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Abstract

This study explored the relationships of teacher leadership, collective efficacy, and trust throughout the school. This study took place in two school districts where data were collected from the Teacher Leadership Inventory, Omnibus T-Scale, and Teacher Collective Efficacy Belief Scale. Findings indicate a strong positive relationship between the three variables. Findings support the hypothesis that teacher leadership is a larger organizational construct, extending beyond the roles of individual teachers.
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Research examining teacher leadership has approached this construct in terms of reform (Silva, Gimbert, & Nolan 2000; Wasley, 1991), roles (Evans, 1996; Fullan & Hargreaves, 1996; Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001; Lieberman, Saxl, & Miles, 2000; Little, 2003), effects (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001; O’Connor & Boles, 1992; Ovando, 1996), responsibilities (LeBlanc & Shelton, 1997; Smylie, 1992), skills (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001; Lieberman et al, 2000; Odell, 1997; Snell & Swanson, 2000) and personal benefits (Harris & Muijs, 2005; Katzenmeyer & Moller, 1996, 2001; Frost & Harris, 2003; Ovando, 1996; Smylie, 1994). The majority of studies have examined teacher leadership at the teacher level of analysis, drawing conclusions that speak to those teachers who take on leadership roles. The literature rarely touches upon the perspective of organizational benefits in schools that offer wide support of teacher leadership.

Leadership capacity, often a focus of the teacher leadership literature, can be found across teacher leaders in the belief that they can bring about change, a desire to work for change, and the knowledge and skills to do so (DiRanna & Loucks-Horsley, 2001). An organizational construct which researchers have found promotes school capacity for leadership is collective efficacy. Demonstrated throughout the literature as related to student achievement, Bandura (1993) posited that “Faculties’ beliefs in their collective instructional efficacy contribute significantly to their schools’ level of academic achievement” (p. 117). School reform literature also cites trust as a variable foundational to teacher empowerment (Bryk & Schneider, 2003; Hoy, Smith, & Sweetland, 2002). Previous studies (Bryk & Schneider, 2003) have linked school cultures with high levels of trust to high levels of teacher efficacy. However, these variables have not previously been examined in light of the extent of teacher leadership in schools.

The purpose of this study was to explore teacher leadership through the wider lens of
influences on the organization through the variables of teacher leadership as practiced in a school, the collective efficacy of the faculty, and the level of trust throughout the school building. To accomplish this purpose, the following research questions guided this study: (1) What is the extent of teacher leadership in the school, as measured by the Teacher Leadership Inventory? (2) What is the extent of teacher collective efficacy in the school, as measured by the Teacher Efficacy Belief Scale – Collective Form? (3) What is the extent of trust in the school as measured by the Omnibus T-Scale? (4) Is there a relationship between the variables? And (5) Are there differences in the variables by grade level?

This study will add to the literature on school organizations through the identification of factors which will increase the effectiveness of the whole school. We hypothesize that schools where teachers are encouraged to take leadership roles have a greater sense of collective efficacy and trust in the organization. This will likely translate into a greater intent to stay in the organization and more effective instructional practices. These findings can be significant to district and school leaders as they plan professional development for teachers, perhaps incorporating leadership development for teachers as part of their professional training. As districts find themselves striving to reach ever rising standards of academic achievement, an ability to know what factors can be targeted to help meet these new standards could be beneficial. Olivier and Hipp (2006) stated that, “Sharing power and authority with teachers through decision making and shared leadership increases leadership capacity and builds a belief in the school's collective ability to affect student learning” (p. 517). Understanding how relational trust increases teacher willingness to step up to school wide leadership roles as well as how collective efficacy might encourage teachers to feel empowered and take on these
leadership roles informs district and school level administrators how capacity in schools can be increased, an essential element of school improvement.

**Review of the Literature**

The following review of literature presents Bandura’s theory of collective efficacy, the theory which frames this study. This will be followed by an examination of the conceptual framework for this study, teacher leadership. The literature review will conclude with research which focuses on trust, also foundational to these findings.

