear the same cloak of being an educator as Dr. Lambert, and it is a privilege and blessing to call her my mentor.

I would also like to thank Kit Keller for introducing me to the world of online learning, and for guiding me toward the topic of servant leadership. In addition, I have sincerely appreciated the many ways Dara Levitch helped me during my doctoral journey. Her navigational guidance was invaluable, along with her constant words of

support and encouragement. I also wish to thank Dr. Shad Bailey and Dr. Julie Davis for serving as committee members, and for sharing their insights with me during the multiple readings of my work. In addition, I am most appreciative of the statistical assistance and patient support of Dr. Maria Karavidas.

Lastly, I would like to thank the many educators who have touched my life in some special way during my lifetime. God's grace has blessed me with outstanding public school teachers, coaches, and college professors who have guided and sustained me throughout my life's journey. It is my greatest hope that I may positively impact others as these people have impacted my life. Following their footsteps, I pray that I may help guide others up the mountains of their lives to reach the summits of *their* dreams.

"I just want to do God's will. And He's allowed me to go up to the mountain. And I've looked over, and I've seen the Promised Land" (King, 2004, ¶36).

<div align="right">(Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. 1929-1968)</div>

CONTENTS

List of Tables

List of Figures

Chapter 1: Introduction

School accountability has sharply increased due to the passage of the federal law No Child Left Behind (NCLB) in 2001 (U.S. Department of Education, 2007). At the same time, states have been facing increasing principal shortages (Norton, 2003). Numerous research findings over the past 35 years have revealed the profound impact school leadership has had on student achievement (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005). Principals have been leaving administrative positions at distressing rates. It is becoming increasingly difficult to retain and attract qualified public school principals (Guterman, 2007). Discovering factors that lead to higher principal job satisfaction levels is critically important to retaining quality administrators and to attracting aspiring administrators.

Servant leadership, a concept introduced by Robert K. Greenleaf (2003) in the 1970s, appears to lead to higher job satisfaction. Greenleaf revealed the need for a better approach to leadership that emphasized serving employees, customers, and community members as the highest priority (Spears & Lawrence, 2004). Educators seem to be increasingly interested in the concept of servant leadership due to its success in business organizations.

Multiple studies have reported a positive relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction (e.g. Anderson, 2005; Drury, 2005; Girard, 2000; Hebert, 2004; Laub, 1999; Miears, 2005; Rude, 2006; Stramba, 2003; Strickland, 2006; Thompson, 2004; VanTassell, 2007). However, servant leadership research has been very limited in public school settings, with only Girard (2000), Miears (2005), and Rude (2006) addressing the issue of servant leadership and job satisfaction in public school settings. A significant positive correlation would indicate servant leadership may be worth exploring

further as a means to increase job satisfaction and retention rates of Ohio elementary public school principals.

Statement of the Problem

Many public school principals continue to leave the educational profession at distressing rates. This has resulted in the need to identify leadership practices which could contribute to increased job satisfaction levels (Guterman, 2007; Norton, 2003). Servant leadership appears to be an approach that has led to higher job satisfaction. The purpose of this quantitative study was to determine if there was a significant correlation between servant leadership and elementary principal job satisfaction in Ohio public school districts.

Principal shortages have been so extreme that many states have passed alternative licensure laws providing non-educators avenues to obtain principal licenses (Education Commission, 2007). The alternative licensure trend appears to be increasing. There were only 11 states that allowed alternative principal licensure in 2003 compared to 16 states in 2007 (Education Commission, 2007; Hale & Moorman, 2003). Alternative licensure for principals has also been considered by at least six additional states, though states such as Florida and Tennessee have not implemented this legal option. Other states such as Massachusetts and Michigan have tried to minimize the utilization of the provision of licensing non-educators as principals (Education Commission, 2007). In Michigan, parents, school boards, and superintendents have been reluctant to turn over their schools to non-school personnel (Cusick, 2003).

Extreme principal shortages in Ohio led to the adoption of alternative principal licensure rules by the Ohio State Board of Education in September 2005 (Ohio

Department of Education, 2006). As a result, there were more than 200 temporarily certified school administrators working during the 2006-2007 school year (Ohio Department of Education, 2006). In Colorado, principal shortages led to the acceptance of non-educators in alternative licensing programs for the first time during the 2006-2007 school year (Colorado Department of Education, 2007). In North Carolina, principal shortages led to 279 assistant principals being issued provisional licenses in 2005-2006, compared with only 40 issued in 1999-2000 (North Carolina Principals & Assistant Principals Association, 2007). In addition, a quarter of North Carolina principals left their professional role after four years on the job, and that number doubled after seven years (Dancy, 2007). It is essential to counter the trend of certifying non-education majors to lead public schools in the 21st century by seeking alternatives to attract and retain qualified principals.

Principal shortages have been evident throughout the nation with 60% of superintendents indicating their school districts were facing shortages of qualified principal candidates. Fewer than half of those teachers qualified to become principals have been willing to consider the principal role (Cusick, 2003). Some principals have left to retire; however, more are leaving prematurely due to low job satisfaction resulting from stress, burnout, inadequate compensation, and lack of support (Field, 2003). It is important to identify effective leadership approaches to counter the trend of principals leaving the education profession since principal shortages are evident throughout the nation.

Leadership practices leading to higher job satisfaction levels must be explored in order to retain quality principals in the workforce and entice qualified teachers to enter

the principalship. Servant leadership seems to be one such approach, and it has been positively related to job satisfaction levels (Anderson, 2005; Drury, 2005; Girard, 2000; Hebert, 2004; Laub, 1999; Miears, 2005; Rude, 2006; Stramba, 2003; Strickland, 2006; Thompson, 2004; VanTassell, 2007). "At its core, servant leadership is a long-term, transformational approach to life and work – in essence, a way of being – that has the potential for creating positive change throughout our society" (Spears & Lawrence, 2004, p. 12). However, servant leadership research has been very limited in public school settings, with minimal focus on principal job satisfaction levels. The purpose of this quantitative study was to better understand whether servant leadership positively correlated with elementary principal job satisfaction levels in order to reveal practices that may lead to higher principal retention rates. The following research questions were addressed in this study: (a) To what extent do public school districts in Ohio implement the principles of servant leadership, and (b) to what extent does the level of servant leadership revealed in Ohio public school districts correlate with Ohio elementary principals' level of job satisfaction?

Background and Significance of the Problem

Background information is provided in order to demonstrate the significance of principals leaving the educational profession at alarming rates and the need for this quantitative study. The next section will include the following topics: (a) principal job satisfaction, (b) servant leadership, (c) servant leadership in educational settings, and (d) servant leadership studies.

Principal job satisfaction and principal shortages. Public school principals have been leaving the administrative profession at disturbing rates for many non-retirement

reasons (Field, 2003). "A sharp increase in responsibilities in recent years has made the job more stressful, and has discouraged some teachers from taking positions in administration" (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2006, ¶ 25). Norton (2003) shared, "National statistics related to principal turnover and dwindling supplies of qualified replacements show clearly that principal turnover has reached crisis proportions" (¶ 1). Elementary and secondary educational administrators held approximately 225,000 jobs in the United States in 2004. It is important to find ways to increase principal retention rates in this large work force (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2006, ¶ 22). Losing 1% of the nation's educational administrative work force would result in a loss of 2,250 administrators. However, one percent appears to be a low estimate. For example, New York's most experienced principals have been leaving the profession in increasing numbers. More than half of principals left their jobs from 2002-2006 and over 200 of those left for reasons other than retirement (*Principals Leaving*, 2006). Field (2003) shared,

> All across America, in communities from California to Maine, similar stories are being told. More and more public school principals are leaving. Fewer and fewer qualified candidates are stepping forward to take their places. In Boston, between 1994 and 2000, half of all public school principals retired or resigned. States as diverse as Washington, Vermont, Texas and Kentucky report annual turnover rates of 20 percent or more. When officials from the Maryland State Department of Education conducted an informal survey of school systems earlier this year, they were shocked to discover that of 1,380 principals in the state, about 300 were expected to retire or leave before September. (¶ 4)

Specific reasons administrators have been leaving the profession, other than retirement, include low job satisfaction levels resulting from high stress levels, low support, and limited resources. "More and more school principals are leaving their jobs early, citing stress, burnout, inadequate compensation, and lack of support as the main reasons for their departure" (Field, 2003, ¶ 5).

In contrast, there are those administrators who appear to sustain a passion for their jobs and who have had long careers as principals. While many administrators have left the profession before retirement, others appear to display a high level of job satisfaction, a strong sense of purpose, and a focus on serving and helping others. It is important to understand what separates these passionate satisfied principals who have remained in their positions from their frustrated and resigning peers. Servant leadership seems to be one leadership approach which has led to higher job satisfaction, and it will be discussed in the next section.

Servant leadership. Robert K. Greenleaf completed a 38-year career working for AT&T before introducing the concept of servant leadership (Greenleaf, 2002). After reading Hesse's (1970) book, *Journey to the East*, Greenleaf was inspired by this fictional story's revelation that the person serving others was ultimately the most important leader. "But to me, this story clearly says that the great leader is seen as servant first, and that simple fact is the key to his greatness" (Greenleaf, 2002, p. 21). Greenleaf's (2003) first essay on the topic, *The Servant as Leader*, was published in 1970 and introduced the concept of servant leader. His definition of servant leadership stated,

> It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead. The difference manifests itself in the care taken by the servant – first to make sure that other people's highest priority needs are being served. The best test is: do those served grow as persons; do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants? (Greenleaf, 2003, p. 16)

Though Greenleaf's writings are almost 40 years old, his concepts remain very relevant, as current organizations continue to embrace them. "The servant-leader concept continues to grow in its influence and impact. In fact, we have witnessed an unparalleled

explosion of interest and practice of servant-leadership in the past decade" (Spears, as cited in Greenleaf, 2003, p. 13). After reading Greenleaf's original writings, Spears (as cited in Spears & Lawrence, 2004) concluded that there are 10 key characteristics of servant leadership which include: (a) listening, (b) empathy, (c) healing, (d) awareness, (e) persuasion, (f) conceptualization, (g) foresight, (h) stewardship, (i) commitment to grow people, and (j) building community. Wheatley (as cited in Spears & Lawrence, 2004), also inspired by Greenleaf's writings, shared,

> Servant leadership is not just an interesting idea but something fundamental and vital for the world, something the world truly does need. The concept of servant leadership must move from an interesting idea in the public imagination toward the realization that this is the only way we can go forward. (p. 268)

There are numerous examples of businesses effectively following the servant leadership principles. Several of these companies annually appear in the top 10 on *Fortune* magazine's list of 100 best companies to work for in America including TDIndustries, Southwest Airlines, Synovus Financial Corporation, and The Container Store (McGee-Cooper & Looper, 2001). According to McGee-Cooper and Looper (2001), these companies outperform others, yielding an approximately 50% higher return to shareholders than competitors not on the *Fortune* list. In addition, these companies all embrace the practices of servant leadership, especially TDIndustries, which has been used as a premiere example of a servant leadership organization for over 40 years.

> TD seeks to help each employee/partner to view him- or herself as a valued leader. From this position, each person must take responsibility for nurturing others, initiating ideas, asking for help, collaborating, calling others to action, challenging assumptions, questioning a policy's alignment with core values, offering suggestions for continuous improvement, and so on. (McGee-Cooper & Looper, 2001, p. 7)

More than one third of *Fortune's* list, or more than 35 organizations, are involved in the servant leadership movement (Hunter, 2004). They have adopted a servant leadership philosophy, practiced shared power and high employee involvement, and demonstrated the results in their strong financial performance. "Using U.S. Department of Labor data and surveys of 1,500 firms from various industries, Huselid and Becker found that such participative practices significantly improved employee retention, increased productivity, and improved financial performance" (Blanchard, 2007, p. 272). Members of educational organizations appear to be giving more attention to the servant leadership philosophy due to its successfulness in the business world. This will be discussed in the next section.

Servant leadership in educational settings. Educators appear to be increasingly interested in exploring the philosophy of servant leadership, learning from the success derived in the world of business. As accountability measures have increased in public schools, there has been a growing consensus that the command and control leadership models have not been effective (Hale & Moorman, 2003). As a result, there seemed to be an increasing shift from top-down management to servant leadership practices, both in public education and higher education institutions. The Robert K. Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership (2002) has listed many colleges and universities offering servant leadership courses or programs. Examples of institutions offering servant leadership courses or programs include: (a) Arizona State University, (b) Baylor University, (c) Butler University, (d) Calvin College, (e) DePaul University, (f) Emory University, (g) Illinois State University, (h) John Brown University, (i) University of Michigan, (j) Regent University, (k) University of South Florida, and (l) Trinity Western University.

Greenleaf (2003) wrote an entire parable titled *Teacher as Servant* based in a university setting describing servant leadership in action. In this story, a passionate professor instilled the servant leadership philosophy as a focus for students living in the same residence hall. This fictional story has become reality on many university campuses throughout the United States. The Robert K. Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership (2002) reported that Butler University and the University of South Florida have been examples of universities implementing Greenleaf's parable as a model for servant leadership in undergraduate residence houses. In addition, Calvin College has instituted a Service Learning Center, the goal of which is to develop future servant leaders focused on economic and social justice. At John Brown University, servant leadership is the model used in its leadership and ethics program, and Regent University hosts an annual Servant Leadership Roundtable Conference. Servant leadership concepts have been taught and implemented in many educational institutions, with a conscious effort to develop and train future servant leaders.

In the kindergarten through 12th grade (K-12) school setting, effective servant leadership type traits have been revealed by Marzano et al. (2005). Marzano et al. conducted a meta-analysis involving 69 studies, 2,802 schools, and approximately 1.4 million students. Leadership traits which positively correlated with student achievement included: (a) affirmation, (b) culture, (c) ideas/beliefs, (d) input, (e) optimizer, and (f) relationships. These traits seem to be similar to the servant leadership characteristics of recognizing others, building a sense of community, involving and valuing others, inspiring others, and focusing on people to strengthen relationships. It was revealed, "The responsibility of relationships might be considered to be the bedrock of the principal's

efforts to establish a purposeful community" (Marzano et al., 2005, p. 103). The concept

of building relationships appears to be highly aligned to the philosophy of servant

leadership.

Servant leadership has appeared to be a strong and viable model for educational

institutions to implement, though more research is needed (Crippen, 2005a).

> Servant leadership provides the promise of an effective educational
> leadership and management model. There is a need for a pilot project
> using this model. More importantly, there is the need for a 3-5 year study
> of institutions that embark upon the integration of such a model. (Crippen,
> 2005a, p. 16)

Though multiple studies have probed the servant leadership philosophy and concepts, the

body of research related to servant leadership in educational organizations is relatively

small (Crippen, 2005b). The servant leadership body of research related to public school

organizations and public school principals is even smaller, as will be discussed in the

next section.

Servant leadership studies. Numerous studies have revealed a positive

relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction (e.g., Anderson, 2005; Drury,

2005; Girard, 2000; Hebert, 2004; Irving, 2005; Laub, 1999; Miears, 2005; Rude, 2006;

Stramba, 2003; Strickland, 2006; Thompson, 2004; VanTassell, 2007; Washington,

2007). Anderson's (2005) study was the best-selling ProQuest dissertation of 2005 and

revealed a strong interest in the concepts of servant leadership and job satisfaction

(ProQuest Information, 2006). However, the Anderson investigation focused on the

extent that employee job satisfaction was correlated with perceptions of servant

leadership in the Church Educational System of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day

Saints, rather than public school districts. Available research has revealed only a small

number of servant leadership studies in public schools related to job satisfaction (Girard, 2000; Miears, 2005; Rude, 2006).

Girard (2000), Miears (2005), and Rude (2006) focused on servant leadership and job satisfaction in public school settings. However, these investigations did not address servant leadership and principal job satisfaction levels. Miears (2005) utilized Laub's (1999) Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA), when focusing on job satisfaction in public school settings. The present study used the OLA to survey principals in Ohio public schools in order to extend the research on this topic.

To briefly review the methodology that was utilized in this study, a systematic random sampling of superintendents, elementary principals, and elementary teachers was conducted throughout the state of Ohio. Participants were mailed the OLA. This instrument is a 66 item five-point Likert scale questionnaire that was used to determine the level of servant leadership present in Ohio public schools, and the level of job satisfaction revealed by elementary principals. The strength of correlation between servant leadership and elementary principal job satisfaction was then revealed. However, limitations included that no cause and effect may be determined from a correlational study; only the strength of the correlation may be revealed (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007). In addition, superintendent district access was required, which eliminated the possibility that this study was based on true systematic random sampling.

To extend the current research, and determine if a significant correlation existed between servant leadership and elementary principals' job satisfaction in Ohio public schools, the following research questions and hypotheses were addressed in this study.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

    1. To what extent do public school districts in Ohio implement the principles of

       servant leadership?

    2. To what extent does the level of servant leadership revealed in Ohio public

       school districts correlate with Ohio elementary principals' level of job

       satisfaction?

$H1_1$. There is a significant correlation between the level of servant leadership

perceived in Ohio public schools, as determined by superintendents, elementary

principals, and elementary teachers ratings on Laub's (1999) OLA, and the level of job

satisfaction perceived by Ohio elementary public school principals as determined by

principal ratings on the OLA.

$H1_o$. There is no significant correlation between the level of servant leadership

perceived in Ohio public schools, as determined by superintendents, elementary

principals, and elementary teachers ratings on the OLA, and the level of job satisfaction

perceived by Ohio elementary public school principals as determined by principal ratings

on the OLA.

Definition of Terms

Servant leadership. Key characteristics of servant leadership include: (a)

listening, (b) empathy, (c) healing, (c) awareness, (d) persuasion, (e) conceptualization,

(f) foresight, (g) stewardship, (h) commitment to the growth of people, and (i) building

community (Spears, as cited in Spears & Lawrence, 2004). Servant leadership may be

defined by asking,

        Do those being served grow as persons: do they, while being served,
        become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves

to become servants? And what is the effect on the least privileged in society; will she or he benefit, or, at least, not be further deprived? (Greenleaf, 2003, p. 43)

Job satisfaction. A school employee's belief that their job is important; they trust the leadership of the school; they enjoy working at their school; they feel respected by those above them in the school; they feel they are able to be creative in their job; they believe their work is more valued than their title; and they perceive that they are able to use their best gifts and abilities in their job (Laub, 1999).

Ohio public school district. One of Ohio's 615 public school districts consisting of 191 city districts, 49 exempted village districts, 374 local districts, and 49 joint vocational districts (Ohio Department of Education, 2007). These districts receive public government funding, and do not include any private, parochial, or any privately funded charter schools.

Ohio public school elementary principal. A licensed school administrator serving as an elementary principal in one of the 615 Ohio public school districts.

Summary and Conclusion

In summary, principals are leaving the administrative profession before retirement at distressing rates, resulting in a need to identify approaches contributing to higher principal job satisfaction rates. Servant leadership appears to be an approach that contributes to higher job satisfaction. It may be a viable approach for school districts to adopt to increase principal retention rates and attract new administrators. Previous studies have revealed a positive relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction levels, but such research has been very limited in public school settings (Anderson, 2005; Drury, 2005; Girard, 2000; Hebert, 2004; Irving, 2005; Laub, 1999; Miears, 2005; Rude,

2006; Stramba, 2003; Strickland, 2006; Thompson, 2004; VanTassell, 2007; Washington, 2007). Minimal attention has been given to analyzing the correlation of servant leadership and principal job satisfaction rates. The purpose of this quantitative study was to extend the current knowledge in the field by correlating servant leadership and elementary principal job satisfaction in Ohio public school districts.

A significant positive correlation between servant leadership and elementary principal job satisfaction would indicate servant leadership may be an approach worth exploring further to counter the exodus of principals from the field of educational administration. In order to signify the importance of conducting this dissertation study, the next chapter will consist of an extensive literature review that is intended to show how this investigation extends the currently available research in the area of servant leadership and job satisfaction in public school settings.

Chapter 2 - Literature Review

Introduction

At a time when the quality of school leadership is becoming increasingly important, principals continue to leave the field of education at distressing rates for non-retirement reasons (Guterman, 2007). Many principals are electing to retire, compounding the principal shortage problem (Field, 2003; NAESP, 2003). Though principal vacancies are extensive, teachers have also been reluctant to fill the role of the principalship (Bureau of Labor, 2006; NAESP 2003). Servant leadership might counter the trend of principals leaving the field of education prior to retirement, while also attracting aspiring principals.

A comprehensive literature review will be presented including the areas of: (a) principal leadership, (b) principal job satisfaction and principal shortages, (c) servant leadership, (d) servant leadership in businesses, (e) servant leadership in educational settings, and (f) servant leadership studies.

