



SERVANT-LEADERSHIP

Creating a Context for Collaboration

—DANIEL VAN BRUGGE

Successful educators are chameleons. As chameleons alter their appearance to suit their environment, so too must educators change their strategies and mind-sets to adapt to changes in education (Laymon 2010). While chameleons adapt in order to blend in, educators must adapt to new surroundings to ensure that students are prepared for full entry into society. This entry must result in benefit to student and society. Schools that lack creative and collaborative leadership cannot move their schools forward to adapt as needed (Ozar 2010). There is a high correlation between collaborative school cultures and schools that are able to adapt (Meirink et al. 2010). Thus, leadership for collaboration is a highly relevant topic for our time.

One goal of leadership for collaboration is to create an environment and culture where inclusivity and collaboration are the purpose of leadership (Crippen 2010a). The increasingly complex nature of children entering our schools presents new challenges for principals. Today's principals have gone from organizing and managing a school to leading a "diverse and challenging education enterprise" (Alberta Commission on Learning [ACOL] 2003, 122). The environment has become increasingly fast-paced and complex as principals are becoming responsible for a variety of school facets (politics, security, public relations, finances, personnel, and technology). In the midst of this is the central role of the principal: that of a learning leader to increase student achievement. More and more, the ability to work collaboratively is one of the core requisites of school culture. Indeed, school collaboration is the most effective way to meet the demands of our modern students (Wiggins and Damore 2006, 49). Unfortunately, much of what passes for collaboration is simply "co-blab-oration" (DuFour, DuFour, Many, and Eaker 2010), which is at best a collegial interaction of shared storytelling. Collaboration assumes that teachers have a shared responsibility



for authority and decisions (Meirink et al. 2010). The focus needs to shift to creating the context for collaborative behaviors to naturally emerge. Indeed, the question that needs to be asked is, “How can we move away from simply leading in a collaborative manner to leading in a manner that intentionally *creates* collaboration?” The former assumes a collegial, friendly, and shared approach that can remain comfortably rooted in traditional ways of leadership. The latter requires leaders to develop new attitudes, approaches, and ways of thinking (Slater 2005).

Because societal and educational needs are continually evolving, there still exists the need for strong leadership from the principal (Cranston 2011, 60). The principal’s position means they have the most opportunity to bring about school improvement (ATA 2002, 65). Unfortunately, the training and experience of most administrators does not include purposeful leading for collaboration (Haskin 1995). Literature on leadership for collaboration is frequently explored (Coleman 2011; Collinson and Collinson 2009) but has mainly focused on leading in a collaborative style (i.e., involving custodians in custodial decisions and teachers in classroom decisions). Many principals struggle with this since it involves skills that their training and experience have not provided to them (ATA 2002, 63). Slater (2005) focused on the “heart” of collaboration. This is the set of leadership behaviors that create the context for collaboration (thus, leadership *for* collaboration). These leadership behaviors involve communicating effectively, modeling the way, and valuing people. Her findings resonate with Crippen’s (2010b) observation that leadership, at its core, is all about relationships. In short, collaboration and leadership rise and fall on the relationship between the leaders and the led.

This paper will pursue the argument that servant-leadership offers the best opportunity of creating a truly collaborative school-culture since servant-leadership theory promotes the three key behaviors that are the foundation of collaboration: communicating effectively, modeling the way, and valuing people. First, I will define the central terms related to collaboration and servant-leadership. Second, a review of the appropriate literature will reveal a significant gap in the literature, which this article attempts to fill. Third, Robert K. Greenleaf’s (1977) original writings on servant-leadership will be explored in the context of Slater’s (2005) research on collaboration. This exploration will show how servant-leadership promotes collaboration. Before concluding with the benefits of a servant-leadership approach and suggestions for future research, I will offer several suggestions on how practitioners can incorporate servant-leadership into their practice.



