Georgia Southern University
Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

Electronic Theses and Dissertations | Graduate Studies, Jack N. Averitt College of

Spring 2007

Study of Teacher Engagement in Four Dimensions of Distributed Leadership in One School District In Georgia

Lisa Michele Smith

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/etd

Recommended Citation
Smith, Lisa Michele, "Study of Teacher Engagement in Four Dimensions of Distributed Leadership in One School District In Georgia" (2007). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 282.
https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/etd/282

This dissertation (open access) is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies, Jack N. Averitt College of at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

A STUDY OF TEACHER ENGAGEMENT IN FOUR DIMENSIONS OF DISTRIBUTED LEADERSHIP IN ONE SCHOOL DISTRICT IN GEORGIA

by

LISA MICHELE SMITH

(Under the Direction of Barbara J. Mallory)

ABSTRACT

The researcher's purpose of this study was to understand teacher engagement within four dimensions of the distributed leadership model in one school district mandated to implement distributed leadership. The researcher administered a Likert-scale survey, Distributed Leadership Readiness Scale, developed by Elmore and modified by Gordon, to 295 certified teachers with Bachelor or higher degrees within eight schools in one school district.

Teachers were engaged in all four dimensions, including: mission, vision and goals; school culture; leadership practices; and shared responsibility. Most teacher participation occurred with the distributed leadership practices in mission, vision and goals and the least engagement within leadership practices. Elementary teachers are more engaged within the all four dimensions of distributed leadership practices than middle or high school teachers. Middle school teachers practice shared responsibility more than high school teachers.

The researcher also analyzed differences in participation of leadership practices by demographics. The researcher found that female, veteran teachers with seven or more years in education within their school were involved in leadership roles and were viewed by others as leaders.

Distributed leadership is a complex phenomenon with teachers engaged in all four dimensions. Second, teachers are most engaged in developing mission, vision, and goals, which provides a foundation for initiating a distributed leadership model. Third, teachers are somewhat reluctant about participating in leadership tasks. Fourth, trust, respect, resources, and time are barriers that influenced full participation in distributed leadership practices. Fifth, teachers in elementary schools are more engaged in distributed leadership practices than high school teachers. Elementary teachers have more trust, collaboration, and desire to participate in leadership. Finally, most teachers involved in distributed leadership practices are female, veteran teachers in formal leadership positions.

Overcoming the barriers of time and resources, as well as establishing a trusting school culture, are essential to engaging teachers in distributed leadership practices.

INDEX WORDS: Distributed leadership, Teacher engagement

A STUDY OF TEACHER ENGAGEMENT IN FOUR DIMENSIONS OF DISTRIBUTED LEADERSHIP IN ONE SCHOOL DISTRICT IN GEORGIA

by

LISA MICHELE SMITH

B.G.S., Armstrong Atlantic State University, 1992

M.S.W., University of Georgia, 1997

Ed.S., Georgia Southern University, 2004

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of Georgia Southern University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

STATESBORO, GEORGIA

2007

© 2007

Lisa Michele Smith

All Rights Reserved

A STUDY OF TEACHER ENGAGEMENT IN FOUR DIMENSIONS OF DISTRIBUTED LEADERSHIP IN ONE SCHOOL DISTRICT IN GEORGIA

by

LISA MICHELE SMITH

Major Professor: Barbara J. Mallory

Committee: Gregory Chamblee
Linda M. Arthur

Electronic Version Approved:
May 2007

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to God, my husband, my children and my parents. I thank them for the guidance support, strength, and knowledge necessary to accomplish my goal. My husband, Jody, has been a constant source of encouragement in my life and has been continuously patient with me, especially during the writing of my dissertation. My children, Matthew and Courtney, have also been understanding and patient with me while I was working on my "paper". I hope that my children will value education and will always pursue their own personal goals. My parents, Cecil and Patsy Gay, have always supported me in whatever dream I had, no matter how long it took me to get there. Their endless support and constant belief in my abilities have made me who I am today.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Writing my dissertation, I have learned many things about perseverance, discipline and the importance of my friends and family. There are several people who have been with me every step of the way through this process. I sincerely thank and acknowledge the valuable support and guidance of the following individuals:

Dr. Barbara Mallory, my committee chair, has been patient with me and has encouraged me throughout the process of fulfilling the requirements for this degree. Her expertise and guidance has been valuable to me throughout the entire process, and I sincerely thank her for being my Major Professor. She has always answered my emails and numerous questions no matter how many emails I sent her in one day.

Dr. Gregory Chamblee, my methodologist, has been a support for me and helped me to refine my "wordy" paragraphs. He helped to guide me through my data analysis and numerous questions. Dr. Linda Arthur, committee member, has been a support system for me for many years. She encouraged me through my Doctoral classes and my dissertation.

Debby Smith, my neighbor and my friend, and I shared many long hours studying and riding together to class. I can't eat at Larry's without thinking of the drives to class every week. Remember, the glass is always half-full.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS 7

LIST OF TABLES 11

CHAPTER

I INTRODUCTION 15

Benefits of Team Leadership 16

Overview of Distributed Leadership 18

Theoretical Framework of Distributed Leadership 23

Distributed Leadership in Barker County 26

Statement of the Problem 27

Research Questions 29

Significance 29

Delimitations 30

Procedures 30

Summary 31

II REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 34

Contemporary School Reform.....35

School Leadership 35

Leadership Capacity 41

Organizational Structures that Facilitate Leadership Capacity 44

Distributed Leadership 49

Elmore's Conceptual Framework Modified by Gordon.....64

Principal and Teacher Leadership 70

Georgia's Advocacy for Distributed Leadership.....78

Summary 81

III METHODOLOGY 83

Introduction 83

Research Questions 84

Research Design 84

Participants 85

Instrumentation.....86

Data Collection.....95

Data Analysis 96

Summary 97

IV REPORT OF DATA AND DATA ANALYSIS 100

Introduction 100

Research Questions 100

Participants 101

Summary of Participants 106

Findings 107

Summary 148

V SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS 152

Introduction 152

Research Questions 154

Findings 154

Discussion of Findings 158

Conclusions 168

Implications 168

Recommendations 169

Concluding Thoughts 171

REFERENCES 172

APPENDICES 181

A IRB CORRESPONDENCE 182

B DISTRIBUTED LEADERSHIP READINESS SCALE 184

C T-TESTS 189

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Table 2.1: Spillane and Elmore's Similarities and Differences 63

Table 3.1: Certified Teachers Surveyed by School Level (N=295).....85

Table 3.2: Demographic Survey Mapped to Literature Review 87

Table 3.3: Survey Items Mapped to Literature Review and Dimensions 89

Table 3.4: Four Dimensions of Elmore's Conceptual Framework of Distributed Leadership Mapped to the 40 Items on the DLRS (Gordon, 2005).....95

Table 4.1: Barker County Teachers' Level of Engagement in DLRS Mission, Vision and Goals Dimension.....108

Table 4.2: Barker County Teachers' Level of Engagement in DLRS School Culture Dimension 110

Table 4.3: Barker County Teachers' Level of Engagement in DLRS Leadership Practices Dimension 113

Table 4.4: Barker County Teachers' Level of Engagement in DLRS Shared Responsibility Dimension 116

Table 4.5: DLRS Dimension Differences by School Level.....120

Table 4.6: Differences between Elementary and Middle School on DLRS Dimension Mission, Vision and Goals Items 122

Table 4.7: Differences between Elementary and Middle School on DLRS Dimension School Culture Items.....124

Table 4.8: Differences between Elementary and Middle School on DLRS Dimension Leadership Practices Items 127

Table 4.9: Differences between Elementary and Middle School on DLRS Dimension Shared Responsibility Items 129

Table 4.10: Differences between Middle and High School on DLRS Dimension Mission, Vision and Goals Items 131

Table 4.11: Differences between Middle and High School on DLRS Dimension School Culture Items 133

Table 4.12: Differences between Middle and High School on DLRS Dimension Shared Responsibility Items 135

Table 4.13: Differences between Elementary and High School on DLRS Dimension Mission, Vision and Goals Items 137

Table 4.14: Differences between Elementary and High School on DLRS Dimension School Culture Items 139

Table 4.15: Differences between Elementary and High School on DLRS Dimension Leadership Practices Items 142

Table 4.16: Differences between Elementary and High School on DLRS Dimension Shared Responsibility Items 144

Table C.1: Differences between Middle and High School on DLRS Dimension Leadership Practices Items 190

Table C.2: Barker County Teachers' Differences on the DLRS by Gender 191

Table C.3: Barker County Teachers' Differences by Degree, Bachelor vs. Master 195

Table C.4: Barker County Teachers' Differences on the DLRS by Total Years in Education, 1-3 Years vs. 4-6 Years 199

Table C.5: Barker County Teachers' Differences on the DLRS by Total Years in Education, 1-3 Years versus 7 or More Years 203

Table C.6: Barker County Teachers' Differences on the DLRS by Total Years in Education, 4-6 Years versus 7 or More Years 208

Table C.7: Barker County Teachers' Differences on the DLRS by Total Years in the Present School, Less Than 1 Year versus 1-3 Years 213

Table C.8: Barker County Teachers' Differences on the DLRS by Total Years in the Present School, Less Than 1 Year versus 4-6 Years 217

Table C.9: Barker County Teachers' Differences on the DLRS by Total Years in the Present School, Less Than 1 Year versus 7 or More Years.....221

Table C.10: Barker County Teachers' Differences on the DLRS by Total Years in the Present School, 1-3 Years versus 4-6 Years 225

Table C.11: Barker County Teachers' Differences on the DLRS by Total Years in the Present School, 1-3 Years versus 7 or More Years 229

Table C.12: Barker County Teachers' Differences on the DLRS by Total Years in the Present School, 4-6 Years versus 7 or More Years 233

Table C.13: Barker County Teachers' Differences on the DLRS Leadership Role versus No Role 237

Table C.14: Barker County Teachers' Differences on the DLRS Viewed as a Leader Moderate Extent versus Minimal Extent 241

Table C.15: Barker County Teachers' Differences on the DLRS Viewed as a Leader Great Extent versus Minimal Extent.....245

Table C.16: Barker County Teachers' Differences on the DLRS Viewed as a Leader Great Extent versus Moderate Extent 249

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Educational reform places an emphasis upon the relationship between leadership and school improvement, thereby, revealing a powerful impact on school change (Harris, 2002). The pressure of educational reform leads educational leaders in this era of accountability to shift their thinking and to develop leadership skills throughout the school (Neuman, 2000). This shift in thinking leads educational leaders to look for new ways to perform their leadership tasks. From the various models of leadership, educational leaders in Georgia are being encouraged to adopt a distributed leadership model for school effectiveness. The Georgia Leadership Institute for School Improvement (GLISI) promotes distributed leadership, which is defined as "an opportunity for leaders within the school to contribute value and exercise their leadership in order to improve student achievement and organizational effectiveness" (GLISI, 2004). In many schools, the distributed form of leadership is an alternative perspective that is gaining more followers as it allows for shared decision making in order to produce greater effect (Yukl, 2002).

Arrowsmith (2005) states that there are three characteristics of distributed leadership that must be evaluated in order to gain an understanding of distributed leadership. First, distributed leadership is a term used in connection with a group and not individuals. Second, there are fluid boundaries with reference to who can be included in the leadership role. Lastly, distributed leadership may entail a variety of expertise across the group of leaders, because the individuals participate based on the expertise in the subject matter in question. People work together in a way that assembles their expertise

and distributes a product that is greater than the sum of its parts (Bennett, Wise, Woods & Harvey, 2003).

Benefits of Team Leadership

Contemporary educational reform places an emphasis upon the relationship between leadership, school improvement and the impact of leadership in securing development and change (Harris, 2002). Current educational reform is embedded in improving student achievement and accountability by focusing on basic academic subjects such as language arts, math, social studies and science (Harrison, 2005). Educational leaders have numerous responsibilities and are responsible for the following: building and supporting collegial cultures; providing feedback; encouraging reflection; developing and keeping a vision; modeling values; and developing collaborative learning experiences (Heller & Firestone, 1995; Spillane, 2006 a.; Neuman, 2000). For several decades, these responsibilities have fallen to one person: the principal (Neuman); but principals can no longer perform all of the tasks and functions alone (Heller & Firestone).

Teachers are being asked to be leaders in order to reduce the workload of the principal, because without teacher leaders, changes and improvement in student achievement could not be achieved (Murphy, 2005). One main idea for distributed leadership is that shared leadership avoids overloading the principal (Storey, 2004; Harris, 2003). Educational leaders must build leadership capacity within their school in order to empower teachers. Barth (1990) concludes the way to motivate teachers to be teacher leaders is to give them ownership over a situation and encourage them to identify the issue that the teacher will be addressing. Giving teachers ownership over the

situation is a way to empower teacher leaders in the era of accountability in student achievement.

Team-Building Approach

Currently, there are two critical areas essential for accountability in leadership: implementing a leadership team and identifying and focusing on one vision (DeMoulin, 1996). Teams are built by formal leaders while team functioning is built by school culture and policies (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson & Wahlstrom, 2004). Leithwood et al. contend that focusing on one vision is part of the culture of the team. The vision provides a sense of the team's purpose as well as identified goals on how the vision will be attained.

Site-Based Decision Making

The team building approach is the basis of site-based decision making. There are four main beliefs regarding site-based decision making (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2004) including, using teachers, who are closest to the students, to make a difference in their academic achievement. Second, teachers, parents, and school staff should have more ownership in their policies and programs. Third, the teachers should have a voice in the decision making process since they are the ones having to carry out the decisions. Finally, change will more likely occur when there is ownership among the staff and those responsible for the process. Distributed leadership relies on a team of leaders (DeMoulin) in the decision-making process, as well as implementing school improvement changes.

Originally, site-based decision making was seen as a means for achieving goals of increased organizational effectiveness. Site-based decision making is a relatively old term, but it was associated with the participative model of leadership (Lunenburg and Ornstein, 2004). Distributed leadership has emerged as the 21st century model that

encompasses many aspects of site –based decision-making, and it, too is associated with the participative model of leadership. Participative leadership is concerned with the sharing of power and empowering others to share in the decision making process (Yukl, 2002). Participative leadership encompasses the terms "group decision making", "teacher leadership", and "shared decision making" (Yukl; Richardson, Lane, Jording, Flanigan & Van Berkum, 1999; Lunenberg & Ornstein).

Kerry and Murdoch (1993) cite the importance of leadership as a shared responsibility. Every member of the team acts on the mission or objectives that the team has identified; each member directs resources and staff accordingly, giving the team feedback on progress and recognizing good performance. If, on the other hand, leadership skills are passed on, the team has a far greater chance of continuing to be successful beyond any one leader. It is important that educational leaders in this time of accountability shift their thinking to develop leadership practices throughout the school (Neuman, 2000), which leads to a distributed leadership model for school effectiveness.

Overview of Distributed Leadership

Distributed leadership is defined as a leadership phenomenon in which leadership activities are not handled by one individual but shared among several people in an organization or team (Storey, 2004; Yukl, 2002). The term distributed leadership was first used in 1951 in the book *Dynamics of Participative Groups* by Jack R. Gibb (Lucia, 2004). In his book, Gibb writes, "There is a maximum of emphasis upon the growth and development of all the members of the group. There is no one leader, the leadership is distributed" (Gibb, 1951, p. 18). The term has been shadowed under terminology of "teacher leadership" and "shared decision making" since that time (Lucia). The term

"distributed leadership" resurfaced in the 1990s with Richard Elmore through his new concept of distributed leadership, which called for leaders to delegate responsibilities among various groups in the organization while working toward common values, culture, symbols and rituals (Lucia).

The distributed style of leadership implies a different power relationship within a school setting, because it encourages the school to make leadership more fluid instead of stationary (Harris, 2003). In distributed leadership, the principal is still the key leader and becomes the architect of the school (Lashway, 2003). The principal builds a leadership team in order to incorporate the behavior of a group of individuals in a school to guide and activate staff in the instructional change process (Harris).

One of the key aspects of distributed leadership is understanding who is involved. The decisions made in starting the team, and identifying the team members are keys to understanding how teams operate and how they succeed (Simon, 1976). A common theme for creating effective teams is to insure that they are balanced in terms of members' expertise; however, while harmonized teams may be successful, the concept of balance may be a problem, if it is the sole criteria for selecting team members (Kamm & Nurick, 1993). More important criteria in the team development process would be the importance of common interests and the interests of the team members to want to be a part of the team (Simon). Team members play a key role in decision making by expressing their ideas and making suggestions (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2004); while their success depends upon the capabilities of people to work together (Leithwood, Steinbach, & Ryan, 1997).

One of the main arguments against distributed leadership is the complexity of the distribution of leadership among faculty. Faculty, parents, students, and community involvement in the leadership of the school can create problems involving role confusion and conflicts among faculty members (Storey, 2004). Storey conducted a multi-method research study using documentary material, individual interviews at all levels, and questionnaires in order to determine the responsibilities, tasks and roles of staff members in schools using a distributed leadership model. Storey's subjects included a number of specialty schools in the Midlands and the south of England. Information from the faculty head, the whole school and students at each school were gathered for the study. Storey found that there were numerous conflicts regarding the roles of faculty members. Storey also found a perceived lack of direction regarding the duties and responsibilities being assigned. Therefore, implementing a distributed leadership model requires an understanding of roles, functions, and practices involved in the model.

The distributed leadership model encompasses the leadership team working on a shared goal, which leads to greater organizational change and may be considered an advantage (Storey, 2004; Yukl, 2002). A distributed view of leadership incorporates the activities of multiple groups of individuals who are guiding the school towards the change process (Spillane, Halverson & Diamond, 2001). This leadership practice is distributed across two or more leaders who work on the same task independently, but on the same element of instruction to achieve a shared goal of student achievement (Spillane & Sherer, 2004).

In order for distributed leadership to be successful, school faculty must focus on the shared goal of increasing student achievement (Harrison, 2005; Spillane et al., 2001).

Gordon (2005) conducted a quantitative research study using 36 schools in Connecticut. Gordon surveyed 1,257 educational practitioners in order to examine distributed leadership practices and the effect on student achievement. The researcher found that student achievement increased within schools where the principal implemented instructional leadership practices throughout the school in a distributed leadership model.

As an instructional leader, the principal's role includes constructing and selling an instructional vision, building trust, building collaboration, supporting teacher's professional development and monitoring instruction (Spillane et al., 2001). The principal's role is to increase the leadership capacity within the school in order for leaders to collaborate with each other and to consolidate resources in order to improve student achievement (Pechura, 2001). Teachers are the most influential contributors to the success of their students, and they have become more involved in the instructional leadership and decision making process within the school (Pechura). The instructional leadership function is a key function when adopting a distributed leadership perspective.

Distributed leadership is based on trust for the team while knowing that the principal cannot possess the knowledge or skills to lead the organization by himself/herself (Reeves, 2006). The key to successful implementation of distributed leadership means that there is a reduction of pressure on the principal enabling teachers to have greater autonomy in where they want to be, how they want to get there and when they want to get there (Oduro, 2004; Spillane, 2006 a.).

Harrison (2005) conducted a qualitative case study of an elementary school in order to discover how leadership becomes distributed and how shared leadership impacts teachers. Data were gathered through individual interviews, focus group interviews,

observations, and the data were analyzed. The researcher provides several implications that are important to the practice of distributed leadership.

First, the principal must be committed to distributing leadership among many individuals. Second, a collaborative culture must be in place for distributed leadership to occur. Third, the distributed leadership team must work toward the same vision and goals. Fourth, in order for distributed leadership to be successful, the goals must be tied to student achievement. Fifth, distributed leadership practice must be embedded within the school culture.

Teachers may not be in official leadership positions, but they can engage in leadership behavior such as sharing ideas, asking questions and working to implement innovative initiatives toward school improvement (Lambert, 2003). Teachers can be trained to incorporate different leadership responsibilities in order to contribute to the overall effectiveness of the school (Davis, McKlin, Page & Brown, 2005). Teacher leadership offers teachers the ability to enhance school improvement through their involvement in decision-making and school governance (Garbriel, 2005). Teachers who are leaders have a sense of ownership of the school which leads to increased motivation, professionalism and commitment (Blase & Blase, 2001).

Silva, Gimbert and Nolan (2000) conducted a qualitative case study using interviews and biographical data on three teachers who were perceived to be leaders by their peers. The purpose of the study was to relate the teachers' experiences of leading from the classroom. Silva et al. found that teacher leaders nurture other teachers, even if the teacher teaches on the other side of the school building. Teacher leaders also attend professional learning opportunities while assisting other teachers adapt to the changes of

the new information acquired at the training. However, the teachers struggled with barriers, such as the threat of administrators losing power and physical constraints of the school. Two of the teachers left the profession of teaching at the end of the case study due to the barriers that challenged their role.

Theoretical Framework of Distributed Leadership

Elmore viewed distributed leadership as a means of providing instructional leadership within the school (Gordon, 2005). His view of distributed leadership has its roots in loose coupling theory. In the 1970s, Karl Weick introduced the concept of loose coupling theory (Lucia, 2004), which is from the field of sociology (Elmore, 2000). Loose-coupling theory holds that the core of education-what to teach, how to teach, what students learn, how students are grouped together and what students should be expected to learn-rests in individual classrooms and not the school as an organization (Elmore; Lucia).

Loose coupling creates an environment that is incompetent at influencing the very job it is set up to oversee: teaching (Elmore, 2000). The best way to change the focus is through multiple sources of guidance and direction (Elmore). Distributed leadership does not mean "no one is responsible for the overall performance of the organization"-rather that leaders must create a "common culture of expectations" regarding skills and knowledge, and holds individuals "accountable for their contributions to the collective result" (Elmore, 2004, p. 38). Elmore believed that in any organized system, people specialize or develop skills that are related to their interests, aptitudes, prior knowledge and roles (Elmore).

From his model of distributed leadership, he identified five dimensions: mission, vision, and goals; school culture; decision-making; evaluation and professional development; and leadership practices (Elmore, 2000). The Connecticut State Department of Education, based in part on Elmore's effective schools research, developed the Distributed Leadership Readiness Scale (DLRS), which was deemed valid and reliable in a study conducted by Gordon (2005).

Through a factor analysis by Gordon (2005), the five dimensions from Elmore's research were condensed into four dimensions: mission, vision and goals; school culture; shared responsibility; and leadership practices. Shared responsibility emerged as a merged dimension, combining Elmore's decision-making and evaluation/professional development. The four dimensions have been identified as Elmore's conceptual framework of distributed leadership modified by Gordon. The DLRS was designed to evaluate distributed leadership in school sites, understand perceptions of shared leadership to identify leadership needs, and to compare student achievement and schools employing, and not employing, distributed leadership practices. The items on the survey were originally developed to understand each of the five dimensions of distributed leadership, which Gordon later condensed into four dimensions: mission, vision and goals; school culture; leadership practices; and shared responsibility.

Mission, Vision and Goals

Numerous researchers have defined the dimension of mission, vision and goals (Gordon, 2005). DuFour and Eaker (1998) define mission as an organization's purpose while vision gives the organization a sense of direction. Mission, vision and goals are considered the building block of the professional learning community (DuFour and

Eaker). Neuman and Simmons (2000) explain that a shared vision encompasses clear goals where the focus is on student achievement. School vision has also been characterized as an educational platform where the organization's beliefs create the norms of the organization (Gordon).

School Culture

Culture is formed over the course of the history of the school and encompasses the beliefs, values and habits of the organization (Gordon, 2005). A culture supportive to distributed leadership includes a setting where teachers are encouraged to collaborate, to participate in school based decision making, to engage in professional development and to foster the leadership of classroom teachers (Murphy, 2005). School cultures will change as an added benefit if the organization pursues a common purpose, understands the change process, develops relationships, fosters knowledge building and strives for consistency (Fullan, 2001).

Leadership Practices

Leadership practices explain "how school leaders define, present, and carryout their interaction with others in the process of leading" (Gordon, 2005, p. 41). Leadership practices provide insights into how school leaders act and the leadership routines within the structure of the school (Spillane, Halveson & Diamond, 2004). Leadership practices may examine, the tasks or activities used in the performance of a routine; who is responsible for the task; what tools are necessary to perform the tasks; and the leadership function or goals the tasks is designed to address (Spillane, 2006 a.).

Shared Responsibility

Distributed leadership as a shared responsibility is "an alternative perspective to the heroic single leader, that is slowly gaining more adherents, is to define leadership as a shared process of enhancing the individual and collective capacity of people to accomplish their work effectively" (Yukl, 2002, p. 432). The concept of shared responsibility is that leadership activities should not be the responsibility of one individual but should be shared between numerous people in an organization (Storey, 2004). These individuals sharing the leadership responsibilities must be given professional development in order for the staff to learn and grow (Gordon, 2005). DuFour and Eaker (1998) in discussing professional development relate that personnel become more effective in helping students learn.

Spillane et al. (2004) relate that the four dimensions of distributed leadership ties the distribution of leadership to the actual experiences regarding instruction and leadership. The four dimensions of distributed leadership aid in connecting the broad concept of leadership to student achievement (Lucia, 2004). Distributed leadership encompasses the entire learning community to promote the overall school vision and mission and to format a method of accountability for their school (Neuman, 2000).

Distributed Leadership in Barker County

In Barker County (pseudonym), a small, rural community in Southeast Georgia, school leaders have been mandated by the superintendent to use the concept of distributed leadership in order to work toward improving student achievement, primarily in math. This model of leadership includes a school-based team led by the principal and comprised of educational leaders, who work together to improve student achievement

(Oduro, 2004; Spillane, 2006 a.). According to the Certification Clerk in Barker County, there are 320 teachers on staff within eight schools in Barker County: five elementary schools, two middle schools and one high school with each school having its own leadership team.

Within each of the eight schools in Barker County, there are teacher leaders who were chosen by the school principal to be included on the leadership team. The distributed leadership team offers an opportunity for motivational potential and builds commitment to the shared goal (Storey, 2004). During modern times, school leaders need the support of their school community in order to reach the shared goals of the organization (Huffman & Jacobson, 2003).

Statement of the Problem

School leaders are expected to make a difference in their schools. A principal is held accountable for the performance of students in his/her school, and the school's success or failure is often attributed to the one person who has the position of school leader. As the demands for accountability and quality in schools persist, however, principals today are also encouraged to look for new ways to administer to the needs of the school. One of the more recent initiatives embraced by some educational leaders is the phenomenon of distributed leadership.

Distributed leadership is a rather new phenomenon in the area of leadership practice. As a new phenomenon, there are a small number of empirical studies on distributed leadership. As more studies are completed, educators have gained some insight into how distributed leadership works in a school setting. Moving from a hierarchal setting, where the principal is at the top of the pyramid, to a school culture that

shares leadership among staff members, may be considered risky in this era of high stakes accountability. However, recent studies have been conducted which relate distributed leadership practices to increased student achievement. Other recent studies on the style and model of distributed leadership in schools have led some school administrators to adopt this new leadership approach in administering schools.

Distributed leadership was mandated by the superintendent in the Barker County School District. The superintendent wanted the principals in all schools in the district to implement distributed leadership. To gain an understanding of teachers' engagement within four dimensions of distributed leadership and to identify leadership needs, the researcher studied the teachers' engagement within four dimensions of the distributed leadership model found in one school district mandated to implement distributed leadership practices. In addition, the researcher determined the differences in engagement within the four dimensions of distributed leadership by school level as well as the differences in distributed leadership practices by demographic characteristics of teachers by gender, degree, total years at their present school, total years in education, as a formal or informal leader and how others view teachers as leaders. All schools need strong leadership in this era of accountability, and Georgia, specifically in Barker County, is expecting distributed leadership to improve student achievement. Gaining understanding into distributed leadership at all three school levels helped the researcher to understand distributed leadership practices within four dimensions, as the schools move into a model involving leaders where accountability is shared-not by one leader-but by many. Therefore, the researcher studied the level of teacher engagement within four dimensions

of the distributed leadership model found in one school district mandated to implement distributed leadership.

Research Questions

The researcher answered the following overarching question in this study: What is the level of teacher engagement within the four dimensions of the distributed leadership model found in one school district mandated to implement distributed leadership?

1. To what extent are teachers engaged in distributed leadership practices within the four dimensions of the distributed leadership model found in Barker County?
2. To what extent do elementary, middle and high school teachers differ in their engagement within the four dimensions of distributed leadership practices in Barker County?
3. To what extent do the teacher demographic characteristics, including gender; degree; participation as a formal or informal leader in the school; how others view teachers as leaders; years of teaching experience; and years of experience working at the school, vary in relation to leadership practices in Barker County?

Significance

Since most of the studies on distributed leadership have been conducted in England, Australia, New Zealand and Canada, the results of this study contributed to the understanding of distributed leadership practices in the United States of America. Teachers engagement of the distributed leadership practices yielded insight into an understanding of the four dimensions of distributed leadership within one school district. The results of this study also provided insight into teacher demographics as a perspective

of the distribution of leadership practices. In addition, the researcher gained insight into differences in elementary, middle and high school teachers' engagement of distributed leadership within four dimensions of distributed leadership practice.

This study is significant to the Barker County School System (pseudonym used to protect the county) as it serves as an evaluation of the leadership practices in Barker County, while working toward the mandated vision of the superintendent. The understanding of teachers engagement within the four dimensions yielded insight into leadership needs. This study was important to the researcher as it was an investment of both time and commitment. The researcher had vested interest in the findings of the study as the researcher works in the school system and sees the time and energy going into the distributed leadership teams.

Delimitations

The findings of this study were limited to only the eight schools within one school system in the state of Georgia. Therefore, the information was not generalizable to other school systems or other states. Since Barker County had implemented distributed leadership for two academic years, a limitation was the entrance of new experiences of distributed leadership, as teachers are at times resistant to change with changes in education happening so rapidly.

Procedures

This study was conducted using a descriptive research design using quantitative research as there is a large population of teachers in Barker County. The researcher used the Distributed Leadership Readiness Scale (DLRS) to survey the teachers with Bachelor or higher degrees at faculty meetings. The survey was completed anonymously while

asking demographic data, including gender; race; degree; total years of experience at the school; total years in education; participation as a formal or informal school leader; and how others view teachers as leaders. There were 295 respondents within the eight schools in Barker County.

The survey data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences version 13.0, and for research question one, the data was shown as a holistic view of the county by dimension. The individual items were placed into the four dimensions in order to find a grand mean per dimension. For research question two, an ANOVA were conducted to determine differences by school level by dimension. Next, the data were analyzed using a t-test with at least 30 participants by data set for differences in distributed leadership practices within four dimensions at the elementary, middle and high school level. For research question three, the data were also analyzed by t-test by demographic teacher characteristics: gender; degree; total years in education; total years in the school; how others view teachers as leaders; and participation as a formal or informal leader.

Summary

Educational reform has placed increased pressure on the principal to distribute leadership throughout the school. Site-Based Decision Making is a term used for a team building approach, which is now being called participative leadership. Distributed leadership is a model of one type of Participative Leadership. Leadership is more about leadership practice than leadership roles. The principal is still the instructional leader in the school and builds the leadership team in order to empower staff to work towards

student achievement. The leadership team is considered to be the distributed leadership or shared leadership team.

Several important implications for distributed leadership teams or shared leadership teams are having the principal committed to distributing leadership; having a collaborative culture in the school; working toward a shared vision/goal; and working toward student achievement. The key to successful implementation of distributed leadership means that the principal has duties and responsibilities delegated to the team and the pressure is lifted from the principal.

Various studies have been conducted on distributed leadership outside of the United States. Empirical studies have found that distributed leadership leads to an increase in student achievement. Distributed leadership was mandated by the superintendent in Barker County for the last two years. This researcher studied the level of teacher engagement within four dimensions of distributed leadership model found in one school district mandated to implement distributed leadership. The results of this study were used to fill in the gap of distributed leadership in the United States.

The findings were, also, delimited to the eight schools within the one county and are, therefore, not generalizable to other systems or states. Other limitations of the study included teacher bias when they completed the surveys such as not having any prior knowledge or experience in distributed leadership.

The researcher conducted this research using Elmore's framework for distributed leadership as modified by Gordon. The researcher used a quantitative research design. The researcher surveyed teachers in order to determine the level of teacher engagement

within four dimensions of a distributed leadership model found on one school district mandated to implement distributed leadership.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The last two decades, particularly in the United States, England, Canada, Australia and New Zealand, have produced increased pressures from the latest wave of educational reform since the establishment of public school systems (Gronn, 2003). In 1983, the National Commission on Excellence in Education published *A Nation at Risk* which increased American concern about the quality of public school education and the failure to prepare students for future employment (DuFour & Eaker, 1998; Hallinan & Khmelkov, 2001; Harrison, 2005). The dissatisfaction with United States schools motivated the school reform effort and was the force for school restructuring with a renewed focus on teaching and learning (Hallinan & Khmelkov). According to Hallinan and Khmelkov, the focus of educational reform was to alter school characteristics and enhance the student's academic performance.

A Nation at Risk served as the catalyst for more than 300 state and national task forces investigating the condition of public schools which became known as the Excellence Movement (DuFour & Eaker, 1998). During this movement, teachers were told to work harder but with limited resources (Harrison, 2005). Teachers were given more leadership responsibilities (Heller & Firestone, 1995). At the same time, a parallel movement tried to give individual schools more freedom to develop the best leadership practices in order to reach their goal (DuFour & Eaker). However, the Excellence Movement called for top-down management to mandate improvement, and the reform effort failed (DuFour & Eaker; Harrison).

The review of the literature explored the evolving role of reform since the 1990's and school leadership, especially the models of leadership. The literature review was organized by addressing contemporary school reform, school leadership, leadership capacity, organizational structures that facilitate leadership capacity, and distributed leadership, Elmore's conceptual framework modified by Gordon, principal and teacher leadership and Georgia's advocacy for distributed leadership.

Contemporary School Reform

Contemporary educational reform places an emphasis upon the relationship between leadership, school improvement and the impact of leadership in securing development and change (Harris, 2002). Educational reform is embedded in improving student achievement and accountability (Harrsion, 2005). This pressure to improve student achievement causes increased work load and stress on the principal (Neuman, 2000). Neuman sites numerous responsibilities that educational leaders are responsible for: building and supporting collegial cultures; providing feedback; encouraging reflection; developing and keeping a vision; modeling values; and developing collaborative learning experiences. For several decades, these responsibilities have fallen to one person-the principal (Neuman) but leaders can no longer perform all of the tasks and functions alone (Harris; Spillane, 2006 a.). Leaders have to shift their thinking since the reform effort in order to pursue an effective school (Kerry & Murdock, 1993).

School Leadership

School improvement within an effective school in the context of the rapid change within the school system requires a constant professional effort by leaders. The job of an effective leader is never done but requires new expectations and new accountabilities

which sharpen the need for effective support and leadership in effective schools (Kerry & Murdoch, 1993). Leithwood, Steinbach and Ryan (1997) state that there are two types of leaders: formal and informal leaders. Formal leaders are assigned by someone to be a leader and are given a set of expectations and power in order to reach certain objectives. Informal leaders may be as assertive as a formal leader but since there is no formal position; the informal leader may be thought of as overbearing and arrogant.

Adair (1991) in the identification of great leaders discusses the importance of the leader in becoming part of a team with each member developing "a sense of complementary skills, interlocking like a jigsaw puzzle" (p. 3). The core leadership responsibilities are to motivate and develop the individual; build and maintain the team; and achieve the task. Leadership in this context is a relationship between the leader and followers which requires the leader to know those who they are leading (Yukl, 2002). It is also a reciprocal relationship whereby leadership is seen in the eyes of those who are being led (Sergiovanni & Carver, 1975).

Rost (1993) conducted an etymological search of the term "leadership" and found over 221 definitions of leadership in 587 books, book chapters and articles. He contends that the term "leadership" originated in the first half of the nineteenth century in England in the writings about political influence referencing management, control and power. After analyzing all of the definitions, he concluded the origin of the term leadership in the United States as beginning in 1900-1929 with leadership being defined as the office of a leader. Rost says that the first books on leadership were published in the 1930s. This was also a time of decentralization when leadership became a social process and focused on a group and not just individuals.

Decentralization

The goal of decentralization in both public and private areas was to shift control from individuals in top management positions to those individuals who had lower level jobs in the organization (McQuaig, 1996; Bimber 1993). In the 1930s, Mary Parker Follett's "law of the situation" stated that one person should not be giving orders to another person but everyone should agree that the situation changes as people are taking charge of the situation (Miller & Vaughan, 2001). The Follett Philosophy related that any organization must be grounded upon the motivational desires of the individual and the group (Metcalf & Warwick, 2003). Follett emphasized the practice of sharing leadership and making workers feel as if the relationships with the leaders are circular instead of linear (McQuaig; Miller & Vaughan). Miller and Vaughan viewed Follett's practice of sharing leadership as the coordination between each individual. This coordination was encompassed in the participation of shared leadership and requires clear communication, openness and understanding. With her concept of shared leadership, Follett was a visionary and the key themes in her work included empowerment, participation, leadership, conflict, and experience (Miller & Vaughan).

Follett's visionary reflections of management are the predecessor of W. Edward Deming's management style, Total Quality Management (TQM). Holt (1993) relates that Deming's doctrine of generating quality was endorsed by Japanese businessmen and sanctioned a process of building into the product and not inspecting the defects out of it. Deming's revolutionary ideas in Japan helped to bring an economic miracle to Japan (Holoviak, 1987; Marzano, Waters & McNulty, 2005). Deming's conception of the organization was based on 14 points that can be organized into five factors that defined

the action of an effective leader: change agency; teamwork; continuous improvement; trust building, and suppression of short-term goals (Marzano et al.). These five factors became the basis of quality circles.

The use of quality circles in Japanese manufacturing was instilled in order to promote quality control activities in the industry (Holoviak, 1987; Bowman, 1989). The climate of the organization was also influenced by quality circles or cooperative learning groups (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2004). Quality circles consist of teachers and other non-administrative staff members being trained in planning, motivation, leadership, decision making, communication and change (Lunenburg & Ornstein). The objectives of quality circles were to gain access to problem solving skills; to enhance job satisfaction and the quality of work life; and to enhance the quality of management within the organization (Holoviak).

In 1981, American businessmen of the Ford Motor Corporation began adopting Deming's management style, in order to restore confidence in products built in America (Holt, 1993). Deming emphasized that lower level workers needed to be involved in the decision making process and that the individuals in the decision making process would produce higher satisfaction (McQuaig, 1996). Deming believed that the climate of an organization influenced an individual's contribution more than the individual himself (Holt).