**Collective Efficacy**

This study is theoretically framed in the work of Bandura’s (1977, 1986) social cognitive theory. Human agency is a fundamental assumption of social cognitive theory. Social cognitive theory not only examines whether individuals believe they are capable of a task but also examines the outcomes expectancy; that is, the likely consequences of performing a specific task at an optimum level (Tshannen-Moran, Hoy, & Hoy, 1998). Bandura (1986) noted that “among the mechanisms of personal agency, none is more central or pervasive than people’s beliefs about their capabilities to exercise control over events that affect their lives” (p. 1176). Bandura (1977) introduced the idea of self-efficacy as “beliefs in one’s capacity to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments” (p. 3). Four primary sources of information contribute to self efficacy: performance accomplishment (also called mastery experience), vicarious experience, verbal persuasion, and physiological states (Bandura, 1977).

While self-efficacy is essential to the individual, collective efficacy refers to the larger group in an organization. Collective efficacy is “the perception[s] of teachers in a school that the faulty as a whole can organize and execute the courses of action required to have a positive effect on students” (Goddard & Goddard, 2001, p. 809). While teacher efficacy has long been
associated with student achievement, the impact of collective efficacy of the staff has surfaced in research over the last 15 years. The perceived collective efficacy of the teachers within a school is a construct that is “systematically associated with student achievement” (Goddard, Hoy, & Hoy, 2000, p. 480). Teachers who believe that their colleagues are able to behave in ways that promote student achievement indicate high collective efficacy (Goddard & Goddard, 2001).

When the collective beliefs of the staff to carry out their tasks are high, the individual efficacy of teachers is also higher. This set of beliefs has an indirect influence on student achievement, as shown by Muijs and Reynolds (2002) who found that “teacher behaviors were not only the most significant predictor of student progress over the year [of their study], but also significantly affected teacher beliefs and self-efficacy” (p. 13), indicating a reciprocal relationship.

Mayer, Mullens, and Moore (2000) explain this in terms of school level indicators that relate to student learning, a goal where all teachers accept accountability for student achievement; that is, the “school faculty that collectively takes responsibility for student learning” (p. 36). If teachers believe they can accomplish a task, they expend more effort and are motivated to persist. Thus, “teachers’ pedagogical competence to affect student learning through their instructional practices is closely tied to their assumptions about whether students can learn and to their ability to modify their instructional practice” (Printy, 2008, p. 198). Ross and Bruce (2007) note that when teachers with high efficacy face struggling students in danger of failure, they exert greater effort, rather than surrendering, deeming that the causes for failure are beyond their control. This belief in self, motivation to persist, and ability to modify practice will likely positively impact student achievement.

An outcome of collective efficacy is the concept of collective responsibility. Walstrom and Louis (2008) define this concept as “teachers’ belief that they not only have the capacity to
influence student learning but the shared obligation to do so” (p. 466). This collective responsibility is a type of collegial accountability, one where teachers share obligations for both teacher and student learning (Taylor & Angelle, 2007). Lee and Smith (1996) consistently found that schools with high collective responsibility for learning not only had students who learned more but also were schools that were more equitable, particularly in terms of social characteristics. As a group construct, the level of collective efficacy is essential to understanding the norms of the organization by “encouraging certain actions and discouraging others” (Goddard, LeGerfo, & Hoy, 2006, p. 404) as well as “establishing common expectations for action and goal attainment” (p. 405) and group responses to problems.

Additional critical outcomes of collective efficacy are persistence and effort. A field trial research study from Ross and Bruce (2007) found that teachers with high efficacy persisted when faced with student failure and expended greater effort. This is particularly pertinent for lower ability students or students who have a history of discipline problems. Conclusions from the study determined that “high-efficacy teachers have positive attitudes toward low achieving students, build friendly relationships with them, and set higher academic standards for this group than do low-efficacy teachers” (p. 51).

**Teacher Leadership**

Teacher leadership reflects teacher agency; that is, the school wide work of teachers as supported through establishing relationships, breaking down barriers, and marshalling resources throughout the organization in an effort to improve students’ educational experiences and outcomes (York-Barr & Duke, 2004). Katzenmeyer and Moller (2001) define teacher leadership in terms of influence while LeBlanc and Shelton (1997) discuss the construct through teacher behaviors.
A report by the Coalition of Essential Schools noted that teachers who self-identify as teacher leaders rarely make up more than 25% of a faculty (Barth, 2001). Yet, studies of teacher leadership have found that teacher leaders can influence policy at the district level, make a difference at the school level through their expertise, (Hatch, White, & Faigenbaum, 2005), and that support of teacher leaders is critical for school reform to occur (Silins & Mulford, 2004). Moreover, Ryan (1999) found that teacher leadership brings about school change, promotes democratic schools, and transforms schools into places of adult, as well as student, learning.