Principal Leadership

The connection between the quality of school leadership and student achievement has been documented for many years (C.D. Howe Institute, 2003; Fullan, 2003; Hessel & Holloway, 2002; Marzano, et al., 2005; Sergiovanni, 2005; The Wallace Foundation, 2007). As accountability expectations in schools increase, it is even more essential to retain quality principals, while attracting talented aspiring principals. "Extensive research in the area of primary and secondary education shows definitively that good principals are essential to strengthening instructional quality in schools and improving student learning" (C.D. Howe Institute, ¶ 1). The job of principal has become even more critical

due to the era of standards-based education and high stakes accountability (The Education Alliance, 2003). Society is changing. The more complex society becomes, the more sophisticated leadership must become (Fullan, 2003). Sergiovanni (2005) emphasized that regardless of how well schools are managed, the extra quality of leadership makes the difference between ordinary and extraordinary performance. "Studies on school effectiveness, school climate, and student achievement all reveal one commonality, the fact that good happenings in schools depend to a great extent on the quality of school leadership" (Norton, 2003, ¶ 3).

Efforts have been made to define key characteristics of effective school leaders, especially as the principal role has continued to become more demanding (Marzano et al., 2005). In 1996, the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) developed the ISLLC Standards for School Leaders (Hessel & Holloway, 2002). These standards guided policy and best practices related to principal leadership skills. At least 35 states have adopted these standards, but they have met with criticism because they are not anchored in rigorous research (Hale & Moorman, 2003). However, the ISLLC guidelines appear to be a significant step forward in attempting to define elements that contribute to effective school leadership.

In 2001, the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), renamed as the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), increased the accountability of educators throughout the nation. Principals were given the challenge of improving student achievement levels or being replaced as administrators of their buildings (U.S. Department of Education, 2007). "At a time when expectations of schools are skyrocketing, school principals must play an increasingly important role in helping to

transform schools and classroom performance" (The Wallace Foundation, 2007, ¶ 4).

Many of the managerial tasks continue to be part of the principal's responsibilities,

resulting in an unparalleled increase in job responsibilities. The highly demanding and

complex principal role has created the need to statistically determine which principal

leadership skills are most effective when correlating them with student achievement.

Marzano et al.'s (2005) research was groundbreaking, as it statistically revealed which

principal leadership traits have a profound impact on student achievement.

    A meta-analysis was conducted by Marzano et al. (2005), in which 69 studies

were reviewed from 1978-2001, to determine the impact of school leadership on student

achievement. Marzano et al. reviewed studies that involved 2,802 schools, approximately

1.4 million students, and 14,000 teachers. Correlations were computed between

leadership behaviors of the principal in the school, and the academic achievement of

students in the school. "In all, we extracted or computed 69 correlations representing the

relationship between general leadership behavior and student academic achievement....the

average correlation was .25" (Marzano et al., 2005, p. 30). The researchers concluded

that the leadership behavior of the principal had a statistically profound effect on student

achievement.

    Marzano et al. (2005) identified 21 categories of behaviors related to principal

leadership, which were referred to as *responsibilities*, with correlations ranging from $r =$

.18 to .33. These responsibilities included: (a) affirmation, (b) change agent, (c)

contingent rewards, (d) communication, (e) culture, (f) discipline, (g) flexibility, (h)

focus, (i) ideas/beliefs, (j) input, (k) intellectual stimulation, (l) involvement in

curriculum, instruction and assessment, (m) knowledge of curriculum, instruction and

assessment, (n) monitoring/evaluating, (o) optimizer, (p) order, (q) outreach, (r) relationships, (s) resources, (t) situational awareness, and (u) visibility. These leadership responsibilities were not new, but the quantification of the relationship each responsibility had to student academic achievement was new to leadership literature. "This is perhaps the first time in the history of leadership research in the United States that we can point to a set of competencies (responsibilities) that are research based" (Marzano et al., 2005, p. 62). Though the importance of principal leadership competencies has been discussed in the literature for decades, Marzano et al.'s work quantitatively indicated that specific leadership skills have a statistically significant relationship when correlated with student achievement. It is essential to retain and attract well-qualified school leaders due to the profound positive impact they have on student achievement.

At a time when the importance of school leadership is becoming increasingly evident, principals have been leaving their positions prior to retirement at alarming rates (Cusick, 2003). Principal shortages continue across the nation, at the same time the job is becoming more demanding and complex, leading to a dilemma regarding who will replace the outgoing principals (NAESP, 2007). Principals' job dissatisfaction, paired with the reluctance of teachers being willing to fill the principal role, has resulted in an alarming number of principal shortages across the nation (Cusick, 2003; Bureau of Labor, 2006). The next section will address the issues of principal job satisfaction and principal shortages.

Principal Job Satisfaction and Principal Shortages

Principal shortages are evident across the nation as many principals are electing to retire, while at the same time principals are leaving the profession for non-retirement reasons (NAESP, 2003). Teachers are also reluctant to fill the role of the principalship. The combination of these factors create a perfect storm that has collided and led to extreme principal shortages (Bureau of Labor, 2006). "There is strong evidence that America's schools are losing their quality administrative personnel, and at a rapid rate" (Norton, 2003, ¶ 4). Reducing principal shortages is especially important since there are so many educational administrative jobs available in the United States. Elementary and secondary school administrators held approximately 225,000 jobs in 2004, with employment opportunities expected to grow through 2014 (Bureau of Labor, 2006). A national survey found that 60% of superintendents indicated their districts were facing a shortage of qualified principal candidates. An additional national survey reported that fewer than half of teachers holding a principal certificate were willing to consider the job of working as a school principal (Cusick, 2003).

Principal shortages have been cited in a number of studies during the past decade, including a 1998 study commissioned by the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) and the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) (NAESP, 2003). This study concluded that approximately half of the surveyed school districts reported a shortage in the labor pool for K-12 principal positions they were trying to fill regardless of whether they were rural, suburban, or urban schools (NAESP, 2003). NAESP (2003) conducted a national survey and found that 66% of principals were planning to retire in the next 6 to 10 years. Pairing principal retirements

with principals leaving for non-retirement reasons, the problem of principal shortages is
at a critical level (Field, 2003).

Examples of principals leaving the profession for non-retirement reasons included
10% of principals in North Carolina who left after their first year on the job, and 25%
who left after four years (Dancy, 2007). In Boston, between 1994 and 2000, half of
school principals resigned or retired, while states such as Washington, Vermont, Texas,
and Kentucky had turnover rates of 20% or more (Field, 2003). In New York City, more
than half of the most experienced principals left their jobs between 2002-2006, with 200
leaving for non-retirement reasons (*Principals Leaving*, 2006). A 2003 survey of
superintendents found that 60% of school districts had principal shortages. This is an
increase from the 1998 national survey which reported principal shortages in 50% of
school districts (NAESP, 2003, Cusick, 2003).

As accountability measures for schools are increasing across the nation, so is the
pressure on school principals to meet the high demands of ensuring that their schools
reach the rigorous NCLB federal mandates (U.S. Department of Education, 2007). "Most
[principals] find working with students extremely rewarding, but as the responsibilities
have increased in recent years, so has the stress" (Bureau of Labor, 2006, ¶ 13).
Increasing workloads, low salary levels, time constraints, and lack of support and respect
have led to lower job satisfaction and high principal turnover rates (Norton, 2003).
Teachers have been reluctant to pursue principal positions, indicating that the higher pay
is not high enough to compensate for the greater responsibilities and additional stress
(Bureau of Labor, 2006). A national survey of superintendents found three top factors
which discouraged qualified candidates to fill principal vacancies: insufficient

compensation compared to responsibilities, too much time required, and the stress level of the job (NAESP, 2003). These factors have also led to principal job dissatisfaction, causing many to leave the profession at distressing rates (Guterman, 2007). "High-stakes testing, accountability for factors out of their control, fragmentation of their time, and focus on management issues rather than instructional leadership all contribute to principals' job-related stress" (NAESP, 2003, ¶ 11). This multitude of stressful concerns has led to what some have called a full-grown shortage of principals (Guterman, 2007).

Principal shortages have been so extreme that 16 states have passed laws, which allow for alternative principal licensure for non-education majors. At least six additional states have considered this option, though in 2003, Iowa's governor vetoed the passage of the alternative licensure law (Education Commission, 2007). To counter the trend of alternative licensure, it appears that attention has been given to the recruitment of more teachers for enrollment in principal licensure programs. However, increasing the principal licensure rates of teachers does not appear to be the remedy. Many teachers are licensed or certificated to be principals, but they do not seem interested in filling principal positions. For example, North Carolina's Department of Public Instruction licensure records revealed that there were 19,321 licensed principal educators, but only 6,017 of them were currently employed as educational administrators (North Carolina Principals & Assistant Principals Association, 2007). States have been increasingly filling vacancies with alternatively licensed principals since traditionally licensed principals are often not applying for principal vacancies (Education Commission, 2007).

Alternative licensing has been a common practice in filling teaching positions for many years, as 47 states now offer teachers alternative routes to certification. Two

decades ago very few teachers were certified using alternative routes, but alternatively

certified teachers now account for almost one in five new teachers nationwide (Walsh &

Jacobs, 2007). "Alternative certification first emerged a quarter-century ago. The concept

was straightforward: make it less cumbersome for talented individuals without teaching

degrees to enter the classroom" (Finn & Petrilli, as cited in Walsh & Jacobs, p. 3).

However, many have argued that the alternative programs have fallen woefully short of

their intended goals. Alternative program personnel have been remarkably nonselective

in their applicants, have shown little flexibility regarding candidate background, offer

expensive licensure programs, and have provided inadequate training and support to their

candidates (Walsh & Jacobs, 2007). It is important to understand the history of teacher

alternative licensure in order to see the potential future trends for alternative license

programs for principals. In 2003, only 11 states allowed alternative principal licensure,

compared to 16 states that allowed alternative licensure in 2007 (Education Commission,

2007; Hale & Moorman, 2003). However, the path to licensure seems to be greatly varied

when comparing each state's alternative licensure program requirements.

Reviewing alternative principal program requirements, it appears states have been

allowed to establish their own criteria for principal alternative licensure (Education

Commission, 2007). The Education Commission compared various state requirements

and reported that Colorado school boards may enter into an employment contract with

any person to serve as a district administrator based on qualifications established by the

board. In Florida, since 2003, school boards are may set their own alternative

qualifications for persons interested in becoming a principal but who do not hold a state

certificate. Idaho has a more clearly defined the path of alternative licensure. Candidates

must have a strong subject matter background, a minimum of a bachelor's degree, and they must have completed a specified preparation program. Alternatively licensed principals and assistant principals in Kentucky may be placed in positions on a temporary basis for two years, while New Hampshire has a very rigorous route for alternative licensure, which few people have attempted.

Since 1999, schools in Michigan have been allowed to place non-educators in administrative positions, but parents, boards, and superintendents have proven reluctant thus far to turn their schools over to non-school personnel (Cusick, 2003). Also in 1999, the General Assembly of North Carolina permitted the issuance of provisional licenses for assistant principals which increased from 40 issued licenses in 1999-2000 to 279 in 2005-2006 (North Carolina Principals & Assistant Principals Association, 2007). Extreme principal shortages in Ohio led to the adoption of alternative principal licensure rules by the Ohio State Board of Education in September 2005 (Ohio Department of Education, 2006). As a result, Ohio had more than 200 temporarily certified school administrators employed during the 2006-2007 school year (Ohio Department of Education).

Debates regarding the effectiveness of the performance of alternatively licensed individuals compared to traditionally licensed individuals have continued as more principals have become alternatively licensed. (Fenwick & Pierce, 2001). This debate is becoming increasingly important as the job of principal is becoming more complex and demanding due to the rigorous NCLB requirements (U.S. Department of Education, 2007).

> While proponents of alternative routes to the principalship propose eliminating teaching or other school leadership experiences as

requirements for principal licensure, it is clear from those who presently
fill that role that a background in education is critically important. Nearly
90 percent of surveyed principals reported that their teaching experience
was 'highly valuable' to their success as a principal. (Fenwick & Pierce,
2001, ¶ 7)

At a time when it seems highly qualified and talented principals are needed more

than ever to guide the nation's schools, data from teacher alternative programs has

revealed concerns which may be relevant to those utilizing alternative licensure options

for principals. For example, teachers hired through alternative routes have been more

likely to be rated as ineffective or poor compared to traditionally trained teachers

(Fenwick & Pierce, 2001). In addition, Fenwick and Pierce revealed that approximately

60% of alternatively certified teachers leave the profession by the third year, which is

twice the rate of traditionally trained teachers. In this age of accountability, most evident

in California and Texas, standardized test scores have also shown that students with

traditionally trained teachers outscored those with alternatively certified teachers

(Fenwick & Pierce, 2001). If similar trends become reality in the alternative licensing of

principals, it will be critically important to find approaches that decrease principal

shortages without turning schools over to those not trained in the field of education.

Avenues contributing to higher principal job satisfaction must be found in order to

deter principals from leaving the educational field and increase the number of aspiring

principals willing to take the job. Servant leadership seems to be this avenue. It has been

positively related to higher job satisfaction and will be discussed in the next section.

Servant Leadership

Servant leadership was first displayed over 2,000 years ago by the greatest servant

leader of all time who was Jesus Christ (New International Version). "Jesus sent a clear

message to all those who would follow Him that leadership has to be first and foremost

an act of service. No Plan B was implied or offered in His words" (Blanchard & Hodges,

2003, p. 12). Jesus embodied the most important aspects of servant leadership, as He

constantly placed the needs of others before His own needs (New International Version).

"The greatest among you will be your servant. For whoever exalts himself will be

humbled, and whoever humbles himself will be exalted" (Matthew 23:11-12, New

International Version). Jesus exemplified the important qualities of servant leadership. He

proved that a leader could be strong, effective, and able to make powerful changes while

remaining humble and caring with a servant's heart. "Take my yoke upon you and learn

from me, for I am gentle and humble in heart, and you will find rest for your souls"

(Matthew 11:29). The most important key to a servant leader's heart is humility. People

do not necessarily think less of themselves, they just think of themselves less (Blanchard,

as cited in, Kouzes et al., 2004).

Pairing the terms servant and leader is sometimes confusing because they are

often interpreted as contradictory concepts. However, the term servant does not

necessarily mean to be weak or to follow. The term leader does not necessarily mean to

be authoritarian or to order. Rather, Jesus proved that the combination of servant and

leader could result in profound changes without dictating or forcing any changes (New

International Version). Jesus did not demand obedience, but He changed people's hearts

through leading by His service to others. He modeled the ability to be caring, loving, and

serving, rather than coercing others to comply with His requests (New International

Version). "For even the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give

His life as a ransom for many" (Mark 10:45).

Therefore, it is essential to understand the motivation behind Jesus' actions which were always a commitment to do what was the best for others regardless of the cost to His own life (New International Version). For example, John 15:13 states, "No greater love has any man than to lay down his life for his friends." However, Blanchard and Hodges (2003) clarified, "Jesus isn't asking us literally to die for our people. But He's saying 'not so with you' (Matthew 20:26) in terms of traditional leadership" (p. 57). Jesus clearly did not mask the cost involved in serving others, but He revealed it would be worth the effort (Blanchard & Hodges, 2003). Power, prestige, wealth, and control did not govern His actions. He was motivated by love to help guide, heal, and strengthen others. Therefore, Jesus did not seek attention or recognition for His actions. He simply focused on what was best for each person He encountered rather than what was best for Him (New International Version).

Jesus also constantly taught others how they should continue His work by serving each other and treating each other with the utmost care and concern (New International Version). "Love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul, and with all your mind. This is the first and greatest commandment. And the second is like it: Love your neighbor as yourself" (Matthew 22:37-40). Jesus encouraged others to follow His example, and serving each other continues to be important in religious teachings (Blanchard & Hodges, 2005). "In the use of His time and efforts on earth, Jesus modeled sacrificial passion for ensuring that His followers were equipped to carry on the movement" (Blanchard & Hodges, 2003, p. 20).

Servant leadership is a simple concept that continues to be applied in a variety of settings as it was over 2,000 years ago. However, servant leadership is deceptively simple

because it is considered by some to be the most profound and difficult type of leadership

(Wong & Davey, 2007). Wong and Davey indicated that servant leadership is not a set of

skills to be learned, but a kind of inner transformation oriented toward serving others.

> All the exercises in team-building will not make you a team person, if you
> are an egotistic person at heart. Egos die hard. Pride will not easily let go
> of its prisoners. That is why there are so few servant leaders. (Wong &
> Davey, p. 7)

Servant leadership does not always seem to be an easy approach to follow,

especially in a complex world driven by winning at all costs. In a world filled with

terrorism, unethical scandals, cynicism, and the ill treatment of people, it is a concept that

might be an antidote to counter the tide of people suffering in the world. "Servant

leadership seems to offer an answer to recent concerns about corporate scandals, toxic

work environments, employee-burnout and retention problems" (Wong & Davey, 2007,

p. 4). Leaders adopting the principles of servant leadership may have the opportunity to

heal the wounds caused by hurtful leadership practices. "Serving means that when the

person leaves my leadership sphere of influence, he or she will be a better person and

leader because of time spent with me" (Ortberg, as cited in Kouzes et al., 2004, p. 97).

Leaders have a unique capability to influence those in their charge, and following Jesus'

example of servant leadership is an approach has the potential to transform the world as it

did over 2,000 years ago.

It must be emphasized that servant leadership does not appear to be carried out in

isolation but rather in relationship with others. Jesus did not strive to be a solo hero to

save the world; rather, He taught His disciples to follow His servant leadership approach

when ministering to others (New International Version). "Sitting down, Jesus called the

Twelve and said, 'Anyone who wants to be first must be the very last, and the servant of

all'" (Mark 9:35). He not only modeled servant leadership, but He taught others how to

also become servant leaders (New International Version). "The fruit of great servant

leadership is realized when a leader seeks to send the next generation of leaders to meet

the challenges of their season with all the wisdom, knowledge, and spiritual resources he

or she can provide" (Blanchard & Hodges, 2005, p. 107). Servant leadership allows

others to serve in such a way that when people leave their presence they stand a little

taller, smile a bit longer, and feel that there is something special about the place they just

left (Ortberg, as cited in Kouzes et al., 2004). It is the antithesis of command and control

leadership, and focuses on valuing, respecting, and caring for others in an effort to build

positive relationships.

A person who grasped the intentions of Jesus was Robert K. Greenleaf (1904-

1990). He introduced the term servant leadership in the 1970s (2002). As a university

student in the 1920s, Greenleaf was profoundly moved by the words of a professor who

taught a course during his senior year in college. Professor Helming (as cited in

Greenleaf, 2002) stated,

> There is a new problem in our country. We are becoming a nation
> dominated by large institutions – churches, businesses, governments, labor
> unions, universities – and these big institutions are not serving us well. I
> hope that all of you will be concerned about this. Now you can do as I do,
> stand outside and criticize, bring pressure if you can, write and argue
> about it. All of this may do some good. But nothing of substance will
> happen unless there are people inside these institutions who are able to
> (and want to) lead them into better performance for the public good. Some
> of you ought to make careers inside these big institutions and become a
> force for good from the inside. (pp. 15-16)

After leaving college, Greenleaf entered the business world in the 1920s with the

knowledge of the importance of making a difference in a large institution. He worked 38

years with American Telephone and Telegraph (AT&T). This was the largest employer in

the world at the time. He retired in 1964 and began consultant work for businesses,

churches, foundations, professional societies, colleges, and universities. In 1964, he also

founded the Center for Applied Ethics. It was later called The Robert K. Greenleaf Center

(The Robert K. Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership, 2002). His work experiences

led him to focus on ways to heal and help organizations. He indicated,

> The servant leadership concept emerged after a deep involvement with colleges and universities during the period of campus turmoil in the late 1960s and early 1970s. It was a searing experience to watch distinguished institutions show their fragility and crumble, to search for an understanding of what happened to them (and never be satisfied that I knew), and to try to help heal their wounds. (Greenleaf, 2002, p. 17)

Greenleaf's life and work experiences led him to write *The Servant as Leader* in

1969. It was based on his concern for pervasive student attitudes which seemed to be

devoid of hope. "Hope, it seems to me, is absolutely essential to both sanity and

wholeness of life" (Greenleaf, 2002, p. 17). Servant leadership was said to be a way to

fulfill this quest for hope, and his concepts have continued to be implemented throughout

the world. *The Servant as Leader* was originally published in 1970, with an initial release

of 200 copies. A half million copies have been sold internationally, and it continues to be

reprinted (The Robert K. Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership, 2002).

Though Greenleaf (2002) thought the words "serve" and "lead" were overused

terms, he indicated that they were the exact words needed to convey the meaning he

wished to share. It is also important to note that his original title was *The Servant as*

Leader, with the key word being *as* in the title. Greenleaf believed that leaders should be

servants first with a conscious choice later which leads the person to aspire to lead. A

person focused on service is a type of person who is sharply different than the person

who first desires to lead (Greenleaf, 2002). "The difference manifests itself in the care

taken by the servant-first to make sure that the other people's highest priority needs are being served" (Greenleaf, 2002, p. 27).