This philosophy of business influenced schools as a means to improve instruction (McQuaig, 1996). Schools began using decentralization as a way to improve education. In education, the term decentralization can mean many different things. Several interpretations of decentralization in schools include allowing teachers empowerment to

make decisions (Bimber, 1993) or shifting decision-making from the central office to the school site where decisions will be made by the people closest to the education of the student (McQuaig; Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2004). One common explanation of decentralization in education is the presence of decision making committees and sharing leadership with teachers, parents and community members. (Bimber). Deming defined leadership as enabling workers to find joy in their work (Schmoker & Wilson, 1993). The leadership in the school is important as it sets the standard for academic performance and adjusts the school's needs based on students' academic performance (Bostock, 1995).

Bimber (1993) identified four components to successful decentralization in schools. First, decision making authority must be given to those closest to the students, and central office administrators must be prepared to lose some of their power. Second, leadership in schools must be guided by shared goals and increases the need for more leadership autonomy in the school by the principal instead of the central office. Third, schools should compensate their staff members with a reward system. Fourth, decentralization must be thought of as a contract between the school and the central office in dividing the responsibilities for student achievement.

Site-Based Decision Making

Bostock (1995) found that site-based decision making emerged as a type of decentralization. In the 1980s, school districts across the country began turning to site-based decision making as a way to improve student learning and include teachers, parents, students and the community into the decision making process (John, 1996; Brouilette, 2002). Site-based decision making and the term site-based management were used interchangeably. This form of management emerged as an effort to facilitate

improvement, innovations, and professional growth at each school site (McQuaig, 1996). Site-based management created an increase in student achievement due to the increase in teacher autonomy and accountability from sharing the decision making (Rodriguez & Slate, 2001).

There are four main beliefs regarding site-based decision making (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2004) including using those closest to the students to make a difference in their academic achievement. Second, teachers, parents, and school staff should have more ownership in their policies and programs. Third, change will more likely occur when there is ownership among the staff and those responsible for the process. Finally, the teachers should have a voice in the decision making process since they are the ones having to carry out the decisions.

Teacher voice or autonomy must be present in order to have successful implementation of site-based management (Rodgriguez & Slate, 2001). McQuaig (1996) conducted a study to examine the process associated with the implementation of site-based management at an elementary school using a qualitative case study. This case study was an ethno-historical, single case study using interviews, observations and document reviews of a small, rural elementary school in Southeast, Georgia. The study was conducted on the implementation of a form of site-based management. For data analysis, McQuaig used a combination of the constant comparison method and the use of QSR Nud.ist computer program.

McQuaig's (1996) study was conducted on the staff at Optima Elementary School over a seven year period. The findings from her study included the importance of having principals with the ability to create conditions in schools which support change. These

conditions included teachers in the decision-making process which created ownership and increased teacher satisfaction. Collaboration was also a vital condition necessary to facilitate learning. Once collaboration was in place, teachers assumed leadership roles while the principal became a facilitator.

Collaboration is an essential element for teachers and leaders to work together in the decision making process (Rodriguez & Slate, 2001). The leaders need to develop relationships and trust in order to establish shared values that will enable leaders to share in the decision making process (Harrison, 2005). Teachers' participation in decision making is a critical component of shared decision making as participation refers to the formal opportunities for teachers to be active in their schools in order to improve the school (McQuaig, 1996). Site-based management represents a collaborative decision-making process involving stakeholders from the school and is at the heart of the ideal of participatory democracy (Brouilette, 2002). Before adopting a collaborative decision making relationship, principals and teachers had been accustomed to working in isolation (McQuaig).

Leadership Capacity

Educational leaders are looking for ways to increase their leadership capacity. Schools are looking at leadership capacity as a way for leaders to collaborate with each other and consolidate resources in order to improve student achievement (Pechura, 2001). Teachers are the most influential contributors to the success of their students, and they have become more involved in making decisions that impact students (Pechura).

Heller and Firestone (1995) conducted a study on the planned change of leadership tasks and functions in the school. Their hypothesis was that it was critical that

leadership functions be performed but who performed them was not as critical. They defined leadership as a set of tasks to be performed instead of as a role. They collected data from 8 principals, 24 teachers, 3 district liaisons, and staff of the Social Problem Solving Program.

Heller and Firestone (1995) found a set of leadership tasks that were sources of changes in leadership distribution. The leadership tasks identified were sustaining a vision for change, encouraging staff members, modifying daily operating procedures and monitoring instructional progress. The results of their study also showed that these leadership tasks were completed redundantly by people in a variety of positions such as principals, teachers and central office staff. Leadership capacity is a broad based effort by principals, numerous teachers, parents and students to participate in the work of leadership (Lambert, 2003).

When there are numerous leaders performing redundant tasks (Lambert, 2003), role confusion and conflicts occur among faculty members (Storey, 2004). Storey conducted a multi-method research study using documentary material, interviews, and questionnaires in order to determine the responsibilities, tasks and roles of staff members in schools using a distributed leadership model. Storey's subjects included a number of specialty schools in the Midlands and the south of England. Information from the faculty head, the whole school and students at each school were gathered for the study. Storey found that there were numerous conflicts regarding the roles of faculty members. Storey, also, found a perceived lack of direction regarding the duties and responsibilities being assigned; and a lack of understanding of teaching roles which lead students to be de-motivated.

Roles, duties and responsibilities must be identified in order to develop leaders throughout the school. Leadership capacity is based on increasing the knowledge and skills of the leaders and followers in the school (Harrison, 2005) and several strategies have been identified that are critical for leadership capacity. First, individuals have to become aware of their own individual capacity (Harrison). As individuals work together, individual capacity grows by expecting more out of colleagues, finding more efficient ways to do work, and seeing partners instead of individuals (Lambert, 2003). Principals encourage teachers to build knowledge of their individual strengths and weaknesses by providing professional development opportunities and encouraging collaboration with others (Harrison). Professional development is the main link between policy and practice, because it provides teachers with necessary support and training to develop leadership within the school (Murphy, 2005).

This distributed view of leadership incorporates the activities of multiple groups of individuals who are guiding the school towards the change process (Spillane, Halverson & Diamond, 2001). This leadership practice is distributed across two or more leaders who work on the same task independently, but on the same element of instruction to achieve a shared goal of student achievement (Spillane, Halverson & Diamond, 2004). Leaders need to work to create a shared goal or moral purpose (Harrison, 2005). The shared goal or vision of the school is critical when principals are trying to build leadership capacity throughout their school.

Pechura (2001), Principal at Jefferson Elementary School in Wauwatosa, Wisconsin conducted a study regarding building and sustaining leadership capacity. Pechura conducted a multi-site case study in three high leadership capacity schools of

one rural, one urban and one suburban school. The researcher examined principal behaviors that developed leadership capacity in others. Pechura found that there are five core beliefs to building leadership capacity. First, teachers, parents and students have to be given opportunities to participate in leadership. Opportunities to participate in leadership practices include principals talking with and then asking them to participate, encouraging and supporting teachers, parents, and students to take on leadership roles. Second, leaders must experience success in their leadership roles. Third, principals have to support leadership experiences in others. Support can be a simple process such as sending emails, writing notes and verbally communicating with them. Fourth, individual leadership capacity builds organizational leadership capacity. Finally, the ability to build leadership capacity lies within school membership.

Organizational Structures that Facilitate Leadership Capacity

In order to successfully build leadership capacity within the school, the school culture must support the growth of teachers as well as students. There are many organizational features of the school that lend themselves to building leadership capacity. The culture of the school is one of the major influences, as a hierarchical top-down structure, would tend to prohibit leadership capacity within the school. Viewing the school as a community, however, Sergiovanni (2005) recommends that leaders and followers must be clear on the shared values when making decisions in order for the organizational structure to provide a culture where by leadership capacity could be explored.

Many schools are restructuring to build professional learning communities for adults and students (Harrison, 2005). Harrison found that when teachers work in a

collaborative environment, the school is positively impacted by increasing positive feelings by the teachers towards the school as a learning community. Phillips (2004) found that shared decision making leads to success of the school mission enabling a positive learning environment within an elementary school. Professional learning communities in reference to schools is a term which refers to all stakeholders such as parents, students and staff members being involved in the planning, action and assessments of improvements for the school (Huffman & Jacobson, 2003). Organizational components of a professional learning community are structure, support and culture (Murphy, 2005). The structure of an organization is embedded in the procedures, rules, policies and relationships among the leaders (DuFour & Eaker, 1998).

Structure and Support Of PLC's

Huffman and Jacobson (2003) conducted a quantitative study in order to study the structure of the professional learning community. The researchers surveyed 83 educators who were enrolled in master's level courses in educational administration in Texas. The researchers found several themes associated with the core processes of the professional learning community: providing a safe environment which is open for ideas, beliefs and strategies; and being a democratic organization guided by principles, ethics and values. The participants believed that a collaborative style of leadership by the principal influenced the characteristics of the professional learning community. Structural support of the learning community may be defined as a mutual purpose of the school, having a collaborative working relationship with other leaders; having trust; and having the structural support of time and resources (Harrison, 2005; Katzenmeyer & Moller, 1996; Murphy, 2005; Phillips, 2004).

Organizational Structure and Distributed Leadership

Organizational structures may include communication strategies encompassing shared decision making and strategies for involving teachers in the decision making groups (Harrison, 2005; Katzenmeyer & Moller, 1996). Harrison conducted a qualitative case study of an elementary school in order to discover how leadership becomes distributed throughout the structure of the organization of the school and how shared leadership impacts teachers. Data were gathered through individual interviews, focus group interviews, observations, and the data were analyzed.

Harrison's (2005) findings included new teachers being active followers leaving veteran teachers in more formal leadership positions as they are more knowledgeable and more experienced. The researcher also provided several implications that are important to the practice of distributed leadership. First, the principal must be committed to distributing leadership among many individuals. Second, a collaborative culture must be in place for distributed leadership to occur. Third, the distributed leadership team must work toward the same vision and goals. Fourth, in order for distributed leadership to be successful, the goals must be tied to student achievement. Fifth, distributed leadership practice must be embedded, in faculty meetings, committee meetings and grade level meetings, within the school culture.

Culture of the School as an Organization

Culture is formed over the course of the history of the school and encompasses the beliefs, values and habits of the organization (Gordon, 2005). A culture supportive of distributed leadership includes a setting where teachers are encouraged to collaborate, to participate in school based decision making, to engage in professional development and

to foster the leadership of classroom teachers (Murphy, 2005). School cultures will change as an added benefit if the organization pursues a common purpose, understands the change process, develops relationships, fosters knowledge building and strives for consistency (Fullan, 2001). Teacher leaders will emerge with more experience by engaging in instructional leadership tasks such as sharing, coaching, reflecting, and modeling (Sabitini, 2000) if the collaborative school culture is in place to support shared decision making (Harrison, 2005).

Shared decision making in the form of teacher leadership was investigated by Sawyer (2005) who conducted a qualitative case study using interviews, questionnaires, reflective writing and observations. The researcher tried to find out how leading a leadership team affects teachers' perceptions regarding teacher leadership, the barriers and support of teacher leadership and the drawbacks of teachers on leadership teams. The researcher studied nine teachers who volunteered to be a part of a team implementing a new report card. The researcher found that the collaborative culture and learning community reinforced each other. The researcher found that teacher leaders perceived leadership as collaboration, facilitation, shared expertise and shared leadership.

Barriers of Organizational Structures

Collaboration within instructional leadership has been found to be a needed cultural strategy for principals and teacher leaders in order to distribute leadership (Phillips, 2004; Spillane, 2006 a.). When the organizational structures are not in place to support the distribution of leadership, they become barriers to the success of distributed leadership. A barrier found by Blasé and Blasé (1999) during their qualitative study was top-down management. Harris (2002) cites "top-down" management as an argument

against distributed leadership, because it leads to a lack of commitment by the school staff (Huffman & Jacobson, 2003).

In order for distributed leadership to take place a principal must give up some power and control (Harris, 2002). This offers a challenge to both the principal's power and ego. The relinquishment of power offers teachers' empowerment and less empowerment for the principal (Harris). In 2003, Harris found that the principal is placed in a vulnerable position because of the lack of control over activities. Some teachers will even isolate the other teachers seeking autonomy and keep them from taking on leadership roles in the school. DuFour and Eaker (1998), also, take opposition to the top-down leadership approach. They found that this coercive approach to school leadership resulted in a lack of commitment by the faculty and staff. However, Lucia (2004) found that teachers are nurturing which leads to a bottoms-up approach instead of top-down.

Overcoming Structural Barriers

In order to overcome barriers to distributed leadership, teacher leaders and administrators must work together to create an environment that supports the distribution of leadership (Harrison, 2005). Lucia (2004) conducted a mixed method study with six Florida elementary schools. Interviews, observations and surveys were used in order to investigate the distribution of leadership and its effectiveness in an elementary school setting. Lucia found that elementary teachers expressed a desire to be leaders from within and beyond their classroom. Lucia also found that effective collaboration is the key to overcoming barriers in order to increase teaching and learning. Collaboration may take on many forms such as providing a common planning time for teachers, changing schedules of teachers and offering collaborative professional development time

(Harrison). Collaborating may be done in routine information such as announcements or meeting minutes and may be shared through professional development time (Lambert, 2003). Allowing collaboration throughout the school leads to a distributed model of school effectiveness.

Distributed Leadership

Distributed leadership is a leadership phenomenon in which leadership activities should not be handled by one individual but should be shared among several people in an organization or team (Storey, 2004; Yukl, 2002). This form of leadership is a way for educational leaders to combat the school reform efforts. Arrowsmith (2005) states that there are three characteristics of distributed leadership that must be evaluated in order to gain an understanding of distributed leadership. First, distributed leadership is a term used in connection with a group and not individuals. Second, there are fluid boundaries with reference to who can be included in the leadership role. Lastly, distributed leadership may entail a variety of expertise across the group of leaders, because the individuals participate based on the expertise in the subject matter in question. People work together in a way that assembles their expertise and distributes a product that is greater than the sum of its parts (Bennett, Wise, Woods & Harvey, 2003).

Distributed leadership falls under the participative model of leadership. Participative leadership encompasses the terms “group decision making”, “shared decision making” and “teacher leadership” (Yukl, 2002; Richardson, Lane, Jording, Flanigan & Van Berkum, 1999; Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2004). Participative leadership is concerned with the sharing of power and empowering others to share in the decision making process (Yukl). Authority and influence are available to any person in the school

based on their expert knowledge, their democratic right to choose, their critical role in the decision making process or a combination of any of the aforementioned ideals (Richardson et. al).

"An alternative perspective that is slowly gaining more adherents is to define leadership as a shared process of enhancing the individual and collective capacity of people to accomplish their work effectively" (Yukl, 2002, p. 432). Kerry and Murdoch (1993) cite the importance of leadership being seen as a shared responsibility and that every member of the team acts on the mission or objectives the team has identified; and directs resources and staff accordingly giving the team feedback on progress and recognizing good performance. If, on the other hand, leadership skills are passed on, the team has a far greater chance of continuing to be successful beyond any one leader (Yukl). Educational leaders in this time of accountability have to shift their thinking to develop leadership skills throughout the school (Neuman, 2000) which leads to a distributed leadership model for school effectiveness.

Background

The term "distributed leadership" was first used in 1951 in the book *Dynamics of Participative Groups* by Jack R. Gibb (Lucia, 2004). In his book, Gibb writes "There is a maximum of emphasis upon the growth and development of all the members of the group. There is no one leader; the leadership is distributed "(Gibb, 1951, p. 18). Gibb's claim was that leadership should not be the responsibility of one individual, but leadership functions must be carried out by the group as dispersed, shared, or distributed (Gibb; Gronn, 2000; Lucia). The distribution of leadership decreases the need for one leader and members have to look at leadership functions and how those functions are

carried out (Gibb). The concept of leadership was altered with this distributed leadership phenomenon, and Gibb's ideas and practices gives credibility to the practices of distributed leadership (Lucia).

Gibb (1951) based his concept of distributed leadership on the theory of group action or participative action. Within this theory, the group sets goals and chooses activities which align with the goals. While it is impossible for all members of a group to participate in solving the problems; the group is deemed successful when the greatest number of individuals feels identification with all of the activities that the group participates in.

In Gibb's view of distributed leadership within leaders and followers, he identified several advantages for the members of the group: increased motivation; individual development; more realistic decisions; improvement in interpersonal relationships; and opportunity for a democratic way of life (Gibb, 1951). The leaders and followers were collaborators and were able to accomplish needed tasks and functions (Gronn, 2000; Lucia, 2004). Gibb proposed two ways in which leadership could be distributed: leadership shared with numerous people; and leadership as a collaborative process involving problem solving (Gronn; Lucia). The term "distributed leadership" has been shadowed under terminology of teacher leadership and shared decision making since that time (Lucia).

Frameworks of Distributed Leadership

When distributed leadership resurfaced in the late 1990s, there were several leading researchers who explored the conceptual frameworks of distributed leadership: Richard Elmore, Peter Gronn, and James P. Spillane. Beginning with Richard Elmore, his

new concept of distributed leadership began with leaders delegating responsibilities among various groups in the organization while working toward common values, culture, symbols and rituals (Elmore, 2000; Lucia, 2004). Elmore conducted a longitudinal research study on distributed leadership funded by the National Science Foundation (Gordon, 2005). Elmore found five key dimensions of distributed leadership which influenced student achievement through his work on distributed leadership: mission, vision and goals; school culture; decision-making; evaluation and professional development; and leadership practices (Gordon).

Elmore's views of distributed leadership encases the idea of school improvement by determining who in the school possesses the skills, knowledge, and desire to complete leadership tasks and functions (Elmore, 2000; Harrison, 2005). "It is the problem of the distribution of knowledge required for large-scale improvement that creates the imperative for the development of models of distributed leadership" (Elmore, 2000, p.14). Lucia elaborated on Elmore's philosophy by concluding that the function of an administrator is about developing knowledge and skills in teachers while putting together pieces of the puzzle that fit together while holding individuals accountable. Elmore believed people possess abilities that reflect their own interests, skills and roles which cast the framework for their participation in distributed leadership (Elmore; Lucia, 2004).

Elmore based his distributed leadership framework on the loose-coupling theory (Elmore, 2000). In the 1970s, Karl Weick introduced the concept of loose coupling (Lucia, 2004) which is from the field of sociology (Elmore). Weick's first paper applied loose coupling theory to K-12 schools as well as universities (Lucia).

Loose coupling creates an environment that is incompetent at influencing the very job it is set up to oversee: teaching (Elmore, 2000). The best way to change the focus is through multiple sources of guidance and direction (Elmore). Distributed leadership does not mean "no one is responsible for the overall performance of the organization"-rather that leaders must create a "common culture of expectations" regarding skills and knowledge, and holds individuals "accountable for their contributions to the collective result" (Elmore, 2004, p. 38). Elmore believed that in any organized system, people specialize or develop skills that are related to their interests, aptitudes, prior knowledge and roles (Elmore).

Loose-coupling theory promotes changes to take place in the organizational structure and not in the actual process of teaching and learning (Lucia, 2004). The beliefs surrounding loose-coupling theory leads to reasons why distributed leadership dwindled when it first appeared in the 1950s but resurfaced in the late 1990s with Elmore's framework of distributed leadership surrounding loose-coupling theory (Lucia). According to Cuban (1988), there were several impediments to the loose-coupling theory. The ideas from loose-coupling were found to be superficial, while promoting changes in the structures of teaching and learning, but not the actual teaching and learning process. Another impediment is the idea that the school administrator is the instructional leader. The impediments from loose-coupling theory are blamed for the reason that education never had a firm grasp on distributed leadership in the 1970s and 1980s (Lucia).

Around the same time period there were two other pioneers in distributed leadership: Peter Gronn and James P. Spillane (Spillane, 2006 b.). Peter Gronn of Australia began to support distributed leadership in the 1990s and cited the work of

fellow Australian Jack Gibb in his work (Lucia, 2004). Gronn's work described distributed leadership in two terms: as a fluid relationship between leaders and followers; and leadership as shared with workers becoming involved in leadership tasks and functions (Gronn, 2000; Lucia). Distributed leadership spreads the impact of the sources of information through leadership and because of the pooling of expertise, there is a greater chance of having fewer errors in judgment due to increased collaboration (Gronn).

Collaboration is a key function in the distribution of leadership according to Gronn's theory (Spillane et al., 2001; Spillane et al., 2004). Gronn believed the distribution of leadership was based on a theory of activity and defined activity to be the connection between the group and organization (Lucia, 2004). Activity theory has roots from Russian Marxist psychology particularly the writings of L.S. Vygotsky (Spillane & Sherer, 2004) and A.M. Leont'ev's theory (Gronn, 2000) has most recently surfaced in the work of Engelstrom. Leont'ev conceived that activity comprises the three elements of motive, action and operation (Gronn). According to Gronn, activity is the heart of the organization and the bridge between agency and structure (Lucia). The patterns of an organization are dependent upon activity, and activities are engaged in by sets of time, place, space and culture (Gronn).

Two common work units are associated with activity theory (Gronn, 2000; Lucia, 2004). First, a team is designed for a specific purpose, and the teams are carefully chosen to carry out an activity. The second unit is that work is more spontaneous and occurs to peoples common beliefs and inter-connections. In both work units, the individual's jobs

and work changes based on the mental framework of the individual into a job that is dependent on a group of people.

Activity theory has three advantages: to fill any gaps in leadership; to complete the work of the organization; and to understand leadership as being fluid (Gronn, 2000). "Activity is a vehicle for representing human behavior in and engagement with the material (i.e. natural and social) world" (Gronn, p. 327). The most common application of the distribution of leadership appears in cognition which is the idea that mind and mindfulness are evident in performed activity and relationships (Gronn). The foundation of distributed cognition is the pattern of interaction by actors with the artifacts and tools rooted within the organization (Gronn).

Gronn sensed the importance of cognition but that this topic should be approached cautiously (Lucia, 2004). He believed that activity theory was the conceptual underpinning for distributed leadership with cognition theory in the background. Gronn differed from James P. Spillane's view of distributed cognition due to Spillane's belief that places cognition on the front burner (Lucia). The study of human cognition focuses on understanding the thinking process in situations in which the thinking occurs (Spillane et al., 2004) "It does not seem satisfying or relevant to talk about thinking as a g-factor, independent of the context or action in which it is exercised, because intelligence is not encountered apart form the occasions in which it is displayed" (Spillane et al., p. 9).

According to Spillane et al. (2001) cognition is more than individual mental capacity, as it is an interactive web of actors, artifacts and situation (Spillane & Sherer, 2004). Cognition is distributed throughout the school culture, material and artifacts with

collaborative efforts to complete leadership tasks and functions (Lucia, 2004; Spillane et al., 2001; Spillane & Sherer).

Schools may be viewed as social systems while referring to activities and interactions of group members who work toward a common goal (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2004). A system is a "set of things or parts forming a whole" (Lowe, 1999, p.3). Jacob Getzels and Egon Guba developed a conceptual framework for understanding the school as a social system (Getzels & Guba, 1957). Getzel and Guba defined the dynamics within the relationship between individuals and organizations in order to understand the behavior of an individual within the organization (Gaynor, 1998). Social systems theory emerged during the twentieth century as an effort to bring more consistency into the field of social sciences (Lowe). Social systems theory focuses on the behavior of the individual as a transaction between the organization and the individual (Gaynor).

According to Gaynor (1998), the Getzels-Guba model involves five essential elements. First, the culture of an organization is characterized by its values. Second, the organization is a structure of roles and expectations. Third, individuals are identified by their needs and behaviors in order to satisfy their needs. Fourth, individuals are gifted and controlled by their physical environment. Finally, individuals carry the values of the group in which they identify themselves.

There are two dimensions in which the social systems are studied which are both interrelated and independent: organizations have roles and expectations in order to fulfill an identified goal; and second, individuals have personalities whose connections contain observed behavior (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2004). The observed behavior is a function of the roles and expectations which make-up the activity in a social system. A role is the set

of behaviors that belong to a specific position, but an individual in a specific role can perform numerous roles (Colbeck, 1998).

Lunenburg and Ornstein (2004) conceive that with roles and personality as the central concept, the Getzels Guba model gives organizations a closed system perspective. The social systems model was expanded in the 1970s in order to include a community dimension to make the cultural setting in a school an open system. Systems exist on all levels: people; families; organizations; communities; societies; and cultures (Lowe, 1999).

Viewing schools as a social system, Spillane along with Halverson and Diamond conducted a study in the United States called the Distributed Leadership Project or the Distributed Leadership Study (Spillane & Sherer, 2004) funded by the National Science Foundation and the Spencer Foundation (Spillane et al., 2001; Spillane & Sherer). This project was a five year long longitudinal study conducted in 13 Chicago elementary schools with five of them only being used for interviews commencing in 1999 using a distributed leadership framework designed to make leadership practice more visible (Spillane et al.; Spillane & Sherer). Research methodologies included a qualitative research design consisting of observations, structured and semi-structured interviews, and videotaped leadership practice (Spillane & Sherer). The data were collected and then analyzed to develop patterns emerging from data analysis (Spillane & Sherer). The researchers developed coding categories based on a framework which addressed four key issues: key goals or macro leadership functions; day to day tasks; their practice as leaders by asking how they enact the tasks; and the tools and materials used in the execution of the tasks (Spillane & Sherer). Leadership practice was studied as a unit of analysis and

not through an individual leader (Spillane et al.). Leadership practice approached through leadership functions rather than through the work of individuals allows an adoption of a distributive leadership perspective (Spillane et al.; Spillane & Sherer). Leadership practice may also be considered supported or constrained dependent upon the situation where leadership practice takes place (Spillane & Sherer).

From this study, Spillane et al. (2004) developed a conceptual framework of distributed leadership based on activity theory and distributed cognition. The framework was "built out of concepts that speak directly to practice" (Spillane et al., 2004, p.4). Spillane along with Halverson and Diamond found that leadership practice is embedded in the tasks, actors, actions, and interactions of school leadership on a day-to-day basis (Lucia, 2004; Harrison, 2005; Spillane & Sherer, 2004). The dimensions of leadership practice and the relationship between the dimensions of leadership provides insight into how school leaders act (Spillane et al.).

Spillane et al. (2004) define "leadership as the identification, acquisition, allocation, co-ordination, and use of the social, material, and cultural resources necessary to establish the conditions for the possibility of teaching and learning" (p.11). Distributed leadership is defined as a distributed leadership practice "stretched over the social and situational contexts of the school" (Spillane et al., 2004, p. 5). Distributed leadership is about leadership practice and not leaders or their roles, functions or routines (Spillane et al, 2004; Spillane, 2006 a.). The leadership practices are viewed as both thinking and activity and are a product of the interactions between school leaders, followers and their situation (Spillane et al., 2001; Spillane et al., 2004; Spillane, 2006 a.). Stemming from this view of leadership practice, a conceptual framework was developed based on four

dimensions-leadership tasks and functions, task-enactment, social distribution of task-enactment, and situational distribution of task-enactment (Spillane et al., 2001).

Tasks and Functions

Spillane et al. (2004) define leadership tasks and functions as the activities that need to done in the school in order to have a school culture that is conducive to learning. Leadership tasks and functions are based on activity theory. After an extensive review of literature, Spillane et al. identify six functions that are important for instructional leadership. The first leadership task and function is developing and working toward a shared instructional vision. This one function has many steps such as writing a draft of the vision; holding a collaborative meeting to discuss the draft; asking for input from teachers; and revising the draft. All of these tasks could take either months or years. The second function is constructing and managing a school culture by building trust and collaboration among staff. The third function is providing resources such as materials, time, support and reimbursement. The fourth function is supporting teacher growth and development. The fifth function is monitoring instruction and innovation. The sixth leadership task and function is maintaining a school climate that is conducive to learning (Spillane et al.). This function could be done by enforcing the disciplinary code of conduct and taking a student to a disciplinary hearing tribunal for violation of the code of conduct.

Task Enactment

Task enactment is how the tasks are carried out in the school (Spillane et al, 2004). Task enactment are the everyday task that leaders perform in order to attain goals

such as observing classrooms, forming breakfast clubs or holding grade level meetings (Spillane & Sherer, 2004).

At Adams Elementary, one of the elementary schools in Chicago studied in the Distributed Leadership Study; there was limited communication between staff members when the principal arrived in the 1980s. The principal with her leadership team and teachers built an organizational routine by establishing the breakfast club to establish communication and to create information sharing (Spillane et al., 2001; Spillane & Sherer, 2004).

The breakfast club gave teachers an opportunity for leadership practices and to establish a learning community around improving teaching and learning (Spillane & Sherer, 2004). Looking at the school as an organization within Adams, the Breakfast Club allowed teachers time to interact regarding instruction and afforded the staff an opportunity to create new structures including information sharing and peer communication (Spillane & Sherer). The leadership practices were redefined at this school which led to more open communication and more knowledge concerning the roles and responsibilities each one had at the school (Spillane et al., 2001).

Task enactment may be the everyday task of leadership behavior regarding classroom instruction (Blasé and Blasé, 1999). Spillane et al.(2004) cites the study by Blasé and Blasé when identifying strategies for promoting teacher reflection in order to promote instructional improvement. These activities include making suggestions, giving feedback, modeling, asking opinions and giving praise (Blasé and Blasé; Spillane et al.). There may be a difference in what a leaders says they are going to do and what a leader actually does (Spillane et al.). The activity of influencing what teachers do may be

complicated by leader's expertise in subject matter as well as the beliefs regarding teacher leadership (Spillane et al.). The pool of expertise on the distributed leadership team may make a difference in the outcomes of the distributed leadership (Gronn, 2000).

Social Distribution of Task-Enactment

Social distribution of task-enactment means understanding how leaders in the school work together, as well as individually, in order to perform leadership tasks and functions (Spillane et al., 2004). "Cognition is also distributed socially through other people in collaborative efforts to complete their tasks" (Spillane & Sherer, 2004, p.5). Leaders may use their individual strengths to work alone on a task but then bring it to others for input and collaboration. It means understanding how leadership practice is extended over the various leaders and the interactions among the team members.

Situational Distribution of Task-Enactment

The situational distribution of task enactment is the activity distributed in the web of actors, artifacts and situation (Spillane et al., 2004). "Cognition is distributed *situationally* in the physical environment, that is, through the environments' material and cultural artifacts" (Spillane & Sherer, 2004, p. 5). Situation means the socio-cultural context that impacts the day-to-day practices of leadership (Spillane & Sherer). Leadership activity is situated in the organizational structure in a distributed leadership environment (Spillane & Sherer). The artifacts may be tools of communication such as forms, memos or meeting agendas (Spillane et al.). Artifacts may also be defined to include language, tools and systems (Spillane & Sherer). On the other hand, leaders thinking and practice may be embedded in the artifacts. The artifacts could include school

calendars or the schedule of the day as ways of effectively communicating with the school leaders (Spillane et al.).

Spillane and Sherer (2004) cite an example of a "tool" used in distributed leadership from The Distributed Leadership Project. At Hillside School, Principal Miller believed that the ability to write and communicate was critical to the success of her students particularly her Mexican-American student population. She spearheaded improvement in the area of writing which lead to changes in teaching by reviewing students' writing folders on a monthly basis. She gave the teachers and students written feedback on a monthly basis. First, she praised students' efforts and then pointed out areas for improvement. Next, she provided teachers with guidance regarding the teaching of writing and identified skills they could cover. The writing folder, a leadership tool, encouraged one teacher, Ms. Crawford to increase the amount of time that she devoted to writing in her classroom. Other teachers offered similar information including changing the way writing instruction was covered in the classroom. The writing folder was not only a leadership tool but was embedded in leadership practice by shaping the overall instruction of writing at Hillside.

Spillane, Halverson and Diamond's (2004) framework: task and functions; task-enactment; social distribution of task-enactment; and situational distribution of task-enactment contains both similarities and differences in relation to Elmore's theoretical dimensions: mission, vision and goals; school culture; leadership practices; and shared leadership. Spillane et al. relate that the four dimensions on distributed leadership theory ties the distribution of leadership to the actual experiences regarding instruction and leadership.

Elmore and Spillane both believe (see table 2.1) that distributed leadership is not about roles (Elmore, 2000; Spillane et al., 2004). Spillane believes that leadership practices are approached through leadership functions, while Elmore believes leaders delegate responsibility among groups. The four dimensions from Elmore are included within the tasks and functions dimension from Spillane. Leadership practices of Elmore looks similar to task-enactment as the dimension includes how the practices are carried out. The four dimensions of distributed leadership aid in connecting the broad concept of leadership to student achievement (Lucia, 2004).

Table 2.1

Spillane and Elmore's Similarities and Differences

Spillane's	Elmore's dimensions	Similarities	Differences
Tasks and functions; Task-enactment; Social distribution of task-enactment; Situational distribution of task-enactment	Mission, vision and goals; Leadership practices Shared responsibility School culture	Spillane includes parts of each of Elmores dimensions in tasks and functions; Both researchers believe that distributed leadership is not about roles. Leadership practices and task-enactment both address how tasks are carried out by individuals.	Elmore defines each dimension independently; Elmore believes leaders delegate responsibility among groups, while Spillane believes leadership practices are embraced by leaders and others throughout the school.

Elmore's Conceptual Framework Modified by Gordon

Another researcher in the field of distributed leadership, Gordon (2005) conducted a quantitative research study using 1,391 certified staff members at 26 elementary schools and 10 middle and high schools in Connecticut using the Distributed Leadership Readiness Scale (DLRS). Gordon's objective was to determine the effect of distributed leadership on student achievement. The researcher used the DLRS to determine if there are differences in leadership practices at high and low performing schools. The researcher related the dimensions of distributed leadership that are highly correlated with leadership practices in high performance schools measured by student achievement. The researcher used the analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) to determine that both high and low performing schools differ in reference to distributed leadership dimensions. The researcher also found that teachers and administrators new to the school may not be fully aware of the leadership practices influencing the school; and that distributing leadership practices throughout the school leads to an increase in student achievement. Gordon made a recommendation at the end of the study to have more quantitative studies conducted on distributed leadership practices.

Gordon's other objective of the study was to examine the psychometric properties of the DLRS in order to assess the validity and reliability of the DLRS. The DLRS was developed by the Connecticut Department of Education and was based on the five dimensions of distributed leadership: mission, vision and goals; school culture; decision-making; evaluation and professional development; and leadership practices based on Elmore's work with the National Science Foundation on the effective schools research.

Gordon (2005) found that the DLRS was valid and reliable. Through a factor analysis, Gordon also found that the five dimensions of distributed leadership (mission, vision and goals; school culture; decision-making; evaluation and professional development; and leadership practices) that had been identified by the developers (Connecticut State Department of Education) of the DLRS were reduced to four dimensions (mission, vision and goals; school culture; leadership practices; and shared responsibility). Shared decision making and evaluation/professional development were merged into one dimension which is shared responsibility. The four dimensions of distributed leadership: mission, vision and goals; school culture; leadership practices; and shared responsibility were found to be internally consistent.

Mission, Vision and Goals

Numerous researchers have defined the dimension of mission, vision and goals (Gordon, 2005). DuFour and Eaker (1998) define mission as an organization's purpose while vision gives the organization a sense of direction. Mission, vision and goals are considered the building block of the professional learning community (DuFour and Eaker). Neuman and Simmons (2000) explain that a shared vision encompasses clear goals where the focus is on student achievement. School vision has also been characterized as an educational platform where the organization's beliefs create the norms of the organization (Gordon). Distributed leadership encompasses the entire learning community to promote the overall school vision and mission and to format a method of accountability for their school (Neuman, 2000). When the direction of the distributed leadership team is working on a shared goal, this type of distributed leadership leads to greater organizational change and may be considered an advantage to distributed

leadership (Storey, 2004; Yukl, 2002). When a shared vision or goal is present, teachers respond with increased motivation and commitment (Sergiovanni, 2001).

School Culture

The school culture encompasses the values, beliefs and norms of the teaching profession (Murphy, 2005). The culture is founded upon the norms of the organization-how people think, feel and act (DuFour & Eaker, 1998). School cultures can foster isolation or collaboration; view teachers as collaborators or adversaries; and encourage student achievement or keep on with the status quo (DuFour & Eaker). In order to build a school culture that is conducive to teacher leaders, classroom teachers must be empowered to shape policy, create curriculum, improve practice and add value to the budget of the school as well as the commitment of improving education for all children (Murphy).

Phillips (2004) conducted a qualitative study using face-to-face interviews and a constant comparative analysis. The researcher interviewed one principal and five teacher leaders (one from each grade level) in a high performing school that used shared governance. The researcher's purpose was to explore the principal's and emergent teacher leaders' perspectives of leadership practices in a school that practices shared leadership. Leadership practices were found to be a collaborative effort between principals and teacher leaders. The findings from the study include four instructional strategies: sharing decision making; communicating for instructional purposes; focusing on student achievement; and focusing on teaching and learning. The researcher further found that the use of the instructional strategies had a positive effect on relationships built on mutual trust and respect within the school organization.

Leadership Practices

Leadership practices explain "how school leaders define, present, and carryout their interaction with others in the process of leading" (Gordon, 2005, p. 41). Leadership practices provide insights into how school leaders act and the leadership routines within the structure of the school (Spillane et al., 2004). Leadership practices may examine the tasks or activities used in the performance of a routine; who is responsible for the task; what tools are necessary to perform the tasks; and the leadership function or goals the task is designed to address (Spillane, 2006 a.).

Spillane and Sherer (2004) cite an example of leadership practices from The Distributed Leadership Study. Adams Elementary School is a high poverty K-8 school with 97% of their 1,100 students being black. A Literacy Committee was developed at Adams including the principal, the Literacy Coordinator, the African-American Heritage Coordinator (AAHC) and a Teacher Leader from the third grade with all of them serving as leaders. The Literacy Committee met every five weeks and was established in order to have teachers from every grade level involved in decision making and contributing to the instruction of literacy.

The meetings began with the principal opening the meeting and giving the floor to the Literacy Coordinator who began with praising the teachers. Next, the AAHC shared information that she found from a book that was purchased as a resource for the teachers by the principal and the Literacy Coordinator. The principal and Literacy Coordinator listened intently and modeled behavior while sending an important message about collaboration. Following the professional development by the AAHC, grade level

teachers shared examples of their own classroom instruction regarding strategies discussed by the AAHC.

