

The Augustinian Values Institute: Vehicle for Educator Participants' Assessment
of the Implementation of the Augustinian Core Values
in the Pedagogy and Leadership of an Augustinian School

Stephen J. Baker

Saint Joseph University

ABSTRACT

The Augustinian Values Institute (AVI) was created in the fall of 2004 as a response to the need to educate administrators, faculty, and staff about the Augustinian Values of education: truth, unity, and love. The purposes for the creation of the AVI was two-fold: first, to share the richness of our Augustinian tradition and legacy with those with whom we work in our schools each day and secondly, to invite our colleagues to share in the work of Augustinian education in light of the dwindling numbers of friars available to work in our secondary schools. This qualitative research study is an opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of the AVI as a vehicle to assess the success of the Institute in assisting our colleagues in the implementation of the Augustinian core educational values of truth, unity, and love in the pedagogy and leadership of an Augustinian school. This study utilizes the tools of open-ended surveys, personal interviews, and focus groups to answer the question about how the Institute serves our colleagues in the implementation of the core values in the areas of pedagogy and leadership. The frameworks through which the value of the AVI is studied are the core values themselves, critical pedagogy, and servant leadership.

Table of Contents

PREFACE	1
CHAPTER ONE.....	8
Statement of the Problem	9
Purpose, Need, and Uniqueness of the Study.....	11
Research Question	12
Definition of Terms.....	12
CHAPTER TWO.....	14
Introduction	14
Education and Learning in the Order of Saint Augustine	15
Core Values of Augustinian Education.....	17
Strengths and Limitations of the Augustinian Values Framework.....	23
Critical Theory.....	24
Critical Pedagogy.....	29
Characteristics of Critical Pedagogy.....	32
Previous Studies Connecting Critical Pedagogy and Catholic Education	37
Criticisms of Critical Pedagogy Framework	41
Historical Sketch of Leadership Theory.....	44
Great-Man Theory	45
Trait Theory.....	46
Behavioral Theory	47
Contingency or Situational Models	47
Charismatic Leadership Theory.....	52
Transformational Leadership Theory.....	54
Strengths and Limitations of Transformational Leadership Theory.....	61
Moral and Ethical Leadership.....	64
Servant Leadership.....	65
Previous Studies About Servant Leadership in Schools	74
Strengths and Limitations of Servant Leadership Theory.....	79
Synthesis of the Theoretical Frameworks for the Study	81
CHAPTER THREE	83
Research Design	83
Participants	83
Role of the Researcher	85
Information Collection.....	88
Information Analysis.....	90
REFERENCES	94
APPENDIX A	101
APPENDIX B.....	102

PREFACE

Aurelius Augustine was born at Thagaste, the modern Souk-Aras in Algeria, on 13 November 354 (Bonner, 1997). His father, Patricius, was a modest landowner and his mother, Monica was a remarkably resilient North African woman (Martin, 2003). According to Thomas Martin (2003), Monica's, "devout Catholic piety was matched by the non-Christian father's religious indifference, and in the course of his first decades the promising young boy would reflect both parents' religious stance" (p. 19).

In Augustine's early years, his devoutly Catholic mother was primarily responsible for his upbringing and she clearly made her own faith part of her son's early upbringing and education (Martin, 2003). In spite of Monica's own devotion to the Catholic faith, Monica had Augustine's baptism delayed until he passed through the stormy years of his youth where sins of the flesh were seen to be unavoidable in the case of a man (Bonner, 1997). However, at his birth, Monica did have him signed with the cross of Christ, thus marking him as a catechumen (Bonner, 1997).

Augustine's parents made great financial sacrifices, even searching for a benefactor, in order to provide for the finest education in Roman Africa (Martin, 2003). Augustine's early school years in Thagaste were characterized by an anxiety to be accepted, avoiding shame, and terror of customary beatings at school by the teacher (Brown, 1969). Augustine despised Greek, but excelled in Latin (Brown, 1969). Gary McCloskey (2005) submits that if early education was the only predictor for a future career in teaching, then Augustine certainly would not have become one of the exemplary teachers in Western Civilization. Augustine's early education was filled with negative experiences.

Upon the completion of his early education, Augustine emerged as a gifted student. According to Peter Brown (1969), Augustine developed a, “phenomenal memory, a tenacious attention to detail, [and] an art of opening the heart” (p. 38). Augustine went on to study at the university town of Madaura, but returned to Thagaste a year later for lack of finances (Brown, 1969). A year later, after Patricius had saved sufficient funds, Augustine, at the age of 17, went to the large urban center, Carthage, to complete his education (Brown, 1969).

Augustine’s life in Carthage was filled with many significant life events. His father, Patricius, died a year after Augustine’s arrival in Carthage, thereby leaving Monica with the burden of completing Augustine’s education (Brown, 1969). In addition, Augustine would take a mistress who bore him a son, Adeodatus (Bonner, 1997). Augustine would remain with this nameless woman for the next 15 years, which was a respectable arrangement for an up and coming professor in the Later Empire (Brown, 1969). Finally, at the age of 19 in the year 373, Augustine would experience a profound change in his life through this reading of Cicero’s *Hortensius* (Brown, 1969). Cicero’s *Hortensius* had an immediate effect on Augustine to search for and fall in love with wisdom (Bonner, 1997).

Augustine’s search for wisdom led him down many different pathways. For a time, Augustine studied the Scriptures, but, as a rhetorician, Augustine was disappointed as the Latin version of the Scriptures did not measure up to the style of Cicero (Bonner, 1997). This disappointment led him, at age 20, to join the Manichee sect for the next nine years (Bonner, 1997). The Manichaean system of thought could be characterized as simple, drastic, and dualistic in its understanding of good and evil (Brown, 1969). However, his association with the Manichaeans would sour as he found little substance to be found behind the complexities of their doctrines (Martin, 2003). Augustine did remain with the sect for pragmatic reasons, as their

influence did offer him stepping stones to future advancement (Martin, 2003). Augustine would move from Carthage to Rome and then on to Milan through his career as a teacher, thanks to the Manichaeans (Martin, 2003). On the eve of his thirtieth birthday, in Milan, the seat of the Western Emperor, Augustine became the chair of rhetoric and eventually a member of the courtly society, bringing with it both success and wealth (Martin, 2003). During this time, Augustine dismissed his mistress back to North Africa so that he might pursue an arranged marriage that would forward his career (Bonner, 1997).

It was in Milan in the year 385 that Augustine, at age 31, decided to once again loosely associate himself with the Catholic faith of his youth. At the urging of his mother, Monica, Augustine decided to become a catechumen in Milan (Brown, 1969). It was at this time that Augustine made his first acquaintance with Ambrose, 14 years his senior and the bishop of Milan (Brown, 1969). Augustine began to attend Ambrose's sermons, not out of desire for Christian instruction, but rather, for his talent as an orator (Bonner, 1997). Augustine also made contact with the Academics who regarded themselves as the heirs of the Academy of the philosopher, Plato (Bonner, 1997). The works of the Neo-Platonists surprised Augustine because of their unexpected agreement with Christian doctrine (Bonner, 1997). This reading of the Neo-Platonists would dispel the last vestiges of Augustine's Academic doubt (Bonner, 1997). These writings of the philosophers would lead Augustine to turn to the Epistles of Saint Paul and read him with great enthusiasm (Bonner, 1997).

Augustine continued to struggle to find an answer to his search. But now, God was going to offer to Augustine a final challenge. Augustine and his friends, Alypius and Nebridius, were living together devoting themselves as much as possible to readings and discussions on wisdom (Bonner, 1997). While Augustine was alone with Alypius in the garden, a tremendous series of

events occurred. During the visit of Ponticianus, another of Augustine's friends, Augustine heard from Ponticianus the conversion of two other friends to the ascetic life as a result of the reading of the Life of St. Anthony (Bonner, 1997). This conversion story recounted by Ponticianus stirred up a storm in Augustine's soul (Bonner, 1997). While in the garden shortly after his friend's visit, he heard the voice of a child repeating the words: "Take and read! Take and read!" (Bonner, 1997, p. 91). Augustine had remembered the story of Anthony and how he had gone into a Church hearing the gospel and took it as a counsel to himself (Bonner, 1997). Augustine's (397/1997) *Confessions* describes this scene best. Augustine himself writes:

Suddenly I heard a voice from a house nearby – perhaps a voice of some boy or girl, I do not know – singing over and over again, "Pick it up and read, pick it up and read." My expression immediately altered and I began to think hard whether children ordinarily repeated a ditty like this in any sort of game, but I could not recall ever having heard it anywhere else. I stemmed the flood of tears and rose to my feet, believing that this could be nothing other than a divine command to open the Book and read the first passage I chanced upon....Stung into action, I returned to the place where Alypius was sitting, for on leaving it I had put down there the book of the apostle's letters. I snatched it up, opened it and read in silence the passage on which my eyes first lighted: Not in dissipation and drunkenness, nor in debauchery and lewdness, nor in arguing and jealousy; but put on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make no provision for the flesh or the gratification of your desires. I had no wish to read further, nor was there need. No sooner had I reached the end of the verse than the light of certainty flooded my heart and all dark shades of doubt fled away. (VIII, xii, 29)

According to Martin (2003), Augustine's heart, "had long been prepared through events, people, and books for that final moment in the garden" (p. 22). Augustine's conversion took place at the beginning of August 386; he now had a plan to remove himself from the schools of rhetoric and devote himself entirely to the service of God (Bonner, 1997).

Following this transformative experience in Augustine's life, he makes his way back to North Africa (Martin, 2003). This trip to North Africa was interrupted by civil wars, the death of his mother, Monica, but eventually he returns and establishes a monastic community at his family estate in Thagaste (Martin, 2003). Augustine had a desire for retreat but was met with sudden fame; in addition he experienced the deaths of both his son, Adeodatus, and his friend, Nebridius, within a short period of time (Martin, 2003).

Augustine's fame continued to grow in North Africa due to his personality, reputation, and literary activity (Bonner, 1997). However, Augustine, felt genuinely called to live the religious life; he desired to be a monk, not a minister and avoided ordination to the priesthood (Bonner, 1997). Augustine lost his battle to avoid ordination when he entered the city of Hippo Regius in order to persuade a friend to embrace the religious life (Bonner, 1997). The gathered people in the cathedral seized Augustine and brought him before, Valerius, the bishop of Hippo for ordination (Brown, 1969). In tears, Augustine submitted and was ordained a priest at the hands of Bishop Valerius (Brown, 1969). In 395, Augustine was consecrated coadjutor bishop of Hippo and upon the death of Valerius in 396, Augustine, at the age of 42, became bishop of Hippo. (Bonner, 1997). Augustine would lead the Church of Hippo for the next 30 years (Bonner, 1997). As Augustine became more and more occupied as bishop, he would envy the monks for their regular life of prayer, reading and manual labor (Brown, 1969).

In the final years of his life, Augustine witnessed the Vandal forces make their way into Africa (Bonner, 1997). Eventually, the Vandals made their way into Hippo and the siege last fourteen months; however, Augustine lived to see only three of them (Bonner, 1997). In the third month of the siege, Augustine fell sick with fever and took to his bed (Bonner, 1997). These were to be Augustine's final days. Augustine's longtime friend, Possidius (437/1998), recounts his final hours:

God granted this holy man a long life for the benefit and prosperity of his holy Church (he lived seventy-six years, almost forty of them as cleric and bishop). In intimate conversations with us he used to say that after receiving baptism even exemplary Christians and bishops should not depart from this life without having repented worthily and adequately. That is precisely what he himself did in his final illness; he had the very few Davidic psalms on repentance written out and the sheets attached to the wall opposite his bed; then, while he lay ill, he looked at them, read them, and wept continually and copiously.

In order that his recollection might not be broken, about ten days before departing from the body he asked us who were present not to let anyone in to see him except when the doctors came to examine him or his meals were brought to him. His wish was carefully respected, and he spent the entire time in prayer.

Right down to his final illness he preached the word of God in the church uninterruptedly, zealously, and courageously, and with soundness of mind and judgment. Then, with all his bodily members still intact and with sight and hearing undiminished, as we stood by watching and praying, he fell asleep with his fathers (as Scripture says) in a

good old age. A sacrifice was offered to God in our presence to commend his bodily death and then he was buried. (31, 1-4)

It was on 28 August 430 that Augustine died and was buried (Brown, 1969). There was nothing left of Augustine but his library (Brown, 1969). All future biographers would come to what Possidius felt as he compiled a list of Augustine's works (Brown, 1969). Possidius (437/1998), writes: "I believe, however, that they profited even more who were able to hear him speaking in church and see him there present, especially if they were familiar with his manner of life among his fellow human beings" (31, 9). Through the centuries, the spirit and legacy of Saint Augustine continues to be read and studied by countless people throughout the world.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background

One of the greatest students and educators of Western Civilization was Saint Augustine of Hippo (354-430 AD). The Order of Saint Augustine, whose friars have lived in the spirit of Saint Augustine throughout the centuries, has been the inheritor and guardian of the thought and spirit of this great churchman, especially in the area of education (Augustinian General Curia, 2008). According to the Order's Prior General, Robert F. Prevost, O.S.A., "since the earliest times of the life of the Order, teaching, study, and investigation have made up a significant part of the Augustinians' service to the Church" (Berdon, 2006, p. 5).

The challenge for the Order of Saint Augustine in these modern times is to continue the legacy of its spiritual father and founder, Saint Augustine. The modern world is changing rapidly and places before humanity a number of social, cultural, and religious challenges. In fact, according to Theodore Tack (1988), the world in the time of Augustine had similar challenges as our present milieu does today. He writes:

Social upheaval marked his times as it does ours. Strong change was in the wind in the early fifth century, and no one could see where it would lead or where it would end. On the other hand he bared his soul, his mind his feelings, and his Christian heritage in such a way that people who are honest with themselves can still find in Augustine some reflection of their own inner life and struggle. (p. viii)

Augustine's struggle is our struggle. Augustine's search is our search. Augustinians throughout the world have a strong desire to offer this treasure that is Augustine's thought and spirit especially in the area of education. Prevost emphasizes that the Order desires to promote, "what

is truly Augustinian within the numerous educational centers that are a part of our Augustinian educational apostolate” (Berdon, 2006, p. 5).

Statement of the Problem

An important concern for the Order is the reality that the number of Augustinians throughout the world is declining due to the many cultural, social, and spiritual challenges of the modern world. This is certainly the case in the United States where the number of Augustinian friars available for service in our schools is steadily declining. Bernard Scianna, O.S.A. (2006) states, “many of these schools are still in operation today, but several Augustinian schools have had to close due to changing demographics as well as the declining number of professed priests and brothers serving in the United States” (p. 2). Robert Murray (2002), who writes in the context of a university setting, concurs that all religious orders in the United States who sponsor schools have experienced a decline of members of religious orders serving as administrators, faculty, and staff due to decrease in membership as well as decisions by orders to work in other ministries outside of higher education. Therefore, the challenge for the Augustinian order is to maintain Augustine’s vision and spirit of education in the face of declining numbers of friars.

Scianna (2006) proffers that despite the decreasing numbers of friars since the 1960s, and with the desire to preserve and hand on the Augustinian Tradition of education, the Order clearly realized that it needed the assistance and the support of the lay community in order to continue its educational mission (p. 2). As a result, the Augustinian Secondary Education Association (ASEA) was created for the purpose of promoting the Augustinian philosophy of education and carry it into the future (p. 2). From the membership of the ASEA, the idea came forth to create opportunities to educate the laity who serve in our schools in the philosophy and mission of Augustinian education. From this desire, the Institute in Augustinian Values in Education for the

laity was born (Scianna, 2006). According to Scianna (2006), “this Institute gives teachers, staff members, administrators, and board members of Augustinian schools an opportunity to explore further what it means to work in an Augustinian school” (p. 2). The Institute was inaugurated in January of 2004 at Villanova Preparatory School in Ojai, California (Scianna, 2006). The ASEA completed its sixth Institute at Saint Augustine College Preparatory School in Richland, New Jersey in October of 2009. The purpose of this three-day Institute is to educate our lay collaborators in the three core values of Augustinian education: Veritas, Unitas, and Caritas (Truth, Unity, and Love) and how our schools put them into practice in its operating principles and practices (Scianna, 2006).

The question that the Augustinians in the North American Provinces need to explore is whether or not the Augustinian Values Institute has made any positive difference in the day to day life of the schools the Order operates. The North American Provinces as well as the secondary schools the Order operates have made a decision over the past five years to make a significant investment of resources in time, personnel, and finances to provide faculty and staff members with the opportunity to become steeped in the values of Augustinian education. The next question the Provinces need to address is in the area of future direction. If the Augustinian Values Institute makes a positive difference for schools, in what areas of school life is it manifested? How do the various stakeholders in the school community benefit from the Institute? If the Augustinian Values Institute is not producing positive results in the life of the schools, should it be reformatted or abandoned? Do the benefits gained justify the investment of the Provinces’ resources? These are just some of the important questions the Augustinian Provinces of North America need to consider in its ministry of Augustinian education. A study

that explores these questions would be beneficial to the Order, the North American Provinces and its educational institutions, and as well as the Church the Augustinian friars seek to serve.

Purpose, Need, and Uniqueness of the Study

The purpose of the study is to explore how the AVI serves as a vehicle for educator participants to assess how the Augustinian core values of truth, unity, and love are implemented in the pedagogy and leadership in an Augustinian school. A second important purpose to this study centers on the model or type of pedagogy and leadership the educator participants of the AVI bring with them as they return to implement their learning in the school. The frameworks of the Augustinian core values, critical pedagogy, and servant leadership will be the lenses through which these models are examined.

The results of this study would serve two purposes: first, this study would be a helpful tool for the North American Provinces to assess whether or not to continue to support the AVI through time, personnel, and financial resources. Secondly, the study would help local Augustinian schools, through the assessment of educator participants from these schools, to ascertain whether or not the schools are implementing the core values in the pedagogy and leadership models operating in the school and to make improvements to implementation as necessary.

A study that examines how the AVI serves as a vehicle for educator participants to assess the implementation of the Augustinian core values of truth, unity, and love in the pedagogy and leadership of a local Augustinian school would be unique because such a study has not yet been undertaken. As Scianna (2006) points out, the Augustinian Secondary Education Association has just completed its fifth Institute in January of 2008. After six years, a study of this nature would be timely and most welcome by the members of the ASEA as well as the leadership of the

North American Provinces. The Values Institute in North America is unique to the whole Order. There is not an Institute of this caliber that exists in any other circumscriptions of the Order.