Greenleaf (2002) formulated the terms "servant as leader" from reading Hess's (1970) *Journey to the East*. The main character in the story was the servant Leo who took care of a fictional traveling group of people by serving them in small unnoticeable ways (Hesse, 1970). Only when Leo disappears does the group reveal what a powerful leader he had become by his service to others. Leo described the importance of service. He explained why so many people in positions of authority strived to rule rather than to serve. "Because they do not understand. There are few who are born to be masters; they remain happy and healthy. But all the others who have only become masters through endeavor end in nothing" (Hesse, 1970, p. 35). Leo appeared to be a great leader because he was focused on serving others rather than gaining any power, prestige or wealth. "Leo was actually the leader all of the time, but he was servant first because that was what he was, *deep down inside*. Leadership was bestowed upon a person who was by nature a servant" (Greenleaf, p. 21). Greenleaf advocated that those who follow this principle of service would not accept the authority of existing institutions. He believed that people would respond to leaders because they were first proven to be trusted servants. Greenleaf defined servant leadership by stating,

> The difference manifests itself in the care taken by the servant-first to make sure that other people's highest priority needs are being served. The best test, and difficult to administer, is this: do those served grow as persons? Do they, *while being served*, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants? *And*, what is the effect on the least privileged in society? Will they benefit or at least not be further deprived? (2002, p. 27)

Greenleaf (2002) indicated that servant leadership would counter an authoritarian approach to leadership. He believed that coercive power strengthened resistance, and if ever successful, the sustained effects of coercion would only last while the force implementing them was strong. Greenleaf thought servant leadership was more effective because it involved the power of gentle persistent persuasion. Therefore, he was concerned with one truth "*Able servants with potential to lead will lead, and, where appropriate, they will follow only servant leaders.* Not much else counts if this does not happen" (Greenleaf, 2002, p. 59). These thoughts are still relevant and timely even though they were written almost four decades ago. Wheatley stated, "Servant-leadership is not just an interesting idea but something fundamental and vital for the world, something the world truly does need" (as cited in Spears & Lawrence, 2004, p. 268).

A contemporary author of many articles and books about servant leadership is Larry C. Spears, the Senior Fellow and President Emeritus of the Robert K. Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership (2007). After carefully reviewing Greenleaf's writings, Spears (as cited in Spears & Lawrence, 2004) revealed that there are 10 key characteristics of servant leadership which are often cited in literature. These traits included: (a) listening, (b) empathy, (c) healing, (d) awareness, (e) persuasion, (f) conceptualization, (g) foresight, (h) stewardship, (i) commitment to the growth of people, and (j) building community. "These ten characteristics of servant leadership are by no means exhaustive. However, I believe that the ones listed serve to communicate the power and promise that this concept offers to those who are open to its invitation and challenge" (Spears, as cited in Spears & Lawrence, p. 16). Spears' characteristics of servant leadership have been referenced in many studies, and have provided a framework

to identify key servant leadership traits (Girard, 2000; Jennings, 2002; Rude, 2006; Strickland, 2006; Taylor-Gillham, 1999; Thompson, 2006; Walker, 2004).

Directing the Robert K. Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership (2002) for the past 17 years, Spears revealed that there is an increasing interest in servant leadership (as cited in Spears & Lawrence, 2004). As Spears shared,

> The servant leader concept continues to grow in influence and impact. In fact, we have witnessed an unparalleled explosion of interest in and practice of servant leadership in the past fifteen years. In many ways, it can truly be said that the times are only now beginning to catch up with Robert Greenleaf's visionary call to servant leadership. (as cited in Spears & Lawrence, p. 9)

This explosion of interest in servant leadership has led to the establishment of 11 International centers which are affiliated with The Robert K. Greenleaf Center (2002). In 2004, 10 million people viewed an NBC Dateline servant leadership segment, and Gonzaga University launched *The International Journal of Servant-Leadership* (The Robert K. Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership, 2007).

Entering the fourth decade, the concept of servant leadership is as timely today as it was during the 1970s (Spears, as cited in Spears & Lawrence, 2004). "Servant leadership is providing a framework from which many thousands of known and unknown individuals are helping to improve how we treat those who do the work within our many institutions" (Spears, as cited in Spears & Lawrence, p. 24). As a result, businesses are seeing the advantages of adopting the servant leadership philosophy, which will be discussed in the next section.

Servant Leadership in Businesses

A Gallup poll study revealed that more than two thirds of people who resigned from their organizations did so specifically because of their leader rather than their place

of employment (Hunter, 2004). Organizations embracing the concepts of servant

leadership appear to be ones with leaders who have better ways of leading and treating

people and modeling for employees how to treat each other. "Servant leadership is not

just another management technique. It is a way of life for those with servant hearts"

(Blanchard, 2007, p. 269).

There are numerous successful examples of businesses following the servant

leadership principles. Several of these companies annually appear in the Top 10 on

Fortune magazine's list of 100 best companies to Work for in America, including:

TDIndustries, Southwest Airlines, Synovus Financial Corporation, and The Container

Store. Companies achieving status on the *Fortune* top 100 list outperform others, yielding

an approximately 50% higher return to shareholders than competitors not on the *Fortune*

list. It was found that these companies also performed better than their rivals in the areas

such as morale, retention, and worker safety, as they work to engage the talents of all

stakeholders (McGee-Cooper & Looper, 2001). "True servant leadership embraces a

humble sincerity that brings out the best in leaders and those they serve" (Blanchard,

2007, pp. 270-71). Blanchard added, "Organizations led by servant leaders are more

likely to create environments where people at all levels can experience both success and

significance" (2007, p. 275).

An exemplar servant leadership organization for over 40 years has been

TDIndustries (TD). TD's founder read Greenleaf's seminal work, *The Servant as Leader,*

in the 1970s, and began to share the servant leadership philosophy with his employees.

As a result, the TD servant leadership principles revealed,

> TD seeks to help each employee/partner to view him- or herself as a
> valued leader. From this position, each person must take responsibility for

nurturing others, initiating ideas, asking for help, collaborating, calling others to action, challenging assumptions, questioning a policy's alignment with core values, offering suggestions for continuous improvement, and so on. (McGee-Cooper & Looper, 2001, p. 7)

Many business leaders have realized the former ways of top down authoritarian decision making are not effective. People are seeking better ways to lead and be led in today's organizations (Wheatley, 2007). "The dominance of command and control is having devastating impacts. There has been a dramatic increase in worker disengagement, no one is succeeding at solving problems, and leaders are being scapegoated and fired" (Wheatley, 2007, p. 64). Therefore, leadership needs to shift from process and outcome to people and the future (Wong & Davey, 2007). "In today's environment, command and control leadership no longer works, because leaders must earn people's respect and trust" (Wong & Davey, 2007, p. 5). Servant leadership has been proven to be a better leadership approach than top down leadership. It reveals the simple truth that leadership and life are about people and relationships (Hunter, 2004). Servant leadership practices are being adopted throughout the world, and people are realizing the value, importance, and essential need to find better ways to serve others (The Robert K. Greenleaf Center, 2002).

More than one third of *Fortune's* list, or more than 35 organizations, are involved in the servant leadership movement. These companies practice shared power and high employee involvement, and demonstrate the results in their strong financial performance (Hunter, 2004). "Using U.S. Department of Labor data and surveys of 1,500 firms from various industries, Huselid and Becker found that such participative practices significantly improved employee retention, increased productivity, and improved financial performance" (Blanchard, 2007, p. 272). Kahl and Donelan (2004) identified essential traits of people committed to being servant leaders: (a) trustworthy, (b) lifelong

students, (c) creative, (d) driven to succeed, (e) courageous and caring, and (f)

disciplined. Ultimately they are servants.

Additional companies that have adopted the tenets of servant leadership include:

Toro Company, ServiceMaster Company, The Men's Wearhouse, Starbucks, The Body

Shop, and Ben and Jerry's Ice Cream (Spears & Lawrence, 2004). Servant leadership

companies are also found on America's Most Admired Companies list including: Federal

Express, Marriott International, Medtronic, Pella, Herman Miller, and Nestle USA.

(Hunter, 2004) Hunter reported,

> In fact, two of the top ten "admired companies" practice servant
> leadership, including the planet's largest business organization, Wal-Mart,
> with more than $250 billion in annual sales and more than 1.4 million
> employees, and Southwest Airlines, one of the most successful airlines in
> the world. (2004, p. 18)

Servant leadership has also influenced the writing of many notable authors,

including: James Autry, Ken Blanchard, Peter Block, Stephen Covey, Max DePree, Tom

Donelan, Phil Hodges, James Hunter, Jack Kahl, James Kouzes, Barry Posner, Peter

Senge, Thomas Sergiovanni, and Margaret Wheatley. Many other authors have revealed

the value and importance of following servant leadership principles in current times. As

Blanchard (2007) shared,

> We believe that servant leadership has never been more applicable to the world of
> leadership than it is today. Not only are people looking for deeper purpose and
> meaning as they meet the challenges of today's changing world, they are also
> looking for principles that actually work. Servant leadership works. (p. 269)

Members of educational organizations seem to give more attention to the servant

leadership philosophy due to the success of its practices in the business world. This will

be discussed in the next section.

Servant Leadership in Educational Settings

Educators appear to be increasingly interested in the philosophy of servant leadership, learning from the success derived in the world of business. As accountability measures have increased in public schools, there has been a growing consensus that the command and control leadership models have been ineffective (Hale & Moorman, 2003). As a result, there seems to be a rising interest in shifting from top down leadership practices to servant leadership approaches in public education and higher education institutions. This shift in thinking appears to be moving educators from focusing solely on student test results, to focusing on the well being, interests, and needs of the students, teachers, and colleagues. Following servant leadership principles, people and relationships appear to be more important than test scores and state standards. "The most important thing in life is to decide what's most important" (Blanchard, 2007, p. 282).

Many colleges and universities offer servant leadership courses, programs, or degrees, including: Arizona State University, Azusa Pacific University, Ball State University, Baylor University, Butler University, Calvin College, Columbus State University (Georgia), Concordia University (Ann Arbor), DePaul University, DePauw University, Eastern Michigan University, Emory University, Fresno Pacific University, Geneva College, Gonzaga Servant Leadership School, Grace University, Greenleaf University (St. Louis), Illinois State University, Indiana State University, Indiana Wesleyan University, John Brown University, LaGrange College, Milwaukee School of Engineering, Northeast Louisiana University, Regent University, Seton Hall, Sterling College (Kansas), the Servant Leadership School of Greensboro, Trinity Western University, the University of Arizona, the University of Detroit Mercy, The University of

Kansas, The University of Michigan, the University of South Florida, and Viterbo University (The Robert K. Greenleaf Center, 2002). Offerings range from courses that teach the foundations and principles of servant leadership to those colleges and universities that offer master's degrees in servant leadership. The large number of universities and colleges implementing and teaching the philosophy of servant leadership reveals the high level of interest in the topic.

Greenleaf (2003) wrote an entire parable titled *Teacher as Servant*, which was based in a university setting describing servant leadership in action. In this story, a passionate professor instilled the servant leadership philosophy as a focus for students living in the same residence hall. This fictional story has become reality on many university campuses throughout the United States. Butler University and the University of South Florida have been examples of universities implementing Greenleaf's parable as a model for servant leadership in undergraduate residence houses (Greenleaf, 2002). In addition, Calvin College has instituted a Service-Learning Center, the goal of which is to develop future servant leaders focused on economic and social justice. At John Brown University, servant leadership has been the model used in its leadership and ethics program, and Regent University hosts an annual Servant Leadership Roundtable Conference. In addition, Sterling College teaches the foundations of servant leadership, emphasizing service projects, mission trips, and volunteer activities while Seton Hall strives to shape students into becoming servant leaders. Overall, servant leadership concepts are being taught and implemented in many educational institutions throughout the nation with a conscious effort to develop and train current and future servant leaders.

Servant leadership principles are also being adopted by K-12 schools, such as in Bloomfield Hills, Michigan, where servant leadership is used as a foundation for their core school values. Edmonton Catholic Schools in Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, have implemented the principles of servant leadership from the classroom level to the evaluation of the superintendent (Greenleaf, 2002). Miears (2004) stated that servant leadership has been encouraged and promoted in the Texas Education Agency Region X public schools by providing servant leadership training. Miears analyzed the perceived presence of servant leadership and job satisfaction in Region X schools and found a strong positive correlation in these Texas districts.

Effective servant leadership type traits in K-12 school settings have also been reported by Marzano, et al. (2005). These researchers conducted a meta-analysis, and leadership traits that positively correlated with student achievement included: (a) affirmation, (b) culture, (c) ideas/beliefs, (d) input, (e) optimizer, and (f) relationships. These traits were similar to the servant leadership characteristics of recognizing others, building a sense of community, involving and valuing others, inspiring others, and focusing on people to strengthen relationships. Investigators found that "The responsibility of relationships might be considered to be the bedrock of the principal's efforts to establish a purposeful community" (Marzano et al., p. 103). The concept of building relationships appears to be highly aligned to the philosophy of servant leadership. "Our natural state is to be together. In this time when we keep moving away from each other, we haven't lost the need and longing to be in relationship" (Wheatley, 2007, p. 219). Servant leadership seems to be an avenue to foster and build these types of needed relationships.

At the classroom level servant leadership speaks to the universal human longing to be known, to care, and to be cared for, in pursuit of the same common good (Bowman, 2005). "We believe those 'seekers' who choose to become teachers are manifesting their innate will to serve. The next step then is to recognize how to best answer the call" (Herman & Marlowe, 2005, ¶ 6). Teachers who believe in being servants first act from the belief that everyone deserves to be surrounded by kindness, and that children who have been repeatedly discouraged need positive experiences to make them whole (Herman & Marlowe, 2005). Servant leadership, in the classroom, has the potential to create a strong, caring and supportive environment with an emphasis on serving and nurturing each student. "It has been expressed very simply in an ancient Buddhist teaching. 'All happiness in the world comes from serving others; all sorrow in the world comes from acting selfishly'" (Wheatley, 2007, p. 129). Teachers who focus on serving their students have the ability to model for, and nurture the next generation of servant leaders.

At the administrative level principalships require people to be instructional leaders through ethical, visionary, cultural, and servant leadership dimensions (Arnold & Harris, 2000). These approaches require putting people first and caring for people through the development of community. This has been the basis of creating all great civilizations (Ba Banutu-Gomez, 2004). Crippen (2005b) indicated that servant leadership may be used to guide school administrators, and the school culture by focusing on serving others and serving the values that shape the school. People in public education are clamoring for their leaders to save and rescue them more than in any other profession (Wheatley, 2002). As Wheatley noted, society's dilemmas and problems are placed on

the shoulders of educational leaders, and when these leaders do not succeed they are dismissed and replaced. Leaders have historically returned to command and control leadership in stressful times of chaos. This is doomed to fail. Wheatley emphasized that there was nothing equal to serving others in order to bring leaders joy (2007). "I have always been astonished by the deep meaning people ascribe to their work. Most people want their work to serve a greater good, to help other people. It doesn't matter what the work is; we'd rather be doing it in service to other people" (Wheatley, 2007, p. 128).

Some educational administrators view their leadership work as ministry work. As a result, it is important to acknowledge that the word administer is from the Latin word *administrare*, which comes from the words minister, ministr-, and servant (American Heritage, 2000). Viewing school administration as ministry work, however, is alien to normal perceptions (Graseck, 2005). Graseck advocated that school administrators should not overlook their nurturing, supportive, and even ministerial role in their learning communities. "Too often school administrators are preoccupied with test scores, discipline, favorable publicity, the avoidance of conflict, and the master schedule. While important, none of these concerns should be at the heart of an administrator's work" (Graseck, 2005, ¶ 11). Rather, if the heart of administration is focused on servant leadership, school leaders may have the ability to create and sustain a culture which fosters commitment rather than compliance.

When surveying 300 educators regarding their perceptions of what constitutes a servant leader, Crippen (2005a) revealed the most common answers were: (a) a true humanitarian, (b) puts others before self, (c) caring and compassionate, (d) balanced, (e) one who empowers others, (f) a servant first then a leader, and (g) transformational. In

order to implement servant leadership principles, it is important that educators have a

common language and understanding of these key traits that need to be implemented in

their school cultures.

> By focusing (on) the development of servant leadership, educators and
> professionals can lift the profession to higher levels of moral thinking and
> decision making. For this change to occur individuals must become aware
> of the underlying assumptions of the theories and techniques they use to
> teach (Feldheim & Johnson, 2004, ¶ 44).

Educators have negatively reacted to top down hierarchical approaches which

have seldom produced more than compliance. This was due to feelings of being

underappreciated, unheard, and undervalued (Tate, 2003). Servant leadership is based on

the core belief that serving others should be the highest priority in schools (Feldheim &

Johnson, 2004). It can be a better approach than top down school leadership due to its

emphasis on building caring communities in classrooms and between colleagues.

Sergiovanni (2005) explained, "Leaders minister to the needs of the school by being of

service and by providing help" (p. 19). This service to others was based on what

Sergiovanni called moral leadership which can be measured by whether the competence,

well being, and independence of the follower is improved. "In schools that means

teaching and learning are enhanced and the developmental needs of students are honored"

(Sergiovanni, 2005, p. 19). In addition, Sergiovanni advocated that servant leadership

requires that one loves the purposes, goals, and intents that define the leader's work, and

that they love those who are being served. "Love is the basis for the practice of servant

leadership" (Sergiovanni, 2005, p. 100).

Overall, servant leadership seems to be a strong and viable model for educational

institutions to implement, though more research is needed (Crippen, 2005a).

> Servant leadership provides the promise of an effective educational
> leadership and management model. There is a need for a pilot project
> using this model. More importantly, there is the need for a 3-5 year study
> of institutions that embark upon the integration of such a model. (Crippen,
> 2005a, p. 16)

Though multiple studies have probed the servant leadership philosophy, and its concepts,

the body of research related to servant leadership in educational organizations is

relatively small (Crippen, 2005b). The servant leadership body of research related to

public school organizations and public school principals is even smaller, as will be

discussed in the next section.

Servant Leadership Studies

Limited servant leadership research has been conducted in K-12 private and

public school settings (Anderson, 2007; Anderson, 2005; Girard, 2000; Jennings, 2002;

Knicker, 1999; Lambert, 2005; Miears, 2005; Ross, 2007; Rude, 2006; Stephen, 2007;

Taylor, 2002; Taylor-Gillham, 1999; Thompson, 2006; Walker, 2004). Studies focused

on servant leadership and job satisfaction in public school settings have been more

limited, with only Girard, Miears, and Rude, addressing servant leadership and job

satisfaction in K-12 public schools. In addition, servant leadership and job satisfaction

studies have been conducted outside of public school settings, including studies in

businesses, higher education institutions, and nonprofit organizations (Anderson, 2005;

Drury, 2005; Hebert, 2004; Irving, 2005; Laub, 1999; Stramba, 2003; Strickland, 2006;

Thompson, 2004; VanTassell, 2007; Washington, 2007). Servant leadership and job

satisfaction studies conducted in school settings, and nonschool settings, have revealed a

positive relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction (Anderson, 2005;

Drury, 2005; Girard, 2000; Hebert, 2004; Irving, 2005; Laub, 1999; Miears, 2005; Rude,

2006; Stramba, 2003; Strickland, 2006; Thompson, 2004; VanTassell, 2007; Washington, 2007).

Anderson's (2005) study revealed there is a strong interest in the concepts of servant leadership and job satisfaction. This dissertation was the best-selling ProQuest dissertation of 2005 (ProQuest Information, 2006). However, this investigation focused on the extent that employee job satisfaction was correlated with perceptions of servant leadership in the Church Educational System of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, a nonpublic school setting rather than a public school setting. In this mixed methods study, Anderson revealed a significant positive correlation between the perceived levels of servant leadership being present, and both teacher job satisfaction $r = .634$ to $.718$, $p < .01$ and principal job satisfaction $r = .521$ to $.616$, $p < .01$. In addition, Anderson obtained a high response rate of 78%, surveying 285 teachers and 145 administrators, based on random sampling using the OLA. Triangulation of the data was also achieved based on post-survey qualitative interviews which were conducted with 5.3% of the respondents.

Anderson (2005) found a significant positive correlation between servant leadership and job satisfaction and a high public interest in this correlation. "Promoting servant leadership on a global scale will allow a greater number of leaders to realize the benefits of using servant leadership in leading their organization and building a cadre of employees who are increasingly satisfied with their careers" (Anderson, 2005, p. 106).

Only a small number of servant leadership and job satisfaction studies have been conducted in public school settings (Girard, 2000; Miears, 2005; Rude, 2006). Girard (2000) conducted a mixed methods study to examine the servant leadership qualities

displayed by Illinois public school district superintendents. All Illinois K-12 public school superintendents, who had been in the superintendent role for at least three years, were invited to participate in Girard's survey study. A total of 77 eligible superintendents completed a mailed survey, out of the initial pool of 201 school districts. School board presidents and principals were also surveyed. They rated the superintendent behavior related to servant leadership qualities, job satisfaction, and identifying characteristics of the population. Out of the 77 districts in which superintendents participated, 40 complete useable data sets were returned. A complete data set was considered a collection of questionnaire answers from all three levels of respondents in the same district including the superintendent, principals, and school board president.

