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ABSTRACT

MEASURING TEACHER LEADERSHIP

John William Triska

With schools under increasing public scrutiny and political pressure to show evidence of improved student achievement, leadership must emerge to sustain healthy school environments for teachers and students. The drive for school reforms should not overlook the leadership potential of classroom teachers, perhaps best positioned to make meaningful changes. This mixed-method study sought to fill a gap in the literature by measuring the degree of classroom-based teacher leadership evident in 56 teachers at three public elementary schools in Northern California. Through a synthesis of the literature, 25 subscales of classroom-based teacher leadership were developed and organized into five constructs: Focus on Student Achievement and Relationships, Initiating and Taking Risks, Trust, Collaboration, and Traditional Leadership. The constructs were assessed through teacher surveys and interviews.

Statistical results were explained through themes that emerged from the interview data, suggesting supports and barriers to teacher leadership. An important finding was predictability of the constructs, whereby a high degree of teacher leadership in one construct predicts a high degree in another. The most correlated of the five, Collaboration is also the most visible construct in schools, and may be a reliable indicator of a school’s overall teacher leadership.
The study’s most significant finding is the fundamental requirement of candid, two-way communication for teacher leadership to flourish. More than merely supportive, an open and healthy school climate is critical to the survival of teacher leadership. It is what allows teachers to live effective, professional lives, and creates the potential for schools to support superior student outcomes.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

In a social and political climate determined to focus solely on standardized achievement scores as evidence of a school’s healthy functioning, public school teachers and students are caught in a vise. It is an environment that many educators consider hostile to meaningful learning experiences in classrooms (Hargreaves, 2003; Lieberman & Miller, 2005). Calls for school reforms should not overlook the leadership potential of classroom teachers, who may be best positioned to make meaningful changes to support schools that work for teachers and students. A review of the literature on leadership in schools finds teacher leadership thrives where transformational administrators sustain learning environments. Missing from the literature has been a measurement of teacher leadership, a gap this study endeavored to fill. If researchers could measure teacher leadership, further studies might concretely determine the variables under which it flourishes or flounders.

In Chapter Two, a thorough review of the literature examines the reforms and societal forces within which public schools operate, and the challenging context within which leadership must respond. From traditional to alternative, several models of leadership are analyzed for their abilities to effectively respond to change in public schools. While not yet clearly defined, teacher leadership is offered as one of the most promising forms of school leadership, largely to its authoritative
basis in the classroom, where real change is most likely to take place. Following the literature reviewing teacher leadership’s many positive effects on schools, factors influencing readiness, creating obstacles, and providing supports for teacher leadership are explored, including school models shown to encourage teacher leadership. Clearly missing from the literature on teacher leadership, however, is a succinct definition, or discrete measurement for it.

Chapter Three presents the methodology of this mixed-method study, beginning with an operational definition for classroom-based teacher leadership. The 25 subscales of The Five Constructs of Classroom-Based Teacher Leadership are presented and discussed, and profiles of the schools and participants follow. The chapter then details the methods employed to obtain consents and data from the 56 teacher surveys and nine teacher interviews at the three Northern California public schools that comprised the study. Next, this section explains the methods used to analyze the results of the quantitative and qualitative data, to determine outcomes. Finally, a discussion of the limitations of this study is presented.

In Chapter Four, the results of the study are presented. First, Pearson correlation analysis determines the strength of the relationships within the constructs. The schools are then ranked by their means for each of the constructs. One-way ANOVA testing reveals the significance of variations between specific construct mean scores, while regression analysis discovers the predictability of many constructs for others. The interview data are analyzed in relation to the statistical data,
with themes emerging that suggest supports and barriers to the constructs at each school site; where appropriate, connections are made to the literature.

Chapter Five consists of an overarching analysis of the results of the study. The operational definition for classroom-based teacher leadership, and the two instruments, are evaluated in terms of their function and effectiveness. The results of the study are analyzed for their importance, including the predictability of the constructs, and visible indications of a healthy degree of teacher leadership. The chapter finishes with significant findings for the potential of teacher leadership in schools.

Chapter Six concludes the thesis with an overview of the study, from the initial question to a succinct overview of the findings. Following the overview, specific suggestions are made, with examples of concrete changes that could be made to immediately begin improving the potential for teacher leadership in schools. Finally, the impact of the study is examined within the context of the literature, and implications are made for further research on teacher leadership.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

With public school teachers under increasing scrutiny and political pressure to raise achievement for all students, leadership must emerge to sustain schools that work not only for students but also for teachers (Hargreaves, 2003; Lieberman & Miller, 2005). This review of literature first examines the reforms and societal forces within which U.S. schools operate, revealing the complex and challenging context in which leadership must respond. Next, traditional models of leadership are analyzed for their effectiveness in bringing about the kinds of changes necessary to facilitate responsive schools. The review reveals new forms of leadership by teachers who are well placed to affect immediate improvements through their relationships with students. Though the literature defines teacher leadership in many ways, the most recent, promising definition of a teacher leader is one that is classroom-based, drawing its authority primarily from experiences with students.

The review turns to the positive effects on teachers and schools of involving teachers in leadership and then reports factors influencing teacher readiness for leadership roles, including personal, career, and organizational factors such as school cultures and climate. Following readiness issues, barriers to teacher leadership are examined, noting especially the obstacles resulting from current federal reform initiatives.
Despite oppositional pressures, teacher leadership is shown to be supported in many schools that identify themselves as communities of learners, just one of the organizing principles of learning organizations (Senge, 1990). The factors of learning organizations in schools, in terms of both norms and leadership, create cultures and climates that support teacher leadership and positive student outcomes.

An Overview of Recent Educational Reforms

In a report authorized by President Ronald Reagan in 1983, the National Commission on Excellence in Education proclaimed the United States *A Nation at Risk*: its educational system was so flawed and mediocre that the country’s technological, economic, and military might were in peril of being eclipsed by foreign competitors whose educational systems worked (Goldberg & Harvey, 1983). Whether or not the U.S. was really at risk, more changes have been made to its public K-12 school systems since 1983 than during any other period in American history (Guthrie & Springer, 2004). Uniquely, all the recent efforts at public school reform emphasize measuring student achievement-- rather than investing dollars-- in public schools (Guthrie & Springer, 2004; Newmann & Wehlage, 1995).

Educators, researchers, and politicians disagree about the impact of the myriad reforms on improving student outcomes (Guthrie & Springer, 2004; Hargreaves, 2003; Newmann & Wehlage, 1995). One positive effect of *A Nation at Risk* was that the new emphasis on achievement scores as a measure of the nation’s success meant paying attention to narrowing the gap between test scores of students who were socially and economically disadvantaged and those of European American, middle class students...
Conversely, some point out the negative legacies of the report, such as achievement test scores being the sole indicators of student progress (Guthrie & Springer, 2004; Hargreaves, 2003), or the belief that public schools can be the solitary source of social reform in the U.S. (Guthrie & Springer, 2004). Autonomous and locally run for 350 years, public schools have recently become so dominated by the federal government that many consider them no longer capable of being creative and diverse (Guthrie & Springer, 2004; Hargreaves, 2003).

The school reforms of the mid and late 1980s tended toward higher expectations (Guthrie & Springer, 2004). School days grew longer, the number of days in the academic year increased (Goldberg & Harvey, 1983), electives were reduced, and standardized achievement tests were instituted or expanded (Guthrie & Springer, 2004; Newmann & Wehlage, 1995). More math and science requirements were added for college admissions (Guthrie & Springer, 2004). Teacher preparation courses became more rigorous, there was an increased emphasis on teacher and administrator professional development, and many states instituted master teaching programs and career ladders (Guthrie & Springer, 2004). In 1989, for only the third time in history, a United States president (H.W. Bush) called a U.S. governors’ conference, and for the first time, the purpose was education. The goal was to create the greatest education system in world (Guthrie & Springer, 2004).

In the 1990s, reforms led to the standardization of teacher credentialing and professional development, textbooks, and statewide achievement tests (Guthrie & Springer, 2004; Lieberman & Miller, 2005). School districts received performance
ratings, report cards, and positive and negative consequences for their test scores (Guthrie & Springer, 2004). At the same time, market-based reforms (reacting to perceptions of public schools as unresponsive monopolies) began diverting larger numbers of students out of traditional public schools into specialized magnet schools, charter schools, and, in some states, voucher-supported private schools (Guthrie & Springer, 2004). Although controversy over market-based reforms is well documented, in fact a minimal fraction of the nation’s almost 50 million K-12 students are affected by them (Guthrie & Springer, 2004).

The most recent reforms follow the 2001 ESEA reauthorization (No Child Left Behind [NCLB]). Originally part of President Lyndon B. Johnson’s “War on Poverty,” the 1965 *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* supported economically disadvantaged children in public schools through compensatory education services (Title I), injecting hundreds of billions of dollars into local schools since its inception (Guthrie & Springer, 2004). The 2001 version of the law leverages states by tying funding to Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) goals (Guthrie & Springer, 2004). AYP and federal funding are what give standardized achievement tests the moniker “high stakes testing,” since meeting or failing to meet goals results in financial rewards or punishments to districts (Guthrie & Springer, 2004). The stakes become even higher when parents in so-called low-achieving schools have the opportunity to send their child to another school (including a private one) at the expense of the original district (Guthrie & Springer, 2004).
Shifts in Society

Education’s new models of uniformity, standardization, and heightened accountability complete with fiscal consequences have not evolved in a void. American society and public school populations have been changing (Lieberman & Miller, 2005). In 2003, minority students made up 42 percent of all American public school students, an increase of 22 percent since 1972. From 1979 to 2004, the number of children who spoke a language other than English at home increased by 162 percent (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2006a); as an example, English learner (EL) students in California made up 25.4% of the school-age population in 2002 (California Department of Education, 2005). While students’ outcomes in schools have been linked to organization in their homes (Mulford & Silins, 2003), students’ parents spend more time working and less time with their children, and there is less community support built into families’ lives (Hargreaves, 2003). Family structures are also changing, with an increase in single parent households (NCES, 2006b) and those in which grandparents are raising their children’s children (Giddens, 2000; Lieberman & Miller, 2005).

Schools in the United States are operating in a society of huge economic opportunity for some and great social instability for others (Giddens, 2000; Hargreaves, 2003). In the United States as in the rest of the world, the gap is widening between the richest and poorest (Giddens, 2000; Hargreaves, 2003), while higher student achievement is known to correlate with higher social and economic status (Mulford & Silins, 2003). Despite substantial economic growth in the U.S. in the 1980s and 1990s, the percentage of school-age students from poor families has changed little since 1975 (NCES, 2006c).
Fourth graders in poverty in 2005 included 70% of African American students, 73% of Hispanic students, 65% of American Indian students, and 24% of Whites (NCES, 2006c). In 2005, 10% of male students reported being threatened or injured with a weapon on school property (NCES, 2006d). Finally, as if underscoring the enormous differences between education in public schools yesterday and today, one out of ten teachers in central city schools were threatened with injury or physically attacked by students in 2003-04 (NCES, 2006d).

In view of all the reform and societal change occurring in public schools today, it would seem an understatement to suggest that stress is endemic in schools (Silins, Zarins, & Mulford, 2002). Nonetheless, public education exists within this context of more than 25 years of constant reform to the school system, a growing sense of social instability within society, and significant demographic alterations within school populations (Hargreaves, 2003; Lieberman & Miller, 2005; Seyfarth, 1999). At the local level, in every public school, administrators and teachers struggle daily to attend to the changing requirements of federal and state law, meet the academic needs of students, and mediate social services for families in a variety of social and economic circumstances (Seyfarth, 1999). While many agree that capable leadership lies at the heart of the potential for the success or failure of the public school system in the United States, there are a variety of perceptions of what that leadership should be (Hargreaves, 2003; Lieberman & Miller, 2005; Seyfarth, 1999).
Traditional Models of School Leadership

Traditional leadership styles in organizations fall under the general categories of transactional and transformational leadership, both characteristics of single leaders at the helm (Bass, 1985; Blase & Kirby, 2000; Burns, 1978). The transactional model tends to be a more hierarchical, top-down approach in which leaders direct followers within a system’s existing culture by offering incentives and rewards and brokering transactions (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978). Followers’ self-interests, rather than the greater goals of the organization, motivate their efforts and their loyalty to leaders (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978).

In education, in which teachers tend to describe their motivations intrinsically (Leithwood, 1994; Shen, 1997), transactional principals are perceived by their staffs as being overly control-oriented, since teachers may not be invited to share significantly in decisions that affect their work (Mulford & Silins, 2003). Meanwhile, burnout has been related to teachers’ perceptions of external controls (Mazur & Lynch, 1989). Those teachers who stay in the profession report perceiving that they have greater influence in decisions about their schools (Shen, 1997). In terms of effecting changes in school cultures, transactional leadership is ineffectual because of its emphasis on playing within the established rules of the game and focusing more on processes than substance (Blase, 1990; Mulford & Silins, 2003). At its worst, the transactional model may even lower productivity and effectiveness of an organization by devaluing risk-taking and initiating (Burns, 1978).

On the other hand, the transformational leadership model is characterized as having the potential to lift followers to Maslow’s highest level of need, self-actualization,
to the end of creating the most effective organizations possible (Burns, 1978). The transformational leader

. . . arouses or alters the strength of needs which may have lain dormant. . . . Franklin Delano Roosevelt sensed what the country needed in 1932, raised peoples’ awareness of what was possible, and put into words for us . . . what we could do. The role of the Federal government would never be the same again. It was transformed into involvement with our social and economic welfare, involvement which remains mostly in place 50 years after Roosevelt’s inspiring inaugural message that the only thing we have to fear (from the economic depression) is fear itself. (Bass, 1985, p. 17)

Rather than transacting incrementally, according to rules of a culture in place, the transformational leader inspires followers to a greater sense of what is possible by persuading them to transcend their own interests for the greater good (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; Leithwood, 1994). At the same time, in a dimension often described as moral, transformational leadership aims to develop followers into leaders—with the belief that ownership of decisions, initiation, and risk-taking contributes to positive change in an organization (Bass, 1985; Blase & Blase, 2004; Burns, 1978). In schools, transformational principals create structures that enable teachers’ professional growth, providing time and resources to learn, collaborate, and institute their ideas (Blase & Blase, 2004; Silins & Mulford, 2004). They distribute leadership; involve the entire staff in decisions affecting the school; and work to create a shared sense of purpose, caring, trust, and mutual respect (Silins & Mulford, 2004). At the same time, transformational
school leaders model reflective thinking and behavior, often challenging assumptions about the status quo (Blase & Blase, 2004; Mai, 2004). While some think it necessary for a leader to manage certain aspects of an organization through transactional practices (Bass, 1988; Silins, 1994), others disagree (Leithwood, 1994); ultimately it is one’s transformational practices that create individual and systematic improvement (Burns, 1978; Leithwood, 1994; Mulford & Silins, 2003; Silins & Mulford, 2004). Aimed at the biggest picture, transformational leadership is identified as the most effective leadership style for changing existing cultures of organizations (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; Leithwood, 1994; Senge, 1990) and may be crucial to successful school restructuring (Leithwood, 1994; Mulford & Silins, 2003; Silins & Mulford, 2004).

*Teachers as Leaders*

Responding to *A Nation at Risk*, the Carnegie Forum’s *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century* argued for restructuring schools into more professional environments for teachers, empowering them to make decisions at local levels about how best to meet the needs of their students (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy [CFEE], 1986). The report promoted higher standards for teaching candidates, better salaries to attract and retain teachers, and the idea of recognizing lead teachers to collaborate with their colleagues in redesigning schools that worked (CFEE, 1986). According to the report, teacher leadership would be essential in meeting the goals of excellence and democracy in education (CFEE, 1986) and key to significant reform capable of improving student outcomes (Blase & Blase, 2004; Katzenmeyer & Moller,

Some believe a complete change must occur to the leadership, power structures, and systems of accountability in order for schools to transform in significant ways; for them, teacher leadership is one solution (Copeland, 2001, Hargreaves, 2003; Lieberman & Miller, 2005). Educational leadership has recently been theorized as residing not within the traditional role of a single leader but in the web of activities of all of the members of an organization, including teachers, as they work toward a goal (Gronn, 2000; Hargreaves, 1997). In this distributed leadership view, a principal, with or without any recognized charisma, skill, ability, or understanding, is just one of many parts of the true leadership capability of a school, since the sum total of a school’s leadership is really all of the participants’ interactions (Spillane, Halverson, & Diamond, 2001). This distributed perspective suggests that the quality of every interaction between individuals is of crucial significance, leading to arguments for consciously developed organizational cultures that place value on relationships (Gronn, 2000; Spillane, 2005; Timperley, 2005). Quality leadership becomes a construct that includes the situation in which the leadership is occurring; the cultural, historical, and institutional setting; the ways in which participants interpret traditional leaders’ actions; and the ways in which leaders respond to followers’ interpretations of those actions (Timperley, 2005). The role of the principal in this view is to build and maintain an organizational climate that supports and encourages teacher leadership in the school (Ash & Persall, 2000).
Definitions of teacher leadership.

While much literature exists on the topic of teacher leadership, few clear definitions exist (York-Barr & Duke, 2004). Historically, teachers led first in managerial positions as head teachers, department and grade-level chairs, or union representatives, administrative-style roles that supported the business of schools while offering few opportunities to make significant changes to a school’s effectiveness (Silva, Gimbert, & Nolan, 2000).

Eventually, forms of programmatic teacher leadership emerged in areas of instruction including team leaders, staff development experts, and mentors for beginning teachers (Silva et al., 2000). In some schools, career ladders recognize the leadership potential of veteran teachers by assigning or offering them special functions on school improvement teams or program and personnel evaluation teams (Silva et al., 2000; Smylie & Denny, 1990; York-Barr & Duke, 2004). Teachers also lead in centers, sharing and modeling materials and model strategies, enabling increased collaboration (Lieberman, 1988). At all of these levels, however, a sense of separation can remain between the specialized consultants, and mainstream classroom teachers, affecting their ability to collaborate most effectively (Silva et al., 2000).