Following the teachers' examples, the principal reminded everyone of the goals established by the committee. The principal opened the meeting for other experiences and the Literacy Coordinator extended a vote for the focus of the next meeting. The leadership practices from this committee of four leaders, collaborating with teacher leaders from every grade level, showed not only leader interaction, but also leaders collaborating with other leaders in order to work toward the shared goal of increasing literacy.

Shared Responsibility

Distributed leadership as a shared responsibility is "an alternative perspective to the heroic single leader, that is slowly gaining more adherents, is to define leadership as a shared process of enhancing the individual and collective capacity of people to accomplish their work effectively" (Yukl, 2002, p. 432). The concept of shared responsibility is that leadership activities should not be the responsibility of one individual but should be shared between numerous people in an organization (Storey, 2004). These individuals sharing the leadership responsibilities must be given time to collaborate, and resources such as professional development in order for the staff to learn and grow (Gordon, 2005).

Blasé and Blasé (1999), while conducting their study on the implementation of shared governance leadership schools, found that the lack of time was a major barrier to the implementation of distributed leadership. They found that, in order to successfully implement distributed leadership, time must be given to the teacher leaders in order to

collaborate with others and to complete their new tasks (Blasé & Blasé; Spillane et al., 2004). The schools they studied were mandated by the central office to establish shared governance. This mandate undermined the potential for growth and educational improvement because the mandate was an order and not by choice. Time dominated as the top barrier to distributed leadership, because teachers need time for professional development, to engage in collegial relationships and for meetings throughout the day (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 1996).

Spillane, Diamond and Jita (2003) while conducting the Distributed Leadership Project in Chicago at Carson Elementary School found that sharing leadership responsibility was embedded within two or more leaders working separately and independently in order to achieve a common goal. The school's administration used standardized test scores and performance based skills to focus on school improvement needs. This analysis of student performance was used for teacher development and monitoring of instruction. The leadership tasks were performed independently but spread throughout leaders in the school. The leadership tasks included scheduling and administration of tests; analyzing data; identifying instructional needs; and disseminating strategies to address those needs. The school principal, assistant principal and counselor worked individually to complete the individual tasks of tests scheduling and administration. They worked together in order to interpret the results. After interpreting the results, they established instructional priorities; disseminated the information to the teachers; and provided professional development to address any instructional needs (Spillane et al.).

Principal and Teacher Leadership

Principal Leadership

The distributed style of leadership implies a different power relationship within a school setting, because it encourages the school to make leadership more fluid instead of stationary (Gronn, 2000; Harris, 2003). On the other hand, The Hay Group (2004) conducted a qualitative case study with 14 elementary schools across the country in order to find out what distributed leadership is; how it was achieved; and the consequences for establishing distributed leadership. The Hay Group found that distributed leadership was given and not taken. Distributed leadership involved a decision by the principal to allow empowerment to other personnel and allow decisions to be made by the subordinates. In distributed leadership, the principal is still the key leader and becomes the architect of the school (Lashway, 2003).

Currently, there are two critical areas essential for accountability in leadership: implementing a leadership team and identifying and focusing on one vision (DeMoulin, 1996). Leithwood et al. (2001) and Leithwood, Louis, Anderson & Wahlstrom (2004) contend that focusing on one vision is part of the culture of the team. The vision provides a sense of the team's purpose as well as identified goals on how the vision will be attained.

Teams are built by formal leaders while team functioning are built by school culture and policies (Leithwood et al., 2004). The principal builds a leadership team in order to incorporate the behavior of a group of individuals in a school to guide and activate staff in the instructional change process (Harris). Understanding the decision made in starting a team and picking the team members is the key to understanding how

teams operate and how they succeed (Simon, 1976). A common theme for creating effective teams is to insure that they are balanced in terms of members' expertise; however, while harmonized teams may be successful, the concept of balance may be a problem if it is the sole criteria for selecting team members (Kamm & Nurick, 1993).

More important criteria in the team development process would be the importance of common interests and interests of the team members to want to be a part of the team (Simon, 1976). Team members play a key role in decision making by expressing their ideas and making suggestions (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2004); while their success depends upon the capabilities of people to work together (Leithwood et al., 1997).

Principal's Role in Distributed Leadership

As an instructional leader, the principal's role includes constructing and selling an instructional vision, building trust, collaboration, supporting teacher's professional development and monitoring instruction (Spillane et al., 2001). Williams (2000) conducted a quantitative research study on the perceived effectiveness of principals in Tennessee secondary schools. Data were analyzed using 824 teachers who had completed the Completed Audit of Principal Effectiveness survey. Williams found from research on 51 randomly selected secondary schools in Tennessee, that principals are not spending enough time on curriculum development and instructional improvement; instead, the principals are establishing working relationships with staff through communication, sensitivity of needs and positive support. Principals must make time to listen and support teachers while actively working to remove barriers to teacher leadership (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 1996).

Camburn, Rowan and Taylor (2003) conducted a qualitative study within an elementary school adoption of a comprehensive school reform model with reference to distributed leadership. The researchers sample included principals, assistant principals, program coordinators and others holding “leadership” positions. The researchers found that gender, race nor highest degree were related to the functions of instructional leadership practices. Principals were found to model behavior by actively participating in professional development opportunities. The researchers also found that principals in elementary schools have small leadership teams ranging from three to seven people. As part of the team, the principal typically stands out and performs a broad range of leadership functions.

The instructional leadership function is a key function when adopting a distributed leadership perspective. The principals studied by Blasé and Blasé (1999) were committed to establishing trust, focusing on student needs to increase academic achievement, facilitating communication and collaboration among all leaders and having high expectations for the shared governance leaders.

Hallinger (2003) found that after reviewing conceptual and empirical development of both transformational and instructional leadership that instructional leadership influenced the quality of school outcomes through the alignment of academic standards, time allocation and curriculum along with the school’s mission.

The most frequently used concept of instructional leadership was developed by Phillip Hallinger and consists of three dimensions of instructional leadership: defining the school’s mission; managing the instructional program; and promoting a positive learning environment (Hallinger, 2003). The National Association of Secondary School Principals

defines part of its mission as "strengthening the role of the principal as instructional leader" (Dufour, 2002, p. 12). Even though building level principals are usually thought of as the instructional leader, teachers may, also, be instructional leaders since principals cannot do this task alone (Lunenberg & Ornstein, 2004).

Benefits of Distributed Leadership for the Principal

Distributed leadership is based on trust for the team while knowing that the principal cannot possess the knowledge or skills to lead the organization by oneself (Reeves, 2006). Principals must give up power and control which challenges both the principal's ego and power (Harris, 2002). One main idea for distributed leadership is that shared leadership avoids overloading the principal (Storey, 2004; Harris, 2003). Mutter (2004) found that distributed leadership provided on the job assistance to overworked principals. Mutter conducted a study in order to discover collaborative concepts in leadership. He conducted a quantitative study using surveys within five school divisions. The researcher concluded that while providing support to overworked administrators, collaboration assisted in improving teacher participation in decision making and in leadership functions. The key to successful implementation of distributed leadership means that there is a reduction of pressure on the principal enabling teachers to have greater autonomy in where they want to be, how they want to get there and when they want to get there (Oduro, 2004; Spillane, 2006 a.).

Teacher Leadership

In the last quarter century, the nation has lived through school reform efforts where the nations' schools have emphasized teachers assuming greater leadership throughout the school which has become known as teacher leadership (Murphy, 2005).

Teachers may not be in official leadership positions, but they can engage in leadership behavior such as sharing ideas, asking questions and working to implement innovative initiatives toward school improvement (Lambert, 2003). Teachers are emerging as leaders with influence by having knowledge, status and access to leadership practices (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 1996).

Sabitini (2002) conducted a study in order to describe teacher's perspectives of emergent teacher leadership in a elementary school. The researchers used a grounded theory research design using face-to-face interviews which were audio-taped and transcribed. Sabitini found several emerging theoretical ideas regarding teacher leadership. First, teachers who are empowered seek out peers to improve their instruction. Second, when teacher leaders interact, the focus of the interaction is on instructional and school improvement. Third, teachers who collaborate together, experience a sense of collective ownership. Fourth, as teachers collaborate and interact, leadership capacity increases. Finally, teachers who are empowered feel trusted, valued and validated.

Teachers can be trained to incorporate different leadership responsibilities in order to contribute to the overall effectiveness of the school (Davis, McKlin, Page & Brown, 2005). Barth (1990) concludes the way to motivate teachers to be teacher leaders is to give them ownership over a situation and encourage them to identify the issue that the teacher will be addressing. Teacher leadership offers teachers the ability to enhance school improvement through their involvement in decision-making and school governance (Garbriel, 2005).

Teacher's Role in Distributed Leadership

Teacher leaders work together in a collaborative environment in order to share ideas, discuss problems and share what is happening in the classroom (Silva, Gimbert & Nolan, 2000). Teacher leaders dream of making a difference and have a sense of purpose for school improvement by being reflective, asking questions and staying focused on the teaching and learning of the students (Lambert, 2003). Katzenmeyer & Moller (1996) identify three critical roles for teacher leaders. First, teacher leaders offer leadership opportunities to their colleagues and to their students. Teachers may provide feedback to students while serving as mentors or peer coaches with their colleagues. Second, teachers perform leadership tasks and functions within and outside of the school. Leadership tasks may include grant writing or serving as researchers. Third, teacher leaders participate in decision making within and outside of the school. Teachers may serve on committees, school councils or steering committees related to textbook adoption.

Benefits of Distributed Leadership for the Teacher

Teachers who are leaders have a sense of ownership of the school which leads to increased motivation, professionalism and commitment (Blasé & Blasé, 1999; Blasé and Blasé, 2001). Teachers reap numerous benefits when increasing their leadership practice: teacher efficacy, teacher retention, improving teaching performance, influencing other teachers and accountability (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 1996). Inman and Marlow (2004) conducted a quantitative analysis of beginning teachers by using surveys in order to find out why teachers were staying in the profession. The researchers sample included 500 teachers with forty-percent of the respondents having fewer than 10 years experience. Teachers who had the most experience were the teachers who were involved in

leadership positions. Beginning teachers were classified into two groups: those who have 0-3 years of experience teaching (beginning teachers) and those who have been teaching 4-9 years (experienced beginners). Beginning teachers were found to benefit and to stay in education if other teachers collaborated with them, if they had teacher mentors and if administrators encouraged and promoted teacher ideas.

Silva et al. (2000) conducted a qualitative case study using interviews and biographical data on three teachers who were perceived to be leaders by their peers. The purpose of the study was to relate the teachers' experiences of leading from the classroom. Silva et al. found that teacher leaders nurture other teachers, even if the teacher teaches on the other side of the school building. Teacher leaders also attend professional learning opportunities while assisting other teachers adapt to the changes of the new information acquired at the training. However, the teachers struggled with barriers, such as the threat of administrators losing power and physical constraints of the school. Two of the teachers left the profession of teaching at the end of the case study due to the barriers that challenged their role.

Stone, Horejs and Lomas (1997) integrated three studies in order to compare and contrast teacher leadership characteristics, motivations, roles, support, barriers, and the effects of teacher leadership on leadership practices and school improvement. The researchers examined six teacher leaders from an elementary, middle and high school in Northern California using a case study methodology research design. A survey was given to teachers at each site to find out whom they perceive to be teacher leaders. Triangulation was used within each study. Data analysis included, pattern matching, explanation building and time-series analysis.

The researchers found similarities among elementary, middle and high school level teacher leaders: teacher leaders are more experienced; teacher leaders participate in leadership positions for both personal and professional reasons; support for teacher leaders include time, decision making, teacher empowerment and professional opportunities; barriers to teacher leadership are time, power, and politics; teacher leaders encourage collaboration and participation in decision making; and teacher leaders assist in school improvements efforts by listening and empowering other teachers. Elementary and middle school teachers identified shared decision making as a top priority within their school; while middle and high school teachers engaged in leadership functions by collaborating and sharing leadership with other teachers.

The researchers also found differences in the perceptions of teacher leaders within the three levels of school. The differences were concentrated on the roles, activities and responsibilities of teacher leadership. Some specific examples include the following: high school teachers reported being the most interested in leadership opportunities and being the most interested in becoming teacher leaders; elementary school teachers viewed accomplishments in terms of their classroom instead of as part of a school improvement effort; middle school teachers viewed accomplishments in reference to improving school climate instead of towards school improvement; but high school teachers had an expanded focus to include a global focus on school improvement. High school teachers were found to engage in formal and informal leadership roles more often than teachers at other school levels. High school teachers were also found to build trust and respect with other school personnel within the school.

Teachers who focus on school improvement initiatives are empowered and are more likely to empower their students (Lambert, 2003). Empowering students means working toward the school improvement effort of increasing student achievement. Leithwood, et al. (1997) conducted a study in order to investigate leadership teams and the organizational effectiveness of the teams. The researchers studied six teams of secondary school teachers in order to learn more about the collective learning and conditions which influence their learning. The researchers used a mixed method design in order to conduct individual and team interviews which were audio taped and transcribed. Following the conclusion of the interviews, members were asked to complete an 11 item survey. The data were coded and analyzed. The researchers found that teams were more cohesive when they worked towards a shared goal of student achievement.

In a review of literature, Leithwood et al. (2004) cautions that distributed leadership may be viewed in two forms: additive and holistic. Additive forms include the diffusion of leadership tasks among numerous people in an organization, while believing that everyone in the organization is a leader. Viewing distributed leadership through a holistic form assumes that leaders are interdependent which may lead to role overlap. This form of distributed leadership emerges from dynamic, social processes which becomes a learning experience for the individual leaders within an organization.

Georgia's Advocacy for Distributed Leadership

Georgia Leadership Institute for School Improvement

According to Davis et al. (2005), the Georgia Leadership Institute for School Improvement (GLISI), is a "partnership devoted to the success of Georgia's educational leaders in meeting elevated expectations for student achievement and school

performance" (p. 8; GLISI, 2004). GLISI is a new effort in Georgia that has been embraced by many school systems in order to work towards achievable goals related to student achievement. The need for school improvement in Georgia provided GLISI with an opportunity to develop a leadership model that drives new behaviors in order to sustain school improvement (GLISI).

GLISI consists of partnerships with "the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, business leaders, the Georgia Partnership for Excellence in Education, the Georgia Professional Standards Commission, state government, including the Georgia Department of Education and the office of the Governor, and K-12 educators" (Davis et al., 2005, p.8; GLISI, 2004). GLISI provides a model based on best practices for the "new work of leadership for school improvement" (Davis et al.; GLISI). The term "new work of leadership" was first used by Senge (1990) in his book *The Fifth Dimension*. Senge defines leaders as designers, stewards and teachers responsible for building organizations in order to understand the complexity, vision and shared goals.

The new work of leadership includes the "8 Roles" for School Leadership and is the product of GLISI. The 8 Roles were developed by analyzing the tasks that effective school leaders perform in order to improve student achievement (Davis et al., 2005).

According to GLISI (2004), the 8 Roles are as follows:

- **Data Analysis Leader**-demonstrates the ability to lead teams to analyze multiple sources of data to identify improvement needs, symptoms and root causes
- **Curriculum, Assessment, Instructional Leader**-demonstrates the ability to implement a systems approach to instruction in a standards-based

environment prioritizing curriculum standards, developing aligned assessments and planning instruction to improve student achievement.

- **Performance Leader**-demonstrates the ability to strategically plan, organize and manage school systems and processes necessary to improve student achievement.
- **Operations Leader**-demonstrates the ability to effectively and efficiently organize resources, processes and systems to support teaching and learning.
- **Relationship Leader**-demonstrates the ability to identify and develop relationships among customer and stakeholder groups and communicate school goals and priorities focused on student learning.
- **Process Improvement Leader**-demonstrates the ability to identify and map core processes and results to create action plans designed to improve student achievement.
- **Change Leader**-demonstrates the ability to drive and sustain change in a collegial environment focused on continuous improvement in student achievement.
- **Learning and Development Leader**-demonstrates the ability to guide the development of professional learning communities to develop leaders at all levels of the organization.

These 8 Roles are an impossible task for any one administrator to perform alone (GLISI, 2004). GLISI asks administrators to develop "Better Seeking Teams" or leadership teams consisting of experts in the administrator's school who will be able to

help the administrator perform the 8 Roles (GLISI). GLISI supports a distributed leadership approach that incorporates the new work of leadership for school improvement by aligning the strengths of individual leaders with the needs of their school and districts (GLISI).

Design Team

Another reform effort in Georgia has been developed by the Regional Educational Services Agency (RESA) and is called Design Team. The Design Team includes similar efforts to GLISI's Better Seeking Team as both teams include leading staff in the analysis of data and identification of targets for student achievement (RESA, 2005). Another similarity is that both initiatives work as a team using distributed leadership. Design Team planning includes benchmarking improvement plan activities and monitoring the implementation of those efforts. Design Teams are asked to review Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and determine subjects and subgroups in need of intervention and to identify actions in school improvement plans. The objective of the Design Team is also to review AYP data related to the graduation rate.

Summary

Mary Parker Follett was the founder of decentralization and emphasized the practice of sharing leadership which was reflected in her predecessor of W. Edward Deming's management style, Total Quality Management. This philosophy began to influence schools as a way to improve instruction. Educational reform particularly in the last two decades has produced increased pressure on leaders in the schools. In this time of accountability, leaders have to shift their thinking and to develop leadership skills throughout the school which leads to a distributed model of school effectiveness.

Distributed leadership is defined as a leadership phenomenon. The concept seemed to disappear after it first surfaced in the 1950's, but it has resurfaced with Elmore, Spillane and Gronn in the 21st century. The concept of delegating responsibility among various groups in the organization while working toward common values, culture, symbols and rituals has emerged as a 21st century model of leadership.

Another researcher, Gordon, in the field of distributed leadership researched Elmore's five dimensions of distributed leadership using the Distributed Leadership Readiness Scale (DLRS). Elmore's conceptual framework of distributed leadership modified by Gordon encompasses four dimensions of leadership: mission, vision and goals; school culture; leadership practices; and shared responsibility.

Principals can no longer perform all of their duties by themselves; they must increase leadership capacity within their school in order to distributed leadership tasks and functions. When building leadership capacity, leadership skills are incorporated into activities of multiple groups who are leading the school towards a shared vision or goal.

School culture must support the growth of teachers as well as provide a learning community for adults and students in order to successfully build leadership capacity. Teachers who are leaders reap numerous benefits such as teacher efficacy, retention, improved performance, influencing others and accountability. Two new movements in Georgia using distributed leadership are the Georgia Leadership Institute for School Improvement and Design Team which is an effort brought about by the Regional Educational Service Agency.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Distributed leadership resurfaced in the 1990s with the work of Richard Elmore (Elmore, 2000; Lucia, 2004), Peter Gronn and James P. Spillane (Spillane, 2006 b.). Distributed leadership is a way to distribute leadership practices throughout the school using collaboration and consolidation of resources in order to improve student achievement (Pechura, 2001). Gordon (2005) researched distributed leadership by using Elmore's five dimensions of leadership: mission, vision, and goals; decision making; evaluation and professional development; leadership practices; and school culture, in the Distributed Leadership Readiness Scale (DLRS). Through a factor analysis of the DLRS, Elmore's conceptual framework of distributed leadership was modified by Gordon and encompasses four dimensions: mission, vision, and goals; school culture; leadership practices; and shared responsibility.

The purpose of this study was to understand teachers' engagement within the four dimensions of distributed leadership model found in one school district mandated to implement distributed leadership. In addition, the researcher determined the differences by school level of engagement within four dimensions of distributed leadership practices and then extent of differences demographic characteristics, including, gender, degree, participation as a formal or informal school leader, how others view teachers as leaders, years of experience, and years of experience working at the school, vary in relation to distributed leadership practices. A description of the research design, participants,

sample, instrumentation, data collection methods, data analysis and reporting of the data is included in this chapter.

Research Questions

The overarching question for this research study was: What is the level of teacher engagement within the four dimensions of the distributed leadership model found in one school district mandated to implement distributed leadership?

1. To what extent are teachers engaged in distributed leadership practices within the four dimensions of the distributed leadership model in Barker County?
2. To what extent do elementary, middle, and high school teachers differ in their engagement within the four dimensions of distributed leadership practices in Barker County?
3. To what extent do the teacher demographic characteristics, including gender; degree; participation as a formal or informal leader in the school; how others view teachers as leaders; years of teaching experience; and years of experience working at the school, vary in relation to leadership practices in Barker County?

Research Design

The research design of this study was a descriptive analysis using quantitative research. Quantitative research, as defined by Gall, Gall and Borg (2003), describes and explains the social environment by collecting numerical data and statistically analyzing the data. Bryman (1992) relates that quantitative research is associated with several different approaches with one of the approaches being a survey. Researchers have the capacity to obtain data using surveys from a large group of people who may be viewed as representing larger populations. A survey is a means of collecting information on the

same variable or characteristic from at least two but normally more cases and ending up with a table of data (De Vaus, 2004). A quantitative design was chosen as the most appropriate method for this study, because it is used to help explain the district's engagement in distributed leadership. The Distributed Leadership Readiness Scale (DLRS) developed by the Connecticut Department of Education in order to measure the engagement and readiness of distributed leadership practices was used along with a demographic survey for this study.

Participants

The participants for this study were the 320 certified teachers with Bachelor or higher degrees in Barker County during the 2006-2007 academic year. There were 250 females and 45 male respondents with 266 White, 22 Black, 3 Asian and 3 Multi-racial and 1 Hispanic. The teachers' level of education included 118 Bachelor degrees, 130 Master degrees, 20 Doctoral degrees and 25 other advanced degrees. The surveys were distributed at five elementary schools (three grade centers with grades K-1, 2-3 and 4-5 and two community schools grades PK-5), two middle schools (6-8) and one high school (9-12). Participants surveyed by school level (elementary, middle and high school) are represented in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1

Certified Teachers Surveyed by School Level (N=295)

Elementary	Middle School	High School
156	69	70

Instrumentation

Data were collected using one instrument with two parts: a demographic survey and Distributed Leadership Readiness Scale (DLRS).

Demographic Survey

This instrument contained two parts. The first part was a demographic questionnaire, asking teachers to identify: race; gender; highest degree obtained; total years in education; total years working in this school; participation as a formal or informal leader; and how others view teachers as leaders. The demographic questions were mapped to the research and to the research questions that the demographic questions answer (see Table 3.2).

Table 3.2

Demographic Survey Mapped to Literature Review

Item	Literature Review	Research Question
Race	Camburn, Rowan and Taylor, 2003	3
Gender	Camburn, Rowan and Taylor, 2003	3
Highest degree	Camburn, Rowan and Taylor, 2003	3
Total years in education	Stone, Horejs and Lomas, 1997	3
Total years in this school	Stone, Horejs and Lomas, 1997	3
Do you serve in a specific, assigned leadership role in the school where you currently work?	Sawyer, 2005; Camburn, Rowan and Taylor, 2003	3
Acknowledging that leadership is not always a formal role within a school, to what extent do you believe that other educators in the school view you as a leader?	Leithwood, Steinbech and Ryan, 2004	3

Distributed Leadership Readiness Scale (DLRS)

The DLRS (see Appendix B) was developed by the Connecticut Department of Education using Elmore's five dimensions of distributed leadership: mission, vision, and goals; leadership practices; school culture; evaluation and professional development; and decision-making. DLRS contains forty items that ask frequency within a five point Likert scale. A Likert scale is a scaling method developed by Likert (De Vaus, 2004). Likert scales are summated with a set of items that are equal in value (Kerlinger & Lee, 2000) and may be answered in frequency, agreement or disagreement. The response options

range from A=continually, B=Frequently, C=Sometimes, D=Rarely/Never to E=Insufficient information. Completion time, according to Gordon (2005) is less than 10 minutes with relative ease. The survey questions were mapped to the leadership dimensions from Elmore's framework, literature review, and research questions (see Table 3.3).

Table 3.3

Survey Items Mapped to Literature Review and Dimensions

Item	**Dimension**	**Literature Review**	**Research Question**
1. The school has a clearly written vision and mission statement.	Mission, vision and goal	Harrison, 2005	1, 2, 3
2. Teachers and administrators understand and support a common mission for the school and can describe it clearly	Mission, vision and goal	Hallinger, 203; Leithwood, Steinbach and Ryan, 1997; Spillane, Halverson, and Diamond, 2004	1, 2, 3
3. If parents are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission clearly	Mission, vision and goal	Huffman and Jacobson, 2003; Pechura, 2001	1, 2, 3
4. If students are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission generally	Mission, vision and goal	Huffman and Jacobson, 2003; Pechura, 2001	1, 2, 3
5. School goals are aligned with its mission statement	Mission, vision and goal	Harrison, 2005; Heller and Firestone; 1995	1, 2, 3
6. The school uses a school improvement plan as a basis to evaluate the progress it is making in attaining its goals.	Mission, vision and goal	Harrison; 2005; Gordon, 2005	1, 2, 3
7. Teachers and administrators collectively establish school goals	Mission, vision and goal	Harrison, 2005; Phillips, 2004; Spillane and Sherer, 2004	1, 2, 3
8. The school's curriculum is aligned with the state's academic standards	Mission, vision and goal	Harrison, 2005; Gordon, 2005; Phillips, 2004; Spillane and Sherer, 2004	1, 2, 3

Item	Dimension	Literature Review	Research Question
9. Teachers and administrators have high expectations for students' academic performance	Shared responsibility	Harrison, 2005; Spillane and Sherer, 2004 ; Gordon, 2005; Storey, 2004	1, 2, 3
10. Teachers and administrators share accountability for students' academic performance	Shared responsibility	Lucia, 2004; Sawyer, 2005	1, 2, 3
11. School and district resources are directed to those areas in which student learning needs to improve most	Shared responsibility	Blasé and Blasé, 1999; Spillane and Sherer, 2004	1, 2, 3
12. The school is a learning community that continually improves its effectiveness, learning from both success and failures	Shared responsibility	Harrison, 2005; Phillips, 2004; Sawyer, 2005	1, 2, 3
13. There is a high level of mutual respect and trust among the teachers and other professional staff in the school.	School culture	Blasé and Blasé, 1999; Harrison, 2005; Phillips, 2004; Sabitini, 2003; Spillane, Halverson and Diamond, 2004	1, 2, 3
14. There is mutual respect and trust between the school administration and the professional staff	School culture	Blasé and Blasé, 1999; Harrison, 2005; Phillips, 2004; Sabitini, 2003; Spillane, Halverson and Diamond, 2004	1, 2, 3
15. The school administrators welcome professional staff members input on issues related to curriculum, instruction, and improving student performance	School culture	The Hay Group, 2004; McQuaig, 1996; Pechura, 2001; Stone, Horejs, and Lomas, 1997	1, 2, 3
16. The school supports using new instructional ideas and innovations.	School culture	Spillane and Sherer, 2004; Stone, Horejs, and Lomas, 1997	1, 2, 3

Item	Dimension	Literature Review	Research Question
17. The school's daily and weekly schedules provide time for teachers to collaborate on instructional issues	Shared responsibility	Gordon, 2005; McQuaig, 1996; Mutter, 2004; Phillips, 2004; Sabitini, 2002; Spillane, 2006 a.; Spillane and Sherer, 2004; Stone, Horejs and Lomas, 1997	1, 2, 3
18. School professionals and parents agree on the most effective roles parents can play as partners in their child's education	Shared responsibility	Phillips, 2004	1, 2, 3
19. The school clearly communicates the chain of contact between home and school so parents know who to contact when they have questions and concerns	Shared responsibility	Spillane and Sherer, 2004	1, 2, 3
20. The school makes available a variety of data (e.g. Student performance) for teachers to use to improve student achievement	Shared responsibility	Spillane and Sherer, 2004; Stone, Horejs, and Lomas, 1997; Heller and Firestone, 1995	1, 2, 3
21. Decisions to change curriculum and instructional programs are based on assessment data	Shared responsibility	Hallinger, 2003	1, 2, 3
22. There is a formal structure in place in the school (e.g. curriculum committee) to provide teachers and professional staff opportunities to participate in school-level instructional decision making	Shared responsibility	Camburn, Rowan and Taylor, 2003; Pechura, 2001	1, 2, 3

Item	Dimension	Literature Review	Research Question
23. The principal actively encourages teachers and other staff members to participate in instructional decision making	School culture	Harrison, 2005; Heller and Firestone, 1995; Inman and Marlow, 2004; Phillips, 2004	1, 2, 3
24. Professional staff members in the school have the responsibility to make decisions that affect meeting schools goals	School culture	Harrison, 2005; Heller and Firestone, 1995; Inman and Marlow, 2004; Phillips, 2004	1, 2, 3
25. The school provides teachers with professional development aligned with the school's mission and goals	Leadership practices	Harrison, 2005	1, 2, 3
26. Administrators participate along side teachers in the schools professional development activities	School culture	Mutter, 2004; Camburn, Rowan, and Taylor, 2003	1, 2, 3
27. The principal actively participates in hi/her own professional developmental activities to improve leadership in the school	School culture	Mutter, 2004; Camburn, Rowan and Taylor, 2003	1, 2, 3
28. My supervisor and I jointly develop my annual professional development plan	School culture	Phillips, 2004; Lucia, 2004	1, 2, 3
29. My professional development plan includes activities that are based on my individual professional needs and school needs	School culture	Camburn, Rowan and Taylor, 2003; Stone, Horejs, and Lomas, 1997	1, 2, 3
30. Teachers actively participate in instructional decision making	School culture	McQuaig, 1996; Mutter, 2004; Silva, Gambert and Nolan, 2000; Stone, Horejs, and Lomas, 1997	1, 2, 3

Item	Dimension	Literature Review	Research Question
31.Central office and school administrator's work together to determine the professional development activities	Leadership practices	Harrison, 2005 Phillips, Spillane and Sherer, 2004; Huffman and Jacobson, ; Stone, Horejs, and Lomas, 1997	1, 2, 3
32. The principal is knowledgeable about current instructional issues	School culture	Mutter, 2004	1, 2, 3
33. My principal's practices are consistent with his/her words	School culture	Mutter, 2004	1, 2, 3
34. Informal school leaders play an important role in the school in improving the performance of professionals and the achievement of students	Leadership practices	McQuaig, 1996	1, 2, 3
35. The school has expanded its capacity by providing professional staff formal opportunities to take on leadership roles	Leadership practices	Blasé and Blasé, 1999; Harrison, 2005; Lucia, 2004; Pechura, 2004; Sawyer,	1, 2, 3
36.Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient time to permit them to make meaningful contributions to the school	Leadership practices	Blasé and Blasé, 1999; Harrison, 2005; Huffman and Jacobson, 2003; Sawyer, Stone, Horejs and Lomas, 1997	1, 2, 3
37. Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient resources to be able to make meaningful contributions to the school	Leadership practices	Blasé and Blasé, 1999; Harrison, 2005; Stone, Horejs, and Lomas, 1997; Sawyer, 2005	1, 2, 3
38. Veteran teachers fill most leadership roles in the school	Leadership practices	Pechura; Blasé and Blasé, 1999; Mutter, 2004; Sabitini; Stone, Horejs, and Lomas, 1997	1, 2, 3
39. New teachers are provided opportunities to fill some school leadership roles	Leadership practices	Pechura,2001; Blasé and Blasé, 1999	1, 2, 3
40. Teachers are interested in participating in school leadership	Leadership practices	Mutter, 2004; Stone, Horejs and Lomas, 1997	1, 2, 3

Gordon (2005) conducted a study in order to investigate the psychometric properties of the DLRS in order to assess the construct validity and reliability of the DLRS. Gordon used two sets of samples-a pilot sample and the proposed sample for the study. A total of 1,257 educators from 36 schools with 26 elementary and 10 middle and high schools in Connecticut were used for the study. Gordon used factor analysis in order to determine the construct validity and reliability of the survey. When using the factor analysis on Elmore's five dimensions: mission, vision and goals, leadership practices, school culture, decision making, evaluation and professional development, the factor analysis produced four dimensions of mission, vision and goals; school culture; shared responsibility; and leadership practices. Gordon merged evaluation and professional development with decision-making in order to have the dimension of shared responsibility. "All the items loaded above .35, indicating reasonably strong construct validity" (p.61). The four dimensions were found to be internally consistent (Cronbach's alpha .84 to .92), reliable and well defined by the items. Inter-item correlation for each item within each dimension ranged from .35 to .77" (Gordon, 2005, p. 61). Gordon concluded that the DLRS is an instrument that schools can use to measure leadership practices, identify weak areas, and make changes needed for improvement.

The four dimensions of leadership practice from Elmore's conceptual framework as modified by Gordon were mapped to the forty items on the survey in table format. Each of the forty questions on the five point scale were identified in the chart (see Table 3.4). The chart was developed by using the item analysis from Gordon's research which identified the questions identified within each dimension.

Table 3.4

Four Dimensions of Elmore's Conceptual Framework of Distributed Leadership Mapped to the 40 Items on the DLRS (Gordon, 2005)

Mission, vision and goals	School culture	Leadership practices	Shared responsibility
1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8	13, 14, 15, 16, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33	25, 31, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40	9, 10, 11, 12,17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22

Data Collection

The researcher obtained approval to conduct this study by submitting an application along with all supporting documentation to the Georgia Southern University Institutional Review Board (IRB). A copy of the approval letter to conduct this study is located in Appendix A as verification of approval from the IRB regarding procedures, protocol and methodology. Permission from the school superintendent was, also, secured as part of the IRB process.

After approval was obtained, the researcher scheduled a time to administer the surveys at each school site within each of the eight schools in Barker County. Along with a presentation and invitation to participate, the researcher administered the survey and collected the participants' responses at faculty meetings during December, 2006. Completion of this survey was voluntary. The researcher used a small group format in order to administer the survey to teachers who were absent from the faculty meeting. The small group was called together after making an announcement regarding survey participation for teachers who did not attend the faculty meeting. The participants did not code any identifying information beyond the demographic information.

Data Analysis

The data from the forty-item survey were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software-program version 13.0. In order to answer the first research question "To what extent are teachers' engaged in distributed leadership practices within the four dimensions of the distributed leadership model in Barker County?", the data were seen by dimension based on data means by question. The data means by question were then used to determine a grand mean for each dimension. The data analysis were dependent on organizing the responses to individual items into the four dimensions. The findings were reported by teachers' engagement of distributed leadership practices within each of the four dimensions.

Question 2, "To what extent do elementary, middle, and high school teachers differ in their engagement within the four dimensions of distributed leadership practices in Barker County?", were analyzed via an ANOVA in order to find the differences by dimension and by t-test. Findings were placed into four tables: ANOVA by dimension, elementary teachers' versus middle school teachers'; middle school teachers' versus high school teachers' and elementary school teacher versus high school teachers. The three school level tables were compared via t-test in order to find the difference of means by dimension by school level.

Finally, the third and final research question "To what extent do the teacher demographic characteristics, including gender; degree; participation as a formal or informal school leader; how others view teachers as leaders; years of teaching experience; and years of working at the school, vary in relation to leadership practices in Barker County?", were answered by analyzing the items with reference to the

demographic data attained on the survey. The data were disaggregated by t-test with at least 30 participants within each data set and placed into tables in order to determine the extent demographic characteristics vary in relation to leadership practices.

Summary

Elmore developed a conceptual framework for studying distributed leadership which was modified by Gordon. The framework is based on four dimensions: leadership tasks and functions, task-enactment, social distribution of task-enactment, and situational distribution of task-enactment. The purpose of this study was to study teachers' engagement within four dimensions of the distributed leadership model found in one school district mandated to implement distributed leadership. In addition, the researcher determined the differences in engagement of distributed leadership practices by dimension by school level and by demographic characteristics, including gender; degree; participation as a formal or informal school leader; how others view teachers as leaders; years of teaching experience, vary in relation to leadership practices.

The overarching research question for this study was "what is the level of teacher engagement within the four dimensions of the leadership model found in one school district mandated to implement distributed leadership". The research design for this study was a descriptive analysis using quantitative research suing a survey to obtain data from 295 teachers with Bachelor or higher degrees in Barker County.

There were eight schools (five elementary, two middle and one high) in Barker County. The participants for this study were the 162 elementary, 82 middle and 89 high school teachers employed during the 2006-2007 academic school year. Data were

collected using two instruments: a demographic survey and the Distributed Leadership Readiness Scale (DLRS).

The DLRS is a five point Likert scale with the range of responses ranging from A=continually, B=frequently, C=sometimes, D=Rarely/Never to E=insufficient information. The survey questions were mapped to the leadership dimensions from Elmore's conceptual framework. Gordon conducted a study on the DLRS in order to investigate the validity and reliability of the survey.

Gordon used a total of 1,257 educators in 36 schools using all three levels of education (elementary, middle and high) in Connecticut. Gordon used factor analysis in order to determine the construct validity and reliability of the survey. The factor analysis produced four dimensions of mission, vision and goal; school culture; shared responsibility; and leadership practices; and the four dimensions were found to be internally consistent (Cronbach's alpha .84 to .92), reliable and well defined by the items. Inter-item correlation for each item within each dimension ranged from .35 to .77.

The researcher obtained permission to conduct the study from the Georgia Southern Institutional Review Board. After obtaining approval, both surveys were distributed and collected by the researcher at faculty meetings. The data from the forty-eight item survey were analyzed through the Statistical Package for Social Sciences software.

For the first research question, "To what extent are teachers engaged within the four dimensions in distributed leadership model in Barker County?" The data were analyzed and the data were presented by item by dimension. The data were based on data means by question along with a grand mean per dimension.

For the second research question, “To what extent do elementary, middle and high school teachers differ in their engagement within the four dimension of distributed leadership practices in Barker County?”, the data were analyzed by using an ANOVA to find the differences by dimensions and by t-test by school level by dimension. Findings were placed into tables by ANOVA and elementary, middle and high school level by dimension.

For the third and final question, “To what extent do the teacher demographic characteristics, including gender; degree; participation as a formal or informal school leader; how others view teachers as leaders; years of teaching experience; and years of experience working at the school, vary in relation to leadership practices in Barker County?”, the data were analyzed with reference to demographic data obtained on the survey with at least 30 participants within each data set.