Servant leadership qualities addressed in the Girard (2000) study included nine of the 10 qualities identified by Spears (as cited in Spears & Lawrence, 2004). Girard investigated the traits of: (a) listening, (b) empathy, (c) healing, (d) foresight, (e) awareness, (f) persuasion, (g) conceptualization and communication, (h) commitment to the growth of others, (i) and building community. Spears also identified the servant leadership characteristic of stewardship but did not specifically identify the trait of communication which Girard added to the quality of conceptualization. In the Girard study, Spears' traits were used to establish construct validity but item validity was established by having two groups of separate individuals match labels with questions typed on index cards. The first or second group of surveyed individuals did not correctly identify the quality of stewardship and were not included in the study (2000).

Using 9 of the 10 traits identified by Spears, Girard's (2000) study revealed that the superintendents most frequently displayed the servant leadership trait of awareness,

followed by empathy. Healing and communication were exhibited less often. Girard also discussed principal job satisfaction levels. A significant positive correlation was found between the principals' job satisfaction ratings and the nine servant leadership qualities displayed by superintendents $r = .61$ to $.82$, p < .01 (two-tailed). A significant positive correlation was also found between all nine servant leadership qualities displayed by superintendents, and school district working relationships $r = .43$ to $.73, p < .01$ (two-tailed). "In all cases, increased ratings by principals of servant leadership qualities correlated with increased principal job satisfaction ratings and increased working relationship ratings" (Girard, p. 2). In contrast, there was a low correlation between superintendent self-perceptions of the servant leadership qualities they displayed and their own job satisfaction with the exception of the quality of awareness $r = .37, p < .05$ (two-tailed). Girard's study directed future researchers revealing, "Servant leadership is a leadership model that has been successfully applied in some business and religious contexts, yet there is scant research on servant leadership in educational settings" (2000, p. 1).

In addition to Girard's (2000) study, multiple studies have been conducted using Spears' (as cited in Spears & Lawrence, 2004) 10 characteristics of servant leadership which were based on Greenleaf's original writings (e.g. Jennings, 2002; Rude, 2006; Strickland, 2006; Taylor-Gillham, 1999; Thompson, 2006; Walker, 2004). However, only Rude's study also focused on public school settings and job satisfaction. This will be discussed next.

Rude (2006) quantitatively surveyed three organization in Calgary, Alberta, Canada and found a significant positive correlation between servant leadership and job

satisfaction. Only one of the three organizations included in the study was a public K-6

school. The other two organizations included a Christian university and a forestry

company. Overall, 145 participants were surveyed using questionnaires including 69

individuals from the forest products company, 46 university participants, and 30 public

school participants. This investigation utilized the following survey instruments: (a)

Maslach Burnout Inventory – General Survey (MBI-GS), (b) Minnesota Satisfaction

Questionnaire (MSQ), (c) Servant Leadership Profile – Revised (SLP), and (d) Servant

Leadership Profile – 360 (SLP – 360). Rude stated,

> In general, the correlation results show that when subordinates perceived their
> supervisor or leader as having high levels of the positive characteristics of servant
> leadership, they also reported higher levels of Professional Efficacy, Job
> Satisfaction (Intrinsic, Extrinsic, and General), as well as lower levels of
> Cynicism and Exhaustion. (2006, p. 50)

Rude (2006) found a statistically positive correlation between servant leadership

and intrinsic job satisfaction on all seven of Page and Wong's (1998) SLP-360 subscales

including: (a) empowering, (b) power and pride, (c) serving, (d) participatory, (e)

visionary, (f) inspirational, and (g) authentic $r = .41$ or greater. All seven SLP-360

subscales were also positively correlated with extrinsic job satisfaction $r = .42$ or greater

and general job satisfaction $r = .41$ or greater. In addition, Rude reported, "The

correlational results between servant leadership and job satisfaction were much stronger

than the correlations between servant leadership and job burnout" (p. 67). Overall,

Rude's findings showed that servant led organizations had higher levels of job

satisfaction and lower levels of burnout. It was indicated that the servant leadership

approach provided the basis for healthy, functional, and productive working relationships

between leaders and their subordinates. "Leadership is considered a situational variable,

and the results presented here support the assertion that servant leadership is a strong predictor of job burnout and job satisfaction" (Rude, 2006, p. 67).

Miears (2005) conducted a quantitative correlational study closely aligned with the presented dissertation study. Miears' investigation was conducted in a public school setting, using the OLA, with a focus on servant leadership and job satisfaction. Teachers in Texas Education Agency Region X public schools were surveyed online. This resulted in 165 respondents and a 54% return rate. The difference in the two studies was that Miears only surveyed teachers and the present study observed all levels of employees including superintendents and principals. In addition, Miears purposely selected a sample of the Region X teachers because of prior knowledge that this region supported the concepts of servant leadership. Texas Region X offered training in servant leadership at the 2002 Superintendent's Academy. Some superintendents in Region X received servant leadership training so Miears concluded this region was appropriate for the research study. Miears' investigation also differs from the presented dissertation study because there are presently no known servant leadership trainings that have been provided to Ohio educators.

Due to the high number of teaching professionals in Texas Region X public schools, Miears (2005) selected a random sample of teachers from 15 different public high schools in this region. Teachers were then separated into three subgroups according to enrollment size: (a) Group 1 - high schools with an enrollment over 1900 students, (b) Group 2 - high schools with an enrollment of 900-1899 students, and (c) Group 3 - high schools with enrollments of 899 and under. This resulted in a pool of 1526 teachers which Miears then reduced to a random sample of 307 teachers stratified across the three

subgroups. Group 1 contained 157 respondents; Group 2 included 107 respondents; and Group 3 had 43 respondents. Miears then contacted each teacher in the randomly selected sample by email to obtain informed consent, and tell them that they would be receiving an online survey. Of the original 307 emails sent, 14 were returned to Miears, and eight invalid addresses were dropped from the study. A total of 165 participants (54%) then completed the study. Miears concluded this was a strong response rate compared to average electronic surveys.

The first purpose of Miears' (2005) study was to establish that the OLA was an appropriate tool to measure the level of servant leadership and job satisfaction in public schools. The OLA - Educational Version is similar to the original OLA, with only minor changes in wording by Laub, such as replacing the word *organization*, used in the original version, with the word *school* used in the educational version (Miears, 2005). Using Cronbach's Alpha, the internal reliability of the OLA – Education Version in the Miears study was .98 for servant leadership items and .86 for job satisfaction items. This is comparable to Laub's original OLA reliability findings, which were .98 for the servant leadership portion, and .81 for the job satisfaction portion. Miears concluded,

> The Organization Leadership Assessment – Education Version (Laub, 1999) shows the same strong internal reliability as the original version of the survey instrument. Researchers can use this instrument with confidence that it will accurately measure the level of servant leadership within a school organization as well as the job satisfaction felt by those in the organization. (p. v)

The OLA has also been used in multiple servant leadership and job satisfaction studies in school settings and non-school settings (Anderson, 2005; Drury, 2005; Hebert, 2004; Irving, 2005; Laub, 1999; Miears, 2005; Stramba, 2003; Thompson, 2004; VanTassell, 2007). The OLA has also been utilized in public and nonpublic school

settings in studies that were not focused on job satisfaction (Anderson, 2007; Lambert, 2005; Ross, 2007). The OLA seems to be the most widely used servant leadership instrument available, and has been utilized in K-12 school settings.

The second purpose of the Miears' (2005) study was to determine the correlation between the teachers perceived level of servant leadership and job satisfaction. A strong correlation was revealed, $r = .723$, p < .01 (two-tailed) indicating that teachers who perceived a high level of servant leadership in their school organization perceived more job satisfaction. Almost no correlation was found among job satisfaction when compared to gender, teacher certification, years of experience, years in district, or size of the high school in which the teachers worked. As a result, servant leadership was the only item that correlated with job satisfaction, revealing a significant positive correlation using the Pearson product moment coefficient. Miears' findings were consistent with other studies, which also reported a positive relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction (Anderson, 2005; Drury, 2005; Girard, 2000; Hebert, 2004; Irving, 2005; Laub, 1999; Rude, 2006; Stramba, 2003; Strickland, 2006; Thompson, 2004; VanTassell, 2007; Washington, 2007). Miears concluded, "The evidence in this study suggest that servant leadership, even when not labeled as such, is a style of leadership whose time has come. Meeting the needs of teachers should be a high priority in the high-stakes testing environment of today" (2005, p. 85). The researcher added that teachers were more satisfied with their jobs when servant leadership was present, and literature revealed that teachers remained in the profession when they were more satisfied with their jobs. As a result, "Servant leadership would enable the campus administrator to develop the

teaching staff to the fullest potential. This would include developing teachers into servant leaders of the students" (Miears, 2005, p. 86).

Table 1 presents a summary of recent servant leadership studies listed by methodology. This table shows the limited number of servant leadership studies found related to the areas of job satisfaction in public school settings. It also indicates different servant leadership instruments that were available.

Table 1

Servant Leadership Studies

Researchers	Qualitative	Quantitative	Mixed Methods	Survey Methods	Interviews	OLA (Laub)	SLP (Page/Wong)	SLS (Dennis)	Spears 10 SL Traits	K-12 Public School	Job Satisfaction	Non-public School
Anderson (2005)	X	X	X	X	X	X					X	X
Miears (2005)		X		X		X				X	X	
Drury (2005)		X		X		X					X	
Stramba (2003)		X		X		X					X	
Thompson (2004)		X		X		X					X	
Hebert (2004)		X		X		X					X	
Laub (1999)	X	X	X	X	X	X					X	
VanTassell (2007)		X		X		X					X	
Irving (2005)		X		X		X					X	
Girard (2000)	X	X	X	X	X				X	X	X	
Strickland (2006)	X			X					X		X	
Rude (2006)		X		X			X		X	X	X	
Washington (2007)		X		X							X	
Taylor (2002)		X		X			X			X		
Walker (2004)	X				X				X	X		
Jennings (2002)	X				X				X	X		
Taylor-Gillham (1999)	X				X				X	X		
Thompson (2006)	X				X				X	X		
Lambert (2005)		X		X		X				X		
Ross (2007)		X		X		X						X
Anderson (2007)	X	X	X	X	X	X				X		
Knicker (1999)	X				X					X		
Dennis (2004)	X	X	X	X	X			X				
Dennis & Bocarnea (2005)	X	X	X	X				X				
Stephen (2007)	X	X	X	X	X		X			X		

　　　Girard (2000), Miears (2005), and Rude (2006) addressed servant leadership and

job satisfaction in public school settings, but none specifically focused on servant

leadership and principal job satisfaction levels. In addition, only Miears (2005) utilized Laub's (1999) OLA – Educational Version, when focusing on job satisfaction in public school settings. The purpose of this correlational quantitative study was to extend the research in the area of servant leadership and principal job satisfaction, by surveying Ohio public school educators using the OLA – Educational Version instrument. A significant correlation revealed between servant leadership and principal job satisfaction would indicate servant leadership may be worth exploring further as a way to counter the principal shortages, which are evident throughout the nation.

Conclusion

In summary, the preceding comprehensive literature review provided evidence of the importance of the presented dissertation study by reviewing the areas of: (a) principal leadership, (b) principal job satisfaction and principal shortages, (c) servant leadership, (d) servant leadership in businesses, (e) servant leadership in educational settings, and (f) servant leadership studies. It also revealed the necessity of extending the current research to determine if there was a significant correlation between servant leadership and elementary principal job satisfaction in Ohio public school districts.

The passage of NCLB sharply increased the accountability of educators throughout the nation (U.S. Department of Education, 2007). School principals must play a significant role in helping to transform schools and improve student achievement (The Wallace Foundation, 2007). Evidence has found that good principals are essential to strengthening the quality of schools (C.D. Howe Institute, 2003). Marzano, et al. (2005) quantified specific leadership skills which lead to improved student achievement. These

investigators statistically supported the fact that principals play a vital role in leading schools.

Though research has revealed that the role of principals is more critical than ever, principal shortages are evident throughout the nation (The Education Alliance, 2003; Field, 2003; NAESP, 2003). Pairing principal retirements with principals leaving for non-retirement reasons, the problem of principal shortages has reached critical levels (Field, 2003). Reasons principals are leaving for non-retirement reasons include: (a) increasing work loads, (b) time constraints, (c) low salary levels, and (d) a lack of support and respect leading to lower job satisfaction (Norton, 2003). Teachers have been reluctant to fill the vacant principal positions (Bureau of Labor, 2006). Principals have left positions for retirement and non-retirement reasons. Candidates have been reluctant to fill positions, and this has led to principal shortages across the nation (Field, 2003; NAESP 2003).

Due to the reluctance of traditionally licensed candidates to fill principal vacancies, 16 states have passed alternative principal licensure laws (Education Commission, 2007). Alternative licensure laws provide non-education majors an avenue to obtain licensure, which is specific to criteria established by each state. The trend of alternatively licensing teachers has been increasing, as currently one in five teachers are now alternatively licensed in the nation (Walsh & Jacobs, 2007). However, alternatively trained teachers do not stay in the job as long as traditionally trained teachers, and students with alternatively trained teachers tend to perform lower on standardized achievement measures those with traditionally trained teachers. There is a concern that alternatively licensed principals will follow a similar trend while 90% of surveyed

principals believe teaching experience is highly valuable to their roles (Fenwick &
Pierce, 2001). It is imperative to find ways to retain quality principals in the field of
education while attracting aspiring principals to counter the trends of principal shortages
and alternatively licensing principals.

Servant leadership seems to be an approach that may lead to higher levels of
principal job satisfaction and retention rates. Servant leadership is a simple concept that
was first displayed by Jesus over 2,000 years ago (New International Version). The
foundation of servant leadership is based on placing the needs of others as the highest
priority (Greenleaf, 2002). Robert K. Greenleaf (2002) introduced the term servant leader
in the 1970s, gaining wisdom from a college professor, life experiences, and reading
Hesse's (1970) book *Journey to the East*.

Businesses following the principles of servant leadership have proven that higher
profits, and increased employee retention rates, may be obtained by adopting servant
leadership practices (McGee-Cooper & Looper, 2001). Following the servant leadership
philosophy, more than one-third of *Fortune's* top 100 list, or more than 35 organizations,
are involved in the servant leadership movement (Hunter, 2004). Many businesses have
realized the former ways of top down authoritarian decision making are not effective, and
people are seeking better ways to lead and be led in today's organizations (Wheatley,
2007). As a result, leaders have embraced servant leadership because it reaches people's
desire to find purpose and meaning in their work, and servant leadership principles
actually work (Blanchard, 2007).

Due to the success of servant leadership practices in the business world, members
of educational organizations also appear to be giving more attention to the servant

leadership philosophy. Many colleges and universities are providing service learning

opportunities, courses, or degrees in servant leadership (The Robert K. Greenleaf Center,

2002). At the classroom level, servant leadership speaks to the universal human longing

to be known, to care, and to be cared for, in pursuit of the same common good (Bowman,

2005). At the administrative level, Crippen (2005b) shared that servant leadership may be

used to guide school administrators, and the school culture, by focusing on serving others

and serving the values that shape the school. People are clamoring for their leaders to

save and rescue them, more in public education than any other profession (Wheatley,

2002). "Too often school administrators are preoccupied with test scores, discipline,

favorable publicity, the avoidance of conflict, and the master schedule. While important,

none of these concerns should be at the heart of an administrator's work" (Graseck, 2005,

¶ 11). Rather, if the heart of administration is focused on servant leadership, school

leaders may have the ability to create and sustain a culture, which fosters commitment

rather than compliance.

Overall, there has been minimal research analyzing the perceived presence of

servant leadership in school settings (Anderson, 2007; Anderson, 2005; Girard, 2000;

Jennings, 2002; Knicker, 1999; Lambert, 2005; Miears, 2005; Ross, 2007; Rude, 2006;

Stephen, 2007; Taylor, 2002; Taylor-Gillham, 1999; Thompson, 2006; Walker, 2004). In

addition, studies focused on servant leadership and job satisfaction in school settings, and

nonschool settings, have revealed a positive relationship (Anderson, 2005; Drury, 2005;

Girard, 2000; Hebert, 2004; Irving, 2005; Laub, 1999; Miears, 2005; Rude, 2006;

Stramba, 2003; Strickland, 2006; Thompson, 2004; VanTassell, 2007; Washington,

2007). However, studies specifically focused on servant leadership and job satisfaction in

public school settings have been very limited, with only Girard (2000), Miears (2005),

and Rude (2006) addressing servant leadership and job satisfaction in K-12 public

schools.

Though Girard (2000), Miears (2005), and Rude (2006), addressed servant

leadership and job satisfaction in public schools, these studies did not specifically focus

on servant leadership and principal job satisfaction levels. In addition, only Miears (2005)

utilized Laub's (1999) Organizational Leadership Assessment – Educational Version

(OLA), when focusing on servant leadership and job satisfaction in public school

settings. Due to the high need for quality principals, and the evidence of principal

shortages across the nation, obtaining additional information about servant leadership

may provide insights about ways to counter the trend of principals leaving the field of

education at distressing rates. The purpose of this correlational quantitative study was to

extend the research in the area of servant leadership and job satisfaction, by surveying

principals, superintendents, and teachers in Ohio public schools using Laub's OLA –

Educational Version instrument. A significant positive correlation between servant

leadership and job satisfaction would indicate servant leadership may be worth exploring

further as an approach to counter the trend of principals leaving the field of education.

The next chapter will reveal the methodology used in this dissertation study.

Chapter 3 - Methodology

Overview

A quantitative correlational survey design study was conducted to answer the presented research questions: (a) To what extent do public school districts in Ohio implement the principles of servant leadership, and (b) to what extent does the level of servant leadership revealed in Ohio public school districts correlate with Ohio elementary principals' level of job satisfaction? Previous studies have found a positive relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction (Anderson, 2005; Drury, 2005; Girard, 2000; Hebert, 2004; Irving, 2005; Laub, 1999; Miears, 2005; Rude, 2006; Stramba, 2003; Strickland, 2006; Thompson, 2004; VanTassell, 2007; Washington, 2007). However, studies focused on servant leadership and job satisfaction in public school settings have been very limited (Girard, 2000; Miears, 2005; Rude, 2006). Though correlational designs do not allow for cause and effect determinations, a significant positive correlation between servant leadership and elementary principal job satisfaction may indicate servant leadership is worthy of further study in public school settings to retain principals and attract aspiring principals.

The following sections will be presented to reveal the methodology which was used in this study including: (a) restatement of the problem, (b) statement of the research questions/hypotheses, (c) description of the research design, (c) operational definitions of variables, (d) description of materials and instruments, (e) selection of participants, (f) procedures, (g) discussion of data processing, (h) methodological assumptions, (i) limitations, (j) delimitations, and (k) ethical assurances.

Restatement of the Problem

Principals are leaving the administrative profession before retirement at distressing rates, resulting in a need to identify approaches which may contribute to higher principal job satisfaction rates (Guterman, 2007; Norton, 2003). Servant leadership appears to be an approach that contributes to higher job satisfaction, and may be a viable approach for school districts to adopt to increase principal retention rates and attract new administrators.

Previous studies have revealed a positive relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction levels (Anderson, 2005; Drury, 2005; Girard, 2000; Hebert, 2004; Irving, 2005; Laub, 1999; Miears, 2005; Rude, 2006; Stramba, 2003; Strickland, 2006; Thompson, 2004; VanTassell, 2007; Washington, 2007). However, this research has been very limited in public school settings, with only Girard (2000), Miears (2005), and Rude (2006) addressing servant leadership and job satisfaction in public school settings. In addition, the studies conducted by Girard, Miears, and Rude did not specifically focus on the correlation between servant leadership and principal job satisfaction rates. As a result, the purpose of this quantitative study was to extend the current research by correlating servant leadership and elementary principal job satisfaction in Ohio public school districts. A significant positive correlation between servant leadership and elementary principal job satisfaction would indicate servant leadership may be an approach worth exploring further to counter the exodus of principals leaving the field of educational administration.

Statement of Research Questions/Hypotheses

This quantitative correlational study answered the following two research questions:

1. To what extent do public school districts in Ohio implement the principles of servant leadership?

2. To what extent does the level of servant leadership revealed in Ohio public school districts correlate with Ohio elementary principals' level of job satisfaction?

In addition, this quantitative correlational study was also intended to support one of the following research hypotheses:

$H1_1$. There is a significant correlation between the level of servant leadership perceived in Ohio public schools, as determined by superintendents, elementary principals, and elementary teachers ratings on Laub's (1999) OLA and the level of job satisfaction perceived by Ohio elementary public school principals as determined by principal ratings on the OLA.

