

Louisiana Tech University

Louisiana Tech Digital Commons

Doctoral Dissertations

Graduate School

Spring 5-2022

A Qualitative Analysis of Distributed Leadership in an Elementary School Setting

Kristel Webb

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.latech.edu/dissertations>

**A QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF DISTRIBUTED
LEADERSHIP IN AN ELEMENTARY
SCHOOL SETTING**

by

Kristel Webb, B.S., M.A.T., M.S.

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education: Educational Leadership

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
LOUISIANA TECH UNIVERSITY

May 2022

LOUISIANA TECH UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL

March 10, 2022

Date of dissertation defense

We hereby recommend that the dissertation prepared by


Kristel Webb, B.S., M.A.T., M.S.

entitled **A Qualitative Analysis of Distributed Leadership in an Elementary**

School Setting

be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education, Educational Leadership Concentration



Bryan McCoy
Supervisor of Dissertation Research



Dustin Hebert
Head of Curriculum, Instruction, and Leadership

Doctoral Committee Members:

Joanne Hood

Patsy Hughey

Approved:



Don Schillinger
Dean of Education

Approved:



Ramu Ramachandran
Dean of the Graduate School

ABSTRACT

This qualitative case study investigated the processes by which an elementary school principal uses Distributed Leadership to accomplish leadership tasks and progress toward organizational goals. It aimed to provide a thick description of the practices, behaviors, perspectives, and experiences of the participants of Distributed Leadership. The research participants included one principal and eight teacher leaders in a pre-kindergarten through second grade school in the southeastern part of the United States, having been identified as having Distributed Leadership. The study used observations, interviews, and document analysis to collect qualitative data. The study's finding revealed four themes: leaders' abilities to pinpoint other leaders within the school, the importance of protected time to complete leadership tasks, leaders' desire for proper planning and preparation, leaders' reluctance to relinquish control, and leaders' responsibilities to monitor progress once expectations have been established and communicated.

The study revealed several essential processes of Distributed Leadership, including time management, the formulation of interpersonal relationships, selecting competent leaders and building the capacity of those leaders, and professional development throughout the Distributed Leadership model. Recommendations from this study suggests that principals invest specific and dedicated time into developing schedules that provide staff with opportunities to complete instructional and leadership

tasks and that principals pinpoint areas of opportunity for staff professional development then provide rigorous and ongoing professional development opportunities for the leadership team members. Lastly, recommendations from this study encourage placing the most suitable people in the most suitable positions. The information provided from the current study will enable school leaders to model Distributed Leadership as they strive to accomplish leadership tasks and progress toward organizational goals. This study will encourage future research to explore claims of causality of Distributed Leadership.

APPROVAL FOR SCHOLARLY DISSEMINATION

The author grants to the Prescott Memorial Library of Louisiana Tech University the right to reproduce, by appropriate methods, upon request, any or all portions of this Dissertation. It was understood that “proper request” consists of the agreement, on the part of the requesting party, that said reproduction is for his personal use and that subsequent reproduction will not occur without written approval of the author of this Dissertation. Further, any portions of the Dissertation used in books, papers, and other works must be appropriately referenced to this Dissertation.

Finally, the author of this Dissertation reserves the right to publish freely, in the literature, at any time, any or all portions of this Dissertation.

Author _____

Date _____

DEDICATION

The completion of my doctoral studies is dedicated in loving memory of my mother, Debora R. Webb. You were with me up to the very end and I am eternally grateful for your love and support. I owe much of my success to you. To my father, Coach Earl Webb, Sr., you are the best educator ever. Terry Douglas, Jr., my only child, I pray that I have set an example that you are proud of; I love you wholeheartedly. Last, but not least, to my dear friend Nemias Madere, Sr., thank you for your encouragement and support. It runs deeper than anyone will ever know.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
APPROVAL FOR SCHOLARLY DISSEMINATION	v
DEDICATION.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	x
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
Background of the Problem	2
Limitations of the Study.....	3
Delimitations of the Study	3
Purpose of the Study	4
Significance of the Study	4
Theoretical Framework.....	5
Conceptual Framework.....	5
Methodology and Research Question	6
Definition of Key Terms.....	7
Summary.....	7
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	9
Literature Search Strategy.....	10
General Systems Theory as a Theoretical Framework	10
Distributed Leadership as a Conceptual Framework	12

Actors Within Distributed Leadership	14
Practices, Behaviors, Perspectives and Experiences of the Participants of Distributed Leadership.....	16
Summary	19
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY	22
Research Question	22
Rationale for Qualitative Design	22
Site and Participant Selection	23
Data Collection and Instruments.....	24
Direct Observations	24
Interviews.....	25
Document Analysis.....	25
Data Analysis	26
Ethical Considerations	26
Role of the Researcher	27
Validity and Trustworthiness.....	29
CHAPTER 4 RESULTS	30
Leaders’ Abilities to Pinpoint Other Leaders Within the School	30
The Importance of Protected Time to Complete Leadership Task.....	34
Leaders’ Desires for Proper Planning and Preparation.....	37
Leaders’ Reluctance to Relinquishing Control.....	40
Monitoring Progress Once Expectations Have Been Established and Communicated	42
CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION.....	44

Discussion	45
Implications for Future Research	50
Recommendations for Professional Practice	51
Conclusion	53
REFERENCES	54
APPENDIX A HUMAN USE APPROVAL LETTER	62
APPENDIX B INTERVIEW PROTOCOL.....	65
APPENDIX C SCHEDULE EXAMPLES	68

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	<i>Participant Demographics and Descriptions</i>	24
---------	--	----

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

School performance is affected by the leadership styles of decision makers. In Distributed Leadership, leadership is the process of continuous interactivity between multiple members who possess the authority to produce the best possible results for an educational institution (Crevani et al., 2007). According to Corrigan (2013), there is considerable interest in the benefits of the reciprocal nature of handing over one's power.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the processes by which an elementary school principal uses Distributed Leadership to accomplish leadership tasks and progress toward organizational goals. There is a robust body of scholarly literature on Distributed Leadership; however, there is little agreement on a working definition (Davison et al., 2013). There is more to be learned about the patterns of distribution of leadership within elementary schools; therefore, this research study aims to provide a detailed description of Distributed Leadership in elementary schools. An exploration of General Systems Theory provides a broader idea of the wholeness of schools and how the interactions among individuals and individual tasks affect the effectiveness of the entire organization (Banathy & Jenlink, 2003). Due to increased demands in the school accountability system, school principals are tasked with creating environments of shared leadership and collaboratively building the capacities of followers.

Background of the Problem

According to Jones (2014), Distributed Leadership emerged from attempts to improve primary and secondary school systems in the United States but can provide substantial groundwork across educational contexts. Shava and Tlou (2018) explained despite its widespread use in studies of educational leadership, the concept of Distributed Leadership remains unclear with different meanings and interpretations. The interchangeable use of differing terms and definitions causes conceptual confusion and theoretical overlaps (Harris & Spillane, 2008). The vagueness surrounding the definition of Distributed Leadership is considered a weakness of the theory. Shared leadership, collaborative leadership, situational leadership, and democratic leadership are considered synonymous. This accumulation of allied concepts not only serves to obscure the meaning, but also presents a real danger that Distributed Leadership will simply be used as a catch all term to describe any form of devolved, shared, democratic, or dispersed leadership practice (Harris & Spillane, 2008).

As a result of the previous concern, Shava and Tlou (2018) imply that the different meanings and approaches to the definition of Distributed Leadership affect the ability to comprehend and apply the concept. Shava and Tlou (2018) have argued that findings from available studies on the effects of Distributed Leadership on educational outcomes may be unreliable or invalid due to the differences in the definition of the term. There is a clear need for a working model and identifiable characteristics of Distributed Leadership.

Limitations of the Study

The following limitations pertain to the research study. One limitation was that COVID-19 restricted my access to schools, school leaders, and students. Many schools were forced to redesign visitor policies with heightened security and safety protocols being put into place. This affected my ability to capture all nuances of situations. Another limitation was data in this study were provided by an elementary school principal and teachers in a diverse school located in the southeastern region of the United States. Therefore, results may not generalize to principals and teachers in other elementary schools or other regions of the United States (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970). Another limitation is that descriptive methodology does not allow for claims of causality.

Delimitations of the Study

The following delimitations pertain to the research study. One delimitation was more virtual engagement occurred for otherwise typical interactions between participants than in the traditional settings. Another delimitation was that this study included one public elementary school in a suburban environment and did not include any private or religious elementary schools. This was purposeful due to the requirements of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) affecting public schools. Another limitation is that there is no assessment of the efficacy of Distributed Leadership; only a rich description was derived. An additional limitation is that the current study examined Distributed Leadership in pre-kindergarten through second grades only.

Purpose of the Study

Due to the accountability requirements placed upon schools, many principals have turned to staff members to assist them in implementing the various school programs and reforms (Margolis & Huggins, 2012). The purpose of this study was to investigate the processes by which an elementary school principal uses Distributed Leadership to accomplish leadership tasks and progress toward organizational goals.

Harris (2009) concluded that the empirical evidence about Distributed Leadership and organizational development was encouraging but far from conclusive. More needs to be known about Distributed Leadership's barriers, unintended consequences, and limitations before offering any advice or prescription. In addition to the limitations, more needs to be known about the pitfalls, opportunities, and potentials of this model of leadership practice. The outcomes of this case study may be used to contribute to the development of a model of Distributed Leadership in an elementary school setting. It is crucial to reveal barriers school leaders experience when distributing leadership throughout their schools.

Significance of the Study

Onukwugha (2013) concluded that school leaders who practice Distributed Leadership need to understand how leadership practices affect student performance. Prior to claims of causality of Distributed Leadership, there must be a clear understanding of the processes by which school leaders use distributed leadership processes to accomplish leadership tasks and progress toward organizational goals. This research examined in detail one elementary school and acknowledged the specific educators who play roles in distributed leadership models. Once the particular educators were identified, the study

provided a thick description of the practices, behaviors, perspectives, and experiences of the participants of Distributed Leadership.

The information provided from the current study will enable school leaders to model Distributed Leadership as they strive to accomplish leadership tasks and progress toward organizational goals. This study will encourage future research to explore claims of causality of Distributed Leadership.

Theoretical Framework

General Systems Theory was the theoretical framework for this study. The premise of General Systems Theory is that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts (Whitchurch & Constantine 2009). General Systems Theory originated across disciplines of science, then eventually grew into organizational realms. Bertalanffy (1950) posited that organizations functioned more like biological systems than machines and recognized that relationships between parts of the system were vital to overall success. This notion is the same for schools.

Conceptual Framework

Distributed Leadership was the conceptual framework for this study. This study examined school leadership through a distributed lens where multiple formal and informal leaders possess mutual student growth and achievement goals. Researchers agree that there is an ambiguity to the term distributed leadership. The different interpretations, however, agree on the basic contention that an organization has multiple leaders whether they are in formal or informal leadership roles (Harris et al., 2007).