Schools are designed as bureaucracies, which by nature, stifle the ability of teachers to be effective as change agents (Wynne, 2001). However, teacher leaders, by using influence, instead of control, can have a profound effect on the success of a school context, both in student achievement and in promoting a collaborative and healthy school culture. Informal teacher leaders define success not just by what happens in the classroom but by success throughout the school (Ryan, 1999). Barth (2001) notes that teacher leadership has a snowball effect on student leadership by serving as roles models. Teacher leaders also serve as role models for their peers. The more teachers participate in school wide decision making, the higher the faculty morale and the greater the participation and commitment to carry out school goals (Barth, 2001).

Roles of teacher leaders documented in the literature also include navigating the structure of schools, sharing knowledge with colleagues, reflecting on work, engaging in action research, mentoring, possessing social consciousness, taking risks, nurturing relationships, encouraging professional growth, helping others with change, challenging the status quo, taking a stand for change, practicing classroom expertise, focusing on curriculum, promoting change to improve quality for teachers, and playing a vital role in school reform (Silva, 2000; Suranna & Moss, 2002; Wynne, 2001). Teachers who are successful in taking on the role of leader were
self-directed, took risks and saw opportunity where others might not. Moreover, teacher leaders felt valued in their work and were able to develop support systems among their peers (DiRanna & Loucks-Horsley, 2001). Wallach, Lambert, Copland, and Lowry (2005), in their study of small schools, found that peer elected teacher leaders perceived vagueness about their role and reported that this vague nature undercut the authority of their leadership.

When discussed in terms of characteristics, rather than roles, teacher leaders demonstrate a focus on student learning, a propensity to develop and maintain relationships, an ability to plan, organize and lead change, and an understanding of policy and politics (Moller, Childs-Bowen, & Scrivener, 2001). In a study of teacher leaders, DiRanna and Loucks-Horsley (2001) found common characteristics across the leaders, including a sense of empowerment that they could bring about change, a desire to work for change for those things about which they were passionate, and the knowledge and skills to do so.

The principal is critical to the success and support of teacher leadership in a school. Principals provide recognition of a job well done, empowerment in the form of decision making, and share in the responsibility when initiatives fail. The context in which the process of teacher leadership succeeds or fails is framed by the principal (Moller, Childs-Bowen & Scrivener, 2001). Thus, as Acker-Hocever & Touchton (1999) found, schools with the greatest extent of teacher leadership are led by principals who are most willing to share power and release control. These researchers noted that empowering principals give respect and trust, setting up school conditions conducive to practicing empowerment.

Within a school, empowering others to lead alongside the principal builds collegiality and shares opportunities for active participation in the improvement of the school. Schools with these cultures are referred to as learning organizations, characterized by collaboration, risk
taking, and shared mission (Silins & Mulford, 2004). Work environments where teachers thrive are those which emphasize collegiality, communication, and collaboration. School cultures built around these relationships find that teacher commitment to the job and loyalty to the organization are enhanced (Fennell, 1999). Moreover, this healthy work culture of trust and support where both principal and teachers share a purpose or set of goals will lead to a growth in teacher leadership (Moller, Childs-Bowen, & Scrivner, 2001).

**Trust**

The foundations for research on the variable of trust began in the field of psychology with the work of Rotter (1980) and Erickson (1968). Coleman (1990) applied economic theory in terms of the goods and services of relationships, resulting in social capital theory. Investment in social capital in an organization produces behavior and outcomes for those individuals with whom relationships are fostered or withheld. Coleman identified one form of social capital as trust based obligations and expectations.