$H1_o$. There is no significant correlation between the level of servant leadership perceived in Ohio public schools, as determined by superintendents, elementary principals, and elementary teachers ratings the OLA, and the level of job satisfaction perceived by Ohio elementary public school principals as determined by principal ratings on the OLA.

Few studies have focused on the relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction in public school settings (Girard, 2000; Miears, 2005; Rude, 2006). The studies conducted by Girard, Miears, and Rude did not focus on the correlation between servant leadership and principal job satisfaction levels. The present study extended

current research by surveying a systematic random sample of superintendents, elementary principals, and elementary teachers currently working in one of Ohio's 615 public school districts using the OLA questionnaire. The strength of correlation between servant leadership and elementary principal job satisfaction was revealed, which was intended to support one of the previously presented hypotheses.

Description of Research Design

A quantitative correlational study was conducted, which was intended to statistically reveal the strength of correlation between servant leadership and elementary principal job satisfaction in Ohio public schools as measured by the OLA. Correlational research refers to approaches that reveal the relationships between variables through the use of correlational statistics (Alreck & Settle, 2004; Gall, et al., 2007; Krathwohl, 2004). The computation is very simple as data is collected on two or more variables, and the correlation coefficient is then calculated. The quality of the research design lies in the depth of the rationale and theoretical constructs, not the complexity of the design (Gall, et al., 2007). "Correlational designs allow us to analyze how these variables, either singly or in combination, affect the pattern of behavior" (Gall et al., p. 336). Correlational designs also reveal the degree, direction, and significance of the relationship found between variables (Alreck & Settle, 2004; Gall et al., 2007; Krathwohl, 2004). As a result, the correlational coefficient takes the degree of relationships into account, and was intended in this dissertation study to measure the degree of relationship between servant leadership and elementary principal job satisfaction. A statistically significant correlation between servant leadership and job satisfaction would reveal servant leadership may be worth

exploring further as an approach which may lead to increased elementary principal job satisfaction and retention rates.

In this study, a systematic random sample of Ohio public school superintendents, elementary principals, and elementary teachers completed the OLA. Statistical analysis revealed the strength of correlation between servant leadership and elementary principal job satisfaction. Though other studies have revealed a positive relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction, this dissertation study appears to be the first to specifically focus on the strength of correlation between servant leadership and elementary principal job satisfaction in public school districts. The following flow chart reveals the research process that was followed:

Figure 1. Flow chart of quantitative correlational research study

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                     Research Problem:                        │
│  Need to determine the strength of correlation between       │
│  servant leadership and elementary principal job             │
│  satisfaction due to principal shortages                     │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
                              ↓
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                     Literature Review:                       │
│  Previous studies have revealed positive relationships       │
│  between servant leadership and job satisfaction, but none   │
│  specifically focused on principals                          │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
                              ↓
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                       Methodology:                           │
│  A quantitative design correlated servant leadership and     │
│  elementary principal job satisfaction using the             │
│  Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA)                  │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
                              ↓
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                     Data Collection:                         │
│  After IRB approval, and superintendent permission, OLA      │
│  questionnaires were mailed to systematically randomly       │
│  selected Ohio superintendents, elementary principals,       │
│  and elementary teachers.                                    │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
                              ↓
```

Data Analysis:
The strength of the correlation between servant leadership and elementary principal job satisfaction was statistically determined.

↓

Results:
Quantitative correlational results were presented which were intended to direct future researchers toward the appropriateness of exploring servant leadership as an avenue to retain and attract elementary principals.

Operational Definitions of Variables

　　　Servant leadership. Servant leadership is defined as the cumulative total of items 1-60, on the Laub's (1999) Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA). Items 1-60 are each five-point Likert scale items, which result in a maximum possible point total of 300 points. The OLA revealed a reliability of .98 for servant leadership items 1-60 (Laub).

　　　Job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is defined as the cumulative total of items 61-66, on the Laub's (1999) Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA). Items 61-66 are also each five-point Likert scale items, which result in a maximum possible point total of 30 points. The OLA revealed a reliability of .81 for job satisfaction items 61-66 (Laub).

Description of Materials and Instruments

　　　Questionnaire surveys were mailed to the sample population which included introductory cover letters (see Appendices B, C, & D) and informed consent forms (see Appendices E & F). Participants were asked to complete Laub's (1999) 66 item Organizational Leadership Assessment – Educational Version (OLA) which measured the qualities of servant leadership present in an organization and job satisfaction using five-point Likert items (see Appendix A). Demographic questions were also added to the OLA which included: (a) gender, (b) number of years worked in the field of education,

(c) number of years in current educational position, (d) number of years participants planned to remain in the field of education, and (e) reason participants planned to leave the field of education.

Laub stated, "The OLA was found to be a reliable tool for measuring servant leadership in organizations and will be useful for further research as well as diagnosis in organizations" (1999, p. iv). Additionally, he indicated that, "A significant (p < .01) positive correlation of .653 was found between the OLA score and the job satisfaction score" (1999, p. v). The OLA also revealed a reliability of .98 for servant leadership items, and .81 for job satisfaction items (Laub, 1999). Miears (2005) used the OLA - Educational Version, which contained minor wording changes making the OLA specific to schools rather than general organizations. The OLA - Educational Version was found to have the same strong internal reliability as the original OLA, resulting in a Cronbach's Alpha of .98. "Researchers can use this instrument with confidence that it will accurately measure the level of servant leadership within a school organization as well as the job satisfaction felt by those in the organization" (Miears, 2005, p. v). As a result, the OLA appeared appropriate to use for this public school dissertation study.

Laub's permission was obtained to utilize and publish the OLA instrument (see Appendix G). It was recommended that the OLA instrument only be used to assess the entire organization on the perceived levels of servant leadership, rather than surveying principals in isolation (James Laub, personal communication, June 17, 2007). Therefore, the need to survey workers throughout the organization was the rationale for including teachers and superintendents in the data collection procedures using the OLA. In

addition, the use of the overall OLA score was recommended for research purposes rather than focusing on any subscales (Laub, 2003).

The OLA seemed to be the most researched servant leadership instrument, and its strong reliability and validity were the reasons it was selected as the instrument to use in this current study. "The OLA has shown itself to be highly reliable with strong construct and face validity. It has been used in multiple research projects as well as for organizational diagnosis and consulting" (Laub, 2003, p. 4). Literature also revealed that Anderson (2007), Lambert (2005), and Miears (2005) used the OLA in a K-12 public school settings. Using the OLA to survey educators across the state of Ohio was intended to extend the current research, and add to the body of knowledge regarding the significance of the correlation between servant leadership and Ohio public elementary school job satisfaction levels.

Selection of Participants

Participants selected for this study were currently working Ohio elementary public school principals, superintendents, and elementary teachers selected from the 615 Ohio public school districts. Ohio's 615 public school districts consist of 191 city districts, 49 exempted village districts, 374 local districts, and 49 joint vocational districts (Ohio Department of Education, 2007). The following definitions of city, exempted, local and joint vocational school districts were provided by Brubaker (1998) to clarify the distinctions between each type of Ohio public school district. A city school district consists of the territory within the city plus the territory attached to it for school purposes, and is exempt from the supervision of the county board of education. An exempted village school district's boundaries contain the entire village plus any territory attached to

it for school district purposes, and is exempt from the supervision of the county board of education. Schools other than city school districts and exempted village school districts are local school districts, and are under the supervision of the county board of education. Lastly, vocational schools contain a minimum of 1,500 students which may include students from multiple districts as districts may form joint vocational schools. Specific demographic information regarding the Ohio's 615 public school districts will be presented next.

The most recently available information from the Ohio Department of Education (2007) revealed Ohio public school districts in 2005-2006 included 615 school districts, 3,925 school buildings, and 1,842,943 students. Ohio public school buildings consisted of 940 senior high schools, 116 junior high schools, 590 middle schools, 2,254 elementary schools, 15 adult schools, and 10 vocational schools. Participants selected to complete questionnaire surveys included elementary principals, superintendents, and elementary teachers working in one of these 615 Ohio public school districts. However, the size of the group was beyond the limits of this research study. Therefore, the following sampling methodology will explain the specific sampling group that was accessed within the target population of Ohio public school superintendents, elementary principals and elementary teachers.

Systematic random sampling was used to select public school districts from Ohio's 615 districts using the list of Ohio public school district tax numbers (Ohio Taxation Department, 2007). The Ohio public school district tax list contained an alphabetical listing of all 88 Ohio counties including all 615 Ohio school districts listed under their respective counties. As a result, systematic random sampling was

implemented using the school district tax list to achieve stronger population validity, and increase the ability to generalize to the target population (Alreck & Settle, 2004; Gall, et al., 2007). Systematic random sampling is more efficient than simple random sampling, and may be used in studies in which a list is available containing the entire target population such as the available taxation list used in this study (Gall et al., 2007).

A large effect size was hypothesized between the correlation of job satisfaction and public school districts displaying servant leadership practices. This was based on an earlier study by Miears (2005) which revealed a strong positive correlation of $r = .723$, p < .01 (two-tailed). As a result, a sample size of at least 23 Ohio public school elementary principals was sought for this study following Gall et al.'s (2007) recommendation to meet the .05 level of significance with the statistical power at the .7 level for a correlational study with a hypothesized large effect size. These researchers later recommended, "In correlational research, a minimum of 30 participants is desirable" (p. 176). Therefore, a minimum of 30 Ohio public school elementary principals was considered the lower limit for participation in this study.

Ohio public school districts were randomly systematically selected for this study (Ohio Department of Taxation, 2007). The selection was based on dividing the 615 school districts by the number of school districts needed to reach the minimum 30 elementary principal required for the study (Alreck & Settle, 2004). As recommended by Alreck and Settle, the starting point on the taxation list was randomly determined by writing the numbers on papers and randomly selecting one number (2004). Following this sampling procedure, the starting number was randomly selected, and the school districts were selected counting every nth school district. Ohio public school districts were

selected until the required minimum number of 30 principals needed was reached for a correlational study (Gall et al., 2007). However, due to the possibility of principal non-response rates, 50 elementary principals were initially sought to participate in the study using this systematic random sampling procedure.

It is important to emphasize that superintendent permission was needed from each participating school district. As a result, 175 districts were identified based on systematic random sampling before the goal of 50 elementary principals was reached based on permission granted from 28 superintendents. Two selected elementary buildings were merged resulting in a final total of 49 elementary principal invitations. A total of 1232 teachers were invited to participate in the study due to the need to survey teachers in the same districts. This resulted in a total of 1309 invited participants.

During the systematic sampling, 1 of the 175 district's contact information was invalid so they could not be contacted. Also, 2 of the 175 districts were part of the delimitations and were excluded from the study. One district was eliminated due to the district being a large urban district with over 30 elementary schools. The second exclusion was because of the systematic random selection of the researcher's own district. It was eliminated to avoid any potential conflict of interest.

This systematic sampling was a modified version of progressive sampling to ensure that the minimum 30 principals was reached based on district personnel who agreed to participate (Alreck & Settle, 2004). Due to the accessibility and participation issues, this study was not based on true random sampling but on factors that could not be controlled by the researcher. In addition, participants were assured that all district names would be kept confidential and only group data would be reported as anonymity was

promised to research participants. Participants were also volunteers who were allowed to withdraw from the study at any time, and omit any questions they were not comfortable answering based on ethical assurances which were provided to participants in the informed consent forms (see Appendices E & F). Ethical assurances will be described in more detail in the ethical assurances section.

Procedures

Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval was obtained, and permission was secured from school district superintendents. Ohio educators were then mailed questionnaire surveys using the procedures outlined in this section. An online survey was desired but not possible due to the lack of email access by some Ohio educators. Personal visits to each school district were not feasible due to the large geographic region included in the study.

In the presented study selecting educators was hoped to increase the initial response rates because previous studies have found that educators have a tendency to yield higher study participation percentages than the general population (Gall et al., 2007). Superintendent offices were personally contacted by telephone prior to sending written district access informed consent requests to increase the likelihood that school district personnel would participate (see Appendix E). Telephone calls were made to explain the study's purpose, and to encourage the district personnel's participation. Studies have revealed that personal contacts increased response rates, and some evidence has suggested that pre-contacting by telephone was the most effective method compared to letters and postcards (Gall et al., 2007). This personal and proactive approach was intended to reduce the level of non-respondents. "The best defense against the non-

respondent problem is motivating respondents in the first place" (Krathwohl, 2004, p. 374).

After the pre-contact phone call was completed, the district superintendent was mailed a cover letter (see Appendix B) and an informed consent form (see Appendix E) which clearly described the research purpose and the district's commitment. A pre-paid postage self-addressed envelope was also included. After IRB approval and superintendent permission was received, the superintendents were mailed a second cover letter (see Appendix C). Superintendents were also mailed the OLA questionnaire (see Appendix A) with a pre-paid postage self-addressed envelope, and a copy of the earlier signed informed consent form to be retained. After IRB approval and after permission was secured from school district superintendents, elementary principals and teachers were also mailed cover letters (see Appendix D), informed consent forms (see Appendix F), and OLA questionnaires (see Appendix A) with pre-paid postage self-addressed envelopes. Previous studies have revealed that a strong cover letter increases return rates (Gall et al., 2007). This cover letter included the purpose and importance of the study, the researcher's identification as an Ohio educator colleague, and the researcher's affiliation with Ohio Association of Elementary School Administrators (OAESA). OAESA is a professional organization in Ohio of which many principals are members. "It is desirable to associate your study with a professional organization with which prospective respondents might identify" (Gall et al., 2007, p. 238).

A week after the questionnaire deadline had passed another cover letter and OLA questionnaire were sent to the superintendents and principals with another self-addressed postage paid envelope (Gall et al., 2007). Due to the large number of teachers being

contacted, additional questionnaires and informed consent forms were not mailed. A third contact was then made with a cover letter only to superintendents and principals two weeks after the deadline had passed. No further contacts were attempted after that time since research has revealed that four or more follow-ups did not significantly increase return rates (Gall et al., 2007). Thank you letters were then sent along with an opportunity to request the research results if the participants were interested.

Discussion of Data Processing

Data from Laub's (1999) Organizational Leadership Assessment – Educational Version (OLA) questionnaires, and demographic information, was captured in an Excel database and was entered in the Statistical Package for Social Sciences, Version 16.0 (SPSS, 2007). OLA questionnaires which were mailed to participants, contained five-point Likert scale items. Items 1-60 were used to determine the level of servant leadership present in Ohio public schools. OLA items 61-66 were used to determine the level of job satisfaction revealed by elementary principals. OLA servant leadership items 1-60 were statistically correlated with OLA job satisfaction items 61-66 to determine the strength of the correlation. The Pearson product-moment correlation was calculated. It is the most frequently used statistical calculation that reveals the strength of relationships (Alreck & Settle, 2004; Krathwohl, 2004). The strength of correlation between servant leadership and elementary principal job satisfaction was measured. The findings of this study will be presented in chapter four, and are intended to extend the current research and provide a compass to direct future researchers to further examine the relationship between servant leadership and elementary principal job satisfaction levels.

Methodological Assumptions, Limitations, and Delimitations

The first methodological assumption was that adults participating in this study were employed as a superintendent, elementary principal, or elementary teacher in one of Ohio's 615 public school districts. Second, subjects voluntarily completed the survey information, and completed the questionnaires based on their own perceptions with no coercion or input from any other person. Third, participants had the ability to read and comprehend the survey information mailed to them. Finally, it was assumed that after reading the informed consent forms the participants understood there was no requirement for them to participate, they could withdraw from the study at any time, and if they decided to participate all information would kept strictly confidential.

Limitations included that cause and effect could not be determined from this nonexperimental correlational research study; only the strength of the relationship between servant leadership and elementary principal job satisfaction could be investigated (Gall et al., 2007; Krathwohl, 2004). In addition, superintendent district access was required. This eliminated the possibility that this study was based on true systematic random sampling.

Delimitations included the elimination of surveying participants in any district in which the researcher had been employed, or any district in the same county in which the researcher resided and was employed. Based on the systematically random sampling, this resulted in one district being eliminated from the study which was the district where the researcher was employed. This delimitation was intended to ensure no participants would be biased in their responses by having personal affiliation with the researcher. Large urban school districts were also part of the delimitations in this study. They included

districts with more than 10 elementary schools. One large urban district with over 30 elementary schools in one district was eliminated. Including respondents from any one large single district may have skewed the results to reflect one particular district's perceptions rather than obtaining elementary principal perceptions throughout the state of Ohio.

Ethical Assurances

Prior to the implementation of any data collection, IRB approval was obtained to protect the participant's rights which included ensuring informed consent, maintaining privacy, confidentiality, and the right to freely choose to decline participation without penalty (Gall et al., 2007). School district access permission was also obtained from all district superintendents, and no district required any separate IRB approval process.

Participants were volunteer adults who were given informed consent information that articulated the confidentiality and anonymity which would be maintained (see Appendices E & F). Reputable researchers always respect and maintain the privacy of the respondents as well as their anonymity when promised (Alreck & Settle, 2004). As a result, data was ethically collected, maintained, and presented while maintaining the confidentiality and anonymity of the participants. This assurance of confidentiality and anonymity was also done to protect against the vulnerability of workers in the workplace, to ensure no coercion or negative impact would occur from the participant's willingness to participate in the study.

Due to the involvement of anonymous human subjects who shared their attitudes and beliefs about servant leadership and their personal job satisfaction, an expedited review by the IRB was found to be appropriate for this study. Adult participation was

voluntary, and questionnaires were completed anonymously as an attempt to minimize any risk to the participants. This study appeared to meet the following Northcentral University Dissertation 12.0 ethical guidelines. First, the participation of human subjects was voluntary, with free choice, without compensation or obligation, and based on full disclosure of relevant information. Next, subjects were protected from physical and mental discomfort, harm or damage by their voluntary participation and ability to withdraw at any time. Third, knowledge to be gained from the study appeared to benefit the subjects, and the larger community of principals, and appeared to outweigh any apparent risks from completing the anonymous questionnaire. Fourth, research was conducted in a fair and equitable manner so that the selection of subjects did not overburden, over utilize, unfairly favor, or discriminate against any subject population. Subjects were systematically randomly selected to avoid any researcher bias, and questionnaires in this study were projected to only take 15 minutes to complete. Fifth, honoring commitments made to participants was of utmost importance with careful attention made to follow the study's design and participant confidentiality (Dissertation, 2007). Data was carefully collected, stored, and presented to maintain high ethical standards which ensured confidentiality, privacy, and the anonymity of the participants (Krathwohl, 2004).

All participants were adults and considered volunteers. The age range was unknown. Participants were surveyed at their places of employment. Extra precautions were taken to protect their vulnerability in the workplace by assuring their anonymity so they were confident their responses were completely voluntary and confidential. Respondents were told they could omit any answers or withdraw their participation at any

time with no consequences. Subjects did not receive compensation for their voluntary participation. This project did not involve investigators from any other institution, and only included the author, and Northcentral University personnel assisting in the dissertation process. Lastly, the subjects were not deceived, misled, and did not have any information about the project withheld. As stated earlier informed consent was secured as required by Northcentral University policy 12.1. This was in alignment with IRB requirements (Dissertation, 2007).

Informed consent was obtained using the forms in Appendix E for the district superintendent, and Appendix F for principal and teacher participants. Consent information provided was based on IRB guidelines and Northcentral policy 12.1 (Dissertation, 2007). Individual signature permission was sought from the district superintendent (see Appendix E) to secure district access. Principal and teacher signatures were not collected in order to increase the likelihood of their participation, protect possible vulnerability of workers in the workplace, and avoid any names being connected to each questionnaire. Each principal and teacher was given the detailed informed consent form (see Appendix F), and their completion of the OLA was considered their positive consent. If any participant chose not to participate they simply discarded the OLA and informed consent form with no negative consequence for their lack of participation. Anonymous responses were mailed from each respondent directly to the researcher to protect participants from any vulnerability that may occur in the workplace. This direct mailing provided assurances to participants that no other person in their workplace would be able to determine if they chose to participate nor would anyone else in the workplace see any response forms.

Safeguards were also in place to ensure the researcher had no connection to any school districts in the study. All districts in which the researcher had worked in the past, and currently works, were excluded from the study as part of the delimitations. This resulted in the elimination of one district based on the systematic random sampling of selecting the researcher's own district. Previous superintendents with whom the researcher had worked were all retired except for one previous superintendent who worked in another state. Every effort was made to add any additional school districts to the delimitations if it was revealed the researcher had any connection to personnel in the randomly selected school districts. None were revealed.

The research protocol implemented in this study was Laub's (1999) OLA, (see Appendix A). Permission to utilize and publish the OLA was obtained (see Appendix G). The OLA was provided at no charge with the agreement that the OLA would not be altered in any way, the researcher would make all copies to distribute to the participants, and that the researcher would submit a copy of the final dissertation to Dr. Laub at the conclusion of the research project (James Laub, personal communication, June 17, 2007).

Questionnaire data was coded to initially keep the school district data together to determine which data had been received, and which school districts should be sent follow up letters. However, no individual names were collected, and district names were converted to the general names of Organization #1, Organization #2, Organization #3, and so on, until all school names were converted to anonymous organization names. In addition, the original OLA protocols were retained until the organizational information was entered into a password protected Excel spreadsheet and the final study was approved. The confidential information was also saved on the researcher's computer

including five flash drive back up copies to ensure the data was not lost. The back up

flash drive copies were retained in the researcher's separate locked office. Once the

dissertation was completed and approved by the dissertation committee the OLA

protocols and flash drives were then destroyed. Data was not destroyed before that time

in order to ensure that the data entered and analyzed was accurate and the protocols were

no longer needed in order to complete the dissertation study.

There were no known risks but precautions were taken since any research project

has the potential to hold risks for participants. To protect the vulnerability of workers in

the workplace, confidentiality and privacy were assured which involved the careful

control of access to the data and protection of each participant's identity. Participation in

any study involves some type of ethical risks and it is the responsibility of the researcher

to minimize these risks (Krathwohl, 2004). The proposed study appeared to have minimal

risks to participants based on surveying adult participants who: (a) were well informed

with detailed consent forms, (b) volunteered to participate, (c) were allowed to omit

questions or withdraw their participation at any time due to questions being asked about

their workplace, (d) were assured that their names and the school district's names would

remain anonymous, (e) were from districts systematically randomly selected, (f) did not

have any connection to the researcher, and (g) were assured that the confidentiality of

their data would be maintained in a password protected database. "The public in general

and respondents in particular have a right to expect the data they provide will be safely

protected and used as intended. Such information privacy rights are implied and

irrevocable" (Alreck & Settle, 2004, p. 13).

The benefits of the presented dissertation study appeared to outweigh any costs. Completing anonymous questionnaires seemed to have minimal risks compared to the potential scientific gains that may provide avenues to increase principal job satisfaction and retention rates. Due to high rates of principals leaving the educational administration profession, it is imperative alternatives be explored which counter the exodus of principals leaving school districts across Ohio and the nation. This study was intended to reveal important data regarding servant leadership and elementary job satisfaction in order to direct future researchers toward a leadership approach which may lead to higher principal job satisfaction and retention rates. Results will be presented in the next section.

Chapter 4 - Findings

Overview

The purpose of this quantitative study was to investigate the strength of the correlation between the perceived level of servant leadership in Ohio public school districts, and the perceived levels of elementary principal job satisfaction. A systematic random sample of superintendents, elementary principals, and elementary teachers was used to conduct a survey of multiple levels of educators using Laub's (1999) Organizational Leadership Assessment – Educational Version (OLA). Data from this quantitative correlational study will be presented to answer the following research questions and to reject one of the following hypotheses:

1. To what extent do public school districts in Ohio implement the principles of servant leadership?

2. To what extent does the level of servant leadership revealed in Ohio public school districts correlate with Ohio elementary principals' level of job satisfaction?

$H1_1$. There is a significant correlation between the level of servant leadership perceived in Ohio public schools, as determined by superintendents, elementary principals, and elementary teachers ratings on Laub's (1999) OLA, and the level of job satisfaction perceived by Ohio elementary public school principals as determined by principal ratings on the OLA.

$H1_o$. There is no significant correlation between the level of servant leadership perceived in Ohio public schools, as determined by superintendents, elementary principals, and elementary teachers ratings on the OLA, and the level of job satisfaction

perceived by Ohio elementary public school principals as determined by principal ratings on the OLA.

The following sections will report the results obtained in this study, an analysis and evaluation of the findings, and a summary of the findings.

Results

Survey data from the OLA was divided into two categories. OLA items 1-60 were used to measure the perceived level of servant leadership, and OLA items 61-66 measured the perceived level elementary principals' job satisfaction. OLA questions were all five-point Likert type with 1-60 resulting in a total possible 300 points, and items 61-66 resulting in a total possible 30 points. Items 1-60 were correlated with items 61-66 using SPSS 16.0 (2007) statistical software. Descriptive statistics and correlational findings obtained from the data analysis will be presented next.

A total of 25 out of 28 superintendents completed the mailed OLA with an 89.3% return rate. In addition, 38 out of 49 elementary principals completed the OLA with a return rate of 77.6%. The elementary teacher participation rate was 38.6%, and 475 out of 1,232 invited participants completed the survey. Demographic gender information, presented in Table 2, indicated that principal respondents were evenly distributed. The majority of superintendents were male, and most teachers were female. In addition, 3.6% of teacher respondents did not specify gender demographics.

Table 2

Number of Participants by Gender

Position	Number of Females	Percentage of Females	Number of Males	Percentage of Males
Superintendents	3	12%	22	88%
Principals	19	50%	19	50%
Teachers	427	89.9%	31	6.5%

Table 3 provides a summary of participants' years of experience in education, number of years in current position, and number of years participants planned to remain in the field of education. Superintendents had the highest average years of experience. Teachers had the highest average years of experience in their current position, and also had the highest number of average years they planned to remain in the field of education.

Table 3

Years of Educational Experience and Planned Years Remaining in the Field of Education

Position	n	Average Years of Overall Experience	Average Years of Experience in Current Position	Average Years Plan to Remain in Education
Superintendents	23	28.0	6.3	6.8
Principals	34	24.1	8.4	10.6
Teachers	399	16.0	10.9	15.8

Superintendents reported planning to leave the field of education for the following reasons: (a) 88% for retirement, (b) 4% for a career change, and (c) 8% for unidentified reasons. Elementary principals planned to leave the field of education for reasons that included: (a) 82% for retirement, (b) 5% for a career change, (c) 2.5% for other reasons,

and (d) 10.5% for unrevealed reasons. Lastly, elementary teacher data revealed: (a) 74%

plan to leave the field of education for retirement, (b) 2% for a career change, (c) 2% due

to burnout, and (d) 22% for other or unidentified reasons.

Mean ratings of servant leadership and job satisfaction are reported in Table 4.

Table 4

Descriptive Organizational Leadership Assessment Data

Position	n	M Servant Leadership	SD	n	M Job Satisfaction	SD
Principals	38	3.95	.640	38	4.20	.741
Superintendents	25	4.07	.363	25	4.47	.403
Teachers	475	3.62	.669	474	3.99	.737
All Respondents	538	3.67	.667	537	4.03	.732

A General Linear Model Multivariate Analysis was conducted, using SPSS 16.0

(2007) software to determine if there was a job position by gender interaction and any

notable main effects on servant leadership and job satisfaction. The independent variables

were gender and job role. Dependent variables included mean servant leadership ratings

and mean satisfaction ratings on the OLA. There was a significant main effect for job

position on the dependant variable of servant leadership, $F(2, 475) = 7.263$, $p = .001$

where superintendent and principal scores were higher than those of the teachers. The

multivariate tests also indicated significant main effects for job position on the dependent

measure job satisfaction $F(2, 520) = 5.826$, $p = .003$. Job satisfaction ratings for

superintendents and principals were significantly higher than teacher ratings. There was

no statistically significant interaction between job position and gender, and no significant

main effect for gender.

