Challenges and Opportunities of Educational Leadership Research and Practice

The State of the Field and Its Multiple Futures

edited by

Alex J. Bowers
Teachers College–Columbia University

Alan R. Shoho
University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee

Bruce G. Barnett
University of Texas at San Antonio

IAP
INFORMATION AGE PUBLISHING, INC.
Charlotte, NC • www.infoagepub.com

CHAPTER 2

FOUR DECADES OF COLLECTIVE LEADERSHIP

The Connection Between Leadership Theories of Action and Student Achievement

Chase Nordengren
University of Washington

There is a paradoxical difference between evidence showing an indirect and sometimes weak relationship between leadership and student outcomes (Heck & Hallinger, 2009; Marks & Printy, 2003; Urick & Bowers, 2014) and the expectations of policymakers and the public that leaders can fix failing schools (Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008). Explaining this difference has been a significant focus of leadership scholars over the last forty years, who have proposed a variety of models to understand who exercises leadership in schools, how they exercise that leadership, and how that leadership affects students (Hallinger, 2013). Models by themselves do not, however, describe the *what* and *how* of leadership practice: which practices of leadership are effective and, in particular, the link between these factors and theories of school improvement.

Challenges and Opportunities of Educational Leadership Research and Practice, pages 17–53

Authors in the field have begun to suggest that a "bewildering array of definitions" (Harris, 2003, p. 318) have prevented a deeper understanding of how leadership functions outside the models that attempt to categorize it (Mayrowetz, 2008; York-Barr & Duke, 2004). When leadership is "a social construction on the part of those experiencing it" (Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999, p. 681), the use of an explicit descriptor of leadership models is not necessary, nor even always expedient. Instead, scholars should consider means of examining studies *across* models, both to get a more complete picture of the state of the field and to understand common elements that transcend traditional model boundaries.

This chapter's purpose is to identify themes in recent educational leadership literature that cross boundaries between models of educational leadership, with an emphasis on new ways of thinking about how informal and formal leaders work together in schools. In doing so, it hopes to provide an introduction to recent scholarship in this arena, and also advance a conversation about how to better integrate models of leadership across diverse authors and contexts. It asks:

1. In literature on educational leadership written since the rise to prominence of collective models of educational leadership (roughly, the year 2000), how do authors conceptually understand leaders, leadership tasks, and student outcomes?
2. What are common "theories of action" in these literatures linking leadership tasks with changes in instruction and in student outcomes?
3. What are common features of these theories of action across leadership models?

Using a "theories of action" model, this chapter seeks to understand the commonalities underlying how collective leadership studies understand who leads, what behaviors leaders lead through, and the student outcomes that measure that success or failure. The chapter identifies three common types of theories of action across studies and three features of studies that are common throughout the educational leadership literature. The chapter concludes by arguing collective leadership serves as a bridge between mediated models of leadership and effects on student outcomes, exploring the implications of this idea for theory and research.

BACKGROUND

In this section, I argue four major models of educational leadership converge around the idea of collectivity. In turn, this convergence suggests the opportunity for work that seeks to integrate models, or understand models

together, through "theories of action," or ways of describing how leaders, through leadership practices, cause impacts on student outcomes. While specific studies of school leadership, both quantitative and qualitative, may suggest a leadership model through which authors understand leadership, leadership models share important similarities that allow work among one scholarly tradition to have utility for scholars in other traditions.

Most leadership models now contend, at a minimum, that leadership is "a social influence process whereby intentional influence is exerted by one person [or group] over other people [or groups] to structure the activities and relationships in a group or organization" (Yukl, 1994, p. 3; see also Leithwood & Duke, 1999; Northouse, 2007). Models of leadership, therefore, address the questions of who ought lead, what they ought do to lead, and how these person or persons ought lead. As such, the relationship between leadership models and leadership as understood in practice is reciprocal and changing, and scholars should examine how accurately each reflects the other.

PROMINENT MODELS OF COLLECTIVE EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

I use the term "collective leadership" here to encompass models of educational leadership that contain three common elements:

1. A unit of analysis: Collective leadership describes teams of leaders working together.
2. A unit of work: Collective leadership models focus on the routines or common practices leaders engage in, rather than the actions of individual leaders.
3. A unit of measurement: Collective leadership orients actors in the school towards the common goal of improving student outcomes.

I focus on four models that, I argue, contain collectivity: Instructional leadership, transformational leadership, teacher leadership, and distributed leadership. These four overlap in interesting ways, and, each in their own way, exhibit a growing or already well-developed focus on the collective nature of leadership practice.