CHAPTER IV

REPORT OF DATA AND DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to understand teacher engagement within the four dimensions of the distributed leadership model found in one school district mandated to implement distributed leadership. The population for the study was all Barker County K-12 teachers who had Bachelor's or higher degrees. Participants were asked to complete the Distributed Leadership Readiness Scale (DLRS) and a demographic survey. The data were analyzed by dimension: mission, vision and goals; school culture; leadership practices; and shared responsibility; by school level: elementary, middle and high school and by dimension; and teacher demographic characteristics. This chapter presents descriptive data on the questions the study sought to answer.

Research Questions

The overarching question for this research study was: What is teachers' engagement within the four dimensions of the distributed leadership model found in one school district mandated to implement distributed leadership?

1. To what extent are teachers engaged in distributed leadership practices within the four dimensions of the distributed leadership model in Barker County?
2. To what extent do elementary, middle, and high school teachers differ in their engagement within the four dimensions of distributed leadership practices in Barker County?

3. To what extent do the teacher demographic characteristics gender; degree; participation as a formal or informal leader in the school; how others view teachers as leaders; years of teaching experience; and years of experience working at the school vary in relation to distributed leadership practices in Barker County?

Participants

The subjects surveyed in this study were teachers with Bachelors or higher degrees from all eight schools (five elementary, two middle and one high) in Barker County (N=320). There were 320 surveys distributed. There were 295 total respondents in Barker County which results in a 92% response rate. Barker County demographic data is presented as follows: elementary school level, middle school level, high school level, and district level.

Elementary School Demographic Profile of Respondents

In the elementary schools, there were 163 surveys distributed and 156 respondents. Therefore, the response rate for elementary school was 96%. There were 145 (92.9%) female and 11 (7.1%) male. Three (1.9%) respondents were Asian, 12 (7.7%) were Black and 141 (90.4%) were White. Respondents noted educational levels from Bachelor to Other advanced degrees with 63 (40.4%) with bachelor degrees, 69 (44.2%) with master degrees, 10 (6.4%) with doctoral degrees and 14 (9.0%) with other advanced degrees. Years of teaching experience at their present school ranged from less than one year to seven or more years, with the majority having seven or more years in their present school. Therefore, there were 28 (17.9%) teachers with less than one year in their present school, while 34 (21.8%) had worked there 1-3 years, 28 (17.9%) had worked there 4-6 years, and 66 (42.3%) teachers had worked in the present school for

seven or more years. Years of teaching experience ranged from less than one year to seven or more years in the field of education, with the majority of participants having seven or more years in the field of education. More specifically, there were 4 (2.6%) teachers with less than one year in the field of education, 26 (16.7%) teachers with 1-3 years, 31 (19.9%) teachers with 4-6 years and 95 (60.9%) teachers with 7 or more years in education. There were 52 (33.3%) teachers currently assigned specific leadership roles within the school, 102 (65.4%) who were not assigned leadership roles and 2 (1.3%) teachers who did not answer the question. Out of the 156 total respondents, 20 (12.8%) believed that other educators see them as a leader to a great extent, 71 (45.5%) to a moderate extent, and 65 (41.7%) believed others considered them leaders to a minimal extent.

Overall, elementary teachers were white, female and had Master's degrees while having worked in their present school and in the field of education for 7 or more years. Most of the participants had not been assigned leadership roles but were thought of by others as leaders to a moderate extent.

Middle School Demographic Profile of Respondents

In the middle school, there were 73 surveys distributed and 69 respondents' accounts for a 95% response rate including 49 (71.0%) female and 20 (29.0%) males. One (1.4%) respondent was Black, 1 (1.4%) Hispanic and 67 (97.1%) White and. Respondents noted educational levels form bachelor to other advanced degrees with 30 (43.5%) having bachelor degrees, 28 (40.6%) master degrees, 3 (4.3%) having doctoral degrees, 7 (10.1%) having other advanced degrees. One (1.4%) teacher did not answer the question. Years of working at the present school ranged from less than one year to

seven or more years, with the majority having seven or more years in their present school. More specifically, there were 13 (18.8%) teachers who had worked in their present school for less than 1 year, 19 (27.5%) teachers had 1-3 years in their present school, 8 (11.6%) with 4-6 years and 29 (42.0%) had 7 or more years in their present school. Years of teacher experience also ranged from less than one year to seven or more years, with the majority having seven or more years. More distinctively, there were two (2.9%) teachers with less than one year, 11 (15.9%) with 1-3 years, 5 (7.2%) teachers with 4-6 years experience and 51 (73.9%) teachers with 7 or more years in education. There were 19 (27.5%) teachers currently assigned specific leadership roles within the school, 50 (72.5%) who were not assigned leadership roles. Ten (14.5%) teachers believed that other educators see them as a leader to a great extent, 33 (47.8%) to a moderate extent, and 26 (37.7%) believed others considered them leaders to a minimal extent.

The participants at the middle school were predominately white, female and had attained bachelor's degrees. There were more male teachers at middle school than elementary school. Similar to elementary school, the majority of middle school participants had 7 or more years in education and their present school and had not been assigned leadership roles but was thought of by others as leaders to a moderate extent.

High School Demographic Profile of Respondents

In the high school, there were 82 surveys distributed with 70 respondents which accounts for an 85% response rate. The respondents were primarily female, 56 (80.0%) with only 14 (20.0%) male participants. There were 3 (4.3%) Multi-Racial, 9 (12.9%) Black respondents and 58 (82.9%) White respondents. Years of experience at their

present school ranged from less than one to seven or more, with the majority having seven or more years of experience at their present school. There were 9 (12.9%) with less than one year, 15 (21.4%) with 1-3 years, 18 (25.7%) with 4-6 years, and 28 (40.0%) teachers with 7 or more years. Their level of education ranged from Bachelor to Other advanced degree and included 25 (35.7%) bachelor, 33 (47.1%) master degrees, 7 (10.0%) doctoral degrees and 4 (5.7%) other advanced degrees. One person did not answer the question. Total years in education ranged from less than one year to seven or more years, with the majority having seven or more years in the field of education. There were two (2.9%) teachers with less than one year, 5 (7.1%) teachers with 1-3 years, 12 (17.1%) teachers with 4-6 years and 51 (72.9%) teachers with 7 or more years in education. There were 17 (24.3%) teachers currently assigned specific leadership roles within the school, 52 (74.3%) who were not assigned leadership roles. One teacher did not answer the question. Out of the 70 total respondents, 15 (21.4%) believed that other educators see them as a leader to a great extent, 26 (37.1%) to a moderate extent, and 29 (41.4%) to a minimal extent.

The majority of participants at the high school level were similar to elementary and middle school with the majority being white and female and had worked in education and in their school for 7 or more years. Parallel to elementary and middle school, the majority of high school participants were not assigned leadership roles but contradicted with the other school levels with the majority of participants at the high school level being thought of as a leader to a minimal extent.

District Demographic Profile of Respondents

There were two hundred fifty females (84.7%) and forty-five males (15.3%) to complete the survey. 266 (90.2%) respondents were White, 22 (7.5%) Black, three respondents (1.0%) were Asian, three (1.0%) Multi-racial and one (.3 %) Hispanic. Respondents noted educational levels from Bachelor to other advanced degrees with 118 (40.0%) having bachelor degrees, 130 (44.1%) having master degrees, 20 (6.8%) having doctoral degrees and 25 (8.5%) denoting other advanced degrees. Two teachers did not answer the question. In reviewing the number of doctoral degrees and speaking to the Certification Clerk in Barker County, the researcher believes the respondents may have misunderstood the way to answer the question regarding doctoral degrees and other advanced degrees. The numbers seem to reflect a mixture of respondents for Educational specialist degrees in the categories of doctoral degrees and other advanced degrees according to the Certification Clerk in Barker County. Years of teaching experience ranged from less than one of teaching to having more than seven of experience, with the majority having seven or more years in education. More specifically, there were eight (2.7%) teachers with less than one year in the field of education, 42 (14.2%) teachers with 1-3 years in education, 48 (16.3%) teachers with 4-6 years experience and 197 (66.8%) teachers with seven or more years in education. Years of teaching experiences at present school ranged from less than one year to having more than seven years in the present school, with the majority having seven or more years in the present school. More specifically, there were 50 (16.9%) teachers who had worked less than one year in their present school, 68 (23.1%) teachers with 1-3 years in their present school, 54 (18.3%) teachers with 4-6 years in their present school and 123 (41.7%) teachers who had worked

seven or more years in their present school. There were 88 (29.8%) teachers currently assigned specific leadership roles within the school, 204 (69.2%) who were not assigned leadership roles and 3 teachers who did not answer the question. Out of the 295 total respondents, 45 (15.3%) believed that other educators see them as a leader to a great extent, 130 (44.1%) teachers perceived others believed they were leaders to a moderate extent, and 120 (40.7%) believed others considered them leaders to a minimal extent.

Overall, Barker County teachers are white, female, have either a Masters (44.1%) or Bachelors Degree (40.0%), have been working in their present school for seven or more years and are not assigned school leadership roles but are viewed by others as leaders.

Summary of Participants

The majority of the respondents in this study were elementary teachers, white, female, had a Master's degree and had seven or more years in education and in their present school. They did not have an assigned leadership role but were thought of as a leader to moderate extent. At the middle school level, most of the participants had Bachelor degrees instead of Masters Degrees but were consistent with the other responses. At the high school level, participants differed by having the majority of participants being thought of as a leaders to a minimal extent. Overall, participants in Barker County are white, female and have either a Master or Bachelor degree, have been working at their present school and in education for seven or more years in education; are not assigned school leadership roles but are viewed by others as leaders.

Findings

Participants completed the Distributed Leadership Readiness Scale (DLRS), developed by the Connecticut Department of Education, to assess teachers' engagement in and readiness in distributed leadership practices. The DLRS is a 40 item survey which aligns with Elmore's five dimensions of distributed leadership but was modified by Gordon to include four dimensions: mission vision and goals; school culture; leadership practices; and shared responsibility. Responses to the items on the DLRS were on a 5-point Likert scale with responses ranging from 1=Continually, 2=Frequently, 3=Sometimes, 4=Rarely/Never to 5=Insufficient Information. Five scores were determined for each participant within each dimension.

Research Question 1

To what extent are teachers engaged in distributed leadership practices within the four dimensions of the distributed leadership model in Barker County?

Dimension 1: Mission, Vision and Goal

Eight DLRS survey items measure teachers' engagement in the mission, vision and goal dimension: 1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7; and 8 (see Table 4.1). Teachers state they are highly engaged in six of the eight areas (Items 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, and 8) that constitute the mission, vision and goals dimension (1.71, 1.63, 1.67, 1.54, 1.94, and 1.21). Teachers are concerned parents or students are not able to describe the school's mission (Item 3 and 4). Teachers believe teachers and administrators collectively establish school goals (Item 7). Overall, teachers appear to be highly engaged in distributed leadership's mission, vision and goals dimensions as denoted by the overall mission, vision and goals dimension mean (2.04).

Table 4.1

Barker County Teachers' Level of Engagement in DLRS Mission, Vision and Goals Dimension

Dimension/ Item	Cont. (1)	Frequ. (2)	Some. (3)	Rarely (4)	Insuff. (5)	Mean	S.D.
1. The school has clearly written vision and mission statements.	249 (84.4%)	30 (10.2%)	5 (1.7%)	6 (2.0%)	2 (0.7%)	1.71	0.645
2. Teachers and administrators understand and support a common mission for the school and can describe it clearly.	155 (52.5%)	99 (33.6%)	36 (12.2%)	5 (1.7%)	0 (0%)	1.63	0.762
3. If parents are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission clearly.	18 (6.1%)	28 (9.5%)	127 (43.1%)	104 (35.3%)	18 (6.1%)	3.26	0.934
4. If students are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission generally.	15 (5.1%)	32 (10.8%)	89 (30.2%)	146 (49.5%)	12 (4.1%)	3.37	0.917
5. School goals are aligned with its mission statement.	155 (52.5%)	103 (34.9%)	24 (8.1%)	6 (2.0%)	7 (2.4%)	1.67	0.891
6. The school uses a school improvement plan as a basis to evaluate the progress it is making in attaining its goals.	163 (55.3%)	115 (39.0%)	12 (4.1%)	1 (0.3%)	4 (1.4%)	1.54	0.718
7. Teachers and administrators collectively establish school goals and revise goals annually.	115 (39.0%)	112 (38.0%)	48 (16.3%)	11 (3.7%)	9 (3.1%)	1.94	0.988
8. The school's curriculum is aligned with the state's academic standards.	244 (82.7%)	48 (16.3%)	8 (2.7%)	1 (0.3%)	0 (0%)	1.21	0.489
Mission, vision and goals (overall mean)						2.04	

Dimension 2: School Culture

Within the dimension of school culture, 13 items addressed teachers' engagement within school culture: 13; 14; 15; 16; 23; 24; 26; 27; 28; 29; 30; 32; and 33 (see Table 4.2). Teachers did not believe there is a high level of mutual trust and respect among teachers and other professional staff, as shown by 32.2% of the teachers answering sometimes or rarely (Item 13) or among teachers and administrators, as shown by 38.1% of the teachers answering sometimes and rarely (Item 14). Principals actively encouraged teachers and other staff members to participate in instructional decision making (Item 23), and teachers actively participate in instructional decision-making (Item 30). Overall, teachers reported engaging moderately in the dimension of school culture, as shown by a mean of 2.21.

Table 4.2

Barker County Teachers' Level of Engagement in DLRS School Culture Dimension

Dimension/ Item	Cont. (1)	Frequ. (2)	Some. (3)	Rarely (4)	Insuff. (5)	Mean	S.D.
13. There is a high level of mutual respect and trust among the teachers and other professional staff in the school.	75 (25.4%)	123 (41.7%)	84 (28.5%)	11 (3.7%)	1 (0.3%)	2.12	0.843
14. There is mutual respect and trust between the school administration and the professional staff.	72 (24.4%)	108 (36.6%)	99 (33.6%)	15 (5.1%)	1 (0.3%)	2.20	0.880
15. The school administrator(s) welcome professional staff members input on issues related to curriculum, instruction, and improving student performance.	78 (26.4%)	119 (40.3%)	80 (27.1%)	17 (5.8%)	1 (0.3%)	2.13	0.884
16. The school supports using new instructional ideas and innovations.	99 (33.6%)	132 (44.7%)	50 (16.9%)	11 (3.7%)	3 (1.0%)	1.94	0.863
23. The principal actively encourages teachers and other staff members to participate in instructional decision-making.	65 (22.0%)	112 (38.0%)	81 (27.5%)	32 (10.8%)	5 (1.7%)	2.32	0.990
24. Professional staff members in the school have the responsibility to make decisions that affect meeting school goals.	60 (20.3%)	104 (35.3%)	111 (37.6%)	18 (6.1%)	2 (0.7%)	2.32	0.888
26. Administrators participate along side teachers in the school's professional development activities.	88 (29.8 %)	120 (40.7%)	68 (23.1%)	12 (4.1%)	7 (2.4%)	2.08	1.543

27. The principal actively participates in his/her own professional development activities to improve leadership in the school.	115 (39.0%)	100 (33.9%)	52 (17.6 %)	12 (4.1 %)	16 (5.4%)	2.03	1.105
28. My supervisor and I jointly develop my annual professional development plan.	71 (24.1%)	75 (25.4%)	65 (22.0%)	54 (18.3%)	27 (9.2%)	2.63	1.285
29. My professional development plan includes activities that are based on my individual professional needs and school needs.	60 (20.3%)	94 (31.9%)	64 (21.7%)	39 (13.2%)	33 (11.2%)	2.62	1.267
30. Teachers actively participate in instructional decision-making.	62 (21.0%)	107 (36.3%)	89 (30.2%)	32 (10.8%)	5 (1.7 %)	2.36	0.986
32. The principal is knowledgeable about current instructional issues.	125 (42.4%)	106 (35.9%)	62 (21.0%)	18 (6.1%)	5 (1.7%)	1.88	0.925
33. My principal's practices are consistent with his/her words.	103 (34.9%)	106 (35.9%)	62 (21.0%)	18 (6.1%)	5 (1.7%)	2.03	0.980
School culture (overall mean)						2.21	

Dimension 3: Leadership Practices

Nine DRLS survey items measure teachers' engagement within leadership practices: 25; 31; 34; 25; 36; 37; 38; 39; and 40 (see Table 4.3). Teachers viewed central office and administration working together (Item 31), and informal leaders were believed to play an important role in the school (Item 34).Teachers do not believe they have sufficient time or resources to make contributions to the school (Item 36 and 37). Veteran teachers were believed to be in leadership roles (Item 38), without a high number of roles being provided to new teachers, as shown by 51.2% of the teachers answering sometimes and rarely (Item 39). Teachers are believed to be slightly interested in leadership roles, as shown by 58.0% of the teachers rating sometimes and rarely (Item 40). Overall, teachers were engaged within leadership practices but less than within the other dimensions, as denoted by a grand mean of 2.56.

Table 4.3

Barker County Teachers' Level of Engagement in DLRS Leadership Practices Dimension

Dimension/ Item	Cont. (1)	Frequ. (2)	Some. (3)	Rarely (4)	Insuff. (5)	Mean	S.D.
25. The school provides teachers with professional development aligned with the school's mission and goals.	69 (23.4%)	126 (42.7 %)	86 (29.2%)	9 (3.1%)	4 (1.4%)	2.16	0.866
31. Central office and school administrator's work together to determine the professional development activities.	65 (22.0%)	88 (29.8%)	91 (30.8%)	21 (7.1%)	30 (10.2%)	2.54	1.203
34. Informal school leaders play an important role in the school in improving the performance of professionals and the achievement of students.	62 (21.0%)	130 (44.1%)	76 (25.8%)	15 (5.1%)	11 (3.7%)	2.26	0.972
35. The school has expanded its capacity by providing professional staff formal opportunities to take on leadership roles.	17 (15.0%)	99 (33.6%)	104 (35.3%)	25 (8.5%)	20 (6.8%)	2.57	1.070
36. Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient school time to permit them to make meaningful contributions to the school.	26 (8.8%)	73 (24.7%)	118 (40.0%)	62 (21.0%)	15 (5.1%)	2.89	1.004
37. Teachers who assume leadership roles have sufficient resources to be able to make meaningful contributions to the school.	28 (9.5%)	90 (30.5%)	126 (42.7%)	34 (11.5%)	17 (5.8%)	2.74	0.982
38. Veteran teachers fill most leadership roles in the school.	47 (15.9%)	124 (42.0%)	82 (27.8%)	30 (10.2%)	10 (3.4%)	2.43	0.989

39. New teachers are provided opportunities to fill some school leadership roles.	28 (9.5%)	95 (32.2%)	120 (40.7%)	31 (10.5%)	21 (7.1%)	2.74	1.012
40. Teachers are interested in participating in school leadership roles.	19 (6.4%)	95 (32.2%)	146 (49.5%)	25 (8.5%)	8 (2.7%)	2.69	0.826
Leadership practices (Overall mean)						2.56	

Dimension 4: Shared Responsibility

There were 10 items which addressed teachers' engagement within shared responsibility: 9; 10; 11; 12; 17; 18; 19; 20; 21; and 22 (see Table 4.4). Teachers and administrators shared accountability for students' performance (item 10), and teachers believe that the school is a learning community (Item 12). Teachers did not have enough time in their schedule to collaborate (Item 17). Teachers also viewed a disconnection between school professionals and parents on the most effective role parents play in their child's education (Item 18). The dimension of shared responsibility was engaged in the most after mission, vision and goals, as shown by a mean of 2.16.

Table 4.4

Barker County Teachers' Level of Engagement in DLRS Shared Responsibility Dimension

Dimension/ Item	Cont. (1)	Frequ. (2)	Some. (3)	Rarely (4)	Insuff. (5)	Mean	S.D.
9. Teachers and administrators have high expectations for students' academic performance.	199 (67.5%)	78 (26.4%)	17 (5.8%)	1 (0.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1.39	0.612
10. Teachers and administrators share accountability for students' academic performance.	122 (41.4%)	113 (38.3%)	52 (17.6%)	3 (1.0%)	4 (1.4%)	1.82	0.852
11. School and district resources are directed to those areas in which student learning needs to improve most.	66 (22.4%)	121 (41.0%)	81 (27.5%)	15 (5.1%)	10 (3.4%)	2.26	0.975
12. The school is a learning community that continually improves its effectiveness, learning from both successes and failures.	96 (32.5%)	128 (43.4%)	63 (21.4%)	5 (1.7%)	3 (1.0%)	1.95	0.836
17. The school's daily and weekly schedules provide time for teachers to collaborate on instructional issues.	42 (14.2%)	78 (26.4%)	102 (34.6%)	73 (24.7%)	0 (0.0%)	2.70	0.997
18. School professionals and parents agree on the most effective roles parents can play as partners in their child's education.	28 (9.5%)	74 (25.1%)	135 (45.8%)	49 (16.6%)	9 (3.1%)	2.79	0.936

19. The school clearly communicates the 'chain of contact' between home and school so parents know who to contact when they have questions and concerns.	79 (26.8%)	131 (44.4%)	72 (24.4%)	11 (3.7%)	2 (0.7%)	2.07	0.848
20. The school makes available a variety of data (e.g. student performance) for teachers to use to improve student achievement.	95 (32.2%)	144 (48.8%)	43 (14.6%)	10 (3.4%)	3 (1.0%)	1.92	0.831
21. Decisions to change curriculum and instructional programs are based on assessment data.	61 (20.7%0	120 (40.7%)	88 (29.8%)	16 (5.4%)	10 (3.4%)	2.30	0.969
22. There is a formal structure in place in the school (e.g. curriculum committee) to provide teachers and professional staff opportunities to participate in school-level instructional decision-making.	57 (19.3%)	120 (40.7%)	79 (26.8%)	11 (3.7%)	1 (0.3%)	2.38	1.189
Shared responsibility (overall mean)						2.16	

Summary Based on Findings for Research Question 1

The DLRS dimension of mission, vision and goals is the dimension that the teachers are most engaged in. Teachers in Barker County believe that their school's mission and vision is well established. The teachers support and understand their mission and can describe the mission when asked. The teachers, however, do not believe parents or students would be able to state the school's mission.

Within the dimension of school culture, teachers believe teachers, administrators and other professional staff do not have a high level of mutual trust and respect for each group. Teachers note that the principal actively encourages teachers and others to participate in instructional decision making, and the teachers make decisions that affect meeting school goals.

Teachers are least engaged in the dimension of leadership practices. Teachers see central office and school administrators working together to determine what professional activities they are to receive. Teachers do state they did not have enough time or sufficient resources to make meaningful contributions to the school. Veteran teachers fill most of the leadership roles within the school. Beginning teachers' have sporadic opportunities for leadership. Overall, teachers in Barker County are believed to be only slightly interested in participating in leadership roles within the school.

Teachers in Barker County are engaged in shared responsibility. Teachers strongly believe their school is a learning community, and teachers and administrators share accountability for students' performance. Teachers believe they do not have enough time in their schedules for collaborating with other teachers though. Teachers did not believe that they would agree with parents on the role that parents play in their child's

education. Overall, teachers in Barker County were highly engaged in the dimensions: mission, vision and goals and shared responsibility and were somewhat engaged in these dimensions: school culture and leadership practices.

Research Question 2

To what extent do elementary, middle, and high school teachers differ in their engagement within the four dimensions of distributed leadership practices in Barker County?

Two different tests were completed to answer the research question. An ANOVA was used to determine if there any significant differences existed between elementary; middle and high school teachers by DLRS dimension. T-tests were used to determine if there were differences between school level and dimensions.

Differences between Elementary, Middle School and High School Teachers by DLRS Dimension

An ANOVA (see Table 4.5) was used to determine if there were any significant differences ($p<.05$) by dimension: mission, vision, and goals; school culture; leadership practices; and shared responsibility, by school level: elementary, middle and high. Significant differences were found for three dimensions: school culture, leadership practices; and shared responsibility between all 3 levels: elementary, middle and high.

A post-hoc Tukey test found significant differences between (1) elementary and middle school teachers and high school and elementary school teachers within school culture dimension, (2) elementary and middle teachers and high school teachers and elementary school teachers within the leadership practices dimension, and (3) within the dimension of shared responsibility, significant differences were found between and

within all school levels: elementary and middle school teachers; middle and high school teachers; and elementary and high school teachers.

Table 4.5

DLRS Dimension Differences by School Level

		Sum of squares	Df	Mean Square	F	P
Mission, Vision and Goals	Between Groups	55.240	2	27.620		
	Within Groups	2784.018	288	9.667	2.857	0.059
	Total	2839.258	290			
School culture	Between Groups	1399.776	2	699.888		
	Within Groups	16388.099	285	57.502	12.172	0.000*
	Total	17787.875	287			
Leadership Practices	Between Groups	382.492	2	191.246		
	Within Groups	9370.622	286	32.764	5.837	0.003*
	Total	9753.114	288			
Shared responsibility	Between Groups	1061.539	2	530.770		
	Within Groups	7560.378	289	26.160	20.289	0.000*
	Total	8621.918	291			

*p<.05

The following data were analyzed by conducting t-test. Three t-test were conducted by school level and the results are shown by dimension. There are details pertaining to significance under each individual dimension.

Differences between Elementary, Middle School and High School Teachers and DLRS Dimension Items

Elementary and middle school teachers had significant differences ($p<.05$) in three of the four dimensions. Elementary and high school teachers had significant differences ($p<.05$) in four of the four dimensions Middle school and high school teachers differed in three of the four dimensions. T-tests were then completed for those groups with significant differences ($p<.05$) to determine how these groups differed by DLRS dimension items.

T-test findings discussed in this section constitute significant differences ($p<.05$) found between elementary, middle school and high school teachers by DLRS dimension items. T-tests that results in no significant differences ($p<.05$) by DLRS dimension items are reported in Appendix C.

Elementary versus Middle School

Dimension 1: Mission, Vision and Goals

Significant differences ($p<.05$) were found between elementary school and middle school teachers on four of the eight dimension items. The four items (see Table 4.6) are: 5; 6; 7 and 8. Elementary teachers' more than middle school teachers believed that school goals are aligned with its mission (Item 5). Elementary teachers believed they collectively establish goals with their administrators more than middle school teachers (Item 7).

Table 4.6

Differences between Elementary and Middle School on DLRS Dimension Mission, Vision and Goals Items

Item		Mean	SD	t	P
1. The school has clearly written vision and mission statements.	Elementary	1.18	0.540	-2.3116	0.052
	Middle	1.40	0.831		
2. Teachers and administrators understand and support a common mission for the school and can describe it clearly.	Elementary	1.60	0.724	-1.016	0.311
	Middle	1.71	0.750		
3. If parents are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission clearly.	Elementary	3.12	0.979	-1.006	0.316
	Middle	3.26	0.902		
4. If students are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission generally.	Elementary	3.43	0.905	1.597	0.112
	Middle	3.22	0.983		
5. School goals are aligned with its mission statement.	Elementary	1.57	0.828	-2.156	0.032*
	Middle	1.84	0.949		
6. The school uses a school improvement plan as a basis to evaluate the progress it is making in attaining its goals.	Elementary	1.45	0.684	-2.356	0.019*
	Middle	1.70	0.810		
7. Teachers and administrators collectively establish school goals and revise goals annually.	Elementary	1.76	0.895	-2.658	0.008*
	Middle	2.13	1.083		
8. The school's curriculum is aligned with the state's academic standards.	Elementary	1.15	0.422	-2.109	0.037*
	Middle	1.30	0.551		

*p <.05

Dimension 2: School Culture

Significant differences ($p<.05$) were found between elementary school and middle school teachers on seven of the 13 dimension items. The seven items (see Table 4.7) are: 15; 16; 23; 26; 27; 30; and 33. Elementary principals are viewed as more encouraging of participating of teachers and other staff in instructional decision making than middle school principals (Item 23). Teachers at the elementary level are believed to participate in instructional decision making more than middle school teachers (Item 30).

Table 4.7

Differences between Elementary and Middle School on DLRS Dimension School Culture Items

Item		Mean	SD	t	P
13. There is a high level of mutual respect and trust among the teachers and other professional staff in the school.	Elementary	1.96	0.821	-1.722	0.087
	Middle	2.17	0.923		
14. There is mutual respect and trust between the school administration and the professional staff.	Elementary	2.08	0.869	-1.320	0.188
	Middle	2.25	0.930		
15. The school administrator(s) welcome professional staff members input on issues related to curriculum, instruction, and improving student performance.	Elementary	1.97	0.842	-2.771	0.006*
	Middle	2.32	0.899		
16. The school supports using new instructional ideas and innovations.	Elementary	1.76	0.757	-3.054	0.003*
	Middle	2.12	0.932		
23. The principal actively encourages teachers and other staff members to participate in instructional decision-making.	Elementary	2.06	0.859	-4.099	0.000*
	Middle	2.67	1.094		
24. Professional staff members in the school have the responsibility to make decisions that affect meeting school goals.	Elementary	1.97	0.884	-1.220	0.224
	Middle	2.32	0.880		
26. Administrators participate along side teachers in the school's professional development activities.	Elementary	1.79	0.817	-4.052	0.000*
	Middle	2.36	1.029		
27. The principal actively participates in his/her own professional development activities to improve leadership in the school.	Elementary	1.70	0.868	-3.653	0.000*
	Middle	2.29	1.214		
28. My supervisor and I jointly develop my annual professional development plan.	Elementary	2.65	1.318	-1.297	0.196
	Middle	2.90	1.327		

29. My professional development plan includes activities that are based on my individual professional needs and school needs.	Elementary Middle	2.60 2.87	1.296 1.325	-.405	0.161
30. Teachers actively participate in instructional decision-making.	Elementary Middle	2.19 2.52	0.910 0.933	- 2.485	0.014*
32. The principal is knowledgeable about current instructional issues.	Elementary Middle	1.69 1.84	0.839 0.949	- 1.173	0.242
33. My principal's practices are consistent with his/her words.	Elementary Middle	1.85 2.17	0.888 1.057	- 2.249	0.026*

*p <.05

Dimension 3: Leadership Practices

Significant differences ($p<.05$) were found between elementary school and middle school teachers on five of the nine dimension items. The five items (see Table 4.8) are: 25; 31; 35; 37; and 40. Central office and school administrators are viewed as working together more by elementary teachers than middle school teachers (Item 31). Elementary teachers believe they have been given more opportunities for leadership roles; while middle school teachers believe they have been provided fewer opportunities for leadership (Item 35). Elementary teachers believe they have more resources, than middle school teachers (Item 37). Elementary teachers believe they are more interested in leadership roles than middle school teachers (Item 40).

Table 4.8

Differences between Elementary and Middle School on DLRS Dimension Leadership Practices Items

Item		Mean	SD	t	P
25. The school provides teachers with professional development aligned with the school's mission and goals.	Elementary	2.02	0.810	-2.119	0.035 *
	Middle	2.28	0.889		
31. Central office and school administrator's work together to determine the professional development activities.	Elementary	2.35	1.196	-2.548	0.012 *
	Middle	2.80	1.232		
34. Informal school leaders play an important role in the school in improving the performance of professionals and the achievement of students.	Elementary	2.14	0.947	-1.404	0.162
	Middle	2.33	0.950		
35. The school has expanded its capacity by providing professional staff formal opportunities to take on leadership roles.	Elementary	2.42	1.078	-2.051	0.041 *
	Middle	2.74	1.038		
36. Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient school time to permit them to make meaningful contributions to the school.	Elementary	2.81	1.036	-1.676	0.095
	Middle	3.06	1.020		
37. Teachers who assume leadership roles have sufficient resources to be able to make meaningful contributions to the school.	Elementary	2.58	0.902	-2.907	0.004 *
	Middle	2.97	1.014		
38. Veteran teachers fill most leadership roles in the school.	Elementary	2.46	1.005	-0.213	0.832
	Middle	2.49	0.906		
39. New teachers are provided opportunities to fill some school leadership roles.	Elementary	2.72	1.008	-0.728	0.467
	Middle	2.83	1.070		
40. Teachers are interested in participating in school leadership roles.	Elementary	2.49	0.783	-2.728	0.007 *
	Middle	2.81	0.839		

*p <.05

Dimension 4: Shared Responsibility

Significant differences ($p<.05$) were found between elementary school and middle school teachers on five of the ten dimension items. The five items (see Table 4.9) are: 9; 11; 12; 19; and 22. Elementary teachers' more than middle school teachers believe that their school is a learning community (Item 12). Elementary teachers believe they have established a clear chain of communication between home and school, while middle school teachers do not (Item 19). Elementary teachers believe they have more of a formal structure in place to participate in instructional decision making than middle school teachers (Item 22).

Table 4.9

Differences between Elementary and Middle School on DLRS Dimension Shared Responsibility Items

Question		Mean	SD	t	P
9. Teachers and administrators have high expectations for students' academic performance.	Elementary Middle	1.28 1.45	0.462 0.530	-2.355	0.020*
10. Teachers and administrators share accountability for students' academic performance.	Elementary Middle	1.66 1.87	0.808 0.873	-1.710	0.089
11. School and district resources are directed to those areas in which student learning needs to improve most.	Elementary Middle	2.07 2.35	0.944 0.997	-1.987	0.048*
12. The school is a learning community that continually improves its effectiveness, learning from both successes and failures.	Elementary Middle	1.72 2.04	0.717 0.812	-3.014	0.003*
17. The school's daily and weekly schedules provide time for teachers to collaborate on instructional issues.	Elementary Middle	2.53 2.48	0.980 0.979	0.334	0.738
18. School professionals and parents agree on the most effective roles parents can play as partners in their child's education.	Elementary Middle	2.66 2.71	0.940 0.824	-0.381	0.704
19. The school clearly communicates the 'chain of contact' between home and school so parents know who to contact when they have questions and concerns.	Elementary Middle	1.97 2.29	0.774 0.956	-2.462	0.015*
20. The school makes available a variety of data (e.g. student performance) for teachers to use to improve student achievement.	Elementary Middle	1.76 1.87	0.701 0.821	-0.998	0.319
21. Decisions to change curriculum and instructional programs are based on assessment data.	Elementary Middle	2.17 2.32	0.917 1.007	-1.066	0.287
22. There is a formal structure in place in the school (e.g. curriculum committee) to provide teachers and professional staff opportunities to participate in school-level instructional decision-making.	Elementary Middle	2.17 2.65	0.915 1.122	-3.159	0.002*

*p<.05

Middle versus High School

Dimension 1: Mission, Vision and Goals

Significant differences ($p<.05$) were found between middle school and high school teachers on one of the eight dimension items. The item (see Table 4.10) is: 3. Middle school teachers believed that parents of their students would be able to describe the mission more often than high school teachers believed that parents of high school students would (Item 3).

Table 4.10

Differences between Middle and High School on DLRS Dimension Mission, Vision and Goals Items

Item		Mean	SD	t	P
1. The school has clearly written vision and mission statements.	Middle	1.40	0.831	1.881	0.062
	High	1.16	0.633		
2. Teachers and administrators understand and support a common mission for the school and can describe it clearly.	Middle	1.71	0.750	0.702	0.484
	High	1.61	0.856		
3. If parents are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission clearly.	Middle	3.26	0.902	-2.059	0.041*
	High	3.56	0.792		
4. If students are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission generally.	Middle	3.22	0.983	-0.978	0.330
	High	3.37	0.871		
5. School goals are aligned with its mission statement.	Middle	1.84	0.949	0.784	0.434
	High	1.71	0.950		
6. The school uses a school improvement plan as a basis to evaluate the progress it is making in attaining its goals.	Middle	1.70	0.810	0.985	0.326
	High	1.57	0.672		
7. Teachers and administrators collectively establish school goals and revise goals annually.	Middle	2.13	1.083	-0.069	0.945
	High	2.14	1.026		
8. The school's curriculum is aligned with the state's academic standards.	Middle	1.30	0.551	0.659	0.511
	High	1.24	0.550		

*p<.05

Dimension 2: School Culture

Significant differences (p<.05) were found between middle school and high school teachers on three of the 13 dimension items. The three items (see Table 4.11) are: 28; 29; and 32. High school teachers believed their professional development plan was

based on individual needs as opposed to middle school teachers (Item 29). Middle school teachers believed their principal was knowledgeable about current instructional issues, as opposed to the beliefs of high school teachers regarding their principal (Item 32). Middle and high school teachers differed slightly in the dimension of school culture.

Table 4.11

Differences between Middle and High School on DLRS Dimension School Culture Items

Item		Mean	SD	t	P
13. There is a high level of mutual respect and trust among the teachers and other professional staff in the school.	Middle High	2.17 2.40	0.923 0.730	-1.603	0.111
14. There is mutual respect and trust between the school administration and the professional staff.	Middle High	2.25 2.44	0.930 0.810	-1.329	0.186
15. The school administrator(s) welcome professional staff members input on issues related to curriculum, instruction, and improving student performance.	Middle High	2.32 2.30	0.899 0.906	0.123	0.902
16. The school supports using new instructional ideas and innovations.	Middle High	2.12 2.17	0.932 0.932	-0.351	0.726
23. The principal actively encourages teachers and other staff members to participate in instructional decision-making.	Middle High	2.67 2.57	1.094 1.001	0.536	0.593
24. Professional staff members in the school have the responsibility to make decisions that affect meeting school goals.	Middle High	2.41 2.37	0.880 0.904	0.227	0.821
26. Administrators participate along side teachers in the school's professional development activities.	Middle High	2.36 2.46	1.029 0.943	-0.567	0.572
27. The principal actively participates in his/her own professional development activities to improve leadership in the school.	Middle High	2.29 2.51	1.214 1.225	-1.085	0.280

28. My supervisor and I jointly develop my annual professional development plan.	Middle High	2.90 2.33	1.327 1.113	2.703	0.008*
29. My professional development plan includes activities that are based on my individual professional needs and school needs.	Middle High	2.87 2.45	1.325 1.119	1.983	0.049*
30. Teachers actively participate in instructional decision-making.	Middle High	2.52 2.57	0.933 1.137	-2.810	0.779
32. The principal is knowledgeable about current instructional issues.	Middle High	1.84 2.33	0.949 0.944	-3.040	0.003*
33. My principal's practices are consistent with his/her words.	Middle High	2.17 2.32	1.057 1.022	-0.819	0.414

*p <.05

Dimension 3: Leadership Practices

There were no significant differences found between middle and high school teachers within leadership practices (see Appendix C).