Trust, as part of social capital, also encompasses the likelihood of betrayal. Tshannen-Moran and Hoy (2000) note that organizational context influences whether this may occur. When the norms of the organization “emphasize ethical behaviors and a work environment of openness, trust, and respect” (p.577) then trust violations are less likely to occur. However, organizations “characterized by goal incongruence, internal politics and conflict, and shifting coalitions lend themselves to a greater number of betrayals” (p. 577). Organizations which do not practice interdependence have no need for trust. If no relationship exists, trust is not required. The very nature of trust requires that it is entrenched in the social context of the organization (Brewster & Railsback, 2003; Tshannen-Moran, 2000).
The principal, as leader of the organization, sets the tone for the values and the importance of relationships to the school culture. Bryk and Schneider also note the importance that the school leader plays in promoting trust in the school through establishing “both respect and personal regard when they acknowledge the vulnerabilities of others, actively listen to their concerns, and eschew arbitrary actions” (p. 43). Principals who violate trust may have difficulty regaining it. Once distrust becomes a part of the organization, it perpetuates. Examples of ways in which principals may violate trust include “public criticism, incorrect or unfair accusations, blaming of employees for personal mistakes, and insults” (Tshannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000, p. 576). This is true of the principal-teacher relationship as well as the teacher-student relationship. Obstacles to trust in a school also include frequent leadership turnover, personnel layoffs, poor communication, top down decision making, and failure to remove ineffective teachers (Brewster & Railsback, 2003).

Trust has also been found to be a reciprocal element in schools. Principals extend trust through shared decision making and, in return, teachers extend greater trust in the principal. Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999) found that schools were there was a high level of shared decision making also had higher levels of faculty trust in parents and students, thus, indicating the “ripple effect” of trust. Kinsler, Caskie, Barber, and White (2009) in their study of democratic processes in middle schools also found strong support that “faculty trust mediates the relationship between democratic community and continuous and team learning, with faculty trust explaining 71% of the relationship” (p. 724). Moreover, in this same study, Kinsler and colleagues found that “the democratic principles in action…significantly predict[ed] higher levels of trust, including trust in the principal, colleagues, and clients” (p. 724).

Chhuon, Gilkey, Gonzalex, Daly, and Chrispeels (2006) found in their study of district trust
that there were three facets of trust, including communication, respect, and risk. Tshannen-Moran and Hoy (2000) also found that communication was an essential component of trust and, conversely, trust was necessary for open communication. Trust is required to share thoughts and feelings and well as to disclose accurate and relevant information.

Trust in schools has been shown to be a resource in reform (Bryk & Schneider, 2003). Noonan and Walker (2008) cite “the importance and pervasiveness of trust (or its betrayal or absence)…[as] implicit in our every effort to establish communities of learners and generative settings for the expression of our shared educational ambitions” (p.1). Seashore Louis (2007) studied change in five schools which implemented Total Quality Management and found that schools which had high levels of trust more easily implemented complex change in their organization than did schools with low levels of trust. Her research found three variables which enhanced trust in the schools, including

1. perceived influence over how decisions are made;
2. a sense that decision makers take stakeholder interests into account; and
3. an agreed upon and objective measure of the effects or outcomes of implemented decisions. (p. 20)

Trusting relationships, organizational structure, and communication are also mentioned as elements of teacher empowerment (Crowther, Kaagan, Ferguson, & Hann, 2002; Hoy, Smith, & Sweetland, 2002; Short, Greer, & Michael, 1991). Hoy and Miskel (2008) note that trust in a school is based on the interdependence of the relationships of the members of the organization. This is particularly true of the relationship between the principal and the teachers. Hoy and Miskel state that
when the faculty has a high level of trust toward the principal, the faculty also believes that the principal is benevolent, reliable, competent, honest, and open in interactions with teachers. (p. 192)

The extent of the culture of trust in a school is the collective trust between all parties; that is, the administration, the teachers, the parents, and the students. Hoy and Miskel (2008) also point out that “the evidence is mounting that trusting relations among teachers, parents, and students promote student achievement and improvement” (p.194). Tschannen-Moran and Goddard (2000) also found an indirect relationship between trust and student achievement, as mitigated by the collective efficacy of the faculty. A study of North Carolina teachers found that trust was strongly correlated with student achievement, with the researchers concluding that “approximately 20 percent more educators in the state’s highest achieving schools agreed there was trust and mutual respect in their school than educators in schools with the lowest student performance” (Reeves, Emerick, & Hirsh, 2007, p. 1). This same study found that trust was also strongly correlated with teachers’ employment decisions, where 66% of North Carolina educators who intended to continue working at their school likewise agreed that their school had and trusting and respectful culture.