A significant positive correlation of $r = .889$, $p < .01$ (two-tailed) among servant leadership and elementary principal job satisfaction was revealed. In addition, a significant positive correlation of $r = .849$, p $< .01$ (two-tailed) existed for all respondents between servant leadership and job satisfaction. There was a significant positive correlation between servant leadership and elementary teacher job satisfaction of $r = .849$, $p < .01$ (two-tailed), and a positive correlation was also found between servant leadership and superintendent job satisfaction of $r = .450$, $p < .05$, (two-tailed). Correlational data is presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Correlational Results of Servant Leadership, Job Satisfaction, and Demographics

	Position	Mean Servant Leadership	Overall Years of Experience	Years of Experience in Current Position	Years Plan to Remain in Education
Mean Job Satisfaction	Principal	.889**	-.108	-.165	-.011
	Superintendent	.450*	-.316	-.448*	.224
	Teacher	.849**	.008	.054	.083
	All	.849**	.039	.013	.042
Mean Servant Leadership	Principal		-.016	-.062	-.091
	Superintendent		-.003	-.209	.101
	Teacher	–	.010	.058	.071
	All		.066	.022	.016
Overall Years of Experience	Principal			.310	-.800**
	Superintendent			.404*	-.792**
	Teacher		–	.767**	-.852**
	All			.645**	-.854**
Years of Experience in Current Position	Principal				-.321
	Superintendent				-.466*
	Teacher			–	-.652**
	All				-.575**

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

No significant correlations existed between servant leadership or job satisfaction when compared with gender, total years of experience in the field of education, total years in current educational position, and years the educator planned to continue working in the field of education. However, a significant negative correlation $r = -.800$, $p < .01$ (two-tailed) was revealed for principals when overall experience in the field of education, was compared to years principals planned to remain working in the field of education. A significant negative correlation was also found for superintendents, teachers, and overall respondents between total years in the field of education and years planned to continue working in the field of education, as reported in Table 5.

There were no significant correlations for teachers or overall respondents. However, a negative correlation of $r = -.448$, $p < .05$ (two-tailed) existed between superintendent job satisfaction, and total years in current educational position. Superintendents, teachers, and overall respondents revealed a significant positive correlation between overall years of experience and years of experience in their current educational position as revealed in Table 5. Superintendents, teachers, and overall respondents also displayed a significant negative correlation between years in their current position and years they plan to remain in the field of education.

An analysis and evaluation of the findings of this quantitative correlational study will be presented next.

Analysis and Evaluation of Findings

Findings revealed a significant positive correlation of $r = .889$, $p < .01$ (two-tailed) between servant leadership and elementary principal job satisfaction based on Laub's (1999) OLA ratings. This significant positive correlation answered the research

questions: (a) To what extent do public school districts in Ohio implement the principles

of servant leadership, and (b) to what extent does the level of servant leadership revealed

in Ohio public school districts correlate with Ohio elementary principals' level of job

satisfaction? A significant positive correlation found in this study indicated that the

higher level of perceived servant leadership, the higher the level of perceived elementary

principal job satisfaction. The $H1_1$ hypothesis could not be rejected. There is a significant

correlation between the level of servant leadership as determined by superintendents,

elementary principals, and elementary teachers' ratings on the OLA, and the level of job

satisfaction of elementary public school principals as determined by principal ratings

OLA. This hypothesis could not be rejected because a significant positive correlation was

found between servant leadership and elementary principal job satisfaction.

Principal demographic information revealed there were no significant correlations

among servant leadership and job satisfaction as related to gender, total years of

educational experience, years in current educational position, or years principals planned

to remain in the field of education. However, a significant negative correlation $r = -.800$,

$p < .01$ (two-tailed) was identified for principals when comparing overall experience in

the field of education and years they planned to remain working in the field of education.

A significant negative correlation existed between total years in the field of education and

years planned to continue working in the field of education for superintendents, teachers,

and overall respondents. These negative correlations may be partially explained by the

assumption that educators with the most educational experience would foresee working

the least amount of years in the future.

Additional demographic information revealed 82% of principals planned to retire from the field of education. A total of 5% of principals indicated they planned to leave their current positions for career changes; 2.5% revealed other reasons; and 10.5% did not report their reason for leaving the field of education. Though no principals specifically cited burnout as a reason they planned to leave the field of education, 7.5% said they were leaving the field due to non-retirement reasons. Even losing 1% of the nation's educational administrative work force would result in a loss of 2,250 administrators (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2006). In Ohio, if 7.5% of all public elementary principals left their jobs for non-retirement reasons, approximately 169 out of the 2,254 Ohio public elementary schools could be impacted. Combining this factor with principals leaving for retirement reasons, the impact in Ohio schools would be even greater. Based on the significant positive correlation revealed in this study between servant leadership and elementary principal job satisfaction, servant leadership appears to be a leadership approach that deserves further attention to determine if it may help counter the trend of principals leaving the field of education for non-retirement reasons.

This dissertation study also revealed a significant positive correlation of $r = .849$, $p < .01$ (two-tailed) for all respondents when comparing servant leadership and job satisfaction. These findings indicated that when higher levels of servant leadership were perceived, educators perceived higher levels of job satisfaction. A positive correlation was also found between servant leadership and elementary teacher job satisfaction of $r = .849$, $p < .01$ (two-tailed). Therefore, if higher levels of servant leadership were perceived by teachers, higher levels of job satisfaction were also perceived by teachers. This significant positive correlation between servant leadership and teacher job satisfaction

was consistent with Miears' (2005) findings. Miears utilized the OLA in Texas public

schools, and reported a strong positive correlation of $r = .723$, p < .01 (two-tailed)

between teachers' perceived levels of servant leadership and job satisfaction. Miears did

not survey superintendents or elementary principals so further comparisons were not

possible.

A significant positive correlation was found between servant leadership and

superintendent job satisfaction of $r = .450$, $p < .05$ (two-tailed). However, the correlation

between superintendent servant leadership and job satisfaction ratings were not as strong

as elementary principal and elementary teacher correlations. Though superintendents

revealed significantly higher job satisfaction ratings than teachers, their ratings did not

appear to be as strongly correlated with servant leadership as principal and teacher

ratings. A negative correlation existed among superintendent job satisfaction, and the

number of years superintendents worked in their current position, $r = -.448$, $p < .05$ (two-

tailed). Findings showed that the longer superintendents worked in their current position,

the lower their job satisfaction was rated on the OLA.

Reliability estimates in this study, using coefficient Alpha, were .98 for the OLA

servant leadership items, and .87 for OLA job satisfaction items. This study's OLA

reliability findings were consistent with Laub's original OLA findings of .98 for the

servant leadership items, and .81 job satisfaction items. In addition, the current study's

findings were also consistent with Miears' (2005) reliability OLA – Educational Version

findings of .98 for servant leadership items and .86 for job satisfaction items. As a result,

the OLA – Educational Version appears highly reliable to be used in K-12 public school

settings to measure the perceived levels of servant leadership and job satisfaction levels.

Overall, this dissertation study's findings were consistent with previous studies that found a positive relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction (Anderson, 2005; Drury, 2005; Girard, 2000; Hebert, 2004; Irving, 2005; Laub, 1999; Miears, 2005; Rude, 2006; Stramba, 2003; Strickland, 2006; Thompson, 2004; VanTassell, 2007; Washington, 2007). Due to the limited research focused on servant leadership and job satisfaction in public school settings, this study's significant positive correlation findings extended the knowledge in the field of public school education (Girard, 2000; Miears, 2005; Rude, 2006). This investigation heightened the understanding in the field regarding job satisfaction and servant leadership, as it appeared to be the only study that focused on elementary principal job satisfaction levels. A significant positive correlation of $r = .889$, $p < .01$ (two-tailed) between servant leadership and elementary principal job satisfaction indicated that servant leadership was worthy of further exploration as a means to increase both the job satisfaction, and the retention rates of Ohio elementary public school principals.

Summary

A systematic random sample was conducted in Ohio public schools, and 25 superintendents, 38 elementary principals, and 475 elementary teachers were surveyed using Laub's (1999) Organizational Leadership Assessment – Educational Version (OLA). Participation rates were 89.3% for superintendents, 77.6% for elementary principals, and 38.6% for elementary teachers. A significant positive correlation of $r = .889$, $p < .01$ (two-tailed) was found between servant leadership and elementary principal job satisfaction. These findings were consistent with previous studies which revealed a positive relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction (Anderson, 2005;

Drury, 2005; Girard, 2000; Hebert, 2004; Irving, 2005; Laub, 1999; Miears, 2005; Rude,

2006; Stramba, 2003; Strickland, 2006; Thompson, 2004; VanTassell, 2007; Washington,

2007). Previous findings have been extended by increasing the servant leadership and job

satisfaction research conducted in public school settings (Girard, 2000; Miears, 2005;

Rude, 2006). This study also appeared to be the first specifically focused on servant

leadership and elementary principal job satisfaction in public schools.

This study found that the higher level of servant leadership perceived in Ohio

public schools, the higher the level of perceived elementary principal job satisfaction

level. Though causation cannot be assumed, the strong positive correlation indicates

further analysis of servant leadership in public school districts is appropriate. Servant

leadership may potentially lead to higher principal job satisfaction levels and higher

retention rates, and potentially higher attraction rates of aspiring educators to enter the

role of the principalship.

A significant positive correlation of $r = .849$, $p < .01$ (two-tailed) was revealed for

all respondents between servant leadership and job satisfaction. A significant positive

correlation was found among servant leadership and elementary teacher job satisfaction

of $r = .849$, $p < .01$ (two-tailed), and a positive correlation also existed between servant

leadership and superintendent job satisfaction of $r = .450$, p < .05 (two-tailed).

Additional discussion of this study's research findings and recommendations for

potential future research studies will be presented in the next chapter.

Chapter 5 – Conclusions and Recommendations

Summary

The purpose of this quantitative study was to determine if a significant correlation existed between servant leadership and elementary principal job satisfaction, and to extend research related to servant leadership in public school settings. Many public school principals continue to leave the educational profession at distressingly high rates, resulting in the need to identify leadership practices that may contribute to increased job satisfaction levels (Guterman, 2007; Norton, 2003). Though some principals have left to retire, more are leaving prematurely due to low job satisfaction resulting from stress, burnout, inadequate compensation, and lack of support (Field, 2003). Further, fewer than half the teachers qualified to become principals have been willing to consider this role (Cusick, 2003).

Principal shortages have been so extreme that many states have passed alternative licensure laws providing noneducators avenues to obtain principal licenses (Education Commission, 2007). The alternative licensure trend appears to be increasing as only 11 states allowed alternative principal licensure in 2003 compared to 16 states in 2007 (Education Commission, 2007; Hale & Moorman, 2003). Leadership practices resulting in higher job satisfaction levels must be explored in order to retain quality principals in the workforce, and entice teachers to enter the principalship.

Servant leadership, a concept introduced by Robert K. Greenleaf (2003) in the 1970s, appears to be one such approach. Greenleaf revealed the need for a better approach to leadership which emphasized serving employees, customers, and community members as the highest priority (Spears & Lawrence, 2004). Servant leadership has been

positively related to job satisfaction levels (Anderson, 2005; Drury, 2005; Girard, 2000;

Hebert, 2004; Laub, 1999; Miears, 2005; Rude, 2006; Stramba, 2003; Strickland, 2006;

Thompson, 2004; VanTassell, 2007). However, servant leadership research has been very

limited in public school settings with minimal focus on job satisfaction levels (Girard,

2000; Miears, 2005; Rude, 2006). No studies were found that focused on public school

principal job satisfaction levels.

The purpose of this quantitative study was to better understand whether a positive

correlation existed between servant leadership and elementary principal job satisfaction.

This topic was important to investigate because many principals leave the administrative

profession before retirement, and this investigation could provide insight into which

leadership approaches lead to higher retention rates.

In this dissertation study, a systematic random sample was conducted in Ohio

public schools surveying 25 superintendents, 38 elementary principals, and 475

elementary teachers using Laub's (1999) Organizational Leadership Assessment –

Educational Version (OLA). The OLA servant leadership instrument measured the

perceived level of servant leadership in Ohio public school districts, and the perceived

level of elementary principal job satisfaction using 66 five-point Likert scale items. A

systematic random sample of respondents was mailed OLA questionnaires but

superintendent permission access did not allow for a true random sampling of school

districts.

In the random sample, the superintendent participation rate was 89.3%,

elementary principal participation rate was 77.6%, and 38.6% of elementary teachers

participated. A significant positive correlation of $r = .889$, $p < .01$ (two-tailed) was found

between the perceived level of servant leadership present in Ohio public schools, and the
perceived level of elementary principal job satisfaction as measured by the OLA. This
significant positive correlation indicated that the higher level of servant leadership
perceived in Ohio public schools, the higher the level of perceived elementary principal
job satisfaction. Based on the strong positive correlation reported in this study, servant
leadership appears to be an approach worth exploring further to counter the exodus of
principals leaving the field of educational administration.

An additional significant positive correlation of $r = .849$, $p < .01$ (two-tailed) was
revealed between servant leadership and job satisfaction based on the OLA survey results
from all 538 respondents. A significant positive correlation also existed among servant
leadership and elementary teacher job satisfaction of ($r = .849$, $p < .01$, two-tailed); and a
positive correlation was found between servant leadership and superintendent job
satisfaction ($r = .450$, $p < .05$, two-tailed).

These research findings were consistent with previous studies that found a
positive relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction (Anderson, 2005;
Drury, 2005; Girard, 2000; Hebert, 2004; Irving, 2005; Laub, 1999; Miears, 2005; Rude,
2006; Stramba, 2003; Strickland, 2006; Thompson, 2004; VanTassell, 2007; Washington,
2007). Previous findings were extended, since this dissertation study appear to broaden
the few studies focused on servant leadership and job satisfaction in public school
settings (Girard, 2000; Miears, 2005; Rude, 2006). This dissertation study also appeared
to be the first to focus on servant leadership and elementary principal job satisfaction in
public school settings. Conclusions obtained from this study will be presented in the next
section.

Conclusions

Many public school principals continue to leave the educational profession at alarming rates resulting in the need to identify leadership practices which may contribute to increased job satisfaction levels (Guterman, 2007; Norton, 2003). Servant leadership appears to be an approach that has led to higher job satisfaction. Due to so many principals leaving the administrative profession before retirement, the purpose of this quantitative study was to better understand whether servant leadership positively correlated with elementary principal job satisfaction levels in order to reveal practices that may lead to higher principal retention rates. Therefore, the following research questions were answered in this study: (a) To what extent do public school districts in Ohio implement the principles of servant leadership, and (b) to what extent does the level of servant leadership revealed in Ohio public school districts correlate with Ohio elementary principals' level of job satisfaction? In answering these research questions, this study revealed a significant positive correlation of $r = .889$, p < .01 (two-tailed) between servant leadership and elementary principal job satisfaction using Laub's (1999) OLA survey instrument. This significant positive correlation indicated that the higher the level of servant leadership perceived in Ohio public schools, the higher the level of perceived elementary job satisfaction. The $H1_1$ hypothesis could not be rejected. There is a significant correlation between the level of servant leadership perceived in Ohio public schools as determined by superintendents, elementary principals, and elementary teacher's ratings on the OLA, and the level of job satisfaction perceived by Ohio elementary public school principals as determined by principal ratings on the OLA. This

hypothesis could not be rejected because a significant positive correlation existed between servant leadership and elementary principal job satisfaction.

A significant positive correlation of $r = .849$, $p < .01$ (two-tailed) was found between servant leadership and job satisfaction based on OLA survey results from all 538 respondents. In addition, a significant positive correlation was revealed between servant leadership and elementary teacher job satisfaction of ($r = .849$, $p < .01$, two-tailed); and a positive correlation was revealed between servant leadership and superintendent job satisfaction ($r = .450$, $p < .05$, two-tailed).

This study extended the knowledge in the field of education regarding servant leadership and elementary principal job satisfaction in public school districts even though cause and effect determinations could not be made from this nonexperimental correlational design. As a result, this study's findings indicated that servant leadership has merit to be studied further in public school settings. Though definitive conclusions could not be made from this correlational study, this investigation did provide a direction for future researchers to further examine servant leadership as a way to attract and retain elementary principals in public school settings. Suggestions for future recommendations will be discussed in the next section.

Recommendations

Retaining and attracting qualified school leaders appears essential to prepare our nation's youth to meet the demands of the 21st Century. The purpose of this study was to determine if a significant correlation existed between servant leadership and elementary principal job satisfaction. Results from this study revealed a significant positive correlation of $r = .889$, $p < .01$ (two-tailed) between servant leadership and elementary

principal job satisfaction. As a result, examining the presence and benefits of servant

leadership in public school settings appears to be worthy of further study to retain and

attract principals. Principals continue to leave the educational profession at alarming rates

(Cusick, 2003; Field, 2003; Guterman, 2007; Norton, 2003). Servant leadership's

significant positive correlation with job satisfaction indicates further analysis of the

benefits of servant leadership in the public school setting is warranted.

Educational administrators who follow the tenets of servant leadership have the

potential to view their leadership role as ministry work, and find what Wong and Davey

(2007) call *right motivation*. That is, they are serving God by serving others, and there

appears to be no greater calling in any profession than to fulfill the mission to place the

needs of others before one's own needs. The term ministry is not often used in the field of

public education, but it is important to acknowledge that the word administer is from the

Latin word *administrare* which comes from the words minister, ministr-, and servant

(American Heritage, 2000). Viewing school administration as ministry work is alien to

normal perceptions (Graseck, 2005). However, in a time of violence, terrorism, wars,

intolerance, and ethical scandals it appears time to shift the American culture, and

America's public schools from one of being served to serving others. Servant leadership

appears to be the antidote that speaks to people's hearts, and speaks to an approach that

may guide leaders to focus on valuing, listening to, and honoring people more than the

emphasis placed on financial gains and bottom line results.

Servant leadership was introduced by the greatest leader of all time, Jesus Christ,

over 2,000 years ago, and its concepts continue to appear relevant and timely (New

International Version). Though discussions of religious concepts are often avoided in

public school settings, servant leadership concepts appear acceptable since they are

presented in more palatable terms. Servant leadership consists of a vocabulary that

appears to be adoptable in public school settings because it includes acceptable secular

terms such as listening, empathy, persuasion, and building relationships.

A challenge encountered by school leaders who are considering the adoption of

servant leadership principles is the increasing accountability for high student achievement

results. School leaders are responsible to ensure high student achievement standards are

met in accordance with the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation or face the

potential of being replaced (U.S. Department of Education, 2007). The connection

between the quality of school leadership and student achievement has been documented

for many years (C.D. Howe Institute, 2003; Fullan, 2003; Hessel & Holloway, 2002;

Marzano, et al., 2005; Sergiovanni, 2005; The Wallace Foundation, 2007). More than

ever, due to the era of standards based education and high stakes accountability the job of

principal has become even more critical (The Education Alliance, 2003). Therefore, it

appears essential to find ways to retain and attract school leaders, and servant leadership

seems to be an approach worthy of further analysis. Adopting servant leadership

principles may lead to higher recruitment and retention rates as school leaders emphasize

building relationships and serving others as much as they emphasize raising test scores

and meeting accountability standards. High achievement in schools would still be

expected to be attained, but servant leadership would hopefully enhance achievement

levels based on the high rates of success businesses have revealed following servant

leadership principles (Blanchard, 2007; Hunter, 2004).

Another area of importance in the field of education is the inclusion of servant leadership principles in educational administration preparation programs. "We are facing a leadership crisis, which will only deepen unless some fundamental change is made. There is an urgent need to do some soul searching and hard thinking regarding how to best train leadership for the next generation" (Wong & Davey, 2007, ¶ 7). Introducing the principles of servant leadership to educators preparing to enter the field of educational administration may lead to higher attraction rates, increased job satisfaction levels, and higher retention rates. In addition, servant leadership principles may provide future leaders with the tools they need to focus on important priorities such as: (a) building relationships, (b) listening, (c) caring, (d) respecting others, (e) gaining trust, and (f) most importantly, humbly and authentically serving others.

It is essential America's youth be guided by servant leaders who are satisfied with their jobs in order for school leaders to remain in the field of education. These servant leaders may in turn model for, and guide students to become future servant leaders. These future servant leaders would be grounded in servant leadership principles as they learn to lead for genuine, authentic, and satisfying reasons, potentially altering the course of our society. "What we need most are servant leaders with exceptional abilities blended with hearts full of humility and love. Such leaders can make this world a better place and restore people's hope in the future" (Wong & Davey, 2007, ¶ 75).

It would also be valuable to conduct further servant leadership correlational studies of large urban public school districts because these districts were part of the delimitations in this study. Focusing on the perceived levels of servant leadership and job

satisfaction in large districts would reveal any similarities or differences compared to this current dissertation study's findings. A replication of this investigation with secondary principals may also uncover important information regarding the strength of correlation between servant leadership and secondary principal job satisfaction levels.

Extending the field of servant leadership research by correlating principal job satisfaction, servant leadership, and student achievement levels also appears potentially valuable for public school districts. This type of study would reveal more information regarding the effectiveness of servant leadership in public school settings, as compared to job satisfaction and student achievement levels. Causation studies are also needed to determine if the presence of servant leadership in work environments causes increased job satisfaction.

In summary, it is important to better understand the benefits of implementing servant leadership principles in public school settings. Servant leadership characteristics which define exceptional leaders include: great capacity for productive work, great vision, great intellect and knowledge, great people skills, great team builders, great motivators, great heart, great communicators, great optimists, great courage, great self-knowledge, and great character (Wong & Davey, 2007). "Potentially, servant leadership can transform leadership, the workplace and society" (Wong & Davey, ¶ 73). Transforming public schools into places of servant leadership with school leaders who have high job satisfaction rates may counter the exodus of school leaders who have been leaving the principal role at alarming rates. "Servant leadership focuses on the humble and ethical use of power as a servant leader, cultivating a genuine relationship

between leaders and followers, and creating a supportive and positive work environment" (Wong & Davey, 2007, ¶ 19). Therefore, servant leadership is an approach that seems highly appropriate for America's public schools. Servant leadership concepts are not new but they have the potential to alter the course of schools which appear to be increasingly focused on achievement scores and standardized test data rather than servant leadership principles such as listening, caring for others, and building relationships.

The stakes appear to be exceptionally high for America's schools, and for America's future as the principal role becomes more demanding. Finding satisfaction in one's work seems to be one of the greatest rewards in life. Servant leadership appears to be an approach that may lead principals to find increased job satisfaction levels, hopefully leading to greater longevity in their careers.

> There are four needs in all people: to live, to love, to learn, to leave a legacy. When these needs overlap, you find that internal motivation, the fire within. Starting with our own fire, you can create something that will burn bright for many people and last a lifetime – you can empower others to live, to love, to learn, to leave a legacy. You can be a servant-leader. (Covey, as cited in Blanchard, 2001)

Embracing the tenets of servant leadership may provide educational leaders with an avenue to change the nation's future one person at a time. As an ancient Chinese proverb stated, "If you want one year of prosperity, grow grain. If you want ten years of prosperity, grow trees. If you want one hundred years of prosperity, grow people" (Wong & Davey, 2007, ¶ 52).

References

Alreck, P. L., & Settle, R. B. (2004). *The survey research handbook* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Irwin. (Original work published 1985)

American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language (4th ed.). (2000). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Anderson, J. D. (2007). Servant leadership in public schools: A case study (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri - Columbia, 2006). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 67*(11). Retrieved April 14, 2007, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database.

Anderson, K. P. (2005). A correlation analysis of servant leadership and job satisfaction in a religious educational organization (Doctoral dissertation, University of Phoenix, 2005). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 66*(1), 239. Retrieved December 6, 2006, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database.

Arnold, M., & Harris, S. (2000). The song sounds better when all the notes are there. *Contemporary Education, 71*(4), 12-15. Retrieved November 26, 2006, from ProQuest database.

Ba Banutu-Gomez, M. (2004). Great leaders teach exemplary followership and serve as servant leaders. *Journal of American Academy of Business, Cambridge, 4*(1), 143. Retrieved November 26, 2006, from ProQuest database.

Blanchard, K. (2001). *Focus on leadership: Servant-leadership for the 21st century* (3rd ed.) (L. C. Spears & M. Lawrence, Eds.). New York: J. Wiley & Sons.

Blanchard, K. (2007). *Leading at a higher level: Blanchard on leadership and creating high performing organizations*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Blanchard, K., & Hodges, P. (2003). *The servant leader: Transforming your heart, head, hands, & habits*. Nashville, TN: J. Countryman.

Blanchard, K., & Hodges, P. (2005). *Lead like Jesus: Lessons from the greatest leadership role model of all time*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, Inc.

Bowman, R. F. (2005). Teacher as servant leader. *The Clearing House, 78*(6), 257-259. Retrieved November 26, 2006, from ProQuest database.

Brubaker, E. S. (1998). Ohio local government structure and finance. In A. Corbin, D. Patton, & J. Rohrer (Eds.), *The Ohio State University extension bulletin* (835). Columbus: The Ohio State University. Retrieved July 16, 2007 from http://ohioline.osu.edu/b835/ index.html

Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2006). *Occupational outlook handbook: Education administrators* (Bulletin 2600). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor. Retrieved March 4, 2007, from http://stats.bls.gov/oco/print/ocos007.htm

C.D. Howe Institute. (2003). *School principals are a key to effective education, researchers find: C.D. Howe Institute report*. Toronto, Canada: C.D. Howe Institute. Retrieved November 22, 2007, from Goliath Business Knowledge on Demand Web site: http://?/?goliath.ecnext.coms2/?gi_0199-1193786/?School-principals-are-a-key.html

Colorado Department of Education (2007). *Application for the alternative principal preparation program.* Retrieved November 18, 2007, from http://64.233.169.104/search?q=cache:zk0H5ZBFNd8J:www.cde.state.co.us/cdeprof/download/pdf/Altprincipalbooklet.pdf+states+with+alternative+principal+licensure&hl=en&ct=clnk&cd=3&gl=us

Crippen, C. (2005a). Servant-leadership as an effective model for educational leadership and management: First to serve, then to lead. *Management in Education, 18*(5), 11-16. Retrieved December 12, 2006, from EBSCOhost database.

Crippen, C. (2005b). The democratic school: First to serve, then to lead. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy, 47*, 1-8. Web site retrieved November 26, 2006, from: http://www.umanitoba.ca/publications/cjeap/articles/crippen.html

Cusick, P. A. (2003). *A study of Michigan's school principal shortage* (Policy Report No. 12). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.

Dancy, S. (2007). *Schools face principal shortage*. Retrieved July 6, 2007, from News 14 24 Hour Local News Top Stories Web site: http://news14.com/content/top_stories/583937/schools-face-principal-shortage/Default.aspx

Dennis, R. S. (2004). Servant leadership theory: Development of the servant leadership assessment instrument (Doctoral dissertation, Regent University, 2004). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 65*(5), 1857. Retrieved March 13, 2007, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database.

Dennis, R. S., & Bocarnea, M. (2005). Development of the servant leadership assessment instrument. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 26*, 600-615. Retrieved April 14, 2007, from ProQuest database.

Dennis, R., & Winston, B. E. (2003). A factor analysis of Page and Wong's servant leadership instrument. *Leadership & Organization Development, 24*, 455-459. Retrieved March 11, 2007, from ProQuest database.

Dissertation Handbook for Learners Northcentral University. (2007). Retrieved September 6, 2007, from Northcentral University Web site: http://learners.ncu.edu