Spillane and Healey (2010) asserted that despite this framework being used by many scholars to frame their research, there was an urgent need to improve each study by developing and identifying which aspects of school leadership are being viewed through a distributed lens. Specifically, this study identified and analyzed Distributed Leadership behaviors in an elementary school's leadership team.

Distributed Leadership presents a contemporary and practical perspective for educators to consider leadership roles within schools. Within schools, many critical roles are fulfilled by different educators. Distributed Leadership could resolve the tendency to describe leadership as either a single-handed responsibility or as a system by which tasks are commissioned to different individuals (Bolden, 2011). Distributed Leadership focuses on the activities and the nature of the social process, which is not a mere transmission of messages but a key component that contributes to the process (Harris, 2009). The flexibility that arises from the interaction in the nature of Distributed Leadership practices has allowed educators to overcome barriers and prevent participants from being passive followers (Davison et al., 2013).

Methodology and Research Question

A qualitative instrumental case study is an appropriate method to conduct an in-depth investigation of the interactions between school leadership and school staff (Timperley, 2005). The present study involved observations, interviews, and document analyses. Unlike a quantitative study, which focuses on outcomes and assessment, a qualitative study emphasizes the perspective of practitioners in the field (Maxwell, 2005).

The case study design is appropriate when investigating a phenomenon in its natural setting because contextual conditions impact the phenomenon under study (Yin,

2009). The current qualitative case study captured the perspectives of a purposefully selected elementary school in which the principal and the teachers applied Distributed Leadership processes. The following research question guided the study: What are the processes by which an elementary school principal uses Distributed Leadership to accomplish leadership tasks and progress toward organizational goals?

Definition of Key Terms

Elementary School: A public school within Louisiana consisting of grades pre-kindergarten through second grade

Diversity: Consisting of several different cultures or ethnicities

Suburban Environment: A residential area on the outskirts of a city or large town

Research Pathway: A particular topic of interest within the literature review

Distributed Leadership: A situation where relationships and interactions between school components are weaved into the organizational structure of the school for the accomplishment of a common cause (Spillane et al., 2004)

Summary

Theoretically, the strategy of using members of the staff other than the principal and assistant principal to carry out some of the school leadership tasks should add to the resources available within the school and ease the burden of the overworked principal (D’Innocenzo et al., 2016). The current study I investigated the processes by which an elementary school principal used Distributed Leadership to accomplish leadership tasks and progress toward organizational goals. Despite Distributed Leadership’s popularity, recent literature indicates that the definition is vague and indefinite. Many scholars

describe Distributed Leadership in many different ways. The legitimacy of any model depends on adequate empirical evidence from the field and its ability to produce usable knowledge that will help schools improve (D’Innocenzo et al., 2016).

The proceeding chapter, research literature relevant to the processes of Distributed Leadership will be discussed. The literature search strategy and the theoretical and conceptual frameworks will also be discussed.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

As a result of globalization, the educational reforms developed after 2000 focus on accountability and quality at the system level all over the world, and these policies affect the role descriptions and behaviors of principals (Boro, 2000). In parallel, leadership has increasingly been moving away from the idea of a singular heroic leader toward a more democratic approach (Luff, 2011; Spillane, 2006). Distributed Leadership has been hailed as a solution in educational circles to reform schools in an era of unparalleled accountability (Elmore, 2000; Ravitch, 2013; Spillane, 2006). The purpose of this study was to investigate the processes by which an elementary school principal uses Distributed Leadership tasks to accomplish leadership tasks and progress toward organizational goals.

This chapter explores the concept of Distributed Leadership. School leaders are tasked with managing the school building, leading and supervising instruction, and interacting with internal and external stakeholders. Leadership no longer rests on the shoulders of a single person. Leadership principles have transitioned to more of a collective leadership phenomenon. The evolution of Distributed Leadership along with the practices, behaviors, and structures that compose the framework of Distributed Leadership were explored during the literature review.

Literature Search Strategy

The following databases were used to identify literature for this study: ProQuest Central, ERIC, Google Scholar, EBSCO Discovery Service, JSTOR Journal Storage, and Education from SAGE. Keywords were distributed leadership, democratic leadership, collaborative leadership, shared leadership, situational leadership, accountability, and school reform. The search was limited to peer-reviewed journals published within the last 7-10 years. The results of the literature search strategy produced qualitative and quantitative studies relating to non-traditional leadership styles. Several studies focused on causality; however, the behaviors, perspectives, and experiences of school leaders were my area of interest.

The next section explores General Systems Theory (Bertalanffy, 1950). Schools are systems that function interdependently with many interconnected parts. An exploration of General Systems Theory supports an expansive concept of schools and how the interactions among individuals and individual tasks affect the effectiveness of the entire organization.

General Systems Theory as a Theoretical Framework

In contrast to earlier theorists who advocated for bureaucratic or scientific management, Bertalanffy (1950) posited that organizations functioned more like biological systems than machines and recognized that relationships between parts of the system were vital to overall success. Initially, General Systems Theory was applied to scientific disciplines including physics, biology, chemistry, and psychology. Eventually, theorists began to associate General Systems Theory in the field of sociology.

Crossing over into the social sciences was important, and Bertalanffy wrote about it extensively. He made many comparisons of how General Systems Theory had already been established in other disciplines of science and could, likewise, be generalized to social systems and human interactions (Bertalanffy, 1950). Bertalanffy wanted General Systems Theory to be more than a metaphor or a fleeting thought in the social sciences. Bertalanffy (1950) considered it necessary to expand conceptual schemas to deal with complex realms to make it possible to establish systems to better understand human sciences where application of the laws of physics or chemistry is not sufficient or even possible. Bertalanffy (1950) felt that problems and concepts such as progressive mechanization, centralization, individuality, leading part, competition, etc., are unfamiliar to the physicist but are basic in the biological and sociological realms and require exact treatment.

General Systems Theory introduced the notion of *wholeness* into theory. The conceptualization of the whole being greater than the sum of its parts began to come to fruition. According to Bertalanffy (1950), General Systems Theory is a new scientific doctrine of wholeness; a notion which has been hitherto considered vague, muddled, and metaphysical. As Bertalanffy labored to convince his peers that General Systems Theory was intelligible, he based all thought processes on the consideration of the *whole*. General Systems Theory consists of the scientific exploration of *wholes* and *wholeness* which not so long ago, was considered to be metaphysical notions transcending the boundaries of science.

Relative to General Systems Theory, the concept of Distributed Leadership considers an organization as a whole, then subsequently considers each part. Studies have

sought to gain a deep and rich understanding of the leaders' and teachers' experiences of Distributed Leadership and as a way of making sense of the parts in relation to the whole (Clandinin & Connelly, 1994; Eisner & Peshkin, 1990). Distributed Leadership is the conceptual framework used in the current study.

Distributed Leadership as a Conceptual Framework

School leadership is changing. It is essential that school leaders adapt to meet increased expectations and embrace effective leadership in the way principals lead schools toward future success (Harris, 2012). Schools of the future are likely to require multiple leaders rather than individual leaders if organizational goals are to be achieved (Harris, 2012).

Rather than a set of personal attributes and characteristics, Distributed Leadership focuses on a set of practices that are enacted by educators at all levels. As compared with exclusively hierarchical forms of leadership, Distributed Leadership more accurately reflects the division of labor that is experienced in an organization on a daily basis and reduces the chances of error arising from decisions based on the limited information available to a single leader (Shava & Tlou, 2018). Distributed Leadership creates more opportunities for students to benefit from the knowledge of more of their educators and allows educators to capitalize on the range of individual strengths (Gronn, 2002). Among organizational members, Distributed Leadership develops a fuller appreciation of interdependence and an understanding of how one's actions affect the organization as a whole (Leithwood & Mascall, 2008). When this is done, interdependent working becomes the cultural norm. This is a comparative advantage where individuals and groups in different positions within an organization contribute to leadership functions in

areas of organizational activity over which they have the greatest influence (Elmore, 2000).

Even though it has been assumed that Distributed Leadership is good leadership, a lot depends on the quality of distributing the leadership as well as on the method and purpose of its distribution (Harris et al., 2007). Without proper implementation or guidance on implementation, Distributed Leadership is purposeless, meaningless, and possibly counterproductive (Harris, 2013). Distributed Leadership over more people is risky practice and may result in the greater distribution of incompetence (Timperley, 2005). It is a possibility that teachers may not care to play a part in leadership processes. Even if teachers possess expertise, they may not desire formal or informal leadership positions (Hoy & Miskel, 2005).

Distributed Leadership requires those serving in formal leadership capacities to relinquish some authority to others. Potentially, this places school leaders in positions of vulnerability because of the lack of direct control over certain activities in the school (Shava & Tlou, 2018). Spillane and Healey (2010) provide some warning signals about Distributed Leadership from principals who felt an acute sense of personal accountability and responsibility for the school's performance. Traditional solo leadership, which conceptualized the leader as a metaphorical hero, has been superseded by the concept of Distributed Leadership, which regards leadership as a process spread through the organization (Shava & Tlou, 2018). In an organization, there is rarely ever just one leader and a number of followers (Gronn, 2008).

The adoption of a distributed framework under the right conditions can contribute to organizational development and subsequent achievement of quality learning outcomes

in schools (Spillane, 2006). In a knowledge-intensive enterprise like teaching and learning, there is no way to perform these complex tasks without widely distributing the responsibilities for leadership among others' roles in the organization (Elmore, 2000).

Actors Within Distributed Leadership

The System for Teacher and Student Advancement (TAP) was launched by the Milken Family Foundation in 1999 and is now operated by the National Institute for Excellence in Teaching (NIET). The goal of TAP is improved teacher professional practice resulting in improved student achievement. TAP is a reform system designed to elevate the teaching profession. Holloway et al. (2018) describe leadership in TAP schools (a school engaging in the TAP system) as tasks being distributed among a group of school actors, where leadership is treated as a tangible object that can be bestowed upon deserving teachers. Formal distributed leadership models that rely on instructional coaches, peer evaluators, and the like allow for more individuals to assume the increased responsibilities conventionally held by one or two school administrators (Lumby, 2013; Youngs, 2014). According to Holloway et al. (2018), TAP defines the mentor teacher as a classroom teacher who is provided with release time from classroom duties to serve as a peer evaluator, a member of the leadership team, a co-leader of professional development, and a support person for classroom teachers. TAP teachers articulated three major areas that function to define their positionalities within the distributed leadership structure: systematic conditions and resource allocation, competing conceptualizations of leadership, and mentor teachers' capacities for participation in decision-making. TAP teachers have expressed concern for the lack of professional development to prepare them for their roles. Within the theme of systematic conditions and resource allocation,

Holloway et al. (2018) questioned whether the mentor teacher role is prescribed in a way that fosters leadership skills, opportunities, or sustainability. Above all, TAP teachers noted a desire to do more mentoring and relationship building and less evaluating, yet they expressed a pressure to prioritize their evaluation duties above others (Holloway et al., 2018).