The move towards school-site management has put control of some aspects of schools into the hands of teachers, parents, students, and administrators (Lieberman, 1988), and some schools have been successful in distributing decision-making to teachers through elected councils and parent-teacher teams; a them-versus-us perception persists, however, when only some are invited to participate (Correa & Bauch, 1999; Smith,
1993). The success of distributed leadership at empowering teachers in schools often depends on the ways teacher leaders become involved in decision-making, including whether they are appointed or elected to positions, or whether leadership is assumed by those who are most apt in a particular area as a need arises (Timperley, 2005). In some cases, sharing decision-making creates new tensions that have to be resolved before any actual collaboration can occur (Chrispeels, Brown, & Castillo, 2000). For example, some teachers become jealous of others’ release time for training and deliberating, while others are afraid to participate in ways that might affect their relationships with other staff members (Chrispeels, Brown, & Castillo, 2000). In any case, many believe these programmatic kinds of leadership have failed to bring major structural changes to schools or improve their efficacy (Silva et al., 2000).

The most recent form of teacher leadership to emerge has been of a different class, and redefines norms of educational organizations (Lieberman & Miller, 2005). It resides within an anti-hierarchical model of collegiality and professionalism in which teachers lead by reflecting, collaborating, and sharing openly with their colleagues; contributing to improvements in schools; and enabling each other to do more than they could have on their own (Lieberman & Miller, 2005; Silva et al., 2000; Spillane, 2005). Some feel this new concept of teacher leadership has the greatest potential to make substantive cultural changes to the educational system (Silva et al., 2000). It stands in contrast to the examples of programmatic teacher leadership listed above in which a recognized leader delegates authority to teachers (Cooper, 1988). In this teacher leadership construct, what matters most is that work gets done—there is not always an
obvious leader in charge, and teachers may even lead and make change occur in the face of administrative apathy (Heller & Firestone, 1995).

This new wave of teacher leadership is classroom-based (Lieberman & Miller, 2005; Sergiovanni & Starrat, 1998), lending teachers increased peer-acceptance and credibility (York-Barr & Duke, 2004). It grows directly out of experiences with and reflection on teachers’ successes with students (Lieberman & Miller, 2005; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1998) and focuses on student achievement at the classroom level through implementation of instructional strategies, rather than at the organizational level, as in site-based management, for example (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001; York-Barr & Duke, 2004). Teacher leaders’ satisfaction has been seen as deriving from pride in their successful work and relationships with their students; the desire to extend it to all students has been cited as their motivation to collaborate, problem solve, and share (Cooper, 1988; Lieberman, 2005; Stone, Horejs, & Lomas, 1997). Unlike technicians in their classrooms, teacher leaders lead by modeling reflection and improvement, on-going dialog, and best educational practices, rather than telling others what to do—in this way they influence their peers by bringing out the teacher voice in schools (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001; Lieberman, 2005; Sergiovanni & Starrat, 1998).

Classroom-based teacher leaders identify with others in education and develop communities of learners (Crowther, Kaagan, Ferguson, & Hann, 2002; Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001). In this model of leadership, all, rather than some, can lead change for whole-school success (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001). Each staff member who takes on new learning increases the entire school’s capacity for improvement (Silins & Mulford,
2004). Unless otherwise noted, this is the definition of teacher leadership that will be referred to throughout this review.

Teacher leadership encompasses a set of functions (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001) that includes building professional communities through trust and relationships (Childs-Bowen, Moller, & Scrivner, 2000). Conducting action research, teacher leaders improve student learning across their schools and inspire good practices in others (Lieberman, 1988; Lieberman, Saxl, & Miles, 1988). Teacher leaders encourage parent participation in schools (York-Barr & Duke, 2004). They work within the complex structures of schools, translating goals for school improvement into classroom practices and helping others deal with change (Day & Harris, 2003). They diagnose problems and create solutions in organizations (Ash & Persall, 2000; Lieberman, 1988). Perhaps most significantly, teacher leaders challenge the status quo in schools by advocating for the needs of their students (Crowther et al., 2002; Silva et al., 2000).

Partly because classroom-based teacher leadership requires structural changes for effectiveness (resources including time to collaborate and needs-specific professional development), and partly because it may be interpreted as circumventing traditional sources of leadership in schools, it has not generally been encouraged by the status quo leadership in schools (Lieberman & Miller, 2005; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1998; Silva et al., 2000). On the other hand, in schools where the culture supports learning together to meet challenges, principals are leaders of leaders, actively encouraging a base of teacher leadership (Blase & Blase, 2004; Childs-Bowen et al., 2000; Silins & Mulford, 2004; Smylie, 1992; Spillane, 2005).
**Effects of Involving Teachers in Leadership**

Much has been written about the positive effects of teacher leadership on teachers, students, and schools (Blase & Blase, 2001; Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001; Lieberman & Miller, 2005; Silins & Mulford, 2004). At a time when statistics portray teachers leaving the career in far greater numbers than those entering it (Hargreaves, 2003), professionalizing teaching through teacher leadership seems increasingly urgent in order to attract and retain the best and brightest in education (Blase & Blase, 2001; Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001). Teachers are more likely to be drawn to and remain in the profession when risk-taking and initiating are encouraged (Lieberman & Miller, 2005), and there is peer recognition of their contributions and efforts, as is the case with teacher leadership (Zinn, 1997). Also invigorating for the profession is the collaborative nature of teacher leadership and the rapport and collegiality that act as antidotes to the often-reported isolation of classroom teachers (Blase & Blase, 1991; Zinn, 1997). Among ways they influence other teachers positively, teacher leaders help one another overcome resistance to change, creating safe and positive learning environments for new and veteran teachers alike based on their expertise with student learning (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001; Lieberman & Miller, 2005).

The professional communities that teacher leaders construct, that include shared governance and responsibility, collaboration and collegiality, and on-going staff development specific to the skills teachers need to support instruction, are considered the biggest factors in improving student learning in schools (Newmann & Wehlage, 1995). At schools of professional communities consistent with teacher leadership models, the
relationship between the teacher and the student is cited as the most important factor in student achievement (Newmann & Wehlage, 1995). Because by experimenting and risk-taking they perceive themselves responsible for their successes and failures in the classroom, teacher leaders hold themselves accountable for their results with their students, increasing their own and their school’s efficacy (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001). Finally, student outcomes including greater engagement with their work at school are associated with teacher leaders’ own feelings of value that result from membership in a professional community (Silins & Mulford, 2004).

Factors Which Influence Teacher Readiness for Leadership

Personal and career factors.

Whether or not a teacher develops into a leader depends partly on factors within the personal and professional life of the teacher (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001; Rosenholtz, 1990; Smylie, 1992). Higher education may have an effect on participation, though not necessarily on desire to participate (Taylor, 1997). One’s stage in the teaching career, be it novice, mid-career, or experienced, may affect how willing one is to take on more responsibility and initiative outside of regular in-classroom duties (Rosenholtz, 1990). Another view based on developmental stages suggests that teachers mature through a spectrum of readiness at different rates (Leithwood, 1990). These stages include a self-protective time when one’s immediate work in the classroom overrides any ability to collaborate openly and honestly with colleagues; a conformist time when a teacher is unwilling to challenge the status quo unless others do first; a conscientious time when consensus is valued most (a good time to be a group member); and an autonomous...
time when a teacher is independent and secure, and so able to value alternative opinions—an opportune time for a teacher leadership role (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001; Leithwood, 1990).

Another connection exists linking teachers who have high job satisfaction and who perceive themselves to be highly effective teachers, with greater desire for and higher participation in decision-making, suggesting that readiness to participate may indeed have something to do with maturity and effectiveness on the job (Smylie, 1992; Taylor, 1997). Other personal factors influencing readiness to lead include having an internalized philosophy of education and an interest in the development of adults (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001).

Finally, being in a stage in one’s career and personal life that enables one to give time and energy to others is important and probably implies a mid-career and mid-life status (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001). Factors in one’s personal life associated with discouraging taking on leadership include family responsibilities, personal health issues, lack of family support for extra time and energy devoted to leadership, and cultural or religious values that discourage leadership (Zinn, 1997).

**Organizational and cultural climate factors.**

Readiness to take on leadership also depends on teachers’ perceptions of the organizational and cultural climate within the school (Mulford & Silins, 2003; Silins & Mulford, 2004; Smylie, 1992). Some classroom teachers are unaware that larger roles outside their classrooms are available to them, a possible indictment of their school culture (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001). They must perceive an invitation to participate,
either formally or through a climate of inclusiveness (Spillane et al., 2001) often noted when a principal’s leadership style is transformational (Mulford & Silins, 2003; Silins & Mulford, 2004). Teachers tend to participate more willingly when they are generally satisfied with all the leadership in their school (Mulford & Silins, 2003; Silins & Mulford, 2004). Simply put, the quality of a principal’s relationship with teachers is correlated with teachers’ willingness to participate in decision-making: the more open, supportive, and facilitative a principal is with teachers, the more willing they are to take on leadership roles (Smylie, 1992). On the other hand, the more a principal is perceived as closed to their ideas or controlling, the more likely it is that teachers will avoid participation (Smylie, 1992). Teachers choose to participate when they believe their input, opinions, and energy expended in decision-making matter (Mulford & Silins, 2003; Silins & Mulford, 2004; Smith, 1993). Finally, readiness to participate increases when schools encourage teachers’ autonomy, recognize their contributions and roles, and support their professional development (Mulford & Silins, 2003; Richardson, 2003; Silins & Mulford, 2004; Zinn, 1997).

Obstacles to teacher leadership within schools.

Beyond the issue of teacher readiness to participate, many obstacles within schools discourage teachers from taking on leadership roles (Lieberman, 1988; Smylie, 1992; Smylie & Denny, 1990). Fundamentally, existing hierarchical and bureaucratic administrative structures stand in opposition to the kind of collaboration necessary for teachers to participate, whether they are ready or not (Ash & Persall, 2000). As a result, teachers are isolated from administrators and from one another, unable to plan
improvements, share information, or solve problems (Ash & Persall, 2000). Within traditional settings, time is one of the biggest barriers to teacher leadership (Smylie & Denny, 1990). Opportunities for teacher leadership often come at the end of the day after students are dismissed, when teachers’ energy and intellectual capability may be limited (Cooper, 1988). Moreover, with little energy left over, teachers are not interested in deciding trivial matters, and membership on committees and teams that do not directly influence their teaching practices interfere with the kinds of professional leadership activities to which teachers aspire (Cooper, 1988; Smylie, 1992; Turnbull, 2003; Weiss, 1990). In many cases, teacher leadership is minimized when it is invited sporadically, for example, for a designated period of time at the beginning or end of the year, or on one afternoon a month during the school year (Cooper, 1988). Insufficient time and opportunity to participate, lack of training in leadership processes or content, and constantly changing agendas that may not be revisited, all result in teachers’ cynicism about the genuineness of their invitation to lead, which also affects their participation (Weiss, Cambone, & Wyath, 1992).

Teacher norms for collegiality and interaction among themselves and their administrators have a potential barrier effect on teacher leadership as well (Lieberman, 1988; Smylie, 1992; Zinn, 1997). Tensions between teachers and administrators over union and management issues often interfere with the free exchange of ideas and actions necessary to teacher leadership in schools (Lieberman, 1988). At the same time, many teachers report parent-child-like relationships with their administrators, affecting their interest or ability to cross certain lines reserved only for the adult—in this case, the
principal—in the relationship (Lieberman, 1988). Even within their own ranks, some
active teacher leaders are wary about identifying their leadership roles, hesitant to point
out their differences in an environment in which equality in status and treatment by the
administration is the norm (Smylie, 1992; Stone et al., 1997).

The recent ESEA (NCLB) reforms, including high stakes testing and pressure on
schools to continuously show improvement, may be responsible for additional barriers to
teacher leadership in schools (Hargreaves, 2003; Lieberman & Miller, 2005). While
teachers are allowed fewer opportunities for decision-making about curriculum and
judging performance, they are nonetheless being held to higher standards of
accountability for their students’ achievements (Hargreaves, 1997). Meanwhile, time and
money for professional development to improve schools and teacher practices are
diminishing (Hargreaves, 1997). Emulating the new environment, administrators are
reverting to top-down approaches that threaten teacher-administrator trust and
collaboration (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001; Lieberman & Miller, 2005). As a result of
rewards and sanctions to schools, teachers must comply rather than innovate, and their
work becomes technical rather than professional, the antithesis to teacher leadership
(Hargreaves, 2003; Lieberman & Miller, 2005). In terms of lost potential for teaching and
learning, NCLB’s emphasis on standardization “is as valuable for a vigorous knowledge
economy and a strong civil society as locusts are for a cornfield” (Hargreaves, 2003,
p. 6).

Perhaps most destructive to potential for teacher leadership in schools is
“contrived collegiality” (Hargreaves, 1997, p. 1310), in which traditional administrators
strive to meet expectations for school improvement by devising the outward appearances of a culture of collaboration, while in fact repressing or redirecting any input from teachers that questions or is critical of preset goals (Blase & Blase, 2004; Hargreaves, 1997). Regulating collegiality by requiring teachers to meet and collaborate about goals that are not their own does more than just produce predictable outcomes and take up time teachers might use in other ways (Hargreaves, 1997). It actually stops them from wanting to improve together on their own (Blase & Blase, 2004; Hargreaves, 1997).

**Supports for teacher leadership in schools.**

While many schools suffer from obstacles that keep teachers from leading, others are organized in ways that enhance cultures of teacher leadership (Blase & Kirby, 2000; Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001). In order to sustain teacher leadership cultures, these schools maintain a developmental focus in which teachers are supported in their own learning and in helping others to learn (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001). Teachers are recognized for their contributions, and there is mutual caring among teachers across the school (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001). There is a provision of autonomy rather than conformity for teachers, and initiative is encouraged (Blase & Kirby, 2000; Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001). Teachers collaborate on strategies, share materials, model for each other, and observe one another’s work in an atmosphere of collegiality (Blase & Blase, 2004; Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001). Decision-making is distributed to teacher-selected teams that work with administrators to make meaningful decisions affecting the whole school (Blase & Blase, 2001; 2004; Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001). In schools that work for teacher leaders, communication is open and honest, and teachers share and receive
information from each other and their administration, feel informed, and are not blamed when things go wrong (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001). Teachers in these schools report a general job satisfaction and perceive mutual respect among their peers, administrators, students, and students’ parents (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001). These schools are often referred to as learning communities because their culture focuses on continuous learning by all its members (Blase & Blase, 2004).

*Schools as Learning Organizations*

Continuous learning, a major construct evident in schools in which teacher leadership thrives, is just one of five identified factors in learning organizations (Senge, 1990). Learning organizations work because careful attention is given to all the systems that make up the organization; if there is a problem with any part of the whole, it is addressed (Senge, 1990). In learning organizations, all members are in a constant process of learning (Senge, 1990). People free themselves from mental models of what they perceive as the known, regularly challenging the status quo in order to make adjustments and improvements (Senge, 1990). The organization’s vision is shared and takes personal visions into account so that members have true ownership in organizational goals (Senge, 1990). Teamwork is the norm (Senge, 1990). The planning approach is for the long-run, so attention is paid to the quality of relationships between all of the parts of the organization (Senge, 1990). Recently, schools have been identified as places where organizational learning (OL) might be the most effective model for improvement (Silins & Mulford, 2004).
Factors of organizational learning in schools.

Schools identified as learning organizations have been analyzed for four factors of OL (Silins, Mulford, Zarins, & Bishop, 2000), all of which exist in schools that enhance teacher leadership (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001; Silins & Mulford, 2004). Reciprocally, teacher leadership has been shown to significantly contribute to OL (Silins & Mulford, 2004). A collaborative climate of open sharing, planning, and communicating among teachers is the first norm in schools with OL (Silins et al., 2000). Teachers help establish the school’s vision, share in decisions about the school’s most significant issues and policies, set goals, and exchange honest dialog between themselves and their administrators (Silins et al., 2000). Second, taking initiatives and risks is encouraged by the leaders in the organization, who themselves are open to change (Silins et al., 2000). Third, the focus is on improving (Silins et al., 2000). The staff pays attention to events outside of their organization that affect their school, shares information from professional associations, and monitors the effectiveness of their teaching practices (Silins et al., 2000). Fourth, professional development is emphasized: teachers read professionally, look to other schools for ideas, bring in experts to lead, and work in teams to do all they can to learn how to improve (Silins et al., 2000).

Leadership factors promoting OL in schools.

Six leadership factors have also been identified as promoting OL in schools, all of which are transformational in nature and supportive of teacher leadership (Silins et al., 2000). The first factor highlights vision and goals: leaders promoting OL build consensus in setting whole-school priorities and make sure the staff and students understand how
priorities serve the overall purpose of the school (Silins et al., 2000). Second, in terms of culture, the principal works to develop a trusting and caring atmosphere with the staff, models respect for students, and is ready to change in order to improve (Silins et al., 2000). Third, the structure of the school is shaped to allow distributed leadership and teacher autonomy in decision-making (Silins et al., 2000). Fourth, the school leader encourages intellectual stimulation by modeling reflection and continual learning and by supporting staff development (Silins et al., 2000). Fifth, the leader shows individual support and appreciation for the efforts of staff members (Silins et al., 2000). Finally, sixth, the principal holds clear performance expectations for both teachers and students, encouraging creative endeavors (Silins et al., 2000).

Improved student outcomes in OL schools.

Studies have yet to directly credit OL and teacher leadership models in schools with the kinds of student achievement measurable on standardized achievement tests (Silins & Mulford, 2004). In looking for that evidence, the most powerful variables have continued to be students’ socio-economic status and home educational environment (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2000; Mulford & Silins, 2003; Silins and Mulford, 2004). However, evidence exists for student outcomes that may be just as important (Silins & Mulford, 2004). In schools that have high ratings for the four factors of OL and the six factors of OL-promoting leadership, teachers report higher levels of professional community, more positive working conditions, and individual job satisfaction (Silins & Mulford, 2004). In turn, those factors influence students’ positive perceptions of teachers’ work in the classroom (Mulford & Silins, 2003). OL schools improve students’ academic
self-concepts, participation in school activities, and engagement in schoolwork (Mulford & Silins, 2003; Silins & Mulford, 2004). Participation in school is directly related to academic achievement, and student engagement is also indirectly related to achievement because engaged students stay in school longer (Mulford & Silins, 2003).

Summary

Public school teachers and students are caught in the vise of a social and political climate that seems determined to focus solely on standardized achievement scores as evidence of a school’s healthy functioning. It is an environment that many educators consider hostile to meaningful learning experiences in classrooms (Hargreaves, 2003; Lieberman & Miller, 2005). However, new models of leadership and learning organizations hold out hope for relief. In schools that are learning organizations, cultures of learning and teacher leadership mutually enhance one another, enabling structures and norms that support improved professional lives for teachers and superior student outcomes.