Research Question

The research question for this study is: How does the Augustinian Values Institute serve as a vehicle for educator participants' to assess the implementation of the Augustinian core values in the pedagogy and leadership of an Augustinian school? The research question seeks to discover how the Augustinian Values Institute (AVI) assists educator participants to assess how the core values are or are not being embodied in the pedagogy and leadership models of their local Augustinian school.

Definition of Terms

- Augustinians or Order of St. Augustine (O.S.A.) – a religious order founded in the year 1256 AD. The Order's spiritual founder is Saint Augustine of Hippo (354-430).
- Augustinian School – secondary school under the care of the Order of St. Augustine.
- Augustinian Values Institute or Augustinian Values in Education Institute (AVI) – A gathering where representative members of the schools come together for the purpose of reflection on the Augustinian core values (Sicanna, 2006).
- Core Values – The core values of an Augustinian education are Veritas (Truth), Unitas (Unity), and Caritas (Love or Charity). The core values direct Augustinians to the pursuit of truth, exercised in love and charity in unity and community with one another (McCloskey, 2006; Seco, 2006).
- Educator Participant – a teacher or administrator from a local Augustinian school who participates in the Augustinian Values Institute

- Leadership – “the ability to establish and manage a creative climate open to change and continuous improvement where people are self-motivated toward the achievement of mutually developed goals in an environment of mutual trust and respect compatible with a mutually developed value system” (Palestini, 2003, p. 5).
- Pedagogy – Pedagogy is to be distinguished from teaching (McLaren, 1998). Pedagogy is “the integration in practice of particular curriculum content and design, classroom strategies and techniques, and evaluation, purpose and methods. All of these aspects of educational practice come together in the realities of what happens in classrooms” (Simon, 1987, p. 370).

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This literature review will be organized into three main sections with a presentation of each of the three frameworks to be engaged in this study: the Augustinian values in education, critical pedagogy, and servant leadership. The first section will begin with a brief exposition of the importance of education and learning in the life of the Order of St. Augustine. This will lead into a presentation of the three core values of an Augustinian education: Truth, Unity, and Love. This first section will conclude with a presentation of some of the strengths and limitations of the Augustinian core values framework.

The second section of the literature review is a discussion about the use of the tools of critical pedagogy to interrogate the Augustinian Values Institutes' impact on the pedagogy in an Augustinian school. This section of the literature review will begin with a presentation of critical theory as it serves as the foundation for the development of critical pedagogy. Following this discussion of critical theory, the development of critical pedagogy and its salient characteristics for education will be discussed. This presentation of the salient features of critical pedagogy will encompass some of the leading scholar contributors to the critical pedagogy framework. Following the discussion about the characteristics of critical pedagogy, there will be a presentation of two previous studies connecting the tenets of critical pedagogy to Catholic education. Finally, some criticisms of critical pedagogy by other scholars in the field will be discussed.

The next section of the literature review will discuss the third theoretical framework, servant leadership, to investigate the Augustinian Values Institute's impact on the leadership in

an Augustinian school. This final section of the literature review will begin with a discussion of the history of leadership that will lay the groundwork for a discussion about servant leadership. Particular attention will be paid to transformational leadership due to the fact that transformational leadership appears to be the foundation stone upon which servant leadership is developed. The section on transformational leadership will conclude with a presentation of some strengths and limitations of this leadership theory. Following the transformational leadership discussion, there will be a brief presentation on the place of ethics and morality in leadership theory as servant leadership is thought to be a theory under the umbrella of ethical or moral leadership. Next will follow a presentation of the characteristics of servant leaders. Following the discussion of the attributes of servant leaders, there will be a presentation of two previous studies about the place of servant leadership in the school environment. In addition, attention will be also be given to a third study that considers the impact of the Lasallian Leadership Institute on the Lasallian (LLI) school culture. Following the presentation on these previous studies, the section on servant leadership will conclude with some strengths and limitations of ethical leadership theory that would seem to apply also to servant leadership theory.

Education and Learning in the Order of Saint Augustine

The promotion of the spirit of St. Augustine has been an important goal of the Order of St. Augustine from the very beginning. Thomas Martin (2006) asserts, “from the earliest decades of its history, the Order made it clear that education would be a central concern as it sought to live out its identity as a religious community that claimed St. Augustine as *father* and *founder*” (p. 209). Santiago Insunza Seco (2006) points out that if one is going to talk about criteria for an Augustinian school, then one needs to be faithful to Augustinian pedagogical principles. Therefore, Seco (2006) emphasizes, “It is essential to refer to Saint Augustine and his

thought on the subject of education. With this criterion as a background, it is possible to point out some elements which define the Augustinian identity of a school” (p. 137).

What are these elements that define the Augustinian identity of a school? Seco (2006) cautions us that there is a difference between Augustinian pedagogy and an Augustinian school. Seco (2006) proffers that Augustinian pedagogy is systemic and constant, whereas the Augustinian school is a living institution. Therefore, using Augustinian pedagogy as a guide, the challenge for the Augustinian school is to maintain, "an open dialogue with its time and other cultures" (Seco, 2006, p. 138). Seco (2006) warns that that the Augustinian school that does not rise up to this challenge becomes, "disconnected from society [and] would not accomplish its function as a place of intellectual confluence, and a laboratory where culture is bred, where important questions are refined and principles for life are offered" (p. 138). For Seco (2006), the Augustinian school must, "hold a critical dialogue with emerging values at each historic juncture" (p. 138).

An additional important comment Seco (2006) proffers is that one must keep in mind that an Augustinian approach to education is not based so much on the words of Augustine, but rather on the spiritual itinerary of his life. Gary McCloskey (2006) concurs with Seco’s thinking stating that if one looks at Augustine’s life, one sees evidence that his plans changed many times when he learned better directions and developed improved insights. McCloskey (2006) goes on to suggest Augustine’s life was one where life plans “were interrupted as he found new ways to advance on his learning journey” (p. 114). With Seco and McCloskey’s comments in mind, there can be identified three core values of Augustinian education: Veritas (Truth), Unity (Unitas), and Caritas (Love).

Core Values of Augustinian Education

The first core value in Augustinian education is the pursuit of truth. McCloskey (2006) argues that Augustine set out on an ongoing journey in pursuing and learning the truth. He goes on to say that Augustine never captured truth once for all and that each new truth moved him forward and lifted him upward in his dialogue with the Inner Teacher, Jesus Christ (McCloskey, 2006).

McCloskey (2006) submits that in opposition to fundamentalism, traditionalism, scientism, or literalism, Augustinian pedagogy does not convey objective truth as a reality that can be captured and frozen. Rather, according to McCloskey (2006), Augustinian pedagogy, "supports learning how to move upward on the learning journey pointing beyond ourselves" (p. 123). McCloskey (2006) continues by saying that the value of truth in Augustinian pedagogy is that the searcher is always on the way to wisdom: one becomes a life-long learner. Roland Barth (2001) states, "a major purpose of a school is to make it likely that students and educators will become and remain life-long learners" (p. 18). Augustinian pedagogy calls us to move beyond what we already know and this approach can be valuable in a postmodern world that questions objective truth claims (McCloskey, 2006). Does this mean that Augustinian pedagogy cannot serve as a means to come to know objective truth? Certainly, this is not the case. Francisco Fincias (2006) contends that Augustine believed that every person has within one's self an inner light and that the disciple learns from this inner light. About this inner light, Augustine (397/1997) writes:

With you as my guide I entered into my innermost citadel, and was given power to do so because you had become my helper (Ps. 29:11). I entered and with my soul's eye, such as it was, saw above that same eye of my soul the immutable light higher than my mind –

not the light of every day, obvious to anyone, nor a larger version of the same kind which would, as it were, have given out a much brighter light and filled everything with its magnitude. It was not that light, but a different thing, utterly different from all our kinds of light. It transcended my mind, not in the way that oil floats on water, nor as heaven is above earth. It was superior because it made me, and I was inferior because I was made by it. The person who knows the truth knows it, and he who knows it knows eternity. Love knows it. Eternal truth and true love and beloved eternity: you are my God. (VII, x,16)

Fincias (2006) defines this inner light as, "the splendour of the Word of God which illuminates every man [sic] who comes into this world, Christ, the Only Teacher" (p. 41).

The Catholic Christian who accepts Christ as the Inner Teacher lives in the world as one who remains steadfast in proclamation of the gospel message. Seco (2006) would seem to particularly emphasize this virtue of steadfastness by discussing how a Christian approaches the concept of dialogue with the modern culture. Seco (2006) submits that, because of a misunderstanding about the meaning of the term *dialogue*, people search for consensus to the detriment of Christian identity. Seco (2006) proposes that the Augustinian commitment to the value of truth means that

without abandoning dialogue with the modern world and with the culture that this same world has generated, it is necessary to note the differences in order to avoid the risk of a syncretism and eclectic education. The option for certain values implies, necessarily, establishing differences. On the grounds of the diversity of cultures and the sincere acceptance of religious pluralism, one's own culture and religion cannot be sacrificed. (p. 151)

This steadfast commitment to the pursuit of truth, which for the Christian is Christ Himself, does not imply or suggest a resistance to respect and dialogue with others who do not share our Christian values. Seco (2006) suggests, "to say that Jesus Christ is the scope of our education is not to speak of a closed school – a school of Christians for Christians – nor does it prevent our welcoming and respecting non-believers or persons of other religious confessions" (p. 151). What it does mean is that an Augustinian education affirms the presence of God and the human person's search for and experience of God (Seco, 2006). It means that the school does not shut out God from the curricula, but attempts to, "contribute to the understanding of the faith and to the experience of God so that it can be transmitted to others" (Seco, 2006, p. 152).

The second core value in Augustinian education is unity. According to McCloskey (2006), Augustine did not envision learning as individualistic. Rather, Augustine sees the learner going beyond her/himself when one finds unity in community (or communion) with others (McCloskey, 2006). In his Rule of life, Saint Augustine tells his brothers and sisters that the main reason for coming together is to "live harmoniously in your house, intent upon God in oneness of mind and heart" (Augustinian General Curia, 2008, p. 9). McCloskey (2006) argues that for Augustine learning *with* others is of utmost importance and the means by which this learning takes place is through dialogue. The core value of unity is promoted in Augustinian education through the dialogue that takes place between teachers and students and students with one another. Everyone is included in this learning enterprise. McCloskey (2006) believes that Augustinian pedagogy can be seen as "having an inclusive thrust to aim to teach ALL learners as a mutual responsibility of an Augustinian learning community" (p. 131). According to McCloskey (2006), some practices that can advance Augustinian pedagogy are collaborative

learning and cooperative learning because they can be used to shape learning activities that reinforce the communitarian dimensions of Augustinian education.

An additional dimension to this core value of unity is not only learning together, but also the promotion of friendship. Learning takes place in the context of friendship. McCloskey (2006) concludes that Augustinian pedagogy in the core value of unity is learning to desire unity, a unity that brings together the spirits and souls of the Augustinian community. In this community, we dialogue with the Inner Teacher and experience Christ in his fullness (McCloskey, 2006).

The final core value of Augustinian education is love. In an Augustinian pedagogy, the value of love begins with a love for God. Tack (2006) asserts that Augustinian education has an important connection to the human heart and, therefore, with relationships with God, with one's self, and with others. According to Tack (2006), Augustine had to come to a love of self and see the God within before he could come to love God. Once Augustine looked within himself, he saw that God was closer to him than Augustine was to himself. About this experience, Augustine (397/1997) writes: "Where was I when I was seeking for you? You were there before me, but I had departed from myself. I could not even find myself, much less you" (V,ii,2). This love of God, in terms of Augustinian pedagogy's core value of love, is then expressed through the promotion of a love for learning and care for the learner.

McCloskey (2006) suggests a person animated by love should model a pedagogical approach that inculcates a wholehearted love for learning as well as teaching learners to strive to possess this love for learning. McCloskey (2006) goes on to say, "An Augustinian pedagogy educates the learner that knowing the right thing is not enough. Learners must develop a humility that enables them, paradoxically, to get out of their own way as they strive to act

rightly” (p. 118). For Augustine, this love for learning has an impact in the formation of a person’s will. According to McCloskey (2006), the will is central in Augustine’s pedagogy. Augustine understands the human will as needing to be developed so that it can act rightly (McCloskey, 2006). McCloskey (2006) argues, “Augustinian pedagogy must include methods and practices that strengthen the habits of the will to act rightly” (p. 119). Augustine sees the education of the will as building character and this character building and the development of good habits are strengthened through dialogue with the Inner Teacher (McCloskey, 2006).

McCloskey (2006) proposes that connected to this formation of the will is also the development of the desire to search out what is not known. An Augustinian education promotes this desire to search out the unknown through a pedagogical approach known as Problem Based Learning (McCloskey, 2006). According to McCloskey (2006), this approach begins with a known problem, then moves from what is already known to what is unknown, and works to make the unknown less intimidating. Problem based pedagogy assists students to develop a more confident will as they explore how other learners throughout history were able to come to new insights when faced with the unknown (McCloskey, 2006). McCloskey (2006) argues that this pedagogy helps learners to discover how to reorganize and adapt their knowledge, resulting in better understanding and living.

An additional dimension to the core value of love is the care for the learner. McCloskey (2006) asserts that this care for the learner is accomplished through the use of the technique of scaffolding to teach and to learn. According to McCloskey (2006), “programs fostering successful transitions across levels of scaffolding and ladders, including orientations of new students in a school, implement the care for the learner that Augustine advocated” (p. 120). Parker Palmer (1998) concurs with this idea of the care of the student through scaffolding when

he proffers, “the way we diagnose our students’ condition will determine the kind of remedy we offer” (p. 41). According to Palmer (1998), teachers are supposed to observe the needs of our students and respond with strategies that will assist them in their learning. This scaffolding and ladder building according to a student’s needs helps to avoid two obstacles to the development of a love for learning: apathy and boredom (McCloskey, 2006). Love for learning and care for the student propels the Augustinian educator not to be content simply with good lesson plans and readiness to teach, but also to develop methods and skills that address the attitudes that students bring with them to the learning process (McCloskey, 2006). McCloskey (2006) asserts that Augustinian education programs need to provide co-curricular programs for students as well as professional development for teachers to help them to develop positive attitudes in their students.

This discussion of the three core values shows that there are many pedagogical practices that can foster Augustinian pedagogy (McCloskey, 2006). While these practices are not uniquely Augustinian, the interrelation of the considerations is unique to Augustine (McCloskey, 2006). Therefore, while there is no precise blueprint for implementing Augustinian pedagogy, Augustine does offer us the insight of reconsideration (McCloskey, 2006). Reconsideration in this context means to identify successful practices as well as practices that can serve to bring about improvement in areas where growth in Augustinian teaching and learning may be needed (McCloskey, 2006).

Now that the Augustinian values in education of truth, unity, and love have been presented, there will next be a discussion of some of the strengths and limitations of the Augustinian values in education framework.

Strengths and Limitations of the Augustinian Values Framework

A first strength of the values framework is that there has been some exploration and articulation as to how the Augustinian values of truth, unity, and love are applied to the twenty-first century secondary education setting. McCloskey (2006) and Seco (2006), especially, have attempted to present how these three values are put into practice in the context of the daily life of an Augustinian school. Although more scholarship and work needs to be done, both McCloskey (2006) and Seco (2006) have made significant contributions to the literature in reflecting upon these three values as articulated in an Augustinian context.

A second strength of the values framework is that it helps to give some nomenclature to the experiences of generations of faculties and students in the schools conducted by the Order of Saint Augustine throughout the world. A goodly number of students and teachers have, over the years, articulated in conversation or in writing that there is something unique about their educational experiences in an Augustinian school. Both students and teachers have sensed that there is a spirit and an energy that has remained with them long after the experience of either teaching or studying at the Augustinian school. The values framework might assist these teachers and students in naming and articulating their experiences.

As there are strengths with the values framework, there are also some limitations as well. A first limitation is that there only a few scholars that have attempted to articulate the meaning of the Augustinian values in the educational setting. There needs to be additional voices added to the literature about how the values are applied to pedagogy and leadership in an Augustinian school.

A second limitation to this framework is that there does not appear to be a strong enough Christological grounding in the articulation of the core values. This grounding may very well be

implied by McCloskey (2006) and Seco (2006) (as both scholars are friars and priests), but this connection of the values to Jesus Christ might need to be made more explicit. In addition, there are some other Christian themes that might be integrated into the articulation of the values. For example, one theme might be the importance of forgiveness in the Christian tradition. This theme of forgiveness might lead on to ask the question of how the Augustinian value of love (caritas) expresses the importance of forgiveness in the Augustinian school in its pedagogy and its leadership.

It would seem fair to conclude that although a complete Augustinian pedagogy would need to give consideration to a host of traditional Christian values – e.g., forgiveness, prayer, the active influence of the Holy Spirit, and most especially, the greater assimilation of the student to Jesus Christ, McCloskey (2006) and Seco (2006) do provide a basic framework for a reliable assessment of the practical application of a uniquely Augustinian approach to pedagogy and leadership in a school.

Critical Theory

The foundation for the development of critical pedagogy is critical theory (Bennett & LeCompte, 1990; Darder, Baltodano, & Torres, 2009; Horn, 2004; Kanpol, 1999; McLaren, 1998; Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 2004; Kincheloe, 2008). Critical theory is a term that usually refers to the theoretical tradition developed by the Frankfurt School, a cluster of social theorists and philosophers who were connected to the University of Frankfurt's Institute of Social Research (Bennett & LeCompte, 1990; Kincheloe, 2008). Some of these initial scholars include Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno, Herbert Marcuse, and Walter Benjamin, "who initiated a conversation with the German tradition of philosophical and social thought, especially that of Marx, Kant, Hegel, and Weber" (Kincheloe, 2008, p. 46). The Italian Marxist Antonio

Gramsci is also a contributor to early critical theory (Bennett & LeCompte, 1990). According to Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, and Taubman (2004), the intent and hope of the Frankfurt School was to assist in establishing a critical social consciousness able, “to penetrate existing ideology, support independent judgment and be capable ... of maintaining the freedom to envision alternatives” (p. 248). Horn (2004) asserts, “the work of the Frankfurt School provided the foundation for the application of critical theory to education” (p. 55). Joe Kincheloe (2008) proffers that critical theory is difficult to describe because: “(a) there are many theories not just one; (b) the critical tradition is always changing and evolving; and (c) critical theory attempts to avoid too much specificity, as there is room for disagreement among critical theorists” (p. 48). Henry Giroux (2009) concurs with Kincheloe (2008) that this association of Frankfurt theorists is a loose one at best. According to Giroux (2009), what this means is that “critical theory was never a fully articulated philosophy shared unproblematically by all the members of the Frankfurt School” (p. 27). Giroux (2009) goes on to affirm that despite this lack of a unified, shared critical theory, one can see the, “common attempt to assess the newly emerging forms of capitalism along with the changing forms of domination that accompanied them” (p. 26).