Holloway et al. (2018) emphasized *leadership*, as defined by the TAP System, was related to carrying out accountability tasks and explicit data collection and reporting (e.g. teacher evaluation) while leadership, as defined by the mentor teachers, was related to relationship building and coaching. Mentor teachers valued building rapport over performing evaluations. However, because the system prioritized evaluating over mentoring, opportunities for relationship building were limited (Holloway et al., 2018). TAP teachers have described feeling pressure to make authoritative decisions despite not having any real authority to do so (Holloway et al., 2018). Highly structured distributed leadership roles may aid in a school's efforts to respond to policy demands, but they do not necessarily cultivate opportunities for leadership growth (Harris et al., 2007). According to Holloway et al., researchers should challenge the notion that structured Distributed Leadership models are more democratically fair to teachers.

In their study of teacher collaboration, Goodard et al. (2015) tested theoretical linkages among principal leadership, teacher collaboration for instructional improvement, collective efficacy beliefs, and student achievement and found that school environments may be most productive when principals work collaboratively with teachers to develop collective expertise. This is also a means of recognizing that school leadership is distributed among both formal and informal leaders (Spillane, 2006). The degree to

which teachers collaborate to improve instruction is strongly predicted by principals' instructional leadership (Goodard et al., 2015). The strong interrelationship between principal leadership and teacher collaboration is consistent with research that suggests the importance of strong instructional leadership to teachers' collaborative work and school improvement (Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008). When teachers perceive principals' instructional leadership behaviors to be appropriate, they grow in commitment, professional involvement, and willingness to innovate (Sheppard, 1996). Goodard et al. (2015) also concluded that formally structured time for teachers to work together on their professional learning is essential for instructional improvement. They suggest that more research is needed on how principals can support sustained interactions around instructional improvement to improve teaching and learning (Goodard et al., 2015). When a principal elicits high levels of commitment and professionalism from teachers and works interactively with teachers in a shared instructional leadership capacity, schools have the benefit of integrated leadership; educators within the organization learn and perform at high levels (Marks & Printy, 2003).

Practices, Behaviors, Perspectives and Experiences of the Participants of Distributed Leadership

Devos et al. (2014) examined the relation between principals' leadership and teachers' organizational commitments, mediated by Distributed Leadership. They found that the school principal remains a pivotal player who should stimulate distributed forms of leadership in the school. The person in the office of principal needs to be an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and

staff professional growth (Barth, 2001). Teachers are more committed practitioners when they perceive their principals, their assistant principals, and their teacher leaders as supportive leaders who provide clear school vision, set directions for teachers, and provide instructional support to teachers. Teachers feel more committed when the principals allow opportunities for the assistant principals and teacher leaders to assume leadership roles. In schools where the principals create a sense of wellness among the members of the leadership team and stimulates fellow members of the leadership team to work together in a cooperative way, to have group cohesion, role clarity, and goal orientedness, teachers feel more committed to the school as an organization (Devos et al., 2014).

Davison et al. (2013) conducted a narrative study to investigate how British Columbia's leadership standards contributed to Distributed Leadership. Four administrators in British Columbia participated in this narrative study aimed at describing the administrator's daily experiences while exercising distributed leadership practices. The primary purpose of their research was to gain a clearer understanding of formal leaders' beliefs about distributed leadership. They found that although the principal was often responsible for crafting and communicating the initial vision, teachers eventually took on the ownership of the vision as long as it spoke to their core beliefs about what was important in the school. Teachers understood that decisions were made according to the school vision and goals. The administrators in this study described how they aimed to model strong character, integrity, and moral courage in their leadership by serving the students and the teachers above all personal needs and personal interests (Davison et al., 2013). They believed that their levels of moral leadership inspired others to join the

initiatives that they led, thus leading to the success of their distribution of leadership. Principals asserted that an important part of their roles was understanding the different personal and professional capacities of the teachers and realizing when teachers needed to be guided to finding their own leadership voices. By cultivating mutually respectful relationships, one principal explained that an environment where everyone was willing to take risks while working together was created.

Struggles between co-leaders and middle leaders are commonplace, though not openly acknowledged (Mifsud, 2017). Hadfield (2007) noted how tensions between leaders of different tiers are a reality. Researchers need to learn more about the internal struggles, dilemmas, and challenges faced by administrators and teachers as they shift between roles and expectations within bureaucratic systems and learning community cultures; additional research is needed on the impact of failed distributed leadership (Davison et al., 2013). The detailed nature of this qualitative study provided significant insight into the characteristics of distributed leadership from principals' perspectives (Devos et al. 2014). However, the study failed to consider any account of assistant principal or informal leaders' perspectives (Devos et al. 2014). More theory-driven, empirical research is needed; teacher leadership remains a largely undertheorized field (Wenner & Campbell, 2017), and there is still a need to understand the supports necessary to enact teacher leadership. Most professional development programs do little to support teacher leadership or to prepare teachers to spread their innovative practices beyond their own classrooms (Klein et al., 2018).

The divergence between distributed leadership and micropolitics research is noteworthy because the practice of school leadership, in both its formal and informal

manifestations, includes administration, management, and micropolitics (Flessa, 2009). Engaging in teacher leadership support in the context where it happens is an important implication of using a distributed leadership lens (Klein et al., 2018). There are a number of factors that influence administrators who support teacher leaders, such as policies and procedures (Klein et al., 2018). Klein et al. (2018) found that teacher leaders' personal definitions of teacher leadership both help and hinder them in how they view their work. When teacher leaders are unsure about the notions of teacher leadership, they have less direction in their work. When teacher leaders have clearly defined notions of teacher leadership, they are more confident in their work (Klein et al., 2018).

Summary

Distributed Leadership has become popular for research and theorizing over the last decade with major projects and texts, which seek to present models and evidence of effective practice in schools (Gunter et al., 2013). The overall body of research on Distributed Leadership demonstrates that more needs to be known to be able to consistently describe the characteristics and actions associated with distributed leadership. According to Spillane and Healey (2010), more descriptive work is necessary to improve understanding of how leadership is distributed in schools so that researchers can then explore how these arrangements influence school outcomes. Overlaying the idea that leadership is somehow shared by team members only further complicates an already ambiguous situation (D'Innocenzo et al., 2016). Elaborate statistical methods, or even random assignments, cannot compensate for loose constructs, weak study operations, and invalid and unreliable measurement (Spillane & Healey, 2010).

Leaders who are the members of schools with distributed leadership can effectively mobilize the collective intelligence, motivation, and creative talent of their partners, which is very significant for school improvement and student success (Spillane & Healey, 2010). However, the inconsistencies in descriptive models make it challenging to measure achievement of organizational goals. Once the organizational goals are identified, consistent models of distributed leadership are difficult to find within the literature. This elusiveness potentially weakens the methodological explanatory force of its effects on a range of school improvement outcomes, which some educational leadership researchers have tried to establish (Hairon & Goh, 2015). A dialogue about study operations and measures is critical if a distributed perspective is to have any chance of realizing its potential in scholarship on school leadership and management (Spillane & Healy, 2010).

Distributed leadership is not the actions of an individual, but the collective actions of many. Distributed leadership in schools requires cooperation, emphasizing that it is necessary to benefit from the skills of principals, teachers, and other personnel (Spillane & Healey, 2010). Distributed leadership requires recognition of individual expertise. Distributed leadership acknowledges multiple sources of guidance and direction, following the contours of expertise in an organization (Elmore, 2000). In a school, the roles and activities of leadership flow from the expertise required for learning and improvement, not from the formal dictates of the institution (Elmore, 2000).

The need for additional study exists in the descriptive nature of distributed leadership. It is troublesome and foolhardy to design research to gauge the effectiveness of something that is weakly operationalized and poorly measured, let alone to make

strong causal inferences based on the data generated from the research (Spillane & Healey, 2010). While much has been written on the theoretical analysis of Distributed Leadership, what is still lacking is the rigor of the operational analysis of Distributed Leadership, which is contingent on the construction of Distributed Leadership measures (Hairon & Goh, 2015). Once distributed leadership is adequately described and operationalized, additional study is needed to examine the causal effects of distributed leadership on operational goals (Hulpia et al., 2007). According to Spillane and Healey (2010), further theorizing about school leadership and management from a distributed perspective would benefit greatly from careful attention to the development of study operations and measurement instruments that could inform empirical research.

Most of the studies analyzed in this chapter used qualitative case study methodology to explore distributed leadership. Case studies serve a number of purposes, but relevant to these studies, case studies provided a means of explaining complex links in real life events and help describe the authentic context where the study occurred (Yin, 1994). The qualitative aspects of these studies allow researchers to collect data relating to the perspectives and thought processes behind participants' actions. Klein et al. (2018) explained that they were seeking to understand the multilayered actions that constituted distributed leadership, therefore they relied on data collection instruments such as interviews and observations to help understand the why and the how. Research that seeks to add to the body of existing empirical research should follow these patterns.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of the current study was to investigate the processes by which an elementary school principal uses distributed leadership to accomplish leadership task and progress toward organization goals. The research product is a thick description of distributed leadership characteristics and behaviors.

Research Question

What are the processes by which an elementary school principal uses Distributed Leadership to accomplish leadership tasks and progress toward organizational goals?

Rationale for Qualitative Design

Case studies are useful apparatuses for understanding holistic kinds of situations and events (Yin, 1994). A case study allowed me to examine the multilayered complexities of distributed leadership in an elementary school. Of the number of purposes that case studies serve (Yin, 1994), two were particularly relevant to the current study. First, case studies provide a means of explaining complex links in real life events; secondly, case studies help describe the authentic context where the study occurred. Case study was the most appropriate research design because it makes it possible to gain an

in-depth understanding of behaviors, processes, practices, and relationships in context by asking why, how, and what questions about the issue under study (Harrison et al., 2017).

Using a qualitative case study approach will ensure that the conclusions are robust.

Site and Participant Selection

Site selection was based on the following criteria: the site must be a mid-large, pre-kindergarten through second grade school in a diverse setting having been identified as having distributed leadership. District-level school leaders aided in determining a school within the district that met the site selection criteria.

Purposeful snowball sampling was used to recruit participants who provided in-depth and detailed information about distributed leadership. Participants were identified based on their contributions to the distributed leadership in the school. First, the principal was interviewed. Additional participants were identified during subsequent leader interviews. Table 1 describes each participant.

Table 1

Participant Demographics and Descriptions

Pseudonym	Demographic	Description
Superintendent 1	African American Male	Ed.D, 19 years of service, second year as superintendent
Elementary T	PreK-2 grade elementary school	diverse staff/student body, identified as having distributed leadership
Principal 1	African American Female	PHD, 11 years of service, entering second year of leading Elementary T
Teacher 2	African American Female	2 nd grade teacher, 10 years of service
Teacher 3	Caucasian Female	kindergarten teacher, 15 years of service, master teacher
Teacher 4	African American Female	SPED Teacher 22 years of service
Teacher 5	Caucasian Female	1 st grade teacher, 5 years of service
Teacher 6	Filipino Female	2 nd grade teacher, 11 years of service, mentor teacher
Teacher 7	African American Female	pre-k teacher, 26 years of service
Teacher 8	Filipino Female	1 st grade teacher, 17 years of service

Data Collection and Instruments

Several tools were employed to collect qualitative data. Sources of data collection included direct observations, interviews, and document analyses.