Evolving Notions of Instructional Leadership

First, instructional leadership refers to several theories that discuss how leaders engage in the work of improving classroom instruction. Scholarship

on instructional leadership has a long and diverse history. Beginning roughly from the period of the "effective schools" movement of the mid-1980s, scholars have sought to understand the role of principals in setting instructional priorities (Hallinger, 2005). Much of this early literature focused on firmly establishing what was expected of principals in terms of setting the vision for and intervening in activities traditionally reserved for teachers (Hallinger & Murphy, 1987). As the accountability movement took hold in the late 1990s and early 2000s, attention once again turned to how principals interacted with instruction, though this time with the desire to better meet more vigorous performance expectations placed on schools (Hallinger, 2005). The various models of instructional leadership may come, in part, from this long and multifaceted heritage.

The diversity of the instructional leadership literature may also stem from a recent focus within that literature on collaboration and collectivity. During the nascent stages of instructional leadership, which studied principals, literature focused on connecting leadership practices to student outcomes to the detriment of a focus on styles of leadership practice (Hallinger, 2005). The trend from "technological, rational planning" models of school improvement toward "cultural, collaborative approaches" (Sheppard, 1996, p. 328), observed by instructional leadership authors, encompassed several different interpersonal leadership styles. In turn, this shift may have also shifted the attention of authors toward the collaboration itself, including actors other than the principal in the leadership umbrella.

One understanding of instructional leadership—termed shared instructional leadership (Marks & Printy, 2003; Printy, Marks, & Bowers, 2009; Urick & Bowers, 2014)—explicitly addresses the role of teachers and other nonadministrators in instructional leadership. These scholars begin from the principle that teaching and learning, as the "technical core" of schools and schooling, ought guide all of the short- and long-term objectives of schools as organizations (Marks & Printy, 2003). This process entails both principals mobilizing action toward improving student outcomes and teachers establishing the norms and culture through which other teachers act (Marks, Printy, & Bowers, 2009). The shared instructional leadership concept is in line with profiles of successful instructional leadership practice (Knapp, 2014; Murphy et al., 2007), and major critiques of the model by other scholars.

Though diverse, instructional leadership theorists share the belief that principals lead by defining and communicating goals, providing feedback on the teaching and learning process, and emphasizing professional development activities (Alig-Mielcarek & Hoy, 2005; Hallinger, 2005). Among some authors, these tasks also include setting a culture of high expectations, monitoring student data, and serving as a visible presence in the school (Hallinger, 2005). Instructional leadership theories still lend substantial, perhaps primary, focus to principals. Still, the focus on principals as collaborative agents has lent focus to collaborative processes, and what kinds of leadership may be exercised within them.

Transformational Leadership

The literature on transformational leadership in schools, begun in the 1970s, has focused largely on whether schools are good places to work and learn and, as such, has addressed a broader set of leadership goals and activities than the improvement of instruction. Under these models, principals are expected to understand and display the behaviors and dispositions necessary to build work environments supportive to teachers. It is incumbent on the leader in this case to promote the overall goals of the institution rather than the goals of the individual (Brower & Balch, 2005). Frequently, the model includes opportunities for teachers to collaborate on leadership activities to create a culture of shared responsibility and accountability.

Transformational leadership models across several literatures focus on the capacities and commitments of an organization's members (Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 2009). Like instructional leadership, the introduction of transformational leadership implies schools are shifting away from the traditional model of leadership and changing "for the better" by increasing the purposes and resources of both leaders and followers (Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 2009).

In recent years, authors (Hallinger, 2003; Marks & Printy, 2003; Urick & Bowers, 2011) have proposed reconciling instructional and transformational leadership models in various ways. Additionally, various reviews of literature (Robinson et al., 2008; Scheerens, 2012) have found that instructional leadership has a more significant impact on student achievement than transformational leadership. These findings may be associated with a decline in published studies utilizing this literature in recent years, as authors appear to transition into using other models to describe similar phenomena. Nevertheless, the term "transformational leadership" has a long history, and retains some salience among practitioners.

Teacher Leadership

Teacher leadership theories understand leadership beginning from the perspectives and needs of classroom teachers. Formally, the term "teacher leader" is used to refer to teachers with a variety of job arrangements outside of the classroom, from full-time formal coaching positions to occasional "drop-in" observation or advice-giving (Lord & Miller, 2000). In addition to these formal arrangements, teacher leadership scholars often seek to understand how

teachers lead informally, including how practices such as modeling effective instruction serve a leadership function even if practitioners do not consider themselves leaders. An egalitarian view of teachers and teaching, combined with the newness of teacher leadership positions, has fed a line of scholarship separate from that focusing on leadership by principals (Neumerski, 2013).