Critical theory has as its starting point Western Marxist philosophy (Kanpol, 1999). According to Kanpol (1999), the emphasis was on, “both mass cultural relations of society (gender, family, aesthetics, popular culture, art, etc.) and on orthodox Marxism in which the interpretive emphasis was reduced to society’s relationship to the economy” (p. 28). Kanpol (1999) goes on to assert that, in relationship to schools, a strict orthodox Marxist analysis of schools attributes student failure to lower socioeconomic status and how schools create low, middle, and upper classes as economic divisions in schools. Strict Marxist analysis of schools would suggest that it is predictable which students will succeed or fail according to the

acquisition level of cultural capital (i.e., knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes) accrued for the purpose of upward mobility (Kanpol, 1999).

Other critical theorists are broadly defined as Neo-Marxists and they view schools not only as an economic concern, but also as a cultural concern (Kanpol, 1999). From a Neo-Marxist analytical perspective, one must view the school as an institution whose function is not only to produce economic inequalities, but also the production of different cultures (Kanpol, 1999). Peter McLaren (1998) argues that critical theorists see schools, “not only as instructional sites, but also has cultural arenas where a heterogeneity of ideological and social forms often collide in an unremitting struggle for dominance” (p. 164). McLaren (1998) submits that critical theorists assert that schools have always operated in ways that “rationalize the knowledge industry into class-divided tiers; that reproduce inequality, racism, and sexism; and that fragment democratic social relations through an emphasis on competitiveness and cultural ethnocentrism” (p. 164). Therefore, schools can be seen as both a political and cultural enterprise (McLaren, 1998).

An additional concern of the early Frankfurt School was to critique the traditional or bourgeois perspectives, “which assumed that social phenomenon could be understood by means of scientific methods of description, classification, generalization, and quantification” (Bennett & LeCompte, 1990, p. 25). According to Bennett and LeCompte (1990), this traditional social theory, named *positivism*, views science as a means to gain knowledge that is objective, value-free, and scientific; the methods to garner this knowledge were similar to those used in the natural sciences. The Frankfurt School scholars were critical of this positivistic model because they contend that social or human phenomena could not be understood in the same way as natural or physical phenomena could (Bennett & LeCompte, 1990). The Frankfurt School

scholars argued, “social phenomenon could not be separated from their social and historical context” (Bennett & LeCompte, 1990, p. 25). Therefore, the scientific methods themselves as well as the decisions about which scientific methods to use are embedded in social values and cannot be considered as objective (Bennett & LeCompte, 1990). Rather, according to the Frankfurt School theorists, these scientific methods and the decisions to use them were expressive of a particular theoretical and philosophical position (Bennett & LeCompte, 1990).

Critical theory depicts the negative impact of the Industrial Revolution and the World Wars in the social and economic transformation of Europe and the United States (Kanpol, 1999). According to Bennett and LeCompte (1990), Antonio Gramsci coined the term *hegemony* to name this state of affairs. The term hegemony describes the, “process by which the worldview of the dominant state is expressed within institutions and maintains control” (Bennett & LeCompte, 1990, p. 25). Gramsci submitted, “these oppressed and subordinate classes could create alternative cultural and political institutions in order to resist and change the hegemony (or patterns of power and control) of the dominant groups” (Bennett & LeCompte, 1990, p. 26).

As a result of these world changing events that birthed these dominant ideological social orders, the Frankfurt School, “sought a new moral social order, a social emancipation from the various economic, social, and cultural oppressive qualities, such as social prejudices and economic inequalities” (Kanpol, 1999, p. 29). Kincheloe (2008), in line with the Frankfurt school stance, submits that critical social theory, “is concerned in particular with the issues of power and justice and the ways that the economy, matters of race, class, and gender, ideologies, discourses, education, religion, and other social institutions and cultural dynamics interact to construct a social system” (p. 49). Critical theory analyzes the competing power interests in a group or society (Kincheloe, 2008). Critical theory proffers that there are persons who gain and

lose, depending on the specific social context or situation and that privileged groups many times have an interest in maintaining and supporting the status quo in order to preserve and protect their advantages (Kincheloe, 2008). Giroux (2009) concurs with Kincheloe (2008) and Kanpol (1999) when he argues that critical theory is interested in the creation of a just society. Giroux (2009) argues, “critical theory contains a transcendent element in which critical thought becomes the precondition for human freedom” and that “rather than proclaiming a positivist notion of neutrality, critical theory openly takes sides in the interest in struggling for a better world” (p. 35). Bennett and LeCompte (1990) submit that critical theorists promote, in opposition to the modernistic tenets of scientific objectivism, the recognition of social and political contexts for social values. Bennett and LeCompte (1990) continue by saying that this subjectivity is recognized through a process of self-criticism and self-reflection. Bennett and LeCompte (1990) also concur with Kanpol (1999), Kincheloe (2008), and Giroux (2009) when they contend that critical theorists “share a concern for injustice, oppression and inequality in society, looking toward the radical transformation of social arrangements in order to increase human freedom” (p. 25).

To sum up this discussion on critical theory, it can be said that while critical theory is certainly not a unified system of thought, it does contain some very valuable general assumptions (Slattery, 1995). About these assumptions, Slattery (1995) states:

All thought and power relations are inexorably linked; these power relations form oppressive social arrangements; facts and values are inseparable and inscribed by ideology; language is a key element in the formation of subjectivities, and thus critical literacy – the ability to negotiate passages through social systems and structures – is more

important than functional literacy – the ability to decode and compute; oppression is based in the reproduction of privileged knowledge codes and practices. (p. 193)

Having presented a brief exposition of the general understanding of critical theory, this discussion now turns to a framework that has grown out of critical theory – critical pedagogy.

Critical Pedagogy

Pepi Leistyna and Arlie Woodrum (1996) contend that critical pedagogy is a lens through which educators are better positioned to examine and interact with the politics of education. Politics in this context does not refer to a particular political party, such as democrat or republican, but rather the underlying power relationships that structure our world (Leistyna & Woodrum, 1996). Critical pedagogy gives educators a framework in order to make meaning of commonplace events, the purpose and goals of education, the way schools are structured, teacher preparation, the curriculum selected and implemented, the manner in which students are perceived and treated, and so forth (Leistyna & Woodrum, 1996). Horn (2004) concurs with Leistyna and Woodrum's (1996) perspective and also talks about critical pedagogy, "to include the consequences of knowledge production, teaching, and learning for each individual within society" (p. 56).

According to Ornstein and Hunkins (2004), "pedagogy as a political process, as critical pedagogy, has the hallmarks of reflection and action" (p. 382). Certainly, one can argue, "all good pedagogy allows for student reflection and demands student action or application" (Ornstein & Hunkins, 2004, p. 382). However, there are many critical theorists who seem to suggest that their particular political social camp has the pulse on such pedagogy (Ornstein & Hunkins, 2004). At the same time, there are critical pedagogues who take issue with the idea that there is a monolithic discourse, one particular way of viewing the world (Ornstein &

Hunkins, 2004). The vast literature and positions of theorists within critical pedagogy demonstrate that because there are multiple versions of critical pedagogy and many scholars who would identify themselves as such, there is no generic definition that can be applied to the term (Leistyna & Woodrum, 1996; McLaren, 2009; Ornstein & Hunkins, 2004). Despite this lack of a generic definition for critical pedagogy, there are salient theoretical insights and practices that “are woven through these various approaches, which often grow out of a common set of issues and conditions, that provide the focus for critical pedagogy within the shifting spheres of political conflict” (p. 3). McLaren (2009) would concur with Leistyna and Woodrum (1996) when he proposes, “there are common themes and constructs that run through many of the adherents of critical pedagogy” (p. 61). Leistyna and Woodrum (1996) submit that as new questions evolve out of these conflicts, so does the call for unique and more inclusive theoretical and practical responses.

Critical pedagogues react strongly against what Paulo Freire (2008/1970) terms the, “banking concept of education” (p. 72). Freire (2008/1970) asserts that in the banking concept of education, students are permitted only to receive, file, and store the deposits of information given to them. In addition, Freire (2008.1970) asserts that in the “banking” concept, “knowledge is a gift bestowed by those who consider themselves knowledgeable upon those whom they consider to know nothing” (p. 72). Freire (2008/1970) contends that this projection of absolute ignorance onto others, a characteristic of the ideology of oppression, stands against the understanding of education and knowledge as processes of inquiry. In the banking concept of education, Freire (2008/1970), asserts that the result is that is, “the people themselves who are filed away through the lack of creativity, transformation and knowledge in this (at best) misguided system” (p. 72).

What does this banking concept of education look like in practice and attitude (Freire, 2008/1970)? According to Freire (2008/1970), the following practices and attitudes also mirror oppressive society as a whole:

- (a) the teacher teaches and the students are taught;
- (b) the teacher knows everything and the students know nothing;
- (c) the teacher thinks and the students are thought about;
- (d) the teacher talks and the students listen – meekly;
- (e) the teacher disciplines and the students are disciplined;
- (f) the teacher chooses and enforces his choice, and the students comply;
- (g) the teacher acts and the students have the illusion of acting through the action of the teacher;
- (h) the teacher chooses the program content, and the students (who were not consulted) adapt to it;
- (i) the teacher confuses the authority of knowledge with his or her own professional authority, which she and he sets in opposition to the freedom of the students;
- (j) the teacher is the Subject of the learning process, while the pupils are mere objects. (p. 73)

Freire (2008/1970) concludes that this banking concept of education results in the students lacking the development of a critical consciousness which would develop from their interaction in the world as transformers of that world.

Now that some understanding of what critical pedagogy is and to what type of education it is reacting, there will next be a presentation on some of the essential characteristics and major concepts in critical pedagogy that scholars are promoting in this framework in the present day.

Characteristics of Critical Pedagogy

Kincheloe (2008) asserts that descriptions of critical pedagogy are molded by those who devise them and the values they espouse. In the presentation of these characteristics and concepts of critical pedagogy, there are some who will believe that more characteristics should be added or that some should be left out (Kincheloe, 2008). These characteristics and concepts of critical pedagogy presented here are based on Kincheloe's (2008) vision of critical pedagogy.

The first characteristic of critical pedagogy is that it is grounded on a social and educational vision of justice and equality (Kincheloe, 2008). Tied into this concern for justice and equality in education is one's understanding of the purpose of schooling. According to Bennett and LeCompte (1990), the purposes of schooling be seen primarily as instruction in the, "cognitive, intellectual, political, economic or social realms. Researchers, communities, politicians, and others interested in education vary in the way they believe these purposes should be slanted and how much emphasis should be accorded to each, depending upon their theoretical orientations" (p. 32). Kincheloe (2008) argues that there is a lack of discussion about the purpose of schooling among educational leaders and school boards. This lack of discussion results in a lacuna in educational direction and vision (Kincheloe, 2008). Kincheloe (2008) submits that a discussion of educational purpose and vision demands both a fundamental rethinking and reconceptualization of:

- What human beings are capable of achieving
- The role of the social, cultural, and political in shaping human identity
- The relationship between community and schooling
- The ways that power operates to create purposes for schooling that are not necessarily in the best interests of the children that attend them

- How teachers and students might relate to knowledge
- The ways schooling affects the lives of students from marginalized groups
- The organization of schooling and the relationship between teachers and learners (p. 6)

Kincheloe (2008) continues to assert that educators not only deal with questions of schooling, curriculum, and educational policy, but also with concerns about social justice and human possibility. Giroux (2004) supports the idea of critical pedagogy's concern for social justice and equality when he proffers that critical pedagogy, "is a moral and political practice premised on the assumption that learning is not about processing received knowledge but actually transforming it as part of a more expansive struggle for individual rights and social justice" (p. 34). Critical pedagogy is able to identify the political and cultural forces that can inhibit some groups of students from success and take steps to correct this injustice (Kincheloe, 2008).

A second characteristic of critical pedagogy is the belief that education is inherently political (Kincheloe, 2008). What this means is that education is a political activity and that all decisions made in schools about personnel and curriculum hold profound political implications (Kincheloe, 2008). Horn (2008) seems to agree with this assessment of education as a political activity when he submits, "the determination of appropriate content and skills is a political process that reflects the values of the experts and the culture in which these experts are positioned" (p. 64). Horn (2004) continues his point by saying that the knowledge and skills that are selected are a reflection of the values of the dominant culture. The ramifications of these, "unchallenged representations erases other oppositional viewpoints, reproduces the status quo, and assumes that rights and privileges are naturally occurring and not assigned by one's position in society through gender, race, and social class" (Horn, 2004, p. 64).

Kincheloe (2008) contends that many times those who participate in developing pedagogies are not aware of the political implications embedded within them. A simple transfer of information about a body of facts in the writing of a curriculum is simply a promotion of the status quo (Kincheloe, 2008). With this act of transference, there is no opportunity for students or teachers in this type of curriculum for the exploration of alternate sources, competing interpretations or independent research with the result of producing knowledge that may challenge the prevailing interpretations (Kincheloe, 2008). The promotion of simple transference of a body of information in a curriculum must give way to the access of knowledge outside of the dominant culture and powerbase. According to Kincheloe (2008), critical pedagogy is more than simply rearranging furniture in classrooms or helping students “feel good.” Critical pedagogy promotes a caring about students that focuses on the subtle workings of racism, sexism, class bias, cultural oppression, and homophobia (Kincheloe, 2008).

A third characteristic of critical pedagogy is its dedication to the alleviation of human suffering (Kincheloe, 2008). Kincheloe (2008) cautions that knowing and learning are practical, emotional, and spirited and not simply intellectual and scholarly activities. Critical pedagogy is interested in the promotion of learning as affective and emotional in a way that connects students to themselves as individuals and as members of groups (Kincheloe, 2008). Kincheloe (2008) submits that critical pedagogy has a special concern for those groups of people who are suffering because of poverty and discrimination. This concern for human suffering spurs on critical educators to search out the causes of such suffering through the understandings of the use of power with its ideological, hegemonic, disciplinary, and regulatory dimensions (Kincheloe, 2008).

Kincheloe (2008) strongly argues that advocates of critical pedagogy believe that “suffering is a humanly constructed phenomenon and does not have to exist” (p. 12). Kincheloe (2008) continues by saying that this suffering can be eradicated if the people of the world and their governments had the collective will to do so. Educators can do their part in alleviating human suffering by cultivating students’ intellects to be cognizant of the reality of human suffering and the responsibility to eradicate it (Kincheloe, 2008). Critical educators participate in the alleviation of human suffering when they utilize scholarship in the service of transformative action in their own part of the world and beyond (Kincheloe, 2008).

A fourth characteristic of critical pedagogy is the prevention of students from being hurt (Kincheloe, 2008). Kincheloe (2008) argues, “critical pedagogy mandates that schools don’t hurt students – good schools don’t blame students for their failures or strip students of the forms of knowledge they bring to the classroom” (p. 13). Once again, understanding that education is always political as it supports the dominant culture while undermining the interests of the marginalized, critical pedagogy does not permit such omissions in the curricula it develops (Kincheloe, 2008). Unfortunately, in many schools, especially those schools shaped by the George W. Bush administration’s “No Child Left Behind” (NCLB) legislation in 2001, “teachers are discouraged from taking into account the social, cultural, and economic backgrounds of their students and the needs and interests that emerge from them” (Kincheloe, 2008, p. 14). Joel Spring (2004) concurs with Kincheloe’s (2008) evaluation of NCLB when he purports that this legislation, “dealt a severe blow to those advocating the protection of minority cultures and languages” (p. 122). With high-stakes standardized tests, only one, single dominant culture exists with one standardized body of knowledge (Spring, 2004). Spring (2004) argues that the

implementation of NCLB appears to be a victory for educators and politicians who promote that schools teach a uniform American culture.

In addition to the politics of the dominant culture played out in curriculum, students can also be hurt in an educational environment that promotes a heavy leaning on psychometrics and mainstream versions of educational psychology that proffer the belief that “intelligence and academic ability are individual dynamics free from social, cultural, and economic influences” (Kincheloe, 2008, p. 14). Critical educators do not accept separation of students’ environmental factors from efforts to measure their abilities or intelligences (Kincheloe, 2008).

Students who are culturally different and/or poor experience tremendous hurt when they come up against a middle-class, white-culture-grounded practice of school and the intelligence-testing establishment (Kincheloe, 2008). From the perspective of the middle-class, poverty is a badge for failure and many educational leaders and psychologists seem to be unconcerned with the psychic toll inflicted on these marginalized students (Kincheloe, 2008). Tracking policies added to this situation only enhances the hurt marginalized students experience on a daily basis (Kincheloe, 2008).

Students from marginalized cultures and backgrounds are deemed inferior by the dominant white culture (Kincheloe, 2008). Kincheloe (2008) argues that because of this hurtful labeling, “students from such backgrounds come to realize that success in school may come only with the rejection of their ethnic and/or class backgrounds and the cultural forms of knowledge that come with them” (p. 15). Spring (2004) concurs with Kincheloe’s (2008) thinking about the disintegration of marginalized students’ backgrounds in order to succeed in school as the process of *deculturalization*. Spring (2004) defines deculturalization as the, “the educational process of destroying a people’s culture and replacing it with a new culture” (p. 3). This new culture is the

marginalized students' amalgamation into the tenets and values of the dominant culture (Spring, 2004). Critical educators stand against this deculturalization of marginalized students by encouraging and assisting students in recalling and contributing to the educational setting the knowledge they already bring with them and make it a part of the curriculum (Kincheloe, 2008).