Direct Observations

Throughout this study, field notes were recorded while conducting direct observations. What was written down or mechanically recorded for a period of observation becomes the raw data from which the study's findings eventually emerge (Merriam, 2009). Once the observation is completed, Bogdan and Taylor (1975) suggest the following: leave the setting after observing as much as can be remembered; record field notes as soon as possible after observing; in case of a time lag between observing and recording, summarize or outline the observation; draw a diagram of the setting and

trace movements through it; and incorporate pieces of data remembered at later times into original field notes. Observations took place during Professional Learning Communities (PLC), professional development, faculty meetings, and other occasions when school leaders brought staff members together. Field notes were taken during and immediately after observations. According to Merriam (2009), observations were quite helpful as I moved between emerging analysis and the raw data of interviews, field notes, and documents.

Interviews

Interviews were conducted in this study. Just as with gathering observation data, the interviewer needs to have a strong advance plan (Stake, 1995). Interviews were conducted using an interview protocol as seen in Appendix 1. Interviews were conducted in person, via Zoom, and by phone. Prior to recording each interview, each participant provided informed consent. Once recorded, each interview was transcribed using an online transcription application. Once transcribed, the interviews were edited and corrected for accuracy. For member checking, each participant was presented with a summary of perceptions and findings. Each participant agreed that perceptions and findings accurately expressed their sentiments.

Document Analyses

Document analysis is a form of qualitative research in which documents are interpreted by the researcher to give voice and meaning around an assessment topic (Bowen, 2009). I analyzed documents such as sign in sheets from PLC and cluster meetings, minutes of meetings, and agendas to identify emerging themes.

Data Analysis

The themes emerging from the data were not predetermined. A constant comparative approach was employed while coding the data using data analysis software, NVivo, then by reading the transcripts/reports continually. Once initially collected, data were coded into meaningful units using NVivo coding software. The units were words, sentences, and paragraphs. I evaluated each unit in terms of what it meant. Then, I reviewed the codes for emerging themes. The codes and themes generated were organized and articulated in a meaningful way to be comprehended by readers and fellow scholars. For purposes of triangulation, I collected data through interviews with one elementary school's leaders and teacher leaders, observations of meetings and professional development, and document analysis. The multiple sources of data, supplemented by field notes, allowed for comparing, contrasting, and crosschecking the information collected to gain a fuller perspective of the phenomenon (Merriam, 2009).

Ethical Considerations

Most educational case data gathering involves at least some invasion of personal privacy (Stake, 1995). I needed to gain permission before entering participants' professional spaces to respect their privacy. I understood that my presence alone could alter the energy surrounding instruction, interactions, and conduct. As I requested permissions from the district and building-level leaders, the nature of the case study, the anticipated time span, the activities intended, and the burden to all parties involved were made known. A brief written description of the intended casework was offered with an extensive plan available upon request. I ensured that I disclosed how and why this organization was selected within the brief description.

To ensure approachability and hospitality, for each face-to-face meeting, refreshments were often served to the informants and host. This was considered a legitimate field expense. Upon leaving the site once the research was complete, I ensured that all promises had been fulfilled and that I had made no personnel less capable of executing their professional duties.

Role of the Researcher

My role as the researcher was to attempt to access the feelings and perspectives of the educators who engaged in distributed leadership in this elementary school. It was my primary responsibility to safeguard participants' sentiments and the data. Qualitative research purposes to gain a deep understanding of a specific phenomenon rather than a superficial description of a large sample of a population. It intends to provide a precise rendering of the order, structure, and broad patterns found among the participants.

It is easy to assume that distributive leadership exists in every school setting. In the field of education, there is an established hierarchy related to decision-making. At the center of decision-making is the student. For instance, the superintendent is hired by the school board in the public-school system. In turn, the superintendent hires district-level supervisors who assist him/her with hiring principals, assistant principals, teachers, and paraprofessionals. Principals, assistant principals, and paraprofessionals directly influence students who educators vow to prepare for college or careers by the end of their secondary studies. One would think that the flow of power and responsibility trickles down in the same fashion. This may not always be the case. It may not always be this simple. This study explored the possibilities.

During these perilous times, COVID-19 caused some hindrances to my study. COVID-19 restricted my access to schools, school leaders, and students. Many schools were forced to redesign visitor policies with heightened security and safety protocols being put into place. More virtual engagement occurred for typical interactions between participants than in the traditional settings. This affected my ability to capture all nuances of situations; however, it was out of my control. Also, my personal biases as a researcher were accounted for in this study. The research site I chose has demographics comparable to those in my district. Before beginning my research, I was somewhat inclined to believe that I knew the outcomes. This could have affected the nature of my self-reporting. To combat this, I maintained an open mind and embodied a student mentality as I navigated each level of data collection.

In case studies, most researchers find they do their best work by being thoroughly prepared to concentrate on a few things yet ready for unanticipated happenings that reveal the nature of the case (Stake, 1995). In advance, being prepared afforded me my best chances of collecting meaningful data. Investing time into interactions with potential participants was the most beneficial way to recruit participants. Each time participants were asked to meet in groups, snacks were provided and participants were engaged in light-hearted conversations geared toward establishing a working relationship. They embraced the sentiment of allowing me into their professional spaces and thought processes. The intentions were to become acquainted with leaders within the school, both formal and informal, through acts of kindness and goodwill. Participants willingly participated in observations and interviews that gathered data to be later analyzed through these sentiments.

Validity and Trustworthiness

Member checks ensured validity. According to Maxwell (2005), member checks are the single most important way of ruling out the possibility of misinterpreting the meaning of what participants say and do and the perspectives they have on what is going on as well as being an important way of identifying personal biases and misunderstandings of what was observed. As suggested by Merriam (2009), the idea is that feedback on my emerging findings is solicited from some of the people interviewed. I solicited input on emerging results from the school principal and several other participants. The purpose of member checking was to revisit previous interviewees to ask if my interpretations were accurate. Although my articulation may have differed, the participants were able to confirm or correct my depictions of their experiences. This provided opportunities to refine and better capture participants' lived experiences.

The triangulation of data also ensured validity. Method triangulation involves the use of multiple methods of data collection about the same phenomenon (Polit & Beck, 2012). Triangulation using multiple sources of data means comparing and cross-checking data collected from people with different perspectives or from follow-up interviews with the same people (Merriam, 2009). Triangulation of the data increased my confidence in my interpretations and confirmed findings.

To establish trustworthiness, periodically, I shared my progress with an expert qualitative researcher who verified and critiqued my analysis.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to examine the processes by which an elementary school principal uses Distributed Leadership to accomplish leadership tasks and progress toward organizational goals. Chapter 4 presents the data collected for this case study and organizes the results into emerging themes.

The findings presented herein are organized by themes. The first theme is leaders' abilities to pinpoint other leaders within the school. The second theme is the importance of protected time to complete leadership task. The third theme is leaders' desire for proper planning and preparation. The fourth theme is the leaders' reluctance to relinquish control. The final theme is leaders' responsibilities to monitor progress once expectations have been established and communicated.

Leaders' Abilities to Pinpoint Other Leaders Within the School

Identifying other leaders and pinpointing their expertise allows for proper positioning of leadership and proper distribution of responsibilities. Participants of this study believed that leaders must be able to pinpoint other leaders within their school. Participants expressed that leaders must be able to identify leaders among peers; then, to a further extent, leaders must be able to identify strengths and weaknesses within

personnel. During observations, prior to learning teachers by name or position, the leaders were easy to identify. They stood out. They were well respected among their peers as well as by students. In cluster meetings, they were most knowledgeable about curriculum content and pedagogy.

Throughout several conversations with Principal 1, she expressed the importance of getting to know the personnel within her school. Although this is only her second year at this school, she takes great pride in conversing with and engaging with teachers to learn more about their educational philosophies and professional goals. According to Principal 1, Teacher 4 is a leader in the special services sector due to her many years of experience and leadership traits. Principal 1 was adamant that I speak with Teacher 4 while conducting my research. She stated:

[Teacher 4] leads everything special education. If I or a teacher has a question or concern about how to handle something pertaining to a special education student, we call on her. She also leads all of our special education professional development. While taking the time to get to know [Teacher 4], I learned about her 22 years as a special services educator. She described her passion for teaching and leading instruction for students with disabilities. I also noticed that both regular education teachers and other special services teachers would seek her advice about IEPs and other responsibilities related to special education. Even school leaders from other schools within the district and district level leaders would reach out to [Teacher 4] for assistance. The time I spent getting to know Teacher 4 allowed me to understand that she is capable of leading her peers. She has been an excellent choice for a teacher leader.

As evidenced in the previous quote, Principal 1 found great value in pinpointing Teacher 4 as a leader and a valuable resource within her school. Several other teachers shared the same sentiment. When asked what Distributed Leadership meant to her, Teacher 3 stated:

Distributed leadership means to me that the leader should be give certain duties as appropriate. For example, based on expertise, so if I know a particular teacher is a great ELA teacher, then I may want him/her to be the content leader for that area. So knowing the boundaries of certain jobs that you would and would not give to certain people. The key is being able to recognize who is who. If the leader of the school cannot recognize who has the knowledge and the capacity to lead, then the leader is lost. She will not know how to distribute responsibility.

When asked to identify specific actions and supports with Distributed Leadership, Teacher 5 stated:

It is important that the principal takes time to build rapport with teachers so she can identify the master teachers, teacher leaders, and grade level chairpersons in her building. Without taking the time to get to know teachers, there is no way for her to know who the potential leaders are. It would not be wise to take someone else's word, or to go along with what has already been established. Principal 1 has done a great job of taking the time to get to know her staff. Although she is just in her second year, I feel that she has been intentional about getting to know who has expertise in which areas.

The following quotes attest to the leaders' abilities to identify other leaders in the building by way of unsatisfactory selections of teacher leaders. Several participants

recalled times when leaders failed to identify effective leaders in the building. These participants believe that failure to identify effective leaders in the building is counterproductive and detrimental to Distributed Leadership. Teacher 6 stated:

I remember a time when the previous principal selected a bunch of his friends as teacher leaders. They have very little knowledge about the curriculum and also had terrible people skills. We suffered for years under his leadership. It was the blind leading the blind. We know that they were chosen because they had connections to the principal. When he came in, he did not care to see who was the best fit to carry out leadership tasks. He simply selected people that he was most familiar with.

Teacher 3 recounted:

It took a while for me to be recognized as a leader among my peers. I always wanted to be a teacher leader or a master teacher, but I always seems to be overlooked. I was enthusiastic about teaching and learning, but principals did not view me as a leader. When [Principal 1] came 2 years ago, she noticed my passion for curriculum implementation. She spent hours talking with me about our shared vision for instruction within our school. No one before her had taken the time to get to know me. She gave me the opportunity facilitate a cluster meeting. From that point forward, I began working on my teacher leader endorsement. I have always had a lot to offer, but many years of productivity were lost because I was not given a chance.