Teacher leadership scholars have focused attention on these nonsupervisory, school-based leadership roles (Mangin & Stoelinga, 2008). While some authors in this space have focused on formalistic job responsibilities and roles—studying teachers who build professional development, critique lessons, and serve on committees (Lord & Miller, 2000)—others have taken an explicitly anti-hierarchical approach to understanding expertise and the building of relationships as key leadership practices (Firestone & Cecilia Martinez, 2007), while others have focused on how specific environments foster opportunities for, or even expectations of, teacher leadership (York-Barr & Duke, 2004).

Given its focus, scholars may consider teacher leadership a descriptive term for teachers who lead, rather than a model in its own right. However, like the other models in this section, teacher leadership scholars refer to a common, yet independent set of understandings about how leadership functions in schools, and share a unique conception of how leadership should function. Placing this literature in dialogue with other literature on collective leadership, while recognizing teacher leadership's limitations, represents the diversity of perspectives currently at play in educational leadership scholarship.

Distributed Leadership

Under a fourth strand of leadership scholarship, distributed leadership models argue that leadership is a situational, rather than permanent, quality of individuals and situations. Copland (2003) tracks the development of distributed leadership from the first human relations perspectives of the 1970s, which pushed against an assumed distrust of employees, through the development of transformational leadership (which focuses on the empowerment of staff), into Elmore's (2000) work, which focuses on re-aligning the center of authority in schools toward whole staffs. While the term distributed leadership is used in varying contexts (and at times to refer to relatively routine practices of delegation) I here refer to models that argue many individuals within a school can serve as leaders or co-leaders during particular times or in areas in which they have expertise (Spillane, Halverson, & Diamond, 2004). These authors reject the dichotomies of leader–follower and leadership–followership they see in other theoretical frames (Gronn, 2002).

By proponents, distributed leadership is seen as a key response to leadership studies that have left unanswered questions about the impact of leadership on instructional improvement (Harris, 2004). Empirical studies in distributed

leadership look to "capture" leadership activities that other models might miss (Harris, 2004). In particular, certain authors within the distributed leader strand redirect focus from individual capacities toward the idea of a collective capacity for leadership, greater than the sum of its parts (Harris, 2004). This focus reflects an emerging consensus that distributed leadership is not merely the division of tasks among several persons but is a manifestation of the interactions that leaders and recipients have with each other (Timperley, 2005).

In distributed leadership theories, the situation is treated as the primary unit of analysis; distributed leadership attempts to understand how the cognition of actors is distributed by time, place, and socialization (Spillane et al., 2004). By focusing on interactions, "organizational routines and tools are a core defining element of practice" (Harris, 2008, p. 255). In this way, distributed leadership ties together knowledge, belief and action: "activity is a product of what the actor knows, believes, and does in and through particular social, cultural, and material contexts" (Spillane, et al., 2004).

Distributed leadership theories also highlight the importance of expertise, or the potential expertise of actors, in creating opportunities for leadership. In distributed leadership theory, expertise rather than hierarchy is a source of authority (Copland, 2003). Expertise is tied to a process of continual learning among teachers about curriculum and instruction (Harris, 2003). While this process can reinforce visions set by formal administrators, distributed leadership can also challenge authority in ways that make joint movement more difficult (Printy, 2007).

METHODOLOGY

This chapter seeks to identify and evaluate qualitative and quantitative studies that link collective leadership practices to student outcomes. In the context of collective leadership, I argue, it is possible to review works of literature across these multifaceted models of leadership by examining how researchers understand the relationship between leaders, leadership actions, and student outcomes.

Here, these understandings are termed "theories of action." A theory of action is a working hypothesis regarding how leadership practices and/or changes in instruction resulting from good leadership create observable improvements in student outcomes. I use the theories of action present in each study reviewed here as a means of understanding the way leadership functions in each instance (Hill & Celio, 1998), and to therefore find common features between studies with nominally different models of leadership. Theories of action, however, are not by themselves a replacement for leadership models or theories: Ultimately, they are primarily a tool for understanding studies together.