DEFINING COLLABORATION AND SERVANT-LEADERSHIP:
A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Collaboration

The term *collaboration* has a tenuous hold on its territory, and its precise definition shifts easily. Laymon (2010) gave an overly broad definition of collaboration, describing education as inherently collaborative because of the large variety of stakeholders. Collaboration is voluntary and based on mutual goals. More explicitly, collaboration is “a system of planned, cooperative activities where [educators] share roles and responsibilities for student learning” (Wiggins and Damore 2006, 49). Meirink et al. (2010) added to this definition by incorporating group accountability and decision making. Slater viewed collaboration as fully developed when educators begin to act responsibly for their own (personal and group) professional growth. They no longer depend upon the principal who, in a collaborative culture, has become a “supporter, reinforcer, and facilitator” (Slater 2005, 322).

The literature generally revealed a tendency among authors to place collaboration within a framework—to make the concept more understandable. What DuFour et al. (2010) called co-blaboration, Meirink et al. termed solely a “collegial interaction of storytelling” (Meirink et al. 2010, 164). Interdependence gradually increased from this level to an “aid and assistance” level, a “sharing” level, and finally a “joint work” level—the highest order of collaboration. Wiggins and Damore (2006) described collaboration in terms of a positive attitude, a team process, and professional development. These frameworks are mainly helpful in understanding the developmental levels of collaboration but do not provide guidance on how to progress from one level to the next. Slater (2005) understood that the style of leadership necessary to create collaboration was not consistent with the training and experience of most administrators and so framed successful collaboration in terms of: (1) modeling the way, (2) communicating effectively, and (3) valuing people. Successful and effective collaboration is dependent on the extent to which administrators display these three behaviors (Slater 2005). In the third major section of this paper, I will show that a servant-leadership approach naturally develops these behaviors.

Leadership for collaboration is also linked to relationship building and emotional intelligence. Slater (2005) based her work on the understanding that relationships are the building blocks of collaboration. She found that the principals that most effectively fostered collaboration did so in a human, relational approach. Without high-quality relationships, the collaborative



process will be rendered ineffective (Wiggins and Damore 2006, 49). Leadership for collaboration is not a “peaceful, rational process” (Slater 2005, 331) and leaders must display high levels of emotional intelligence to foster collaboration. Sergiovanni described leadership for collaboration as rooted in “covenantal relationships...planted in the hearts” (Sergiovanni 2004, 51) of participants. A collaborative principal will be more facilitative, democratic, and caring; giving everybody voice (Crippen 2011). Greenleaf (1977), described the servant-leader as *primus inter pares* or “first among equals.” This phrase neatly places servant-leadership at the nexus between educational leadership and successful collaboration.

SERVANT-LEADERSHIP

Robert K. Greenleaf, who coined the term *servant-leadership* and wrote extensively about its nature, provided this definition:

The servant-leader is servant first. It begins with a 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, and 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? (Greenleaf 1977, 7)

Servant-leaders seek to engage others in leadership in an ethical and caring manner to support the growth of colleagues and the organization (Spears 2010). Ten characteristics of the servant-leader are: listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community (Spears 2010).

As part of the increasing number of leadership studies that focus on the relationship between the leader and led, Van Dierendonck (2011) indicated that servant-leadership is gaining credibility and widespread acceptance. Earlier, transformational leadership theory was quite popular and considered to be a dominant theory for many years (Rainey and Watson 1996). It was a theory that was focused on the development and growth of followers but yet the primary loyalty of the leader was to the organization (Graham 1991). Servant-leadership, on the other hand, was distinguished by Patterson (2003) as an extension of transformational leadership. While



both are interested in the growth of their followers, transformational leaders focus on encouraging better employee performance for the sake of the organization. Servant-leaders focus on their followers by creating conditions so that the followers' well-being will be improved. Servant-leaders trust their followers to do what is right for the organization. Servant-leaders are oriented to their follower's needs and transformational leaders are more oriented to organizational goals. Thus, leadership behaviors that are entirely focused on the well being of others are natural to servant-leadership theory but unexplainable from a transformational leadership construct (Patterson 2003, 2; Van Dierendonck 2011, 1235).