The Importance of Protected Time to Complete Leadership Task

During observations and document analysis, it was apparent that time had been protected for master teachers and teacher leaders to develop and cultivate other teachers. This is essential to Distributed Leadership. Without designated time to interact and connect with followers, leaders will have less success imparting knowledge to others. During our first interview, Principal 1 promised herself that she would preserve time within her weekly schedule to have one-on-one consultations with teacher leaders to build their leadership capacities. She felt that the distribution of leadership would strengthen her ability to be an instructional leader, rather than simply a school manager. Once she established leadership among teachers, she felt she would be able to focus more on instruction. In their interviews, Teacher 2 and Teacher 3 stated that time management was vital to Distributed Leadership. Teacher 3, who conducts weekly cluster meetings, stated, “There is only so much time in the day and sometimes things overlap. It is difficult to have time to complete everything during the regular workday.”

Teacher 4 explained:

In Distributed Leadership, time has to be set aside to meet the responsibilities bestowed upon you. You cannot give responsibilities then not carve out time to meet the demands. That only frustrates us. We have our regular responsibilities in addition to our leadership responsibilities. We intend to thrive in both arenas, but we will fail without the proper amounts of time for both.

Teacher 6 stated:

The loss of learning due to COVID-19 has been devastating. Coming into the 2021-2022 school year, we knew that something drastic would have to be done to

address the learning gaps caused by the loss of classroom time during the pandemic. As teacher leaders, we knew that we would need designated time to focus on leading our peers during incredibly challenging times. I worried that we would be consumed by our day-to-day responsibilities and would not be able to dedicate time to leadership tasks. We brainstormed with [Principal 1] and requested additional personnel so that time could be preserved to get things done. The district responded by providing a paraprofessional for each classroom. This allows teacher leaders, master teachers, and mentor teachers the availability to conduct weekly meetings and attend professional development and conferences.

These quotes illuminate the notion that time to carry out leadership tasks must be designated and protected within daily and weekly schedules. According to the master schedule in Appendix C, Elementary T has designated time weekly for cluster meetings and professional learning communities.

During a cluster meeting observation, [Teacher 3] stressed the importance of arriving at cluster meetings on time. She urged teachers to arrive on time to start on time and complete each activity. When teachers did not arrive on time, she questioned them. When teachers did not complete activities as directed, she pointed out the loss of time for future reference. For example, Teacher 3 directed teachers to type several Louisiana Student Standards into a Goggle Doc in the cluster meeting. They chose to copy and paste the standards rather than type them but had difficulty doing so. She called to their attention how time was lost by failing to follow her directive. Not only must time be protected, it must be valued. Teacher 3 stated:

As master teachers, we must instill a respect for the time that has been designated for professional development, especially when it is embedded into the regular workday. We are blessed to have that. I have seen many elementary schools with little to no professional development or planning time embedded into the schedule. As I work with teachers, I ensure that they understand the importance of not wasting precious time on trivial things. We must focus on the task at hand which is student growth.

Teacher 2 expressed that, as a mentor teacher, documentation is extremely important but also time consuming. She stated:

One dilemma that we face in our school is time. The amount of time that we have to get certain things done. For me, being a mentor teacher, I have to document, document, document. I would say one of our biggest challenges is time management. We went to [Principal 1] about the time management. She immediately came up with a solution to add more time to our planning on Thursdays. She recognized the need for her educators and immediately stepped in and gave us the support that we needed.

Teacher 7 expressed:

Observations and walk through are necessary for us to see what teachers are doing in their classrooms. We cannot coach them if we are unable to see them in action. We are still teachers too, so we have to be granted the time to perform observations and engage in coaching cycles. If we are not afforded the time to perform these task, it is like a shot in the dark. We may advise teachers on an area that they are strong in or fail to advise them on areas where they are weak.

Distributed Leadership is multifaceted, but one of the most important pieces is to ensure that time is made available for us to do what is expected of us.

According to the data, Distributed Leadership is strengthened when educators are given proper time to plan, prepare, interact, and cultivate each other.

Leaders' Desires for Proper Planning and Preparation

Throughout my research, both teachers and school leaders alike spoke of the effort it takes to plan and prepare to lead their schools. Superintendent 1 initially encouraged me to conduct my research at Elementary T because Elementary T had excellent structures in place for teachers and leaders to plan and prepare for instruction. He stated that Elementary T had a great model of Distributed Leadership because their weekly cluster and PLC meetings were well executed and productive.

Teacher 4, Teacher 5, Teacher 7, and Teacher 8 spoke about TAP during interviews. TAP promotes consistent and purposeful professional development facilitated by teacher leaders. During observations, weekly professional development was well-orchestrated and well-executed. The weekly cluster meetings and professional learning communities provided great structure and opportunities for teachers to grow as instructors and facilitators. They also provided occasions where rapport could be built and relationships could be strengthened. Instructional tasks were identified, discussed, and monitored during weekly professional development.

Teacher 5 expressed:

Professional development is time-consuming, but necessary. The TAP model consists of lots of professional development that provides the needed structure for teacher leader and student growth. The TAP model is designed to carve out

dedicated planning and preparation time. It is required that cluster meetings and professional learning communities are convened to discuss instructional strategies and monitor student progress/work. Teacher leaders facilitate these meetings within the school. This helps us prepare and brainstorm for upcoming lessons. It is time consuming, yet extremely valuable.

Teacher 8 stated:

Distributed Leadership does not exist without planning and preparation. When you think of Distributed Leadership, you don't immediately think of planning and preparation, but consider how teachers would not be able to conduct lessons in their own classrooms and lead other teachers without time to plan and prepare. Specifically, planning time should be embedded in the work day. It cannot be expected of teachers to familiarize themselves with materials during their personal time.

According to Teacher 4:

The TAP model provides time and space for us to expose other teachers to strategies and best practices that will grow students. During our weekly meeting we help teachers plan the next lessons and show them how to tailor lessons to fit the needs of their scholars. It is so important to have that time because without it, it would be a shot in the dark.

The process of planning and preparing occurs at the principal and teacher levels. During observations, Principal 1 spent a few minutes in the mornings to map out which teachers she would casually engage with throughout the day. Seemingly to teachers, it appeared that Principal 1 was making friendly stops into their classrooms just to check in.

They did not realize that she had strategically planned to engage them in conversation about their thoughts, sentiments, and educational philosophies. She referred to these lighthearted conversations as “wellness checks”. Through this process, she built trust and confidence among her staff. Wellness checks were apparently powerful. Teachers were often happy to engage with Principal 1 and morale appeared to be consistently high during observations and interviews. There was very little negative energy.

Principal 1 explained:

I try my best to plan calculated interactions with teachers daily. Based on the previous days or the previous weeks, I chose one or two teachers to speak with in a spontaneous way. I try to keep it light, but I try to spend 3 to 5 minutes showing them that I am here and easily approachable. This is my second year at Elementary T. This strategic has brought me a long ways in building a rapport with teachers. It also helped me to get to know who has expertise in particular areas. The more time I spend with them, the more I learn about them.

The data also indicated that teacher leaders need ample time to prepare for their roles as leaders. The process of preparing teacher leaders requires time in terms of professional development. Teachers who hold the teacher leader endorsement undergo rigorous training to evolve into their roles. According to Teacher 7:

About a year ago, I completed teacher leader training through the Louisiana Department of Education. It was a tough program because I was far removed from coursework. I had been out of college for 25 years. They trained me on the ELA and math curriculums over the course of 12 months. I had to be away from my classroom 2 days a month for a whole year. The principal would make sure my

room was covered so I could be gone. Getting my teacher leader endorsement prepared me to lead other teachers in instruction. It was a lot but it was worth the time. I hope to take a refresher soon because things constantly change and evolve.

Leaders' Reluctance to Relinquishing Control

Distributed Leadership complimented Principal 1's persona. She was pleasant, accommodating, and confident. However, she mentioned difficulties stepping back and allowing teachers to lead themselves. During her first year as principal, she recalled being consumed with wanting to lead in every aspect of the school. She stated:

In the beginning, I could not imagine allowing teachers to make certain decisions for themselves. I wanted to be a part of every decision. I did not believe that they had the capacity to govern themselves. I spread myself really thin trying to sit through every meeting and every conference. I tried to resolve every conflict.

Not only did the principal struggle with relinquishing control, so did several teacher leaders. At the teacher level, Principal 1 noted that in response to COVID-19, to address the loss of learning, each teacher in her building was assigned a paraprofessional. The paraprofessional is responsible for assisting with classroom management, assisting with small groups, and carrying out classroom activities while teachers attend weekly professional development. Interviews and observations revealed that some teachers experienced difficulties allowing others to manage classroom activities. Several teachers were observed being quite territorial. During one observation, Teacher 6 was seen walking her students to lunch while the paraprofessional remained in the classroom. All other teachers allowed their students to attend lunch with paraprofessionals. When asked

why she did not allow her paraprofessional to take the students to lunch, she replied that the paraprofessional cannot handle student behavior. According to Teacher 6:

If I allow my para to take my kids to lunch, I will get 10 reports about my students before lunch is over. I would have to sort out all kinds of mess. It would take more time to sort out all the mess than to just take them myself. I would rather take them myself than to have to worry about how they will act with her.

When asked about some of the internal struggles of Distributed Leadership, Teacher 1 stated:

A lot of people who don't want to let go of the control because they've been accustomed to doing it all. I suppose in the classroom, teachers have co- teachers or para educators. Normally in the past, teachers are accustomed to doing all can't do it anymore. If you have someone in there to assist you, be specific and allow them to do it.

In casual conversation while walking to a cluster meeting, Teacher 4 stated that she does not allow her paraprofessional to continue lessons on when she is out of the classroom. She stated that she did not feel that her paraprofessional was familiar enough with the curriculum to carry on instruction in her absence. Teacher 4 expressed:

No one can teach my scholars like me. In fact, I have found that sometimes I have to unteach lessons that I have allowed other to teach my students. I love my paraprofessional, but she does not study the curriculum like I have over the years. She does not know it as well as I do. I am passionate about growing my kids. She doesn't see instruction from the same perspective as me and I do not expect her to.

Observations and interviews revealed that the underlying tone of relinquishing control was distrust. Teachers did not trust their paraprofessionals enough to relinquish control of their classrooms. Monitoring progress once expectations have been established and communicated was the final theme that emerged from the data. This final theme will be discussed in the next section.

Monitoring Progress Once Expectations Have Been Established and Communicated

The following quotes confirm the final theme of monitoring progress once expectations have been established and communicated. Teacher 1, Teacher 3, and Teacher 5 expressed the sentiment that leaders cannot simply set expectations then fail to follow up on the progress. They deemed failure to follow up as counterproductive.

According to Teacher 5:

There are such high expectations for teacher leaders. We have to teach our own students and teach other teachers too. It can get overwhelming. When no one comes to check on my progress, it gets frustrating. It can feel like we are doing all this for nothing. I mean, I know that I am doing it for the kids, but someone needs to come check in every now and then. If no one comes to check in, a lot of teachers stop doing everything that is being asked because it is a lot.