In constructing a basis for the review, I followed the eight criteria of successful systematic reviews of literature described by Hallinger (2003). Hallinger calls for reviews to have explicit goals (here, understanding the collectivity behind contemporary studies in educational leadership) and an explicit conceptual perspective (here, the idea of theories of action, which must be identified and explicated). These two orientations guided how studies in the review were sorted and what data was extracted from them (Hallinger, 2013). I conduced a "bounded search" (Hallinger, 2013) of literature, with an inclusive approach to sources of information, methods of leadership and conceptions of student outcomes, in studies from 2000 to the present. Beginning from the year 2000, this review seeks to pick up where Leithwood and Duke (1999) ostensibly left off. The period also encompasses major theoretical developments, including Gronn's (2002) early work on distributed leadership and the development of instructional leadership beyond the principalship.

Four separate strategies were used to gather studies:

1. The ERIC database was searched for abstracts containing at least one term for a leadership model that implied collective work ("distributed leadership," "teacher leadership," "instructional leadership," "leadership effects," "collaborative leadership," "shared leadership," or "collective leadership") and one term for student outcomes ("student achievement," "student learning," "student outcomes," "social outcomes," or "student performance").
2. All studies published from 2000 to the present included in Robinson, Lloyd and Rowe's 2008 meta-analysis were reviewed for inclusion.
3. Key theoretical literature on distributed leadership (Spillane, Halverson, & Diamond, 2004; Spillane, 2006; Mayrowetz, 2008; Gronn, 2002) was used as the basis for a Google Scholar reverse citation search to discover any empirical studies that utilized distributed leadership to describe leadership activities.
4. Key journals were identified and reviewed for any remaining relevant empirical studies. This search included the four key journals referenced in Leithwood and Duke's 1999 review of the history of leadership literature across the past century (*Education Administration Quarterly; Journal of School Leadership; Educational Management, Administration, & Leadership;* and *Journal of Educational Administration*) as well as two journals established after 1999 (*School Leadership & Management* and *Leadership & Policy in Education*). The previous three search strategies substantially incorporated work in other journals as well.

From this initial search strategy, 76 applicable studies were identified. These studies were placed in three groups, summarized in Table 2.1.

TABLE 2.1 Do Reviewed Studies (76) Conceptualize Leadership as Driven by Leadership Teams and Link Their Results to Student Outcomes?

Team of Leaders Without Link to Student Outcomes (29)	Team of Leaders With Link to Student Outcomes (26 in 29 Publications)	Focus on Teacher Perceptions of Principal Leadership (21)
• Beycioglu and Aslan 2010	• Abbott and McKnight 2010	• Alig-Mielcarek and Hoy 2005
• Curtis 2013	• Akopoff 2010	• Brown and Keeping 2005
• Dean 2005	• Alexander 2010	• Cerit 2009
• Edge and Mylopolous 2008	• Angelle 2010	• Christianson 2010
• Eyal et al. 2004	• Chang 2011	• Deike 2009
• Feeney 2009	• Chen 2007	• Donaldson et al. 2010
• Firestone and Cecilia Martinez 2007	• Copland 2003	• Goldring et al. 2009
• Gopalan 2004	• Davidson and Dell 2003	• Good 2008
• Hill 2009	• Droese 2010	• Griffith 2004
• Huffman and Hipp 2000	• Fancera and Bliss 2011	• Hulpia and Devos 2009
• Hur 2011	• Foster 2005	• Hulpia et al. 2011
• Ishimaru 2013	• Grunedahl 2010	• Jacobsen 2011
• Kelley 2011	• Hallinger and Heck series (Hallinger and Heck 2010a; Hallinger and Heck 2010b; Heck and Hallinger 2009; Heck and Hallinger 2010)	• Leithwood and Jantzi 2008
• Kennedy et al. 2009		• Loder and Spillane 2005
• Lambert 2006		• McDonald and Keedy 2002
• Lowett and Cameron 2011		• Murphy et al. 2009
• Margolin et al. 2000	• Harris 2002	• Shatzer 2009
• Margolis 2008	• Holland 2002	• Shatzer et al. 2013
• Park and Datnow 2009	• Kim 2010	• Wahlstrom and Louis 2008

(continued)

TABLE 2.1 Do Reviewed Studies (76) Conceptualize Leadership as Driven by Leadership Teams and Link Their Results to Student Outcomes? (continued)

Team of Leaders Without Link to Student Outcomes (29)	Team of Leaders With Link to Student Outcomes (26 in 29 Publications)	Focus on Teacher Perceptions of Principal Leadership (21)
• Penuel et al. 2010 • Pitts 2009 • Printy 2007 • Printy et al. 2009 • Rogers et al. 2006 • Senesac 2010 • Sheppard et al. 2010 • Somech 2010 • Spillane et al. 2009 • Watson 2005	• Leithwood and Jantzi 2000 • Leithwood and Jantzi 2006 • Leithwood and Mascall 2008 • Leithwood et al. 2010 • Marks and Printy 2003 • Rivers 2010 • Seashore Louis et al. 2010 • Silins and Mulford 2004 • Terrell 2010 • Timperley 2008[1]	• Wells et al. 2010 • Williams 2006

[1] Study was discovered as part of the author's review of conceptual literature and not as part of general review methodology.