Wong (cited in Taylor et al. 2007), echoed servant-leadership in his definition of collaboration. He expressed that educators must collaborate in response to today's changing educational environment. To do this requires humility and integrity. Leaders need to accurately assess their own strengths and weaknesses; stepping forward when required or aside when recognizing that others have the answers. This definition particularly resonates with Greenleaf's original concept of *primus inter pares*. Dr. Carolyn Crippen, who has written extensively on servant-leadership in education, agreed that servant-leadership was essentially about collaboration. For her, it was about colleagues coming "together with a common purpose and [pulling] together with their strengths" (personal communication, November 7, 2011).

Regrettably, servant-leadership is "virtually missing from the mainstream conversation on educational leadership" (Sergiovanni 2000, 273). Crippen (2005a, 2005b, 2006, 2010a, 2010b) serves as an exception to this. Greenleaf did not intend for the educational voice to be silent and wrote especially to educators, teachers and principals alike:

Many teachers have sufficient latitude in dealing with students that they could, on their own, help nurture the servant-leader potential, which I believe, is latent to some degree in every young person. Could not many respected teachers speak those few words that might change the course of life, or give it new purpose? (Greenleaf 1977, 5)

Senge (1995) suggested that servant-leadership in education opened up a new and much-needed caring paradigm of leadership because of its focus on relationship and service to others. Black (2008) discovered a strong positive relationship between servant-leadership and school climate. DuFour (2001) noticed that principals who embrace a servant-leader approach will create a school culture where people work with a shared vision on their collective commitments to their community. Servant-leadership is emerging as a viable



(Crippen 2005a), sustainable (Black 2008), and needed (Senge 1995) model of educational leadership.

Overall, a significant gap appeared in the servant-leadership literature relating to education. Similarly, there is an abundance of literature that describes effective collaboration. There is little available on the type of leadership needed to create the conditions that foster collaborative behavior. As the literature has revealed that servant-leadership is all about relationships (Crippen 2010b) and that effective collaboration is rooted in relationships (Slater 2005), the remainder of this paper seeks to bridge the gap that has so far existed between servant-leadership theory and leadership for collaboration.

THE CONNECTION BETWEEN SERVANT-LEADERSHIP AND COLLABORATION

Servant-leadership literature and theory suggest a strong connection to the theory and literature on the presence of relationships as a necessary condition for collaboration. What follows is an explanation of servant-leadership theory presented within the framework of three principal behaviors deemed necessary for collaboration to thrive. Spears's (2010) ten characteristics of servant-leadership theory serve as a basis for this explanation.

Communication Skills

Active Listening

Excellent communication skills are necessary to foster collaboration. By adopting a listening approach rather than a telling approach, the servant-leader encourages diversity in voice (Greenleaf 1977). A culture of collaboration can be built through dialogue and inquiry (Kennedy, Deuel, Holmlund Nelson, and Slavitt 2011). Greenleaf's (1977) original writings on servant-leadership place a distinct emphasis on active listening as a characteristic of servant-leadership. This involves an automatic response from the leader to always listen first. Active listening—listening to really understand the level of meaning that the speaker wants us to receive—will build strength in other people and enable them to become better collaborators (Greenleaf 1977). Those listened to are encouraged to more effort, problem solving, and appropriate risk taking (Crippen 2005a). The best way to communicate that one is open to collaboration is to engage in active listening.



Empathy

There is a strong relationship between collaborative cultures and the presence of empathy (Slater 2005). According to Greenleaf (1977), empathy requires a conscious effort to understand the experiences of another and requires us to unreservedly accept people for who they are. Importantly, Crippen (2006) clarified that this empathy must be supportive rather than patronizing and insistent on high standards. When leaders emphasize and accept others, they become trusted. Trust builds collaboration. As those empathized with “grow taller” they ultimately become better collaborators (Greenleaf 1977). In short, we must not be efficient with people, but effective.