Now that the critical pedagogy framework has been presented, the question is: Can the characteristics of critical pedagogy be incorporated into one's understanding of the mission of a Catholic school and, more specifically, a Catholic, Augustinian school? This question is discussed through the presentation of previous studies in this area of inquiry.

Previous Studies Connecting Critical Pedagogy and Catholic Education

Thomas Oldenski (1997), for his doctoral dissertation, conducted a critical ethnography of a Marianist-sponsored alternative school in East Saint Louis, Illinois. Oldenski (1997) argues that the purpose of Catholic education is to proclaim the Gospel of Jesus Christ and to assist young people to integrate faith into their daily lives. Oldenski (1997) proffers that "one of the ideals of Catholic education is to become and to be a model of critical theory and practice in a liberation theology context" (p. 6). Oldenski (1997) grounds his study in church documents about the purposes of Catholic education and the scholarly discussions about the two discourses of critical pedagogy and liberation theology. Oldenski (1997) argues, "the discourses of liberation theology and critical pedagogy can describe advantageous alternative practices of schooling" (p. 216). Oldenski (1997) continues his argument by proposing that the understanding about the discourses of liberation theology and critical pedagogy can positively affect both a school's understanding of its mission as well as its practices, especially for those schools who serve the poor and the marginalized in society.

Oldenski (1997) asserts through his study that it is possible for the Catholic school to incorporate the discourses of critical pedagogy and liberation theology. In his study, Oldenski (1997) demonstrates, "how educators can conclude that liberation theology and critical pedagogy discourse can reconstruct schooling practices in Catholic and public schools" (p. 216). Oldenski (1997) sees similarities between the two discourses: both advocate the importance of building a community spirit in schools; each encourages assisting students in developing a language of critique and possibility that they can apply to their own unique living situations; each provide educators with a framework for evaluating pedagogical practices both in their own schools and in other school sites. Finally, Oldenski (1997) submits that the discourses of both liberation theology and critical pedagogy respond to the contemporary challenge offered by the pope and the bishops to promote a concern for the poor and disadvantaged.

Oldenski (1997) draws upon two previous studies for his own study. The first was an ethnographic study conducted by Peter McLaren (1986). McLaren's subject for this study was a Catholic middle school, "St. Ryan's," in Toronto. The focus of McLaren's (1986) study was to present how daily school life at "St. Ryan's" exhibited the tensions between the two poles of domination and resistance. These tensions played out in the school through the participation in various rituals of the school day (McLaren, 1986). McLaren (1986) purports that there were two root paradigms underlying daily life in the classroom for students and teachers: becoming a Catholic and becoming a worker. McLaren (1986) argues that these two paradigms are "intractably linked...[and] freely interpenetrate one another" (p. 175).

McLaren (1986) points out in his study that in the religion class, "a concept of Catholic charity developed which stressed the important values of love, kindness, justice, generosity, self-denial and social action" (p. 226). However, McLaren (1986) continues by saying that these

values were often superseded by those values contained in the root paradigms, those which stressed subservience and subordination. Despite this reversion to the dominant values, McLaren (1986) proposes that "Catholic schooling did show flashes of progressivism and emancipation in its religious teachings" (p. 227). McLaren (1986) affirms that the fight for social equality is part of the fabric of the Catholic Church's social teachings.

McLaren (1986) concludes in his study that the future task for Catholic schools, as well as public schools, is to construct an emancipatory curriculum aimed at social justice. About this task McLaren (1986) writes:

Not only must we dream a better world but we must muster the civic courage which requires us to act as if we are living in a democratic society. Within the tensions and conflicts that exist between radical critiques of schooling and Catholic education I am confident that, in the long run, a vision of social justice and emancipation can be won.

More important, I am confident that educators will begin to take a more active role in the fight for equality and liberation. (p. 254)

McLaren (1986) affirms, "the achievements of Catholic schooling, which has been outstanding, particularly with regard to preserving an enclave for the exercise of care and compassion in an often indifferent society" (p. 248). At the same time, McLaren (1986) argues that vigilance needs to be exercised so that schooling does not, "humanize inhumanity or spiritualize injustice" (p. 248).

The second study that influences Oldenski's (1997) study was conducted by Nancy Lesko (1988). Lesko (1988) conducted a case study with a coeducational high school owned and operated by the Franciscan Sisters in Port Gilbert, a blue-collar city of 85,000 in the Midwest. Lesko's (1988) focus was to look at, "the continuing struggle between public and private domains

and interests, a major cultural dilemma affecting social organizations on all levels, including schools and the Catholic Church as well as families and work settings" (p. 1).

Lesko (1988) discovered through student interviews that there were two emphases at the school that were in opposition to each other. On the one hand, the school's religious foundation placed an emphasis on caring among its members (Lesko, 1988). On the other hand, as a private school, it had to promote competitive achievement (Lesko, 1988). Lesko (1988) suggested that that two all school assemblies, "spoke to the underlying conflict of caring and contest at St. Anne's" (p. 114). These two assemblies were a school spirit assembly and an all school Mass (Lesko, 1988). Lesko (1988) proffered that these two assemblies used *love* and *fun* to mediate and regulate the tensions between a caring and competitive community. Lesko (1988) argues that "through the ideas communicated in the mass and the shared fun of the Spirit Assembly, the school assemblies temporarily resolved the tension between the egalitarian relations and individualistic competition" (p. 114).

Lesko (1988) concludes in her study that St. Anne's, as a Catholic school, promotes a spirit of thoughtfulness that helps St. Anne's to negotiate its conflicts. About this spirit of thoughtfulness and its benefit to St. Anne's, Lesko (1988) writes:

This thoughtfulness about the school is one major impact of St. Anne's resolutions of its conflicts. Its assemblies and rituals produce conditions in which thoughtfulness is fostered. At the same time that St. Anne's rituals heighten reflection on and about the school, they also point to something beyond the school. School practices and ideas 'lead out of themselves'. This analysis suggested that they lead out toward a public domain, toward mediations of conflicts, albeit temporary ones. Thus, the school is not simply a passive mediator or amplifier of the cultural conflicts of which it partakes. It

demonstrates the one must seek something beyond the given, create new moments with and through others and upon established principles. (p. 147)

This spirit of thoughtfulness can help to cultivate what Lesko (1988) calls its uniqueness, "a characteristic that makes a school come alive, become something rather than an abstraction" (p. 145). The promotion of this uniqueness, this coming alive can create the space for the school to become a site for " identity-creation as well as of training and competition....Both the contest and caring view of schools need to be preserved; the tension between them is productive, just as is the tension between private and public welfare" (Lesko, 1988, pp. 147-148).

Now that the critical pedagogy framework has been presented, there will next be a presentation about some of the critiques scholars have about the limitations of the critical pedagogy framework as a tool for analysis of pedagogy in schools.

Criticisms of Critical Pedagogy Framework

Scholars over the years have offered critiques about some of the limitations of the critical pedagogy framework. Willem Wardekker and Siebren Miedema (1997) assert that in the 1970s, critical pedagogy was considered to be the best available model for education, "synthesizing ... all previous approaches with a clear critique of the societal conditions of education" (p. 45). Wardekker and Miedema (1997) continue by saying that in a relatively short period of time, critical pedagogy has met with fierce criticism. The first criticism comes from critical pedagogues themselves who contend that one of the problems of critical pedagogy is that it is a theory in search of a praxis (Giroux & McLaren, 1995; Purpel & Shapiro, 1995; Wardekker & Miedema, 1997). Giroux and McLaren (1995) submit that

many current trends in critical pedagogy are embedded in the endemic weaknesses of a theoretical project overly concerned with developing a language of critique. Critical

pedagogy is steeped in a posture of moral indignation toward the injustices reproduced in American public schools. Unfortunately, this one-sided emphasis on critique is matched by the lack of theoretical and pragmatic discourse upon which to ground its own vision of society and schooling and to shape the direction of a critical praxis. (p. 32).

David Purpel and Svi Shapiro (1995) would appear to concur with Giroux and McLaren's (1995) caution about critical pedagogy. Purpel and Shapiro (1995) submit that critical pedagogical theories have discovered the relationship between education to wider economic, cultural, and social structures, "yet they are generally unable to match their insights about how schools function with some realistic or effective notions of how flesh-and-blood human beings (whether students, teachers, parents, or citizens in general) can respond" (p. 113). Willem Aredekker and Siebren Miedema (1997) concur that critical pedagogy was inadequate due to its, "incapacity to bridge the gap between theory and practice" (p. 53).

A second critique of the critical pedagogy framework concerns disagreements within the critical pedagogy camp itself. Marit Trelstad (2008) asserts, "critical pedagogies do not, of course, provide a panacea to all power, ethics and trust issues in the classroom. There is plenty of internal criticism of these pedagogies from practitioners of critical pedagogy" (p. 195). Purpel and Shapiro (1995) point out that critical pedagogy not only has to deal with external obstacles of opposition or outright rejection, but also with what Purpel and Shapiro (1995) name as the "schismatic infighting among critical pedagogues themselves" (p. 120). Purpel and Shapiro (1995) contend that this infighting is not only important to the scholars in the field, but it can also, "drain important energy from the task of making the ideas broadly accessible" (p. 120) and they also seem to come from the very same debilitating approaches of extreme competition and aggression of which they speak against.

A third critique of critical pedagogy is that it does not speak to all educational critics who adopt other theories toward educational reform. According to Purpel and Shapiro (1995), some scholars might focus on the preservation of Western civilization as represented in the great books movement. Other countercultural communities might adopt approaches based in psychology, spirituality, religion, or learning theory that are at variance with critical pedagogy (Purpel & Shapiro, 1995).

Related to this third critique is the fact that there are some issues or concerns in education that might not embrace critical pedagogy as the best response (Purpel & Shapiro, 1995). Educators may dismiss critical pedagogy in favor of focusing their energies on providing, "other kinds of responses to the plight and suffering of particular groups and specific situations (Purpel & Shapiro, 1995). Purpel and Shapiro (1995) propose that critical pedagogy has failed or may not be able to respond to the needs of these groups and situations.

A fourth critique of critical pedagogy is how it might address members of oppressor groups. Rickey Allen and César Rossatto (2009) define an oppressor student as one, "who is a member of an oppressor group (White, male, middle- or upper-class, etc.) and a benefactor of oppressor group membership" (p. 165). Allen and Rossatto (2009) contend that critical pedagogy has not provided critical educators adequate answers for dealing with the problem of power and privilege in U.S. classrooms. Allen and Rossatto (2009) propose the need for critical pedagogy to speak to the student oppressors with the goal, "to influence the perspectives, ideologies, and behaviors of enough members of powerful and privileged identity groups so that new institutional and legal policies would be enacted" (p. 172). In a word, critical pedagogy needs to articulate a teaching for social justice (Allen & Rossatto, 2009).

A final critique of critical pedagogy is that the prime authors in this field are male. Nicholas Burbules and Rupert Berk (1999) contend that there are significant contributions by female scholars to the critical pedagogy discourse, but the chief spokespersons, and the most visible in debates about pedagogy have been men. Burbules and Berk (1999) go on to say that it is not surprising, therefore, that feminists have criticized critical pedagogy for the fact that "their ostensibly universal categories and issues in fact exclude the voices and concerns of women and other groups" (p. 56).

Historical Sketch of Leadership Theory

There would seem to be general agreement among scholars that there are a wide variety of leadership theories and approaches to explain the complexities of the leadership process (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Bass, 2008; Bolman and Deal, 2008; Northouse, 2007; Palestini, 2003, 2005, 2009; Yukl, 2002). In fact, Joseph Rost (1993) claims that he found in the 1980s literature alone 110 definitions of leadership from the 312 books, chapters, and articles he examined. Palestini (2003, 2005, 2009) asserts despite the fact that the call for leadership is universal, there is much less clarity about what the term *leadership* means. Smith, Montagno, and Kuzmenko (2004) concur with Palestini's assertion in that they proffer even though the subject of leadership has been most popular among scholars and considerable research has appeared in the literature, "there is still no comprehensive understanding of what leadership is, nor is there agreement among different theorists on what good or effective leadership should be" (p. 80). Gary Yukl (2002) avers that the concept of leadership is difficult to nail down as one's understanding of leadership is arbitrary and subjective. Palestini (2003) argues for the authenticity of the following definition of leadership:

Leadership is the ability to establish and manage a creative climate open to change and continuous improvement where people are self-motivated toward the achievement of mutually developed goals in an environment of mutual respect compatible with a mutually developed value system. (p. 5)

Palestini (2003, 2009) proposes that this definition of leadership presumes a positivist approach to educational administration that is informed by both critical theory and a system of values.

Palestini (2005) submits that historically, researchers in the field have searched for that one best style of leadership that would be the most effective. Palestini (2005) contends that for one to understand the evolution of leadership theory, it is important to take an historical look at the progression of leadership theory.

Great-Man Theory

In the early 20th century, leadership traits were studied in order to ascertain what made certain persons great leaders (Northouse, 2007). For many commentators, history is shaped by the leadership of great individuals (Bass, 2008). According to Peter Northouse (2007), the theories that subsequently developed were called "great man" theories due to the fact that they focused upon the identification of the innate qualities and characteristics possessed by great social, political, and military leaders. Northouse (2007) continues by saying that it was commonly believed that people were born with these traits, and only the "great" people possessed them. Bass (2008) submits that, at this time, it was accepted that heredity played a major part in a person's leadership "greatness." Bass (2008) argues that this conception had implications for a society's understanding of the importance of marriage and family with regard to leadership. It was the survival of the fittest people along with intermarriage among them that produces an aristocratic class, which differs biologically from the lower class (Bass, 2008).

Thus, Bass (2008) concludes that aristocrats with this mentality believed that an, adequate supply of superior leaders depends on a proportionally high birthrate among the abler classes" (p. 49).

Trait Theory

Bass (2008) proposes that the great-man theories drew the attention of scholars to identify the specific qualities of leaders. Trait theory was popular in the 1940s and 1950s (Bass, 1990, 2008; Palestini, 2003, 2005). According to Palestini (2003, 2005), trait theory suggests that one can evaluate leadership and propose ways of leading effectively by considering the potential leader possesses certain personality traits, social traits, and physical characteristics. The purpose of trait theory was, "to predict which individuals would successfully become leaders and, then, whether they would be successful (Palestini, 2003, p. 6). The position of the trait theorists was, "leaders differ from non-leaders in their drive, desire to lead, honest, and integrity, self confidence, cognitive ability, and knowledge of the business that they are in" (Palestini, 2005, p. 41).

Palestini (2003) purports that limitations in trait theory in the prediction of effective leaders had given way to researchers moving toward the view of a person's behavior, rather than personality traits, being used as a criteria for effective leadership. In addition, it was seen that trait leadership fell short in explaining leadership given the fact that both the person and the situation needed to be included in any investigation about leadership (Bass, 2008; Northouse, 2007). Despite these limitations, trait theory, "did pave the way for later situational theories" (Palestini, 2003, p. 6). In addition, Palestini (2005) proffers that even though trait theory has more historical than practical interest to managers and administrators, there has recently been resurgence in the research tying leadership effectiveness to leadership traits. Palestini (2005)

informs us that some scholars “view the transformational perspective ... as a natural evolution of the earlier trait perspective” (p. 41).

Behavioral Theory

Bass (1990) submits that behavior theory offered, "an analysis of the observable behaviors of leaders that change the behavior of subordinates" (p. 48). Bass (1990) goes on to say that all the behavior theories, "emphasized reinforcement and making the receipt of rewards or the avoidance of punishment contingent on the subordinate behaving as required" (p. 48). Palestini (2003) contends that “the types of leadership behaviors investigated typically fell into two categories: production-oriented and employee-oriented” (p. 6). Production-oriented leadership, also known as concern for production, initiating structure, or task-focused leadership, involves the goal of acting to get the task done (Palestini, 2005). Employee-oriented leadership, also known as concern for people or consideration, “focuses on supporting the individual workers in their activities and involving the workers in decision-making” (Palestini, 2005, p. 42).

Contingency or Situational Models

Bolman and Deal (2008) suggest that an age-old question regarding leadership is: "Do leaders make the times, or do the times make leaders" (p. 348). Palestini (2005) argues that “contingency or situational models differ from the earlier traits and behavioral models in asserting that no single way of leading works in all situations. Rather, appropriate behavior depends on the circumstances at a given time” (p. 44). In this contingency or situational model, effective managers are able to diagnose a particular situation and then determine they can implement the required style to address that situation (Palestini, 2003, 2005). Palestini (2003, 2005) informs us that early research on the situational model suggested that subordinate,

supervisor, and task considerations affected the most appropriate leadership style to be used in a given situation. Therefore, one can conclude that varying situations call for varying leadership responses. The idea that “one can use leadership theory to predict whether a certain style will be effective is termed a positivist or functionalist approach to leadership (Palestini, 2003, p. 7).

Northouse (2007) and Bass (2008) seem to argue that there is a distinction between the contingency and situational leadership theories. It appears that the difference between the two theories lies in the leadership style of the leader in a given situation. Northouse (2007) contends that contingency theory is a, "leader-match theory that emphasizes the importance of matching the leader's style with the demands of a situation" (p. 125). Bass (2008) submits that in contingency theory, "leaders are conceived to have a personally consistent style of task or relations orientation. Either different types of leaders need to be chosen for various situations, or leaders need to change the situation to suit their particular personal style" (p. 522). Situational leadership theory, on the other hand, would seem to provide for leaders the freedom and flexibility to implement a best leadership style in response to a particular situation (Bass, 2008; Northouse, 2007). Situational leadership theory proposes that different situations insist on different kinds of leadership thus requiring that effective leaders adapt his or her style to the demands of different situations (Bass, 2008; Northouse, 2007). Therefore a leader needs to be capable of implementing several different types of leadership skills depending on the situation.

Bolman and Deal (2008) submit that there are several scholars who have studied situational theories of leadership, but most take a limited view of leadership and there are few with much empirical support. Bolman and Deal (2008) argue that many situational leadership theories fuse leadership with managing subordinates. Other leadership scholars argue that leaders need skills for managing relationships with all the significant stakeholders, including

supervisors, peers, and the external community (Bolman & Deal, 2008). Contingency theories continue to be an area needing further research, but almost all leadership scholars aver that widely varying situations and circumstances require different leadership approaches (Bolman & Deal, 2008).