Dimension 4: Shared Responsibility

Significant differences (p<.05) were found between middle school and high school teachers on three of the ten dimension items. The three items (see Table 4.12) are: 12; 17; and 20. While middle school teachers did not believe they had time to collaborate, they believed they had more time to collaborate than high school teachers (Item 17). Middle and high school teachers differed slightly in the dimension of shared responsibility with middle school engaging more than high school within shared responsibility.

Table 4.12

Differences between Middle and High School on DLRS Dimension Shared Responsibility Items

Item		Mean	SD	t	P
9. Teachers and administrators have high expectations for students' academic performance.	Middle	1.45	0.530	-1.109	0.269
	High	1.59	0.876		
10. Teachers and administrators share accountability for students' academic performance.	Middle	1.87	0.873	-1.772	0.079
	High	2.13	0.850		
11. School and district resources are directed to those areas in which student learning needs to improve most.	Middle	2.35	0.997	-1.359	0.176
	High	2.57	0.941		
12. The school is a learning community that continually improves its effectiveness, learning from both successes and failures.	Middle	2.04	0.812	-2.324	0.022*
	High	2.39	0.921		
17. The school's daily and weekly schedules provide time for teachers to collaborate on instructional issues.	Middle	2.48	0.979	-5.400	0.000*
	High	3.30	0.805		
18. School professionals and parents agree on the most effective roles parents can play as partners in their child's education.	Middle	2.71	0.824	-2.863	0.055
	High	3.14	0.952		
19. The school clearly communicates the 'chain of contact' between home and school so parents know who to contact when they have questions and concerns.	Middle	2.29	0.956	1.321	0.189
	High	2.09	0.864		
20. The school makes available a variety of data (e.g. student performance) for teachers to use to improve student achievement.	Middle	1.87	0.821	-3.006	0.003*
	High	2.33	0.974		
21. Decisions to change curriculum and instructional programs are based on assessment data.	Middle	2.32	1.007	-1.483	0.140
	High	2.57	1.001		
22. There is a formal structure in place in the school (e.g. curriculum committee) to provide teachers and professional staff opportunities to participate in school-level instructional decision-making.	Middle	2.65	1.122	0.439	0.661
	High	2.57	1.044		

*p <.05

Elementary versus High School

Dimension 1: Mission, Vision and Goals

Significant differences ($p<.05$) were found between elementary school and high school teachers on two of the eight dimension items. The two items (see Table 4.13) are: 3 and 7. The researcher found that elementary parents were believed to be able to describe the school's mission more often than high school parents (Item 3). Elementary school teachers more often than high school teachers believed teachers and administrators collectively establish goals (Item 7).

Table 4.13

Differences between Elementary and High School on DLRS Dimension Mission, Vision and Goals Items

Item		Mean	SD	t	P
1. The school has clearly written vision and mission statements.	Elementary High	1.18 1.16	0.540 0.633	0.257	0.797
2. Teachers and administrators understand and support a common mission for the school and can describe it clearly.	Elementary High	1.60 1.61	0.724 0.856	-0.106	0.916
3. If parents are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission clearly.	Elementary High	3.12 3.56	0.979 0.792	-3.269	0.001*
4. If students are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission generally.	Elementary High	3.12 3.56	0.905 0.871	0.472	0.637
5. School goals are aligned with its mission statement.	Elementary High	1.57 1.71	0.828 0.950	-1.152	0.250
6. The school uses a school improvement plan as a basis to evaluate the progress it is making in attaining its goals.	Elementary High	1.46 1.57	0.684 0.672	-1.253	0.211
7. Teachers and administrators collectively establish school goals and revise goals annually.	Elementary High	1.76 2.14	0.895 1.026	-2.818	0.005*
8. The school's curriculum is aligned with the state's academic standards.	Elementary High	1.15 1.24	0.422 0.550	-1.291	0.199

*p <.05

Dimension 2: School Culture

Significant differences ($p<.05$) were found between elementary school and high school teachers on 11 of the 13 dimension items. The 11 items (see Table 4.14) are: 13; 14; 15; 16; 23; 26; 27; 29; 30; 32; and 33. At the elementary level, there is a higher level of trust and respect observed among teachers, administrators and other professional staff, than at the high school level (Item 13 and 14). Elementary schools are believed to support using new ideas more than the high school (Item16). The teachers believed they are encouraged to participate in decision making more at the elementary level than teachers at the high school level (Item 23). Elementary teachers believe that they participate in instructional decision making more than high school teachers (Item 30). Elementary teachers differed significantly from high school teachers in school culture.

Table 4.14

Differences between Elementary and High School on DLRS Dimension School Culture Items

Item		Mean	SD	t	P
13. There is a high level of mutual respect and trust among the teachers and other professional staff in the school.	Elementary	1.96	0.821	-3.837	0.000*
	High	2.40	0.730		
14. There is mutual respect and trust between the school administration and the professional staff.	Elementary	2.08	0.869	-2.988	0.003*
	High	2.44	0.810		
15. The school administrator(s) welcome professional staff members input on issues related to curriculum, instruction, and improving student performance.	Elementary	1.97	0.842	-2.625	0.009*
	High	2.30	0.906		
16. The school supports using new instructional ideas and innovations.	Elementary	1.76	0.757	-3.541	0.000*
	High	2.17	0.932		
23. The principal actively encourages teachers and other staff members to participate in instructional decision-making.	Elementary	2.06	0.859	-3.722	0.000*
	High	2.57	1.001		
24. Professional staff members in the school have the responsibility to make decisions that affect meeting school goals.	Elementary	2.25	0.884	-0.948	0.344
	High	2.37	0.904		
26. Administrators participate along side teachers in the school's professional development activities.	Elementary	1.79	0.817	-5.367	0.000*
	High	2.46	0.943		
27. The principal actively participates in his/her own professional development activities to improve leadership in the school.	Elementary	1.70	0.868	-5.033	0.000*
	High	2.51	1.225		
28. My supervisor and I jointly develop my annual professional development plan.	Elementary	2.65	1.318	1.862	0.064
	High	2.33	1.113		

29. My professional development plan includes activities that are based on my individual professional needs and school needs.	Elementary High	2.60 2.45	1.296 1.119	0.869	0.386
30. Teachers actively participate in instructional decision-making.	Elementary High	2.19 2.57	0.910 1.137	- 2.460	0.015*
32. The principal is knowledgeable about current instructional issues.	Elementary High	1.69 2.33	0.839 0.944	- 5.067	0.000*
33. My principal's practices are consistent with his/her words	Elementary High	1.85 2.32	0.888 1.022	- 3.327	0.001*

*p <.05

Dimension 3: Leadership Practices

Significant differences ($p<.05$) were found between elementary school and high school teachers on five of the nine dimension items. The five items (see Table 4.15) are: 25; 31; 34; 37; and 40. Elementary teachers participate in the dimension of leadership practices more than high school teachers. Elementary school teachers believe informal leaders play a more important role than high school teachers (Item 34). Teachers at the elementary level are believed to be more interested in leadership roles (Item 40).

Table 4.15

Differences between Elementary and High School on DLRS Dimension Leadership Practices Items

Item		Mean	SD	t	P
25. The school provides teachers with professional development aligned with the school's mission and goals.	Elementary High	2.02 2.36	0.810 0.917	-2.650	0.009*
31. Central office and school administrator's work together to determine the professional development activities.	Elementary High	2.35 2.69	1.196 1.136	-2.005	0.047*
34. Informal school leaders play an important role in the school in improving the performance of professionals and the achievement of students.	Elementary High	2.14 2.46	0.947 1.023	-2.300	0.022*
35. The school has expanded its capacity by providing professional staff formal opportunities to take on leadership roles.	Elementary High	2.42 2.71	1.078 1.051	-1.892	0.060
36. Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient school time to permit them to make meaningful contributions to the school.	Elementary High	2.81 2.90	1.036 0.903	-0.678	0.499
37. Teachers who assume leadership roles have sufficient resources to be able to make meaningful contributions to the school.	Elementary High	2.58 2.86	0.902 1.067	-2.038	0.043*
38. Veteran teachers fill most leadership roles in the school.	Elementary High	2.46 2.30	1.005 1.033	1.028	0.305
39. New teachers are provided opportunities to fill some school leadership roles.	Elementary High	2.72 2.69	1.008 0.971	0.225	0.822
40. Teachers are interested in participating in school leadership roles.	Elementary High	2.49 3.01	0.783 0.789	-4.654	0.000*

*p <.05

Dimension 4: Shared Responsibility

Significant differences ($p<.05$) were found between elementary school and high school teachers on nine of the ten dimension items. The nine items (see Table 4.16) are: 9; 10; 11; 12; 17; 18; 20; 21; and 22. Elementary teachers believe their school is more of a learning community than high school teachers (Item 12). Elementary teachers believe they have more time to collaborate than high school teachers (Item17). Elementary teachers agree with parents more often than high school teachers do on the role parents play in their child's education (Item 18). Elementary teachers believe they have more of a formal structure in place to participate in instructional decision making than high school teachers (Item 22). Elementary and high school teachers differed significantly in shared responsibility.

Table 4.16

Differences between Elementary and High School on DLRS Dimension Shared Responsibility Items

Item		Mean	SD	t	P
9. Teachers and administrators have high expectations for students' academic performance.	Elementary	1.28	0.462	-3.476	0.001*
	High	1.59	0.876		
10. Teachers and administrators share accountability for students' academic performance.	Elementary	1.66	0.808	-3.924	0.000*
	High	2.13	0.850		
11. School and district resources are directed to those areas in which student learning needs to improve most.	Elementary	2.07	0.944	-3.679	0.000*
	High	2.57	0.941		
12. The school is a learning community that continually improves its effectiveness, learning from both successes and failures.	Elementary	1.72	0.717	-5.377	0.000*
	High	2.39	0.921		
17. The school's daily and weekly schedules provide time for teachers to collaborate on instructional issues.	Elementary	2.53	0.980	-6.237	0.000*
	High	3.30	0.805		
18. School professionals and parents agree on the most effective roles parents can play as partners in their child's education.	Elementary	2.66	0.940	-3.554	0.000*
	High	3.14	0.952		
19. The school clearly communicates the 'chain of contact' between home and school so parents know who to contact when they have questions and concerns.	Elementary	1.97	0.774	-1.020	0.309
	High	2.09	0.864		
20. The school makes available a variety of data (e.g. student performance) for teachers to use to improve student achievement.	Elementary	1.76	0.701	-4.378	0.000*
	High	2.33	0.974		
21. Decisions to change curriculum and instructional programs are based on assessment data.	Elementary	2.17	0.917	-2.934	0.004*
	High	2.57	1.001		
22. There is a formal structure in place in the school (e.g. curriculum committee) to provide teachers and professional staff opportunities to participate in school-level instructional decision-making.	Elementary	2.17	0.915	-2.942	0.004*
	High	2.57	1.044		

*p <.05

Summary Based on Findings for Research Question 2

Elementary teachers are more engaged in distributed leadership practices within all four dimensions than middle or high school teachers. Elementary and high school teachers differ significantly in school culture and shared responsibility. Middle school teachers engaged in distributed leadership practices within shared responsibility more than high school teachers; therefore high school teachers have the least engagement in distributed leadership practices.

Within the dimension of mission, vision and goals, elementary teachers collectively establish goals more than middle or high school teachers. Parents of elementary school students and middle school students would be more able to describe the school mission than parents of high school students.

Within the dimension of school culture, elementary teachers have engaged more in the distributed leadership practices. Elementary teachers engage in higher levels of mutual respect among themselves, administrators and other professional staff than high school teachers. Elementary and middle school teachers believe that their principal is knowledgeable about current instructional issues more often than high school teachers believe it about their principal. Elementary teachers more often than high school teachers believe their principal is more consistent with their word.

Within the dimension of leadership practices, middle and high school teachers did not differ in their engagement of distributed leadership practices. Elementary teachers believe more than high school teachers that informal leaders play an important role in the school. Teachers want to be leaders more often at the elementary level than at the middle or high school level.

Within the dimension of shared responsibility, elementary teachers believe that their schools are learning communities more often than middle school or high school teachers do. Elementary school teachers do a better job than middle school teachers of communicating between home and school. Elementary and middle school teachers agree more with parents on the role parents play in their child's education than high school teachers. High school teachers have less time in their schedules for collaborating than elementary or middle school teachers.

Research Question 3

To what extent do the teacher demographic characteristics, including gender; degree; participation as a formal or informal leader in the school; how others view teachers as leaders; years of teaching experience;, years of experience working at the school, vary in relation to distributed leadership practices in Barker County?

The researcher ran t-tests within the demographic categories of gender; degree (Bachelor vs. Master); total years in education, 1-3 years vs. 7 or more years, 4-6 years vs. 7 or more years; total years in the present school, less than one year vs. 1-3 years, less than one year versus 4-6 years, less than one year vs. 7 or more years, 1-3 years vs. 4-6 years, 1-3 years vs. 7 or more years, 4-6 years vs. 7 or more years; leadership role; others view of teachers as leaders, moderate vs. minimal extent, and great vs. minimal extent. T-test were not run on race, EdD/Phd and Other advanced degree, and teachers in education for less than 1 year

There were significant findings at the $p<.05$ level within the demographic data sets of gender; Total years in education , 1-3 years vs. 4-6 years in education, 1-3 years vs. 7 or more years, 4-6 years in education v. 7 or more years; Total years in present

school, less than 1 year vs. 1-3 years, less than 1 year vs. 4-6 years, less than 1 year vs. 7 or more years, 1-3 years vs. 4-6 years, 4-6 years vs. 7 or more years, 1-3 years vs. 7 or more years, Leadership Role; Others viewed teachers as leaders, minimal vs. moderate extent minimal extent v. great extent.

Gender

Fifteen DLRS survey items were found to be significant between males and females: 1; 4; 7; 9; 10; 12; 13; 14 ;15; 16; 19, 20, 21, 24; 25; and 30 (see Table C.2). Overall, females more often than males appear to be engaged in distributed leadership practices.

Degree

There were no significant differences found within Degree, Bachelor vs. Master (see Table C.3).

Total Years in Education

There were significant differences found within total years in education on the DRLS (see Table C.4, C.5 and C.6). Overall, teachers with the most experience (7 or more years) in education had a higher rate of engagement in distributed leadership practices than newer teachers (six years or less) to the field of education.

Total Years in the Present School

Significant differences were found between teachers with different total years in the present school on the DLRS (see Table C.7, C.8, C.9, C.10, C.11 and C.12). Teachers with less than one year experience in the present school engage in distributed leadership practices more often than teachers with teachers with 1-6 years experience in the present

school. However, veteran teachers with 7 or more years in the present school engage in leadership practices more than newer teachers (6 years or less).

Leadership Role

Significant differences, within teachers involved in a leadership role versus teachers who were not involved in leadership roles, were found in 12 items on the DLRS: 6; 7; 15; 16; 20; 21; 22; 23; 24; 26; 34; and 35) (see Table C.13). Teachers who were involved in leadership roles were more engaged in distributed leadership practices than teachers who were not in leadership roles.

Others Viewed as a Leader

Significant differences were found on the DLRS by teachers being viewed as a leader (see Table C.14 and C.15). No significant differences were found between teachers being viewed as a leader to a moderate versus great extent (see Table C.16). Teachers who were viewed by others as leaders to a moderate or great extent engaged in distributed leadership practices more than teachers who were viewed as leaders to a minimal extent.

Summary

The researcher conducted a quantitative, descriptive study to understand teachers' Engagement within the four dimensions of the distributed leadership model found in one School district mandated to implement distributed leadership. In addition, the researcher determined the differences in engagement within the four dimensions of the distributed leadership model by demographic characteristics, such as, gender, degree, participation as a formal or informal school leader, how others viewed teachers as leaders, years of experience in education, and years of experience working at the school. The data were

gathered using the Distributed Leadership Readiness Scale (DLRS), and the data were analyzed by using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences version 13.0.

For researcher question one, the extent to which teachers are engaged within the four dimensions of the distributed leadership model in Barker County, within the dimension of mission, vision and goals, the researcher found that teachers were engaged the most within this dimension. Teachers view the mission as well established and support and understand the mission. Neither parents nor students were believed to be able to describe the mission of the school. Within the dimension of school culture, the principal encourage teachers to participate and teachers participate in instructional decision making. Teachers did not feel a high level of mutual trust and respect among teachers, administrators or other school personnel. Within leadership practices, the teachers were the least engaged within this dimension. Central office administrators and school administrators do work together to determine professional development activities. Veteran teachers fill most of the leadership roles, which allows for new teachers to have only sporadic opportunities in teacher leadership. Teachers need more time and resources to make a meaningful contribution to the school. Teachers are only mildly interested in teacher leadership. Within the dimension of shared responsibility, teachers need more time to collaborate with other teachers. Their school was viewed as a learning community while teachers did not agree on the role parents play in the school.

For research question two, the extent to which elementary, middle and high school teachers differ in their engagement within four dimensions of distributed leadership practices, there were significant differences between levels within every dimension except mission, vision and goals. Within mission, vision and goals, elementary

teachers engage in distributed leadership practice more than middle or high school teachers. Elementary parents more often than high school parents would be more able to describe a mission at their school. Within school culture, elementary teachers engage more than middle or high school teachers in distributed leadership practices. At the elementary level more than middle or high, principals actively encourage teachers decision making and elementary more often than middle or high school teachers participate in decision making. Elementary more so than high school teachers feel a high degree of trust and respect among teachers and other professional staff. Within the dimension of leadership practices, elementary teachers more often than middle or high school teachers, want to participate in leadership roles. Within shared responsibility, elementary teachers more often than middle or high school teachers engage in distributed leadership practices. Middle school teachers were more engaged within shared responsibility than high school teachers. Middle school teachers more often than high school teachers had time to collaborate with other teachers. Middle school teachers more often than high school teachers agree with parents on the role parents play in education.

For research question three, the extent to which teacher demographic characteristics vary in relation to distributed leadership practices, females participate more often than males in distributed leadership. Teachers with less than one year experience in the present school engage in distributed leadership practices more often than teachers with teachers with 1-6 years experience in the present school. However, veteran teachers with 7 or more years in the present school engage in leadership practices more than new teachers. Teachers with the most experience in education had a higher rate of engagement in distributed leadership practices than newer teachers to the field of

education. Teachers who have official leadership roles and teachers viewed by others as leaders to a moderate extent engaged in distributed leadership practices more often than teachers who were thought of by others as teacher leaders to a minimal extent and did not have an official leadership role within the school.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter provided an overview of the study, including research questions, findings, discussion of the findings, conclusions, implications, recommendations, and concluding thoughts. This chapter was organized by the researcher to include a discussion of how the research findings related to the review of the literature. Finally, the chapter concludes with recommendations for additional study and concluding thoughts.

Introduction

The researcher's purpose of this study was to understand teacher engagement within the four dimensions of the distributed leadership model in one school district mandated to implement distributed leadership. In addition, the researcher determined the differences in engagement within the four dimensions among elementary, middle, and high school levels, as well as differences in distributed leadership practices by demographic characteristics of teachers, including: gender; degree; participation as a formal or informal school leader; years of experience; years of experience working at the school; and others view of teachers as leaders.

Various interpretations of the term "distributed leadership" exist (Elmore, 2000; Gronn, 1999; Spillane, 2001; Harris, 2003; Lashway, 2003), but for purposes of this study, the term was defined as a leadership phenomenon in which leadership activities are practiced among several people within an organization or team (Storey, 2004; Yukl, 2002). In the school setting, distributed leadership requires the principal to be a leader among leaders, giving others the opportunity to lead when their expertise is needed, what Gronn (1999) describes as "an emergent property of a group or network of individuals"

who “pool” their expertise. Principals and teachers work with teams using collaboration and consolidation of resources in order to improve student achievement (Pechura, 2001).

Elmore’s conceptual framework of distributed leadership was modified by Gordon to define four dimensions of distributed leadership: mission, vision, and goals; school culture; leadership practices; and shared responsibility. Gordon developed the Distributed Leadership Readiness Scale (DLRS) to measure teacher engagement of distributed leadership practices within these four dimensions in order to identify leadership needs. The 40-item survey, referred to in this study as the DLRS, also included a demographic section for all teachers to complete. The 40 items on the survey were mapped to the four dimensions of distributed leadership by the researcher. For example, the item, “Teachers and administrators collectively establish school goals and revise goals annually,” was mapped to the dimension of mission, vision and goals. The teachers were asked to indicate the frequency they engaged in the specific practice.

The researcher administered the survey to 320 teachers’ with Bachelor or higher degrees within eight schools in one school district. The principals in the district had been issued a mandate by the Superintendent to implement distributed leadership two years prior to the study. The return rate was 92% and the researcher analyzed the responses to the survey to respond to the research questions.

Quantitative descriptive analysis were conducted and analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 13.0 to generate frequencies, means and percentages for each items on the survey. For research question one, the data were reported by data means by dimension and by data means by item within each dimension. For research question two, ANOVA and t-tests were conducted between

school levels and reported by dimension. For research question three, t-tests were conducted between demographic characteristics with at least 30 participants within each data set. The data were reported by items and significance per t-test.

Research Questions

The overarching question for this research study was: What is the level of teacher engagement within the four dimensions of the distributed leadership model found in one school district mandated to implement distributed leadership?

1. To what extent are teachers engaged in distributed leadership practices within the four dimensions of the distributed leadership model in Barker County?
2. To what extent do elementary, middle, and high school teachers differ in their engagement within the four dimensions of distributed leadership practices in Barker County?
3. To what extent do the teacher demographic characteristics, including gender; degree; participation as a formal or informal leader in the school; how others view teachers as leaders; years of teaching experience; and years of experience working at the school vary in relation to distributed leadership practices in Barker County?

Findings

The researcher explored the answer to the overarching question through the sub questions and by analyzing the responses provided by teachers. The findings to each sub question from Chapter IV are presented, followed by the researcher's discussion of the findings as related to the literature.

Research Question 1: To what extent are teachers engaged in distributed leadership practices within the four dimensions of the distributed leadership model in Barker County?

Teachers were engaged in distributive leadership with engagement in all dimensions. The most frequent distributed leadership practices were found within the dimension of mission, vision, and goals. Teachers participated to a great degree in writing and supporting a common mission and vision. Teachers reported, however, they did not believe parents and students were aware of the mission of the school.

Four other findings evolved from an analysis of teacher participation within the dimension of school culture. Even though teachers were highly engaged in building the mission, vision, and goals of the school, within the dimension of school culture they reported a lack of mutual trust and respect among teachers, administrators, and other professional staff. The teachers believed principals were encouraging them to participate in decision making, and there was the belief that teachers participated to a moderate extent in instructional decision making.

However, the researcher found that teachers were least engaged in the leadership practices dimension. Teachers in the school district believed there was cooperation among central office administrators and school administrators to determine professional development activities. Veteran teachers were believed to fill most of the leadership roles, while teachers with fewer years of experience had only sporadic opportunities to lead. Teachers were mildly interested in leadership. Teachers also indicated a need for more resources and time.

Four additional findings were found within the dimension of shared responsibility. Teachers believed that they do not have enough time in their schedules to collaborate with others. Teachers believed, however, that they shared accountability with administrators for student performance and that their schools were learning communities. Lastly, teachers did not believe that parents and teachers agreed on parental roles in education.

Research Question 2: To what extent do elementary, middle, and high school teachers differ in their engagement within the four dimensions of distributed leadership practices in Barker County?

There were significant differences between teacher engagement in the dimensions of distributed leadership and school levels. Overall, elementary teachers are more engaged than high school teachers in distributed leadership practices, largely due to differences in school culture and shared responsibility. Within the dimension of mission, vision and goals, elementary teachers engage in distributed leadership practices more than middle or high school teachers. Elementary teachers believed that their parents were more aware of their school's mission, vision, and goals, than high school teachers.

Within the dimension of school culture, elementary teachers engage more than middle or high school teachers in distributed leadership practices. At the elementary level more than middle or high, principals actively encourage teacher participation in decision making and at the elementary level, more often than middle or high school levels, teachers participate in decision making. Elementary teachers, more so than high school teachers, feel a high degree of trust and respect among teachers and other professional staff.

Within the dimension of leadership practices, elementary teachers more often than middle or high school teachers want to participate in leadership roles.

Within the dimension of shared responsibility, elementary teachers more often than middle or high school teachers engage in distributed leadership practices. Middle school teachers more often than high school teachers had time to collaborate with other teachers. Middle school teachers more often than high school teachers agree with parents on the role parents play in education. Elementary teachers more often than middle or high school teachers and middle school teachers more often than high school teachers viewed their school as a learning community.

Research Question 3: To what extent do the teacher demographic characteristics, including: gender; degree; participation as a formal or informal leader in the school; how others view teachers as leaders; years of teaching experience; and years of experience working at the school vary in relation to leadership practices in Barker County?

The researcher found that females participate more often than males in distributed leadership.

Veteran teachers with seven or more years in the present school engage in leadership practices more than newer teachers.

Teachers with the most experience in education had a higher rate of engagement in distributed leadership practices than newer teachers to the field of education.

Teachers who have official leadership roles and teachers viewed by others as leaders to a moderate extent engaged in distributed leadership practices more often than teachers who were thought of by others as teacher leaders to a minimal extent and did not have official leadership roles within the school.

Discussion of Findings

Introduction

The model of distributed leadership has been highly encouraged in Georgia through the Georgia Leadership Institute for School Improvement (GLISI). However, there are very few studies related to distributed leadership in action. Elmore (2000) developed a model of distributed leadership with five dimensions; the model was revised by Gordon (2004) in her study to include four dimensions: mission, vision, and goals; school culture; leadership practices; and shared responsibility.

The engagement of teachers within these four dimensions of distributed leadership practices were analyzed from the survey results of the 295 teachers who worked in eight different schools. An analysis of this data provided insight into understanding the engagement of teachers within the four dimensions of distributed leadership within a mandated setting.

Discussion of Findings from Research Question 1

To what extent are teachers engaged in distributed leadership practices within the four dimensions of the distributed leadership model in Barker County?

Overall, teachers are engaged in distributed leadership practices representing all four dimensions. The researcher found that the dimension of mission, vision, and goals is the dimension in which most teachers in Barker County are engaged. The researcher found that teachers believe that the mission is well established, and they support and understand their mission. Consistent with the literature, Harrison (2005) found that within distributed leadership, leaders need to work together in order to create a shared vision or goal. Spillane, Halverson and Diamond (2004) and Hallinger (2003) believe that

developing and working toward a shared vision is the first function involving leadership tasks. Barker County has only been engaged in implementing this model for two academic years, and it is consistent with the literature that the first function of leadership is developing a shared mission.

Within this dimension of mission, vision, and goals, the teachers, however, indicated a belief that parents and students would not be able to describe the mission or vision of the school. The literature on distributed leadership explains that all stakeholders such as parents, students and staff members need to be involved in planning and action for the school (Huffman & Jacobson, 2003). Pechura (2001) also found that in order to build leadership capacity of the school, parents and students must be given opportunities to participate in leadership. Lunenberg and Ornstein (2004) indicated that parents must have ownership for distributed leadership to be realized.

Within the dimension of school culture, the researcher found that teachers in Barker County did not observe high levels of mutual trust and support between teachers, administrators and other professional staff, especially at the high school level. The literature relates that leaders need to develop relationships and trust in order to establish shared values that will enable leaders to share in the decision making process (Harrison, 2005). Distributed leadership is built on trust (Reeves, 2006). Positive effects come from the effect of relationships being built on mutual trust and respect within the organization (Phillips, 2004) and having trust also impacts the structural support of the learning community (Harrison; Phillips). Teachers must feel trusted in order to be empowered (Sabitini, 2002). Spillane et al. (2004) found the second function involving leadership task and function was based on managing a school culture by building trust among staff.

Blasé and Blasé (1999) found that principals must be committed to establishing trust in order to adopt distributed leadership. The participants of this study were in a school district where the superintendent had mandated distributed leadership. Although the teachers reported being engaged in distributed leadership practices, they also reported a level of distrust within the school culture.

The researcher also found within the dimension of school culture that teachers believed that principals were actively encouraging them to participate in decision making, and teachers reported moderately participating in instructional decision making. Heller and Firestone (1995), Inman and Marlowe (2004), and Phillips (2004) found that encouraging staff members is a key leadership function. Distributed leadership involves a decision by the principal to allow decisions to be made by others (The Hay Group, 2004). In order to support change within a school, McQuaig (1996) found that teachers must be included in the decision-making process, as it is a critical component of shared decision making. Pechura (2001) found that teachers needed to be encouraged to participate in decision making and become involved in decision making that impact students, as they are the most influential contributors to the success of students. Barker County teachers report having the support of principals in regards to decision making, and teachers are participating in instructional decision making, which Spillane et al. (2004) considers essential in distributed leadership.

The researcher found that teachers were engaged the least within the leadership practices dimension. Some of the leadership practices barriers were that teachers did not have time or resources to make meaningful contributions to the school. This may be related to the finding that teachers reported only mild interest in participating in school

leadership roles. However, the participants of the study reported that innermost office administrators and school administrators were working together to determine professional development activities. The structural support within the learning community needs collaborative working relationship with other leaders (Harrison, 2005; Phillips, 2004). Spillane and Sherer (2004) found that leaders collaborating with other leaders show not only interaction but working toward a shared goal. Blasé and Blasé (1999) found that mandates by the central office undermined the potential for growth and educational improvement because the mandate was an order and not a choice. Even though the participants of the study were in a district where the superintendent mandated distributed leadership, the teachers observe a collaborative effort with their central office.

Teachers believe they do not have enough time or sufficient resources to make meaningful contributions to the school. Blasé and Blasé, (1999), Harrison (2005), Katzenmeyer and Moller (1996), and Phillips (2004), found that distributed leadership cannot be successfully implemented without support of time and resources. Spillane et al. (2004) concedes that the third most important function for instructional leadership is in providing resources such as time and materials to teachers. Teachers who are making leadership decisions needs to be given time and resources in order to share in the leadership responsibilities (Gordon, 2005; Stone, Horejs and Lomas, 1997).

Veteran teachers in Barker County have also been found to fill most of the leadership roles within the school, while new teachers report only sporadic opportunities for leadership tasks. Stone et al. (1997) found that veteran teachers are the teacher leaders within the school, but Pechura (2001) explained how all teachers need to be given opportunities for leadership roles within the school. Spillane and Sherer (2004) found that

new teachers within small groups, such as grade levels, are provided opportunities to become teacher leaders. Arrowsmith (2005) states that leaders in distributed leadership are selected based on expertise in the subject matter and not experience.

The researcher found that teachers in Barker County are only slightly interested in participating in leadership roles within the school. Stone et al. (1997) found that teacher leaders participate in leadership position in order to be able to make decisions. Distributed leadership is dependent upon individuals within the school being in leadership roles (McQuaig, 1996). Researchers observe that teachers who are leaders have a sense of ownership of the school, which leads to increased motivation, professionalism and commitment (Blase & Blase, 2001). Teacher leaders nurture other teachers but at times leave the profession due to the barriers of teacher leadership (Silva, Gimbert & Nolan, 2000). Teacher leaders will emerge if the collaborative school culture is in place to support shared decision making (Harrison, 2005). The school culture in Barker School district was found to be collaborative, but the researcher also found that teachers expressed some distrust and a lack of time and resources concerning distributed leadership practices.

In reference to the fourth dimension, shared responsibility, the researcher found that teachers believed that their school is a learning community. Structural support for a learning community may be defined as teachers having a collaborative working relationship with other and working toward a mutual purpose of the school (Harrison, 2005; Phillips, 2004). In Barker County School District, the teachers report that there is collaboration with administrators, and the teachers clearly work toward a shared purpose. An additional finding of shared responsibility was that teachers did not have enough time

in their schedules to collaborate with others. With teachers not having time to collaborate, teachers and administrators will have to work in isolation (McQuaig, 1996). Spillane and Sherer (2004) found, while working at Adams Elementary, that the principal was creative in making time for teachers to collaborate when she established the breakfast club giving teachers an opportunity to interact regarding instruction. In order to share leadership responsibilities, teachers must be given time to collaborate (Gordon, 2005), because collaboration assisted in improving teacher participation in decision making (Mutter, 2004). Leadership capacity also increases when teachers collaborate and interact (Sabitini, 2002). Yukl (2002) explained that the collective capacity of distributed leadership allows the school to work more effectively.

Discussion of Findings from Research Question 2

To what extent do elementary, middle, and high school teachers differ in their engagement within the four dimensions of distributed leadership practices in Barker County?

Elementary, middle and high school teachers differ in their engagement within three dimensions of distributed leadership practices, by having significant differences within the dimensions of school culture, leadership practices and shared responsibility. Within mission, vision and goals, elementary teachers engage in distributed leadership practice more than middle or high school teachers. Resulting from collaborating with others within reference to the school's mission, elementary teachers engaged in shared decision making ensuring success of the mission (Phillips, 2004).

Elementary teachers believed their parents would be able to describe the mission, vision, and goals of the school, more than high school teachers believed their parents

would be more able to do so. At the elementary level, teachers, parents and students were found to be ready to become involved with leadership within the school (Pechura, 2001).

Within school culture, elementary teachers engage more than middle or high school teachers in distributed leadership practices. At the elementary level more than middle or high, principals actively encourage teachers decision making and elementary more often than middle or high school teachers participate in decision making. Harrison (2005) found that elementary teachers engage in leadership task through making decisions for instructional leadership.

Elementary, more so than high school teachers, feel a high degree of trust and respect among teachers and other professional staff. Elementary principals begin to develop relationships focusing on building trust and working collaboratively with teachers (Harrison, 2005). Lucia (2004) found that elementary school teachers are nurturing which leads to a bottoms-up design instead of a top-down approach. Stone et al. (1997) found that high school teachers were able to build trust and respect with other school personnel in the school. One explanation for elementary teachers more so than other school level teachers participating in decision making and feeling more trust and support within their school is that elementary teachers and principals are more nurturing by nature (Lucia). They tend to focus on taking care of everyone within the school and also focus on relationships and not just teaching and learning (Stone et al.).

Within the dimension of leadership practices, elementary teachers more often than middle or high school teachers want to participate in leadership roles. This finding is similar to the finding by Lucia (2004) who found that elementary teachers expressed a desire to lead within and beyond their class. Elementary teachers emerge as teacher

leaders and engage in sharing, coaching, reflecting and modeling (Sabitini, 2002). Teachers at the elementary level see their opportunity for becoming teacher leaders by being requested to be leaders, elected, asked or volunteered (Stone et al., 1997).

Within shared responsibility, elementary teachers more often than middle or high school teachers engage in distributed leadership practices. At the elementary level, leadership practices have been embedded routinely within faculty meetings, committee meetings and grade level meetings allowing for distributed leadership (Harrison, 2005). One consideration for elementary teachers being engaged in more leadership practices is that three of the schools in Barker County house the majority of elementary teachers in grade centers. There may be more opportunities within grade level meetings and faculty meetings for them to engage in distributed leadership practices.

Middle school teachers more often than high school teachers had time to collaborate with other teachers. One explanation for middle school teachers having more time to collaborate than high school teachers in Barker County is that middle school teachers have two planning periods instead of one, as in the high school. Gordon (2005) found that teachers in leadership positions must be given time to collaborate and engage in their leadership positions. Spillane and Sherer (2004) and Stone et al. (1997) found that principals had to make the time, even if they had to develop creative ways, for teachers to collaborate with each other.

Middle school teachers more often than high school teachers agree with parents on the role parents play in education. Middle school teachers view success in improving school climate (Stone et al., 1997), which parents and students are a major catalyst in school climate (Pechura, 2001). Elementary teachers more often than middle or high

school teachers and middle school teachers more often than high school teachers viewed their school as a learning community. Harrison (2005) found that distributed leadership where teachers work in a collaborative environment positively impacts a learning environment and increases the positive feelings by the teachers towards the school as a learning community. Phillips (2004) found that shared decision making led to a positive learning community within an elementary school setting. Elementary teachers view their school as more of a learning community may be due to the perception that elementary teachers are more nurturing (Lucia, 2004) and view accomplishments in terms of their classroom or grade level which allows them more of an opportunity to see their school as a learning community (Stone et al.).

Discussion of Findings from Research Question 3

To what extent do the teacher demographic characteristics, including gender; degree; participation as a formal or informal leader in the school; how others view teachers as leaders; years of teaching experience; and years of experience working at the school vary in relation to distributed leadership practices in Barker County?

The researcher found that female teachers are more engaged than male teachers within their school in distributed leadership practices. This is inconsistent with research by Camburn, Rowan and Taylor (2003) who found that gender does not make a difference in the findings on instructional leadership practices within distributed leadership.

The researcher found that within two demographic categories, including years of teaching experience and years in education, the majority of the findings of this study are consistent with findings of other studies. Veteran teachers actively engage in leadership

practices more often than newer teachers to the school and newer teachers to the field of education. This finding is consistent with the literature as Stone et al. (1997) found that veteran teachers participated more in leadership practices at elementary, middle and high school levels. Veteran teachers in education and at the school view new teachers as having leadership opportunities; while new teachers to the school and to education observe veterans in the majority of leadership roles. Harrison (2005) found that new teachers were active followers, leaving veteran teachers in more positional leadership positions as they are more knowledgeable and experienced.

Another finding by the researcher is that teachers who were engaged in formal leadership roles were more engaged in distributed leadership practices than teachers who were not in leadership roles. Distributed leadership begins with formal leaders (Lucia, 2004). Formal leaders are the teachers within the school who are building the leadership teams and engaging others in leadership practices (Leithwood et al., 2004). Informal leaders perform leadership tasks by supporting others, asking question, making suggestions and sharing ideas (Harrison, 2005), which is necessary for distributed leadership to work. The researcher found that teachers who were viewed by others as leaders to a moderate extent engaged in distributed leadership practices more than teachers who were viewed as leaders to a minimal extent. Harrison found that veteran teachers engaged in leadership task by committees and were thought of as more experienced teacher leaders.

Conclusions

The researcher analyzed the findings from the study to conclude:

1. Distributed leadership is a complex phenomenon with teachers engaged in all four dimensions.
2. Teachers are most engaged in developing mission, vision, and goals, which provides a foundation for initiating a distributed leadership model.
3. Teachers are somewhat reluctant about participating in leadership tasks.
4. The factors of trust, respect, resources, time, and the extent to which parents were perceived to understand school goals are factors that influenced full participation in distributed leadership practices.
5. Teachers in elementary schools are more engaged in distributed leadership practices than high school teachers, largely due to differences in school culture and shared responsibility. Elementary teachers have more trust, collaboration, and desire to participate in leadership.
6. Most teachers involved in distributed leadership practices are female, veteran teachers who are in formal leadership positions.