Teacher 1 felt strongly about ensuring that expectations are clearly established and communicated. With all that is required of principals and teacher leaders, she felt that establishing norms and communicating expectations all along the way was the best way to distribute leadership. Teacher 1 stated:

You have to inspect what you expect. You cannot expect teachers to execute a plan that you never monitor. You must also give a “glow” when you see that

progress is being made. Encouragement and acknowledgement are huge. It goes a long way when distributing leadership tasks. People want to be affirmed when working hard toward organizational goals.

Teacher 3 stated:

It is best to let people know what you expect of them. You cannot allow them to establish their own expectations. Everyone has to be on the same page, or else everyone will be working toward their own individual goals, rather than a collective goal. As a teacher leader, I want to make sure we are all working toward the goals that [Principal 1] has set for us. Once I make sure we are all on the same page, I engage in coaching cycles so I can see what everyone is doing in their classrooms. If I did not perform weekly or monthly walk-throughs, I would not be able to see if progress is being made. They could tell me anything. I have to go see for myself. They know I am coming, so they try to do their best. The study's findings are situated within the context of relevant research.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to investigate the processes by which an elementary school principal uses Distributed Leadership to accomplish leadership task and progress toward organizational goals. The following research question guided the study: What are the processes by which an elementary school principal uses Distributed Leadership to accomplish leadership tasks and progress toward organizational goals?

Prior to conducting the study, a review of the literature indicated that there is more to be discovered about Distributed Leadership, its benefits, its shortcomings, and the misconceptions surrounding the theory. Shava and Tlou (2018) explained that despite its widespread use in educational leadership studies, the concept of Distributed Leadership remains unclear with different meanings and interpretations. The interchangeable use of differing terms and definitions causes conceptual confusion and theoretical overlaps. The vagueness surrounding the definition of Distributed Leadership is considered a weakness of the theory. Shared leadership, collaborative leadership, situational leadership, and democratic leadership are considered to be synonymous. This accumulation of allied concepts not only serves to obscure the meaning but also presents a real danger that Distributed Leadership will simply be used as a catch all term to.

describe any form of devolved, shared, democratic or dispersed leadership practice (Harris & Spillane, 2008)

Distributed Leadership in schools is premised on a ready and willing group of staff members who will assume administrative responsibilities, carry out the principal's vision, have mutual trust in one another's leadership abilities, and achieve their assignments adequately without supervision (MacBeath et al., 2004). During interviews and observations, I questioned some of the internal struggles, dilemmas, and challenges administrators and teachers faced as they shifted between roles and expectations within their school. As highlighted by Harris (2012), the reality is that it would be naïve for a school leader to ignore the structural and cultural barriers present in schools that make distribution challenging. This research provided an opportunity to examine such structural and cultural barriers and provide implications and recommendations for practice.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to observe, investigate, and describe the processes and actions taken by an elementary school principal and teachers while working to accomplish leadership tasks and progress toward organizational goals. More precisely, this study investigated what a Distributed Leadership model looks like in an elementary school and how educators felt about this type of leadership. The study questioned whether teacher leaders and mentor teachers recognized Distributed Leadership in their school and precisely what it meant. This research also examined the struggles, dilemmas, and challenges administrators and teachers face as they shift between roles and expectations in a Distributed Leadership model. In addition, this research explored how

professional development programs foster teacher leadership and address some of the complexities of Distributed Leadership in schools. The research findings were primarily consistent with the literature review; however, the learning environments were very nuanced.

Despite the presence of a commonly recognized hierarchy in public school systems, this particular school took great pride in establishing leadership that flowed from the top down. To their benefit, this elementary school operated as a TAP school with embedded professional development that was required to be facilitated by teacher leaders within the school. The TAP model was essential in establishing Distributed Leadership. Professional development within the TAP model allowed teacher leaders and mentor teachers to elevate above their peers and presented the opportunities to assist the principal in leading instruction. The results of this study reinforced the notion that Distributed Leadership is a very structured leadership model where roles and responsibilities must be established and defined. It was not difficult to recognize who the teacher leaders and mentor teachers were. They were highly knowledgeable of the curricula and outwardly confident in leading their peers. Throughout my initial interviews with the principal, she spoke of several teachers who would eventually show themselves as assets to her leadership team. She named several teachers that she insisted that be included in this research. Later, these particular teachers were observed facilitating professional development, managing large numbers of students, and advising other teachers.

Being a TAP school meant that there were conventional ways for teachers to advance into leadership roles. TAP allows teachers to pursue a variety of positions

throughout their careers—career, mentor, and master teacher—depending upon their interests, abilities, and accomplishments. As teachers advance in their careers, their qualifications, roles, and responsibilities increase as does their compensation. This allows good teachers to advance professionally without having to leave the classroom and develops expert teacher leaders within schools to provide support to colleagues. The TAP model allowed for structures to be put in place for leadership to be distributed among worthy teachers. Although entering only her second year, the principal was well informed of the formal and informal leaders in her school. She spoke of how the TAP model helped her cultivate other leaders in her school. Developing other leaders in her school would allow her to be less restricted and free to be more focused on instruction.

During this study, the practical understanding of the Distributed Leadership concept by different members of the schools' leadership teams was considered. Throughout each interview and observation, a deeper understanding of each team member's thoughts about Distributed Leadership was gained. Each leadership team member had his/her own opinions about the definition of Distributed Leadership, but all were consistent in their conceptual and practical understandings of the model. They all proudly agreed that a Distributed Leadership model existed in their school. According to Shava and Tlou (2018), despite its widespread use in educational leadership studies, the concept of Distributed Leadership remains unclear with different meanings and interpretations. The interchangeable use of differing terms and definitions causes conceptual confusion and theoretical overlaps. In this case study, the participants were unambiguous and free of confusion about what Distributed Leadership was. A clear and consistent understanding of the definition of Distributed Leadership is essential to

implementation. All participants of Distributed Leadership must understand their roles, the expectations, and their responsibilities within the model. Also, Distributed Leadership is most assertive when the head of the organization articulates a shared vision with subordinates. For instance, the principal should promote the organizational goals and mission of the school at every opportunity to ensure that everyone is working to accomplish mutual tasks and progress toward those goals.

Time management is an essential process of Distributed Leadership. Participants often stated that there was not enough time to complete instructional or leadership tasks. They explained that there is so much more that they must do when operating under a Distributed Leadership model. For example, besides the daily instructional tasks and management of students, teacher leaders and mentor teachers are also required to prepare for weekly cluster meetings and professional learning communities. Cluster meetings and professional learning communities require lots of preparation and documentation in addition to actual facilitation. The research illuminated all the ancillary responsibilities teacher leaders and mentor teachers possess in a Distributed Leadership model. When the principal correctly implements a Distributed Leadership model, time is allotted within the daily schedule for these responsibilities. Fortunately, the principal in this case study responded to the need for additional time within the daily schedule. When asked about time as a challenge to Distributed Leadership, one teacher responded by saying that their leader recognized the need for additional time and addressed it by changing the master schedule. The principal was also purposeful about supporting teachers when they facilitated cluster meetings or professional learning communities. In an interview, she stated that she protects time within her day to sit in on meetings and have one-on-one

conversations with teacher leaders and mentor teachers. These meetings and one-on-one conversations were great examples of leading by example. She was willing to protect the time to cultivate the distribution of leadership; therefore, her followers will value the sentiment the same.

Forming interpersonal relationships is another essential process of Distributed Leadership. The triangulation of the data emphasized the importance of the social and professional interactions of the school leadership team members (Harris, 2013). The principal fostered cooperation and support throughout the study by developing relationships that resulted in a shared sense of responsibility for student achievement among teachers, faculty, and staff. She built interpersonal relationships that allowed for the distribution of leadership responsibilities. Two-way communication resulted in mutual respect and effective problem-solving. Strategic interactions with faculty and staff allowed the principal to become familiar with teachers' views, perspectives, and educational philosophies.

Distributed Leadership involves to a great extent, the process of selecting competent leaders and building the capacities of those leaders. Principals must be able to discern leadership characteristics and traits. Understanding the current condition of a school, such as the availability of leadership capacity in the school, the presence of structures to facilitate collaboration and teamwork, and a shared vision for the school, is an essential component for leadership change, and lack of this understanding can result only in the distribution of incompetence (Mayrowetz et al., 2009). Once leadership traits are recognized, the principal can distribute leadership according to areas of strength and expertise.

Expanding leadership functions to the leadership team members requires significant training to make this transition successful (Klar, 2012). Once expectations were set and communicated, professional development was another essential process that Elementary T1's principal and teachers engaged in consistently. They were required to undergo training on curriculum changes and updates, communication and interpersonal skills, conflict resolution, leadership skills, and conducting meetings. The process of determining which professional development was needed for which personnel was a priority for the principal. According to Harris and Spillane (2008), capacity building in a school organization is a process that requires a serious analysis of the needs of the organization as well as careful planning of the sequence of the trainings necessary for the entire organization to benefit. Professional development is essential for building capacity in schools.

Implications for Future Research

Claims of causality need to be investigated. It would be worthwhile to explore the impact of Distributed Leadership on student achievement. The fundamental goal of school leadership is to sustain student achievement; therefore, a direct correlation between Distributed Leadership and student achievement is worthy of consideration.

Principal evaluation methods are also worthy of further research. Goldring et al. (2008) found in their review of current principal assessment instruments that almost half of all assessments failed to provide principals with clear feedback that was linked to a development plan on what they could be doing better to improve learning and teaching. Traditional evaluation tools often fail to capture nuances and the entire scope of responsibilities of the school leader, hence failing to measure the true impact on the

different school activities. Further research on the evaluation tools used to appraise principals who implement a Distributed Leadership model would be noteworthy. By providing practitioners with substantial evaluation tools for examining principals' leadership practices, principals will be better equipped to create equity-driven, more responsive educational systems.

It is necessary to conduct more research on the type of professional development needed to develop teacher leaders. Teacher leaders are necessary in Distributed Leadership models. High performing teachers who take on leadership responsibilities need and deserve professional development that prepares them to guide, organize, and cultivate their peers. More research is needed to identify effective trainings that will encourage teachers to take on more leadership roles and responsibilities. The findings may assist in helping school leaders identify and prepare teacher leaders.

Additional qualitative research is needed to examine educators' sentiments toward Distributed Leadership. It would be valuable to survey if educators find the Distributed Leadership model useful or valuable. If not, it would be equally as valuable to examine which leadership model they prefer.

Recommendations for Professional Practice

Principals should invest specific and dedicated time into developing schedules that provide staff with opportunities to complete instructional and leadership tasks. While implementing a Distributed Leadership model, school leaders must consider when specific processes will take place and how much time these processes will take. Distributed Leadership is most robust when leaders acknowledge that there is a lot to be done with little time to do it. Principals should not expect staff to work toward

organizational goals during their personal time. Distributed Leadership requires designated time for teacher leaders to help other teachers plan for upcoming lessons and to prepare for future instruction. In addition to time to complete leadership tasks, teacher leaders need time to plan and prepare for their own classrooms, as well as to help other teachers plan and prepare. Once the principal has assigned leadership tasks and has established organizational goals, teachers have to be given the opportunities to execute the plans.