Bass (2008) submits that "situational theorists have argued that leadership is a matter of situational demands; that is situational factors determine who will emerge as a leader" (p. 52). Bass (2008) goes on to say that the situationalists, "advanced the view that the emergence of a great leader is the result of time, place, and circumstances" (p. 52). Bass (2008) asserts that in the United States particularly, scholars favored situationalism over the idea that leaders were born, not made. Bass (2008) purports that, "according to situationalism, the leader is a product of the situation and circumstances, not self-made and not a product of personality, drive or ability" (p. 52).

As a result of wars and other crises, situational theory began to develop as time went on (Bass, 2008). Various scholars came to submit that the situation, in itself, was not sufficient to account for leadership (Bass, 2008). According to Bass (2008), "a combination of personal and situational elements needs to be considered" (p. 53). Palestini (2005) submits that current research in situational leadership proposes that the effect of leader behaviors on leadership performance,

is altered by such intervening variables as the effort of subordinates, their ability to perform their jobs, the clarity of their job responsibilities, the organization of the work, the cooperation and cohesiveness of the group, the sufficiency of resources and support provided to the group and the coordination of work group activities with those of other subunits. (p. 46)

As a result, according to Palestini (2005), leaders must take into consideration these aforementioned variables in choosing an appropriate style of leadership. Palestini (2005) proposes this leader-environment-follower interaction theory of leadership advises, "effective leaders first analyze deficiencies in the follower's ability, motivation, role perception, and work environment that inhibit performance and then act to eliminate those deficiencies" (p. 46).

Palestini (2003, 2005) proposes that one unique situational leadership theory is that proposed by Lee Bolman and Terrence Deal. Bolman and Deal (2008) talk about leadership in terms of frames. Bolman and Deal (2008) define a frame as, "a mental model - a set of ideas and assumptions - that you carry in your head to help you understand and negotiate a particular 'territory'" (p. 11). From the idea of the frame, Bolman and Deal (2008) then talk about leadership in terms of *reframing* and *multiframing*. By reframing, Bolman and Deal (2008) suggest that as framing encompasses matching mental maps to situations, reframing requires the additional skill of the ability to break frames. According to Bolman and Deal (2008), reframing allows leaders to redefine situations, to find new ways to shift points of view when necessary. This reframing allows leaders to choose the right tools when situations are sized up correctly (Bolman & Deal, 2008). In addition to reframing, Bolman and Deal (2008) also put forward the concept of multiframe thinking. Bolman and Deal (2008) define multiframe thinking as thinking that "requires moving beyond narrow, mechanical approaches for understanding organizations" (p. 19). Bolman and Deal (2008) propose that the use of multiple perspectives, or frames, helps to prevent leaders from reacting to situations without a clue as to what they are doing or why. In sum, Bolman and Deal (2008) argue that frames serve multiple functions: "they are filters for setting essence from trivia, maps that aid investigation, and tools for solving problems and getting things done" (p. 21).

Bolman and Deal (2008) have developed and refined over the years a theory of leadership based on the use of four frames: structural, human resource, political, and symbolic. According to Bolman and Deal (2008), the focus of the structural framework is the architecture of an organization. The architecture of an organization includes such essentials as the design of units and subunits, its rules, the roles of its people, as well as the organization's goals and policies (Bolman & Deal, 2008). The human resource frame emphasizes the understanding of people, their strengths and weaknesses as well as their thinking, emotions, desires and fears (Bolman & Deal, 2008). The political lens focuses on organizations as competitive arenas with limited resources, competing interests, and struggles for power and position (Bolman & Deal, 2008). The symbolic frame highlights such things as meaning and faith with ritual, story, play, and culture placed in the center of organizational life (Bolman & Deal, 2008).

Bolman and Deal (2008) assert that it is the fourth frame, the symbolic frame that defines the transforming leader. Palestini (2003) concurs with this assertion when he writes, "symbolic, or transforming leaders are visionary leaders, and visionary leadership is invariably symbolic" (p. 9). Bolman and Deal (2008) submit that, in recent years, the symbolic and political leadership has become more pronounced and the literature teems with advice as to how to become a powerful and visionary leader. Bolman and Deal (2008) conclude that "wise leaders understanding their own strengths, work to expand them and build diverse teams that can offer an organization leadership in all four modes: structural, political, human resource, and symbolic" (p. 372). Palestini (2003) concurs with Bolman and Deal's (2008) conclusion as he believes that effective leaders not only need to understand each frame and its limits, but also they need to have the skills to make use of multiple frames in given situations. These understandings and skills

about the four leadership frames will result in a more comprehensive and powerful leadership style (Palestini, 2003).

Having provided an example of a modern situational leadership theory in Bolman and Deal's (2008) leadership frameworks, one can see that the last frame, the symbolic frame, is the place from which the transformational leader can emerge. As mentioned earlier, the understanding of the symbolic leader as transformational is now the focus of scholarly attention about what it means to be engaged in effective leadership. Before discussing transformational leadership itself, it would be helpful to set the stage by offering a discussion about charismatic leadership. This is due to the fact that, according to Yukl (2002), "management researchers become very interested in the emotional and symbolic aspects of leadership" (p. 240). This interest in the emotional and symbolic aspects of leadership has resulted in the development of charismatic and transformational leadership (Yukl, 2002).

Charismatic Leadership Theory

Yukl (2002) submits that the terms *transformational* and *charismatic* are used interchangeably by many scholars, but Yukl (2002) also notes that there does also appear to be important distinctions between the two theories.

Yukl (2002) submits that current theories about charismatic leadership were strongly influenced by the sociologist, Max Weber. Weber, "used the term to describe a form of influence based not on tradition or formal authority but rather on follower perceptions that the leader is endowed with exceptional qualities" (Yukl, 2002, p. 241). Yukl (2002) suggests that, according to Weber, charisma occurs as a result of a social crisis, from which a leader emerges with a radical vision that offers a solution to the crisis. This results in followers becoming

attracted to the vision, experience the vision as successfully implemented and attribute its success to this extraordinary person (Yukl, 2002).

Yukl (2002) asserts that one important issue for leadership scholars is to what extent charismatic and transformational leadership are compatible. Some theorists view them both as essentially the same while others view them as distinct but overlapping concepts (Yukl, 2002). Yukl (2002) asserts that even those scholars who see charismatic and transformational leadership as distinct disagree as to whether one can be both charismatic and transformational at the same time. Yukl (2002) argues that, in recent years, the major charismatic theories have been so revised that they have moved closer to transformational theories.

Yukl (2002) proposes that there appears to be some differences between charismatic and transformational leadership in the area of empowerment of followers. Yukl (2002) contends that transformational leaders probably do more things that will empower followers and make them less dependent on the leader, such as delegating significant authority to individuals, developing follower skills and self-confidence, creating self-managed teams, providing direct access to sensitive information, eliminating unnecessary controls, and building a strong culture to support empowerment. Charismatic leaders probably do more things that foster an image of extraordinary competence, such as impression management, information restriction, unconventional behavior, and person risk-taking. (p. 261)

Therefore, it seems that the major difference between charismatic and transformational leadership is the priority transformational leaders give to the empowerment of followers. Having discussed the concept of charismatic leadership, attention can now be focused upon transformational leadership theory.

Transformational Leadership Theory

In speaking about transformational leadership, Bass and Riggio (2006) proffer, "a new paradigm of leadership has captured widespread attention" (p. 3). According to Yukl (2002), "most of the current theories of transformational leadership were strongly influenced by James McGregor Burns (1978), who wrote a best-selling book on political leadership" (p. 241). Burns (1978/2010) theorized leadership to be either transactional or transformational. Burns (1978/2010) defines transactional leaders as those who, "approach followers with an eye to exchanging one thing for another: jobs for votes, or subsidies for campaign contributions. Such transactions comprise the bulk of the relationships among leaders and followers, especially in groups, legislatures, and parties" (p. 4). Burns (1978/2010) defines the transforming leaders one who, "recognizes and exploits an existing need or demand of a potential follower. But beyond that, the transforming leader looks for potential motives in followers, seeks to satisfy higher needs, and engages the full person of the follower" (p. 4). Burns (1978/2010) goes on to say that "the result of transforming leadership is a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents" (p. 4). Kenneth Leithwood (1992) submits that, in the world of education, an example of transactional leadership would be based on, "an exchange of services (from a teacher, for example) for various kinds of rewards (salary, recognition, and intrinsic rewards) that the leader controls, at least in part" (p. 9).

Burns (2003), writing over twenty years later since introducing the concepts of transactional and transformational leadership, submits that these past two decades have both transactional and transformational leadership becoming the subject of much research and controversy. Burns (2003) contends that transactional leadership is easy enough to define as it

is, "the basic daily stuff of politics, the pursuit of change in measured and often reluctant doses" (p. 24). Burns (2003) asks what it means to transform, and is there a decisive difference between transactional and transformational leadership or were they simply variations on a continuum?

Burns (2003) proposes that there is a significant difference between transactional leadership and transformational leadership. About this Burns (2003) writes:

We must distinguish here between the verbs "change" and "transform," using exact definitions. To change is to substitute one thing for another, to give and take, to exchange places, to pass from one place to another. These are the kinds of changes I attribute to transactional leadership. But to transform something cuts much more profoundly. It is to cause a metamorphosis in form or structure, a change in the very condition or nature of a thing, a change into another substance, a radical change in outward form or inner character, as when a frog is transformed into a prince or a carriage maker into an auto factory. It is change of this breadth and depth that is fostered by transforming leadership. (p. 24).

It would seem that Burns (2003) sees a substantial difference between transactional and transformational leadership. However, Bass and Riggio (2006) contend that transformational leadership is in some ways simply an expansion of transactional leadership. Bass and Riggio (2006) propose that "transactional leadership emphasizes the transaction or the exchange that takes place among leaders, colleagues, and followers. This exchange is based on the leader discussing with others what is required and specifying the conditions and rewards these others will receive if they fulfill those requirements" (p. 4). Bass and Riggio (2006) continue to explain that transformational leadership raises leadership to the next level as it, "involves inspiring leaders to commit to a shared vision and goals for an organization or unit, challenging them to be

innovative problem-solvers, and developing followers' leadership capacity via coaching, mentoring, and provision of both challenge and support" (p. 4).

Palestini (2003) appears to ground his understanding of transformational leadership in the differences between the functionalist and critical modes of educational leadership. Palestini (2003) submits that in the current debate surrounding administrative theory in education, there are two different approaches: the functionalist perspective and the critical mode. The functionalist frame tends to be positivistic, objectivist, and supposedly value neutral while the critical frame focuses on the concerns of ends and means. Palestini (2003) argues, "organizational or societal ends or goals are of major importance to the development of a critical frame. Which ends to pursue, whom they benefit and whom they harm, and how they contribute to a social vision are crucial questions in this approach" (p. 32). Palestini (2003) continues by saying that the notion of praxis helps one to use administrative or social theory, not only to analyze institutional structures, but also to inform action leading to justice.

It is out of this critical theoretical stance that transformational leadership can be discussed. Palestini (2005) proffers that transformational leadership theory "combines aspects of the early trait theory perspective with the more current situational or contingency models" (p. 58). Palestini (2005) proposes that a transformational leader "changes an organization by recognizing opportunity and developing a vision, communicating that vision to organizational members, building trust in the vision, and achieving the vision by motivating organizational members" (p. 55). Smith, Montagno, and Kuzmenko (2004) seem to concur with Palestini (2005) when they suggest that "transformational leadership occurs when a leader inspires followers to share a vision; empowering them to achieve the vision, and provides the resource

necessary for developing their personal potential” (p. 80). One can see from these descriptions of transformational leadership the importance of vision and empowerment.

It would seem from the discussion thus far that, in addition to the importance of vision and empowerment, transformational leaders also need to promote the place of morals or values in an organization. Burns (1978/2010) mentions the place of moral principles in leadership when he talks about the concept of moral leadership, a concept which concerns Burns (1978/2010) the most. By moral leadership, Burns (1978/2010) means that

leaders and led have a relationship not only of power but of mutual needs, aspirations, and values; second, that in responding to leaders, followers have adequate knowledge of alternative leaders and programs and the capacity to choose among those alternatives; and third, that leaders take responsibility for their commitments....Moral leadership is not mere preaching, or the uttering of pieties, or the insistence of social conformity. Moral leadership emerges from, and always returns to, the fundamental wants and needs, aspirations, and values of the followers. I mean the kind of leadership that can produce social change that will satisfy followers' authentic needs. (p. 4)

Burns (1978/2010) would seem to conclude that transformational leadership occurs, "when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality" (p. 20). Thomas Sergiovanni (1990), writing for an educational context, would seem to concur with Burns (1978/2010) when he talks about leadership by bonding. Sergiovanni (1990) proposes that in leadership by bonding, the leader, focuses on arousing awareness and consciousness that elevates school goals and purposes to the level of a shared covenant that bonds together leader and follower in a moral

commitment. Leadership by bonding responds to such human needs as the desire for purpose, meaning, and significance in what one does. (p. 24)

Bass and Riggio (2006) submit that Bass, who once believed that the dynamics of transformational leadership were expected to be the same, regardless of whether it was beneficial or harmful to followers, has come to accept Burns' (1978/2010) position that for leadership to be transforming, it had to be morally uplifting. Bass and Riggio (2006) name those persons who may exhibit transforming behaviors, but for their own self-interest, self-concern, and self-aggrandizement or for the purpose of exploitation as pseudotransformational leaders. Bass and Riggio (2006) argue that pseudotransformational leaders, "believe in distorted utilitarian and warped moral principles" (p. 14). In contrast to pseudotransformational leaders, authentic transformational leaders transcend their own self-interests for one of two reasons: utilitarian or moral (Bass & Riggio, 2006). According to Bass and Riggio (2006),

If utilitarian, their objective is to benefit their group or its individual members, their organization or society, as well as themselves, and to meet the challenges of the task or mission. If a matter of moral principles, the objective is to do the right thing, to do what fits principles or morality, responsibility, a sense of discipline, and respect for authority, customs, rules, and traditions of society. There is belief in the social responsibility of the leader and the organization. (p. 14)

Therefore, it would seem that one could conclude that there is a moral or ethical dimension to transformational leadership. This moral and ethical dimension to transformational leadership will be revisited in the forthcoming discussion about servant leadership.

Now that the theoretical dimension of transformation has been discussed, there will now be a presentation of the components or characteristics of transformational leadership. These

characteristics come out of work done by Bass and Avolio (2006). Bass and Avolio (2006) submit there are four components to transformational leadership: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Now a word about each.

For transformational leaders, idealized influence means that leaders, "behave in ways that allow them to serve as models for their followers" (Bass & Avolio, 2006, p. 6). Leaders are admired, respected, and trusted by followers and followers want to emulate them (Bass & Avolio, 2006). This desire for emulation is due to the fact that followers perceive leaders as having extraordinary capabilities, persistence, and determination (Bass & Avolio, 2006). Bass and Avolio (2006) propose that there are two types of idealized influence: "the leader's behavior and the elements that are attributed to the leader by followers and other associates" (p. 6). In addition, leaders who have a great amount of idealized influence are willing to engage in risk-taking and are consistent rather than arbitrary (Bass & Avolio, 2006). Finally, they are also persons one can count on do the right thing, thus embodying high standards of ethical and moral conduct (Bass & Avolio, 2006).

The second component for transformational leaders, inspirational motivation, points to the idea that these leaders, "behave in ways that motivate and inspire those around them by providing meaning and challenge to their followers' work" (Bass & Avolio, 2006, p. 4). The result of this inspirational motivation is that team spirit is stirred and enthusiasm and optimism is displayed (Bass & Avolio, 2006). Leaders motivate followers to become involved with envisioning an attractive future state (Bass & Avolio, 2006). In addition, leaders are able to clearly communicate expectations that followers desire to meet and demonstrate a commitment to shared goals and vision (Bass & Avolio, 2006). Bass and Avolio (2006) note that this,

"charismatic-inspirational factor is similar to the behaviors described in charismatic leadership theory" (p. 6).

The third characteristic of transformational leaders, intellectual stimulation, means that leaders, "stimulate their followers' efforts to be innovative and creative by questioning assumptions, reframing problems, and approaching old situations in new ways" (Bass & Avolio, 2006, p. 7). Here, the space for creativity is created and there is no public criticism of an individual member's mistakes (Bass & Avolio, 2006). Followers are included in the process of addressing problems and seeking solutions through creative ideas and problem-solving approaches (Bass & Avolio, 2006). In the intellectual stimulation component, the leader is not threatened by followers' ideas that are different from the leader's own; leaders encourage coming at problems from various different angles (Bass & Avolio, 2006).

Individualized consideration, the fourth attribute of transformational leaders, defines leaders as paying, "special attention to each individual follower's needs for achievement and growth by acting as a coach or mentor" (p. 7). Leaders encourage an ever greater level of potential in followers (Bass & Avolio, 2006). Leaders practice individualized consideration when new opportunities for learning are promoted along with a supportive climate characterized by communication and listening (Bass & Avolio, 2006). In addition, leaders who practice individualized consideration are cognizant of individual differences in needs and desires of followers and these differences are respected (Bass & Avolio, 2006). Finally, individualized consideration promotes leaders delegating tasks to followers and supporting followers through monitoring followers' needs for additional direction, support, and assessment of progress (Bass & Avolio, 2006).

Strengths and Limitations of Transformational Leadership Theory

Northouse (2007) submits that there are number of strengths as well as limitations to transformational leadership theory. Northouse (2007) argues that the first strength of transformational leadership theory is that this theory has been widely researched from a number of perspectives by scholars since the 1970s. Northouse (2007) proffers that over the last decade in the *Leadership Quarterly* journal, 34% of the articles have been about transformational or charismatic leadership. Moreover, over 200 theses, doctoral dissertations, and research projects have been conducted using the transformational leadership approach (Northouse, 2007).

A second strength is transformational leadership's intuitive appeal (Northouse, 2007). The transformational leadership approach embodies what is appealing and sensible to people such as advocating change for others and providing a vision for the future (Northouse, 2007). Bass (1990) would appear to agree that transformational leadership is, "closer to the prototype of leadership that people have in mind when they describe their ideal leader and is more likely to provide a role model with which subordinates want to identify" (p. 54).