Modeling The Way

Awareness

Greenleaf (1977) ultimately pointed to the leadership characteristic of awareness as the frame that surrounds everything else the leader does. Awareness keeps a leader alert, preventing complacency and making one a more effective leader. Greenleaf goes so far as to say that awareness is a prerequisite for leadership. Awareness allows the leader to face the future and gives them a way, even in times of crisis, to still think rationally about an issue. More generally, awareness involves accurate self-assessment skills and a healthy sense of self-worth (Goleman 1998). One’s true voice comes forward, permitting the leader to be appropriately vulnerable to others while remaining secure. Visibly, this happens when a leader presents an idea to their colleagues and is open to critique. This cannot be done in a token or patronizing way since through their actions, leaders send a signal of who they are and what they expect of others regarding collaboration (Kouzes and Posner 2003). This self-knowledge and willingness to be open fosters collaboration as leaders model when to step forward to lead and when to step back to let others lead.

Conceptualizing

Greenleaf (1977) indicates that leadership in the sense of trailblazing is not so much an operational concept as it is a conceptual one. Yet, if the conceptual



vision is not clearly seen in operation—if the leader does not “walk the talk”—trust and relationships will suffer. This will negatively impact the ability and willingness of all participants to act collaboratively (Starratt cited in Crippen 2005b). Modeling the way requires integrity and a depth of moral character—something that Sergiovanni (2000) said is always found in exceptional servant-leaders and is impossible to fake. At best, the conceptualizing servant-leader is a persuader and a relationship builder (Greenleaf 1977). Thus, the strength of this leadership characteristic is that it prepares the mind and attitude of staff and teachers to be oriented toward collaboration.

Foresight

To be an effective leader requires the ability to evaluate, analyze, and to foresee future contingencies. Greenleaf expressed that foresight is a very important part of modeling the way. This foresight—a better than average guess as to what is going to happen in the future—is the “lead” that a leader possesses (Greenleaf 1977, 18). The amount of foresight required by a leader bears a proportional relationship to the amount of organizational responsibility one bears. Therefore, Greenleaf recommends that leaders, when faced with decisions, “lose the moment” (*ibid.*, 14) while remaining concerned, responsible, effective, and value-oriented. By viewing today’s decisions in the “long sweep of history” (*ibid.*) principals can remove barriers to effective collaboration. Foresight is crucial to leadership development. As leader, one can encounter a seemingly unavoidable ethical compromise when in reality, it could have been realistically avoided earlier with appropriate foresight and action. Experience contributes significantly to the development of this skill (Crippen 2010b). Indeed, good judgment comes from experience, and experience rises from poor judgment. Modeling the way includes leading by example in times of good and poor judgment alike. This fosters collaboration as staff members learn appropriate responses to failure and become more willing and creative risk takers; thereby fostering their own foresight skills.

Persuasion

A servant-leader also models the way by employing persuasion. Ultimately, a servant-leader seeks to convince rather than coerce (Crippen 2010b). Through skilful consensus building, a servant-leader can



persuade and convince others to take a certain course of action as if it was their own idea in the first place (ibid.). Persuasion is at work when a leader models effectively; when their actions speak louder than words. Thus, transparent, fair, and consistent action by the leader to include staff, parents, and students in the decision-making process of the school will demonstrate that the leader is serious about collaboration.

Valuing People

I have so far explained servant-leadership characteristics in the context of (1) communication skills, and (2) modeling the way. What follows is the application of servant-leadership theory to the third principal behavior: valuing people. It is a key part of the connection between servant-leadership theory and the literature that suggests the presence of high quality relationships as a requirement for collaboration. This is likely the most visible aspect of servant-leadership, leading Wright (2009) to redefine servant-leadership as relational leadership. Slater (2005) defines this behavior as the leader listening to what teachers have to say and actually using this feedback to solve problems and make decisions. By valuing their contribution and focusing on the interdependent nature of their job, the principal fosters the collaborative process in a truly collaborative way. For servant-leaders, valuing people is not a management technique but is the primary reason they are leaders—to enable the followers to achieve their fullest potential while in service to the vision of the organization (Van Dierendonck 2011). Teachers need to “believe they are being seen, heard, approved of, and appreciated, [and this] can lead to better practice and more creative risk-taking based on the expectation that you are safe, no matter how the experiment turns out” (Slater 2005). For servant-leaders, then, one of the ultimate measures of their leadership is whether or not their followers take on the mantle of leadership.