Implications

Teachers reported engaging in distributed leadership practices within four dimensions of a distributed leadership model mandated by the superintendent to be implemented. There were also factors that impacted teacher participation in distributed leadership practices. Therefore the following should be considered:

1. School leaders should continue to build capacity for school leadership, especially engaging parents in understanding the role of parental involvement.

2. Distributed leadership assumes that teachers should participate in leadership tasks of teaching and learning, but teachers may need training and additional resources to understand this new role.
3. Leaders within schools should be aware of the factors that might impede the success of distributed leadership and identify strategies to overcome them.
4. Superintendents and others at the central office level should recognize and encourage leadership practices at the school level by engaging in the process.
5. As schools adapt to a new model of leadership, school leaders need to seek ways for veteran teachers who assume leadership roles to have more time to do the work of leadership. School leaders also need to recognize leadership skills and build capacity of new and male teachers to participate in leadership activities.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and insights of the implementation identified in this study, the researcher made the following recommendations for participants and others.

1. Superintendents should provide professional development on how to implement and how to participate in distributed leadership to central office administrators, principals, teachers and other school personnel. Within the professional development, teaching the principals about the components of distributed leadership and how to involve teachers in decision making will be beneficial in the implementation of a distributed leadership model.
2. Parents and students should be invited to participate in decision making and become involved as stakeholders within the school. Parents and students need to be assigned specific roles and responsibilities within the schools when it comes to

decision making. Collaboration between parents, students and teachers will improve communication and help to understand the roles of each within education.

3. The superintendent should model distributed leadership practices at the central office and school level, therefore setting the stage for distributed leadership within the school setting. Principals have to buy into distributed leadership and give up some of the power that goes with decision making.
4. Distributed leadership should be embedded in the school culture by overcoming barriers to distributed leadership. Schedules should be changed to provide common planning time so that teachers could not only collaborate between grade levels but between subject areas, as well. Resources should be allocated through distributed leadership allowing for teachers to have input on who receives the resources. Principals being consistent, encouraging teachers to participate and allowing their decisions to impact instructional decision making, should increase trust and respect within the school culture.
5. More studies on distributed leadership should be conducted especially in the area of middle and high school teachers. Principals and administrators need to find ways to increase their leadership capacity at the middle and high school level.
6. New teachers need to be more engaged within the distributed leadership model. Teachers participating in the implementation of distributed leadership need to remember that experience is not the only criteria but criteria should expound upon expertise and knowledge in the subject matter at hand.

Concluding Thoughts

Distributed leadership is a new phenomenon not only in the United States but in Barker County. Even though it stems from decentralization, there are major differences which give credence to the success of distributed leadership practices. The researcher worked in a school district mandated to implement distributed leadership. Distributed leadership was implemented for two years but appears to have as many impediments as successes, when looking at the pieces of the puzzle and how they fit together. Although teachers are engaged within the four dimension of distributed leadership, other criteria such as trust and support must be felt for a school to be embedded with distributed leadership. Without either of these practices, distributed leadership will not occur.

From this study, Barker County will know what small gains have been made but will also know what barriers they need to overcome in order to implement distributed leadership successfully. The researcher plans to meet with the key players involved in the implementation of the distributed leadership model in order to share insights of what the researcher learned form the study. The researcher will give the key players examples about implementing distributed leadership, such as professional learning and resources being used to help with the implementation of the distributed leadership model, which does not leave time or resources for what teachers believe they should be used for. This researcher recommends further studies to be conducted in Barker County regarding distributed leadership especially at the high school level. This will allow for an understanding of how the principal at the high school level is implementing distributed leadership, and the barriers that need to be overcome in order for high school teachers to engage in distributed leadership practices.

REFERENCES

Adair, J. (1991). *Great Leaders*. Guildford, The Adair Press.

Arrowsmith, T. (2005). Distributed leadership: Three questions, two answers review of the Hay Group Education research, July 2004. *Management in Education, 19*(2), 30-33.

Barth, R.S. (1990). *Improving schools from within.* Jossey Bass: San Francisco, California.

Bennett, N., Wise, C., Woods, P., & Harvey, J. (Spring 2003). *Distributed leadership*. Gloucestire, England: National College for School Leadership.

Bimber, B. (1993). *School decentralization: Lessons form the study of bureaucracy.* Distribution Services, Rand Corporation: Santa Monica, California.

Blasé, J. & Blasé, J.(1999). Implementation of shared governance for instructional improvement: Principal's perspectives. *Journal of educational administration, 37* (5), 476-5000.

Blasé, J. & Blasé, J. (2001). Empowering teachers: What successful principals do (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Bostock, R. (2004). Putting an emphasis on learning. *USA today, May 1995*, 90-97.

Bowman, J. S.(1989). Quality Circles: Promise, problems, and prospectus in Florida. *Public Personnel Management, 18* (4) 375-395.

Brouillette, L. (2002). *Charter schools: Lessons in school reform.* Lawrence Eribaum Associates: Mahwah, New Jersey.

Brundrett, M., Burton, N., & Smith, R. (2003). *Leadership in education*. 1st ed. Trowbridge, GB: Cromwell Press.

Bryman, A. (1992). *The nature of quantitative research*. London, England: Routledge.

Camburn, E., Rowan, B. & Taylor, J. (2003). Distributed leadership in schools: The case of elementary schools adopting comprehensive school reform models. *Research reported for the Consortium for policy research in education as part of the Study of Instructional Improvement*, University of Michigan.

Colbeck, C. (1998). Merging in a seamless blend: How faculty integrate teaching and research. *Journal of Higher Education, 69, 6*, 647-661.

Cuban, L. (1988). The managerial imperative and the practice of leadership in schools: Albany State University: New York Press.

Davis, D. R., McKlin, T., Page, D., & Brown, J. (2005). Validating a performance-based internship in Educational Leadership preparations: The Georgia Leadership Institute for School Improvement's 8 Roles of Effective School Leadership. *Draft-Paper presented at the Annual Conference of that National Council of Professors of Educational Administration, Washington D.C. ,* 1-23.

DeMoulin, D. (1996). Introducing accountability in the leadership training for the school administrators: Leadership pattern centered*. Education, 116 (3) 346-353.*

De Vaus, D. (2004). *Surveys in Social Research* (5th ed.). Great Britain: Routledge.

DuFour, R.(2002). The Learning-centered principal. *Educational Leadership, 59* (8) 12-15.

DuFour, R., & Eaker, R. (1998). Professional learning communities at work: Best practices for enhancing student achievement. Bloomington, IN: National Educational Services.

Elmore, R. F. (2000). Building a new structure for school leadership. Washington, D.C.: The Albert Shanker Institute.

Elmore, R.F. (2004). School reform from the inside out: Policy, practice and performance. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Fullan, M. (2001). Leading in a culture of change. (1st ed.) San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass Publishing.

Gabriel, J. (2005). *How to thrive as a teacher leader.* (1st ed.). Alexandria, VI: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Gall, M., Gall, J. & Borg, W. (2003). *Educational Research: An introduction* (7th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Gaynor, A. (1998*). Analyzing problems in schools and school systems: A theoretical approach.* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates: Mahwah, New Jersey.

Georgia Leadership Institute for School Improvement (GLISI) (2004). *Using quality tools to analyze and display data: A performance-based learning module in the Data Analysis Leader series for educational leaders and Rising Stars.* Atlanta, GA: GLISI.

Getzels, J.W. & Guba, E.G. (1957). Social behavior and the administrative process. *School Review, 65*, 423-441.

Gibb, J.R. (1951). *Dynamics of Participative Groups*. John S. Swift Company: New York.

Gordon, Z. (2005). The effect of distributed leadership on student achievement (Doctoral Dissertation, Central Connecticut State University, 2005).

Gronn, P. (2000). Distributed properties: A new architecture for leadership. *Educational management and administration: Journal of the British educational management and administration society, 28* (3), 317-338.

Gronn, P. (2003). *The new work of educational leaders.* Sage: Thousand Oaks, California.

Hallinan, M. & Khmelkov, V. (2001). Recent developments in teacher education in the United States of America. *Journal of Education for Testing, 27* (2) 175-185.

Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 33* (3) 329-351.

Harris, A. (2002). *Distributed leadership in schools: Leading or misleading?* (CV4 7AL). Retrieved January 26, 06 from http://www.shu.ac.uk/bemas/harris2002.html

Harris, A. (2003). Teacher leadership as distributed leadership: Heresy, fantasy or possibility? *School Leadership and Management, 23*(3), 313-325.

Harrison, N. (2005). The Impact of distributed leadership on teachers. (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 2005). *Dissertation Abstracts International, AAT3189149.*

Hay Group Education (2004). *The Five pillars of distributed leadership in schools: An investigation into the advantages and disadvantages, causes and constraints of a more distributed form of leadership in schools*, NCLS.

Heller, M. & Firestone, W. (1995). Who's in charge here? Sources of leadership for change in eight schools. *The Elementary School Journal, 96* (1) 65-86.

Holoviak, S.J. (1987). Managing human productivity: People are your best investment. Praeger Publishers: New York, New York.

Holt, M. (1993). The educational consequences of W. Edwards Deming. *Phi Delta Kappan, 74(5)* 382-392.

Huffman, J., & Jacobson, A. L. (2003). Perceptions of professional learning communities. *International Leadership in Education, 6*(3), 239-250.

Inman, D. & Malrow, L. (2004). *Teacher retention: Why do beginning teachers remain in the profession?*Education, *124, 4*, 605-611.

John, E. (1996). Six elements of effective decisions. *School Administrator, 53* (9) 39-41.

Kamm, J. & Nurick, A. (1993). The stages of team venture formation: A decision-making model. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice, 17* (2), 17-26.

Katzenmeyer, M. & Moller, G. (1996) Awakening the sleeping giant. Corwin Press: Thousand Oaks, California.

Kerlinger, F. & Lee, H. (2000). *Foundations of behavior research* (4th ed.). Northridge, CA: Wadsworth Thomson Learning.

Kerry, T. & Murdoch, A. (1993). Educational managers as leaders: some thought on the context of the changing nature of schools. *School Organization,* 13 (3) 221-231.

Lambert, L. (2003). *Leadership capacity for lasting school improvement.* (1st ed.) Alexandria, VI: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Lashway, L. (Summer, 2003). Distributed leadership. Clearinghouse on Educational Policy Management, 1-7. Retrieved January 26, 2006 from Research Roundup.

Leithwood, K., Louis, K., Anderson, S. & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). How leadership influences student learning. *The Wallace Foundation.*

Leithwood, K., Steinbach, R., & Ryan, S. (1997). Leadership and team learning in secondary schools. School Leadership and Management, 17(3), 303-325.

Lowe, G. (1999). *Human behavior in the social environment: A social systems approach.* Aldine De Gruyter: New York.

Lucia, R. T. (2004). Distributed leadership: An exploratory study. (Doctoral Dissertation, Florida Atlantic University, 2004). Dissertation Abstracts International, AAT3159315.

Lunenburg, F. C., & Ornstein, A. C. (2004). Educational Administration: Concepts and practices (4th ed.). Belmont, California: Thomson Wadsworth.

Marzano, R., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. (2005). *School leadership that works from research to results*. 1st ed. Aurora, CO: McRel.

McQuaig, L.G. (1996*). Implementing site-based management in the rural south: The process and challenge.* (Georgia Southern University, 1996). Dissertation Abstracts International, AAT9810580.

Metcalf, H. C. & Urwick, L. (2003). *The Early sociology of management and organizations.* Routledge: London, England.

Miller, T.R. & Vaughan, B.J. (2001). Messages from the management past: Classic writers and contemporary problems. SAM *Advanced Management Journal, 66* (1) 4-13.

Murphy, J. (2005). *Connecting teacher leadership and school improvement.* (1st edition). Corwin Press: Thousand Oaks, California.

Mutter, D. (2004). An inquiry into distributed leadership in Virginia: From reliance on self to reliance on collective strength. Retrieved April 15, 2006 from http://www.cepi.vcu.edu/Publications/SAELP/inquiry_Dist_Lead_inVa.htm.

Neuman, M. (2000). Leadership for student learning. Phi Delta Kappan, 82(1), 9-13.

Neuman, M. & Simmons, W. (2000). Leadership for student learning. *Phi Delta Kappan, 82 (1*) 9-12.

Oduro, G. K. (2004). Distributed leadership in schools. Education Journal, (80), 23-25.

Pechura, J.M. (2001). What principals do to build and sustain the leadership capacity of teachers, parents, and students in elementary schools. Dissertation Abstracts International, AAT3040998.

Phillips, D.Y. (2004). The perspectives of a principal and emergent teacher leaders of instructional leadership in a shared governance school. Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 2004, electronic format.

Reeves, D. (2006). *The learning leader.* (1st ed.). Alexandria, VI.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Regional Educational Services Agency (RESA) (2005). *Design Team*. Presentation presented to Wayne County School System in Jesup, Georgia.

Richardson, M. D., Lane, K. E., Jording, C. S., Flanigan, J. L., & Van Berkum, D. W. (1999). Participatory decision making: Implications for administrators. In F. Kochan (Ed.), *Leadership for the 21st century: 1999 SRCEA yearbook*. Auburn University, AL: Truman Pierce Institute.

Rodriguez, T. & Slate, J.R. (2001). Principals' and teachers' view of site-based management in Texas. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the University Council of Educational Administration on November 2-4, 2001.

Rost, J.C. (1993). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. Praeger Publishers; Westport, Connecticut.

Sabitini, E. (2002). *Teachers' perspectives of emergent teacher leadership in an elementary school*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 2002).

Sawyer, J. (2005). A case study of teacher leadership as a strategy for implementing change. (Doctoral Dissertation, Lynch Graduate School of Education, 2005). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, AAT3173679.

Schmoker, M.J. & Wilson, R.B. (1993). *Total quality education: Profiles of schools that demonstate the power of Deming's management principles.* Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation: Bloomington, Indiana.

Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline : The art and practice of the learning organization.* New York: Double Day Publishing.

Sergiovanni, T.J. & Carver, F.D. (1975). *The New School Executive,* New York: Dodd, Mead and Company.

Sergiovanni, T.J. (2001). *What's in it for schools?* RoutledgeFalmer: London, England.

Sergiovanni, T.J. (2005) *Strengthening the heartbeat : Leading and learning together in schools (*1st ed.*).* San Francisco, California: Jossey Bass Publishing.

Silva, Gimbert and Nolan (2000). Sliding the doors: Locking and unlocking possibilities for teacher leadership. *Teachers College Record, 102* (4), 779-804.

Simon, H.A. (1976) *Administrative behavior. A study of decision making processes in administrative organizations* (3rd ed.). New York: The Free Press.

Spillane, J. P. (2006 a.). *Distributed leadership.*(1st ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Leadership Library in Education.

Spillane, J.P. (2006 b.). (personal communication, June 15, 2006).

Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. B. (2001). Investigating school leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Educational Researcher,* 23-28.

Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. B. (2004). Towards a theory of leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies 36* (1), 3-34.

Spillane, J.P., Diamond, J.B. & Jita, L. (2003). Leading instruction: The distribution of leadership for instruction. *Journal of Curriculum studies, 35 (5), 533-543.*

Spillane, J.P. & Sherer, J.Z. (2004, April). *A distributed perspective on school leadership: Leadeship practice as stretched over people and place*. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Association in San Diego, California.

Stone, M., Horejs, J. & Lomas, A. (1997). *Commonalities and differences in teacher leadership at the elementary, middle and high school levels*. Paper presented for the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association in Chicago, Illinois.

Storey, A. (2004). The problem of distributed leadership in schools. *School leadership and management*, 24(3), 249-265.

Williams, H.S. (2000). Teacher's perceptions of principal effectiveness in selected secondary schools in Tennessee. *Education, 121* (2) 264-274.

Yukl, G. (2002). *Leadership in Organizations* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NY: Prentice Hall.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

IRB CORRESPONDENCE

Georgia Southern University
Office of Research Services & Sponsored Programs

Institutional Review Board (IRB)

Phone: 912-681-5465 Administrative Annex
P.O. Box 8005
Fax:912-681-0719 Ovrsight@GeorgiaSouthern.edu Statesboro, GA 30460

To: Lisa Smith
555 South Sunset Blvd
Jesup, GA-31545

CC: Dr. Barbara Mallory
P.O. Box-8131

From: Office of Research Sendees and Sponsored Programs
Administrative Support Office for Research Oversight
Committees (IACUC/IBC/IRB)

Date: December 1, 2006

Subject: Status of Application for Approval to Utilize Human Subjects in Research

After a review of your proposed research project numbered: H07101. and titled "A **Study of Teacher Engagement In Four Dimensions of Distributed Leadership In One School District In Georgia",** it appears that (1) the research subjects are at minimal risk, (2) appropriate safeguards are planned, and (3) the research activities involve only procedures which are allowable.

Therefore, as authorized in the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, I am pleased to notify you that the Institutional Review Board has approved your proposed research.

This IRB approval is in effect for one year from the date of this letter. If at the end of that time, there have been no changes to the research protocol, you may request an extension of the approval period for an additional year. In the interim, please provide the IRB with any information concerning any significant adverse event, **whether or not it is believed to be related to the study,** within five working days of the event. In addition, if a change or modification of the approved methodology becomes necessary, you must notify the IRB Coordinator **prior** to initiating any such changes or modifications. At that time, an amended application for IRB approval may be submitted. Upon completion of your data collection, you are required to complete a *Research Study Termination* form to notify the IRB Coordinator, so your file may be closed.

Sincerely,

Julie B. Cole
Director of Research Services and Sponsored Program

APPENDIX B

DISTRIBUTED LEADERSHIP READINESS SCALE

Distributed Leadership Readiness Scale

Thank you in advance for completing this survey honestly and completely. Completion and return of the survey, questionnaire, etc. imply that you agree to participate in this study and the data will be used for research purposes only.

Directions: Please bubble in the corresponding answers on the scantron sheet.

1: **Gender**
A. Female
B. Male

2: **Race/Ethnicity:**
A= Asian/Pacific Islander
B = Black (non-Hispanic)
C = White
D = Hispanic
E = Multi-racial

3: **Degree**
A. BA/BS
B. MA/MS
C. PhD/EdD
D. Other advanced degree

4: **Total years in education**
A. less than one year
B. 1-3 years
C. 4-6 years
D. 7 or more year

5: **Total years in present school**
A = less than 1
B = 1 – 3
C = 4 – 6
D = 7 or more

6: Do you serve in a specific, assigned leadership role in the school where you currently work? Examples would be member of leadership team, grade level chair, etc.

A = yes **B**= no

7. **Acknowledging that leadership is not always a formal role within a school, to what extent do you believe that other educators in the school view you as a leader?**

A-to a great extent **B-**to a moderate extent **C**-to a minimal extent

8: **What school level are you currently working in:**

A=elementary (K-5)
B=middle (6-8)
C=high school (9-12)

Response Options:

A = Continually - the particular practice is well-established as a "standard operating procedure" in the school
B = Frequently - this practice is often observed in the school.
C = Sometimes - this practice is intermittently observed in the school.
D = Rarely/Never - this practice has rarely or never been observed in the school.
E= Insufficient Information – insufficient information to respond to the statement.

Directions: Use the five point scale from '**Continually**' (**A**) to '**Rarely/Never**' (D) to describe how regularly the following statements apply to you and your school. Select 'E' if you do not have sufficient information to respond to the statement.	**Continually**	**Frequently**	**Sometime**	**Rarely/ Never**	**Insufficient Information**
1. The school has clearly written vision and mission statements.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
2. Teachers and administrators understand and support a common mission for the school and can describe it clearly.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
3. If parents are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission clearly.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
4. If students are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission generally.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
5. School goals are aligned with its mission statement.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
6. The school uses a school improvement plan as a basis to evaluate the progress it is making in attaining its goals.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
7. Teachers and administrators collectively establish school goals and revise goals annually.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
8. The school's curriculum is aligned with the state's academic standards.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
9. Teachers and administrators have high expectations for students' academic performance.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
10. Teachers and administrators share accountability for students' academic performance.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
11. School and district resources are directed to those areas in which student learning needs to improve most.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**

12. The school is a learning community that continually improves its effectiveness, learning from both successes and failures.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
13. There is a high level of mutual respect and trust among the teachers and other professional staff in the school.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
14. There is mutual respect and trust between the school administration and the professional staff.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
15. The school administrator(s) welcome professional staff members input on issues related to curriculum, instruction, and improving student performance.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
16. The school supports using new instructional ideas and innovations.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
17. The school's daily and weekly schedules provide time for teachers to collaborate on instructional issues.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
18. School professionals and parents agree on the most effective roles parents can play as partners in their child's education.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
19. The school clearly communicates the 'chain of contact' between home and school so parents know who to contact when they have questions and concerns.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
20. The school makes available a variety of data (e.g. student performance) for teachers to use to improve student achievement.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
21. Decisions to change curriculum and instructional programs are based on assessment data.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
22. There is a formal structure in place in the school (e.g. curriculum committee) to provide teachers and professional staff opportunities to participate in school-level instructional decision-making.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
23. The principal actively encourages teachers and other staff members to participate in instructional decision-making.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
24. Professional staff members in the school have the responsibility to make decisions that affect meeting school goals.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
25. The school provides teachers with professional development aligned with the school's mission and goals.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**

26. Administrators participate along side teachers in the school's professional development activities.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
27. The principal actively participates in his/her own professional development activities to improve leadership in the school.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
28. My supervisor and I jointly develop my annual professional development plan.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
29. My professional development plan includes activities that are based on my individual professional needs and school needs.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
30. Teachers actively participate in instructional decision-making.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
31. Central office and school administrator's work together to determine the professional development activities.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
32. The principal is knowledgeable about current instructional issues.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
33. My principal's practices are consistent with his/her words.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
34. Informal school leaders play an important role in the school in improving the performance of professionals and the achievement of students.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
35. The school has expanded its capacity by providing professional staff formal opportunities to take on leadership roles.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
36. Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient school time to permit them to make meaningful contributions to the school.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
37. Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient resources to be able to make meaningful contributions to the school.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
38. Veteran teachers fill most leadership roles in the school.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
39. New teachers are provided opportunities to fill some school leadership roles.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
40. Teachers are interested in participating in school leadership roles.	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**

APPENDIX C

T-TESTS

Table C.1

Differences between Middle and High School on DLRS Dimension Leadership Practices Items

Item		Mean	SD	t	P
25. The school provides teachers with professional development aligned with the school's mission and goals.	Middle High	2.28 2.36	0.889 0.917	-0.534	0.595
31. Central office and school administrator's work together to determine the professional development activities.	Middle High	2.80 2.69	1.232 1.136	0.554	0.580
34. Informal school leaders play an important role in the school in improving the performance of professionals and the achievement of students.	Middle High	2.33 2.46	0.950 1.023	-0.776	0.439
35. The school has expanded its capacity by providing professional staff formal opportunities to take on leadership roles.	Middle High	2.74 2.71	1.038 1.051	0.140	0.889
36. Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient school time to permit them to make meaningful contributions to the school.	Middle High	3.06 2.90	1.020 0.903	0.967	0.334
37. Teachers who assume leadership roles have sufficient resources to be able to make meaningful contributions to the school.	Middle High	2.97 2.86	1.014 1.067	0.645	0.520
38. Veteran teachers fill most leadership roles in the school.	Middle High	2.49 2.30	0.906 1.033	1.089	0.278
39. New teachers are provided opportunities to fill some school leadership roles.	Middle High	2.83 2.69	1.070 0.971	0.810	0.419
40. Teachers are interested in participating in school leadership roles.	Middle High	2.81 3.01	0.839 0.789	-1.497	0.137

*p <.05

Table C.2

Barker County Teachers' Differences on the DLRS by Gender

Item		Mean	SD	t	P
1. The school has clearly written vision and mission statements.	Females	1.16	0.514	-2.663	0.011*
	Males	1.60	1.072		
2. Teachers and administrators understand and support a common mission for the school and can describe it clearly.	Females	1.60	0.723	-1.540	0.129
	Males	1.82	0.936		
3. If parents are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission clearly.	Females	3.22	0.964	-1.460	0.145
	Males	3.44	0.725		
4. If students are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission generally.	Females	3.32	0.929	-2.218	0.027*
	Males	3.64	0.802		
5. School goals are aligned with its mission statement.	Females	1.64	0.868	-1.264	0.207
	Males	1.82	1.007		
6. The school uses a school improvement plan as a basis to evaluate the progress it is making in attaining its goals.	Females	1.51	0.724	-1.333	0.184
	Males	1.67	0.674		
7. Teachers and administrators collectively establish school goals and revise goals annually.	Females	1.88	0.969	-2.269	0.024*
	Males	2.24	1.048		
8. The school's curriculum is aligned with the state's academic standards.	Females	1.18	0.470	-1.949	0.056
	Males	1.36	0.570		
9. Teachers and administrators have high expectations for students' academic performance.	Females	1.34	0.567	-2.721	0.009*
	Males	1.67	0.769		
10. Teachers and administrators share accountability for students' academic performance.	Females	1.77	0.824	-2.681	0.008*
	Males	2.13	0.944		
11. School and district resources are directed to those areas in which student learning needs to improve most.	Females	2.24	1.000	-0.744	0.458
	Males	2.36	0.830		
12. The school is a learning community that continually improves its effectiveness, learning from both successes and failures.	Females	1.89	0.819	-3.174	0.002*
	Males	2.31	0.848		

13. There is a high level of mutual respect and trust among the teachers and other professional staff in the school.	Females Males	2.05 2.49	0.812 0.920	-3.009	0.004*
14. There is mutual respect and trust between the school administration and the professional staff.	Females Males	2.14 2.56	0.855 0.943	-2.953	0.003*
15. The school administrator(s) welcome professional staff members input on issues related to curriculum, instruction, and improving student performance.	Females Males	2.08 2.44	0.863 0.943	-2.598	0.010*
16. The school supports using new instructional ideas and innovations.	Females Males	1.88 2.24	0.825 1.004	-2.275	0.027*
17. The school's daily and weekly schedules provide time for teachers to collaborate on instructional issues.	Females Males	2.67 2.84	1.000 0.976	-1.069	0.286
18. School professionals and parents agree on the most effective roles parents can play as partners in their child's education.	Females Males	2.76 2.93	0.956 0.809	-1.144	0.253
19. The school clearly communicates the 'chain of contact' between home and school so parents know who to contact when they have questions and concerns.	Females Males	2.02 2.33	0.821 0.953	-2.268	0.024*
20. The school makes available a variety of data (e.g. student performance) for teachers to use to improve student achievement.	Females Males	1.86 2.24	0.795 0.957	-2.860	0.005*
21. Decisions to change curriculum and instructional programs are based on assessment data.	Females Males	2.24 2.67	0.938 1.066	-2.775	0.006*
22. There is a formal structure in place in the school (e.g. curriculum committee) to provide teachers and professional staff opportunities to participate in school-level instructional decision-making.	Females Males	2.33 2.64	1.012 1.026	-1.927	0.055
23. The principal actively encourages teachers and other staff members to participate in instructional decision-making.	Females Males	2.28 2.58	0.978 1.033	-1.890	0.060

24. Professional staff members in the school have the responsibility to make decisions that affect meeting school goals.	Females Males	2.27 2.56	0.891 0.841	-1.982	0.048*
25. The school provides teachers with professional development aligned with the school's mission and goals.	Females Males	2.14 2.24	0.873 0.830	-2.275	0.027*
26. Administrators participate along side teachers in the school's professional development activities.	Females Males	2.04 2.33	0.931 1.022	-1.917	0.477
27. The principal actively participates in his/her own professional development activities to improve leadership in the school.	Females Males	1.98 2.29	1.116 1.014	-1.710	0.088
28. My supervisor and I jointly develop my annual professional development plan.	Females Males	2.58 2.87	1.300 1.179	-1.364	0.174
29. My professional development plan includes activities that are based on my individual professional needs and school needs.	Females Males	2.63 2.61	1.302 1.061	0.069	0.945
30. Teachers actively participate in instructional decision-making.	Females Males	2.28 2.78	0.963 1.020	-3.138	0.002*
31. Central office and school administrator's work together to determine the professional development activities.	Females Males	2.50 2.76	1.223 1.069	-1.334	0.183
32. The principal is knowledgeable about current instructional issues.	Females Males	1.85 2.02	0.922 0.941	-1.137	0.257
33. My principal's practices are consistent with his/her words.	Females Males	2.02 2.09	1.008 0.821	-0.407	0.684
34. Informal school leaders play an important role in the school in improving the performance of professionals and the achievement of students.	Females Males	2.22 2.51	1.001 0.757	-1.877	0.062
35. The school has expanded its capacity by providing professional staff formal opportunities to take on leadership roles.	Females Males	2.54 2.71	1.101 0.869	-1.163	0.249

36. Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient school time to permit them to make meaningful contributions to the school.	Females Males	2.90 2.84	1.042 0.767	0.387	0.700
37. Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient resources to be able to make meaningful contributions to the school.	Females Males	2.73 2.76	1.020 0.743	-0.184	0.855
38. Veteran teachers fill most leadership roles in the school.	Females Males	2.42 2.44	1.027 0.755	-0.162	0.872
39. New teachers are provided opportunities to fill some school leadership roles.	Females Males	2.72 2.84	1.058 0.706	-1.030	0.306
40. Teachers are interested in participating in school leadership roles.	Females Males	2.66 2.82	0.853 0.650	-1.450	0.151

*p<.05

Table C.3

Barker County Teachers' Differences by Degree, Bachelor vs. Master

Item		Mean	SD	t	P
1. The school has clearly written vision and mission statements.	Bachelor	1.26	0.687	0.720	0.472
	Master	1.20	0.589		
2. Teachers and administrators understand and support a common mission for the school and can describe it clearly.	Bachelor	1.66	0.808	0.785	0.433
	Master	1.58	0.724		
3. If parents are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission clearly.	Bachelor	3.32	0.933	1.099	0.273
	Master	3.19	0.924		
4. If students are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission generally.	Bachelor	3.34	0.936	1.101	0.275
	Master	3.21	0.926		
5. School goals are aligned with its mission statement.	Bachelor	1.75	0.944	0.926	0.355
	Master	1.64	0.880		
6. The school uses a school improvement plan as a basis to evaluate the progress it is making in attaining its goals.	Bachelor	1.62	0.805	1.345	0.180
	Master	1.49	0.673		
7. Teachers and administrators collectively establish school goals and revise goals annually.	Bachelor	1.98	1.070	0.230	0.188
	Master	1.95	0.931		
8. The school's curriculum is aligned with the state's academic standards.	Bachelor	1.21	0.487	1.017	0.310
	Master	1.15	0.403		
9. Teachers and administrators have high expectations for students' academic performance.	Bachelor	1.64	0.789	0.781	0.435
	Master	1.56	0.714		
10. Teachers and administrators share accountability for students' academic performance.	Bachelor	1.91	0.938	0.885	0.377
	Master	1.81	0.808		
11. School and district resources are directed to those areas in which student learning needs to improve most.	Bachelor	2.34	1.018	0.500	0.618
	Master	2.28	0.952		
12. The school is a learning community that continually improves its effectiveness, learning from both successes and failures.	Bachelor	2.01	0.882	0.368	0.713
	Master	1.97	0.797		

13. There is a high level of mutual respect and trust among the teachers and other professional staff in the school.	Bachelor Master	2.15 2.15	0.883 0.808	-0.008	0.994
14. There is mutual respect and trust between the school administration and the professional staff.	Bachelor Master	2.18 2.23	0.823 0.911	-0.477	0.632
15. The school administrator(s) welcome professional staff members input on issues related to curriculum, instruction, and improving student performance.	Bachelor Master	2.09 2.22	0.827 0.900	-1.179	0.239
16. The school supports using new instructional ideas and innovations.	Bachelor Master	2.01 1.94	0.920 0.824	0.632	0.528
17. The school's daily and weekly schedules provide time for teachers to collaborate on instructional issues.	Bachelor Master	2.72 2.78	0.923 1.029	-0.454	0.650
18. School professionals and parents agree on the most effective roles parents can play as partners in their child's education.	Bachelor Master	2.85 2.75	0.921 0.965	0.780	0.436
19. The school clearly communicates the 'chain of contact' between home and school so parents know who to contact when they have questions and concerns.	Bachelor Master	2.04 2.05	0.891 0.829	-0.105	0.916
20. The school makes available a variety of data (e.g. student performance) for teachers to use to improve student achievement.	Bachelor Master	1.94 1.94	0.754 0.869	0.021	0.983
21. Decisions to change curriculum and instructional programs are based on assessment data.	Bachelor Master	2.36 2.26	1.051 0.894	0.832	0.406
22. There is a formal structure in place in the school (e.g. curriculum committee) to provide teachers and professional staff opportunities to participate in school-level instructional decision-making.	Bachelor Master	2.34 2.42	0.980 1.002	-0.606	0.545
23. The principal actively encourages teachers and other staff members to participate in instructional decision-making.	Bachelor Master	2.26 2.36	0.910 1.004	-0.809	0.419

24. Professional staff members in the school have the responsibility to make decisions that affect meeting school goals.	Bachelor Master	2.40 2.25	0.917 0.845	1.360	0.175
25. The school provides teachers with professional development aligned with the school's mission and goals.	Bachelor Master	2.19 2.18	0.899 0.775	0.156	0.876
26. Administrators participate along side teachers in the school's professional development activities.	Bachelor Master	2.22 2.01	1.022 0.858	1.765	0.079
27. The principal actively participates in his/her own professional development activities to improve leadership in the school.	Bachelor Master	2.12 1.92	1.126 1.031	1.428	0.155
28. My supervisor and I jointly develop my annual professional development plan.	Bachelor Master	2.65 2.54	1.270 1.261	0.703	0.483
29. My professional development plan includes activities that are based on my individual professional needs and school needs.	Bachelor Master	2.69 2.54	1.264 1.229	0.980	0.328
30. Teachers actively participate in instructional decision-making.	Bachelor Master	2.31 2.44	0.920 1.012	-1.082	0.280
31. Central office and school administrator's work together to determine the professional development activities.	Bachelor Master	2.56 2.52	1.202 1.202	0.287	0.774
32. The principal is knowledgeable about current instructional issues.	Bachelor Master	1.98 1.82	0.896 0.922	1.452	0.148
33. My principal's practices are consistent with his/her words.	Bachelor Master	1.98 2.12	0.961 0.996	-1.124	0.262
34. Informal school leaders play an important role in the school in improving the performance of professionals and the achievement of students.	Bachelor Master	2.28 2.22	1.012 0.915	0.525	0.600
35. The school has expanded its capacity by providing professional staff formal opportunities to take on leadership roles.	Bachelor Master	2.61 2.50	1.170 0.982	0.806	0.421

36. Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient school time to permit them to make meaningful contributions to the school.	Bachelor Master	2.86 2.87	1.056 0.971	-0.095	0.924
37. Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient resources to be able to make meaningful contributions to the school.	Bachelor Master	2.74 2.74	1.066 0.920	-0.009	0.993
38. Veteran teachers fill most leadership roles in the school.	Bachelor Master	2.33 2.45	0.863 1.042	-0.976	0.330
39. New teachers are provided opportunities to fill some school leadership roles.	Bachelor Master	2.82 2.72	0.930 1.136	0.812	0.418
40. Teachers are interested in participating in school leadership roles.	Bachelor Master	2.76 2.64	0.759 0.867	1.177	0.240

*p<.05

Table C.4

Barker County Teachers' Differences on the DLRS by Total Years in Education, 1-3 Years vs. 4-6 Years

Item		Mean	SD	t	P
1. The school has clearly written vision and mission statements.	1-3 years	1.39	0.833	0.931	0.355
	4-6 years	1.25	0.526		
2. Teachers and administrators understand and support a common mission for the school and can describe it clearly.	1-3 years	1.90	0.850	2.410	0.018*
	4-6 years	1.50	0.744		
3. If parents are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission clearly.	1-3 years	3.40	1.014	1.032	0.305
	4-6 years	3.19	0.982		
4. If students are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission generally.	1-3 years	3.57	0.859	1.046	0.298
	4-6 years	3.38	0.914		
5. School goals are aligned with its mission statement.	1-3 years	1.88	1.109	0.392	0.696
	4-6 years	1.79	1.051		
6. The school uses a school improvement plan as a basis to evaluate the progress it is making in attaining its goals.	1-3 years	1.79	0.951	0.890	0.376
	4-6 years	1.63	0.761		
7. Teachers and administrators collectively establish school goals and revise goals annually.	1-3 years	1.88	0.969	1.279	0.205
	4-6 years	2.24	1.048		
8. The school's curriculum is aligned with the state's academic standards.	1-3 years	1.24	0.532	0.084	0.933
	4-6 years	1.23	0.472		
9. Teachers and administrators have high expectations for students' academic performance.	1-3 years	1.34	0.567	0.045	0.965
	4-6 years	1.67	0.769		
10. Teachers and administrators share accountability for students' academic performance.	1-3 years	1.77	0.824	-2.223	0.824
	4-6 years	2.13	0.944		
11. School and district resources are directed to those areas in which student learning needs to improve most.	1-3 years	2.52	1.174	0.899	0.371
	4-6 years	2.31	1.055		

12. The school is a learning community that continually improves its effectiveness, learning from both successes and failures.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.19 2.21	0.943 0.967	-0.088	0.930
13. There is a high level of mutual respect and trust among the teachers and other professional staff in the school.	1-3 years 4-6 years	1.90 2.19	0.878 0.762	-1.635	0.106
14. There is mutual respect and trust between the school administration and the professional staff.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.05 2.40	0.882 0.792	-1.973	0.052
15. The school administrator(s) welcome professional staff members input on issues related to curriculum, instruction, and improving student performance.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.10 2.23	0.790 0.905	-0.743	0.460
16. The school supports using new instructional ideas and innovations.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.14 2.10	0.952 0.905	0.198	0.844
17. The school's daily and weekly schedules provide time for teachers to collaborate on instructional issues.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.57 2.65	0.831 0.978	-0.386	0.700
18. School professionals and parents agree on the most effective roles parents can play as partners in their child's education.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.67 2.75	1.052 1.000	-0.385	0.701
19. The school clearly communicates the 'chain of contact' between home and school so parents know who to contact when they have questions and concerns.	1-3 years 4-6 years	1.95 2.08	0.962 0.739	-0.717	0.476
20. The school makes available a variety of data (e.g. student performance) for teachers to use to improve student achievement.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.05 2.02	0.854 0.887	0.145	0.885
21. Decisions to change curriculum and instructional programs are based on assessment data.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.40 2.38	1.170 0.789	0.139	0.889
22. There is a formal structure in place in the school (e.g. curriculum committee) to provide teachers and professional staff opportunities to participate in school-level instructional decision-making.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.36 2.33	1.100 0.859	-0.115	0.909