This review of literature placed the issue of leadership in schools in the broader context of social and political change, explored traditional and more recent notions of leadership, and examined the myriad ways some teachers find their way to leadership while remaining first and foremost classroom teachers. Not all, but many are ready to lead. Many teachers manage to break through barriers to leadership. Meanwhile, in some schools, administrators are transformational, sustaining learning organizations in which teacher leadership flourishes. In those places, teachers lead professional careers, and students benefit from their reflective practices.
Missing from the literature are studies measuring the degree of teacher leadership evidenced in individual teachers and schools. If researchers could measure teacher leadership, further study might be done to concretely determine the variables under which it flourishes or flounders. In this study based on the literature about leadership in schools, I seek to measure the degree of classroom-based teacher leadership evident in teachers at three elementary schools in Northern California. In the methods chapter that follows, I will explain my methodology for conducting that research.
CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY

Introduction

In Chapters One and Two I examined the need for effective leadership in schools that works both for students and teachers. The push for school reforms to improve student learning should not overlook the leadership potential of classroom teachers. In particular, in contrast to traditional forms of leadership emanating from school administrators, newly recognized classroom-based teacher leadership may provide the most promising approach to meaningful improvement in public schools. Many theorize that a school’s overall teacher leadership is a function of factors including teachers’ personal and career goals, as well as a school’s organizational and climate conditions that may impose barriers or provide supports for classroom-based teacher leadership. A missing piece in the literature is a measurement of the degree of teacher leadership evident in individual teachers and their schools.

Research design

This chapter outlines the steps I took to conduct a mixed-method study measuring teacher leadership. It begins by explaining how I determined an operational definition for “classroom-based teacher leadership,” followed by a detailed description of what each of the constructs and subscales represents, specifically in terms of the beliefs and behaviors of classroom teachers. Table 1, The Five Constructs of Classroom-based Teacher Leadership
Leadership, lists the 25 subscales measured in my research. In subsequent sections this chapter describes the data and analysis techniques used to develop the constructs, and details both the quantitative and qualitative approaches employed both to collect and analyze the data. At the end of the chapter I list the limitations of the study.

The Five Constructs of Classroom-based Teacher Leadership

A qualitative analysis of the literature yielded twenty-five specific subscales regarding “classroom-based teacher leadership.” By sorting and grouping them together with related subscales, five separate constructs emerged and are depicted in Table 1, The Five Constructs of Classroom-based Teacher Leadership. An explanation of the constructs and their subscales, about which data from the surveys and interviews were obtained in this study, follows below.

Construct A: Focus on student achievement and relationships.

This construct surveys the relationship between the classroom teacher and the students. It sets out to measure teachers’ commitment to the belief that their relationships with students is crucial to their students’ achievements. Classroom-based teacher leaders realize that they are responsible for the successes and failures of students in their classes, actively contemplating and modifying their interactions with students in order to increase their effectiveness. Additionally, teacher leaders buy into their school’s goals for improvement and find ways to incorporate those goals into their own practices. Teacher leaders’ classroom interactions with students are a major source of the satisfaction they derive from their work in schools.
Construct B: Initiating and taking risks.

This construct describes teachers’ degrees of initiative and risk-taking in their work. Inherent in this construct is the notion that classroom-based teacher leaders don’t wait for their principals to tell them what they should be doing to succeed with their students. On the contrary, they are actively assessing their own performance as it relates to their students’ achievement, trying new strategies in order to meet the needs of their students, and perhaps taking action to solve problems rather than waiting for an administrator to solve them for them. They are in perpetual research mode, making note of what is working and what isn’t, and learning from their experiences, colleagues, books, articles, and speakers at conferences. They are not afraid to make mistakes along the way, knowing that taking risks and trying new things outside their comfort zone may pay off in increased student learning.

Construct C: Trust.

This is an important construct that is only partly under an individual teacher’s control. While trust among colleagues appears crucial to the kind of clear and direct communication that allows teacher leadership to flourish, individual teachers can do only so much to affect the total degree of trust felt between teachers at a school. Nonetheless, this construct is meant to measure teachers’ levels of confidence that they may speak openly about issues affecting their work with students, as well as their tolerance of the diverse or alternative opinions of others on staff.
**Construct D: Collaboration.**

A healthy degree of trust among teachers makes collaboration possible, but there must also be a desire on the part of teachers to work together, as well as time to do so. This construct looks at teachers’ behaviors and attitudes about working with others to bring about positive change. In addition to addressing the degree of openness teachers may feel about sharing problems and insights, it examines whether collaboration is actually occurring, and whether or not parents are valued for their role in their children’s education. A high score for this construct would suggest willingness to collaborate freely for the benefit of the school and its students, an identifying characteristic of classroom-based teacher leaders.

**Construct E: Traditional Leadership.**

This construct features subscales readily linked to leadership in the more traditional sense. To what degree do teachers view themselves as leaders of followers? How clearly do they see themselves as individuals that other teachers on staff look to for assistance, guidance and example? This construct is meant to measure teachers’ role in the professionalism of the school, their part in developing school-wide systems that work for students, and their behaviors to assist colleagues in need. Teachers with a high score in this construct can be assumed to be actively working toward the success of the entire school, rather than interested only in the success of students in their own classrooms.

Table 1 summarizes each of the five constructs.
Table 1

The Five Constructs of Classroom-based Teacher Leadership

A. Focus on Student Achievement and Relationships
1. I believe the most important factor in my students’ success is my relationship with them.
2. I am responsible for the successes and failures of the students in my classroom.
3. I spend time thinking about what works and what doesn’t work in my classroom, and make changes to improve my teaching.
4. I translate my school’s goals for improvement into my own classroom practices.
5. I feel satisfaction from my work and my relationships with my students.

B. Initiating and Taking Risks
1. I try modifications in my classroom to help all my students succeed.
2. I seek out best teaching practices and strive to implement them in my classroom.
3. I formally or informally conduct research using my students in order to determine ways I can improve my teaching.
4. I take action to solve problems at school that may not be addressed by our school administrators.

C. Trust
1. I believe other teachers at this school are respectful of my opinions and beliefs.
2. I feel supported in my work by other teachers here at school.
3. I am happy hearing other teachers share different views from my own here at school.
4. I feel safe openly disagreeing with others during school meetings.

D. Collaboration
1. I candidly share my ideas about teaching and learning with other teachers at this school.
2. I share teaching problems I have with other teachers in order to gain from their insights.
3. I look for opportunities to support the successes of other teachers here at school.
4. I recognize the important contributions of other teachers in the successes of this school.
5. Together with other teachers I work to create solutions to problems at our school.
6. I encourage parent participation here at school.

E. Traditional Leadership
1. I consider my role important in the building of a professional community at this school.
2. I strive to extend the successes and relationships I have with my own students to all the students at the school.
3. I speak out about the needs of all students to make sure they are addressed.
4. I find time to help other teachers deal with change here at school.
5. I help others translate our school goals for improvement into their classroom practices.
6. I model reflection and improvement in my classroom for the benefit of other teachers.

Developing the Instruments

Once classroom-based teacher leadership was operationalized in the five constructs, the next step was to create instruments with which to measure the degree of that leadership in individuals and at a school. In spring of 2006 I developed a 43-item quantitative survey and piloted it with the participation of teachers at a nearby K-8 elementary school. Based on the results of that pilot, I revised the survey to reflect all the
At the time of the quantitative pilot, I also piloted a qualitative project at the same school site using an interview schedule to conduct hour-long interviews with three teachers. The interviews provided data about the individuals themselves, as well as providing the context of the school’s culture, within which the quantitative data appeared more meaningful. As a result of my experiences in the two pilot studies, the present study utilizes a mixed-method approach to develop a more thorough understanding of the data.

The revised interview schedule now includes 13 open-ended questions, with three demographic questions at the end. (In both the surveys and the interviews, the same demographic information of age, gender, years of full-time teaching, years of part-time or substitute teaching, and current classroom assignment was obtained.) The finalized interview schedule can be found in Appendix B.

**Conducting the Research**

**Sample selection.**

I conducted my research at three Northern California K-5 elementary schools from separate school districts in three separate towns. I selected K-5 elementary schools rather than K-3 or K-8 schools because the K-5 model is the most representative elementary model in the area. Following are descriptions of the schools using pseudonyms, and data found in Ed-Data Profiles and Reports, 2005-06 (Ed-Data, 2007a).

Classified as a Large Town school, Hillside School has the smallest yet most diverse student population in the study. Its 295 students in 16 K-5 classes earn it a 66 on
the Ethnic Diversity Index (EDI measures a school’s diversity of ethnicity; scores closer to 0 indicate students are predominantly from a single ethnic group, while those closer to 100 indicate more evenly distributed diversity). At Hillside, 64% of students are identified as other than white, and 24% are identified as English Language (EL) learners. The low-income level of most of the school’s families is indicated by the 91% of students who qualify for Free/reduced price meals. In 2006 Hillside School posted an Academic Performance Index (API) of 772, the lowest of the three schools. While it met its overall API target, it failed to meet its targets for subgroups. However, when compared with 100 similar California schools, Hillside scored a 10—higher than either of the other two schools (in Similar School Scores--SSRs--schools with similar demographic data are compared and given rankings between 1 – 10, with 10 being the high score). Hillside met its Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) requirement. Hillside School employs 19 teachers, all of whom are fully credentialed.

Valley School is classified as a Small Town school. It has the largest but least diverse population of the three schools. In contrast to Hillside’s high EDI ranking, Valley’s 430 students in 22 classrooms earn an EDI ranking of only 21, indicating a much more ethnically homogenous student body. Just 19% of the students are identified as other than white, while the EL population at Valley makes up 5% of its total. At Valley School, 41% of students come from families identified as low-income, qualifying their children for Free/reduced price meals. Valley’s posted API of 823 is the highest for the three schools, with all targets and AYP met. However, its Similar Schools Rank is only 5. Valley School employs 23 teachers, all of whom are fully credentialed.
Also a Small Town school, Seaview School is a newly created district consolidation of two separate K-5 sites, now located on one of the former sites, a consequence of declining enrollments in the district over the past several years. (As a result, the data here are based on combinations, averages, or listed separately for each of the former sites, as appropriate.) Seaview School’s 325 students in 18 classes earn it an EDI of 29—a ranking higher than Valley’s, but far lower than Hillside’s. At Seaview, 28% students are identified as other than white, with an EL population of just 6%. Seaview has 60% of its students qualifying for Free/reduced price meals—indicating a less affluent average population than Valley’s, but more affluent than Hillside’s. The posted APIs from last year for the two currently merged schools were 801 (SSR: 6) and 816 (SSR: 9), with both API targets met, but with neither schools’ targets met for subgroups. Seaview employs 19 fully credentialed teachers.

Data collection

Quantitative.

Through e-mail, I obtained permissions from the superintendents of the three districts to contact the principals of the three schools and propose my project using their teachers. I then emailed the principals and obtained their permissions to attend staff meetings at each school, at which I obtained signed consents from the teachers in attendance. (The survey consent is found in Appendix C.) I then passed out the surveys and collected them when teachers were finished filling them out.

At Hillside School I obtained consents and surveys from all 15 teachers who attended the staff meeting. Through follow up letters, accompanied by email reminders, I
received two more surveys, for a total of 17 of the 19 teachers at the school, a response rate of 89%.

At Valley School I obtained consents and surveys for all 21 teachers who attended the staff meeting. Through follow up letters and email reminders, I received one more consent and survey, for a total of 22 of the 23 teachers at the school, a response rate of 96%.

At Seaview School I obtained consents and surveys for all 15 teachers who attended the staff meeting. Through follow up letters and emails I received 3 more consents but only 2 more surveys, for a total of 17 surveys for the 19 teachers at the school, a response rate of 89%. (One consent was mailed back accompanied by a note on the blank survey, which I will discuss in the results section of this paper.) Combined, I received 56 surveys back from the 61 teachers at the three schools, an overall response rate of 92%.

Qualitative.

After surveying the teachers at each school, I arranged, obtained consents for, and conducted audio taped interviews with three teachers from each site. (The interview consent is in Appendix D.) In all, 12 teachers were contacted out of which 9 consented. I had hoped to achieve a maximum variation of ages, teaching experience, grade levels taught, and gender, but settled on a sample of convenience and consent. Still, much of the variation I initially intended was achieved with a range of ages (25 – 60 years), full time teaching experience (2 to 33 years), grade level assignments (K – 4th), and gender (3 men, 6 women), as seen below in Table 2.
Table 2

*Interview Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Alias: Pat</th>
<th>Alias: Diane</th>
<th>Alias: Vicky</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender: F</td>
<td>Gender: F</td>
<td>Gender: F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 25</td>
<td>Age: 53</td>
<td>Age: 56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT years: 2</td>
<td>FT years: 16</td>
<td>FT years: 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade level: 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Grade level: 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;/2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Grade level: 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Alias: Tom</th>
<th>Alias: Carol</th>
<th>Alias: Alice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender: M</td>
<td>Gender: F</td>
<td>Gender: F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 38</td>
<td>Age: 52</td>
<td>Age: 60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT years: 11</td>
<td>FT years: 24</td>
<td>FT years: 33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade level: 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Grade level: 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Grade level: 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Alias: Allan</th>
<th>Alias: Richard</th>
<th>Alias: Amy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender: M</td>
<td>Gender: M</td>
<td>Gender: F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 38</td>
<td>Age: 52</td>
<td>Age: 51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT years: 13</td>
<td>FT years: 14</td>
<td>FT years: 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade level: 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Grade level: 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;/5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Grade level: K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Analysis*

After collecting the quantitative survey data I entered it into Microsoft Excel worksheets and, using Microsoft Excel and Minitab, analyzed it in terms of the five constructs of classroom-based teacher leadership. I compared and contrasted the
individual participants and their schools by determining means for each of the subscales and the constructs. Pearson correlations were conducted to determine the strength of relationships between items within the constructs, as well as the relatedness of each of the constructs to each other. Regression analysis was also used to measure correlations of the constructs. I used One-way ANOVA to determine the level of the significance of differences between the means of the constructs at the three school sites.

I analyzed the qualitative interview data by first transcribing the taped interviews and then coding it, using thematic content analysis, according to the subscales of the constructs. When participants’ responses indicated evidence for or against subscales, I recorded the quotes in columns dedicated to those subscales. In this way I was able to perceive the participants’ interview responses within the subscales and the five constructs, and use this information to interpret the quantitative results of the survey.

By using both quantitative and qualitative methods, I was able to learn more about the classroom-based teacher leadership of individuals and their schools than I might have using only a single research lens. Each method brings its own strengths and weaknesses to the research. The survey data gauges the beliefs and opinions of a large group of individuals, allowing comparisons between participants and sites, yet offers no explanation for those beliefs and opinions. Meanwhile, the interview data from my small sample of teachers is rich with meaning, but reflects only the beliefs and opinions of those individuals, and may not represent larger groups even at the same school sites. By using the surveys to determine specific construct information about the entire group of teachers, and then interviews to learn the context behind and possible meanings for the
survey data, I was able to develop a more comprehensive understanding of classroom-based teacher leadership for the individuals and the sites.

Limitations

For reasons of practicality, the size of the sample in this study is small. Although I measured classroom-based teacher leadership in three separate schools from three separate districts and towns, the total sample is just 56 teachers.

Related to the above limitation, the mean age of the participants in the study, 51, is skewed by the relative maturity of the local teaching population. This is in opposition to a broader range of ages in the ranks of teachers elsewhere in California, where in 2005-06, only about half of the 308,000 teachers were over 45 (Ed-Data, 2007b). Also, in this study the mean number of years of full-time teaching experience is 19.2 years, versus California’s mean of 12.7 (Ed-Data, 2007b). While Leithwood’s view of developmental stages influencing readiness to lead may be separate from issues of age or accrued years of experience (Leithwood, 1990), others hold that life and career stages do affect leadership potential (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001; Rosenholtz, 1990; Smylie, 1992) and these may be connected to a teacher’s age.

Another limitation is the K-5 model. While nothing in my findings suggests issues that may be limited only to teachers serving in K-5 models, future studies might measure classroom-based teacher leadership in schools with different configurations, including the K-8, 6-8 or middle school model, and high schools.

A potential limitation occurred as a result of how and when the surveys were completed. In order to ensure high response rates, I opted to survey teachers when they
were gathered together in one place: the staff meeting. Having all the teachers present at one time allowed me to efficiently answer questions and clarify instructions, obtain consents, and to collect the completed surveys in a timely manner. Being present at the staff meetings also allowed me to casually observe the collegiality of each staff and administration, and begin perceiving each school’s culture. However, because the teachers’ principals were asking them to consider my appeal for their participation, during contracted time, teachers may have chosen to participate at least partly because of a perception that it was expected of them. Additionally, they may have rushed through the survey rather than thoughtfully taking their time, in order to get it out of the way. Both of these considerations could potentially influence the validity of the results.

Summary

While effective leadership is being touted as necessary to effect meaningful change in public schools, recent studies suggest teacher leadership may hold greatest promise. This mixed-method study sets out to fill a gap in the literature about teacher leadership in schools by measuring what is referred to as classroom-based teacher leadership. Three schools were selected for the study, with 56 teacher surveys administered and nine interviews with teachers completed. An analysis of the data resulted in the measurement of the degree of classroom-based teacher leadership evident in all of the individual teachers surveyed, those interviewed, and the overall teacher leadership at each of the three schools. In the following chapter I will detail the results of the study.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Introduction

In Chapter Three I outlined the process followed in conducting a mixed-method study of classroom-based teacher leadership, including possible limitations of the research. The study was undertaken to fill a gap in the literature by measuring the degree to which teacher leadership is evident among individual teachers and schools. This chapter examines the results of the study, including both the statistical analysis of the survey data, and the thematic content analysis of the interview data.

The chapter begins with the results of Pearson correlation analyses determining the strength of the relationships between subscales within the constructs. Next, the five constructs, and separate subconstructs determined through Pearson correlation analysis, are analyzed in order, A – E. For each construct and subconstruct, the three schools’ means are compared and illustrated in Tables 3 – 10. Levels of significance are presented for the variance between the three schools’ means, obtained through One-way ANOVA testing. Regression analyses determine the predictability of a school’s mean for a given construct, based on its mean for another.

Following an introductory statistical analysis for each construct, the interview data are presented. Headings summarize the major themes that emerged from the data, which are characterized in relation to the subscales and constructs, the survey data, and
their own thematic content. When appropriate, findings from the interview data and the statistical data are discussed in light of findings about teacher leadership in the literature.