A third strength is that the transformational approach takes into account the needs of both followers and leaders and that leadership is not solely the responsibility of the leader, but of both leaders and followers (Northouse, 2007). Northouse (2007) goes on to say that the needs are more important to the transformational leader than the leader's own needs; therefore followers have a more prominent place in the leadership process as their attributions or characteristics are pivotal in the evolving transformation process.

A fourth strength of the transformational leadership approach is the fact that it allows for a broader view of leadership that compliments other leadership models (Northouse, 2007). For example, many leadership models focus upon the exchange of rewards for achieved goals;

transformational leadership expands to the picture to include not only rewards and goals, but also attention to the needs and growth of followers (Northouse, 2007).

A fifth strength of transformational leadership is the strong emphasis on the needs, values, and morals of followers (Northouse, 2007). Burns (1978) proposed that transformational leadership challenges leaders to move followers toward higher levels of moral responsibility. Therefore, transformational leadership includes transcending above one's own self interest in favor of the good of others on a team, organization, or community (Northouse, 2007). Transformational leadership is morally uplifting and dissuades the interpretation of coercive uses of power as legitimate models of leadership (Northouse, 2007).

Finally, transformational leadership is seen in the substantial evidence that it is an effective form of leadership (Northouse, 2007). Yukl (2002) reports that studies would seem to show that transformational leadership theory, "provides an explanation for the exceptional influence some leaders have on subordinates, a level of influence not adequately explained by earlier theories of instrumental or situational leadership" (p. 262). In addition, Northouse (2007) submits that in studies employing interviews and observations, transformational leadership was demonstrated to be effective in a variety of different situations.

As there are many strengths to transformational leadership, the theory is not without its limitations and criticisms. One criticism of transformational leadership theory is its lack of conceptual clarity (Northouse, 2007). Due to the fact that transformational leadership encompasses such a wide range of characteristics, such as creating a vision, motivating, becoming a change agent, building trust, etc., it is difficult to define exactly the parameters of the theory (Northouse, 2007). According to Northouse (2007), some studies have demonstrated a blurring or overlap of the characteristics of transformational leadership with charismatic

leadership, despite the fact that in some leadership models, charisma is seen as only a component of transformational leadership.

A second limitation of transformational theory centers on the manner in which transformational leadership is measured, especially with the Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) (Northouse, 2007). Northouse (2007) reports that some researchers have challenged the validity of the MLQ, due to the high correlation of the factors of transformational leadership with each other. This high correlation suggests to these researchers, that the factors, therefore, are not distinct factors at all (Northouse, 2007). In addition, Northouse (2007) reports that some of the transformational factors also correlate with factors belonging to transactional and laissez-faire models, which suggests that these factors may not be unique to transformational leadership theory.

A third criticism proffered by some is that transformational leadership theory treats leadership as a personality trait or predisposition, rather than as a behavior that people can learn (Northouse, 2007). Northouse (2007) posits that even though scholars such as Weber, House, and Bass emphasize that transformational leadership is about how leaders involve themselves with followers, there is a tendency to see this approach from a trait perspective. In addition, transformational leaders can be viewed as persons who have special abilities to transform other people, thereby leading some to conclude the connection to trait theory. A related criticism is offered by Yukl (2002) who argues that transformational leadership suffers from a bias toward heroic leadership. Yukl (2002) and Northouse (2007) both contend that more focus and attention is needed on the understanding of the reciprocal relationship between leaders and followers. Followers influence leaders just as much as leaders influence followers (Northouse, 2007; Yukl, 2002).

A final criticism of transformational leadership is that it has the potential to be abused (Northouse, 2007). As transformational leadership moves to change people's values and move them toward a new vision, the question is asked: whose values and whose vision (Northouse, 2007)? Who decides which values and visions are better (Northouse, 2007)? In addition, how do followers respond to leadership that must be challenged due to the fact that the values or the vision is not humanizing (Northouse, 2007)? These are questions that transformational leadership theory needs to answer (Northouse, 2007).

Moral and Ethical Leadership

Northouse (2007) contends that the influence of leadership has a tremendous impact upon the lives of followers; therefore, "to make a change in other people carries with it an enormous ethical burden and responsibility" (p. 346). Northouse (2007) emphasizes that because leaders have a great deal more power and control than followers, leaders also have greater responsibility to be sensitive to how their leadership impacts the lives of followers. In addition, leaders also have the moral charge to treat each follower as a human being with dignity and therefore deserving of respect. Northouse (2007) argues that ethics is central, and leaders facilitate the establishment and reinforcement of organizational values. Sergiovanni (2000) concurs with Northouse (2007) in the position that ethics has a prominent place in any discussion of leadership. Sergioivanni (2000) argues that many school administrators are practicing a form of leadership that is based on moral authority, but, unfortunately, this practice is often not considered to be leadership due to the fact that "moral authority is underplayed and that the management values undergirding this authority are largely unofficial" (p. 269).

Because leaders can have a tremendous influence on followers and can greatly impact the lives of followers and organizations, there has been great interest in the ethical aspects of

leadership (Yukl, 2002). In fact, the subject has become more prominent in leadership literature (Yukl, 2002). Yukl (2002) argues that "much of the current thinking about ethical leadership has been influenced by a few scholars ... and the examples used by these scholars often involve political leaders, community leaders, religious leaders, and leaders in not-for profit organizations" (p. 402). One such scholar that will be used as a theoretical framework for this study is Robert Greenleaf and his work in an approach to leadership called servant leadership.

Servant Leadership

Northouse (2007) reports that in the 1970s, "Robert Greenleaf developed a somewhat paradoxical approach to leadership called *servant leadership*" (p. 348) It is an approach that has gained prominence in recent years (Northouse, 2007; Spears, 2002) About this increased interest in servant-leadership, Larry Spears (2002) writes:

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 during the past decade. 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. (p. 1)

Spears (2002) continues by saying, servant leadership, now in its fourth decade as a service and leadership concept, persists in fashioning a quiet revolution in workplaces around the globe.

What is this concept of servant leadership that seems to have made a return to the leadership literature? Greenleaf (1977), when talking about leadership, contends that

a new moral principle is emerging which holds that the only authority deserving one's allegiance is that which is freely and knowingly granted by the led to the leader in response to, and in proportion to, the clearly evident servant stature of the leader. (p. 7)

Sergiovanni (2000), concurring with Greenleaf (1977), asserts that servant leadership is the means by which leaders acquire the essential legitimacy to lead. Spears (2002) asserts Greenleaf's (1977) servant leadership model identifies serving others as the number one leadership priority. Servant leadership emphasizes, "increased service to others, a holistic approach to work, building a sense of community, and the sharing of power in decision making" (Spears, 2002, p. 4). Who is this servant leader? Greenleaf (1977) proffers that the servant-leader is one who is first a servant. About this servant leader, Greenleaf (1977) writes:

It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first. Then conscious choice bring 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? (p. 27)

Spears (2002) stresses that servant-leadership is not simply a "quick-fix" approach to problems for an institution. Nor is it something that is quickly infused in an institution (Spears, 2002). According to Spears (2002), 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" (p. 4).

The Ten Characteristics of the Servant-Leader

Spears (2002) has gleaned from Greenleaf's (1977) original work ten characteristics of the servant-leader that are of critical importance. These characteristics are: listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the

growth of people, and the building of community (Spears, 2002). There will now be a discussion about each of these crucial attributes of the servant-leader.

The first characteristic is the servant-leader's ability to listen. Greenleaf (1977) asks why leaders spend so little time listening. Greenleaf (1977) responds to his own question by conjecturing that those who lead are faced with a difficulty, their first reaction is to pin the problem on someone else rather than acknowledging the presence of the problem and the need to do something about it. Greenleaf (1977) suggests that leaders notice: "I have a problem, What is it? What can I do about *my* problem" (p. 30)? Greenleaf (1977) submits that sensible persons would react by listening, and somebody is likely in the situation to identify the problem and offer a solution to it or the problem will be solved through intuitive insight.

Spears (2002) affirms the importance of listening when he suggests that leaders need to listen intently to others and find out what followers are saying and not saying. This posture of intent listening will result in identifying and clarifying the will of the group (Spears, 2002). Spears (2002) also reminds us of the importance of listening to one's inner voice in order to seek to understand what one's body, spirit, and mind are communicating. Listening, coupled with regular opportunities for reflection, is essential to the growth of the servant-leader (Spears, 2002).

The second characteristic of the servant-leader is empathy (Spears, 2002). About the meaning of empathy, Greenleaf (1977) writes: "The servant always accepts and empathizes, never rejects. The servant as leader always empathizes, always accepts the person but sometimes refuses to accept some of the person's effort or performance as good enough" (pp. 33-34). Greenleaf (1977) submits that this acceptance of the person means that the servant-leader is required to be tolerant of imperfection. According to Greenleaf (1977), people grow taller when

leaders empathize and accept people for who they are, despite the fact that sometimes persons will fall short in their performance. Leaders who empathize and fully accept persons for who they are more likely to gain the trust of followers (Greenleaf, 1977). Spears (2002) concurs with Greenleaf's understanding of empathy when he states, "the most successful servant-leaders are those who have become skilled empathetic listeners" (p. 5).

The third attribute of the servant-leader is healing (Spears, 2002). Greenleaf (1977) contends that those in the helping and healing professions are primarily doing this type of work for their own healing. In talking about healing and leadership, Greenleaf (1977) proffers that "there is something subtle communicated to one who is being served and led if, implicit in the compact between servant-leader and led, is the understanding that the search for wholeness is something they share" (p. 50).

Spears (2002) upon reflecting on Greenleaf's (1977) understanding of servant-leadership and healing proposes that "learning to heal is a powerful force for transformation and integration" (p. 5). Spears (2002) acknowledges that one of the great strengths of servant-leadership is the potential to bring about healing in the lives of others and in the lives of the leaders themselves. Servant-leaders have the opportunity to assist people whose spirits and emotions are broken so that they might begin to "become whole" once again (Spears, 2002).

The fourth characteristic of servant-leaders is awareness, specifically, general awareness and self-awareness (Spears, 2002). Greenleaf (1977) asserts that awareness strengthens one's effectiveness as a leader. Greenleaf (1977) recommends that "when one is aware, there is more than the usual alertness, more intense contact with the immediate situation, and more is stored away in the unconscious computer to produce intuitive insights in the future when needed" (p.

41). Greenleaf (1977) avers that awareness is risky and it is not a consolation. About this attribute of awareness, Greenleaf (1977) continues to advise:

The cultivation of awareness gives on the basis for detachment, the ability to stand aside and see oneself in perspective in the context on one's own experience, amid the every present dangers, threats, and alarms. Then one sees one's own peculiar assortment of obligations and responsibilities in a way that permits one to sort out the urgent from the important and perhaps deal with the important. Awareness is not a giver of solace – it is just the opposite. It is a disturber and an awakener. Able leaders are usually sharply awake and reasonably disturbed. They are not seekers after solace. They have their own inner serenity. (p. 41)

The positive side of awareness is that it opens for servant-leaders the doors to creative insight to respond to the stresses that life presents (Greenleaf, 1977). Spears (2002) avers that awareness assists servant-leaders to understand and respond to issues that involve ethics and values.

The fifth characteristic of servant-leaders is persuasion (Spears, 2002). Sergiovanni (2000) proposes that "moral authority relies heavily on persuasion" (p. 284). Greenleaf (1977) cites John Woolman, an American Quaker, as an example of a leader who almost singlehandedly rid the Religious Society of Friends of slaves. Greenleaf (1977) argues that Woolman was able to rid the Society of the acceptability of slave ownership through the power of gentle, but clear and persistent persuasion. Greenleaf (1977) concludes that leadership by persuasion, "has the virtue of change by convincement rather than coercion" (p. 44). Spears (2002) builds on Greenleaf's (1977) understanding of persuasion by proposing that servant-leaders rely on persuasion, rather than positional authority, in making decisions in an organization. According to Spears (2002), this ability to convince, rather than to coerce, "offers one of the clearest

distinctions from the traditional authoritarian model and that of servant leadership" (p. 6).

Spears (2002) contends that servant-leaders are effective at building up consensus within groups.

The sixth attribute of servant-leaders is conceptualization (Spears, 2002). Greenleaf (1977) proposes that through servant-leaders' skill for conceptual leadership, great social, political, and economic transformations can take place. In talking about conceptualization, Spears (2002) suggests that "the ability to look at a problem (or an organization) from a conceptualizing perspective means that one must think beyond day-to-day realities" (p. 6). Spears (2002) advises that the traditional manager focuses on the need to complete short-term goals, while the manager who is a servant-leader stretches his or her thinking to take in broader-based conceptual thinking. The challenge for servant-leaders is to strike the balance between the day-to-day focused approach and more conceptual thinking for the long term (Spears, 2002).

The seventh characteristic of servant-leaders is foresight (Spears, 2002). Greenleaf (1977) proposes that "the prudent person is one who constantly thinks of now as the moving concept in which past, present moment, and future are one organic unity" (p. 38). Greenleaf (1977) posits that servant-leaders are at once, at every moment in time historian, analyst, and prophet, not three separate roles. Greenleaf (1977) strongly asserts that the failure of a leader not to foresee is an *ethical* failure, because, many times, serious ethical compromises are the result of the failure of the leader at an earlier time to foresee today's events and take the right course of action when there was time to do so. Spears (2002) contends that foresight, "is the characteristic that enables the servant-leader to understand the lessons from the past, the realities of the present, and the likely consequence of a decision for the future" (p. 7). Greenleaf (1977) calls foresight the "lead" the leader has which enables leaders to live in a proactive stance, rather than a reactive stance when dealing with situations. Living from a reactive stance is the result of the

loss of leadership due to the fact that there was a failure to foresee what reasonably could have been foreseen, and from failure to act on that knowledge while the leader had the freedom and opportunity to do so (Greenleaf, 1977). Greenleaf (1977) concludes that servant-leaders are required to live on two level of consciousness:

one is the real world – concerned, responsible, effective, value-oriented. One is also detached, riding above it, seeing today's events, and seeing one-self deeply involved in today's events, in the perspective of a long sweep of history and projected into the indefinite future. Such a split enables one better to foresee, the unforeseeable. (p. 40)

Greenleaf (1977) submits that servant-leaders who live on these two levels of consciousness, "can live and act in the real world with a clearer conscience" (p. 40). Spears (2002) remarks that foresight seems to be the one characteristic with which the servant-leader may be born, while the other nine characteristics can be consciously developed. Spears (2002) acknowledges that there has not been much written about foresight and that this is an area in leadership studies that remains largely unexplored and in need of further careful attention.

The eighth characteristic for servant-leaders is stewardship (Spears, 2002). According to Spears (2002), Greenleaf's (1977) view of institutions was one in which, "CEOs, staffs, and trustees all played significant roles in holding their institutions in trust for the greater good of society" (p. 7). About this trust Greenleaf (1977) writes: "The only sound basis for trust is for people to have the solid experience of being served by their institutions in way that builds a society that is more just and loving, and with greater creative opportunities for all of its people" (p. 83). Sergiovanni (2000) contends that the servant leadership style brings into the center stewardship responsibilities. Sergiovanni (2000) believes that stewardship symbolizes, "an act of trust, whereby people and institutions entrust a leader with certain obligations and duties to fulfill

and perform on their behalf" (p. 286). Greenleaf (1977) would argue that the foundation for building an institution for the greater good of the society is for servant-leaders to start with serving people within the institution itself. Greenleaf (1977) recommends that "the first order of business is to build a group of people who, under the influence of the institution, grow taller and become healthier, stronger, [and] more autonomous" (p. 53). As people within the institution are served by servant-leaders, the result is a group of people whose mission is to go forth and serve others.

The ninth attribute for servant-leaders is commitment to the growth of people (Spears, 2002). Spears (2002) suggests that the commitment to the growth of people means that servant-leaders recognize the fact that people have an intrinsic value and dignity beyond their contributions as workers. Therefore, servant-leaders need to be deeply committed to the growth and well-being of each person within the institution (Spears, 2002). One can see that this was Greenleaf's (1977) ardent belief as he asks servant-leaders to reflect upon the effect that these leaders have upon those they serve. Greenleaf (1977) argues that servant-leaders serve others by assisting them in becoming healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, and inclined to become servants themselves. Spears (2002) suggests concrete ways in which servant-leaders can promote this growth of persons when he writes:

The servant-leader recognizes the tremendous responsibility to do everything within his or her power to nurture the personal, professional, and spiritual growth of employees. In practice, this can include (but is not limited to) concrete actions such as making available funds for personal and professional development; taking a personal interest in the ideas of and the suggestions from everyone; encouraging workers' involvement in decision-making; and actively assisting laid-off workers to find other employment. (p. 8)

For servant-leaders, this responsibility to the growth of persons involves a concern, not just for the benefits that can be brought to the institution, but for the benefits to persons themselves.

The tenth, and last, characteristic for servant-leaders is the building of community (Spears, 2002). Greenleaf (1977) argues that there has been a separation of institutions from the life of the community and this can have negative implications for society. Greenleaf (1977) suggests that "human service that requires love cannot be satisfactorily dispensed by specialized institutions that exist apart from the community, that take the problem out of sight of the community. Both those being cared for and the community suffer" (p. 52). Spears (2002) concurs with this when he suggests that "much has been lost in recent human history as a result of a shift in which large institutions, rather than local communities, have become the primary shapers of human lives" (p. 8). Greenleaf (1977) submits that a contributor to this damage of community is a diminishment of love. Greenleaf (1977) suggests that one of the conditions of love is *unlimited liability* for others. As soon as one thinks that love for another can be qualified or limited in any degree, the result is a diminishment of love (Greenleaf, 1977).

Greenleaf (1977) discusses examples of how this suffering of community and persons has occurred in society, one being the school. He names the problem for schools when he says the *school*, on which we pinned so much of our hopes for a better society, has become too much of a social-upgrading mechanism that destroys community. Now we have the beginnings of questioning of the school as we know it, as a specialized, separate-from-community institution. And much of the alienation and purposelessness of our times is laid at the door, *not of education*, but of the *school*. (p. 51)

For Greenleaf (1977), it is not education itself that is the problem, but the way it is delivered that causes the alienations of the persons and institutions from the community. Greenleaf (1977)

suggests that what is needed to combat this separation from community and to rebuild community as a viable life form is for servant-leaders, "to show the way, not by mass movements, but by each servant-leader demonstrating his or her own unlimited liability for a quite specific community-related group" (p. 53). Spears (2002) concurs that servant-leaders need to identify some means for creating true community among those who work within institutions.