Drury, S. (2005). Employee perceptions of servant leadership: Comparisons by level and with job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Doctoral dissertation, Regent University, 2004). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 65*(9), 3457. Retrieved March 13, 2007, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database.

The Education Alliance at Brown University, & NAESP. (2003). *Making the case for principal mentoring*. Providence, RI: Brown University. Retrieved July 6, 2007, from http://www.alliance.brown.edu/pubs/pln/prncpalmntrg.pdf

Education Commission of the States. (2007). Administrator license requirements, portability, waivers and alternative certification. In *ECS StateNotes*. Denver, CO: Author. Retrieved November, 18, 2007, from http://mb2.ecs.org/reports/Report.aspx?id=859

Feldheim, M., & Johnson, G. (2004). Normative education: Putting the public servant in public service. *Global Virtue Ethics Review, 5*(3), 7-29. Retrieved November 26, 2006, from ProQuest database.

Fenwick, L. T., & Pierce, M. C. (2001). *The principal shortage: Crisis or opportunity?* (10th ed., Vol. 2) Retrieved July 7, 2007, from Australian Primary Principals Association Web site: http://appa.asn.au/cms/uploads/gold/ the%20principal%20shortage%20v2%20no%2010%dec%202001.doc

Field, M. (2003, Fall). Uncommon principals. *Johns Hopkins Professional Studies, 4*, 1-6. Retrieved March 14, 2007, from http://www.spsbe.jhu.edu/professional/ archives/mag2003/principals1.cfm

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

Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2007). *Educational research: An introduction* (8th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon. (Original work published 1963)

Girard, S. H. (2000). Servant leadership qualities exhibited by Illinois public school district superintendents (Doctoral dissertation, Saint Louis University, 2000). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 61*(5), 1690. Retrieved December 2, 2006, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database.

Graseck, P. (2005). Where's the ministry in administration? Attending to the souls of our schools. *Phi Delta Kappan, 86*, 373-378. Retrieved November 19, 2006, from ProQuest database.

Greenleaf, R. K. (2002). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press. (Original work published 1977)

Greenleaf, R. K. (2003). *The servant-leader within: A transformative path*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.

Guterman, J. (2007). *Where have all the principals gone*? Retrieved July 6, 2007, from The George Lucas Education Foundation Web site: http://?/?www.edutopia.org/?node/?3879/?print

Hale, E. L., & Moorman, H. N. (2003). *Preparing school principals: A national perspective on policy and program innovations*. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership.

Hebert, S. C. (2004). The relationship of perceived servant leadership and job satisfaction from the follower's perspective (Doctoral dissertation, Capella University, 2003). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 64*(11), 4118. Retrieved December 2, 2006, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database.

Herman, D. V., & Marlowe, M. (2005). Modeling meaning in life: The teacher as servant leader. *Reclaiming Children and Youth, 14*(3), 175-178. Retrieved November 26, 2006, from ProQuest database.

Hesse, H. (1970). *Journey to the east*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux. (Original work published 1956)

Hessel, K., & Holloway, J. (2002). *A framework for school leaders: Linking the ISLLC standards to practice*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Hunter, J. C. (2004). *The world's most powerful leadership principle: How to become a servant leader*. New York: Crown Business.

Irving, J. A. (2005). Servant leadership and the effectiveness of teams (Doctoral dissertation, Regent University, 2005). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 66*(4), 1421. Retrieved October 29, 2007, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database.

Jennings, D. B. (2002). Those who would lead must first serve: The praxis of servant leadership by public school principals (Doctoral dissertation, The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 2002). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 63*(4), 1207. Retrieved December 6, 2006, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database.

Kahl, J., & Donelan, T. (2004). *Leading from the heart: Choosing to be a servant leader*. Westlake, OH: Jack Kahl and Associates.

King, M. L. (2004). *I have seen the promised land.* Retrieved March, 3, 2008, from Creighton University Web site: http://www.creighton.edu/mlk/speeches/promised.html

Knicker, C. M. (1999). The elementary school principal as servant leader (Doctoral dissertation, University of St. Thomas Minnesota, 1998). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 59*(11), 4020. Retrieved December 4, 2006, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database.

Kouzes, J. M., Posner, B. Z., Maxwell, J. C., McAllister-Wilson, D., Lencioni, P., Ortberg, N., et al. (2004). *Christian reflections on the leadership challenge* (J. M. Kouzes & B. Z. Posner, Eds.). San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Krathwohl, D. R. (2004). *Methods of educational and social science research: An integrated approach*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, Inc. (Original work published 1998)

Lambert, W. E. (2005). Servant leadership qualities of principals, organizational climate, and student achievement: A correlational study (Doctoral dissertation, Nova Southeastern University, 2004). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 66*(2), 430. Retrieved December 2, 2006, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database.

Laub, J. A. (1999). Assessing the servant organization: Development of the servant organizational leadership assessment (SOLA) instrument (Doctoral dissertation, Florida Atlantic University, 1999). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 60*, 308. Retrieved March 13, 2007, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database.

Laub, J. (2003, August). *From paternalism to the servant organization: Expanding the organizational leadership assessment (OLA) model*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of Servant Leadership Research Roundtable, Virginia Beach, VA.

Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

McGee-Cooper, A., & Looper, G. (2001). *The essentials of servant-leadership: Principles in practice*. Waltham, MA: Pegasus Communications, Inc.

Miears, L. D. (2005). Servant-leadership and job satisfaction: A correlational study in Texas education agency region X public schools (Doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University, 2004). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 65*(9), 3237. Retrieved February 24, 2007, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database.

NAESP. (2003). *NAESP fact sheet on the principal shortage*. Alexandria, VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals. Retrieved November 22, 2007, from

NAESP Web site: http://www.naesp.org/ContentLoad.do?contentId=1097/
.&action=print

NAESP. (2007). *Where have all the principals gone*. Alexandria, VA: National
Association of Elementary School Principals. Retrieved July 6, 2007, from
NAESP Web site: http://naesp.typepad.com/blog/principal_shortage/index.html

Newman, J. H. (2006). *God has created me*. Retrieved November 11, 2007, from
Ascension Catholic Community Web site: http://ascensioncatholic.net/lectionary/
CycleA/reflection/Ordinary25A.html

North Carolina Principals and Assistant Principals Association (2007). *School based
administrator shortage.* Retrieved July 6, 2007, from
http://www.ncpapa.org/iaprincipalshortage.html

Norton, M. (2003). Let's keep our quality school principals on the job. *The High School
Journal, 86*(2), 50-56. Retrieved November 19, from ProQuest database.

Ohio Department of Education (2006). *Alternative licensure for administrators.*
Retrieved July 6, 2007, from http://www.ode.state.oh.us/GD/Templates/Pages
/ODE/ODE Detail.aspx?page=3& TopicRelationID =563&ContentID=
4980&Content=26262

Ohio Department of Education (2007). *Fact sheet.* Retrieved May 30, 2007, from
http://www.ode.state.oh.us/GD/Templates/Pages/ODE/ODEDetail.aspx?page=3&
TopicRelationID=1367&ContentID=30198&Content=30200

Ohio Department of Taxation (2007). *Ohio public school district numbers.* Retrieved
June 24, 2007, from http://tax.ohio.gov/divisions/school_district_income/
documents/school_district_list_ 2004.pdf

OLAgroup. (2007). *OLAgroup.* Retrieved June 24, 2007, from: http://www.olagroup.com

Page, D., & Wong., P. T. P. (1998). *Servant leadership profile - revised*. Retrieved April
13, 2007, from Trinity Western University Web site: http://www.twu.ca/
academics/graduate/leadership/servant-leadership/self-assessment.aspx

Patterson, K. A. (2003). Servant leadership: A theoretical model (Doctoral dissertation,
Regent University, 2003). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 64*(2), 570.
Retrieved July 10, 2007, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database.

Principals leaving New York City in droves. (2006, May 27). *New York Times*, pp. 1-2.
Retrieved March 14, 2007, from http://schoolsmatter.blogspot.com/2006/05/
principals-leaving-new-york-city-in.html

ProQuest Information, & Learning. (2006, June 12). *Job satisfaction analysis tops ProQuest's best-selling dissertations of 2005*. Ann Arbor, MI: ProQuest Company. Retrieved November 27, 2006, from http://www.proquest.com/pressroom/pressrelease/06/20060612b.shtml

The Robert K. Greenleaf Center for Service-Leadership. (2002). *Greenleaf Center for servant-leadership.* Web site retrieved April 19, 2007, from: http://www.greenleaf.org/

The Robert K. Greenleaf Center. (2007). *The servant leader: Newsletter of the Robert K. Greenleaf Center* (Winter). Westfield, IN: The Robert K. Greenleaf Center. Retrieved December 13, 2007, from The Robert K. Greenleaf Center Web site: http://www.greanleaf.org/ServantLeader_Winter07.pdf

Ross, D. B. (2007). Perceptions of the evidence of a servant leadership culture among educators in the p-12 school system in the North American Division of Seventh-day Adventists (Doctoral dissertation, Andrews University, 2006). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 67*(9). Retrieved April 14, 2007, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database.

Rude, W. J. (2006). The connection between servant leadership and burnout (Master's thesis, Trinity Western University, 2004). *Masters Abstracts International, 44*(6). Retrieved February 24, 2007, from ProQuest database.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (2005). *Strengthening the heartbeat: Leading and learning together in schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Spears, L. C., & Lawrence, M. (Eds.). (2004). *Practicing servant leadership: Succeeding through trust, bravery, and forgiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

SPSS Inc. (2007). *SPSS.* Web site retrieved June 24, 2007, from: http://www.spss.com

Stramba, L. (2003). Servant leadership practices. *The Community College Enterprise, 9*(2), 103. Retrieved November 26, 2006, from ProQuest database.

Strickland, S. (2006). Not for-profit organizational leaders' self-perception of servant leadership characteristics (Doctoral dissertation, Capella University, 2006). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 67*(1), 265. Retrieved April 14, 2007, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database.

Tate, T. (2003). Servant leadership for schools and youth programs. *Reclaiming Children and Youth, 12*(1), 33-39. Retrieved November 26, 2006, from ProQuest database.

Taylor, T. A. (2002). Examination of leadership practices of principals identified as servant leaders (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri - Columbia, 2002). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 63*(5), 1661. Retrieved December 4, 2006, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database.

Taylor-Gillham, D. J. (1999). Images of servant leadership in education (Doctoral dissertation, Northern Arizona University, 1998). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 59*(7), 2288. Retrieved March 13, 2007, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database.

Thompson, C. H. (2006). The public school superintendent and servant leadership (Doctoral dissertation, Edgewood College, 2005). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 66*(9). Retrieved December 6, 2006, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database.

Thompson, R. S. (2004). The perception of servant leadership characteristics and job satisfaction in a church-related college (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana State University, 2002). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 64*(8), 2738. Retrieved March 13, 2007, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database.

U. S. Department of Education. (2007). *ED.gov.* Web site retrieved December 19, 2007, from: http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/index.html.

VanTassell, M. (2007). Called to serve: Servant-leadership perceptions at a Franciscan-sponsored university correlated with job satisfaction (Doctoral dissertation, Capella University, 2006). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 67*(8). Retrieved April 14, 2007, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database.

Walker, L. A. (2004). Phenomenological profiles of selected Illinois public-school superintendents as servant leaders (Doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 2003). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 64*(12), 4308. Retrieved December 4, 2006, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database.

The Wallace Foundation. (2007). *Stanford report outlines common elements of highly effective school principal training and development programs.* Washington, DC: Stanford University. Retrieved November 22, 2007, from The Wallace Foundation Web site: http://?/?seli.stanford.edu/?research/?documents/?sls_final_report_pr.pdf

Walsh, K., & Jacobs, S. (2007). *Alternative certification isn't alternative* (September). Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Institute.

Washington, R. R. (2007). Empirical relationships among servant, transformational, and transactional leadership: Similarities, differences, and correlations with job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 68*(5). Retrieved October 29, 2007, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database.

Washington, R. R., Sutton, C. D., & Feild, H. S. (2006). Individual differences in servant leadership: The roles of values and personality. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 27*, 700-716. Retrieved November 26, 2006, from ProQuest database.

Wheatley, M. J. (2002). Spirituality in turbulent times. *School Administrator, 59*(8), 42. Retrieved December 12, 2006, from ProQuest database.

Wheatley, M. J. (2007). *Finding our way: Leadership for an uncertain time*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc. (Original work published 2005)

Wong, P. T. P., & Davey, D. (2007, July). *Best practices in servant leadership*. Paper presented at the Servant Leadership Research Roundtable, Virginia Beach, VA. Retrieved November 2, 2007, from Regent University Web site: http:// www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/sl_proceedings/2007/wong-davey.pdf

Appendix A

Organizational Leadership Assessment

Organizational Leadership Assessment - Educational Version

(© James Alan Laub, 1998)

General Instructions

The purpose of this instrument is to allow schools to discover how their leadership practices and beliefs impact the different ways people function within the school. This instrument is designed to be taken by people at all levels of the organization including teachers/staff, managers and school leadership. As you respond to the different statements, please answer as to what you believe is generally true about your school or school unit. Please respond with your own personal feelings and beliefs and not those of others, or those that others would want you to have. Respond as to how things *are* … not as they could be, or should be.

Feel free to use the full spectrum of answers (from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree). You will find that some of the statements will be easy to respond to while others may require more thought. If you are uncertain, you may want to answer with your first, intuitive response. Please be honest and candid. The response we seek is the one that most closely represents your feelings or beliefs about the statement that is being considered. There are three different sections to this instrument. Carefully read the brief instructions that are given prior to each section. Your involvement in this assessment is anonymous and confidential.

IMPORTANT ….. please complete the following

School being assessed:_____

Name of your work unit:_____

Indicate **your present role/position** in the school. Please **circle one**.

       1 = School Leadership (top level of leadership)

       2 = Management (supervisor, manager)

       3 = Teacher/Staff (member, worker)

Please provide your response to each statement by placing an **X** in <u>one</u> of the five boxes

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	**Strongly Agree**

Section 1   In this section, please respond to each statement as you believe it applies to **the entire school** including teachers/staff, managers/supervisors and school leadership.

In general, people within this school ….

		1	2	3	4	5
1	Trust each other					
2	Are clear on the key goals of the school					
3	Are non-judgmental – they keep an open mind					
4	Respect each other					
5	Know where this school is headed in the future					
6	Maintain high ethical standards					
7	Work well together in teams					
8	Value differences in culture, race & ethnicity					
9	Are caring & compassionate towards each other					
10	Demonstrate high integrity & honesty					
11	Are trustworthy					
12	Relate well to each other					
13	Attempt to work with others more than working on their own					
14	Are held accountable for reaching work goals					
15	Are aware of the needs of others					
16	Allow for individuality of style and expression					
17	Are encouraged by supervisors to share in making *important* decisions					
18	Work to maintain positive working relationships					
19	Accept people as they are					
20	View conflict as an opportunity to learn & grow					
21	Know how to get along with people					

Please provide your response to each statement by placing an **X** in <u>one </u>of the five boxes

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	**Strongly Agree**

<u>**Section 2**</u>   In this next section, please respond to each statement as you believe it applies to the **leadership** of the school including managers/supervisors and school leadership

Managers/Supervisors and the School Leadership in this School	1	2	3	4	5
22 Communicate a clear vision of the future of the school					
23 Are open to learning from those who are *below* them in the organization					
24 Allow teachers/staff to help determine where this school is headed					
25 Work in collaboration with teachers/staff, not separate from them					
26 Use persuasion to influence others instead of coercion or force					
27 Don't hesitate to provide the leadership that is needed					
28 Promote open communication and sharing of information					
29 Empower teachers/staff to make *important* decisions					
30 Provide the support and resources needed to help teachers/staff meet their goals					
31 Create an environment that encourages learning					
32 Are open to receiving criticism & challenge from others					
33 Say what they mean, and mean what they say					
34 Encourage each person to exercise leadership					
35 Admit personal limitations & mistakes					
36 Encourage people to take risks even if they may fail					
37 Practice the same behavior they expect from others					
38 Facilitate the building of community & team collaboration					
39 Do not demand special recognition for being leaders					
40 Lead by example by modeling appropriate behavior					
41 Seek to influence others from a positive relationship rather than from the authority of their position					
42 Provide opportunities for all teachers/staff to develop to their full potential					
43 Honestly evaluate themselves before seeking to evaluate others					
44 Use their power and authority to benefit the teachers/staff					
45 Take appropriate action when it is needed					

Please provide your response to each statement by placing an **X** in <u>one</u> of the five boxes

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	**Strongly Agree**

Managers/Supervisors and the School Leadership in this School	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
46 Build people up through encouragement and affirmation					
47 Encourage teachers/staff to work *together* rather than competing against each other					
48 Are humble – they do not promote themselves					
49 Communicate clear plans & goals for the school					
50 Provide mentor relationships in order to help people grow professionally					
51 Are accountable & responsible to others					
52 Are receptive listeners					
53 Do not seek after special status or the "perks" of leadership					
54 Put the needs of the teachers/staff ahead of their own					

Section 3 In this next section, please respond to each statement as you believe it is true about **you personally** and **your role** in the organization (or organizational unit).

In viewing my own role …	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
55 I feel appreciated by my principal for what I contribute					
56 I am working at a high level of productivity					
57 I am listened to by those *above* me in the school					
58 I feel good about my contribution to the school					
59 I receive encouragement and affirmation from those *above* me in the school					
60 My job is important to the success of this school					
61 I trust the leadership of this school					
62 I enjoy working in this school					
63 I am respected by those *above* me in the school					
64 I am able to be creative in my job					
65 In this school, a person's *work* is valued more than their *title*					
66 I am able to use my best gifts and abilities in my job					

(© James Alan Laub, 1998, used by permission)

Demographic Questions

Gender: Female _____   Male_____

Total years of experience in the field of education: _____

Total years in current educational position: _____

Total years you plan to continue working in the educational profession:_____

Reason you plan to leave the field of education:_____

Appendix B

Cover Letter to Superintendent to Obtain District Permission for Study

Dissertation Study

Northcentral University
10000 East University Drive
Prescott Valley, Arizona 86314

Researcher: Sandra N. Svoboda,
Principal
Lancaster, Ohio 43130
(740) 687-7352
ssvoboda001@columbus.rr.com

Superintendent Name
Superintendent
School District
Street Address
City, OH Zip Code

Date

Dear _____:

Your district was randomly selected to participate in a dissertation research project titled, *A Correlational Study of Servant Leadership and Elementary Principal Job Satisfaction in Ohio Public School Districts.*

As a fellow Ohio educator, I understand that your time is extremely valuable. However, it is anticipated that this study may reveal important information regarding ways to retain and attract educators in the state of Ohio.

Please read the enclosed Informed Consent Form and, if you agree for your district to participate in this study, simply sign and return the form in the enclosed self-addressed envelope. Sometime in the spring 2008, the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) questionnaire will be mailed to you. The OLA should only take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

An Informed Consent Form and OLA questionnaire will also be mailed to your district's elementary principal(s) and teachers at the same time in the spring 2008.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (740) 687-7352 or ssvoboda001@columbus.rr.com.

Thank you for your willingness to participate in this important study.

Sincerely,

Sandra N. Svoboda, Doctoral Candidate
Elementary Principal, Medill Elementary
Director of Special Education, Lancaster City Schools
OAESA Member

Appendix C

Cover Letter to Invite Superintendent to Participate in the Study

Dissertation Study

Northcentral University   Researcher: Sandra N. Svoboda,
10000 East University Drive   Principal
Prescott Valley, Arizona 86314   Lancaster, Ohio 43130
                                                 (740) 687-7352
                                                 ssvoboda001@columbus.rr.com

Superintendent Name
Superintendent
School District
Street Address
City, OH Zip Code

                                   Date

Dear _____:

Thank you for returning the Informed Consent Form to participate in the dissertation research project, *A Correlational Study of Servant Leadership and Elementary Principal Job Satisfaction in Ohio Public School Districts.* A copy of your previously signed Informed Consent Form is enclosed for you to keep. As previously stated in the initial contact letter, your district was randomly selected to participate in this study.

Your time is highly valued, and the attached Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) should only take approximately 15 minutes to complete. As a fellow Ohio educator, I understand your time is extremely limited. However, it is hoped that this study will reveal important information regarding ways to retain and attract educators in the state of Ohio.

Please complete the enclosed OLA questionnaire, and return it in the enclosed self-addressed envelope by _____. Informed Consent Forms and OLA questionnaires were also mailed to your district's elementary principal(s) and teachers. It is critically important that data be collected from all district levels including superintendents, principals and teachers.

If you have any questions, or if you would like a written copy of the research study, please feel free to contact me at (740) 687-7352 or ssvoboda001@columbus.rr.com.

Thank you again for your willingness to participate in this important study.

Sincerely,

Sandra N. Svoboda, Doctoral Candidate
Elementary Principal, Medill Elementary
Director of Special Education, Lancaster City Schools
OAESA Member

Appendix D

Cover Letter to Invite Principal and Teachers to Participate in Study

Dissertation Study

Northcentral University	Researcher: Sandra N. Svoboda,
10000 East University Drive	Principal
Prescott Valley, Arizona 86314	Lancaster, Ohio 43130
	(740) 687-7352
	ssvoboda001@columbus.rr.com

Date

Dear Ohio Colleague,

Superintendent _____ has agreed for your district to participate in the research study, *A Correlational Study of Servant Leadership and Elementary Principal Job Satisfaction in Ohio Public School Districts.* Your district was randomly selected to participate in this study.

Your time is highly valued, and the attached Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) should only take approximately 15 minutes to complete. As a fellow Ohio educator, I understand that your time is extremely limited. However, it is hoped that this study will reveal important information regarding ways to retain and attract educators in the state of Ohio.

Please read the Informed Consent Form, which is yours to keep, and it will reveal to you that your information will be kept completely anonymous. No individual names will be collected, nor will school district names be revealed in this study.

If you are willing to participate in this study, please complete the enclosed OLA questionnaire and return it in the enclosed self-addressed envelope by _____. It is critically important that data be collected from all district levels including superintendents, principals and teachers.

If you have any questions, or if you would like a written copy of the research study, please feel free to contact me at (740) 687-7352 or ssvoboda001@columbus.rr.com.

Thank you for your time, and for your willingness to consider participating in this important study.

Sincerely,

Sandra N. Svoboda, Doctoral Candidate
Elementary Principal, Medill Elementary
Director of Special Education, Lancaster City Schools
OAESA Member

Appendix E

Informed Consent Form School District Superintendent

Informed Consent Form – School District Superintendent

A Correlational Study of Servant Leadership and Elementary Principal Job Satisfaction in Ohio Public School Districts

Purpose – Your district is invited to participate in a research study being conducted for a dissertation for Northcentral University in Prescott Valley, Arizona. The purpose of this study is to examine if there is a correlation between the presence of servant leadership in organizations and elementary principal job satisfaction levels. Principal shortages are increasing, and it is important to better understand this phenomenon. Servant leadership, a concept introduced by Robert K. Greenleaf in the 1970s, must be analyzed at all levels in the organization including the perceptions of the superintendent, elementary principals and teachers. There is no deception in this study. This study is only intended to measure opinions about the presence of servant leadership and job satisfaction in your school organization.

Participation Requirements – The superintendent, elementary principals, and elementary teachers will be asked to complete the 66 item Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) questionnaire, which should take approximately 15 minutes.

Research Personnel – The following person is involved in this research project, and may be contacted at any time: Sandra Svoboda, Elementary Principal and OAESA member, Medill Elementary, 1151 James Rd., Lancaster, Ohio, 43130, (740) 687-7352.

Potential Risk/ Discomfort – Although there are no known risks in this study, some of the information may be viewed as personally sensitive related to the school organization or personal job satisfaction. Participants may withdraw at any time and may choose <u>not</u> to answer any question that they feel uncomfortable answering.

Potential Benefit – There are no direct benefits to your district for participating in this research project. No incentives are offered. However, the results will have scientific interest that may eventually have benefits for educators regarding possible ways to increase job satisfaction levels.

Anonymity/ Confidentiality – The data collected in this study are confidential. All data are coded such that your school district will not be associated with them. In addition, the coded data will be only available to the researcher associated with this project. No names will be collected.

Right to Withdraw – Your district has the right to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. Participants may omit any questions on the questionnaire they do not wish to answer.

Signatures
I have read the above description of the proposed study and understand the conditions of the district personnel's participation. I understand the data will be coded to keep school district information together, and will not be used in any way to later identify the school district or me personally. My signature indicates that I agree for myself and the district personnel to participate in this study.

Superintendent's Name:_____ Researcher's Name:__Sandra N. Svoboda
Superintendent's Signature:_____ Researcher's Signature:_____
Date:_____

(Adapted from Northcentral University Dissertation Handbook, 2007)

Appendix F

Informed Consent Form Elementary Principals and Teachers

Informed Consent Form – Elementary Principals and Teachers

A Correlational Study of Servant Leadership and Elementary Principal Job Satisfaction in Ohio Public School Districts

Purpose - You are invited to participate in a research study being conducted for a dissertation for Northcentral University in Prescott Valley, Arizona. Your superintendent's permission has already been obtained. The purpose of this study is to examine if there is a correlation between the presence of servant leadership in organizations and elementary principal job satisfaction levels. Principal shortages are increasing, and it is important to better understand this phenomenon. Servant leadership, a concept introduced by Robert K. Greenleaf in the 1970s, must be analyzed at all levels in the organization including the perceptions of the superintendent, elementary principals and elementary teachers. There is no deception in this study. This study is only intended to measure your opinions about the presence of servant leadership and job satisfaction in your organization.

Participation Requirements – You will be asked to complete the attached 66 item Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) questionnaire, which should take approximately 15 minutes.

Research Personnel – The following person is involved in this research project, and may be contacted at any time: Sandra Svoboda, Elementary Principal and OAESA member, Medill Elementary, 1151 James Rd., Lancaster, Ohio, 43130, (740) 687-7352.

Potential Risk/ Discomfort – Although there are no known risks in this study, some of the information may be viewed as personally sensitive related to the school organization or personal job satisfaction. You may withdraw at any time and may choose <u>not</u> to answer any question that you feel uncomfortable answering.

Potential Benefit – There are no direct benefits to you for participating in this research project. No incentives are offered. However, the results will have scientific interest that may eventually have benefits for educators regarding possible ways to increase job satisfaction levels.

Anonymity/ Confidentiality – The data collected in this study are confidential. All data are coded such that your school district will not be associated with them. In addition, the coded data will be only available to the researcher associated with this project. No names will be collected.

Right to Withdraw – You have the right to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. You may omit any question on the questionnaire if you do not wish to answer them.

Permission
I have read the above description of the proposed study and understand the conditions of my participation. My completion of the attached OLA questionnaire indicates that I agree to participate in this study and will reveal my positive consent. I also understand the data will be coded to keep school district information together, and will not be used in any way to later identify the school district or me personally. As a result, once the information is returned in the self-addressed envelope, it cannot be later withdrawn since it is anonymous and cannot later be traced to any individual respondents.

(Adapted from Northcentral University Dissertation Handbook, 2007)

Appendix G

Permission to Utilize and Publish the OLA

----- Original Message -----
From: Jim Laub <olagroup@comcast.net>
To: Sandra Svoboda <ssvoboda001@columbus.rr.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 28, 2007 9:03 PM
Subject: RE: Request to use OLA

I hereby grant permission for you to use the Organizational Leadership Assessment
(OLA) for the purpose of this study. I have attached a copy of the OLA that you can use
to make the copies needed for your study. I wish you well with your research.

Jim Laub, Ed.D.
OLAgroup

----- Original Message -----
From: Jim Laub <olagroup@comcast.net>
To: Sandra Svoboda <ssvoboda001@columbus.rr.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 04, 2007 8:42 PM
Subject: RE: Request to use OLA

Sandra: I am pleased to provide you with express written permission to include the OLA
scale in your published dissertation.

Jim Laub
OLAgroup