*Interconstruct and Construct Correlation*

Pearson correlations were used to determine the strength of relationships between subscales within the constructs. The raw results of these correlations tests are found in Appendix E. Overall within the five constructs, items showed degrees of correlation ranging from negligible to marked, with *p* levels also ranging from statistically insignificant to very significant (*p* > .05 to *p* < .001).

The weakest interconstruct correlations were found within Construct A. Focus on Student Achievement and Relationships. In particular, those assessing A1 (“The most important factor in your students’ achievement is your relationship with them.”) and A2 (“You are responsible for the success and failures of the students in your classroom.”) showed negligible correlation with the other items in the construct, appearing to be independent subscales. In the final analysis they were removed from the construct and compared separately as “Subscales A1, A2: Locus of Control for Student Achievement.” In this chapter, the findings for this subconstruct immediately follow the findings for Construct A.

Correlations within Construct B. Initiating and Taking Risks indicate significant relationships with moderate to strong values (.33 to .51), except for B2 (“Sought advice from another teacher, an article, or a book about a better way to teach something?”). However, it moderately correlated with items in Construct D. Collaboration, and so was moved to that construct for the final analysis.
In Construct C. Trust, all items showed significant relationships with moderate to strong values (0.28 to 0.77).

Again in Construct D. Collaboration all items showed significant relationships with moderate to strong values (0.30 to 0.70) except for the item for subscale D6 (“Took an action that increased parent participation here at school?”). That subscale appears to stand alone, and was removed from the construct and compared separately in the final analysis. The findings for D6 immediately follow those for Construct D in this chapter.

Finally, the subscales in Construct E. Traditional Leadership show a range of low to moderate degrees of correlation. In particular, the item for subscale E3 (“Spoke out on behalf of students whose needs weren’t being met?”) does not appear related to the other items in the construct, so it was removed and compared separately in the final analysis. Findings for E3 immediately follow findings for Construct E in this chapter.

Using the newly configured constructs, Pearson correlations showed the constructs to be highly related to one-another. The raw results of these correlations tests are found in Appendix F.

Mean scores were determined for each school. Tables 3-10 show each school’s mean scores for each of the constructs and subconstructs. The possible range of scores was between 1 and 4, with 4 representing the highest possible classroom-based teacher leadership score.
Construct A. Focus on Student Achievement and Relationships

Table 3

Construct A Mean Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct A. Focus on Student Achievement and Relationships</th>
<th>Hillside M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Seaview M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Valley M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each of the three schools, the mean of this construct was the highest of the five constructs tested. A One-way ANOVA determined the variance between means was not statistically significant, $F(2, 53) = 0.43$, $p = .653$. Additionally, the interview data concur; it appears that teachers at all three schools are highly focused on student achievement, spend time improving their classroom teaching, and derive satisfaction from working with their students, all traits of classroom-based teacher leaders (Lieberman & Miller, 2005). Regression analysis found a school’s mean for this construct to be significantly predictive of its means for Initiating and Taking Risks ($t = 3.12, p = .003$), Collaboration ($t = 3.68, p = .001$) and Traditional Leadership ($t = 4.22, p < .001$).

The following section presents the results of the interview data from the nine teachers interviewed at the three schools. The data are grouped under thematic headings for clarity.

Focus on student achievement.

Interviewees in all three schools focused on their students’ progress, making changes when necessary to improve their teaching efficacy. “And the hard part is,” 24-
year veteran Vicky added, citing the challenges of meeting the needs of a variety of
learners in her Hillside 2nd grade classroom,

you also have to look at, “Well, here’s where I need the whole class to be, by testing,
and by the end of the year,” and so you’re constantly splitting your time. You’re
trying to work in these small group settings, or these one-on-one settings, and still
get the curriculum—especially in writing and math—across to all of them.

At Seaview, Kindergarten teacher Amy agreed, even with 18 years in the
classroom, it is difficult fitting her instruction to the needs of her class:

What is going to be the most powerful (instruction) for the time that I have? What is
going to be open-ended enough, that when I bring each group to that activity, I can
make adjustments within it to really meet that wide range of children’s’ needs?

After 33 years of teaching, Valley third grade teacher Alice refused to cave in to
the pressure of high stakes testing, even though it makes her feel “Horribly rushed. But I
won’t rush myself. I will slow down and be behind, perhaps where somebody else is, so
that I can do the depth. I refuse to just do a glossy finish . . .”

*Teacher responses to school-wide goals for improvement.*

Frustration about higher expectations, in the form of standards and standardized
testing, was a theme in many of the teacher interviews. Valley 2nd grade teacher Carol,
with 24 years of teaching, complained that by taking school-wide goals into
consideration, she regularly over-plans each week. By Friday she is upset by all the work
her class hasn’t finished. “I do think the pressures we have from the state to accomplish
more are probably the reason I do this over and over again.”
From her Seaview perspective, Amy also vented about directives from administrators and the state

. . . that you better demonstrate you’re meeting those children’s needs. “And we’ll set you up with even the testing to really identify where those weaknesses are; but then you’re going to be held responsible for then making this growth. But we’re not going to back you with money; we’re not going to back you with time; we’re not going to back you with materials. But we are going to punish you if you don’t do it.”

Still, she said, she’s quite aware of what today’s 5 year-olds need to know by the time they leave her. “So I am trying very hard to make them as ready as possible,” she concluded.

Seaview colleague and 13-year veteran Allan said he enjoys the challenge of matching his instruction to his 4th grade students:

And you think back to “How did this work last year?” Was this really the best way to do this?” And then you just try a different way to do it. That’s kind of the fun in teaching, too. You’re constantly evaluating. You’re constantly trying to get better at what you do. I don’t know too many jobs that are like that.

On the other hand, when asked how his school’s goals for improvement affect his teaching, he showed less enthusiasm:

I have to be frank and say none of the things-- none of the workshops, or days and hours we’ve spent discussing the scores or trying to improve them-- have ever really, I don’t think, helped one way or the other. I think all the teachers know their job and what their grade level-- and you know, I think they’re working to improve
themselves every year. And I’m not sure being told what the test scores are, and how to improve them, has ever driven that. I mean, when the kids are able, that’s reflected in the test scores, you know, usually. And I’ve never been driven by that, put it that way.

Apparently committed to meeting students’ needs, Allan appears less certain that results from once-a-year, standardized tests are useful.

14-year veteran Richard’s interview drew a similar response regarding the usefulness of his school’s test result-driven goals in his 4th/5th classroom. He reported he does not set the small goals based on student’s test performance that his principal expects. Instead,

A. . . . they tend to be broader goals of making improvements, gaining concepts; but I really don't set individual goals.

Q. So would it be fair to say that whether or not you did this disaggregation, or whether or not you saw the STAR test results, your goals would be still be the same?

A. That's correct.

Q. For all the students, it’s just “making progress?”

A. That's correct.

But Richard remains torn about his abilities to match his instruction to his students, admitting, “my weakest piece has to do with planning and organization.” He continued,

And I see teachers that really have it down, that are really good at determining a need and diagnosing, prescribing, and figuring stuff out and doing things differently. And I tend not to do that. I tend to respond to situations and deal with stimulus at the
time, but not necessarily incorporate it into how I do my whole year, or deal with that person the whole time, or how I can better teach a particular piece of curriculum.

At Hillside, teachers indicated disagreement about school-wide goals for improvement. Not so sure there are any, Vicky stated, “it’s more individual [between teachers and students] than something that’s put down from above.” Second year, first grade teacher Pat sincerely shared, “Well, you know, I don’t really pay too much attention to that stuff, until, you know, there’s a meeting, and then we have to kind of talk about it.” Meanwhile, 1st/2nd teacher Diane, with 16 years in the classroom, called herself “a real advocate” for school wide improvement. Speaking of the new “Response to Intervention” (RtI) approach her district has adopted, she determined “there is inconsistency in the way students are assessed in different classrooms.” She believes the new DIBLES (The Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills) testing will eliminate that problem, allowing Hillside to have a single standard by which reading progress is assessed. But many teachers on staff are resisting the changes, “So the school is getting really divisive right now, when we’ve always been really unified before.”

Satisfaction from classroom work and student-teacher relationships.

At all three schools, teachers reported great satisfaction from their work and their relationships with students. At Hillside, “Watching a kid pick up a book voluntarily. That’s satisfying,” Diane said. Reflecting on the poverty and trauma many of her students come from, her colleague Vicky noted, “I think that’s what keeps me going, is watching them just accrue all this ability and knowledge, and feel good about themselves.”
At Seaview, Richard linked his students’ growth to his own, explaining his satisfaction comes from “. . . not just being pleased at what the kids realize they can do, but me realizing what I can do.” Allan agreed: “You feel like you had a part in helping, you know. You see that growth; that success. And that’s definitely the payoff that’s beyond salary, obviously.”

The three Valley teachers indicated an almost parental satisfaction about their students. Carol said

I think the older I get, the more I appreciate the whole concept of little by little, every day makes growth. . . . You know, that’s fun with children. You do little bits day after day and then—boom-- one day you see—wow—the growth that they’ve made, and that’s very rewarding; very satisfying.

It’s also more than just teaching and learning for Valley 3rd grade teacher Tom, in his 11th year:

And they learn—don’t get me wrong. There’s all those things, but I think that the biggest satisfaction is connecting with the kids and—you know—being part of their lives. A pretty big part, you know?

Describing her relationship with a third grader she has “adopted” out of a determination not to allow the child to fail, Valley’s Alice quoted herself:

“Honey, you’re stuck with me for three more years, third, fourth, and fifth, because I can. You are not going to be able to fail yourself emotionally. I will not accept your garbage. You’ll be out now for a few minutes, and you’ll come back in because you’re smart, and you’re not going to ever lose me because I’m behind you.”
Alice not only derives satisfaction from relationships the students in her own classroom; she has energy and drive to maintain those relationships until the children leave her school.
Subscales A1, A2: Locus of Control for Student Achievement

Table 4

Subscales A1, A2 Mean Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hillside</th>
<th>Seaview</th>
<th>Valley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subscales A1, A2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for Student</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because subscales A1 ("The most important factor in your students’ achievement is your relationship with them.") and A2 ("You are responsible for the success and failures of the students in your classroom.") showed negligible correlation with the other items in the construct, they were removed from the construct and compared on an individual basis. They are important subscales because they measure a teachers’ locus of control: their belief in how much they are in control of their students’ achievement. According to the literature, the most important factor in student achievement cited by teacher leaders is the teacher and student relationship (Newmann & Wehlage, 1995). Also, by seeing themselves as responsible for success and failure in the classroom, teacher leaders are encouraged to experiment and take risks, increasing their own and their schools’ effectiveness (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001).

A One-way ANOVA found the variance between the two shared mean scores, Hillside’s and Seaview’s, and the discrepant score, Valley’s, highly significant, $F(2, 53) = 3.21, p = .048$. However, the interview data do not support a marked difference
between the beliefs of the nine teachers interviewed about how much they are in control of their students’ achievement. Only one teacher voiced full responsibility for her students’ achievement, which is shared at the end of the section.

Limits to teacher influence: relationships, time, home factors.

With the low, discrepant score, Valley teachers nonetheless express determination to overcome the limitations that affect student achievement. Tom stressed his emphasis on building relationships to engender success:

So I think that relationship helps or influences their ah-ha moments and their learning. Definitely, you know, we all provide a safe learning environment, but I think kids get to different levels of feeling okay and safe. But when they have that comfort-- right now until the end of the year is just when they're so much like sponges. You can give them everything you can possibly try to give them and they just-- you know-- they're comfortable.

Carol also makes it her business to understand all the variables in her students’ lives, calling parents to find out about issues at home that may be affecting student behavior at school.

Alice explained her determination by her demand for a commitment to achievement from all of her students, despite their varied abilities and backgrounds:

I expect every child-- all I can ask for them is that they do their best, whatever that is, whether it's an RSP student or a GATE kid or a child who is an underachiever-- whatever. If they're doing their best they recognize it, and I recognize it. And that's my expectation for them, is they try.
Despite their higher score, Seaview’s interviewees all expressed an understanding of limitations to their abilities to control their students’ achievement. Seaview’s Richard explained his role as preparing the way for learning to occur, but said there are many more factors in play that he can not control: “I’m the teacher so I kind of set the tone. And I have kids that can unset the tone, or change the tone, and set it in their own way. So it is a team effort.”

Amy also expressed limits to what she personally can affect in terms of her students’ achievement:

There's a lot of band-aid things that are put out there. Okay. This student works so let's do a little bit more of this. Maybe if we do this longer. Maybe if we do this thing and buy a little package that's going to solve it. But that's not what you need. What is really needed, she believes, is one-on-one time with her Kindergartners, which, with her students’ wide ranges of abilities, is hard to find.

Allan related his realization that his influence on his pupils is limited by both his own ability as a teacher, and his students’ lives beyond the classroom: “Sometimes you can’t help a kid get to where they need to be, and that can be like banging your head against the wall, for whatever reason—their limitations or your inability to find it.” The knowledge that his students’ achievement is only partly under his control is difficult to face, because:

You get personally attached and emotionally attached to your little colleagues in your room, and it’s frustrating when you can only do so much, you know, for them. And at the end of the day they have to go home, and some of them have terrible
lives, and there’s not much else you can do for them; barring— you know—aside from trying to help them get out of their crazy life. But sometimes that doesn’t happen, and that can be emotionally draining.

At Hillside, the other high-scoring school for Locus of Control, the data echoed similar frustrations about limits to teacher influence. New teacher, Pat, finds the most challenging limitation to be a classroom full of active children, when she knows achievement will result from working with each individual child. Diane spoke of the difficulty of accommodating the many differences in her classroom, another factor that limits her effect on students. For example, “. . . I’ve got another little boy, his father is Chinese and his mother is Vietnamese, so there’s two different languages going on at home, and he’s here learning English. I mean, his head is really spinning.”

Parents can also limit a teachers’ influence, Diane explained, by interfering with the program. When she tried to reward her students with Friday free time and a snack, but only when they followed through by finishing the week’s work, a parent complained to the principal that her child was being discriminated against.

*Taking a stand for teacher responsibility.*

Vicky voiced the strongest personal responsibility for her students’ progress: “Anything that’s frustrating me about them is really not their fault. They’re six, they’re seven, they might even be eight years old. They’re kind of doing the best they can.” Despite prior school experiences, home life, and their developmental ages, by February, the time of the interview, Vicky believed,
Now it falls to me, I think. If things are not the way I’d like them to be at this point, then it’s falling to me, that I somehow haven’t been able to make up and get them where they need to be. Because-- you know-- they’ve had me for over half a year, and I should have been able to get them where they need to be.

Vicky’s dissatisfaction derives not from limitations that keep her from connecting sufficiently with her students, but instead from teachers who use those limitations as excuses:

I don’t have a lot of patience with people, who-- when they work with children like we work with-- who will not have high expectations for the kids. They’ll use their poverty as an excuse to not push the children, and I don’t like that, and that drives me crazy.
Construct B. Initiating and Taking Risks

Table 5

Construct B Mean Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hillside</th>
<th>Seaview</th>
<th>Valley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construct B. Initiating and Taking Risks</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A One-way ANOVA revealed a high level of significance in the variance of the mean scores for this construct between Hillside, with the lowest score of the three, and Valley, which scored highest, $F(2, 53) = 4.84, p = .012$. This is especially meaningful since regression analysis determined that a school’s mean for Initiating and Taking Risks is a significant predictor for its means for Collaboration ($t = 3.72, p < .001$) and for Traditional Leadership ($t = 3.95, p < .001$).

Teacher buy-in to school-wide goals enhances risk and initiation.

The interview data suggest Valley’s highest score in the construct may be related to recently adopted programs, for which there is apparent buy-in from teachers. This year Valley has embarked on an RtI program modeled on Hesperia School District’s ExCEL (Excellence: A Commitment to Every Learner) program. Students are grouped by reading ability and sent to different teachers school-wide for portions of the school day, in an effort to individualize instruction and meets students’ diverse needs. Of the collaborative tone, Carol recalled, “When we were told that we had to teach two-and-a-half hours of
reading a day and that we had to accelerate growth, we said, ‘How are we going to do this?’” Alice shared the initial reactions from her staff: “Somebody said, ‘This is going to be a lot more work [than teaching reading in our own classes],’ and I said, ‘No. It’s going to be different.’”

Like the community of learners model of leadership, in which each staff member’s learning enhances the improvement of the school (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001), change at Valley may be encouraging teachers to take risks and initiate new ways of working with students. Carol described how the ExCEL process works for students:

So we took three afternoons, half-hour slots in our afternoons, and put reading in there, too, and for our really ready readers, our good readers-- we have them read in sustained silent reading groups, and they only read with other kids who can read. So, I mean, the room is silent and they are all really, really reading for a half an hour. There's nothing-- no goof balls in there. They're really reading.

Then we have groups of kids who are building fluency in reading, and that's the technician kind of process where they're working and logging progress. Those are the kids who-- who don't-- you know, they may be readers but they're not eager readers, and so you have to kind of build-in their practice to make them better readers.

And then we have also a group of kids who need a lot of intervention, and we are reteaching techniques like phonics that we've missed the first time around.

The ExCEL model requires teachers to formally and informally conduct research to improve their teaching, and to try modifications to help all students succeed, characteristics of classroom-based teacher leaders (Lieberman, 1988; Lieberman, Saxl, &
Miles, 1988). It may also stimulate Valley teachers to initiate and take risks in other curricular areas. Referring to what used to be a Reader’s Workshop in his class, Tom explained

I've taken the readers part off and I've called it "Workshop" where we can do follow-up writing, so I can have a writing component. We can have a spelling component. We can have a penmanship, cursive writing component.

So my workshop has-- they have more activities and there's a little structure, and I've liked that this year. And I've done centers and workshop-type things before, but I've really tried to model that more.

Which is not to say the staff is not challenged by the school’s changes. Hargreaves (2003) cites the pressure of ESEA (NCLB) reforms as creating barriers to teacher leadership, when teachers are held accountable to higher standards of achievement, despite lack of time and money for improvement. Reflecting those barriers, Tom shared his personal expertise as a trainer in “The Governor’s Reading Program,” a 40-hour summer institute on the Open Court reading program used by Valley school. Although he has approached his administrator with many proposals and requests to train his own colleagues, Valley’s staff has not been adequately trained in Open Court, let alone the new RtI model:

. . . to me there's such a disconnect of what we need and what we get, or, you know, what's decided we need. Our role (the teachers’) is not-- to me-- big enough in the decision-making process on what we should do for the kids in the classroom. It's usually handed to us.
So that's what's expected, you know, of us at Valley: “Here's your program. We're not going to train you on it; we're not going to keep you fresh on it; we're not going to look at the new edition. Just teach it.”