Studies were screened for relevance to the study (Hallinger, 2013) using two key elements. First, reviewed studies had to include non-principal actors (chiefly, teachers) who are treated as leading school-level improvement in tandem with principals. Second, studies had to make connections, direct or indirect, to student achievement. Broad discretion was given to authors to define the achievement variable of interest. Twenty-six studies (over 29 publications: four publications by Hallinger and Heck discuss the same data set) included multiple leaders and a link to student achievement; these met the criteria for review. Twenty-nine of the studies in the review included multiple leaders without a corresponding link to student achievement. The final group contains 21 studies that do not contain multiple leaders: these studies use distributed leadership or similar frameworks to understand how teachers perceive leadership by their principals.

In accordance with Hallinger (2013), I followed a specific strategy in extracting and collecting information from the 26 studies of interest. The intent was not to create a meta-analysis, in which the effect sizes of each of the studies are quantified. Instead, I used "narrative text, idea units [and] descriptions of studies" (Hallinger, 2013, p. 135) to extract the particular units of study design identified by Spillane (2006): who the leaders in the study were, how leadership was understood conceptually, the specific leadership style(s) or structure(s) under study, the means by which student outcomes were assessed or analyzed, and the general finding of the study. These units are presented in Table 2.2, the primary tool of analysis. From this matrix display, I drew conclusions through analytic tools such as understanding relationships between design features in the study, visible across the rows of the matrix, and contrasting and comparing the texts against one another (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014), visible across the columns. From there, I was able to generate hypotheses about themes in the text and test those hypotheses by returning to the texts.

As a systematic review of literature, this chapter joins meta-analyses (Robinson, Hohepa, & Lloyd, 2009; Scheerens, 2012) that seek to understand the quantitative relationship between leadership and student outcomes. However, this chapter's purpose is to understand these relationships qualitatively, in order to clarify how leadership theory is applied, understood, and modified in each instance. Further while Scheerens' (2012) review focuses on measures of student outcomes and leadership variables, like this study, its focus on intermediate variables is primarily demographic, rather than seeking to understand the features of leadership examined in reviewed studies. This study therefore complements and extends this developing literature base.

TABLE 2.2 How Do Studies Including Both Teams of Leaders and a Connection to Student Outcomes (26 Studies Over 29 Publications) Understand Leadership?

Reference	Study Type	Leaders Under Study; Conception of Leadership	Changes in Leadership Structure or Style Examined	Variable(s) of Student Outcomes Examined	Finding
Abbott & McKnight 2010	Mixed methods longitudinal study, examining nine Title I schools over five years	Principals and teachers in secondary schools; Distributed leadership[2]	Multiple leadership meetings, including monthly instructional team meetings and biweekly teacher learning team meetings	Standardized test scores	Collaborative leadership schools showed stronger achievement than similar schools
Akopoff 2010	Qualitative multiple case study dissertation, examining three under-performing senior high schools	Principals, assistant principals & teachers; Distributed leadership	Professional learning communities, particularly group meetings	Program improvement status under NCLB and low California API score used as part of selection criteria	Inconsistent implementation negatively impacted program efficacy
Alexander 2010	Mixed methods dissertation, examining 109 multicultural teachers from two high schools in a southwestern state	Teachers with more than two years of experience; Transformative leadership (constructivist leadership)	Encouraged teacher creativity, shared decision making, and increased collaboration time	Teacher retention as strategy for student performance improvement	Constructivist leadership promotes teacher retention
Angelle 2010	Qualitative case study, examining one middle school selected by local flagship university	Principals, teachers and administrators; Distributed leadership	Teacher autonomy over decision making structures and planning time	Disciplinary data, value-added state test scores	Leadership practices support student achievement gains

(continued)

TABLE 2.2 How Do Studies Including Both Teams of Leaders and a Connection to Student Outcomes (26 Studies Over 29 Publications) Understand Leadership? (continued)