Now that there has been a discussion about servant-leadership and its salient characteristics, attention will now be turned to past studies that have been done with regard to servant-leadership and educational institutions.

Previous Studies About Servant Leadership in Schools

The first study that will be discussed was done by Charles Wheaton (1999) as his doctoral dissertation. Wheaton (1999) uses Greenleaf's (1977) servant leadership theory as a framework to examine the statements of participants regarding their assessments of effective superintendents and their identification of desired qualities in a superintendent. Wheaton (1999) then takes participants' statements and compares them to the characteristics of the servant leader as outlined by Greenleaf (1977).

Wheaton (1999) found that participants identified six of the ten servant-leadership characteristics: listening, empathy, foresight, awareness, conceptualization, and teamwork. However, Wheaton (1999) found that participants' identification of the qualities of effective superintendents was not closely aligned enough to the characteristics of Greenleaf's (1977) servant-leadership to allow for a conclusive statement on whether or not participants' identified effective leadership with servant leadership. Wheaton (1999) draws this conclusion based on the

fact that only three of the fourteen participants described effective superintendent leadership with the attributes of servant leadership.

Wheaton (1999) reports that his study revealed that participants ascribed qualities of effective leadership that were not considered to be servant leadership. Wheaton (1999) states some participants associated such things as providing structure, behaving autocratically at times, and expertise in fiscal affairs as attributes associated with effective leadership.

Wheaton (1999) proffers through this study that it is difficult to become a servant-leader as a superintendent of a public school system. Wheaton (1999) submits that some of the challenges that serve as obstacles to servant leadership or that can make a servant leadership stance difficult are a "lack of funding, legal restrictions, labor unions, school boards, and annual legislative mandates" (p. 129). Wheaton (1999) avers that these realities can serve as reasons as to why not many superintendents are identified as servant-leaders.

A second study that attempts to correlate servant leadership with school climate with conducted by Glenda Black (2010). According to Black (2010) the aim of this mixed method study was to determine, "the extent that servant leadership was correlated with perceptions of school climate to identify whether there was a relationship between principal's and teachers' perceived practice of servant leadership and of school climate" (p. 437). Through the use two assessments and focus groups, Black (2010) asserts that the data reveals a significant positive correlation between servant leadership and school climate.

Black (2010) asserts that both the language and characteristics of servant leadership, "are the most appropriate leadership style for Catholic school leaders. In addition, "the doctrines and teachings of the Catholic Church encourage members of the Catholic community to live the principles of servant leadership" (p. 442).

Black (2010) claims that the correlational analysis suggested a significant positive relationship between the participants' perceptions of servant leadership practices and school climate. According to Black (2010), the correlational analysis demonstrated the supportive, intimate, and collegial dimensions of school climate as well as the builds community, values people, and displays authenticity dimensions of servant leadership. In addition, Black (2010) avers that the focus group interviews revealed both teachers and principals described many of the constructs of servant leadership. According to Black (2010), the servant leadership constructs with the highest number of patterns (the different ways in which people discussed the same construct) were values people, develops people, and shares leadership. In addition, the school climate dimensions with the highest number of responses were supportive principal behavior, intimate teacher behavior, and collegial teacher behavior (Black, 2010). Black (2010) submits that this, "strong relationship suggests that when servant leadership is perceived to be present, the perceptions of the school climate are positive" (p. 460). Black (2010) contends that her study, "begins to fill the void in empirical evidence supporting the relationship between servant leadership behaviors and school climate, a perceived by members of the organization" (p. 460).

Black (2010) concludes her study by expressing the opinion that Catholic school leaders can practice the theory of servant leadership in order to have a positive impact on school climate. Black (2010) goes on to say that the adoption of servant leadership theory by school leaders can impact positively not only school climate, but also influence student achievement. Black (2010) asserts that previous studies do show how positive school climates can positively influence student achievement. not only impact positively school climate, but also student achievement.

A third study, not related to servant leadership specifically, but to a Lasallian Leadership Institute (LLI), similar to the Augustinian Values Institute, was conducted by Diane Kettle and

Carol Swain (2002). This study is worth mentioning because it attempts to evaluate the effect of the Lasallian Leadership Institute on the culture of schools in the De La Salle tradition.

According to Kettelle and Swain (2002), the LLI was created in order to, "expand the partnership between laypersons and the De La Salle Christian Brothers in the church's ministry of education" (p. 1). Kettelle and Swain (2002) submit that the LLI was designed, "to serve as comprehensive formation program for leadership within Lasallian institutions throughout the United States and Toronto Region of the International Institute" (p. 1). The three-year formation program is comprised of classroom teachers, principals, high school presidents as well as professors and administrators (Kettelle & Swain, 2002). The theme for each of the three years consists of : 1) Lasallian leadership and spirituality; 2) Lasallian leadership and Education; and 3) Lasallian leadership and Management/Community (Kettelle and Swain, 2002).

According to Kettelle and Swain (2002), this study was initiated by both the Director of the Regional Conference of Christian Brothers and the members of the LLI board in order to determine whether or not the LLI has been successful in assisting laypersons to interiorize the Lasallian mission. Kettelle and Swain (2002) utilized both quantitative and qualitative methods using an evaluation survey as well as follow-up telephone interviews.

Kettelle and Swain (2002) report that the survey and interview results demonstrated very positive results stating that respondents used such words as "worthwhile" and "favorable" to describe their overall experience of the LLI. However, respondents appeared to have found more enjoyable years one and two more than year three (Kettelle & Swain, 2002). Kettelle and Swain (2002) point out that the respondents in the phone interviews stated very clearly that the first year focusing on spirituality was the most helpful in clarifying the meaning of the Lasallian mission.

Kettelle and Swain (2002) report that the study suggested that the LLI's strengths were an increased depth of understanding of the Lasallian mission, the connections that participants made with each other in continued networking and friendships, and the understanding that the Lasallian mission must be translated into concrete actions. According to Kettelle and Swain (2002), lessons learned from the LLI were the fact that the Leadership Institute was seen as a need, participation was both worthwhile and powerful, and that the LLI has the potential to change the culture of Lasallian schools through a deepened understanding of the Lasallian mission.

Kettelle and Swain (2002) also that the study surfaced some areas for improvement. The first area for improvement was the schedule needed to be reworked due to the number of hours spent each day at the Institute. Related to the schedule improvement was the suggestion to make accommodations for families to come and stay along with participants in order that participants could continue to spend time with family, especially in the summer session (Kettelle and Swain, 2002). A second suggestion for improvement was the reexamine the third year curriculum as well as the projects that were created during the Institute to be more connected to participants' work life (Kettelle & Swain, 2002). A third suggestion was to encourage schools to send teams of participants so that dialogue between members of the same school community will assist in looking at particular ways the Institute can affect school culture (Kettelle & Swain, 2002). A fourth suggestion was to develop an ongoing contact mechanism to the LLI (Kettelle & Swain, 2002). A final suggestion for improvement was to give attention to increasing the ethnic, gender and religious diversity of participants (Kettelle & Swain, 2002).

Strengths and Limitations of Servant Leadership Theory

Northouse (2007) suggests that there are both strengths and limitations to an understanding about the place of ethics in leadership. Northouse (2007) considers servant leadership to have an ethical dimension to it. Therefore, the strengths and limitations of ethics and leadership could apply specifically to servant leadership theory.

The first strength of ethics in leadership is that the general field of study provides a body of timely research on ethics (Northouse, 2007). Northouse (2007) asserts that there exists a high demand for moral leadership in our society today; people expect and insist on higher levels of moral responsibility from their leaders. It would seem to be the case that in a time when there appears to be a vacuum in ethical leadership, research in ethics in leadership can offer some direction on how to frame thinking about ethical leadership and how to put it into practice (Northouse, 2007).

A second strength of a consideration of ethics in leadership is that the research in this area suggests that ethics ought to be considered as an integral part of any leadership theory (Northouse, 2007). Burns' (1978) transformational leadership theory was the first to include ethics as a dimension of the leadership process (Northouse, 2007). Northouse (2007) argues that leadership is not an amoral phenomenon, but a process of influencing others that has moral implications. Leadership involves values, being respectful to followers, promoting fairness and justice, and building community (Northouse, 2007).

A third strength of the consideration of ethics in leadership is that the body of research points to several principles that are essential to the development of ethical leadership (Northouse, 2007). The values and virtues discussed in this body of research have passed the test of time and have been around for over two millennia (Northouse, 2007).

Just as there are many strengths to a consideration of ethics in leadership, there are also some limitations. The first limitation is the fact that the research about ethics in leadership is in its early stages of development and, therefore, it lacks a substantial body of traditional research findings to corroborate it (Northouse, 2007). The scarcity of research in the area of leadership ethics makes theorizing about the nature of ethical leadership difficult (Northouse, 2007). Until the body of research in this area grows, theoretical frameworks about ethical leadership remain tentative (Northouse, 2007).

A second limitation to ethical leadership theory is that it relies primarily on the writings of a few scholars who have written texts and essays that are strongly influenced by their own personal stances about the nature of leadership ethics and their worldview (Northouse, 2007). Northouse (2007) submits although the writings of scholars such as Burns and Greenleaf have stood the test of time, they have not been tested using traditional quantitative or qualitative research methods. Northouse (2007) suggests that their work is primarily descriptive and anecdotal. Sen Suddjaya and James Sarros (2002) concur with Northouse (2007) when they argue that due to the fact that, "current literature on servant leadership is filled with anecdotal evidence, empirical research is critically needed to test and validate these various questions and to create further predictions and hypotheses in order to fully develop the concept and construct of servant leadership" (p. 63). Leadership ethics, at the present time, lacks the traditional kind of empirical grounding that usually accompanies established theories about human behavior (Northouse, 2007).

Synthesis of the Theoretical Frameworks for the Study

Three theoretical frameworks presented in the literature review of this study: The Augustinian Core Values in Education, Critical Pedagogy, and Servant Leadership. I would now like to emphasize how these three frameworks will be used in this study.

The Augustinian Core Values of *veritas* (truth), *unitas* (unity), and *caritas* (love) are the primary themes of the AVI. The Augustinian school is challenged to live these three core values in the daily life of the school community, particularly in the areas of pedagogy and leadership. The goal of the use of these core values framework is to see how, if at all, the AVI challenges participants to incorporate the core values in the pedagogy and leadership aspects of the school.

The framework of critical pedagogy will be used to see if the AVI articulates some of the salient features that are central to critical pedagogy. These themes include such things as a social and educational vision of justice and equality, the recognition that education is inherently political, the desire to alleviate human suffering, and the prevention of students being hurt (Kincheloe, 2008). The goal for the use of this critical pedagogy framework is to see how, if at all, these features are articulated in the pedagogy and leadership of an Augustinian school.

The servant leadership framework will be used a lens to see if the AVI expresses the salient characteristics of the servant leadership framework. Spears (2002) gleans ten characteristics of servant leadership from the work of Greenleaf (1977): Listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and the building of community. The goal for the use of this servant leadership framework is to discover how many of these ten characteristics are part of the fabric of an Augustinian model of pedagogy and leadership.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The methodology for this study that would seem best to answer the research question is the case study. Yin (2003) suggests that the case study as a research strategy “is used in many situations to contribute to our knowledge of individual, group, organizational, social, political, and related phenomena” (p. 1). Bogdan and Biklen (2007) assert, “a case study is a detailed examination of one setting, or a single subject, a single depository or documents, or one particular event” (p. 59). For the purpose of this study, one case with participants from *two* of the schools who are embedded in the case will be examined; therefore, this falls under the category of a single-case embedded study (Yin, 2003). The rationale for the single case is that this case will be *representative* or a *typical case* to capture the experience of the AVI for all of the participating Augustinian schools (Yin, 2003). Yin (2003) submits that a case study is embedded when, “within a single case, attention is also given to units or subunits” (p. 42). This study is an *embedded* case study due to the fact that there is an examination of how the AVI serves as a vehicle to assess how the subunits, the three Augustinian core values of truth, unity, and love, are fostered in the pedagogy and leadership in an Augustinian school (Yin, 2003). In addition, this case study is also embedded due to the fact that the study includes two Augustinian schools as subunits within the one AVI (Yin, 2003).

Participants

Since the purpose of this case study is to understand one situation in great depth, the researcher will be intentional, nonrandom, and purposeful when selecting participants for this

study (Glesne, 2006; Leedy & Ormrod, 2005). According to Leedy and Ormrod (2005), nonrandom and purposeful sampling enables the researcher to “select those individuals or objects that will yield the most information about the topic under investigation” (p. 145). The number of participants for this study will vary according to the type of data collection technique to be used.

For the open-ended questionnaire, there will be surveys sent to the number of anticipated participants representing the two Augustinian schools before they attend the Institute. For the individual interview, there will be five participants from each of the two schools that will be studied. The rationale for the number five from each school comes from Kvale (1996) submitting that in, "current interview studies, the number of interviews tend to be around 15 ± 10 " (p. 102). In addition, as the purpose of the study is to explore and describe in detail the AVI's impact on participants' understanding of the pedagogy and leadership of their school, this number of interviews will reveal rich information for interpretation and analysis as well as take the researcher to the point of saturation where there is yielded little new knowledge (Yin, 2003).

The focus group will be comprised of two groups of four participants from each of the two schools in the study. Two groups each with four participants would seem to work best in the researcher's attempt to follow up research in order to clarify findings from another method, in this case, the personal interviews (Morgan, 1997). With regard to the size of each group, Morgan (1997) suggests that the rule of thumb specifies a range of 6 to 10 persons. However, Morgan (1997) also suggests that smaller size groups work best when the participants are likely to be interested and also respectful of each other. This researcher is confident that four participants in each group would fulfill both criteria for level of interest in the subject due to the fact that the participants volunteered to attend the Institute and that these persons would also be respectful of one another (Morgan, 1997). An additional practical factor to be considered in

determining the size of the focus groups is the fact that there are only 5 to 8 members of a school community represented at the AVI. The interviews and the focus group will take place at a time after participants' attendance at the Institute.

One of the issues in this study is the protection of the confidentiality of the participants. Kvale (2006) warns the researcher to be conscious of how one presents the participants in the report so as not to change the meaning of the analysis. The confidentiality of the participants in this study will be maintained as much as possible through a few ways. First, there will not be a description of the two schools provided in the study. The only identification for the schools is that they are both Augustinian schools. A second means to preserve confidentiality is that the identity of the participants will not be revealed. This means that the participants will not be identified by race, gender, or position in the school. The only identifier for each participant is from which of the two schools the participant belongs, i.e. school A or B. Even though some administrators at each school will know who participated in the AVI, they will not know which participants are attached to the comments made at the personal interviews and the focus group. Only the researcher will know the identity of the participants as related to the comments made at the interviews and focus groups. In the text of the study, participants will be identified only by the use of a number – for example, participant 1, 2, etc.

Role of the Researcher

For this study, the researcher will be a participant-observer. This means that the researcher is not merely a passive observer, but may actually participate in the events being studied (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Glesne, 2006; Yin, 2003). One of the major problems related to participant-observation involves the potential biases that are produced (Yin, 2003).

Qualitative scholars have addressed this issue of bias in a study. Leedy and Ormrod (2005) contend it is impossible to avoid data not coming into contact with bias in one way or another. Bogdan and Biklen (2007) assert, “Qualitative researchers are concerned with the effect that their own subjectivity may have on the data and the papers they produce” (p. 37). Yin (2003) asserts that in case study research one can test for bias by the degree in which the researcher is open to contrary findings. Yin (2003) suggests that the researcher can test for one’s own tolerance for contrary findings by reporting preliminary findings from the research to two or three critical colleagues. These colleagues can offer alternative explanations and suggestions for the collection of data (Yin, 2003). Yin (2003) submits that if this search for contrary findings can produce rebuttals that can be documented, then the likelihood of bias will have been reduced (Yin, 2003). In interview research, Kvale (1996) acknowledges bias may occur on either the side of the interviewer or the interviewee. One way in which this can occur is through the expectations of researchers or participants resulting in unintentional influence on the findings of the study (Kvale, 1996). Kvale (1996) continues by asserting that the interpersonal interaction in the interview can have very decisive impacts on the results. Therefore, this potential influence of interviewer and interviewee bias calls for careful attention. Kvale (1996) submits that recognized bias and subjective perspectives can have a positive impact on a study by the fact that this subjectivity may, “highlight specific aspects of the phenomenon investigated, bring new dimensions forward, contributing to multiperspectival construction of knowledge” (p. 286).

As the researcher for this study, I bring to this study a number of biases that need to be acknowledged from the outset, and these biases and prejudgments will need to be rigorously monitored during data collection and analysis (Kvale, 1996; Leedy & Ormrod, 2005). There are a few biases that this researcher has for this study. Bogdan and Biklen (2007) argue that it is

important to remember that the researcher's primary goal is not to pass judgments on a setting, but to add to the knowledge base. Bogdan and Biklen (2007) affirm, "the worth of a study is the degree to which it generates theory, description, or understanding" (p. 38). A study that intends to assign blame or to label a particular school as "good" or "bad" or to present simple prejudicial analysis is a superficial study, not worthy of consideration (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). The first bias that I bring to this study is that I am a member of the Order of Saint Augustine, the religious community who either owns or sponsors these Augustinian schools. I have a hope that this study will have a positive impact on the schools and on the credibility of the Augustinian Values Institute as a successful tool in articulating the Augustinian values in the areas of pedagogy and leadership in the schools. A second bias that I acknowledge is that I have attended four of the previous AVIs out of the six that have occurred. I have been a participant in two of the Institutes and have been an observer for two of the Institutes. In the next Institute from which I will collect data, I will also be an observer. I have my own ideas and opinions about which parts of the Institute work and which parts of the Institute could use revision.