Methods

Data Collection

This multi-site quantitative study took place in two school districts in a southeastern state. Invitations to participate in the study were offered to three elementary schools, three middle schools, three secondary schools, three K-12 schools, and one K-8 school. Since there was only one K-8 school in the two districts, this was the only school with that configuration. All schools agreed to participate. However, after agreeing to participate, when surveys were disseminated,
two high schools and one K-12 school withdrew participation. The final sample consisted of ten schools (3 elementary, 3 middle, 1 secondary, 2 K-12, and 1 K-8).

After receiving permission from the university review board and the district superintendents to conduct the study, an online link to three survey instruments (Teacher Leadership Inventory, Teacher Efficacy Belief Scale –Collective, Omnibus T Scale) was sent to the principals of the schools that agreed to participate. Principals were asked to forward the link to teachers in their respective schools and were sent a follow-up reminder with the link and time frame for completion. Surveys were disseminated to the email accounts of 288 teachers, with 168 teachers accessing and completing the surveys, for a response rate of 45%. Informed consent was obtained through the online data collection process. Access to surveys was available for 30 days, at which time data were downloaded to an SPSS PAWS 18 © software program. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and correlations.

Instrumentation

The Teacher Leadership Inventory consists of 17 statements constructed along a simple 4-point Likert scale (never, seldom, sometimes, and routinely) designed to measure the extent of teacher leadership in schools. Angelle and DeHart (2010) report Cronbach alpha reliabilities of .85 for the entire instrument. The alpha reliability for the first factor, Sharing Expertise was 0.84, and a sample item from this factor is “Other teachers willingly offer me assistance if I have questions about how to teach a new topic or skill.” The second factor, Sharing Leadership,” had an alpha of 0.84, and an item from this factor included “Teachers have opportunities to influence important decisions even if they do not hold an official leadership position.” With an alpha of 0.85, the third factor of Supra-Practitioner is represented by the item “Teachers willingly stay after school to work on school improvement activities.” Finally, the last factor of Principal
Selection had an alpha reliability of 0.56; a sample item from this fourth factor is “Most teachers in leadership positions only serve because they have been principal appointed.”

The Teacher Efficacy Belief Scale – Collective Form (TEBS-C) developed by Olivier (2001), is a 10 item instrument with a one faction solution, with an alpha reliability of 0.96. The 4-point Likert scale for the TEBS-C ranged from Weak Beliefs to Very Strong Beliefs. This instrument measures the strength of beliefs of teachers in the capabilities of the fellow faculty to carry out tasks such as produce high levels of learning with our students and effectively communicate with the school administration.

The Omnibus T-Scale contains 26 items and was developed by Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (2003). This instrument measures three dimensions of trust, including trust in the principal, trust in the faculty, and trust in the client. These subscales have alpha reliability ranging from .90 to .98, with validity confirmed through factor analysis (Trust in Principal, $\alpha = .97$; Trust in Colleagues, $\alpha = .95$; Trust in Clients, $\alpha = .96$). Responses are elicited on a 6-point Likert scale, ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree. Items from the Omnibus T-Scale include The principal in this school typically acts in the best interests of teachers (trust in principal), Teachers in this school do their job well (trust in colleagues), and Students in this school can be counted on to do their work (trust in clients).

Findings

Data were collected from three instruments, the Teacher Leadership Inventory (TLI), the Omnibus T-Scale, and the Teacher Efficacy Belief Scale - Collective (TEBS-C). Data were downloaded from the Mr. Interview © online survey software to PASW Statistics 18© software. Descriptive statistics were run to examine mean differences. Pearson correlations were calculated to examine the relationship between collective efficacy and extent of teacher leadership, trust and
teacher leadership, and trust and collective efficacy as perceived by all teachers (n=168). All results were statistically significant and all indicated a large effect size (Cohen, 1988). Results of the correlations between collective efficacy and teacher leadership found $r(166) = .59$, $p < .01$, between trust and teacher leadership found $r(166) = .50$, $p < .01$, and between trust and collective efficacy, $r(166) = .68$, $p < .01$.