Reference	Study Type	Leaders Under Study; Conception of Leadership	Changes in Leadership Structure or Style Examined	Variable(s) of Student Outcomes Examined	Finding
Chang 2011	Quantitative correlational study, examining 1500 Taiwanese elementary school teachers	Teachers; distributed leadership	Teachers' perceptions of distributed leadership; academic optimism	Monthly student exams in four subjects	Distributed leadership has indirect positive relationship with student achievement via academic optimism
Chen 2007	Quantitative correlational dissertation, examining teachers and principals in schools in 57 districts over 15 Texas counties	Principals and teacher leaders; Distributed leadership	Principal leadership traits measured through teacher leader perceptions, including enabling the leadership of others	Texas statewide assessment data (AEIS)	Collaborative learning styles and enlistment of teacher leaders correlate with higher student achievement
Copland 2003	Mixed methods case study, examining 16 schools in Bay Area School Reform Collaborative	Principals and teachers; Distributed leadership	Teacher engagement in the analysis of student and school performance	Leadership capacity to advance continued school improvement	Inquiry-based approach aides staff in identifying key issues, sustaining reform over time
Davidson & Dell 2003	Mixed methods case study, examining three rural low income elementary schools	Principals and teachers; Teacher leadership (through Accelerated Schools Process)	Training in ASP values, inquiry process, coaching role, leadership cadres	Standardized test scores, student attendance rates, School Performance Score	ASP provides a process, leading to leadership action plans that improved test scores
Droese 2010	Qualitative case study, examining three schools	Teachers; Distributed leadership	Lesson Study model: Joint lesson planning and observation process	Pupils' academic self-concept, pupils' participation, student engagement	Lesson Study improves teacher-driven instructional improvement and student learning in mathematics

(continued)

TABLE 2.2 How Do Studies Including Both Teams of Leaders and a Connection to Student Outcomes (26 Studies Over 29 Publications) Understand Leadership? (continued)

Reference	Study Type	Leaders Under Study; Conception of Leadership	Changes in Leadership Structure or Style Examined	Variable(s) of Student Outcomes Examined	Finding
Fancera & Bliss 2011	Quantitative path analysis, examining 53 New Jersey high schools across state	Principals and teachers; Instructional leadership	Teacher perceptions of principal efficacy, including curriculum coordination and professional development	Collective teacher efficacy, school report cards	SES is a stronger predictor of achievement than instructional leadership or collective teacher efficacy
Foster 2005	Qualitative case study, examining two secondary schools involved in school improvement	Principals and teachers; Collective leadership	New outcomes-based curriculum, student advocacy program, cross-department cohort groups, etc.	Hopkins: focus on teaching-learning process	Leadership intervention leads participating teachers and principals to feel joint responsibility for student outcomes
Grumdahl 2010	Mixed methods, examining three elementary schools in one suburban district	Principals and teachers; Distributed leadership	Teacher participation in organizational change, use of data and professional development, via survey instrument and interviews	Superintendent perceptions of schools' academic improvement	TQM principles, strategic planning and supportive culture positively impacted the achievement gap
Hallinger & Heck 2010a, 2010b; Heck & Hallinger 2009, 2010	Quantitative longitudinal study, examining 192-198 elementary schools over a four-year period	Teachers; Collaborative leadership	Organizational structures and processes that support broad participation in decision making, via survey	Standardized test scores in reading and math	Data supports mediated and reciprocal effects models, where leadership drives change in school improvement capacity

(continued)

TABLE 2.2 How Do Studies Including Both Teams of Leaders and a Connection to Student Outcomes (26 Studies Over 29 Publications) Understand Leadership? (continued)

Reference	Study Type	Leaders Under Study; Conception of Leadership	Changes in Leadership Structure or Style Examined	Variable(s) of Student Outcomes Examined	Finding
Harris 2002	Qualitative multiple case study, examining 10 high-poverty improving secondary schools	Headteachers; transformational leadership	Headteacher leadership as mechanism for cultivating shared vision and values, professional autonomy	Empowering teachers leads to improved outcomes (via Silins and Mulford 2002)	Teacher leadership influenced collective problem solving
Holland 2002	Mixed methods case study, examining eight intentionally small schools in Chicago	Teachers; Distributed leadership (via PLCs)	Collective responsibility, shared leadership, focus on student care, professional community	Attendance rate, development of institutional ethos; school safety	Small high schools using leadership model had better attendance, stronger ethos of responsibility than other students
Kim 2010	Qualitative case study, examining two California charter schools identified for positive leadership practices	Principals and lead teachers; Distributed leadership	Teacher mentoring program, shared decision making, graduate leadership coursework for teachers	California API scores; teacher perceptions of student maturity, positive attitude toward learning and student collaboration	A positive correlation between leadership intervention and increase in standardized test scores
Leithwood & Jantzi 2000	Quantitative survey, examining 1818 teachers and 6490 students	Principles and teachers; Teacher leadership	Perception of teacher and principal influence on school culture	Student engagement via Student Engagement and Family Culture Survey	Principal leadership produces greater effects on student engagement, compared with teacher leadership