Healing

Healing involves helping others repair emotional hurts and helps create trusting bonds. This is one servant-leadership characteristic that serves both the leader and the led (Greenleaf 1977). This includes discussing subpar performance with colleagues. In healing, the leader exercises a great deal of emotional intelligence and needs to use their emotions as a critical filter for



thinking and acting (Goleman 1998). Leaders can do their part by engaging in and promoting reflective practice. By candidly discussing what works and what does not with colleagues, healing leaders create an environment of mutual accountability for effort and results.

Stewardship

A second servant-leadership characteristic that demonstrates valuing people is stewardship—the “heart” of servant-leadership. Greenleaf (1977) possessed the belief that all members of an institution were stewards holding the institution in trust for the greater good of the community. To hold in trust means to act in such a way that is motivated by their “moral commitment to children [and] rooted in their beliefs about the significance of their roles as teachers” (Sergiovanni 2000, 270). Stewardship creates collaborative cultures. Wheatley said in Crippen: “[I]f we hear our colleagues speak about their own yearnings to make a small difference, we feel new energy for the work and for each other.” Stewardship is “accountability without control or compliance” (Crippen 2010b). Stewards are internally motivated to act in the interests of the students because it is the right and moral thing to do—not because anyone required it of them (Greenleaf 1977). Stewards find their own way to make a difference in the school. The sum of these individual parts is greater than the whole and embodies a collaborative culture.

Commitment to the Growth of People

Servant-leaders must be also committed to the academic, personal, and social development of all teachers, students, and administrators (Graham 1991; Patterson 2003). Greenleaf stated that in addition to the organizational vision, leaders must be in service to those they lead. Greenleaf believed that the success of leaders can be seen among their followers, particularly whether those who are being led are also adopting leadership roles. Fullan (2003) offered a reminder about the importance of building leadership capacity in followers. According to servant-leadership principles, truly effective leadership cannot exist outside of a collaborative approach (Fullan 2003). The very act of being committed to the growth of others is collaborative in nature. To be committed to the growth of others



requires a collaborative approach; to engage in collaboration means being committed to the growth of others.

Building Community

A truly collaborative, servant-led community means that all of the members are felt as valuable, capable, and responsible members of that community (Crippen 2011). In a collaborative community, people learn best, as they are engaged with one another, and everyone is a student and teacher at the same time. There is a “shared sense of purpose built effectively around a vision” (Wheatley 2007, 173) that still allows for individuality. A servant-leader builds community not primarily for student achievement or organizational gain, but for the sake of community itself (Sergiovanni 2004). In practice, this appears when the school resembles more a family than a business. Servant-leaders build community by engaging in acts of service to the community. The community is encouraged to move into the school through various parent groups and structures that are in place to hear and act on concerns. Greenleaf lamented the separation of the school from the broader community. Young people require “love that cannot be satisfactorily dispensed by specialized institutions that exist apart from the community” (Greenleaf 1977, 21). Slater’s (2005) study of principal behaviors showed that community-building efforts greatly enhanced the possibilities of collaboration.

Strong leadership for collaboration needs to be present. Unfortunately, education for the type of leadership that supports collaboration has not traditionally been part of principal leadership programs (ATA 2002). Principals have increasingly been required to act as CEOs of businesses where they are required to do much more than align strategies to ensure student success. They are responsible and “profoundly accountable” (ACOL 2003, 113) for public relations, policy direction, multimillion dollar budgets, school safety, staff evaluation, and teacher and student motivation. To create collaborative cultures, principals may need to develop unfamiliar talents and skills they never needed (ACOL 2003). In its report, the commission argued for a separate training program for principals. Such a program could benefit from a foundation based on servant-leadership theory as it would prepare principals to lead intentionally for collaboration. Before concluding with a summary of the benefits of such a collaborative approach, this article will discuss several ways to begin implementing servant-leadership for collaboration.