To test for homogeneity of variance Levine’s statistic was calculated. Results indicated that the three variables tested, Teacher Leadership Inventory, Teacher Efficacy Belief Scale – Collective, and the Omnibus T-Scale, did not violate the assumption of homogeneity of variance. The Shapiro-Wilk test for normality was run and found that all three variables exhibited non-normality. To examine any differences in the variables by grade levels, an ANOVA was run. Results of the ANOVA indicated significant differences in mean scores of the five grade level groups for the TLI, $F(4, 163) = 3.174$, $p = .015$. Tukey post hoc comparisons of the five groups indicated that the K-8 school teachers ($M = 3.31$, 95% CI [3.18, 3.45]) gave significantly higher scores than the high school teachers ($M = 2.86$, 95% CI [2.71, 3.01]), $p = .015$. No significant differences were found for either the TEBS-C or the Omnibus T-Scale.

Due to the non-normality, non-parametric tests were run to examine any differences in variables by grade level. The Kruskal-Wallis test found significant differences in grade level groups for the Teacher Leadership Inventory ($\chi^2(4) = 13.858$, $p = .008$). Mann-Whitney U tests were run on all possible grade level group combinations (elementary, middle, high, K-8, and K-12). Significant differences were found between the following groups: elementary and high school ($U = 253.5$, $Z = -2.562$, $p = 0.01$); Middle school and K-8 ($U = 134.5$, $Z = -2.283$, $p = .022$); high school and K-8 ($U = 11.0$, $Z = -3.681$, $p < .001$); and K-12 and K-8 ($U = 70.5$, $Z = -2.725$, $p = .005$).
Conclusions

Findings from the study indicate a clear and strong relationship between collective efficacy and the extent of teacher leadership. A strong collective efficacy of staff is indicative of belief in their ability to meet their goals and achieve their mission. When a teaching staff perceives collective efficacy is strong, the impact on student achievement is high (Bandura, 1993; Goddard et al., 2000). Findings from this study indicate that teachers who believe in the capacity of the faculty as a whole and in the capability of individual teachers work in schools where the extent of teacher leadership is greater. Mayer, Mullens, and Moore (2000) note this collective responsibility and group accountability for student achievement comes from teachers who believe in themselves, expend more effort, and have greater motivation to persist. These qualities are much like the teacher leadership behaviors described by York-Barr and Duke (2004) which include breaking down barriers and finding school resources to improve student educational experiences and student outcomes.

As school leaders seek to enable their staffs to meet the demands of increasing achievement for all students, this study provides support for developing shared leadership which can impact the collective beliefs of the staff in a positive manner. As Moller, Childs-Bowen, and Scrivener (2001) remind us, the success or failure of teacher leadership is framed by the principal, who influences the context where the teacher leader works. Empowerment, shared decision making, and shared responsibility are all part of the agency of teacher leaders and all under the purview of the principal to support or place barriers. Following the work of Fennell (1999), school cultures built around supportive teacher-principal relationships increase teacher motivation to improve the school as well as engender loyalty and intent to stay in the organization.
A strong positive relationship was found between trust and teacher leadership as well as trust and collective efficacy. As indicated by these findings, extending teacher leadership increases collective efficacy, and trust is foundational to both of these constructs. Just as the extent of teacher leadership and the level of collective efficacy depends, in large part, upon the support of the school leadership, so, too, does the level of trust in the school. As trust extends from a supportive culture based on positive relationships between stakeholders, results from this study affirms those leaders who believe in the power of relationships, shared decision making, and opportunities for teacher leadership. The principal sets the tone for the importance placed on social capital and the value placed on relationships, respect, and transparent communications, all elements of trust. Teachers who are given the opportunity to lead and who may be willing to lead must also have the necessary skills to lead. A critical component of efficacy is mastery experience (Bandura, 1977). Teachers will participate in activities in which they believe they can succeed and where they have succeeded in the past. Honing the skills of teachers through professional development and opportunities for training can be provided by the principal, thus, increasing the trust relationship between principal and teacher, the collective efficacy of the faculty, and the willingness of individual teachers to lead.

The findings from this study also support the hypothesis that teacher leadership is a larger organizational construct that extends beyond the roles and responsibilities of the individual teacher. Teacher leadership is a variable that can contribute to the success of the organization through the relationship with collective efficacy as well as the school culture through the relationship with school trust. Extending this research to include qualitative methodology can strengthen these conclusions. Interviews which examine the perceptions of teachers, both those who are leaders and those who do not see themselves as leaders, will increase understanding of
the impact of teacher leadership on the perceived efficacy of the staff, the culture of trust in an organization, and the link to student achievement.
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