That's a frustration. That. Then take that program and now insert Excel. (You know there's RtI, Response to Intervention, partly legislated from the federal mandates and I think state mandates, too . . .) But then insert a new program on top of a program that you're already not trained in, and you're diluting your already insufficient program with yet another program!

**Seaview: A Mixed Response**

Seaview teachers Amy and Allan reported trying modifications in their classrooms to help all their students succeed. With her many years of experience, Amy knows the kind of Kindergarten classroom she wants: one full of experiences. Well, there are certain things I feel very positive about, like, for instance, I will always have a dramatic play area in the classroom that changes. Because it won’t always remain the “house play” area, because I want to get a wide range of children mixed—involved-- and it’s another way for me to include the language arts. . . .

I’m always going to do hands-on science, and we are going to use the language right from the start that you should be using in math and language and science, not dumbing it down. Because they pick it up, you know kids. “Oh, we can’t go outside. It’s precipitating.”

But she is also paying attention to what works and what needs changing. She reported lowering the pocket charts in the room, so the children interact with them,
instead of just the teachers. To get more of her children reading, she told of making more books available, and keeping them down at their level in the classroom. And where last year she sent the books students made home at the end of the week, this year she is only sending them home with children when they have practiced reading them enough to really know them.

Allan shared a problem he solved trying to make modifications that would meet his students’ needs. He described his lack of success trying to teach to the wide range of spelling ability in his 4th grade class. He realized, “I’ve got to find something else.” So he went to the special day class teacher.

I just thought, “Well, I know this person’s class has all kinds of different kids at every level, so she’s got to have a plan for that.” And so she helped me with overhauling my spelling strategy, which has been really fun. It’s a lot more work, but it’s been fun.

For Allan, initiating a modification that might work in his class began with going outside of his classroom, taking a risk by asking for help.

On the other hand, Richard described himself working through his curricula without worrying much about improving his teaching. He appeared untouched by the current pressures of school improvement and standardized testing in this response:

. . . in math I just go for the next lesson and I feel comfortable doing that, so that's pretty easy. For social studies, although I follow the book, I kind of have a broader goal, and so when I'm teaching about explorers I think that the thing that I care that
the kids know is that there are a lot of reasons why people came from Europe to the Americas and we don't know all the reasons.

Richard reported he continues to teach in his comfort zone, without trying new ideas or initiating new approaches.

*Hillside: Less initiating and risk taking without shared goals.*

Unlike at Valley, where the RtI implementation appears to drive discussion and negotiation, Hillside’s RtI model is under adoption with little evident conversation. Whereas even while they implement it, Valley teachers disagree and parley about how their new program should proceed, Hillside teachers appear to work quietly and independently within their classrooms. What risk and initiation they do take with their students is not shared much with other teachers. Of new modifications she’s attempted recently, Diane reported

> I have just so many EL kids this year, and they’re just really low, so I’ll do that whole group (teach spelling). I have smaller-- only three-- reading groups, and have a longer session. I’m trying a lot of new things this year.

Grade level partner Vicky’s testimony echoed Diane’s reference to lower ability students in her classroom.

> This is a year I have a larger amount of non-readers. And so I have to kind of pick and choose: I can use the reading program—the Houghton Mifflin—or I can pull them aside and put them in leveled readers. It just depends on where they are academically.
I pull them and put them in leveled readers, and I then I also pull them and work on assessment more, one-on-one with them, because I think they need more non-fictional text. They need to be more analytical, and so I’ll work in a very tiny group on that.

I kind of have to go back and forth between, you know, putting them in the reading text, which may be too hard for them and letting them stumble, and then the next week putting them in something where they’ll have more fluency and they’ll feel better about it.

Yet while the two grade-level partners shared similar frustrations over the levels of their students and the difficulty of meeting all their needs, neither referred to working together to solve problems or help each other differentiate their instruction. Unlike the grade-level colleagues at Valley who reported working to modify their approaches and solve problems together, Vicky and Diane presented themselves as completely independent, despite their proximity, shared concerns, and grade level issues.
Construct C. Trust

Table 6

Construct C Mean Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct C. Trust</th>
<th>Hillside</th>
<th>Seaview</th>
<th>Valley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A One-way ANOVA revealed a high level of significance in the variance of the mean scores of the schools for this construct; in particular, between the mean scores for Seaview, with the lowest score of the three, and for Valley, which once again scored highest, \( F(2, 53) = 5.48, p = .007 \). This is an especially important finding since regression analysis indicated a school’s mean for Trust is a significant predictor of its scores for Collaboration \( (t = 2.98, p = .004) \).

Valley: communication enhanced by respect, support, safety.

At Valley, the first factor of organizational learning (OL) (Silins, Mulford, Zarins, & Bishop, 2000) may be in place: interviewees expressed a fundamental respect between colleagues leading to feeling supported in their work. They expected to hear differences between teachers, and were satisfied with that. Speaking for her staff, Valley’s Alice summed it up:

Opinions are respected. There’s lots of sharing; yeah, and there’s no judgment. And I don’t think there is at any grade level—any resentment or jealousy. I can’t imagine that at our school. No. I don’t see it anywhere.
Tom reflected on an example of trust:

The casual meeting, eating lunch, meeting with my other third grade teachers and, you know, we’re reflecting on our kids and what’s working and what’s not working, or a specific kid. “What do you think I should do next?” So sharing of those ideas and respecting other people’s input; that definitely occurs.

Tom reported being comfortable going to students’ previous teachers for support. “What do I need to do? Tell me about the kid. What would be more effective? Can you provide me with materials, you know, or supplement what I’m doing, from your grade level?” Carol sorted out the most important ingredient in Valley teachers’ trust and communication: “They are all hardworking and able to see other people's point of view. I guess they must listen. They listen to each other. And it's amazing what you can accomplish when you do that, you know?”

At staff meetings, on the other hand, there is some reserve, reflected Tom: You know—and it depends on the climate of what’s going on. Like right now (in the middle of the new RtI transition) people are so overwhelmed and tired and fed up with the new program and all this, that it’s not the best time to open up, and people aren’t feeling like it, you know. It’s a less productive, more businesslike environment.

Nonetheless, Alice reported feeling free to speak out:

I’m the queen of being willing to say what I think. People come to me and say, “I’m really upset about this. Will you bring it up?” And that’s been my history. And I know, yeah, I have nothing to lose. What are they going to do, fire me?
*Hillside: communication marred by rifts, perceived lack of safety.*

With a slightly lower mean score than Valley’s, Hillside teachers also expressed a degree of trust and support among teachers, although decisions and priorities handed down from the administration may be causing conflicts between camps. Teachers’ responses evidenced tenuous relationships between grade level groups. “Staff members, I don’t have a problem disagreeing with,” claimed Diane. She gave an example:

> There is a rift between me and the kindergarten teachers, but I am going out of my way to be polite and to socialize, you know. I want them to know it’s not a personality thing; it’s not that I don’t like them. It’s just that we have different approaches.

Philosophic disagreements may be leading teachers to feel unsupported in their work, as Diane’s comments evidenced:

> . . . but some people think it’s just not appropriate to teach kindergartners how to read, or the skills-- other than letter naming and sounds—the skills that go along with it. So that makes my job [*teaching 1st/2nd grade*] adhering to the standards even harder.

Diane illustrated a finding that a lack of trust interferes with collaboration and problem-solving, in a situation in which a counselor was assigned by their administrator to observe a group of low-performing students:

> And she came in for this meeting, which I felt very uncomfortable about, especially since neither the principal nor the counselor had ever taught reading. “Just get out of here.” And you know, the day prior the counselor had come in to observe a student,
supposedly, yet, she had her back to the student and was interacting with my kids and watching me teach reading. So I called them on it. So I told the teacher [sic] I don’t want her involved, because I don’t trust her.

Second year teacher Pat shared how her colleagues support her with activities and ideas, knowing she will benefit from their help. But being new may not account for all of her insecurity sharing in some situations. “Staff meetings I don’t ever say anything,” she said.

Both Diane and Vicky concurred. Speaking about meetings, Diane said, “Nobody talks at the staff meeting if they can avoid it, and that’s because of the administration.” She continued, “It’s subtle, but our staff meetings are not for discussion any more. There is no dialog any more, and it’s a huge change from what it used to be. It’s just evolved that way.” According to Vicky:

If there are things that come up, you’ll say a little bit, but it’s not a feeling that you can just have an open conversation in front of the administrator. So if we want to have those conversations, we don’t do it in front of the administrator. And then it’s safe; then it’s fine.

That is different from the way it used to be at their school, under other administrations, Vicky recalled:

We have weathered every storm at that school. We have had practically knockdown brawls over issues in the past, and we have always said, “We can almost come to blows over an issue, and then we’re fine.” And that’s always been the history of that
staff. And we have that history, but now it’s just a different feel. And so we’ve just learned that we don’t have those discussions at staff meetings.

Hillside teachers’ inability to share freely in the presence of their administrator is an important finding, in light of previous research that correlated teachers’ willingness to lead, with their principal’s open and supportive style (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001; Smylie, 1992).

Seaview teachers consolidated, not united.

Seaview School’s significantly low mean for the construct may result from its unique situation: Seaview is experiencing its first year as the consolidation, onto one surviving site, of two formerly separate neighborhood schools in the district. Perhaps significantly, one Seaview teacher returned a signed consent form and a blank survey with the note, “I don’t feel comfortable answering these questions this year with [the district] going through so much change.” Speaking of the merger’s affect on the teachers, and the alienation he and others feel, Allan, who moved to Seaview from the abandoned site reflected,

Both communities have existed for a long time, and a lot of teachers are having a hard time-- they don’t like their cheese moved at all. Anyway, so you know what I’m saying. So this whole thing is like a huge adjustment for all of us.

About the culture and environment at the former site, Amy recalled

That we highly respected each other. We weren't put out by each other's having a different idea. We could work really well together. . . . We not only worked together, we played together.
In order to lead, teachers must feel invited to participate; a climate of inclusiveness is essential to that (Spillane, J.P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. B. April, 2001). However, at Seaview Amy found the contrary to be true. Early on at the merged site, her new administrator told the former site teachers they “would be ‘assimilated,’” Amy remembered with raised eyebrows. “That was the word used.” Amy compared the difference in the two schools’ tones. At her old site,

We recognized that everybody had different teaching styles, and felt very comfortable in asking questions about it, to get more information; knowing that that person wasn’t threatened by someone asking questions or someone having a different opinion; knowing that I could state something that just is—was a different thing from what they thought—and being very safe in them asking me questions. I can’t do that here.

At the merged site, Amy continued, the trust that allows colleagues to share opinions and beliefs, let alone ideas about teaching, is missing. When she arrived at Seaview,

Just sharing an idea was unwelcome; was threatening, was stating, “Well, you must not be doing it right.” Because you shared this book that you've done! And I've worked really hard at not cultivating that feeling with my direct colleagues at my grade level, because I've become aware of it, and I was blown away by it.

Like at Hillside, Seaview staff meetings are not a place where ideas are safely discussed. Unlike at Hillside, teachers at Seaview are clear that their distrust stems equally from teachers as well as their administrator. The literature suggests this apparent norm of distrust could impose a barrier effect on Seaview’s teachers, disabling their
potential leadership (Lieberman, 1988; Smylie, 1992; Zinn, 1997). Richard, with 13 of his 14 years at the present site, attributed his reticence to worry that he would have to defend his point of view:

I think that I don't have a great deal of confidence, in some aspects, of the things that I believe, because I don't know that I can back them up except by the fact that I know that I believe them.

Allan believes disagreeing has never been easy at staff meetings, but “It’s important to fight through that to be heard.” But Amy was clearest about her response when she hears something she disagrees with at staff meetings. “I say nothing,” she said. “Because I hear about it later on, and I am not accustomed to people being straight-forward.”
Construct D. Collaboration

Table 7

Construct D Mean Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>construct D. Collaboration</th>
<th>Hillside</th>
<th>Seaview</th>
<th>Valley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A One-way ANOVA revealed a low level of significance in the variance of the mean scores of the schools for this construct, $F(2, 53) = 2.44, p = .097$. According to the range of means, Valley’s average for the construct ranks highest, while Hillside’s ranks lowest. Earlier in this chapter, regression analysis showed that mean scores for both Initiation and Risk, and for Trust, are predictive of the mean score for Collaboration at high levels of significance. So it follows that Valley, with the highest scores for the two predictors, would appear to be the most collaborative school. Conversely, the other two schools would fall somewhat lower on a scale of collaboration. The predictability of a school’s mean for Traditional Leadership of teachers, based on its mean for Collaboration, was also highly significant ($t = 5.41, p < .001$).

Valley teachers: working together to accomplish more.

Like its high mean score for Construct B. Initiating and Taking Risks, Valley’s high collaboration mean may result, at least in part, from their current RtI adoption, ExCEL. As evidenced in earlier interview excerpts, a great deal of discussion, negotiation, and cooperation has been required to overhaul the school’s reading program.
However, Carol pointed out that she and her second grade colleagues began the process of sharing ideas, students and resources a full year prior to the official district adoption of the program. She shared, “A lot of grade levels were reluctant to start something like that, but if they had-- the hardest part is getting it started. If they had, they would have known how much it pays off I think.”

Lieberman and Miller (2005) hold that in collaborative schools, teachers’ reflection and collaboration allow them to accomplish much more together than they might working individually. Carol concurred:

It's wonderful because we know every second grader in the school, you know. We know them really well. They're coming and going and-- and we know where their level is, you know, so we can really collaborate. We could come together at the end of the unit, sit down and talk about kids and-- and it wasn't just a name; it was a kid that all of us really knew, and, you know, sometimes we'd say, "Well, I notice he sits real quietly but I don't know if he's really reading," or "I don't know if he chooses material that's appropriate for him."

Heller and Firestone (1995) describe a model of teacher leadership in which teachers move forward to solve problems on their own, rather than wait for their principal to direct them. Thirty-eight year old Tom shared his colleagues’ reputation for collective initiative to improve their school, regardless of the presiding administrators:

There's sort of a joke at our site, and sometimes in the district, that it's like, “Take any administrator and we'll train them how to do their job.” And we pretty much keep the school going, you know. It's a strong staff. It's been together for a long time. That's
20-to 30-plus years for many teachers-- that’s part of the reason why we're talking.

They've been there a lot, not only in a strong professional way, but in a supportive way. It's a good group of people.

Which is not to say their administrator doesn’t play an important role. Tom and Alice both described their principal as solicitous to the needs of teachers and their classrooms, an administrative trait noted for promoting OL, and teacher leadership, in schools (Silins, Mulford, Zarins, & Bishop, 2000). Tom gave this example:

My administrator will come in to me and say, “What can I do to support you? What can I do to help your program, you know, to function more smoothly, be better?”

Tom’s response to the offer of help indicated how secure he feels in his colleagues’ abilities to support one another:

I’ll say, “You know, it's really important for you to be here to support me, but my peers are who I look for my improvement. So, if anything, we need to provide peer support, get someone else out of another third grade class, come into my class, watch what I'm doing, give me some input, and the other way around.” And that's not a disrespectful thing, you know. It's a thank you. “There's only so much I believe you can do for me as an administrator.” And that's just the nature of their position.

Alice pointed out the necessary role the principal plays on the site leadership council, along with representative teachers. This special group receives the majority of training to facilitate the new ExCEL RtI model, and makes critical decisions in which the majority of the teachers have no say. Rather than resent her lack of input, Alice found the expedience of the council appropriate: “You know, if you get people’s opinions it can take
weeks and months to make a decision. If you say, ‘This is the schedule,’ that’s it.” Like many of the 22 teachers on staff, Alice has served on decision-making committee. “Having been in a similar position where I’ve had to walk in and say, you know, ‘This has been decided for us,’ who would I be to argue? You know, that’s not right.” The literature cites cases in which shared leadership like this creates jealousy that interferes with the possibility of collaboration (Chrispeels, Brown, & Castillo, 2000). However, in schools that work, teacher-selected teams work with administrators to make decisions affecting the whole school (Blase & Blase, 2001; 2004; Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001). It may be that at Valley, teachers control of enough of their immediate environment, and feel adequate trust in each other, to let others make important decisions for them. As a learning community (Blase & Blase, 2004), its culture may be more focused on learning than staking out or defending territory.

“It's all part of it,” says Alice. “All part of RtI, and we have a site leadership team who's making all of the decisions. We have nothing to say about it as to the big picture. And that's okay.”

Seaview teachers: lack of trust interferes with collaboration.

While Valley teachers appeared to be moving forward on their own, while pulling their administrator along with them, Seaview teachers complained about the lack of teacher-initiated collaboration at their site. Instead, the majority of collaboration occurs during mandated sessions provided by their district. “Not that I don’t think that is valuable,” Allan said.

I don’t know if that’s valuable for you, but I just kind of noticed that the people
wandering and going next door to the other doors tend to be the people that were at the old site with them. So it’s like we’re still two schools—functioning in parallel. Reconsidering, he added, “Maybe a Venn diagram. There’s a little bit of interrelation. That’s not across the board.” Allan works at collaborating with as many colleagues as he can, since “everything is so new for all of us this year . . . but I don’t know if that’s been a ‘pop next door and talk after school.’”

Richard agreed: teachers do meet at assigned collaboration times, but he doesn’t see much that teachers instigate. A lack of trust between the two newly joined teaching staffs appears to curtail the school’s levels of collaboration.

Amy meets every Monday with one of her two grade level colleagues to share ideas about teaching and learning, and share plans. Her planning mate is one of the teachers that came from her prior site. Amy remembered how she overtly worked to overcome the low level of trust that existed, trying to include the third colleague:

And we were really aware. We talked a lot about that, and said, “Well, that's an uncomfortable situation: there's three. This other person is going to feel so out of it if we collaborate between the two of us; so maybe we won’t be able to do that, if we really hurt that person’s feelings.” So we spent a lot of time definitely opening the door-- and definitely still do nonstop-- including that person. So that there's always that open door and that person can make that choice to do that, but at the same time being really cautious to never make that person feel that their way of teaching something is-- is not the right way.

Amy is determined to do what she can to improve the level of discourse at her new school
site by establishing the trust necessary to share candidly:

I’m going to establish that relationship even if they don't have one with me and I think that's working a little bit. You know, and first it’s social things so we get comfortable, and then it’s more comfortable with sharing concept stuff. And that's-- that is increasing. So I’m trying to make connections. So if the person never comes out of their room and eats lunch in the room alone, I’m still going in there and make some kind of connection.