IMPLEMENTING SERVANT-LEADERSHIP FOR COLLABORATION

Attempts at collaboration are rendered ineffective if they are not accompanied by a human relational connection (Wiggins and Damore 2006). Servant-leadership adequately provides for the human relational connection but also encourages the behaviors that foster collaboration. What follows are some practical suggestions as to how collaboration can be fostered from a servant-leadership perspective. These practical suggestions should be implemented with a focus on (1) communication skills, (2) modeling the way, and (3) valuing people—all three of which have been dealt extensively in this paper.

First, a positive staff attitude needs to be established. When collaborators are sharing common goals, they need to be willing to be accountable for their own performances and for their students' progress. A positive attitude will permit them to work more effectively together to solve problems and to not be distracted from their real work. If staff are isolated, there is benefit to some "contrived collegiality" (Sergiovanni 2004) to get the collaborative process going. This can be accomplished through regularly scheduled meetings and activities, peer observations, and joint planning. Once collegiality becomes established, collaboration can begin to become increasingly interdependent.

Second, a team process needs to be developed where the focus is on distributing leadership rather than information. Leaders can foster this team approach by ensuring that meetings remain goal oriented and are structured to make people feel valued and to engage them in decisions (Wiggins and Damore 2006). This will become more defined as the principal becomes increasingly characterized as facilitator, coach, and supporter. Placing the agenda for professional development partly in the hands of teachers by having them plan and lead in-service sessions will greatly enhance teacher voice and allow them to participate in building a collaborative culture (Wiggins and Damore 2006). The development of an effective professional learning community (PLC) as defined by DuFour et al. (2010) and Sergiovanni (2004) ought to be a goal. Sick organizations really do contaminate (Slater 2005), and where no team process is evident, this pattern will perpetuate itself. Servant-leadership practices can support the development of a team process where the focus is on improving student learning (DuFour 2001; DuFour and Marzano 2011).

Third, a balance between school and individual professional development needs to be achieved. Administration can ensure that school-wide professional



development facilitates collaboration. Teacher in-service sessions can be required to demonstrate to administration specifically how their session will promote joint-work—the highest level of collaboration (Meirink et al. 2010). As teachers (as well as principals) have indicated that they are ill-prepared for collaborative work (Slater 2005), support should be provided in areas such as emotional intelligence, conflict restoration, facilitation, and team building. In this way, administration can indirectly but significantly enhance the collaborative capacity of staff.

Fourth, servant-leadership needs to be supported and fostered in administrative positions. However, it must be recognized that this shift is “an emotionally challenging feat” involving significant “role strain” (Slater 2005, 322). It is a wrong assumption to assume that principals who were effective under traditional leadership styles will continue to be effective in a collaborative style. Principals should be given the opportunity to study servant-leadership at the graduate level, or to participate in a mentoring relationship with another servant-leader (Ozar 2010). Essentially, teachers and principals alike must be given ample opportunity to see themselves as high-performing professionals (Wiggins and Damore 2006).

Lastly, resources must be provided. If principals are serious about collaboration, they ought to build weekly, or at least regular, collaboration time into the schedule. These resources include funds for appropriate off-site professional development as well as job-imbedded learning. Additionally, creative ways to employ support staff beyond the traditional means will pay off in teacher satisfaction, student performance, and increased “buy-in” from support staff (see Devecchi and Rouse 2010).

The benefits of such a collaborative approach are manifold. Teachers will receive more time to focus on their specialties and to improve their pedagogy with input from colleagues. Students will be enriched with a diversity of teaching approaches. Teachers will be motivated to stay in the profession longer with an increased period of maximum effectiveness. Teachers will have increased self-efficacy. Parents will also increasingly feel that they are a vital part of their child’s education (Wiggins and Damore 2006). Today’s educational environment is faced with a myriad of challenges (ACOL 2003, 33) that can be better met and turned to an advantage if leaders are collaborating (Thomas 2007). Indeed, servant-leadership for collaboration ensures that “no one will get diminished if we collaborate; rather, all will achieve greater strength and clarity” (Ozar 2010).