(continued)

TABLE 2.2 How Do Studies Including Both Teams of Leaders and a Connection to Student Outcomes (26 Studies Over 29 Publications) Understand Leadership? (continued)

Reference	Study Type	Leaders Under Study; Conception of Leadership	Changes in Leadership Structure or Style Examined	Variable(s) of Student Outcomes Examined	Finding
Leithwood & Jantzi 2006	Quantitative path analysis, examining 2290 teachers from 655 elementary schools	Principals and teachers; transformational leadership	Leadership styles that promote collaborative school culture, community relationships, via survey of teachers	British Key Stage 2 tests in numeracy and literacy	Leadership affected classroom practices but not achievement
Leithwood & Mascall 2008	Quantitative correlational study, examining 2570 teachers in 90 elementary and secondary schools	Principals and teachers; Collective leadership	Teacher work settings & conditions, as they influence teacher motivation	Student achievement data in language and math, averaged over three years	Collective leadership explains significant portion of variation in achievement
Leithwood et al. 2010	Quantitative correlational study, examining 199 schools through 1445 teachers	Teachers; Distributed leadership	Management of an instructional program	Grade 3 and 6 math and literacy province-wide testing	Four Paths model explains 43% of variation in student achievement
Louis et al. 2010	Mixed methods study, with data collected over six years from a survey 8,391 teachers and 471 school administrators and interview and observational data from a subset	District-level staff, administrators, principals and teachers; Multiple shared leadership perspectives	Leadership behaviors that direct organizational improvement, influence goal-setting and set the direction of staff	Student achievement data on state tests in literacy and mathematics, Adequate Yearly Progress Status	Broadly, collective leadership has a stronger influence on student achievement than individual leadership; school leaders influence achievement primarily through influence on teachers' motivation and working conditions

(continued)

TABLE 2.2 How Do Studies Including Both Teams of Leaders and a Connection to Student Outcomes (26 Studies Over 29 Publications) Understand Leadership? (continued)

Reference	Study Type	Leaders Under Study; Conception of Leadership	Changes in Leadership Structure or Style Examined	Variable(s) of Student Outcomes Examined	Finding
Marks & Printy 2003	Quantitative hierarchical linear modeling, examining 24 restructured schools across grade levels	Principals and teachers; Transformational and instructional leadership	Level of active leadership, as measured in teacher / principal collaboration on instructional planning and assessment	Student achievement in mathematics and social studies, as well as pedagogical quality as an indirect influence on achievement	Effect of transformational and shared instructional leadership correlates with significantly higher achievement and pedagogical quality
Rivers 2010	Quantitative correlational study, examining four South Carolina elementary schools	Principals, assistant principals and teachers; Distributed leadership	Leadership activities that create shared culture, responsibilities and practices, via Distributed Leadership Readiness Scale	Palmetto Academic Challenge Test data for 289 students in reading and math	Distributed leadership correlates with growth in reading and math
Silins and Mulford 2004	Quantitative path model, examining 96 schools in a collaborative research project	Principals and teachers; Transformational leadership	Leadership activities that support changes in school structure, intellectual stimulation for staff, individual support, and the expectation of high performance	Attendance, students' self-concept, participation in school	Teacher leadership is exercised in both formal and informal ways, and is predictive of organizational learning

(continued)

TABLE 2.2 How Do Studies Including Both Teams of Leaders and a Connection to Student Outcomes (26 Studies Over 29 Publications) Understand Leadership? (continued)

Reference	Study Type	Leaders Under Study; Conception of Leadership	Changes in Leadership Structure or Style Examined	Variable(s) of Student Outcomes Examined	Finding
Terrell 2004	Quantitative correlation, examining elementary schools in two urban school districts	Principals and teachers; Distributed leadership	Leadership activities that support the development of shared culture, mission, responsibility and leadership practices, via Distributed Leadership Readiness Scale	Reading and math pass rates on statewide assessments	No significant relationship between distributed leadership and student achievement
Timperley 2008	Mixed methods study, examining seven elementary schools involved in a school improvement initiative	Principals, literacy leaders and teachers; Distributed leadership	Opportunities for group interpretation of data and critique of teaching methodologies	Literacy scores upon school entry and one year after matriculation	The quality of distributed leadership depends heavily on which artifacts and routines of leadership are used

[2] Studies which focused on professional learning communities were classified as using a distributed leadership model. Professional learning communities (PLCs) are conceived in recent literature as a mechanism by which leadership is distributed (e.g., Hudson et al., 2013; Harris et al., 2007, 341).