But she feels frustrated by the alienating atmosphere at Seaview. “I don’t know why the heck people should be so insecure,” she wondered aloud.

_Hillside: lack of shared goals, time, and administrative support._

Data from teachers interviewed at Hillside suggest the school’s lowest mean may result from a combination of barriers: a lack of shared goals, little time set aside for meeting, and an administrator’s leadership style that is incompatible to candid sharing between colleagues. Shared vision and goals are the first factor of leadership present in schools with organizational learning, and are essential to setting priorities under which a well-functioning school works (Silins, Mulford, Zarins, & Bishop, 2000). Diane pointed to Hillside’s historical reputation for working hard to develop shared goals:

One of the things I like so much about teaching at this school is we have always been really consistent about our high expectations. And I think our test scores really tell of our collaboration together and our hard work together and our high expectations. And if you look at the poverty rate, you know, the demographics at this school is really, really poor. And there’s not a lot of parental involvement, and we’ve always done
really, really well for our population. And I see it sliding right now, so I find it very frustrating.

Vicky also recalled the school’s historical success that came from working through problems and coming together as a learning organization:

We had kind of all come together, and it wasn’t an easy road. I mean, and there was a lot of ups and downs, because you had a group of teachers who said, “Look, we have to start doing this; it’s what’s best.” And you had people who were learning resistant. And finally, everybody pretty much was on board, and the school made great strides, and we really-- we were all talking the same language, and all trying to do the same thing. And that’s kind of fallen apart.

Vicky described half-day grade level articulation meetings as venues that were productive before, but haven’t been so much lately. During the February 19 interview, she realized she had only attended one of these so far this year, when in past years, by now three meetings might have taken place. “We started so late, we probably won’t get to it more than once this year,” she noted. In this case, Vicky blamed Hillside’s administrator for not supplying ample collaboration time within which to work, a common barrier to participation referenced in the literature (Cooper, 1988: Smylie & Denny, 1990). Additionally, it has been shown that in order to be effective leaders, teachers need more than sporadic opportunities, like this once a year event, to work together (Cooper, 1988). On the other hand, Vicky noted teachers haven’t complained much about the lack of meetings because
When you have meetings like that, if there are things that perhaps need to be worked
on or fixed, and you know that, then you have to work on those things and fix them.
And so if you don’t have those meetings, and that doesn’t come up, then you don’t
have to worry about it. So, I just think that some people possibly don’t want to go
there.

According to Vicky, Hillside’s teachers may balk at meeting, to avoid the conflicts
involved in solving problems. The lack of depth in the sharing at Hillside may best be
summed up by where and when it is occurring. “Some of the best collaboration we do at
this school,” Vicky commented, “we do in the halls, on the fly.”

Two-year teacher Pat reported relying on what little collaboration she is able to
accomplish to determine much of what she does with students in her classroom.

Since I’m new, I really go by what my other teachers are doing, and they are total
opposites, so I kind of get both, you know, from one who’s very old school, and
another one who’s very, you know, everything is new.

She said she gets a balanced approach by learning from the two of them. But Pat expressed
feeling isolated from the rest of the staff, another barrier to teacher leadership (Ash &
Persall, 2000). Even though the primary teachers eat lunch together, most of their
conversations are venting, “about how excited we were to have three days off. And how
much there is to do.” Other than lunches, the staff is divided into grade levels by wings,
and there are no overlap times that teachers share. “So the only time we really see each
other is maybe Thursday for 30, 40, minutes during a staff meeting, and that’s about it,”
she said.
Staff meetings tend to be informational only, and consist of the principal running down a list of items on a provided agenda. All three teachers concurred staff meetings are not venues for sharing with, or supporting one another. What may be more detrimental to the possibility of collaboration, according to Diane, is that their principal:

. . . does the motions of collaboration. Like last year, we had these collaborations of the grade above me and the grade below, and she gave us an agenda-- which we had to follow! And she was there! So you can’t really talk. You can’t talk with your administrator there! And the whole idea of—you don’t respect your teachers enough to just let them have the time to do what they need to do. You’ve got to monitor them. Like we would goof off.

Diane’s frustration reflects findings in the literature, in which teachers blame parent-child relationships with their administrators for a loss of interest in teacher leadership (Lieberman, 1988). So-called collaboration, like Diane’s example, in which teachers are monitored to follow a provided agenda, produces predictable outcomes and wastes valuable time (Hargreaves, 1997). Even worse, it has been shown to actually end teachers’ desires for improvement at their schools (Blasé & Blasé, 2004).
Subscale D6. I encourage parent participation here at school.

Table 8

Subscale D6 Mean Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale D6. I encourage parent participation here at school.</th>
<th>Hillside</th>
<th>Seaview</th>
<th>Valley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In an interconstruct correlation analysis the item for subscale D6 (“Took an action that increased parent participation here at school?”) appeared to measure information separate from the other subscales in Construct D, so it was removed and compared separately. However, collaboration with parents has been identified as a significant characteristic of teacher leadership in schools that work (York-Barr & Duke, 2004). A One-way ANOVA found the variance between the high and low means for this item highly significant, $F(2, 53) = 7.57, p = .001$. Interview data for the three schools supports these findings with themes that may explain the discrepant range, particularly between the highest scoring Seaview, and the lowest scoring Hillside.

*Seaview: teamwork, and inspiration to work harder.*

At Seaview, teachers referred to the important role parents can play to support their children’s success. Richard pointed out how parents can create the one-on-one situation so difficult to achieve in the classroom. Amy concurred, “I’ve definitely picked up the fact that the more you see them, the better they are as your teammates, and the more productive this whole school system can be.” Allan referred to “. . . community
Valley: Communication of expectations key to support.

Meanwhile, at Valley, teachers report a school wide effort to relate school values and expectations for home participation, to allow families to participate more fully. Carol stated,

I think we have in recent years done a little better job of communicating with parents what our accomplishments have been, and conveying to parents that our standards are high and our expectations are high. In recent years we have had much more cooperation in terms of homework—homework assignments and just communication with parents has been really good.

Tom suggested parents of all backgrounds can be expected to participate:

I think that's such a huge role in student achievement, is how much time families provide for their kids. And the parents don't have to be college educated, you know, graduate level parents. They just have to be able to give their kids the time and have some expectations of, you know, achievement.

Hillside: parent collaboration missing.

Despite her expressed need for parent support, Hillside’s Pat shared her only regular parent volunteer appears to be checking up on her, rather than helping much in the classroom. Referring to Hillside’s high poverty rate, Diane shared, “Really, because of our population, we don’t really have much involvement from our parents.” She feels her students are as successful as they can be, given the lack of parent involvement in many
children’s education:

The homework is coming back in. So I have to give everyone credit for that. That’s been a hard struggle this year as well. I still have about a quarter of my kids who don’t read to a parent at home, but they do it every day, so I give them credit. I mean, what are you going to do? I make sure someone else, another adult here, does that with them during the day.

Vicky sums up Hillside teachers’ perspective on encouraging parent involvement this way:

I’ve learned after 20-something years at this school, I don’t rely on a lot of parent support; that’s just not something I expect. I would love it, but I’ve just never had it, so I don’t know what it’s like. . . . Occasionally, when I have kids that their home life is so horrific, and I look and them and I think, with just a tiny bit of parenting, and a tiny bit of support at home this child could go even further, and really, be so much more successful in life. . . . I try to always be very welcoming when [parents] come in. But it’s not something they really want to do. They’ll come to conferences.
Construct E. Traditional Leadership

Table 9

Construct E Mean Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hillside</th>
<th></th>
<th>Seaview</th>
<th></th>
<th>Valley</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construct E. Traditional Leadership</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A One-way ANOVA revealed a statistically insignificant variance of the mean scores of the schools for this construct, $F(2, 53) = .79, p = .461$. Still, according to the range of the means, once again, Valley’s average for the construct ranks highest. This was predicted with high levels of significance by Valley’s strongest means for Initiating and Taking Risks, and for Collaboration. A school’s mean for Traditional Leadership of teachers predicts its mean for Collaboration to a highly significant level ($t = 5.36, p < .001$).

Valley: modeling, speaking out for improvement.

The interview data indicate a community of learners may be developing at Valley, as described in the literature: open sharing, planning, and communication occur between teachers (Crowther, Kaagan, Ferguson, & Hann, 2002; Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001). The interviewees at Valley School all saw themselves as holding important roles in their professional community. Alice called herself the “de facto math chair” at Valley, since the district-appointed math chair does little to affect mathematics at Valley School. She has served on multiple school and union committees over the years, has been a Beginning
Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) teacher, and mentors a student teacher in her classroom most years, including this one. She described herself as one of the most outstanding critics of NCLB at her school, saying, “It’s a political issue now. It is nothing. There is nothing real about it.”

Tom represented himself as “Someone who’s honest and, you know, I’ll really speak my mind. And I don’t hesitate writing letters to board members, writing letters to administration; encouraging other people to do the same.” With his expertise as an Open Court program trainer, Tom described his advocacy for more training for Valley teachers, to support the RtI implementation. His perception of his role on staff evidences a modeling of reflection and improvement.

I always have to say, “We’re [italics added] not trained adequately,” because, you know, I’m including myself in there. Every year as a trainer it’s learning even more how to do better, you know . . .

Like Tom, Carol also described her role as helping others translate the school’s goals for improvement into their classroom practices. Carol shared her membership on the school’s student study team, working to improve the success of students outside her own classroom. She is also a member of the site leadership team for integrating grade-level collaboration to teach reading using the new RtI model. About its benefits for all the school’s students, she said

When you put collaboration into it where you're always talking it over with your colleagues and saying, "You know, this kid made a jump and needs to be in a more independent level," then you're able to accelerate them and not doom them to stay
where they’re at.

_Hillside: more cautious leadership._

Hillside teachers also reported traditional leadership roles that included speaking out for the needs of all students, not just their own. The two-year novice teacher, Pat reported apprehension about her leadership as a result of her unique identity as a minority teacher:

“I have a lot of Hmong parents that will come to me because I’m Hmong, obviously, so I guess they feel like I could help them. And last year [at another school site], because the city, you know, schools and police, all know I speak English and Hmong, they asked me to do things that a teacher shouldn’t be doing.”

Vicky described her role mentoring new teacher prospects (“I always have a student teacher”), and as a member of a district-wide Language Arts curriculum committee. However, trust issues interfere with Vicky’s ability to lead at her own site. Even with her direct line to the center of curricular issues in her district, Vicky admitted she will not speak out for change at Hillside: “If somebody were going to push it, it would be me. And I’m not going to, because I’ve learned there would be no point.” Her unwillingness reflects literature findings that in order to participate in leadership, teachers must believe their input, opinions, and energy put forth in decision-making will make a difference (Mulford & Silins, 2003; Silins & Mulford, 2004; Smith, 1993).

Hillside’s foremost advocate for the DIBLES RtI approach, Diane also reported caution in the way she leads to affect change. She referred to her colleagues as,
. . . loving, and they really want every student to succeed, but if you are doing testing under that, you need something a little more clear. This year we are just going to try DIBLES with one or two students, and see if it is valid. And that is how I got them to agree to it. It’s just a baby step. But it’s a start at being more consistent.

Diane also serves as a member of Hillside’s student study team, from which she said, “I think I get some satisfaction out of listening and brainstorming.”

As a BTSA mentor, Diane reports some frustration sharing with the new-hires. About last year’s assignment, she shared, “You know, I tried really hard, and she was young, and she knew everything already. It’s hard to help someone who doesn’t need your help.” About this year’s work, Diane said, “I don’t want to overwhelm the new colleagues. And I know in this school, with this population, consistency is really important, so I want to bring people on board.”

According to Diane, the school’s social committee is one of the important school committees that she serves on. The group supplies birthday cards and treats, checks in on teachers with personal problems, and does essential “things to take care of each other.” In the same way that Pat’s report of convivial lunchtimes contrasted with the small amount of actual collaboration taking place, Diane’s emphasis on the social nurturing between cohorts contrasts with Hillside teachers’ reported difficulty leading each other towards a more effective professional community.

*Seaview: traditional leadership roles surviving.*

Despite issues affecting trust and collaboration at Seaview, the interviewed teachers all shared more traditional roles they play in the leadership of their school.
Richard described his involvement in the teacher union as important. He regularly attends board meetings to make sure the teachers’ voice is heard there. About the needs of all students, Richard believes there need to be more than just NCLB standards and expectations for children in schools; that is the perspective he represents at his school.

It's silly to think that every [italics added] kid is going to read at grade level, ever. I mean there are too many variables, and there are too many jobs to do in the world that require too wide a variety. I mean the twelve intelligences aren’t given to everybody in the same way, and so some kids are-- by third grade you can see that they have something other than being a bank executive in their future. And if you try to create a bank executive out of them you're going to ruin them. You're going to make their lives miserable and they're not going to be happy.

Amy reported she has always held a union office, also regularly attends board meetings, and serves on the school’s Parent Teacher Organization. She has leadership responsibility with the school’s annual thematic fair (leading teachers around the theme of her former site). She told of attending professional events and bringing ideas back to others: “I’m constantly going to conferences, you know, if I can do that. I plan with a colleague, so that I’m able to have some discussion about the things that I do.” But Amy’s ability to lead by sharing and helping others improve, is severely limited by issues of trust. In the first year of the merger, she has been disappointed by all the barriers to communication.

And somebody told me that most schools are more like this school site. . . . “You’re going to find people that are threatened by other people in most environments, or
who don’t want to see somebody shine because they’re threatened by the fact that that person’s shining,” you know. And it’s like, no one is going to open up everything they have in their classroom for somebody else to take, and use, and borrow, and learn [italics added] from.

Teachers’ norms for collegiality and interaction among themselves have been shown to have potential barrier effects on teacher leadership (Lieberman, 1988; Smylie, 1992; Zinn, 1997) The possibility that this anti-collegial climate may be a lasting norm for her, is something Amy appears unwilling to accept.

Allan’s leadership outside of his own classroom teaching, despite the many problems with trust and communication at his new site, appears to derive from a personal drive to advocate for students, a leadership quality recognized in the literature (Crowther, F., Kaagan, S.S., Ferguson, M, Hann, L., 2002; Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001). His leadership positions extend the successes of his relationships with students, to all students in the school. For example, although at this new site he was overlooked for the stipended position of “teacher in charge” that he held at his former school, teachers continue to send disruptive students to Allan, where they sit in the back of his room rather than in the principal’s office. Allan has a knack for building relationships with troubled children, so You try to do what you’re good at. Dealing with those kids—that’s a strength of mine. I learned from Sharon [the principal at the discontinued site], you want to know all those kids, and so you try to find some level to meet them on when they’re not in trouble. You know, I just get in the habit of—I make that habit of connecting with kids that I know eventually I’m going to deal with in a different context. It’s
very cool. So there is some level you can find each other at when there’s a crisis.
And I can’t let that go just because I’m not getting paid for it. It’s hard for me to do,
you know. But I can’t leave them in the lurch whether there’s money involved or
not. I never did it for the stipend. We don’t do this job for the money.

Allan has chosen to extend his duties to include coaching, as well. Perceiving a
need for a basketball team at his K-5 school, when otherwise the first district-wide team
sport would exist only at the middle school, Allan started a 5th grade team. With other
teachers from area schools, he set up a fifth grade game schedule. He was thinking as
much of declining enrollment as families took their children to other area schools, as he
was of his players. “Maybe this will get our name out there a little bit more and help our
district a little bit.”

Another unpaid position Allan is unwilling to give up is his leadership with the
district’s Salmon in the Classroom project. Each year he coordinates with teachers and
multiple agencies to provide every elementary classroom with aquariums, curriculum,
and visiting instructors allowing students to rear salmon and steelhead from eggs, for
release back into area rivers and streams. About his commitment, Allan reported
benefiting personally, if not financially:

It’s fantastic, and it’s a lot of work; those things suck you in. There’s no way I’m
going to let it go. It’s awesome. The day we all go to the river, and each kid has a
little cup with a fry in it, and lets it go? Come on. That gets you going for another
year.
Subscale E3. I speak out about the needs of all students to make sure they are addressed.

Table 10

Subscale E3 Mean Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale E3. I speak out about the needs of all students to make sure they are addressed.</th>
<th>Hillside</th>
<th>Seaview</th>
<th>Valley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson correlation analysis suggested the item for subscale E3 (“Spoke out on behalf of students whose needs weren’t being met?”) measures information separate from the other subscales in Construct E, so it was removed and compared separately.

Advocating for the needs of students has been determined to be an important characteristic of classroom-based teacher leaders that enables schools to succeed (Crowther, Kaagen, Ferguson, & Hahn, 2002; Silva, Gimbert, & Nolan, 2000). A One-way ANOVA found the variance between Seaview’s high mean and Hillside’s low mean to be highly significant, $F(2, 53) = 3.88, p = .027$. While few specific interview data support this discrepant finding, themes that emerged from data for the other constructs may offer partial explanations.

Hillside: lack of trust and collaboration inhibit speaking out.

Themes that emerged for the other constructs suggest Hillside’s low levels of trust and collaboration may make speaking out against the status quo difficult, if not impossible. For example, Diane, who sees herself as an advocate for students by working to level their language arts assessments school-wide, admits she had to work hard to get
buy-in from her staff to just try DIBLES with one or two students per classroom this RtI implementation year. Likewise, Vicky recognized she is probably the most capable and appropriate advocate to speak for maintaining high academic expectations for all students at her school, regardless of their background. Still, she admitted to backing down from that confrontation with her staff, feeling it would be at least upsetting, if not fruitless.

*Valley’s high trust and collaboration energize speaking out for all.*

Data from Valley teachers in other areas suggest their high degree of trust and collaboration support speaking out. Tom described confronting his principal directly to find time and resources to allow teachers to meet students’ needs. Carol pointed to her staff’s shared knowledge of children and their particular needs, as allowing all to work as one to reach their students. Alice called herself “the queen of being willing to say what I think,” in describing her readiness to speak out in front of her staff and principal.

*Seaview teachers remain focused on student needs overall.*

Seaview’s teachers may feel so strongly about their professional obligations to students’ needs, they are willing to find ways to speak out, even in this year’s low-trust, low-collaboration environment. For example, Amy determinedly strives to find ways to break through barriers to collaboration, unwilling to allow the new norm to keep her from helping students succeed: “I make a point of trying to talk about [materials I can share], and then also collaborate with them . . . because it’s got to be both ways.” Allan’s determination to create or sustain programs that meet students’ needs, whether or not he is recognized or compensated for his time, seems separate from his working environment’s lack of trust or cross-group collaboration. His work as basketball coach for
a new team, coordinator of “Salmon in the Classroom,” and unofficial “teacher in charge” status all indicate his willingness to speak out for students, in whatever form that takes.