CONCLUSION

Conventional wisdom suggests that as the demands on today's principals and classroom teachers increase in complexity and number, they are better met with a collaborative approach. More importantly, research indicates that a collaborative approach can best meet the needs of today's students (Wiggins and Damore 2006). Teachers have also reported that the presence of collaboration in a classroom is a powerful condition for learning (Meirink et al. 2010). Within this context, this article has defined the terms *collaboration* and *servant-leadership* while providing a review of the relevant literature. The main part of this paper discussed how servant-leadership characteristics are able to foster collaboration by (1) communicating effectively, (2) modeling the way, and (3) valuing people. Considering the presence of high quality relationships as a prerequisite for collaboration (Slater 2005), servant-leadership provides us with an excellent model for educational leadership because of its focus on the relationship between leader and follower. After providing some suggestions for practical support, I concluded with a positive reminder about the benefits of pursuing such an approach. This article serves the body of literature well as it provides a relational connection between collaboration and leadership theory. While much of it can be effectively applied to any educational position, additional research would be welcomed. This research should focus on teacher behaviors that foster collaboration and the forms of followership that provide a similar relational connection to collaboration.

Finally, new teachers are entering the profession with an expectation to work collaboratively (Wiggins and Damore 2006). The outlook is bright as this reveals a real potential to establish a collaborative, sustainable school leadership model. Yet, collaboration is "very emotional work, where the various partners should expect to remain committed for a considerable period of time" (Emihovich and Battaglia 2000, 236). There will be fall-off in commitment and enthusiasm levels but this only requires stronger servant-leadership skills. Speaking from experience as lifetime practitioner of servant-leadership at all levels of education, Crippen (personal communication, November 7, 2011) stated, "If you truly believe in servant-leadership you have to be brave and courageous. You have to stand by it!"



WORKS CITED

- Alberta Commission on Learning. 2003. *Every Child Learns, Every Child Succeeds: Report and Recommendations*. Edmonton.
- Alberta Teachers Association. 2002. *Improving Student Learning*. Edmonton.
- Black, G. 2008. "A Correlational Analysis of Servant-Leadership and School Climate." *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice* 13 (4): 437–66.
- Coleman, A. 2011. "Towards a Blended Model of Leadership for School-Based Collaborations." *Educational Management Administration & Leadership* 39 (3): 296–316.
- Collinson, D., and M. Collinson. 2009. "'Blended Leadership': Employee Perspectives on Effective Leadership in the UK Further Education Sector." *Leadership* 5 (3): 365–80.
- Cranston, J. 2011. "Relational Trust: The Glue That Binds a Professional Learning Community." *Alberta Journal of Educational Research* 57 (1): 59–72. Retrieved from <http://ajer.synergiesprairies.ca/ajer/index.php/ajer/article/view/869>.
- 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.
- . 2005b. "The Democratic School: First to Serve, Then to Lead." *Journal of Educational Administration* (47): 1–17.
- . 2006. "Servant-Leadership: First to Serve, Then to Lead." *International Journal of Learning* 13 (1): 13–19.
- . 2010a. "Inclusive Education: A Servant-Leadership Perspective." *Education Canada* 45 (4): 19–22.
- . 2010b. "Serve, Teach, and Lead: It's All about Relationships." *InSight: A Journal of Scholarly Teaching* 5: 27–37. Retrieved from <http://www.insightjournal.net/Volume5/ServeTeachLeadRelationships.pdf>.
- Devecchi, C., and M. Rouse. 2010. "An Exploration of the Features of Effective Collaboration between Teachers and Teaching Assistants in Secondary Schools." *Support for Learning* 25 (2): 91–99.
- DuFour, R. 2001. "In the Right Context." *Journal of Staff Development* 22 (1): 17.
- DuFour, R., T. Many, and R. Eaker. 2010. *Learning by Doing: A Handbook for Professional Learning Communities at Work*. 2nd ed. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.
- DuFour, R., and R. J. Marzano. 2011. *Leaders of Learning: How District, School, and Classroom Leaders Improve Student Achievement*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.
- Emihovich, C., and C. Battaglia. 2000. "Creating Cultures for Collaborative Inquiry: New Challenges for School Leaders." *International Journal of Leadership in Education* 3 (3): 225–38.
- Fullan, M. 2003. *The Moral Imperative of School Leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.