Rigorous and ongoing professional development opportunities for the leadership team members are needed to update and increase their leadership skills. School leaders should provide relevant professional development to all staff to expand knowledge of teamwork skills, effective school-change processes, and interpersonal skills. Such an initiative has the potential not only to locate and stimulate high performance but also to contribute substantially to change in school and the collective involvement of stakeholders in improvement efforts (Klar, 2012).

Placing the most suitable people in the most suitable positions is valuable to the implementation of the Distributed Leadership model. Leaders must take the time to get to know the strengths and weaknesses of their staffs then assign responsibilities accordingly. School leaders cannot maximize their impacts on the improvement of schools without using the staff expertise available within the schools and, consequently, building their own leadership capacities (Barth, 2001). It is necessary to identify and train aspiring leaders, prepare them comprehensively, provide them opportunities for leadership, and support them in their roles as they lead so as to nurture their abilities and build their senses of self-efficacy (Davis et al., 2005). Contrary to this notion, principals should not

place unsuitable people in positions that could cause digression. Avoiding putting the wrong people in the wrong positions is equally as valuable. Decisions concerning the assignment of leadership responsibilities should always be made according to merit rather than personal preference or bias.

Lastly, leaders implementing the Distributed Leadership model must take the time to pinpoint areas of opportunity for staff professional development. It is not beneficial to the school to facilitate one size fits all professional development. The leader must analyze the needs of the individual staff members then design, conduct, or hire for professional development sessions in the areas identified as necessary. For example, to assist with analyzation of the needs of the individual staff members, vendors can be brought in to help identify the learning styles of staff members. In turn, vendors can be hired to facilitate professional development suited to meet the learning styles that have been identified. Interpersonal relationships also aid in pinpointing areas of opportunity among staff members. Frequently conversations and casual interactions will increase chances of developing interpersonal relationships. As leaders work to build a rapport with staff members, leaders will easily identify strengths and weaknesses.

Conclusion

The opportunity gap will continue to widen if the responsibility of improving schools is concentrated solely on one or two individuals rather than distributing the work among willing and capable staff members. The principal, as a lone practitioner, cannot endeavor to improve schools. Hence, principals must cultivate and empower other educators in the processes necessary for school improvement and student growth.

REFERENCES

- Barth, R. S. (2001). Teacher leader. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82(6), 443-449.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/003172170108200607>
- Banathy, B. H., & Jenlink, P. M. (2003). Systems inquiry and its application in education. In *Handbook of research for educational communications and technology* (pp. 37-58). Routledge.
- Bertalanffy, L. V. (1950). An outline of general systems theory. *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, 1(2), 134-165. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/685808>
- Bogdan, R., & Taylor, S. J. (1975). *Introduction to qualitative research methods: A phenomenological approach to the social sciences*. Wiley.
- Bolden, R. (2011). Distributed leadership in organizations: A review of theory and research. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 13(3), 251-269.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2011.00306.x>
- Boro, N. (2000). Organizational and environmental contexts affecting school principals' distributed leadership practices. *International Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, 8(2), 172-203. doi:10.17583/ijelm.2020.4482
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9, 27-40. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>

- Corrigan, J. (2013). Distributed leadership: Rhetoric or reality? *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 35(1), 66-71.
- Crevani, L., Lindgren, M., & Packendorff, J. (2007). Shared leadership: A post heroic perspective on leadership as a collective construction. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 3(1), 40-67.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1994). Personal experience methods. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 413–427). Sage Publications, Inc.
- Davis, S., Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M., & Meyerson, D. (2005). *School leadership study: Developing successful principals*. Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education.
<https://edpolicy.stanford.edu/library/publications/244>
- Davison, A., Brown, P., Pharo, E., Warr, K., McGregor, H., Terkes, S., Boyd, D., & Abuodha, P. (2013). Distributed leadership: Building capacity for interdisciplinary climate change teaching at four universities. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 15(1), 98-110.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSHE-10-2012-0091>
- Devos, G., Tuytens, M., & Hulpia, H. (2014). Teachers' organizational commitment: Examining the mediating effects of distributed leadership. *American Journal of Education*, 120(2), 205-231. <https://doi.org/10.1086/674370>
- D'Innocenzo, L., Mathieu, J. E., & Kukenberger, M. R. (2016). A meta-analysis of different forms of shared leadership–team performance relations. *Journal of Management*, 42(7), 1964-1991.

- Eisner, E. W., & Peshkin, A. (Eds.). (1990). *Qualitative inquiry in education*. Teachers College Press.
- Elmore, R. (2000). *Building a new structure for school leadership*. The Albert Shanker Institute.
- Flessa, J. (2009). Educational micropolitics and distributed leadership. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 84(3), 331-349.
- Goldring, E., Porter, A. C., Murphy, J., Elliot, S. N., & Cravens, X. (2008). Assessing learning-centered leadership: Connections to research, professional standards, and current practices. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 8(1), 1-36.
- Goodard, R., Goodard, Y., Kim, E., & Miller, R. (2015). A theoretical and empirical analysis of the roles of instructional leadership, teacher collaboration, and collective efficacy beliefs in support of student learning. *American Journal of Education*, 121(4), 501-530.
- Gronn, P. (2002). Distributed leadership. In K. Leithwood, P. Hallinger, G. C. Furman, K. Riley, J. MacBeath, P. Gronn, & B. Mulford (Eds.), *Second international handbook of educational leadership and administration* (pp. 653-696). Springer.
- Gronn, P. (2008). The future of distributed leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 46, 141-158.
- Gunter, H., Hall, D., & Bragg, J. (2013). Distributed leadership: A study in knowledge production. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 41(5), 555-580.

- Hadfield, M. (2007). Co-leaders and middle leaders: The dynamic between leaders and followers in networks of schools. *School Leadership & Management, 27*, 259-283.
- Hairon, S., & Goh, J. W. (2015). Pursuing the elusive construct of distributed leadership: Is the search over? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 43*(5), 693-718.
- Harris, A. (2013). *Distributed leadership matters: Perspectives, practicalities, and potential*. Corwin Press.
- Harris, A. (2009). *Distributed leadership: Different perspectives*. Springer.
- Harris, A., Leithwood, K., Day, C., Sammon, P., & Hopkins, D. (2007). Distributed leadership and organizational change: Reviewing the evidence. *Journal of Educational Change, 8*, 337-347.
- Harris, A., & Spillane, J. (2008). *Distributed leadership through the looking glass: Management in education*. Sage Publications, Inc.
- Harris, A. (2012). Leadership system transformation. *School Leadership and Management, 3*, 179-209.
- Harrison, H., Birks, M., Franklin, R., & Mills, J. (2017). Case Study Research: Foundations and methodological orientations. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 18*(1), 1-17.
- Holloway, J., Nielsen, A., & Saltmarsh, S. (2018). Prescribed distributed leadership in the era of accountability: The experiences of mentor teachers. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 46*(4), 538-555.

- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2005). *Educational administration: Theory, research and practice* (7th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Hulpia, H., Devos, G., Rosseel, Y., & Vlerick, P. (2012). Dimensions of distributed leadership and the impact on teachers' organizational commitment: A study in secondary education. *Journal of applied social psychology, 42*(7), 1745-1784.
- Jones, S. (2014). Distributed leadership: A critical analysis. *Leadership, 10*(2), 129-141. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715011433525>
- Klar, H. W. (2012). Fostering distributed instructional leadership: A sociocultural perspective of leadership development in urban high schools. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 11*(4), 365-390.
- Klein, E. J., Taylor, M., Munakata, M., Trabona, K., Rahman, Z., & McManus, J. (2018). Navigating teacher leaders' complex relationships using a distributed leadership framework. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 45*(2), 89-112.
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30*(3), 607-610. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001316447003000308>
- Leithwood, K., & Mascall, B. (2008). Collective leadership effects on student achievement. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44*(4), 529-561.
- Luff, J. (2011). *Fostering teacher leadership: Transforming learning and leading to enhance school culture* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Rowan University.
- Lumby, J. (2013). Distributed leadership: The uses and abuses of power. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 41*(5), 581-597.

- MacBeath, J., Oduro, G. K. T. & Waterhouse, J. (2004). *Distributed leadership in action: A study of current practice in schools*. National College for School Leadership.
- Margolis, J., & Huggins, K. S. (2012). Distributed but undefined: New teacher leader roles to change schools. *Journal of School Leadership*, 22(5), 953-981.
- Marks, H. M., & Printy, S. M. (2003). Principal leadership and school performance: An integration of transformational and instructional leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(3), 370-397.
- Maxwell, J. A. (2005). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications, Inc.
- Mayrowetz, D., Murphy, J., Louis, K. S. & Smylie, M. A. (2009). *Conceptualizing distributed leadership as a school reform: Revisiting job redesign theory*. Routledge.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. Jossey-Bass.
- Mifsud, D. (2017). Distributed leadership in a Maltese college: the voices of those among whom leadership is 'distributed' and who concurrently narrate themselves as leadership 'distributors'. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 20, 149-175.
- Onukwugha, P. I. (2013). *Distributed leadership in school, teacher practices, and student learning* (Publication No. 3562449). [Doctoral dissertation, Louisiana Tech University]. ProQuest Dissertations.

- Polit, D., & Beck, C. (2012). Data collection in quantitative research. In D. Polit & C. Beck (Eds.), *Nursing research, generating and assessing evidence for nursing practice* (pp. 293-327) Wolters Kluwer Health/Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.
- Ravitch, D. (2013). *Reign of error: The hoax of the privatization movement and the danger to America's public schools*. Alfred A. Knopf.
- Shava, G. N., & Tlou, F. N. (2018). Distributed leadership in education, contemporary issues in educational leadership. *African Educational Research Journal*, 6(4), 279-287.
- Sheppard, B. (1996). Exploring the transformational nature of instructional leadership. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 52, 325-344.
- Spillane, J., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. (2004). Towards a theory of school leadership practice: Implications of a distributed perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 36(1), 3-34.
- Spillane, J. P. (2006). *Distributed leadership*. Jossey-Bass.
- Spillane, J. P., & Healey, K. (2010). Conceptualizing school leadership and management from a distributed perspective: An exploration of some study operations and measures. *The Elementary School Journal*, 111(2), 253-281.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Sage Publications, Inc.
- Timperley, H. S. (2005). Distributed leadership: Developing theory from practice. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 37, 395-420.
- Wahlstrom, K., & Louis, K. (2008). How teachers experience principal leadership: The roles of professional community, trust, efficacy, and shared responsibility. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(4), 458-95.