23. The principal actively encourages teachers and other staff members to participate in instructional decision-making.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.45 2.50	1.087 0.899	-0.227	0.821
24. Professional staff members in the school have the responsibility to make decisions that affect meeting school goals.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.52 2.33	0.969 0.781	1.032	0.305
25. The school provides teachers with professional development aligned with the school's mission and goals.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.05 2.15	0.825 0.743	-0.594	0.554
26. Administrators participate along side teachers in the school's professional development activities.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.17 2.25	1.010 .957	-0.402	0.689
27. The principal actively participates in his/her own professional development activities to improve leadership in the school.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.07 2.19	1.197 1.024	-0.496	0.621
28. My supervisor and I jointly develop my annual professional development plan.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.43 2.65	1.291 1.178	-0.850	0.398
29. My professional development plan includes activities that are based on my individual professional needs and school needs.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.52 2.63	1.383 1.254	-0.379	0.705
30. Teachers actively participate in instructional decision-making.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.36 2.27	1.008 0.869	0.436	0.664
31. Central office and school administrator's work together to determine the professional development activities.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.74 2.71	1.363 1.110	0.114	0.909
32. The principal is knowledgeable about current instructional issues.	1-3 years 4-6 years	1.95 2.13	0.854 0.937	-0.909	0.366
33. My principal's practices are consistent with his/her words.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.19 1.98	1.215 0.887	0.931	0.355
34. Informal school leaders play an important role in the school in improving the performance of professionals and the achievement of students.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.14 2.27	1.026 0.893	-0.633	0.529

35. The school has expanded its capacity by providing professional staff formal opportunities to take on leadership roles.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.57 2.65	1.309 0.956	-0.304	0.762
36. Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient school time to permit them to make meaningful contributions to the school.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.76 2.94	1.122 0.909	-0.808	0.421
37. Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient resources to be able to make meaningful contributions to the school.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.60 2.81	1.061 0.842	-1.082	0.282
38. Veteran teachers fill most leadership roles in the school.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.43 2.35	0.914 0.956	0.376	0.708
39. New teachers are provided opportunities to fill some school leadership roles.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.86 2.56	1.072 0.769	1.511	0.134
40. Teachers are interested in participating in school leadership roles.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.57 2.69	0.831 0.803	-0.673	0.503

*p<.05

Table C.5

Barker County Teachers' Differences on the DLRS by Total Years in Education, 1-3 Years versus 7 or More Years

Item		Mean	SD	t	P
1. The school has clearly written vision and mission statements.	1-3 years	1.39	0.833	1.417	0.163
	7 or more years	1.19	0.636		
2. Teachers and administrators understand and support a common mission for the school and can describe it clearly.	1-3 years	1.90	0.850	2.275	0.024*
	7 or more years	1.61	0.745		
3. If parents are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission clearly.	1-3 years	3.40	1.014	0.930	0.353
	7 or more years	3.26	0.903		
4. If students are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission generally.	1-3 years	3.57	0.859	1.643	0.102
	7 or more years	3.32	0.924		
5. School goals are aligned with its mission statement.	1-3 years	1.88	1.109	1.621	0.111
	7 or more years	1.59	0.794		
6. The school uses a school improvement plan as a basis to evaluate the progress it is making in attaining its goals.	1-3 years	1.79	0.951	2.743	0.007*
	7 or more years	1.46	0.642		
7. Teachers and administrators collectively establish school goals and revise goals annually.	1-3 years	2.31	1.220	2.672	0.008*
	7 or more years	1.85	0.955		

8. The school's curriculum is aligned with the state's academic standards.	1-3 years 7 or more years	1.24 1.19	0.532 0.474	0.610	0.542
9. Teachers and administrators have high expectations for students' academic performance.	1-3 years 7 or more years	1.38 1.41	0.697 0.613	-0.283	0.778
10. Teachers and administrators share accountability for students' academic performance.	1-3 years 7 or more years	1.83 1.82	0.762 0.859	0.077	0.939
11. School and district resources are directed to those areas in which student learning needs to improve most.	1-3 years 7 or more years	2.52 2.18	1.174 0.899	1.792	0.079
12. The school is a learning community that continually improves its effectiveness, learning from both successes and failures.	1-3 years 7 or more years	2.19 1.84	0.943 0.759	2.616	0.009*
13. There is a high level of mutual respect and trust among the teachers and other professional staff in the school.	1-3 years 7 or more years	1.90 2.15	0.878 0.858	-1.696	0.091
14. There is mutual respect and trust between the school administration and the professional staff.	1-3 years 7 or more years	2.05 2.20	0.882 0.907	-0.980	0.328
15. The school administrator(s) welcome professional staff members input on issues related to curriculum, instruction, and improving student performance.	1-3 years 7 or more years	2.10 2.11	0.790 0.906	-0.075	0.940
16. The school supports using new instructional ideas and innovations.	1-3 years 7 or more years	2.14 1.85	0.952 0.813	2.071	0.039*

17. The school's daily and weekly schedules provide time for teachers to collaborate on instructional issues.	1-3 years 7 or more years	2.57 2.74	0.831 1.035	-0.996	0.320
18. School professionals and parents agree on the most effective roles parents can play as partners in their child's education.	1-3 years 7 or more years	2.67 2.82	1.052 0.883	-1.002	0.317
19. The school clearly communicates the 'chain of contact' between home and school so parents know who to contact when they have questions and concerns.	1-3 years 7 or more years	1.95 2.08	0.962 0.835	-0.883	0.378
20. The school makes available a variety of data (e.g. student performance) for teachers to use to improve student achievement.	1-3 years 7 or more years	2.05 1.86	0.854 0.814	1.359	0.175
21. Decisions to change curriculum and instructional programs are based on assessment data.	1-3 years 7 or more years	2.40 2.24	1.170 0.942	0.993	0.322
22. There is a formal structure in place in the school (e.g. curriculum committee) to provide teachers and professional staff opportunities to participate in school-level instructional decision-making.	1-3 years 7 or more years	2.36 2.39	1.100 1.052	-0.178	0.852
23. The principal actively encourages teachers and other staff members to participate in instructional decision-making.	1-3 years 7 or more years	2.45 2.25	1.087 0.998	1.152	0.250
24. Professional staff members in the school have the responsibility to make decisions that affect meeting school goals.	1-3 years 7 or more years	2.52 2.27	0.969 0.896	1.617	0.107
25. The school provides teachers with professional development aligned with the school's mission and goals.	1-3 years 7 or more years	2.05 2.17	0.825 0.875	-0.819	0.414
26. Administrators participate along side teachers in the school's professional development activities.	1-3 years 7 or more years	2.17 2.00	1.010 0.898	1.068	0.287

27. The principal actively participates in his/her own professional development activities to improve leadership in the school.	1-3 years 7 or more years	2.07 1.96	1.197 1.068	0.604	0.547
28. My supervisor and I jointly develop my annual professional development plan.	1-3 years 7 or more years	2.43 2.67	1.291 1.312	-1.078	0.282
29. My professional development plan includes activities that are based on my individual professional needs and school needs.	1-3 years 7 or more years	2.52 2.64	1.383 1.244	-0.534	0.594
30. Teachers actively participate in instructional decision-making.	1-3 years 7 or more years	2.36 2.39	1.008 1.017	-0.166	0.868
31. Central office and school administrator's work together to determine the professional development activities.	1-3 years 7 or more years	2.74 2.45	1.363 1.184	1.384	0.168
32. The principal is knowledgeable about current instructional issues.	1-3 years 7 or more years	1.95 1.79	0.854 0.923	1.069	0.286
33. My principal's practices are consistent with his/her words.	1-3 years 7 or more years	2.19 2.03	1.125 0.960	0.932	0.352
34. Informal school leaders play an important role in the school in improving the performance of professionals and the achievement of students.	1-3 years 7 or more years	2.14 2.29	1.026 0.988	-0.875	0.383

35. The school has expanded its capacity by providing professional staff formal opportunities to take on leadership roles.	1-3 years 7 or more years	2.57 2.55	1.309 1.042	0.084	0.933
36. Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient school time to permit them to make meaningful contributions to the school.	1-3 years 7 or more years	2.76 2.93	1.122 1.003	-0.986	0.325
37. Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient resources to be able to make meaningful contributions to the school.	1-3 years 7 or more years	2.60 2.76	1.061 1.005	-0.964	0.336
38. Veteran teachers fill most leadership roles in the school.	1-3 years 7 or more years	2.43 2.46	0.914 1.026	-0.162	0.871
39. New teachers are provided opportunities to fill some school leadership roles.	1-3 years 7 or more years	2.86 2.75	1.072 1.047	0.593	0.554
40. Teachers are interested in participating in school leadership roles.	1-3 years 7 or more years	2.57 2.71	0.831 0.838	-0.957	0.340

*p <.05

Table C.6

Barker County Teachers' Differences on the DLRS by Total Years in Education, 4-6 Years versus 7 or More Years

Item		Mean	SD	t	P
1. The school has clearly written vision and mission statements.	4-6 years	1.25	0.526	0.555	0.579
	7 or more years	1.19	0.636		
2. Teachers and administrators understand and support a common mission for the school and can describe it clearly.	4-6 years	1.50	0.744	-0.910	0.364
	7 or more years	1.61	0.745		
3. If parents are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission clearly.	4-6 years	3.19	0.982	-0.483	0.630
	7 or more years	3.26	0.903		
4. If students are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission generally.	4-6 years	3.38	0.914	0.395	0.693
	7 or more years	3.32	0.924		
5. School goals are aligned with its mission statement.	4-6 years	1.79	1.051	1.482	0.140
	7 or more years	1.59	0.794		
6. The school uses a school improvement plan as a basis to evaluate the progress it is making in attaining its goals.	4-6 years	1.63	0.761	1.566	0.119
	7 or more years	1.46	0.642		
7. Teachers and administrators collectively establish school goals and revise goals annually.	4-6 years	2.02	0.863	1.113	0.267
	7 or more years	1.85	0.955		

8. The school's curriculum is aligned with the state's academic standards.	4-6 years 7 or more years	1.23 1.19	0.472 0.474	0.542	0.588
9. Teachers and administrators have high expectations for students' academic performance.	4-6 years 7 or more years	1.38 1.41	0.570 0.613	-0.371	0.711
10. Teachers and administrators share accountability for students' academic performance.	4-6 years 7 or more years	1.87 1.82	0.875 0.859	0.357	0.721
11. School and district resources are directed to those areas in which student learning needs to improve most.	4-6 years 7 or more years	2.31 2.18	1.055 0.899	0.886	0.376
12. The school is a learning community that continually improves its effectiveness, learning from both successes and failures.	4-6 years 7 or more years	2.21 1.84	0.967 0.759	2.868	0.004*
13. There is a high level of mutual respect and trust among the teachers and other professional staff in the school.	4-6 years 7 or more years	2.19 2.15	0.762 0.858	0.255	0.799
14. There is mutual respect and trust between the school administration and the professional staff.	4-6 years 7 or more years	2.40 2.20	0.792 0.907	1.387	0.167
15. The school administrator(s) welcome professional staff members input on issues related to curriculum, instruction, and improving student performance.	4-6 years 7 or more years	2.23 2.11	0.905 0.906	0.841	0.401
16. The school supports using new instructional ideas and innovations.	4-6 years 7 or more years	2.10 1.85	0.905 0.813	1.917	0.056

17. The school's daily and weekly schedules provide time for teachers to collaborate on instructional issues.	4-6 years 7 or more years	2.65 2.74	0.978 1.035	-0.578	0.564
18. School professionals and parents agree on the most effective roles parents can play as partners in their child's education.	4-6 years 7 or more years	2.75 2.82	1.000 0.883	-0.496	0.621
19. The school clearly communicates the 'chain of contact' between home and school so parents know who to contact when they have questions and concerns.	4-6 years 7 or more years	2.08 2.08	0.739 0.835	0.016	0.987
20. The school makes available a variety of data (e.g. student performance) for teachers to use to improve student achievement.	4-6 years 7 or more years	2.02 1.86	0.887 0.814	1.221	0.223
21. Decisions to change curriculum and instructional programs are based on assessment data.	4-6 years 7 or more years	2.38 2.24	0.789 0.942	0.927	0.355
22. There is a formal structure in place in the school (e.g. curriculum committee) to provide teachers and professional staff opportunities to participate in school-level instructional decision-making.	4-6 years 7 or more years	2.33 2.39	0.859 1.052	-0.397	0.692
23. The principal actively encourages teachers and other staff members to participate in instructional decision-making.	4-6 years 7 or more years	2.50 2.25	0.899 0.998	1.561	0.120
24. Professional staff members in the school have the responsibility to make decisions that affect meeting school goals.	4-6 years 7 or more years	2.33 2.27	0.781 0.896	0.421	0.674
25. The school provides teachers with professional development aligned with the school's mission and goals.	4-6 years 7 or more years	2.15 2.17	0.743 0.875	-0.164	0.870
26. Administrators participate along side teachers in the school's professional development activities.	4-6 years 7 or more years	2.25 2.00	0.957 0.898	1.708	0.089

27. The principal actively participates in his/her own professional development activities to improve leadership in the school.	4-6 years 7 or more years	2.19 1.96	1.024 1.068	1.337	0.182
28. My supervisor and I jointly develop my annual professional development plan.	4-6 years 7 or more years	2.65 2.67	1.178 1.312	-0.077	0.939
29. My professional development plan includes activities that are based on my individual professional needs and school needs.	1-3 years 7 or more years	2.63 2.64	1.254 1.244	-0.043	0.966
30. Teachers actively participate in instructional decision-making.	1-3 years 7 or more years	2.27 2.39	0.869 1.017	-0.721	0.471
31. Central office and school administrator's work together to determine the professional development activities.	4-6 years 7 or more years	2.71 2.45	1.110 1.184	1.362	0.174
32. The principal is knowledgeable about current instructional issues.	4-6 years 7 or more years	2.13 1.79	0.937 0.923	2.269	0.024*
33. My principal's practices are consistent with his/her words.	4-6 years 7 or more years	1.98 2.03	0.887 0.960	-0.338	0.736
34. Informal school leaders play an important role in the school in improving the performance of professionals and the achievement of students.	4-6 years 7 or more years	2.27 2.29	0.893 0.988	-0.128	0.898

35. The school has expanded its capacity by providing professional staff formal opportunities to take on leadership roles.	4-6 years 7 or more years	2.65 2.55	0.956 1.042	0.560	0.576
36. Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient school time to permit them to make meaningful contributions to the school.	4-6 years 7 or more years	2.94 2.93	0.909 1.003	0.024	0.981
37. Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient resources to be able to make meaningful contributions to the school.	4-6 years 7 or more years	2.81 2.76	0.842 1.005	0.325	0.745
38. Veteran teachers fill most leadership roles in the school.	4-6 years 7 or more years	2.35 2.46	0.956 1.026	-0.626	0.532
39. New teachers are provided opportunities to fill some school leadership roles.	4-6 years 7 or more years	2.56 2.75	0.769 1.047	-1.174	0.161
40. Teachers are interested in participating in school leadership roles.	4-6 years 7 or more years	2.69 2.71	0.803 0.838	-151	0.880

*p <.05

Table C.7

Barker County Teachers' Differences on the DLRS by Total Years in the Present School, Less Than 1 Year versus 1-3 Years

Item		Mean	SD	t	P
1. The school has clearly written vision and mission statements.	Less than one year 1-3 years	1.42 1.31	0.950 0.802	0.657	0.512
2. Teachers and administrators understand and support a common mission for the school and can describe it clearly.	Less than one year 1-3 years	1.62 1.78	0.725 0.826	-1.090	0.278
3. If parents are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission clearly.	Less than one year 1-3 years	3.24 3.34	1.061 0.874	-0.551	0.583
4. If students are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission generally.	Less than one year 1-3 years	3.30 3.43	1.015 0.891	-0.751	0.454
5. School goals are aligned with its mission statement.	Less than one year 1-3 years	1.94 1.69	1.058 0.996	1.036	0.194
6. The school uses a school improvement plan as a basis to evaluate the progress it is making in attaining its goals.	Less than one year 1-3 years	1.60 1.56	0.808 0.741	0.287	0.775
7. Teachers and administrators collectively establish school goals and revise goals annually.	Less than one year 1-3 years	2.20 2.21	1.195 1.059	-0.028	0.978
8. The school's curriculum is aligned with the state's academic standards.	Less than one year 1-3 years	1.22 1.31	0.507 0.629	-0.821	0.413
9. Teachers and administrators have high expectations for students' academic performance.	Less than one year 1-3 years	1.24 1.43	0.517 0.630	-1.710	0.081

10. Teachers and administrators share accountability for students' academic performance.	Less than one year 1-3 years	1.80 1.84	1.020 0.840	-0.246	0.806
11. School and district resources are directed to those areas in which student learning needs to improve most.	Less than one year 1-3 years	2.26 2.43	1.006 1.055	-0.863	0.390
12. The school is a learning community that continually improves its effectiveness, learning from both successes and failures.	Less than one year 1-3 years	1.98 2.15	0.714 0.885	-1.097	0.275
13. There is a high level of mutual respect and trust among the teachers and other professional staff in the school.	Less than one year 1-3 years	1.94 2.16	0.843 0.940	-1.322	0.189
14. There is mutual respect and trust between the school administration and the professional staff.	Less than one year 1-3 years	2.06 2.22	0.740 0.895	-1.065	0.289
15. The school administrator(s) welcome professional staff members input on issues related to curriculum, instruction, and improving student performance.	Less than one year 1-3 years	2.08 2.21	0.778 0.821	-0.841	0.402
16. The school supports using new instructional ideas and innovations.	Less than one year 1-3 years	1.92 2.13	0.900 0.945	-1.231	0.221
17. The school's daily and weekly schedules provide time for teachers to collaborate on instructional issues.	Less than one year 1-3 years	2.38 2.74	0.923 0.891	-2.107	0.037*
18. School professionals and parents agree on the most effective roles parents can play as partners in their child's education.	Less than one year 1-3 years	2.70 2.81	1.055 0.885	-0.608	0.544
19. The school clearly communicates the 'chain of contact' between home and school so parents know who to contact when they have questions and concerns.	Less than one year 1-3 years	2.12 2.09	0.918 0.893	0.189	0.851

20. The school makes available a variety of data (e.g. student performance) for teachers to use to improve student achievement.	Less than one year 1-3 years	1.98 2.06	0.845 0.770	-0.527	0.599
21. Decisions to change curriculum and instructional programs are based on assessment data.	Less than one year 1-3 years	2.22 2.51	1.183 0.872	-1.489	0.140
22. There is a formal structure in place in the school (e.g. curriculum committee) to provide teachers and professional staff opportunities to participate in school-level instructional decision-making.	Less than one year 1-3 years	2.28 2.46	0.927 0.921	-1.022	0.309
23. The principal actively encourages teachers and other staff members to participate in instructional decision-making.	Less than one year 1-3 years	2.20 2.47	0.990 0.938	-1.513	0.133
24. Professional staff members in the school have the responsibility to make decisions that affect meeting school goals.	Less than one year 1-3 years	2.26 2.60	0.986 0.794	-2.091	0.039*
25. The school provides teachers with professional development aligned with the school's mission and goals.	Less than one year 1-3 years	2.34 2.22	1.154 0.832	0.604	0.547
26. Administrators participate along side teachers in the school's professional development activities.	Less than one year 1-3 years	2.20 2.18	1.088 0.929	0.126	0.900
27. The principal actively participates in his/her own professional development activities to improve leadership in the school.	Less than one year 1-3 years	1.94 2.09	1.236 0.989	-0.724	0.471
28. My supervisor and I jointly develop my annual professional development plan.	Less than one year 1-3 years	2.84 2.51	1.419 1.211	1.365	0.175
29. My professional development plan includes activities that are based on my individual professional needs and school needs.	Less than one year 1-3 years	2.88 2.61	1.423 1.167	1.118	0.266
30. Teachers actively participate in instructional decision-making.	Less than one year	2.18	0.850	-1.859	0.066

	1-3 years	2.51	1.044		
31. Central office and school administrator's work together to determine the professional development activities.	Less than one year 1-3 years	2.58 2.60	1.430 1.024	-0.097	0.923
32. The principal is knowledgeable about current instructional issues.	Less than one year 1-3 years	1.78 1.97	0.815 0.828	-1.243	0.216
33. My principal's practices are consistent with his/her words.	Less than one year 1-3 years	1.80 2.25	0.990 1.042	-2.368	0.020*
34. Informal school leaders play an important role in the school in improving the performance of professionals and the achievement of students.	Less than one year 1-3 years	2.36 2.16	1.225 0.840	0.987	0.327
35. The school has expanded its capacity by providing professional staff formal opportunities to take on leadership roles.	Less than one year 1-3 years	2.60 2.62	1.278 1.093	-0.081	0.936
36. Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient school time to permit them to make meaningful contributions to the school.	Less than one year 1-3 years	2.88 3.01	1.118 0.954	-0.687	0.493
37. Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient resources to be able to make meaningful contributions to the school.	Less than one year 1-3 years	2.70 2.84	1.165 0.874	-0.706	0.482
38. Veteran teachers fill most leadership roles in the school.	Less than one year 1-3 years	1.98 2.69	0.769 1.033	-4.241	0.000*
39. New teachers are provided opportunities to fill some school leadership roles.	Less than one year 1-3 years	3.00 2.84	1.229 1.016	0.781	0.436
40. Teachers are interested in participating in school leadership roles.	Less than one year 1-3 years	2.74 2.76	0.922 0.866	-0.149	0.882

*p <.05

Table C.8

Barker County Teachers' Differences on the DLRS by Total Years in the Present School, Less Than 1 Year versus 4-6 Years

Item		Mean	SD	t	P
1. The school has clearly written vision and mission statements.	Less than one 4-6 years	1.42 1.15	0.950 0.361	1.879	0.065
2. Teachers and administrators understand and support a common mission for the school and can describe it clearly.	Less than one 4-6 years	1.62 1.52	0.725 0.746	0.702	0.484
3. If parents are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission clearly.	Less than one 4-6 years	3.24 3.30	1.061 0.882	-0.295	0.769
4. If students are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission generally.	Less than one 4-6 years	3.30 3.52	1.015 0.885	-1.172	0.244
5. School goals are aligned with its mission statement.	Less than one 4-6 years	1.94 1.69	1.058 1.006	1.259	0.211
6. The school uses a school improvement plan as a basis to evaluate the progress it is making in attaining its goals.	Less than one 4-6 years	1.60 1.59	0.808 0.714	0.050	0.961
7. Teachers and administrators collectively establish school goals and revise goals annually.	Less than one 4-6 years	2.20 1.81	1.195 0.848	1.906	0.059
8. The school's curriculum is aligned with the state's academic standards.	Less than one 4-6 years	1.22 1.20	0.507 0.491	0.167	0.868
9. Teachers and administrators have high expectations for students' academic performance.	Less than one 4-6 years	1.24 1.52	0.517 0.720	-2.277	0.025*

10. Teachers and administrators share accountability for students' academic performance.	Less than one 4-6 years	1.80 1.94	1.020 0.811	-0.822	0.413
11. School and district resources are directed to those areas in which student learning needs to improve most.	Less than one 4-6 years	2.26 2.28	1.006 0.899	-0.095	0.924
12. The school is a learning community that continually improves its effectiveness, learning from both successes and failures.	Less than one 4-6 years	1.98 2.06	0.714 0.878	-0.479	0.633
13. There is a high level of mutual respect and trust among the teachers and other professional staff in the school.	Less than one 4-6 years	1.94 2.26	0.843 0.757	-2.035	0.044*
14. There is mutual respect and trust between the school administration and the professional staff.	Less than one 4-6 years	2.06 2.39	0.740 0.979	-1.941	0.055
15. The school administrator(s) welcome professional staff members input on issues related to curriculum, instruction, and improving student performance.	Less than one 4-6 years	2.08 2.19	0.778 0.973	-0.606	0.546
16. The school supports using new instructional ideas and innovations.	Less than one 4-6 years	1.92 2.04	0.900 0.823	-0.693	0.490
17. The school's daily and weekly schedules provide time for teachers to collaborate on instructional issues.	Less than one 4-6 years	2.38 2.85	0.923 0.979	-2.523	0.013*
18. School professionals and parents agree on the most effective roles parents can play as partners in their child's education.	Less than one 4-6 years	2.70 2.94	1.055 0.940	-1.250	0.214
19. The school clearly communicates the 'chain of contact' between home and school so parents know who to contact when they have questions and concerns.	Less than one 4-6 years	2.12 2.22	0.918 0.816	-0.601	0.549

20. The school makes available a variety of data (e.g. student performance) for teachers to use to improve student achievement.	Less than one 4-6 years	1.98 2.06	0.845 0.940	-0.430	0.668
21. Decisions to change curriculum and instructional programs are based on assessment data.	Less than one 4-6 years	2.22 2.39	1.183 1.071	-0.764	0.447
22. There is a formal structure in place in the school (e.g. curriculum committee) to provide teachers and professional staff opportunities to participate in school-level instructional decision-making.	Less than one 4-6 years	2.28 2.39	0.927 0.979	-0.581	0.562
23. The principal actively encourages teachers and other staff members to participate in instructional decision-making.	Less than one 4-6 years	2.20 2.43	0.990 1.057	-1.123	0.264
24. Professional staff members in the school have the responsibility to make decisions that affect meeting school goals.	Less than one 4-6 years	2.26 2.24	0.986 0.775	0.111	0.912
25. The school provides teachers with professional development aligned with the school's mission and goals.	Less than one 4-6 years	2.34 2.11	1.154 0.744	1.192	0.237
26. Administrators participate along side teachers in the school's professional development activities.	Less than one 4-6 years	2.20 2.13	1.088 0.953	0.352	0.726
27. The principal actively participates in his/her own professional development activities to improve leadership in the school.	Less than one 4-6 years	1.94 2.37	1.236 1.154	-1.837	0.069
28. My supervisor and I jointly develop my annual professional development plan.	Less than one 4-6 years	2.84 2.60	1.419 1.176	0.946	0.346
29. My professional development plan includes activities that are based on my individual professional needs and school needs.	Less than one 4-6 years	2.88 2.66	1.423 1.255	0.820	0.414

30. Teachers actively participate in instructional decision-making.	Less than one 4-6 years	2.18 2.39	0.850 0.998	-1.144	0.255
31. Central office and school administrator's work together to determine the professional development activities.	Less than one 4-6 years	2.58 2.72	1.430 1.156	-0.560	0.577
32. The principal is knowledgeable about current instructional issues.	Less than one 4-6 years	1.78 2.02	0.815 0.942	-1.376	0.172
33. My principal's practices are consistent with his/her words.	Less than one 4-6 years	1.80 1.98	0.990 0.942	-0.958	0.340
34. Informal school leaders play an important role in the school in improving the performance of professionals and the achievement of students.	Less than one 4-6 years	2.36 2.28	1.225 0.878	0.396	0.697
35. The school has expanded its capacity by providing professional staff formal opportunities to take on leadership roles.	Less than one 4-6 years	2.60 2.69	1.278 0.865	-0.395	0.694
36. Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient school time to permit them to make meaningful contributions to the school.	Less than one 4-6 years	2.88 2.96	1.118 0.910	-0.416	0.678
37. Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient resources to be able to make meaningful contributions to the school.	Less than one 4-6 years	2.70 2.67	1.165 0.824	0.167	0.868
38. Veteran teachers fill most leadership roles in the school.	Less than one 4-6 years	1.98 2.57	0.769 0.944	-3.530	0.001*
39. New teachers are provided opportunities to fill some school leadership roles.	Less than one 4-6 years	3.00 2.65	1.229 0.756	1.773	0.079
40. Teachers are interested in participating in school leadership roles.	Less than one 4-6 years	2.74 2.78	0.922 0.793	-0.225	0.823

*p <.05

Table C.9

Barker County Teachers' Differences on the DLRS by Total Years in the Present School, Less Than 1 Year versus 7 or More Years

Item		Mean	SD	t	P
1. The school has clearly written vision and mission statements.	Less than one	1.42	0.950	2.061	0.449*
	7 or more	1.13	0.444		
2. Teachers and administrators understand and support a common mission for the school and can describe it clearly.	Less than one	1.62	0.725	0.148	0.882
	7 or more	1.60	0.744		
3. If parents are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission clearly.	Less than one	3.24	1.061	0.224	0.823
	7 or more	3.20	0.941		
4. If students are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission generally.	Less than one	3.30	1.015	0.047	0.963
	7 or more	3.29	0.903		
5. School goals are aligned with its mission statement.	Less than one	1.94	1.058	2.508	0.015*
	7 or more	1.54	0.657		
6. The school uses a school improvement plan as a basis to evaluate the progress it is making in attaining its goals.	Less than one	1.60	0.808	1.076	0.283
	7 or more	1.47	0.669		
7. Teachers and administrators collectively establish school goals and revise goals annually.	Less than one	2.20	1.195	2.839	0.005*
	7 or more	1.74	0.857		
8. The school's curriculum is aligned with the state's academic standards.	Less than one	1.22	0.507	0.929	0.356
	7 or more	1.15	0.377		
9. Teachers and administrators have high expectations for students' academic performance.	Less than one	1.24	0.517	-1.491	0.139
	7 or more	1.37	0.578		

10. Teachers and administrators share accountability for students' academic performance.	Less than one 7 or more	1.80 1.77	1.020 0.808	0.160	0.873
11. School and district resources are directed to those areas in which student learning needs to improve most.	Less than one 7 or more	2.26 2.15	1.006 0.946	0.687	0.493
12. The school is a learning community that continually improves its effectiveness, learning from both successes and failures.	Less than one 7 or more	1.98 1.79	0.714 0.812	1.534	0.128
13. There is a high level of mutual respect and trust among the teachers and other professional staff in the school.	Less than one 7 or more	1.94 2.10	0.843 0.817	-1.143	0.254
14. There is mutual respect and trust between the school administration and the professional staff.	Less than one 7 or more	2.06 2.17	0.740 0.875	-0.787	0.432
15. The school administrator(s) welcome professional staff members input on issues related to curriculum, instruction, and improving student performance.	Less than one 7 or more	2.08 2.09	0.778 0.923	-0.064	0.949
16. The school supports using new instructional ideas and innovations.	Less than one 7 or more	1.92 1.80	0.900 0.799	0.886	0.377
17. The school's daily and weekly schedules provide time for teachers to collaborate on instructional issues.	Less than one 7 or more	2.38 2.74	0.923 1.070	-2.083	0.039*
18. School professionals and parents agree on the most effective roles parents can play as partners in their child's education.	Less than one 7 or more	2.70 2.74	1.055 0.913	-0.249	0.804
19. The school clearly communicates the 'chain of contact' between home and school so parents know who to contact when they have questions and concerns.	Less than one 7 or more	2.12 1.98	0.918 0.804	1.027	0.306
20. The school makes available a variety of data (e.g. student performance) for teachers to use to improve student achievement.	Less than one 7 or more	1.98 1.76	0.845 0.790	1.596	0.112

21. Decisions to change curriculum and instructional programs are based on assessment data.	Less than one 7 or more	2.22 2.18	1.183 0.859	0.223	0.824
22. There is a formal structure in place in the school (e.g. curriculum committee) to provide teachers and professional staff opportunities to participate in school-level instructional decision-making.	Less than one 7 or more	2.28 2.37	0.927 1.125	-0.518	0.606
23. The principal actively encourages teachers and other staff members to participate in instructional decision-making.	Less than one 7 or more	2.20 2.24	0.990 0.986	-0.265	0.791
24. Professional staff members in the school have the responsibility to make decisions that affect meeting school goals.	Less than one 7 or more	2.26 2.21	0.986 0.917	0.309	0.757
25. The school provides teachers with professional development aligned with the school's mission and goals.	Less than one 7 or more	2.34 2.07	1.154 0.791	1.498	0.139
26. Administrators participate along side teachers in the school's professional development activities.	Less than one 7 or more	2.20 1.97	1.088 0.896	1.452	0.148
27. The principal actively participates in his/her own professional development activities to improve leadership in the school.	Less than one 7 or more	1.94 1.89	1.236 1.065	0.287	0.774
28. My supervisor and I jointly develop my annual professional development plan.	Less than one 7 or more	2.84 2.62	1.419 1.315	0.984	0.327
29. My professional development plan includes activities that are based on my individual professional needs and school needs.	Less than one 7 or more	2.88 2.51	1.423 1.257	1.678	0.095
30. Teachers actively participate in instructional decision-making.	Less than one 7 or more	2.18 2.33	0.850 0.997	-1.022	0.309
31. Central office and school administrator's work together to determine the professional development activities.	Less than one 7 or more	2.58 2.40	1.430 1.213	0.847	0.398

32. The principal is knowledgeable about current instructional issues.	Less than one 7 or more	1.78 1.80	0.815 1.005	-0.155	0.877
33. My principal's practices are consistent with his/her words.	Less than one 7 or more	1.80 2.03	0.990 0.944	-1.448	0.150
34. Informal school leaders play an important role in the school in improving the performance of professionals and the achievement of students.	Less than one 7 or more	2.36 2.27	1.225 0.971	0.461	0.646
35. The school has expanded its capacity by providing professional staff formal opportunities to take on leadership roles.	Less than one 7 or more	2.60 2.47	1.278 1.051	0.684	0.495
36. Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient school time to permit them to make meaningful contributions to the school.	Less than one 7 or more	2.88 2.79	1.118 1.022	0.528	0.598
37. Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient resources to be able to make meaningful contributions to the school.	Less than one 7 or more	2.70 2.72	1.165 1.027	-0.132	0.895
38. Veteran teachers fill most leadership roles in the school.	Less than one 7 or more	1.98 2.40	0.769 1.010	-2.968	0.004*
39. New teachers are provided opportunities to fill some school leadership roles.	Less than one 7 or more	3.00 2.61	1.229 0.997	2.177	0.031*
40. Teachers are interested in participating in school leadership roles.	Less than one 7 or more	2.74 2.58	0.922 0.772	1.174	0.242

*p <.05

Table C.10

Barker County Teachers' Differences on the DLRS by Total Years in the Present School, 1-3 Years versus 4-6 Years

Item		Mean	SD	t	P
1. The school has clearly written vision and mission statements.	1-3 years	1.31	0.802	1.480	0.142
	4-6 years	1.15	0.361		
2. Teachers and administrators understand and support a common mission for the school and can describe it clearly.	1-3 years	1.78	0.826	1.808	0.073
	4-6 years	1.52	0.746		
3. If parents are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission clearly.	1-3 years	3.34	0.874	0.262	0.794
	4-6 years	3.30	0.882		
4. If students are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission generally.	1-3 years	3.43	0.891	-0.527	0.599
	4-6 years	3.52	0.885		
5. School goals are aligned with its mission statement.	1-3 years	1.69	0.996	0.033	0.974
	4-6 years	1.69	1.006		
6. The school uses a school improvement plan as a basis to evaluate the progress it is making in attaining its goals.	1-3 years	1.56	0.741	-0.254	0.800
	4-6 years	1.59	0.714		
7. Teachers and administrators collectively establish school goals and revise goals annually.	1-3 years	2.21	1.059	2.208	0.029*
	4-6 years	1.81	0.848		
8. The school's curriculum is aligned with the state's academic standards.	1-3 years	1.31	0.629	1.008	0.315
	4-6 years	1.20	0.491		
9. Teachers and administrators have high expectations for students' academic performance.	1-3 years	1.43	0.630	-0.752	0.454
	4-6 years	1.52	0.720		
10. Teachers and administrators share accountability for students' academic performance.	1-3 years	1.84	0.840	-0.705	0.482
	4-6 years	1.94	0.811		

11. School and district resources are directed to those areas in which student learning needs to improve most.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.43 2.28	1.055 0.899	0.825	0.411
12. The school is a learning community that continually improves its effectiveness, learning from both successes and failures.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.15 2.06	0.885 0.878	0.569	0.570
13. There is a high level of mutual respect and trust among the teachers and other professional staff in the school.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.16 2.26	0.940 0.757	-0.619	0.537
14. There is mutual respect and trust between the school administration and the professional staff.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.22 2.39	0.895 0.979	-0.989	0.324
15. The school administrator(s) welcome professional staff members input on issues related to curriculum, instruction, and improving student performance.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.21 2.19	0.821 0.973	0.127	0.899
16. The school supports using new instructional ideas and innovations.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.13 2.04	0.945 0.823	0.585	0.559
17. The school's daily and weekly schedules provide time for teachers to collaborate on instructional issues.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.74 2.85	0.891 0.979	-0.687	0.494
18. School professionals and parents agree on the most effective roles parents can play as partners in their child's education.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.81 2.94	0.885 0.940	-0.818	0.415
19. The school clearly communicates the 'chain of contact' between home and school so parents know who to contact when they have questions and concerns.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.09 2.22	0.893 0.816	-0.854	0.395
20. The school makes available a variety of data (e.g. student performance) for teachers to use to improve student achievement.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.06 2.06	0.770 0.940	0.021	0.983
21. Decisions to change curriculum and instructional programs are based on assessment data.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.51 2.39	0.872 1.071	0.715	0.476

22. There is a formal structure in place in the school (e.g. curriculum committee) to provide teachers and professional staff opportunities to participate in school-level instructional decision-making.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.46 2.39	0.921 0.979	0.388	0.699
23. The principal actively encourages teachers and other staff members to participate in instructional decision-making.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.47 2.43	0.938 1.057	0.247	0.805
24. Professional staff members in the school have the responsibility to make decisions that affect meeting school goals.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.60 2.24	0.794 0.775	2.528	0.013*
25. The school provides teachers with professional development aligned with the school's mission and goals.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.22 2.11	0.832 0.744	0.786	0.433
26. Administrators participate along side teachers in the school's professional development activities.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.18 2.13	0.929 0.953	0.273	0.785
27. The principal actively participates in his/her own professional development activities to improve leadership in the school.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.09 2.37	0.989 1.154	-1.454	0.149
28. My supervisor and I jointly develop my annual professional development plan.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.51 2.60	1.211 1.176	-0.401	0.689
29. My professional development plan includes activities that are based on my individual professional needs and school needs.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.61 2.66	1.167 1.255	-0.213	0.831
30. Teachers actively participate in instructional decision-making.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.51 2.39	1.044 0.998	0.674	0.502
31. Central office and school administrator's work together to determine the professional development activities.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.60 2.72	1.024 1.156	-0.603	0.547
32. The principal is knowledgeable about current instructional issues.	1-3 years 4-6 years	1.97 2.02	0.828 0.942	-0.299	0.766