There are some ways in which I can deal with possible biases in the study. One way in which I can deal with the bias issue is not to study the school at which I was a recent faculty member. My own experiences and interactions with the school environment its administration, faculty, and staff would prejudice greatly the data collection, analysis, and results of the study. A second way to deal with the issue of bias is to acknowledge that it is impossible to be a clean slate – one cannot divorce one's research and writing from one's experiences, beliefs, and values (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). I need to be reflective and conscious about the data being collected by the study and to allow myself to be open to being shaped by the research experience and to have my own thinking be informed by the data, even when the data takes me into an unexpected

direction (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). A third way to deal with bias is to be conscious of my style in conducting the interviews and the focus groups. Leedy and Ormrod (2005) suggest, "bias can creep into a research project in a variety of subtle and undetected ways" (p. 209). Leedy and Ormrod (2005) offer an example of this subtle bias in the interview process when they write: "when conducting an interview, the researcher's personality may affect the responses of the interviewee. In asking questions, the researcher's tone of voice or the inflection or emphasis within the sentence may influence how the respondent replies" (p. 209). Leedy and Ormrod's (2005) caveat is a reminder that I need to be very reflective and conscious about how I conduct the interviews and the focus groups and to be consistent in my personality and style.

Information Collection

There will be three types of data collection used for this study for the purposes of convergence or triangulation of the data (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005). The first technique will be an open-ended questionnaire sent before the Institute to each of the anticipated participants (See Appendix A). The questionnaire will assess participants' views about the Augustinian values and their impact upon the pedagogy and leadership of their school. In addition, this open-ended questionnaire will add a layer of confidentiality to the study because the two schools selected for the study will have already been chosen.

The second data collection method will be the interview. Kvale (1996) submits that interviews are frequently used in case studies to help develop knowledge about a specific person or institution or to illustrate more general phenomena. The purpose of the research interview is "to understand themes of the lived daily world from the subjects' own perspectives" (Kvale, 1996, p. 27). Following the AVI, the researcher will interview five attendees each from two representative Augustinian schools. The researcher will conduct an interview because the

purpose of an interview is “to gather descriptive data in the subjects’ own words so that the researcher can develop insights on how subjects interpret some piece of the world” (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007, p. 103). Conducting an interview involves following an interview guide, and carrying out the interview “with a reflective approach to the knowledge sought and the interpersonal relation of the interview situation” (Kvale, 1996, p. 88). The interview guide questions will facilitate a semi-structured type of interview because the guide focuses on certain themes and includes suggested questions (Kvale, 1996) (See Appendix B). Once the interview guide is completed, the researcher will arrange for the interview with the selected participants.

The third collection method will be the focus group. The focus group will provide additional insight into issues that developed through interview information analysis and also provide member checking of the understandings of interview participants (Glesne, 2006). The focus group questions will be constructed from the interview information. The focus group will provide supplementary data in partnership with the individual interviews (Morgan, 1997). Once the personal interviews following the AVI have been completed, the focus groups will be scheduled to take place at the site of each school. Morgan (1997) suggests that the length of the focus group be 90 minutes with an additional 30 minutes to serve as a cushion against any possible disruptions such as late arrivals or early departures. Morgan (1997) continues to suggest that the interview guide should be, "limited to probably four to five distinct topics or questions, with preplanned probes under each major topic" (p. 47). Morgan (1997) advises that an interview guide is valuable, "both in channeling the group interaction and in making comparisons across groups in the analysis phase of the research" (p. 47). This study will comprise two focus groups with four participants from each school.

Information Analysis

Meaning condensation will be the primary analysis tool utilized for this study (Kvale, 1996). Kvale (1996) asserts that meaning condensation, entails an abridgement of the meanings expressed by the interviewees into shorter formulations. Long statements are compressed into shorter formulations in which the main sense of what is said is rephrased in a few words. Meaning condensation thus involves a reduction of large interview texts into briefer, more succinct formulations. (p. 192).

Once this condensation of interview material takes place, the researcher can then begin, “working with the data, organizing them into manageable units, coding them, synthesizing them, and searching for patterns” (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007, p. 159). Glesne (2006) asserts, data analysis involves organizing what you have seen, heard, and read so that you can make sense of what you have learned. Working with the data, you describe, create explanations, pose hypotheses, develop theories, and link your story to other stories. To do so, you must categorize, synthesize, search for patterns, and interpret the data you have collected. (p. 147)

By interrogating the data in this manner, common themes and patterns will begin to emerge. From these themes, coding categories will be established. Glesne (2006) submits that, “coding is a progressive process of sorting and defining and defining and sorting the scraps of collected data ... that are applicable to your research purpose” (p. 152). Bogdan and Biklen (2007) concur that the coding system involves a search through the data for patterns and topics and that these words and phrases subsequently become coding categories. For this investigation, these coding

categories will become the means by which the study data will be sorted for analysis (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007).

Once the initial open-ended surveys come back from the survey, I can examine the information in order to begin thinking about the creation of a coding system. Glesne (2006) proposes, “data analysis done simultaneously with data collection enables you to focus and shape the study as it proceeds” (p. 148). Glesne (2006) continues by saying that it is important to, “consistently reflect on your data, work to organize them, and try to discover what they have to tell you” (p. 148). I will repeat this procedure after conducting the interviews and the focus group from each of the two schools. According to Bogdan and Biklen (2007), the development of a coding system involves several steps. The researcher first searches through the data for regularities and patterns as well as for topics the data cover (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Once these patterns and topics have been discovered, one then writes down the words and phrases to represent these topics and patterns, thus creating coding categories (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Bogdan and Biklen (2007) contend, “the development of a list of coding categories once the data have been collected is a crucial step in the data analysis process.

The development of the category codes to be used for analysis is influenced by the perspectives of the researcher as well as social values and ways of making sense of the world (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). In addition, Bogdan and Biklen (2007) propose, “different theoretical perspectives that researchers hold shape how they approach, consider, and make sense out of the data” (p. 180). For this case study, the theoretical frameworks explicated in the literature review, namely, the Augustinian core values, critical pedagogy, and servant leadership, will be influential in the creation of the coding categories.

Once I have developed the coding categories from the data collected from the open-ended surveys, the interviews, and the focus groups, I will then make a list and assign each code an abbreviation or a number (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Upon completion of these code identifiers, I can begin the process of going through the data and marking each unit with the appropriate coding category (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). This process of coding the data involves scrutinizing sentences carefully and making judgments about what codes the material pertains (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). When this coding process has been completed, I will make a copy of the notes and place the original mastery copy in a safe place (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). The data will then be ready for interpretation (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). But before interpretation can take place, it is important to confirm the trustworthiness of the analytical interpretations (Glesne, 2006). Leedy and Ormrod (2005) would discuss this concept of trustworthiness in terms of the validity of the findings.

Leedy and Ormrod (2005) note, “qualitative researchers frequently use triangulation – comparing multiple data sources in search of common themes – to support the validity of their findings” (p. 100). Leedy and Ormrod (2005) submit that qualitative researchers also use additional strategies to establish the trustworthiness or validity of their finding. A first strategy is spending extensive time in the field (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005). The researcher spends definitive time in the field in order to study a particular phenomenon, form tentative hypotheses and continuously looking for evidence that either supports or disconfirms the hypotheses (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005). In this study, I will be sending the open-ended questionnaire by mail to the participants, but I will be visiting the two schools to conduct the interviews and the focus groups. The second strategy is negative case analysis (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005). In this strategy, the researcher looks for cases that contradict existing hypotheses, and then continuously revises

explanations or theories until all cases have been accounted for (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005). For this particular study, I have researched previous studies that have used the theoretical frameworks employed for this study. These studies are cited in the literature review chapter of this study. As the data is collected from my own study, I will be analyzing the data with an eye to the analysis conducted in these previous studies. A third strategy is thick description whereby the situation is described in a sufficiently rich and thick detail so that readers can draw their own conclusions from the information presented (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005). The fourth strategy is feedback from others (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005). Here the researcher seeks the opinion of colleagues in the field in order to establish where they agree or disagree that the researcher has made appropriate interpretations and drawn valid conclusions from the data (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005). For this study, the dissertation committee will serve as the vehicle for feedback to determine the appropriateness of interpretations and the validity of the conclusions. A fifth strategy is respondent validation (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005). With this strategy, the researcher takes conclusions back to the participants in the study and inquires of them whether they agree with the conclusions of the data that they provided (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005). In this study, I will verify the information gathered with the participants of the interviews as well as the focus groups to ensure the accuracy of their input. This will be done by sending the participants copies of the transcripts of the interview and focus group sessions. In addition, once I have written the interpretation of the data, I will send this interpretation to the participants in order to see if they agree with the conclusions of the data that they provided.

REFERENCES

- Allen, R., & Rossatto, C. (2009). Does critical pedagogy work with privileged students? *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 36(1), 163-180.
- Augustine (397/1997). J. Rotelle (Ed.). *The confessions* (M. Boulding, Trans.). Hyde Park, NY: New City Press.
- Augustinian General Curia. (2008). *Rule and constitutions of the order of St. Augustine*. Rome: Author.
- Barth, R. S. (2001). *Learning by heart*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Bass, B. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Bass, B. (2008). *The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (4th ed.). New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Bass, B., & Riggio, R. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Bennett, K. P., & LeCompte, M. D. (1990). *The way schools work: A sociological analysis of education*. New York: Longman.
- Berdon, E. B. (Ed.). (2006). *Basic elements of Augustinian pedagogy*. Rome: Augustinian General Curia.
- Black, G. (2010). Correlational analysis of servant leadership and school climate. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice*, 13(4), 437-466.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Allyn and Bacon.

- Bolman, L., & Deal, T. (2008). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bonner, G. (1997). *St. Augustine of Hippo: Life and controversies* (Rev. ed.). Norwich: Canterbury Press.
- Brown, P. (1969). *Augustine of Hippo*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Burbules, N., & Berk, R. (1995). Critical thinking and critical pedagogy: Relations, differences, and limits. In T. Popkewitz & L. Fendler (Eds.), *Critical theories in education: Changing terrains of knowledge and politics* (pp. 45-65). New York: Routledge.
- Burns, J. (2003). *Transforming leadership*. New York: Grove Press.
- Burns, J. (2010). *Leadership*. New York: HarperPerrenial. (Original work published 1978)
- Darder, A., Baltodano, M., & Torres, R. (2009). Critical pedagogy: An introduction. In A. Darder, M. P. Baltodano, & R. D. Torres (Eds.), *The critical pedagogy reader* (2nd ed.), (pp. 1-20). New York: Routledge.
- Fincias, F. G. (2006). The Augustinian Educational Model. In E. B. Berdon (Ed.), *Basic elements of Augustinian pedagogy* (pp. 33-42). Rome: Augustinian General Curia.
- Freire, P. (2008). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum Publishing Co. (Original work published 1970)
- Giroux, H. A. (2004). Critical pedagogy and the postmodern/modern divide: Towards a pedagogy of democratization. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, (31)1, 31-47.
- Giroux, H. A. (2009). Critical theory and educational practice. In A. Darder, M. P. Baltodano, & R. D. Torres (Eds.), *The critical pedagogy reader* (2nd ed.), (pp. 27-51). New York: Routledge.

- Giroux, H. & McLaren, P. (1995). Radical pedagogy as cultural politics: Beyond the discourse of critique and anti-utopianism. In P. McLaren (Ed.), *Pedagogy, culture, and the body*. London: Routledge.
- Glesne, C. (2006). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction* (3rd ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Greenleaf, R. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Horn, R. (2004). *Standards primer*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Kanopol, B. (1999). *Critical pedagogy: An introduction* (2nd ed.). Westport, CT: Bergen & Garvey.
- Kincheloe, J. (2008). *Critical pedagogy* (2nd ed.). New York: Peter Lang.
- Kvale, S. (2006). *InterViews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. (2005). *Practical research: Planning and design* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Leistyan, P., & Woodrum, A. (1996). Context and culture: What is critical pedagogy? In Leistyna, P., Woodrum, A., & Sherblom, S. A. (Eds.), *Breaking free: The transformative power of critical pedagogy* (pp. 1-7). Cambridge: Harvard Educational Review.
- Leithwood, K. (1992). The move toward transformational leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 49(5), 8-12.
- Lesko, N. (1988). *Symbolizing society: Stories, rites and structure in a catholic high school*. New York: The Falmer Press.
- Martin, T. F. (2003). *Our restless heart: The Augustinian tradition*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis.

- Martin, T. F. (2006). The educational tradition in the order. In E. B. Berdon (Ed.), *Basic elements of Augustinian pedagogy* (pp. 209-221). Rome: Augustinian General Curia.
- McCloskey, G. N. (2005). Cracked pots and brave hearts: Augustine on teaching and learning. *Catholic and Augustinian Heritage Part III: Educational Foundations*. Andover, MA: Augustinian Center for Study and Legacy at Merrimack College
- McCloskey, G. N. (2006). Considerations and practices of Augustinian pedagogy. In E. B. Berdon (Ed.), *Basic elements of Augustinian pedagogy* (pp. 114-136). Rome: Augustinian General Curia.
- McLaren, P. (1986). *Schooling as a ritual performance: Towards a political economy of educational symbols and gestures*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- McLaren, P. (1998). *Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education (3rd Ed.)*, New York, NY: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.
- McLaren, P. (2009). Critical pedagogy: A look at the major concepts. In A. Darder, M. Baltodano, & R. Torres (Eds.), *The critical pedagogy reader (2nd ed.)*, (pp. 61-83). New York: Routledge.
- Morgan, D. L. (1997). *Focus groups as qualitative research (2nd ed.)*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Murray, R. J. (2002). Effecting a university's mission: The praxis of charism. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice*, 6(1), 49-70.
- Northouse, P. (2007). *Leadership: Theory and practice (4th ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Oldenski, T. (1997). *Liberation theology and critical pedagogy in today's catholic schools: Social justice in action*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.

- Ornstein, A. C., & Hunkins, F. P. (2004). *Curriculum: Foundations, principles, and issues* (4th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Palmer, P. J. (1998). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Palestini, R. (2003). *The human touch in educational leadership: A postpositivist approach to understanding educational leadership*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, Inc.
- Palestini, R. (2005). *Educational administration: Leading with mind and heart* (2nd ed.). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Palestini, R. (2009). *Catholic school administration: Theory, practice, leadership* (2nd ed.). Lancaster, PA: ProActive Publications.
- Pinar, W., Reynolds, W., Slattery, P., & Taubman, P. (2004). *Understanding curriculum: An introduction to the study of historical and contemporary curriculum discourses*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Possidius (437/1998). J. Rotelle (Ed.). *The life of Saint Augustine*. Villanova, PA: Augustinian Press.
- Purpel, D. & Shapiro, S. (1995). *Beyond liberation and excellence: Reconstructing the public discourse on education*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Rost, J. (1991). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. New York: Praeger.
- Scianna, B. C. (2006). *A history of Cascia Hall Preparatory School: A Catholic, Augustinian school in Tulsa, Oklahoma (1924-2006)* (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 2006). Dissertation Abstracts International, 67 (02). (UMI No. 32707185)
- Seco, S. M. (2006). The identity of an Augustinian school. In E. B. Berdon (Ed.), *Basic elements of Augustinian pedagogy* (pp. 137-169). Rome: Augustinian General Curia.

- Sendjaya, S., & Sarros, J. (2002). Servant leadership: Its origin, development, and application in organizations. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 9(2), 57-64.
- Sergiovanni, T. (1990). Adding value to leadership gets extraordinary results. *Educational Leadership*, 47(8), 23-27.
- Sergiovanni, T. (2000). Leadership as Stewardship. In *The Jossey-Bass reader on educational leadership* (pp. 287-308). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Simon, R. (1987, April). Empowerment as a pedagogy of possibility. *Language Arts*, 64(4), 370-382.
- Slattery, P. (1995). *Curriculum development in the postmodern era*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Smith, B., Montagno, R., & Kuzmenko, T. (2004). Transformational and servant leadership: Content and contextual comparisons. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 10(4), 80-91.
- Spears, L. (2002). Tracing the past, present, and future of servant-leadership. In Spears, L., & Lawrence, M. (Eds.), *Focus on leadership: Servant leadership for the 21st century* (pp. 1-16). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Spring, J. (2004). *Deculturalization and the struggle for equality: A brief history of the education of dominated cultures in the United States*. (4th ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Tack, T. (1988). *If Augustine were alive: Augustine's religious ideal for today*. New York: Alba House.
- Tack, T. (2006). Saint Augustine, Student and Teacher. Considerations and practices of Augustinian pedagogy. In E. B. Berdon (Ed.), *Basic elements of Augustinian pedagogy* (pp. 15-32). Rome: Augustinian General Curia.

- Trelstad, Marit. (2008). The ethics of effective teaching: Challenges from the religious right and critical pedagogy. *Teaching Theology and Religion*, 11(4), 191-202.
- Wardekker, W., & Miedema, S. (1997, Spring). Critical pedagogy: An evaluation and a direction for reformulation. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 27(1), 45-61.
- Wheaton, C. (1999). *Servant leadership and the public school superintendent*. (Doctoral Dissertation, Gonzaga University, 1999). Dissertation Abstracts International, 60 (5). (UMI No. 9931545)
- Yin, R. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Yukl, G. (2002). *Leadership in organizations* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

APPENDIX A**OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE**

Views about Augustinian Values and Impact upon Pedagogy and Leadership

1. As a member of an Augustinian School community, how would you define your understanding of the Augustinian values of unity, truth, and love?
2. How do you see each of the Augustinian values of unity, truth, and love impacting the pedagogy of your school at this time?
3. How do you see the Augustinian values of truth, unity, and love impacting the leadership model of your school at this time?
4. What do you hope to come away with from the Augustinian Values Institute as you prepare to attend the Institute?

APPENDIX B**PARTICIPANT INTERVIEW GUIDE**

1. How long have you been employed here at ____ and what are your basic tasks in the area of _____ for the school community?
2. Why did you agree to participate in this study?
3. Why did you decide to come to work at _____?
4. What were some things that influenced your decision to go into the profession of education?
5. What attracted you to the idea of attending the Augustinian Values Institute?
6. What were some of your expectations about what the Institute would be like as you were preparing to make the trip to the weekend?
7. What were some of the highlights of the weekend experience for you?
8. What were some of the lowlights of the weekend experience for you?
9. How do you see the Augustinian values of truth, unity, and love presented at the Institute impacting your pedagogy as an educator in an Augustinian school? After your attendance at the AVI, do you see yourself making any changes in the way you approach your pedagogy as an educator?
10. How do you see the Augustinian values of truth, unity, and love presented at the Institute impacting upon the leadership model in your Augustinian school? After your attendance at the AVI, do you see any changes that could be made in the leadership model of the school?