Summary

Statistical results.

Pearson correlations determined the strength of relationships between subscales within the constructs. In four cases, due to weak interconstruct correlation, subscales were removed from their constructs to examine independently or with another construct. In a fifth case, a subscale was moved into another construct where it appeared to measure similar data.

The statistical data indicate various degrees of classroom-based teacher leadership evident in the individual teachers and their schools. One-way ANOVA results reveal highly significant variances between the schools’ means for constructs B. Initiating and Taking Risks, and C. Trust. The variance is found to be moderately significant for D. Collaboration. Highly significant variances were also revealed between the means for subscales A1, A2: Locus of Control for Student Achievement, D6. I encourage parent participation here at school, and E3. I speak out about the needs of all students to make sure they are addressed. A summary of the mean ratings and ANOVA results for each of the constructs and subscales may be found in Appendix G.

Regression analysis determined predictability with high levels of significance for the following: Traditional Leadership is predicted by Collaboration, and by Initiating and Taking Risks. Collaboration is predicted by Trust, Initiating and Taking Risks, Focus on
Student Achievement and Relationships, and Traditional Leadership. Initiating and Taking Risks is predicted by Focus on Student Achievement and Relationships.

Quantitative and qualitative results by construct.

The interview data are characterized in relation to the subscales and constructs, the survey data, and their own thematic content. Generally, they support the statistical data by illuminating themes that may help explain the means, and point to areas that need further examination.

Construct A. Focus on Student Achievement and Relationships.

The highest mean scores for all three schools appeared in Construct A. Focus on Student Achievement and Relationships. The interview data support these findings with examples of ways teachers focus on student achievement, make changes to be more effective, and derive satisfaction from teacher-student relationships. High scores for this construct are significant since it was found to be a predictor of Initiating and Taking Risks, and Collaboration.

Subscales A1, A2: Locus of Control for Student Achievement.

Subscales A1 and A2 were removed from Construct A and grouped as A1, A2: Locus of Control for Student Achievement, when Pearson correlation analysis indicated they measured unique data. A highly significant variance was determined between the means for higher scoring Hillside and Seaview schools, versus lower scoring Valley. While the interview data did not support dramatic differences between the schools, themes of limits to teacher control of student achievement emerged, including the two-way nature of relationships, lack of time to work with individuals as needed, and home
factors that interfere with teacher potential to affect student achievement. Data from a Hillside interview stood alone as dramatic evidence of teacher ownership of locus of control for student achievement.

*Construct B. Initiating and Taking Risks.*

A highly significant variance was found in the mean scores for Construct B. Initiating and Taking Risks. It suggests an important difference in the degree of classroom-based teacher leadership at highest scoring Valley School, and lowest scoring Hillside School. This is a particularly notable finding since Initiating and Taking Risks has been found to be a highly predictive of both Collaboration and Traditional Leadership, characteristics of classroom-based teacher leaders. At Valley, interview data suggest teacher buy-in to their school-wide RtI implementation may encourage teachers to try new things, both individually and together. Meanwhile, teachers at Hillside report less certainty of school-wide priorities, due to poor communication, and so may initiate less, and keep to themselves, as a result. Seaview teachers’ data evidenced a mix of both initiating and teaching within one’s comfort zone.

*Construct C. Trust.*

Another highly significant variance of the mean scores was determined for Construct C. Trust. Again, this is particularly important since Trust has been found to be a highly significant predictor of Collaboration. Themes from the interview data suggest Valley’s highest score derives from good communication that is enhanced by teachers’ perceptions of mutual respect, support, and safety to disagree. At the middle scoring school, Hillside, communication appears marred by rifts between camps of teachers, and
a perceived lack of safety to disagree with each other and their administrator. Seaview’s significantly low score may be affected by its recent consolidation from two sites onto one, resulting in two separate groups of teachers on one school site, as yet divided and distrustful of each other.

Construct D. Collaboration.

The variance between mean scores for Construct D. Collaboration was found to be at a moderate level of significance. Valley scored highest, followed by Seaview, and finally Hillside. Collaboration was found to be highly significant predictor of Traditional Leadership. Interview data suggest Valley’s highest score may again result from teachers’ commitment to their school-wide RtI implementation. However, teachers spoke of historically high levels of trusting relationships at Valley, where working together, with and without the support of their administrators, has been a norm. Moreover, their current administrator is seen as generally solicitous and helpful, traits that may support their collaborative success. Seaview teachers reported a lack of trust that inhibits their ability to work together beyond their original school site relationships. Data from the lowest scoring school, Hillside, suggest a lack of communicated and shared goals, missing administrative support in terms of time, and meeting requirements that may actually prevent teachers from addressing issues that might help them succeed.

Subscale D6. I encourage parent participation here at school.

Pearson correlation analysis found the item for subscale D6 (“Took an action that increased parent participation here at school?”) measured data that is unique, so it was removed from Construct D and compared separately. A highly significant variance was
determined between high scoring Seaview and low scoring Hillside. At highest scoring Seaview, interview data highlighted teamwork between parents and teachers that may inspire teachers to work harder. Valley teachers expressed their culture of communicating the school’s expectations for parent support. Lowest scoring Hillside’s teachers pointed to missing parent collaboration as a constant, due to the nature of their site’s high poverty population.

Construct E. Traditional Leadership.

The variance of mean scores for Construct E. Traditional Leadership was not found to be significant, although Valley ranked highest, as it did for all the major constructs. Interview data suggest Valley teachers take on traditional leadership roles in their highly collaborative community, modeling reflection and speaking out for school improvement. Second ranked Hillside appears more cautious in their traditional leadership, due to an environment where it may not be safe to speak out and lead, despite intentions to support one another socially. Traditional leadership at third-ranked Seaview may be surviving, despite apparent barriers to communication and trust. Interview data revealed teachers at Seaview are determined to extend their successful relationships with students and find ways to work together for the benefit of their school and professional community.
Subscale E3. *I speak out about the needs of all students to make sure they are addressed.*

Lastly, Pearson correlation analysis suggested the item for subscale E3 (“Spoke out on behalf of students whose needs weren’t being met?”) measured information separate from the other subscales in Construct E, so it was removed and compared separately. The variance between Seaview’s high mean and Hillside’s low mean were found to be highly significant. Few specific interview data support this discrepant finding, but themes suggest lowest scoring Hillside’s lack of trust and collaboration make speaking out against the status quo difficult. Valley’s high levels of trust and collaboration appear to energize teachers to speak out for students. Highest scoring Seaview’s teachers appear focused on meeting students’ needs, despite low levels of trust and collaboration overall.

This chapter examined the results of an analysis of the quantitative and qualitative data gathered in a mixed-method study measuring teacher leadership. The study was designed to fill a gap in the literature by operationalizing classroom-based teacher leadership, and determining its degree of evidence in individual teachers and their schools. In the next chapter I will provide an analysis of the results.
CHAPTER FIVE

ANALYSIS

Introduction

Chapter Four presented the results of this mixed-method study Measuring Teacher Leadership. While schools are held increasingly accountable for student achievement, teachers may be the most promising resource for leadership in schools that work. This study was designed to fill a gap in the existing literature on teacher leadership, by operationalizing classroom-based teacher leadership, and testing for the degree of teacher leadership evident in individual teachers and their schools. Chapter Five presents an analysis of the results of the study.

The chapter begins by evaluating the effectiveness of the operational definition. Next, conclusions are drawn about the instruments used to generate the data, specifically regarding the ways they triangulated data to support the findings. Significant findings about teacher leadership are discussed, that may be generalizable beyond the specific teachers and schools in the study. Predictability of the constructs, and examples of schools’ pathways to subsequent construct scores, are explained in light of themes that emerged from the interview data. Information that emerged about specific supports and barriers to teacher leadership at the three schools is analyzed, and connections to the existing literature are examined. Finally, generalizations and
recommendations are made for schools looking to support teacher leadership, and to remove barriers that inhibit it.

*The Five Constructs of Classroom-based Teacher Leadership*

An important finding is that the subscales and constructs actually measured what they were intended to measure. The results of the Pearson correlations confirm that, with the revised format in which five subscales were removed and evaluated separately, the subscales of The Five Constructs of Classroom-based Teacher Leadership measure data that are related within each construct. Together, they contribute to the overall figure of classroom-based teacher leadership. By revising the constructs as a result of the Pearson correlations, individual teachers’ and their schools’ classroom-based teacher leadership were measured in this study, and can be measured and compared by future researchers utilizing the operational definition.

*The Instruments: the Teacher Survey and the Interview Schedule*

Another important conclusion is that both instruments, the teacher survey and the interview schedule, provided data resulting in findings that were related to one-another. The teacher survey worked well to obtain data that could be easily analyzed using statistical methods, while the interview schedule provided data that were easily disaggregated into the subscales of the constructs for further examination, and for identification of its own thematic content. The qualitative data also generally supported the quantitative data by providing information that helped explain it. Using these instruments, future research could be conducted measuring classroom-based teacher leadership in other teachers and schools.
**Measured Classroom-Based Teacher Leadership**

Observing the results for the three schools in the study, one may conclude that there are differing degrees of teacher leadership evident for teachers and staffs at each site. Additionally, One-way ANOVA results indicate that some of the variation between means was highly statistically significant. In this way, overall conclusions about teacher leadership at each site can be drawn by comparing the mean scores for each construct, or by examining the overall mean for all five constructs at each site.

While the rankings may be informative in themselves, it is important to go beyond merely determining which schools were “winners” and “losers,” and instead examine each school individually for themes that emerged to amplify and contextualize the statistical data. The data from the interviews are essential in discerning the results. As a researcher of teacher leadership, I am most interested in the variables in schools that support or impede classroom-based teacher leadership, and these are discovered through the interview data.

*Predictability of the Constructs: All Roads Lead to Collaboration*

An important conclusion is that the constructs that make up classroom-based teacher leadership are highly correlated, as determined through regression analysis and an analysis of the interview data. Simply put, a high degree of teacher leadership in one of the constructs predicts a high degree in others. Stated differently, degrees of teacher leadership in the constructs tend to vary together. With this knowledge, it would be surprising to discover that a school with a low degree of Trust, nonetheless showed high degrees of Collaboration. While Trust predicting Collaboration may confirm common
sense thinking, other predictors for Collaboration might be less intuitive. For example, the study found that a high degree of Focus on Student Achievement and Relationships also predicts a high degree of Collaboration, as do high degrees of Initiating and Taking Risks, and Traditional Leadership. In fact, while there are many predictors for the constructs, Collaboration is the most highly correlated with the other constructs. In the same way that once, all roads led to Rome, this study found that, more than any other construct, all classroom-based teacher leadership leads to Collaboration. (It should be no great surprise that Collaboration predicts Traditional Leadership as well, since communication and the ability to work well with others has always been recognized as central to more traditional leadership in organizations.) Besides being the most visible characteristic of teacher leadership in a school, Collaboration is also a core trait of schools that work (Lieberman & Miller, 2005; Silva Gimbert, & Nolan, 2000; Spillane, 2005).

Examples of Construct Predictability From the Study

The interview data make sense of this, showing how each construct was affected by major themes at each school that ultimately encouraged or discouraged teacher collaboration at that site. As a case in point, Hillside’s lowest ranking for Collaboration is predicted throughout the constructs, in both the quantitative and qualitative data. Its lower score for Focus on Student Achievement and Relationships was illuminated by teachers’ frustrated remarks indicating confusion over school-wide goals, which impeded their work with students in their classrooms. This confusion, one would suspect, would result from, or otherwise impact Hillside teachers’ efficacy in collaborating. Next, Hillside’s
highly statistically significant low mean for Initiating and Taking Risks was illustrated by a missing school-wide conversation about its RtI implementation—resulting in teachers feeling isolated with their own problems. Isolation, of course, is an effect of, or a source of, absent collaboration. Within the construct of Trust, Hillside teachers described rifts between groups resulting in perceived lack of safety to speak out about real issues among themselves, or in the company of their administrator. From the data in these three formative constructs, one would logically predict Hillside’s lowest score for collaboration itself. In fact, Hillside’s low Collaboration score is additionally highlighted by interview data revealing teacher dismay over administrator-enforced collaboration, where there otherwise might be none, complete with an agenda by which the teachers must abide. Finally, Hillside’s Traditional Leadership data shows teachers’ unwillingness to stand up for their beliefs in the school’s divided professional community, further exacerbating the possibility of collaboration.

On the other hand, Valley school’s highest mean for Collaboration is predicted throughout the data for the other constructs, through themes that tell its unique story. High scores for all of the constructs are supported by interview data that reveal a dynamic, motivated teaching staff that shares school-wide goals for improvement. Currently in the form of an RtI implementation, their vision demands conversation, negotiation, and change by all parties. Underlying their ability to collaborate fully is a school culture that values communication above all, based on mutual respect, support, and safety to disagree, even with their administrator.
While the specific circumstances underlying each school’s high and low means appear to be unique, nonetheless, themes emerging from the interview data describe supports and barriers to teacher leadership that appear to be generalizable to teachers and schools everywhere.

*Climate of Communication: Fundamental*

A fundamental support to teacher leadership emerged from the interview data about Valley School. It describes a climate of candid, mutual communication between teachers, administrators, and parents. Foundational to collaboration, forthright communication was cited across all the constructs as essential to teachers’ ability to do the work, and aspire to the traits, of teacher leadership. At Valley School, open communication among teachers and principal, including sharing, disagreeing, negotiating, and planning, underpin all the teachers’ reported successes, and all Valley’s highest mean scores for the five constructs. Ultimately, their open culture allows teachers to share in important decisions and set goals, and implement the new RtI plan for improvement as their own.

*A Climate of Silence: Greatest Detriment*

Conversely, the greatest detriment to teacher leadership that emerged from the interview data was the lack of free and open communication, cited by teachers at both Hillside and Seaview Schools, each with different explanations.

At Hillside, the breakdown of communication stems partly from a perception of separate camps of educational philosophy, in which a silent battle of wills simmers over appropriate teacher expectations for academic achievement. Part of the struggle may be
to gain the influence of the principal, whose style is transactional at best, and who prefers to keep disagreement, if not discussion, off the table. With staff meetings reserved for to-do lists, and collaboration times doled out in once-a-year, monitored servings, teachers feel isolated and fearful about speaking out. The data indicate that, while many subscales of teacher leadership are in place, without the fresh air of open communication, even the strongest teacher leaders are wilting at Hillside.

Newly-merged Seaview’s barriers to communication derive from an unresolved elephant in the room: the mutual distrust that results when two unique neighborhood schools are forced to share a site that previously held one. In this new incarnation, many teachers suspiciously hold tight to what they already know, rather than look for ways to share and learn. Teachers perceive themselves as members of the two former sites working in parallel, rather than a united entity working as one. While the data suggest some are reaching across the divide, Seaview’s administrator has not openly addressed the issue; and may even exacerbate it by implying the problem belongs to the newly arrived teachers, rather than the whole staff. As a consequence, teachers do not share candidly at staff meetings or in other combined groupings. In Seaview’s distrustful climate, the lack of two-way communication interferes with potential for teacher leadership.

**Implications and Literature-Based Connections**

Recent literature on teacher leadership and schools that work reinforces this study’s finding that the presence of open and mutual communication is critical to teacher leadership. While four factors of organizational learning (OL) (Silins, Mulford, Zarins, &
Bishop, 2000) have been determined to exist in schools where teacher leadership flourishes (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001; Silins & Mulford, 2004), all four depend on a climate of free communication.

In fact, the first factor of OL is itself a norm of collaboration, including sharing, planning, and communicating among teachers (Silins, Mulford, Zarins, & Bishop, 2000). Teachers in OL schools are involved in establishing the school’s vision and setting goals, making decisions about the most important issues and policies, and honest exchange between themselves and their administrators (Silins et al., 2000). It is encouraging to see reflections of the first factor of OL emerge from the data in this study, most easily identified in the communication at Valley School, where teachers and administrators are working together to implement their school-wide goals.

The second factor of OL also relies on an open climate: it is an environment in which leadership encourages initiating and taking risks, and where leaders themselves are open to change (Silins, et al., 2000). Again, this factor is reflected in the work teachers describe at Valley, where implementation of the new language arts program requires teachers to communicate among themselves and try new things, some of which require letting go of the status quo. As Alice reported, “Somebody said, ‘This is going to be a lot more work [than teaching reading in our own classes],’ and I said, ‘No. It’s going to be different.’” On the other hand, in schools where open communication is suppressed, teachers may be unwilling to risk or initiate conversation, let alone take on significant change.
The third factor of OL is a focus on improving, a professional intention that teachers maintain by monitoring their own effectiveness, attending professional events, and paying attention to issues that might affect their school—and sharing back to their colleagues (Silins, et al., 2000). The interview data suggest that teachers at all three sites value this focus, including Amy who is “constantly going to conferences,” but for most, the missing piece is sharing back. Sharing with colleagues involves a commitment of time and organization, but most importantly, it requires a climate of two-way communication.

Finally, the fourth factor of OL in schools is an emphasis on professional development: teachers stay current with professional literature, look to successful schools for new ideas, bring in experts to lead, and work in teams to enhance their ability to improve (Silins, et al., 2000). Most of the teachers in this study described work environments with insufficient time for daily preparation, let alone time prioritized by their administrators for professional growth activities. Even at Valley, where Tom is in place as an expert trainer of the specific curriculum used in their school-wide RtI implementation, his sharing with his colleagues is minimal. Let’s say, two to three hours of training on an afternoon after people are done with school. . . . And I know that costs money, but if we are looking to improve our test scores and student achievement, the only way we’re going to be more efficient is training our teachers, and that’s the missing piece.

On the other hand, what is in place at Valley, but not at the other two sites, is a climate of mutual trust and cooperation that allows open communication between parties.
Professional development requires collaboration, described in the subscales of Construct D. as candidly sharing with others, gaining from the insights of others, supporting the successes of others, recognizing the contributions of others, and creating solutions with others. Collaboration is not about self; it is about interaction with others. It demands listening, in a culture of trust and communication.

Conclusion

Through a measurement of the five constructs of classroom-based teacher leadership in three schools, and a subsequent analysis of the data, this study determined specific supports and barriers to teacher leadership. An important finding is that the constructs of teacher leadership are highly correlated—that is, a high degree of teacher leadership in one construct predicts a high degree of teacher leadership in others. Collaboration was the most predicted construct of the five, suggesting that teachers’ high degree of leadership in any of the constructs supports their ability to collaborate with others. Since Collaboration may be the most visible construct of teacher leadership in schools, its evidence may be a reliable indicator of a school’s overall teacher leadership.