- Goleman, D. 1998. *Working with Emotional Intelligence*. New York: Random House.
- Graham, J. W. 1991. "Servant-Leadership in Organizations: Inspirational and Moral." *Leadership Quarterly* 2 (2): 105–19.
- Greenleaf, R. K. 1977. *The Servant as Leader: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Haskin, K. 1995. *A Process of Learning: The Principal's Role in Participatory Management*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/detail?accno=ED385949>.
- Kennedy, A., A. Deuel, T. Holmlund Nelson, and D. Slavit. 2011. "Requiring Collaboration or Distributing Leadership?" *Phi Delta Kappan* (May), 20–24.
- Kouzes, J. M., and B. Z. Posner. 2003. *The Leadership Challenge*. 3rd ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Laymon, S. R. 2010. "Implications of Collaboration in Education." *Academic Leadership* 8 (4).
- Meirink, J. A., J. Imants, P. C. Meijer, and N. Verloop. 2010. "Teacher Learning and Collaboration in Innovative Teams." *Cambridge Journal of Education* 40 (2): 161–81.
- Ozar, L. 2010. "Voices from the Field: Interviews with Three Prominent Catholic School Educators about Leadership and Collaboration." *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice* 14 (1): 114–27.
- Patterson, K. A. 2003. *Servant-Leadership: A Theoretical Model*. Doctoral dissertation. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (3082719).
- Rainey, H. G., and S. A. Watson. 1996. "Transformational Leadership and Middle Management: Towards a Role for Mere Mortals." *International Journal of Public Administration* 19 (6): 37–41.
- Senge, P. 1995. "Robert Greenleaf's Legacy: A New Foundation for Twenty First Century Institutions." In *Reflections on Leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's Theory of Servant-Leadership Influenced Today's Top Management Thinkers*, edited by L. Spears, 217–40. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. 2000. "Leadership as Stewardship." In *The Jossey-Bass Reader on Educational Leadership*, 269–86. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- . 2004. "Collaborative Cultures and Communities of Practice." *Principal Leadership* 5 (1): 49–52.
- Slater, L. 2005. "Leadership for Collaboration: An Affective Process." *International Journal of Leadership in Education* 8 (4): 321–33.
- Spears, L. 2010. "Character and Servant-Leadership: Ten Characteristics of Effective, Caring Leaders." *The Journal of Virtues & Leadership* 1 (1): 25–30.
- Taylor, T., B. N. Martin, S. Hutchinson, and M. Jinks. 2007. "Examination of Leadership Practices of Principals Identified as Servant-Leaders." *International Journal of Leadership in Education* 10 (4): 401–19.
- Thomas, N. 2007. "Collaboration Is Key to Leadership." *Journal of Special Education Leadership* 20 (1): 44–46.



- Van Dierendonck, D. 2011. "Servant-Leadership: A Review and Synthesis." *Journal of Management* 37 (4): 1228–61.
- Wheatley, M. 2007. *Finding Our Way: Leadership for an Uncertain Time*. Berkeley: Berrett Koehler.
- Wiggins, K. C., and S. J. Damore. 2006. "'Survivors' or 'Friends'? A Framework for Assessing Effective Collaboration." *Teaching Exceptional Children* 38 (5): 49–56.
- Wright, W. C. 2009. *Relational Leadership: A Biblical Model for Service and Influence*. 2nd ed. Colorado Springs: Paternoster Publishing.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Daniel Van Brugge (danielvanbrugge@gmail.com) welcomes any comments on this article. He teaches at Timothy Christian School in the Fraser Valley, B.C. He has also held teaching positions in Alberta and Ontario. He holds a BA in history, a certificate in enterprise education, and a BEd in intermediate/senior education. He is currently engaged in a Masters of Education in Leadership for Learning at University of Calgary.