33. My principal's practices are consistent with his/her words.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.25 1.98	1.042 0.942	1.475	0.143
34. Informal school leaders play an important role in the school in improving the performance of professionals and the achievement of students.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.16 2.28	0.840 0.878	-0.743	0.459
35. The school has expanded its capacity by providing professional staff formal opportunities to take on leadership roles.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.62 2.69	1.093 0.865	-0.371	0.711
36. Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient school time to permit them to make meaningful contributions to the school.	1-3 years 4-6 years	3.01 2.96	0.954 0.910	0.304	0.762
37. Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient resources to be able to make meaningful contributions to the school.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.84 2.67	0.874 0.824	1.104	0.272
38. Veteran teachers fill most leadership roles in the school.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.69 2.57	1.033 0.944	0.619	0.537
39. New teachers are provided opportunities to fill some school leadership roles.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.84 2.65	1.016 0.756	1.145	0.254
40. Teachers are interested in participating in school leadership roles.	1-3 years 4-6 years	2.76 2.78	0.866 0.793	-0.086	0.932

*p <.05

Table C.11

Barker County Teachers' Differences on the DLRS by Total Years in the Present School, 1-3 Years versus 7 or More Years

Item		Mean	SD	t	P
1. The school has clearly written vision and mission statements.	1-3 years	1.31	0.802	1.722	0.089
	7 or more	1.13	0.444		
2. Teachers and administrators understand and support a common mission for the school and can describe it clearly.	1-3 years	1.78	0.826	1.520	0.130
	7 or more	1.60	0.744		
3. If parents are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission clearly.	1-3 years	3.34	0.874	0.973	0.332
	7 or more	3.20	0.941		
4. If students are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission generally.	1-3 years	3.43	0.891	1.027	0.306
	7 or more	3.29	0.903		
5. School goals are aligned with its mission statement.	1-3 years	1.69	0.996	1.289	0.199
	7 or more	1.54	0.657		
6. The school uses a school improvement plan as a basis to evaluate the progress it is making in attaining its goals.	1-3 years	1.56	0.741	0.830	0.407
	7 or more	1.47	0.669		
7. Teachers and administrators collectively establish school goals and revise goals annually.	1-3 years	2.21	1.059	3.303	0.001*
	7 or more	1.74	0.857		
8. The school's curriculum is aligned with the state's academic standards.	1-3 years	1.31	0.629	2.231	0.055
	7 or more	1.15	0.377		
9. Teachers and administrators have high expectations for students' academic performance.	1-3 years	1.43	0.630	0.581	0.562
	7 or more	1.37	0.578		

10. Teachers and administrators share accountability for students' academic performance.	1-3 years 7 or more	1.84 1.77	0.840 0.808	0.532	0.595
11. School and district resources are directed to those areas in which student learning needs to improve most.	1-3 years 7 or more	2.43 2.15	1.055 0.946	1.858	0.065
12. The school is a learning community that continually improves its effectiveness, learning from both successes and failures.	1-3 years 7 or more	2.15 1.79	0.885 0.812	2.827	0.005*
13. There is a high level of mutual respect and trust among the teachers and other professional staff in the school.	1-3 years 7 or more	2.16 2.10	0.940 0.817	0.485	0.628
14. There is mutual respect and trust between the school administration and the professional staff.	1-3 years 7 or more	2.22 2.17	0.895 0.875	0.374	0.628
15. The school administrator(s) welcome professional staff members input on issues related to curriculum, instruction, and improving student performance.	1-3 years 7 or more	2.21 2.09	0.821 0.923	0.374	0.709
16. The school supports using new instructional ideas and innovations.	1-3 years 7 or more	2.13 1.80	0.945 0.799	0.868	0.387
17. The school's daily and weekly schedules provide time for teachers to collaborate on instructional issues.	1-3 years 7 or more	2.74 2.74	0.891 1.070	2.602	0.010*
18. School professionals and parents agree on the most effective roles parents can play as partners in their child's education.	1-3 years 7 or more	2.81 2.74	0.885 0.913	-0.030	0.975
19. The school clearly communicates the 'chain of contact' between home and school so parents know who to contact when they have questions and concerns.	1-3 years 7 or more	2.09 1.98	0.893 0.804	0.505	0.614

20. The school makes available a variety of data (e.g. student performance) for teachers to use to improve student achievement.	1-3 years 7 or more	2.06 1.76	0.770 0.790	0.890	0.374
21. Decisions to change curriculum and instructional programs are based on assessment data.	1-3 years 7 or more	2.51 2.18	0.872 0.859	2.489	0.013*
22. There is a formal structure in place in the school (e.g. curriculum committee) to provide teachers and professional staff opportunities to participate in school-level instructional decision-making.	1-3 years 7 or more	2.46 2.37	0.921 1.125	2.573	0.011*
23. The principal actively encourages teachers and other staff members to participate in instructional decision-making.	1-3 years 7 or more	2.47 2.24	0.938 0.986	0.563	0.552
24. Professional staff members in the school have the responsibility to make decisions that affect meeting school goals.	1-3 years 7 or more	2.60 2.21	0.794 0.917	1.547	0.123
25. The school provides teachers with professional development aligned with the school's mission and goals.	1-3 years 7 or more	2.22 2.07	0.832 0.791	2.960	0.003*
26. Administrators participate along side teachers in the school's professional development activities.	1-3 years 7 or more	2.18 1.97	0.929 0.896	1.232	0.219
27. The principal actively participates in his/her own professional development activities to improve leadership in the school.	1-3 years 7 or more	2.09 1.89	0.989 1.065	1.523	0.129
28. My supervisor and I jointly develop my annual professional development plan.	1-3 years 7 or more	2.51 2.62	1.211 1.315	1.287	0.200
29. My professional development plan includes activities that are based on my individual professional needs and school needs.	1-3 years 7 or more	2.61 2.51	1.167 1.257	0.568	0.570

30. Teachers actively participate in instructional decision-making.	1-3 years 7 or more	2.51 2.33	1.044 0.997	0.536	0.593
31. Central office and school administrator's work together to determine the professional development activities.	1-3 years 7 or more	2.60 2.40	1.024 1.213	1.184	0.238
32. The principal is knowledgeable about current instructional issues.	1-3 years 7 or more	1.97 1.80	0.828 1.005	1.178	0.240
33. My principal's practices are consistent with his/her words.	1-3 years 7 or more	2.25 2.03	1.042 0.944	1.159	0.222
34. Informal school leaders play an important role in the school in improving the performance of professionals and the achievement of students.	1-3 years 7 or more	2.16 2.27	0.840 0.971	1.464	0.145
35. The school has expanded its capacity by providing professional staff formal opportunities to take on leadership roles.	1-3 years 7 or more	2.62 2.47	1.093 1.051	-0.776	0.439
36. Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient school time to permit them to make meaningful contributions to the school.	1-3 years 7 or more	3.01 2.79	0.954 1.022	0.907	0.366
37. Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient resources to be able to make meaningful contributions to the school.	1-3 years 7 or more	2.84 2.72	0.874 1.027	0.815	0.417
38. Veteran teachers fill most leadership roles in the school.	1-3 years 7 or more	2.69 2.40	1.033 1.010	1.841	0.467
39. New teachers are provided opportunities to fill some school leadership roles.	1-3 years 7 or more	2.84 2.61	1.016 0.997	1.506	0.134
40. Teachers are interested in participating in school leadership roles.	1-3 years 7 or more	2.76 2.58	0.866 0.772	1.523	0.130

*p <.05

Table C.12

Barker County Teachers' Differences on the DLRS by Total Years in the Present School, 4-6 Years versus 7 or More Years

Item		Mean	SD	t	P
1. The school has clearly written vision and mission statements.	4-6 years	1.15	0.361	0.286	0.775
	7 or more	1.13	0.444		
2. Teachers and administrators understand and support a common mission for the school and can describe it clearly.	4-6 years	1.52	0.746	-0.684	0.495
	7 or more	1.60	0.744		
3. If parents are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission clearly.	4-6 years	3.30	0.882	0.617	0.538
	7 or more	3.20	0.941		
4. If students are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission generally.	4-6 years	3.52	0.885	1.542	0.125
	7 or more	3.29	0.903		
5. School goals are aligned with its mission statement.	4-6 years	1.69	1.006	0.996	0.322
	7 or more	1.54	0.657		
6. The school uses a school improvement plan as a basis to evaluate the progress it is making in attaining its goals.	4-6 years	1.59	0.714	1.085	0.279
	7 or more	1.47	0.669		
7. Teachers and administrators collectively establish school goals and revise goals annually.	4-6 years	1.81	0.848	0.537	0.592
	7 or more	1.74	0.857		
8. The school's curriculum is aligned with the state's academic standards.	4-6 years	1.20	0.491	0.847	0.398
	7 or more	1.15	0.377		
9. Teachers and administrators have high expectations for students' academic performance.	4-6 years	1.52	0.720	1.302	0.196
	7 or more	1.37	0.578		

10. Teachers and administrators share accountability for students' academic performance.	4-6 years 7 or more	1.94 1.77	0.811 0.808	1.303	0.194
11. School and district resources are directed to those areas in which student learning needs to improve most.	4-6 years 7 or more	2.28 2.15	0.899 0.946	0.846	0.399
12. The school is a learning community that continually improves its effectiveness, learning from both successes and failures.	4-6 years 7 or more	2.06 1.79	0.878 0.812	1.964	0.051
13. There is a high level of mutual respect and trust among the teachers and other professional staff in the school.	4-6 years 7 or more	2.26 2.10	0.757 0.817	1.231	0.220
14. There is mutual respect and trust between the school administration and the professional staff.	4-6 years 7 or more	2.39 2.17	0.979 0.875	1.472	0.143
15. The school administrator(s) welcome professional staff members input on issues related to curriculum, instruction, and improving student performance.	4-6 years 7 or more	2.19 2.09	0.973 0.923	0.625	0.533
16. The school supports using new instructional ideas and innovations.	4-6 years 7 or more	2.04 1.80	0.823 0.799	1.825	0.070
17. The school's daily and weekly schedules provide time for teachers to collaborate on instructional issues.	4-6 years 7 or more	2.85 2.74	0.979 1.070	0.658	0.512
18. School professionals and parents agree on the most effective roles parents can play as partners in their child's education.	4-6 years 7 or more	2.94 2.74	0.940 0.913	1.361	0.175
19. The school clearly communicates the 'chain of contact' between home and school so parents know who to contact when they have questions and concerns.	4-6 years 7 or more	2.22 1.98	0.816 0.804	1.870	0.063
20. The school makes available a variety of data (e.g. student performance) for teachers to use to improve student achievement.	4-6 years 7 or more	2.06 1.76	0.940 0.790	2.129	0.035*

21. Decisions to change curriculum and instructional programs are based on assessment data.	4-6 years 7 or more	2.39 2.18	1.071 0.859	1.272	0.207
22. There is a formal structure in place in the school (e.g. curriculum committee) to provide teachers and professional staff opportunities to participate in school-level instructional decision-making.	4-6 years 7 or more	2.39 2.37	0.979 1.125	0.130	0.897
23. The principal actively encourages teachers and other staff members to participate in instructional decision-making.	4-6 years 7 or more	2.43 2.24	1.057 0.986	1.106	0.270
24. Professional staff members in the school have the responsibility to make decisions that affect meeting school goals.	4-6 years 7 or more	2.24 2.21	0.775 0.917	0.205	0.838
25. The school provides teachers with professional development aligned with the school's mission and goals.	4-6 years 7 or more	2.11 2.07	0.744 0.791	0.299	0.765
26. Administrators participate along side teachers in the school's professional development activities.	4-6 years 7 or more	2.13 1.97	0.953 0.896	1.088	0.278
27. The principal actively participates in his/her own professional development activities to improve leadership in the school.	4-6 years 7 or more	2.37 1.89	1.154 1.065	2.714	0.007*
28. My supervisor and I jointly develop my annual professional development plan.	4-6 years 7 or more	2.60 2.62	1.176 1.315	-0.103	0.918
29. My professional development plan includes activities that are based on my individual professional needs and school needs.	4-6 years 7 or more	2.66 2.51	1.255 1.257	0.701	0.484
30. Teachers actively participate in instructional decision-making.	4-6 years 7 or more	2.39 2.33	0.998 0.997	0.341	0.733

31. Central office and school administrator's work together to determine the professional development activities.	4-6 years 7 or more	2.72 2.40	1.156 1.213	1.659	0.099
32. The principal is knowledgeable about current instructional issues.	4-6 years 7 or more	2.02 1.80	0.942 1.005	1.327	0.186
33. My principal's practices are consistent with his/her words.	4-6 years 7 or more	1.98 2.03	0.942 0.944	-0.333	0.740
34. Informal school leaders play an important role in the school in improving the performance of professionals and the achievement of students.	4-6 years 7 or more	2.28 2.27	0.878 0.971	0.047	0.962
35. The school has expanded its capacity by providing professional staff formal opportunities to take on leadership roles.	4-6 years 7 or more	2.69 2.47	0.865 1.051	1.414	0.160
36. Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient school time to permit them to make meaningful contributions to the school.	4-6 years 7 or more	2.96 2.79	0.910 1.022	1.089	0.278
37. Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient resources to be able to make meaningful contributions to the school.	4-6 years 7 or more	2.67 2.72	0.824 1.027	-0.359	0.720
38. Veteran teachers fill most leadership roles in the school.	4-6 years 7 or more	2.57 2.40	0.944 1.010	1.066	0.288
39. New teachers are provided opportunities to fill some school leadership roles.	4-6 years 7 or more	2.65 2.61	0.756 0.997	0.281	0.779
40. Teachers are interested in participating in school leadership roles.	4-6 years 7 or more	2.78 2.58	0.793 0.772	1.564	0.120

*p <.05

Table C.13

Barker County Teachers' Differences on the DLRS Leadership Role versus No Role

Item		Mean	SD	t	P
1. The school has clearly written vision and mission statements.	Role	1.19	0.522	-0.610	0.542
	No role	1.24	0.697		
2. Teachers and administrators understand and support a common mission for the school and can describe it clearly.	Role	1.63	0.700	0.025	0.980
	No role	1.62	0.781		
3. If parents are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission clearly.	Role	3.18	0.965	-0.938	0.349
	No role	3.29	0.927		
4. If students are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission generally.	Role	3.47	0.805	1.227	0.221
	No role	3.33	0.949		
5. School goals are aligned with its mission statement.	Role	1.59	0.705	-0.889	0.375
	No role	1.69	0.951		
6. The school uses a school improvement plan as a basis to evaluate the progress it is making in attaining its goals.	Role	1.38	0.532	-2.506	0.004*
	No role	1.60	0.778		
7. Teachers and administrators collectively establish school goals and revise goals annually.	Role	1.66	0.786	-3.299	0.001*
	No role	2.07	1.043		
8. The school's curriculum is aligned with the state's academic standards.	Role	1.22	0.535	0.160	0.873
	No role	1.21	0.473		
9. Teachers and administrators have high expectations for students' academic performance.	Role	1.39	0.556	-0.074	0.941
	No role	1.39	0.638		
10. Teachers and administrators share accountability for students' academic performance.	Role	1.70	0.730	-1.583	0.115
	No role	1.88	0.901		
11. School and district resources are directed to those areas in which student learning needs to improve most.	Role	2.09	0.960	-1.950	0.052
	No role	2.33	0.978		
12. The school is a learning community that continually improves its effectiveness, learning from both successes and failures.	Role	1.89	0.808	-0.882	0.379
	No role	1.98	0.848		

13. There is a high level of mutual respect and trust among the teachers and other professional staff in the school.	Role No role	2.06 2.14	0.783 0.866	-0.740	0.460
14. There is mutual respect and trust between the school administration and the professional staff.	Role No role	2.14 2.24	0.833 0.901	-0.881	0.379
15. The school administrator(s) welcome professional staff members input on issues related to curriculum, instruction, and improving student performance.	Role No role	1.97 2.21	0.877 0.880	-2.140	0.033*
16. The school supports using new instructional ideas and innovations.	Role No role	1.66 2.06	0.741 0.886	-3.709	0.000*
17. The school's daily and weekly schedules provide time for teachers to collaborate on instructional issues.	Role No role	2.61 2.75	1.033 0.979	-1.035	0.302
18. School professionals and parents agree on the most effective roles parents can play as partners in their child's education.	Role No role	2.80 2.77	0.924 0.935	0.176	0.860
19. The school clearly communicates the 'chain of contact' between home and school so parents know who to contact when they have questions and concerns.	Role No role	2.03 2.09	0.850 0.852	-0.544	0.587
20. The school makes available a variety of data (e.g. student performance) for teachers to use to improve student achievement.	Role No role	1.76 1.99	0.858 0.812	-2.172	0.031*
21. Decisions to change curriculum and instructional programs are based on assessment data.	Role No role	2.05 2.41	0.856 1.001	-3.141	0.002*
22. There is a formal structure in place in the school (e.g. curriculum committee) to provide teachers and professional staff opportunities to participate in school-level instructional decision-making.	Role No role	2.18 2.47	1.034 1.004	-2.196	0.029*
23. The principal actively encourages teachers and other staff members to participate in instructional decision-making.	Role No role	2.09 2.42	0.967 0.982	-2.614	0.009*

24. Professional staff members in the school have the responsibility to make decisions that affect meeting school goals.	Role No role	2.08 2.40	0.847 0.885	-2.893	0.004*
25. The school provides teachers with professional development aligned with the school's mission and goals.	Role No role	2.02 2.22	0.807 0.885	-1.789	0.075
26. Administrators participate along side teachers in the school's professional development activities.	Role No role	1.81 2.20	0.842 0.974	-3.299	0.001
27. The principal actively participates in his/her own professional development activities to improve leadership in the school.	Role No role	1.93 2.07	1.153 1.087	-1.004	0.316
28. My supervisor and I jointly develop my annual professional development plan.	Role No role	2.66 2.61	1.337 1.270	0.280	0.780
29. My professional development plan includes activities that are based on my individual professional needs and school needs.	Role No role	2.53 2.64	1.262 1.265	-0.656	0.512
30. Teachers actively participate in instructional decision-making.	Role No role	2.26 2.41	0.941 1.005	-1.156	0.248
31. Central office and school administrator's work together to determine the professional development activities.	Role No role	2.44 2.58	1.212 1.207	-0.878	0.381
32. The principal is knowledgeable about current instructional issues.	Role No role	1.75 1.93	0.874 0.941	-1.501	0.134
33. My principal's practices are consistent with his/her words.	Role No role	1.91 2.08	0.936 0.992	-1.404	0.161
34. Informal school leaders play an important role in the school in improving the performance of professionals and the achievement of students.	Role No role	2.02 2.36	0.876 1.000	-2.901	0.004*
35. The school has expanded its capacity by providing professional staff formal opportunities to take on leadership roles.	Role No role	2.33 2.66	1.025 1.069	-2.430	0.016*

36. Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient school time to permit them to make meaningful contributions to the school.	Role No role	2.79 2.93	0.966 1.015	-1.079	0.281
37. Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient resources to be able to make meaningful contributions to the school.	Role No role	2.61 2.78	0.863 1.033	-1.359	0.175
38. Veteran teachers fill most leadership roles in the school.	Role No role	2.43 2.44	0.972 1.000	-0.103	0.918
39. New teachers are provided opportunities to fill some school leadership roles.	Role No role	2.59 2.80	0.918 1.051	-1.649	0.100
40. Teachers are interested in participating in school leadership roles.	Role No role	2.63 2.71	0.783 0.848	-0.777	0.438

*p<.05

Table C.14

Barker County Teachers' Differences on the DLRS Viewed as a Leader Moderate Extent versus Minimal Extent

Item		Mean	SD	t	P
1. The school has clearly written vision and mission statements.	Moderate	1.19	0.556	-0.633	0.527
	Minimal	1.24	0.712		
2. Teachers and administrators understand and support a common mission for the school and can describe it clearly.	Moderate	1.63	0.738	-0.027	0.979
	Minimal	1.63	0.788		
3. If parents are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission clearly.	Moderate	3.22	1.004	-0.945	0.346
	Minimal	3.33	0.811		
4. If students are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission generally.	Moderate	3.32	0.918	-1.171	0.243
	Minimal	3.45	0.858		
5. School goals are aligned with its mission statement.	Moderate	1.71	0.821	0.436	0.663
	Minimal	1.66	0.966		
6. The school uses a school improvement plan as a basis to evaluate the progress it is making in attaining its goals.	Moderate	1.55	0.737	0.132	0.895
	Minimal	1.54	0.721		
7. Teachers and administrators collectively establish school goals and revise goals annually.	Moderate	1.95	0.963	-0.170	0.865
	Minimal	1.98	1.000		
8. The school's curriculum is aligned with the state's academic standards.	Moderate	1.19	0.530	-0.253	0.800
	Minimal	1.21	0.466		
9. Teachers and administrators have high expectations for students' academic performance.	Moderate	1.37	0.612	-0.807	0.421
	Minimal	1.43	0.645		
10. Teachers and administrators share accountability for students' academic performance.	Moderate	1.75	0.848	-1.542	0.124
	Minimal	1.92	0.836		
11. School and district resources are directed to those areas in which student learning needs to improve most.	Moderate	2.15	0.914	-2.302	0.022*
	Minimal	2.43	1.027		

12. The school is a learning community that continually improves its effectiveness, learning from both successes and failures.	Moderate Minimal	1.86 2.07	0.795 0.857	-1.963	0.051
13. There is a high level of mutual respect and trust among the teachers and other professional staff in the school.	Moderate Minimal	2.00 2.24	0.854 0.813	-2.302	0.022*
14. There is mutual respect and trust between the school administration and the professional staff.	Moderate Minimal	2.17 2.25	0.916 0.843	-0.724	0.470
15. The school administrator(s) welcome professional staff members input on issues related to curriculum, instruction, and improving student performance.	Moderate Minimal	2.05 2.25	0.918 0.812	-1.784	0.076
16. The school supports using new instructional ideas and innovations.	Moderate Minimal	1.79 2.08	0.832 0.801	-2.732	0.007*
17. The school's daily and weekly schedules provide time for teachers to collaborate on instructional issues.	Moderate Minimal	2.53 2.87	1.051 0.859	-2.754	0.006*
18. School professionals and parents agree on the most effective roles parents can play as partners in their child's education.	Moderate Minimal	2.70 2.90	0.978 0.893	-1.691	0.092
19. The school clearly communicates the 'chain of contact' between home and school so parents know who to contact when they have questions and concerns.	Moderate Minimal	2.04 2.11	0.848 0.906	-0.630	0.529
20. The school makes available a variety of data (e.g. student performance) for teachers to use to improve student achievement.	Moderate Minimal	1.92 1.95	0.924 0.743	-0.328	0.743
21. Decisions to change curriculum and instructional programs are based on assessment data.	Moderate Minimal	2.27 2.34	0.913 1.000	-0.599	0.550
22. There is a formal structure in place in the school (e.g. curriculum committee) to provide teachers and professional staff opportunities to participate in school-level instructional decision-making.	Moderate Minimal	2.37 2.44	1.035 0.977	-0.568	0.571

23. The principal actively encourages teachers and other staff members to participate in instructional decision-making.	Moderate Minimal	2.22 2.43	0.983 0.967	-1.636	0.103
24. Professional staff members in the school have the responsibility to make decisions that affect meeting school goals.	Moderate Minimal	2.18 2.53	0.830 0.888	-3.202	0.002*
25. The school provides teachers with professional development aligned with the school's mission and goals.	Moderate Minimal	2.09 2.29	0.821 0.903	-1.770	0.078
26. Administrators participate along side teachers in the school's professional development activities.	Moderate Minimal	1.93 2.27	0.891 0.994	-0.818	0.005*
27. The principal actively participates in his/her own professional development activities to improve leadership in the school.	Moderate Minimal	1.84 2.26	1.055 1.149	-3.013	0.003*
28. My supervisor and I jointly develop my annual professional development plan.	Moderate Minimal	2.63 2.64	1.341 1.182	-0.048	0.962
29. My professional development plan includes activities that are based on my individual professional needs and school needs.	Moderate Minimal	2.70 2.62	1.305 1.169	0.518	0.605
30. Teachers actively participate in instructional decision-making.	Moderate Minimal	2.04 2.38	0.952 0.981	-2.152	0.033*
31. Central office and school administrator's work together to determine the professional development activities.	Moderate Minimal	2.40 2.73	1.243 1.137	-2.151	0.032*
32. The principal is knowledgeable about current instructional issues.	Moderate Minimal	1.73 2.04	0.861 0.965	-2.692	0.008*
33. My principal's practices are consistent with his/her words.	Moderate Minimal	1.98 2.10	0.992 1.008	-0.973	0.332
34. Informal school leaders play an important role in the school in improving the performance of professionals and the achievement of students.	Moderate Minimal	2.18 2.39	0.987 0.955	-1.683	0.094

35. The school has expanded its capacity by providing professional staff formal opportunities to take on leadership roles.	Moderate Minimal	2.42 2.76	1.092 1.029	-2.494	0.013*
36. Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient school time to permit them to make meaningful contributions to the school.	Moderate Minimal	2.83 3.02	0.961 1.021	-1.491	0.137
37. Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient resources to be able to make meaningful contributions to the school.	Moderate Minimal	2.65 2.87	0.962 0.995	-1.719	0.087
38. Veteran teachers fill most leadership roles in the school.	Moderate Minimal	2.42 2.46	1.077 0.881	-0.377	0.707
39. New teachers are provided opportunities to fill some school leadership roles.	Moderate Minimal	2.65 2.86	1.062 0.946	-1.610	0.109
40. Teachers are interested in participating in school leadership roles.	Moderate Minimal	2.59 2.79	0.891 0.766	-1.879	0.061

*p <.05

Table C.15

Barker County Teachers' Differences on the DLRS Viewed as a Leader Great Extent versus Minimal Extent

Item		Mean	SD	t	P
1. The school has clearly written vision and mission statements.	Great	1.31	0.701	0.594	0.553
	Minimal	1.24	0.712		
2. Teachers and administrators understand and support a common mission for the school and can describe it clearly.	Great	1.62	0.777	-0.081	0.936
	Minimal	1.63	0.788		
3. If parents are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission clearly.	Great	3.20	1.036	-0.815	0.416
	Minimal	3.33	0.811		
4. If students are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission generally.	Great	3.29	1.058	-1.006	0.316
	Minimal	3.45	0.858		
5. School goals are aligned with its mission statement.	Great	1.58	0.892	-0.487	0.627
	Minimal	1.66	0.966		
6. The school uses a school improvement plan as a basis to evaluate the progress it is making in attaining its goals.	Great	1.47	0.661	-0.609	0.544
	Minimal	1.54	0.721		
7. Teachers and administrators collectively establish school goals and revise goals annually.	Great	1.80	1.036	-0.992	0.323
	Minimal	1.98	1.000		
8. The school's curriculum is aligned with the state's academic standards.	Great	1.24	0.435	0.452	0.652
	Minimal	1.21	0.466		
9. Teachers and administrators have high expectations for students' academic performance.	Great	1.33	0.522	-0.932	0.353
	Minimal	1.43	0.645		
10. Teachers and administrators share accountability for students' academic performance.	Great	1.78	0.902	-0.930	0.354
	Minimal	1.92	0.836		
11. School and district resources are directed to those areas in which student learning needs to improve most.	Great	2.09	0.949	-1.958	0.052
	Minimal	2.43	1.027		

12. The school is a learning community that continually improves its effectiveness, learning from both successes and failures.	Great Minimal	1.91 2.07	0.874 0.857	-1.032	0.303
13. There is a high level of mutual respect and trust among the teachers and other professional staff in the school.	Great Minimal	2.11 2.24	0.859 0.813	-0.918	0.360
14. There is mutual respect and trust between the school administration and the professional staff.	Great Minimal	2.18 2.25	0.886 0.843	-0.483	0.629
15. The school administrator(s) welcome professional staff members input on issues related to curriculum, instruction, and improving student performance.	Great Minimal	2.04 2.25	0.952 0.812	-1.380	0.170
16. The school supports using new instructional ideas and innovations.	Great Minimal	2.00 2.08	1.044 0.801	-0.491	0.664
17. The school's daily and weekly schedules provide time for teachers to collaborate on instructional issues.	Great Minimal	2.73 2.87	1.116 0.859	-0.725	0.471
18. School professionals and parents agree on the most effective roles parents can play as partners in their child's education.	Great Minimal	2.73 2.90	0.915 0.893	-1.061	0.290
19. The school clearly communicates the 'chain of contact' between home and school so parents know who to contact when they have questions and concerns.	Great Minimal	2.07 2.11	0.688 0.906	-0.316	0.752
20. The school makes available a variety of data (e.g. student performance) for teachers to use to improve student achievement.	Great Minimal	1.87 1.95	0.786 0.743	-0.631	0.529
21. Decisions to change curriculum and instructional programs are based on assessment data.	Great Minimal	2.29 2.34	1.058 1.000	-0.297	0.767
22. There is a formal structure in place in the school (e.g. curriculum committee) to provide teachers and professional staff opportunities to participate in school-level instructional decision-making.	Great Minimal	2.22 2.44	1.085 0.977	-1.246	0.214

23. The principal actively encourages teachers and other staff members to participate in instructional decision-making.	Great Minimal	2.33 3.43	1.066 0.967	-0.527	0.599
24. Professional staff members in the school have the responsibility to make decisions that affect meeting school goals.	Great Minimal	2.16 2.53	0.952 0.888	-2.332	0.021*
25. The school provides teachers with professional development aligned with the school's mission and goals.	Great Minimal	2.02 2.29	0.866 0.903	-1.686	0.094
26. Administrators participate along side teachers in the school's professional development activities.	Great Minimal	2.04 2.27	0.928 0.994	-1.302	0.195
27. The principal actively participates in his/her own professional development activities to improve leadership in the school.	Great Minimal	1.98 2.26	1.033 1.149	-1.435	0.153
28. My supervisor and I jointly develop my annual professional development plan.	Great Minimal	2.60 2.64	1.405 1.182	-0.163	0.871
29. My professional development plan includes activities that are based on my individual professional needs and school needs.	Great Minimal	2.42 2.62	1.406 1.169	-0.834	0.407
30. Teachers actively participate in instructional decision-making.	Great Minimal	2.10 2.38	0.948 0.881	-2.140	0.040*
31. Central office and school administrator's work together to determine the professional development activities.	Great Minimal	2.42 2.73	1.215 1.137	-1.495	0.137
32. The principal is knowledgeable about current instructional issues.	Great Minimal	1.87 2.04	0.944 0.965	-1.044	0.298
33. My principal's practices are consistent with his/her words.	Great Minimal	2.02 2.10	0.876 1.008	-0.450	0.653
34. Informal school leaders play an important role in the school in improving the performance of professionals and the achievement of students.	Great Minimal	2.14 2.39	0.955 0.955	-1.517	0.131

35. The school has expanded its capacity by providing professional staff formal opportunities to take on leadership roles.	Great Minimal	2.47 2.76	1.057 1.029	-1.609	0.109
36. Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient school time to permit them to make meaningful contributions to the school.	Great Minimal	2.71 3.02	1.058 1.021	-1.696	0.092
37. Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient resources to be able to make meaningful contributions to the school.	Great Minimal	2.62 2.87	0.984 0.995	-1.410	0.161
38. Veteran teachers fill most leadership roles in the school.	Great Minimal	2.36 2.46	1.014 0.881	-0.608	0.544
39. New teachers are provided opportunities to fill some school leadership roles.	Great Minimal	2.64 2.86	1.026 0.946	-1.263	0.208
40. Teachers are interested in participating in school leadership roles.	Great Minimal	2.67 2.79	0.769 0.766	-0.933	0.352

*p<.05

Table C.16

Barker County Teachers' Differences on the DLRS Viewed as a Leader Great Extent versus Moderate Extent

Item		Mean	SD	t	P
1. The school has clearly written vision and mission statements.	Great	1.31	0.701	1.083	0.283
	Moderate	1.19	0.556		
2. Teachers and administrators understand and support a common mission for the school and can describe it clearly.	Great	1.62	0.777	-0.066	0.947
	Moderate	1.63	0.738		
3. If parents are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission clearly.	Great	3.20	1.036	-0.880	0.930
	Moderate	3.22	1.004		
4. If students are asked to describe the school's mission, most would be able to describe the mission generally.	Great	3.29	1.058	-0.175	0.861
	Moderate	3.32	0.918		
5. School goals are aligned with its mission statement.	Great	1.58	0.892	-0.895	0.372
	Moderate	1.71	0.821		
6. The school uses a school improvement plan as a basis to evaluate the progress it is making in attaining its goals.	Great	1.47	0.661	-0.701	0.484
	Moderate	1.55	0.737		
7. Teachers and administrators collectively establish school goals and revise goals annually.	Great	1.80	1.036	-0.906	0.366
	Moderate	1.95	0.963		
8. The school's curriculum is aligned with the state's academic standards.	Great	1.24	0.435	0.594	0.553
	Moderate	1.19	0.530		
9. Teachers and administrators have high expectations for students' academic performance.	Great	1.33	0.522	-0.352	0.726
	Moderate	1.37	0.612		
10. Teachers and administrators share accountability for students' academic performance.	Great	1.78	0.902	0.173	0.863
	Moderate	1.75	0.848		
11. School and district resources are directed to those areas in which student learning needs to improve most.	Great	2.09	0.949	-0.372	0.710
	Moderate	2.15	0.914		

12. The school is a learning community that continually improves its effectiveness, learning from both successes and failures.	Great Moderate	1.91 1.86	0.874 0.795	0.351	0.726
13. There is a high level of mutual respect and trust among the teachers and other professional staff in the school.	Great Moderate	2.11 2.00	0.859 0.854	0.751	0.453
14. There is mutual respect and trust between the school administration and the professional staff.	Great Moderate	2.18 2.17	0.886 0.916	0.054	0.957
15. The school administrator(s) welcome professional staff members input on issues related to curriculum, instruction, and improving student performance.	Great Moderate	2.04 2.05	0.952 0.918	-0.059	0.953
16. The school supports using new instructional ideas and innovations.	Great Moderate	2.00 1.79	1.044 0.832	1.347	0.180
17. The school's daily and weekly schedules provide time for teachers to collaborate on instructional issues.	Great Moderate	2.73 2.53	1.116 1.051	1.097	0.274
18. School professionals and parents agree on the most effective roles parents can play as partners in their child's education.	Great Moderate	2.73 2.70	0.915 0.978	0.200	0.841
19. The school clearly communicates the 'chain of contact' between home and school so parents know who to contact when they have questions and concerns.	Great Moderate	2.07 2.04	0.688 0.848	0.201	0.841
20. The school makes available a variety of data (e.g. student performance) for teachers to use to improve student achievement.	Great Moderate	1.87 1.92	0.786 0.924	-0.316	0.752
21. Decisions to change curriculum and instructional programs are based on assessment data.	Great Moderate	2.29 2.27	1.058 0.913	0.119	0.905
22. There is a formal structure in place in the school (e.g. curriculum committee) to provide teachers and professional staff opportunities to participate in school-level instructional decision-making.	Great Moderate	2.22 2.37	1.085 1.035	-0.811	0.419

23. The principal actively encourages teachers and other staff members to participate in instructional decision-making.	Great Moderate	2.33 2.22	1.066 0.983	0.635	0.526
24. Professional staff members in the school have the responsibility to make decisions that affect meeting school goals.	Great Moderate	2.16 2.18	0.952 0.830	-0.143	0.886
25. The school provides teachers with professional development aligned with the school's mission and goals.	Great Moderate	2.02 2.09	0.866 0.821	-0.487	0.627
26. Administrators participate along side teachers in the school's professional development activities.	Great Moderate	2.04 1.93	0.928 0.891	0.730	0.466
27. The principal actively participates in his/her own professional development activities to improve leadership in the school.	Great Moderate	1.98 1.84	1.033 1.055	0.767	0.444
28. My supervisor and I jointly develop my annual professional development plan.	Great Moderate	2.60 2.63	1.405 1.341	-0.119	0.906
29. My professional development plan includes activities that are based on my individual professional needs and school needs.	Great Moderate	2.42 2.70	1.406 1.305	-1.206	0.230
30. Teachers actively participate in instructional decision-making.	Great Moderate	2.10 2.04	0.948 1.072	0.198	0.989
31. Central office and school administrator's work together to determine the professional development activities.	Great Moderate	2.42 2.40	1.215 1.243	0.104	0.917
32. The principal is knowledgeable about current instructional issues.	Great Moderate	1.87 1.73	0.944 0.861	0.890	0.375
33. My principal's practices are consistent with his/her words.	Great Moderate	2.02 1.98	0.876 0.992	0.272	0.786
34. Informal school leaders play an important role in the school in improving the performance of professionals and the achievement of students.	Great Moderate	2.14 2.18	0.955 0.987	-0.283	0.778

35. The school has expanded its capacity by providing professional staff formal opportunities to take on leadership roles.	Great Moderate	2.47 2.42	1.057 1.092	0.233	0.816
36. Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient school time to permit them to make meaningful contributions to the school.	Great Moderate	2.71 2.83	1.058 0.961	-0.693	0.489
37. Teachers who assume leadership roles in the school have sufficient resources to be able to make meaningful contributions to the school.	Great Moderate	2.62 2.65	0.984 0.962	-0.189	0.850
38. Veteran teachers fill most leadership roles in the school.	Great Moderate	2.36 2.42	1.014 1.077	-0.280	0.780
39. New teachers are provided opportunities to fill some school leadership roles.	Great Moderate	2.64 2.65	1.026 1.062	-0.052	0.959
40. Teachers are interested in participating in school leadership roles.	Great Moderate	2.67 2.59	0.769 0.891	0.488	0.626

*p<.05