Predictability of the constructs is hopeful for teachers and schools, because it implies that any start is a good start. When an individual, group, or team of teachers and administrators, undertakes to learn about conducting formal or informal research on students, in order to find ways to improve classroom teaching (Subscale B3), that is where the focus may begin. But advancement made within the construct of Initiating and Taking Risks may predict advancement in other constructs—in this case, in Collaboration, and in Traditional Leadership. Predictability of the constructs implies that
engaging in learning within any construct of teacher leadership, teachers may benefit their development in the others, growing as teacher leaders.

Ultimately, however, this study concludes that the key to developing teacher leadership, and therefore, schools that work, resides in the overall school climate. In schools that work, the four factors of OL assume the same premise that this study found essential to all five constructs of classroom-based teacher leadership: first, there must be honest, two-way communication. Then, teacher leadership may flourish.
CHAPTER 6
CONCLUSIONS

Overview of the Study

With schools under increasing public scrutiny and political pressure to show evidence of improved student achievement, leadership must emerge to sustain healthy school environments for teachers and students. The drive for public school reforms should not overlook the leadership potential of classroom teachers, perhaps best positioned to make meaningful changes. A school’s overall teacher leadership has been seen as a function of factors including teachers’ personal and career goals, as well as a school’s organizational and climate conditions that may impose barriers or provide supports for classroom-based teacher leadership. Missing from the literature has been a measurement of the degree of teacher leadership evident in individual teachers and their schools.

This study sought to measure the degree of classroom-based teacher leadership evident in teachers at three elementary schools in Northern California. Through a synthesis of the literature, 25 subscales of classroom-based teacher leadership were developed and organized into five constructs. A teacher survey was created to collect quantitative data, and an open-ended interview schedule generated qualitative data. In this study, 56 teachers at the three schools completed the surveys, and nine granted interviews, three at each school site.
For each construct, statistical results were interpreted in light of the interview data, from which themes emerged for each school, suggesting various supports and barriers to teacher leadership. An important finding was predictability of the constructs, whereby a high degree of teacher leadership in one construct predicts a high degree in another. The most highly correlated construct of the five was Collaboration. As the most visible construct of teacher leadership in schools, evidence of robust collaboration may be the most reliable indicator of a school’s overall teacher leadership.

The study’s most significant finding is the fundamental requirement of candid, two-way communication for teacher leadership to flourish. More than merely supportive, an open and healthy school climate is critical to the survival of teacher leadership. It is what allows teachers to live effective, professional lives, and creates the potential for schools to enable superior student outcomes.

**Implications for Change**

What changes must take place in schools right now, today, to cultivate cultures of learning in which teachers can lead?

First, administrators must heed the call for inclusion. When teachers receive directives from above, with little opportunity to meaningfully participate in creating goals, or even strategies to achieve them, they feel alienated and disenfranchised in their own workplace. Their impetus to lead is squelched.

This is particularly harmful when teachers with hundreds of years of combined experience working with students and families find themselves disregarded by newly arrived administrators with far less classroom experience than most teachers. At the very
least, school leaders must invite input from their staffs. Ideally, they should recognize and develop the leadership capacity in their schools, by building common vision and shared goals. Under leadership that welcomes teachers’ experience and wisdom, teacher leaders feel encouraged to lead.

Why not start building a shared vision the first day back together, at the preschool inservice? In this time of high stakes testing, many administrators begin the school year with directives and tasks focused on the minutia of test scores and percentile-raising strategies—less than motivating for classroom teachers with long lists to cross off before their students arrive. Pushed to the back of their minds are the impending curricular, bureaucratic, and societal problems they wrestled with last year, which they know they won’t be granted time, let alone permission, to solve.

A transformational leader might begin the year differently. After allowing mixed teams of teachers to develop lists of concerns, the principal stands in front of the staff with a felt pen and blank chart pad, and fields their input. Based on the teachers’ experiences last year, what are their concerns for this year? What goals and themes might the staff work on, together? How can individuals, with their many unique abilities and talents, work together towards this new, shared vision? Much sloppier than a prepared PowerPoint presentation of mandates, a staff meeting like this one is likely to be filled with discussion, disagreement, and negotiation. Most importantly, teachers will have the opportunity to be heard. The facilitator encourages listening and compromising, with the rule that none are left out, and all are brought in. Significantly, the transformational administrator asks, “How might I support you in this endeavor?” One likely response will
be, “Give us more time.” An important priority of this administrator will be to find ways for teachers to collaborate.

Beyond inclusion, there must be support for risk taking. Everyone on staff, including the administrators, must be encouraged to try new things and share their successes and setbacks. Professional development-- from book and research groups, to hosted experts, to sponsored teams observing successful programs in other schools-- must be sustained. Time and money must be set aside for professional enrichment that can benefit individuals and enhance the effectiveness of the whole school.

Meanwhile, regular time to reflect is essential. Staff meetings must consist of more than just to-do lists: sufficient time must be devoted to sharing. What are we learning? What is being attempted, and with what success? How are we progressing towards our goals? What problems and solutions do teachers have to share? Who needs support? Who is best able to be supportive? Again, the administrator, as a servant to the success of classroom teachers, must ask, “How might I help?”

Recommendations for Further Research

In Chapter Three, limitations to this study were described including the small size of the sample in this study: 56 teachers in three schools. Ideally, further research would expand the number of teachers and schools studied to generate findings that might be more generalizable. Also, other school models besides the K-5 elementary one of this study should be examined to see how classroom-based teacher leadership is supported or limited in those contexts.
With an operational definition for classroom-based teacher leadership in place, and instruments ready for measuring teacher leadership in teachers and schools, a logical next step might be to study the effects of an administrators’ style on a school’s overall measurement of teacher leadership. The findings of this study imply that a transformational style, as described in the discussion above, would support teacher leadership by cultivating a climate of inclusion and two-way communication, determined to be crucial in this study.

Survey instruments and interview schedules exist that measure leadership style, specifically, the degree to which a school administrator’s style is transformational rather than transactional (Chirichello, 1997; Mulford, W. Silins, H., & Leithwood, K., 2004). While the literature contains studies that examine the effects of an administrator’s leadership style on a school’s overall climate (Chirichello, 1997; Mulford & Silins, 2003; Silins & Mulford, 2004), so far, no study directly links the leadership style of the administrator to the degree of teacher leadership evident at a school. It is my hope that, in filling a gap in the literature by providing an operational definition, instruments, and a measurement of classroom-based teacher leadership, further steps in the research of teacher leadership may be undertaken.
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APPENDIX A

Teacher Survey

Thank you for participating in this confidential survey about your work as a teacher at this school over the past year. The survey is divided into five parts: 1) your work with others, 2) decisions you make about your teaching, 3) your work outside your classroom duties, 4) the trust you feel among other teachers here, and 5) your thoughts about your students’ achievement and the satisfaction you derive from your work in the classroom.

There are no “right” or “wrong” answers to any of the questions—only answers that reflect your own thoughts and ideas about your work. Please think carefully about each question and answer each one truthfully. Remember that the questions are about your work at this school over the past year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This section is about your work with others at your school. This year, how often would you say you:</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Voiced your personal thoughts about teaching or learning with other teachers?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Assisted another teacher who specifically asked for or needed support?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Worked with other teachers to solve a school problem not about your class?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Took an action that increased parent participation here at school?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Complemented or thanked another teacher for work done to improve the school?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Asked another teacher for advice or help with a teaching problem you had?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This section is about the decisions you made about teaching this year. This year, how often would you say you:</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 Sought advice from another teacher, an article, or a book about a better way to teach something?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Tried a strategy in your classroom that you had never tried before?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Kept note of student behaviors and, as a result, changed your teaching strategy?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Independently solved a problem that may actually have been an administrator’s job to fix?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These next two sections are about work you did this year to improve your school, beyond teaching in your own classroom. This year, how often would you say you:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Took time out to help a teacher deal with changes at school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Met with a teacher to improve their practices to meet school goals?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Spoke out on behalf of students whose needs weren’t being met?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thinking about work you did this year to improve your school, how would you rate the following statements about you?

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>You modeled reflection leading to improvement of practices in your classroom, which may have impacted other teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>You took an action whose goal was increasing the success of all the students in this school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>You played an important role in building the professional community here at school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This next part is about the level of trust you feel among your colleagues here at school this year. How would you rate the following statements about you at school this year?

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Teachers at this school were respectful of your opinions and beliefs, whether they agreed with you or not.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>It was safe for you to openly disagree with others during school meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>You felt supported in your work by other teachers here at school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>You welcomed views of other teachers that were different from your own here at school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This section is about influences that had an impact on your students’ achievement this year. How would you rate the following statements about your part in their achievement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 The most important factor in your students’ achievement is your relationship with them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 You are responsible for the success and failures of the students in your classroom.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 You spend time thinking about what works and what doesn’t work in your classroom, and make changes to improve your teaching.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 You make certain you translate the school’s goal’s for improvement into your own classroom practices.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 You derive satisfaction from your work in the classroom and your relationships with your students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, please fill out this chart about yourself.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The number of years you have been a full-time teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of years you taught part time or subbed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The grade level(s) you were assigned this year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please circle one</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your age on December 31, 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, thank you very much for your participation.
APPENDIX B

Interview Schedule

Thank you for agreeing to this interview. I’m going to ask you about thoughts, ideas, and feelings about the work you and others at this school do as teachers. The interview will be broken up into four sections. First I’m going to ask you to share your thoughts about your work with students in your own classroom. Later I’ll ask you about issues of trust between colleagues, work you do with others, and finally about teacher leadership here at school.

1. To begin with, I’d like you to tell me about satisfactions and frustrations in the work you do with students in your classroom. What are some of your satisfactions from teaching the children in your classroom? What are some of your frustrations?

2. Can you tell me what goes through your mind when you are making decisions about what to teach your students or how you will teach them?

3. As a teacher, how are you affected by the school’s goals for improvement in student achievement?

4. How do you explain differences in achievement between students in your classroom?

5. Thinking over the current school year, can you describe some things you tried as a teacher in your classroom, either in terms of teaching content or setting up your classroom routines and systems, which you had never tried before?

Now I’m going to ask you about trust between yourself and other classroom teachers here at school. Please remember your responses are completely confidential, and will not be shared with anyone here at school.

6. In meetings or other settings here at school, how do you feel when you hear other teachers sharing ideas and opinions that are different from your own?

7. At staff meetings and other kinds of school meetings, how safe do you feel openly disagreeing with others on the school staff?

This next part is about the ways teachers work together and collaborate here at school.
8. What kinds of things you do meet and share about with other teachers here at school?

9. Please think back over the past several weeks here at school. Can you describe any specific actions other teachers here at school have taken to support your work?

10. In the past several weeks, can you describe any specific actions you have taken to support the work of other teachers with their work?

11. What are your thoughts about the role parents play in their child’s education here at school?

Finally, I’m going to ask about your thoughts on teachers in traditional leadership roles.

12. Thinking about your work this year as a member of the staff, in addition to teaching students in your classroom, what are some of the other hats you wear? What other work do you do here at school?

13. Are you a member of any professional organizations? If yes, this year are you involved in any work with those organizations here or off-campus? If so, please describe the work you are doing.

My last questions are:
   14. What will be your age on December 31, 2006?
   15. How many years have you taught full-time in a classroom?
   16. Part-time or substituting?

That’s the end of my questions for you. Before we end the interview, is there anything else you want to tell me about your work as a teacher?

Thank you very much for your participation in this project.
APPENDIX C

Survey Consent

You are invited to participate in a survey about teacher leadership and the ways elementary teachers think about their work in schools. The study is part of my Master’s in Education program at H.S.U. under the guidance of faculty sponsor Dr. Ann Diver-Stamnes.

I am asking you to participate because I believe your thoughts and feelings about teaching will help me to better understand how elementary teachers work and lead in schools. While filling out the survey, you may identify for yourself some of the ways you are satisfied with your work at school. In terms of risk, it is possible that identifying some of your thoughts and feelings about your work as a teacher might make you feel uncomfortable.

There are no factual questions that you will have to worry about getting right. In fact, there are no right or wrong answers to any of the questions, only answers that reflect your own thoughts and feelings as a teacher.

The surveys will be kept confidential. No one will see them other than myself. When I report my findings, I will not use real names to identify participants or schools. While I am using the surveys I will keep them locked in my file cabinet. After finishing the study, I will destroy them.

Finally, participation in the survey is totally voluntary, and you may stop answering questions or decide not to participate in the study at any time.

I, as participant, understand that John Triska will answer any questions I may have concerning this study or the procedures at any time. I also understand that my participation in any study is entirely voluntary and that I may decline to enter this study or may withdraw from it at any time without jeopardy. I also understand that John Triska may terminate my participation in the study at any time.

Participant ___________________________ Date ______________

Interviewer ___________________________ Date ______________

Contact Information: John Triska, 1646 Old Arcata Rd., Bayside, CA 95524 (707) 826-0487 jtriska@humboldt.k12.ca.us

Participating in a program with Faculty Advisor Dr. Ann Diver-Stamnes, Education Department, Graduate Studies, Humboldt State University, Arcata, CA 95521 (707) 826-5822
You are invited to participate in an interview for a study I’m conducting to learn about teacher leadership and the ways elementary teachers think about their work. The study is part of my Master’s in Education at H.S.U., under the guidance of faculty sponsor Dr. Ann Diver-Stamnes.

I am asking you to participate because I believe your thoughts and feelings about teaching will help me to better understand how elementary teachers work and lead. In terms of risk, it is possible that revealing some of your thoughts and feelings about your work as a teacher might make you feel uncomfortable-- you will not be made to answer any questions you’d rather not answer.

I will be the only other person that will know you are participating in this study. When I report my findings, I will use a pseudonym rather than your name. During the interview I will use a tape recorder and take notes, but I will be the only person to listen to the interviews and see the notes. When I am not using them I will keep them locked in my file cabinet. When I am finished with the study, I will destroy the tapes and notes.

The interview will be arranged at a place and time of your choosing, after your contractual work hours. It will last between 45 minutes and an hour. I will ask you questions about your thoughts and feelings about your work as a teacher, and may ask you to elaborate on some of your answers so I understand them completely. There are no factual questions that you will have to worry about getting right. In fact, there are no right or wrong answers to any of the questions I will ask you, only answers about your own thoughts and feelings. I will be listening to you as the expert who knows the most about your work as a teacher.

Finally, this interview is totally voluntary, and you may stop answering questions or decide not to participate in the study at any time.
I, as participant, understand that John Triska will answer any questions I may have concerning this study or the procedures at any time. I also understand that my participation in any study is entirely voluntary and that I may decline to enter this study or may withdraw from it at any time without jeopardy. I understand that the interviewer may terminate my participation in the study at any time.

Participant ___________________________    Date _____________

Interviewer ____________________________    Date _____________

Contact Information: John Triska, 1646 Old Arcata Rd., Bayside, CA 95524
(707) 826-0487 jtriska@humboldt.k12.ca.us
Participating in a program with Faculty Advisor Dr. Ann Diver-Stamnes, Education Department, Graduate Studies, Humboldt State University, Arcata, CA 95521
(707) 826-5822
APPENDIX E

Intercorrelations Between Construct Subscales

Table 11

*Intercorrelations Between Subscales Within Construct A*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>A4</th>
<th>A5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p ≤ .05  ** p ≤ .005  *** p ≤ .001

Table 12

*Intercorrelations Between Subscales Within Construct B*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B3</th>
<th>B4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.4**</td>
<td>.47***</td>
<td>.51***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p ≤ .05  ** p ≤ .005  *** p ≤ .001
### Table 13

*Intercorrelations Between Subscales Within Construct C*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>C4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.69***</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.78***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.49***</td>
<td>.76***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.42***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p ≤ .05 ** p ≤ .005 *** p ≤ .001

### Table 14

*Intercorrelations Between Subscales Within Construct D*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>D2</th>
<th>D3</th>
<th>D4</th>
<th>D5</th>
<th>D6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.51***</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.51***</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td>.56***</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td>.71***</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.51***</td>
<td>.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.36**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p ≤ .05 ** p ≤ .005 *** p ≤ .001*
Table 15

*Intercorrelations Between Subscales Within Construct E*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E3</th>
<th>E4</th>
<th>E5</th>
<th>E6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.38**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p ≤ .05   ** p ≤ .005   *** p ≤ .001
APPENDIX F

Construct Correlations

Table 16

Construct Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construct A</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>.50***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct B</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>.47***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct C</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct D</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.59***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct E</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p ≤ .05  ** p ≤ .005  *** p ≤ .001
### APPENDIX G

Mean Ratings and ANOVA Results

Table 16

*Mean (+SD) ratings of schools for the constructs and separately measured subscales tested by analysis of variance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Hillside</th>
<th>Seaview</th>
<th>Valley</th>
<th>One-way ANOVA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.73 (0.31)</td>
<td>3.80 (0.29)</td>
<td>3.80 (0.26)</td>
<td>(F(2, 53) = 0.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscales A1, A2(^a) &amp; 3.47 (0.37) &amp; 3.47 (0.41) &amp; 3.20 (0.37) &amp; (F(2, 53) = 3.21^*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2.88 (0.51)</td>
<td>3.29 (0.56)</td>
<td>3.39 (0.51)</td>
<td>(F(2, 53) = 4.84^*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.60 (0.42)</td>
<td>3.23 (0.62)</td>
<td>3.73 (0.41)</td>
<td>(F(2, 53) = 5.48^*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>3.26 (0.56)</td>
<td>3.34 (0.51)</td>
<td>3.59 (0.40)</td>
<td>(F(2, 53) = 2.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale D6(^a) &amp; 2.29 (0.77) &amp; 3.35 (0.70) &amp; 2.72 (0.88) &amp; (F(2, 53) = 7.57^{***})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>3.01 (0.52)</td>
<td>2.99 (0.53)</td>
<td>3.18 (0.51)</td>
<td>(F(2, 53) = 0.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale E3(^a) &amp; 2.59 (0.87) &amp; 3.24 (0.66) &amp; 3.16 (0.71) &amp; (F(2, 53) = 3.88^*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Pearson correlation analysis suggested these subscales measured data that were separate from the other data measured within their constructs; they were therefore removed and analyzed separately.

\(^* p \leq .05 \quad ** p \leq .005 \quad *** p \leq .001\)