- Wenner, J. A., & Campbell, T. (2017). The theoretical and empirical basis of teacher leadership: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 87(1), 134-171.
- Whitchurch, G. G., & Constantine, L. L. (2009). Systems theory. In *Sourcebook of family theories and methods* (pp. 325-355). Springer, Boston, MA.
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th ed.) Sage Publications, Inc.
- Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research and methodology*. Sage Publications, Inc.
- Youngs, H. (2014). Moving beyond distributed leadership to distributed forms: A contextual and socio-cultural analysis of two New Zealand secondary schools. *Leading and Managing*, 20(2), 89.

APPENDIX A

HUMAN USE APPROVAL LETTER



LOUISIANA TECH
UNIVERSITY

Office of Sponsored Projects

EXEMPTION MEMORANDUM

TO: Ms. Kristel Webb and Dr. Bryan McCoy

FROM: Dr. Richard Kordal, Director of Intellectual Properties
rk
rkordal@latech.edu

SUBJECT: HUMAN USE COMMITTEE REVIEW

DATE: July 1, 2021

TITLE: "A Qualitative Analysis of Distributed Leadership in an
Elementary School Setting"

NUMBER: HUC 21-111

According to the Code of Federal Regulations Title 45 Part 46, your research protocol is determined to be exempt from full review under the following exemption category(s):
46.104 (a)(d)(1)(2)(i)(ii).

(a) Unless otherwise required by law or by department or agency heads, research activities in which the only involvement of human subjects will be in one or more of the categories in paragraph (d) of this section are exempt from the requirements of this policy, except that such activities must comply with the requirements of this section and as specified in each category.

(d) Except as described in paragraph (a) of this section, the following categories of human subjects research are exempt from this policy:

(1) Research, conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, that specifically involves normal educational practices that are not likely to adversely impact students' opportunity to learn required educational content or the assessment of educators who provide instruction. This includes most research on regular and special education instructional strategies, and research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods.

(2) Research that only includes interactions involving educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior (including visual or auditory recording) if at least one of the following criteria is met:

(i) The information obtained is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that the identity of the human subjects cannot readily be ascertained, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects;

(ii) Any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research would not reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, educational advancement, or reputation

Thank you for submitting your Human Use Proposal to Louisiana Tech's Institutional Review Board.

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Interview Protocol

Researcher's Name: _____

Participant's Name: _____

Location: _____

Date/time: _____

My name is Kristel Webb, doctoral student at Louisiana Tech University. I will be conducting this interview with the goal of investigating the processes by which an elementary school principal uses Distributed Leadership to accomplish leadership tasks and progress toward organizational goals. As an educator, I value your opinions and insights. We want to know what works and what does not. I want you to feel comfortable saying what you truly think and how you truly feel. Everything you say will remain confidential. Only myself and my dissertation committee chairperson will be aware of your answers. Ultimately, the information provided from this study will enable school leaders to model distributed leadership as they strive to accomplish leadership tasks and progress toward organizational goals. This study will encourage future research to explore claims of causality of distributed leadership.

You were voluntarily selected based on your contribution to Distributed Leadership in your school. Approximately 8-10 participants within your school will engage in 10-15 interviews.

Prior to today's meeting, you were sent an introductory letter and two consent forms (one to sign and return and one to keep). The interviews will take approximately 15 minutes.

Be assured that all responses will be held in strict confidence and will be anonymized.

Have you returned your consent form? If not, I have it here for you. (copies distributed). Do you have any questions?

If there are no further questions, we will get started with the first question.

- **What does the term "Distributed Leadership" mean to you?**

- **How does an educator identify "Distributed Leadership"?**

- **Is “Distributed Leadership” present in your school?**

- **What are some of the internal struggles, dilemmas, and challenges faced by administrators and teachers as they shift between roles and expectations within your school?**

- **How can professional development programs foster teacher leadership and address some of the complexities of Distributed Leadership in schools?**

- **What specific actions and supports do teacher leaders need in the highly complex policy contexts of schools?**

- **From a distributed perspective, interactions are a crucial part of leadership practice. What events and/or actions take place that influence decision making and the development of leadership within the school?**

- **Are you willing to review and respond to my interpretations of your responses to ensure accuracy?**

- **Would you be willing to meet for follow up questions?**

APPENDIX C

SCHEDULE EXAMPLES

ELA Block–K & 2nd Grade: 8am Module & 9am Skills; 1st grade: Skills 8am & Module 9am

Time	Pre-K	Kindergarten	1st Grade	2nd Grade
7:45 – 7:55	DEAR	DEAR	DEAR	DEAR
7:55-8:00	Morning Announcements	Morning Announcements	Morning Announcements	Morning Announcements
8:00 – 10:00	Greeting Circle/ Morning Routine/Frog Street/Read Aloud (8:00 – 9:00)	ELA-EL Curriculum 8:00-10:00	ELA-EL Curriculum 8:00-10:00	ELA-EL Curriculum 8:00-10:00
	Elective/Centers 9:00-9:45			
	Brain Break 9:45-10:00			
10:00 – 10:15	Small Group/Frog Street; 10:00-10:15	Reading Interventions 10:00 – 10:30	Elective 10:00-11:00	Reading Interventions 10:00-10:30
10:15-10:20	DEAR; 10:15-10:20			Science/Social Studies 10:30-11:00
10:20 – 10:40	Lunch 10:20-10:40	DEAR 10:30 – 10:40		
10:40 - 11:10	Planned Gross Motor 10:40 – 11:10	Lunch 10:40-11:00	Lunch 11:00 - 11:20	Lunch 11:25-11:45
11:10 - 12:10	Outside Gross Motor Bathroom 11:10 – 11:40	Recess 11:00 – 11:15		
	Story Time 11:40 – 12:00	Elective 11:15-12:15	DEAR 11:30-11:45	
	12:10 – 1:15		Nap Time (12:00 – 1:10)	Science/Social Studies 11:45-12:15
Snack Time & Brain/Restroom Break 12:15-12:25		Reading Interventions 12:15-12:45	Snack Time & Brain/Restroom Break 1:00-1:15	
		Eureka Math 12:25-1:40		
1:15-2:45	Snack Time & Brain/Restroom Break 1:10 - 1:30	Math Interventions 1:40-2:10	ZEARN Math 12:45-2:00	Elective 1:15-2:15
	Centers /Frog Street/Large Group 1:30-2:45		Math Interventions 2:00-2:30	Math Interventions 2:15-2:45
	Review and Reflect/ Wrap-up Goodby Time 2:45-3:00	Social Studies/Science 2:10– 2:40	Recess 2:30 – 2:45	
	Dismissal 3:00-3:10	Handwriting 2:40 – 2:55		
2:45-3:00	DEAR 2:55-3:00	Handwriting/Wrap-Up 2:45 – 3:00	Handwriting 2:45-3:00	

**Daily Schedule Grade Pre-K
2021 – 2022**

Time	Subject/Activity
7:45 – 7:55	DEAR
7:55-8:00	Morning Announcements
8:00-9:00	Greeting Circle/ Morning Routine/Frog Street/Read Aloud
9:00-9:45	Elective/Centers
9:45-10:00	Brain Break
10:00-10:15	Small Group/Frog Street
10:15-10:20	DEAR
10:20-10:40	LUNCH
10:40-11:10	Planned Gross Motor
11:10-11:40	Outside Gross Motor/ Restroom
11:40-12:00	Story Time
12:00-1:10	Nap Time
1:10-1:30	Snack/Brain/Restroom Break
1:30-2:45	Centers/Large Group/Frog Street
2:45-3:00	Review and Reflect/Wrap-up Goodby Time
3:00-3:10	Dismissal

Elective Schedule (9:00-9:45)

Class	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
[REDACTED]	Library	P.E.	Keyboarding/ iReady	Music	Library
[REDACTED]	Music	Library	Music	Keyboarding/ iReady	P.E.
[REDACTED]	P.E.	Music	Library	P.E.	Keyboarding/ iReady

TAP Cluster meetings will meet on Thursdays.

**Daily Schedule Grade K
2021 - 2022**

Time	Subject/Activity
7:45 – 7:55	DEAR
7:55-8:00	Morning Announcements
8:00-10:00	ELA
10:00-10:30	Reading Interventions
10:30-10:40	DEAR
10:40-11:00	LUNCH
11:00-11:15	Recess
11:15-12:15	Elective
12:15-12:25	Snack/Brain/Restroom Break
12:25-1:40	Math
1:40-2:10	Math Interventions
2:10-2:40	Social Studies/Science
2:40-2:55	Handwriting
2:55-3:00	DEAR
3:00	WRAP UP

Elective Schedule (11:15 – 12:15)

Class	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
[REDACTED]	P.E.	Sel (Counselor)	Keyboarding /iReady	Library	Music
[REDACTED]	Music	P.E.	Sel (Counselor)	Keyboarding / iReady	Library
[REDACTED]	Library	Music	P.E.	Sel (Counselor)	Keyboarding/ iReady
[REDACTED]	Keyboarding/ iReady	Library	Music	P.E.	Sel (Counselor)
[REDACTED]	Sel (Counselor)	Keyboarding / iReady	Library	Music	P.E.

TAP Cluster meetings will meet on Thursdays.

**Daily Schedule Grade 1
2021-2022**

Time	Subject/Activity
7:45 – 7:55	DEAR
7:55-8:00	Morning Announcements
8:00-10:00	ELA
10:00-11:00	ELECTIVE
11:00-11:20	LUNCH
11:20-11:30	Snack/Brain/Restroom Break
11:30-11:45	DEAR
11:45-12:15	Science/Social Studies
12:15-12:45	Reading Interventions
12:45-2:00	Math
2:00-2:30	Math Interventions
2:30-2:45	RECESS
2:45-3:00	Handwriting
3:00	Wrap Up

Elective Schedule (10:00-11:00)

Class	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
[REDACTED]	Sel (Counselor)	Music	Library	Keyboarding/ iReady	P.E.
[REDACTED]	P.E.	Sel (Counselor)	Music	Library	Keyboarding/ iReady
[REDACTED]	Keyboarding/ iReady	P.E.	Sel (Counselor)	Music	Library
[REDACTED]	Library	Keyboarding/ iReady	P.E.	Sel (Counselor)	Music

TAP Cluster meetings will meet on Thursdays.

**Daily Schedule Grade 2
2021 – 2022**

Time	Subject/Activity
7:45 – 7:55	DEAR
7:55-8:00	Morning Announcements
8:00-10:00	ELA
10:00-10:30	Reading Interventions
10:30-11:00	Science/Soc Studies
11:00-11:15	Recess
11:15-11:25	DEAR
11:25-11:45	LUNCH
11:45-1:00	Math
1:00-1:15	Snack/Brain/Restroom Break
1:15-2:15	Elective
2:15-2:45	Math Interventions
2:45-3:00	Handwriting
3:00	WRAP UP

Elective Schedule (1:15 – 2:15)

Class	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
	Sel (Counselor)	Keyboarding / iReady	Library	Music	P.E.
	P.E.	Sel (Counselor)	Keyboarding / iReady	Library	Music
	Music	P.E.	Sel (Counselor)	Keyboarding / iReady	Library
	Library	Music	P.E.	Sel (Counselor)	Keyboarding / iReady

TAP Cluster meetings will meet on Thursdays