FINDINGS

This review synthesizes and interprets contemporary research on collective leadership in K–12 schools. By specifically identifying the leadership practices at work in the included studies, this review differs significantly from previous work. By identifying together leadership models, leadership routines, and measures of student outcomes, this review depicts the theories of action under use in each study. This chapter also demonstrates that, outside individual models of leadership in each study, a general conception of collective leadership can serve as a bridge between mediated models of leadership and effects on student outcomes.

To answer its research questions, this review seeks common elements from the examined studies in order to understand how studies generally understand the relationship between leaders, leadership behaviors or actions, and changes in student outcomes. This section details similarities between reviewed studies in two respects: common theories of action, and common features of leadership activity. Each of these is described in detail below, along with representative examples drawn from the studied literature. This section concludes with a discussion of the limitations of this approach, and of attempts to reconcile diverse theories of action in leadership studies.

In concurrence with Harris (2004), I find relatively few studies measure the impact of leadership, either directly or indirectly, on student outcomes. In general, however, models that could explain a significant portion of the variation in student achievement, both qualitative and quantitative, hypothesized a clear theory of action connecting leadership activities with changes in classroom practice that impacted how students learn. In this case, the investigative power of studies was greatly enhanced by approaches that clearly understood leadership routines, and had methodological tools capable of investigating them. The remainder of this section parallels that emphasis, highlighting studies where the relationship between these three core elements was articulated in a clear but nuanced fashion.

The findings of this chapter are limited by the natural complexities involved in considering qualitative and quantitative work together across multiple contexts. This review produces no precise account of "what works"—or what does not—in the leadership of schools. Its methods cannot necessarily assess the quality of the studies it examines. What it endeavors to do instead is to understand the direction of the field as it is currently aligned: major trends in literature can both highlight areas of emerging effectiveness and shed light on corners of leadership work as yet unexplored.

THREE THEORIES OF ACTION CONNECTING LEADERSHIP AND STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Studies that demonstrate notable effects of leadership in this review show one or more of three types of theories of action at work: whole school change through the enhancement of "school improvement capacity," the cultivation of a culture of shared purpose, and/or the redesign of teachers' work. While each study maintains its own unique theory of action, often blending these types in different ways, a handful of the studies in the sample reflect trends and commonalities that appear across the literature sample. These commonalities in how leaders in studies, through behaviors, influence student outcomes, suggest a common structure between studies that, further, suggests ways in which leadership models are reconcilable with one another. Additionally, these theories are similar in scope and application to the factors identified in Scheerens' (2012) meta-analysis of similar work.

Targeting School Improvement Capacity

First, many studies utilize a theory of action in which leadership practices reciprocally influence "school improvement capacity," in turn improving learning (Hallinger & Heck, 2010; Heck & Hallinger, 2009; Heck & Hallinger, 2010). School improvement capacity refers to a school's ability to increase teacher learning and respond to learning problems (Hallinger & Heck, 2010a). The authors use nine factors of collaboration as their measure of leadership, including empowering staff, shared accountability and collaborative decision making focused on educational improvement (Hallinger & Heck, 2010a). Leadership is, under their conception, responsible for how an organization and its members deliberately change their practices to enact school improvement (Hallinger & Heck 2010b). In this way, the growth of school improvement capacity not only helps schools do something different, but something more.

One example of an approach using a theory of action with a focus on school improvement capacity is Copland's (2003) study of the Bay Area School Reform Cooperative. Copland uses a mixed methods case study that explores how 16 member schools, using distributed leadership, use data to improve instruction. The study outlines a clear theory of action: as teachers engage data, they increase their own and the school's overall leadership capacity to advance continued school improvement. Principals, in turn, shift their understanding of leadership to one "aptly reframed as leadership of inquiry" (Copland, 2003, p. 391). Key to Copland's conception of distributed leadership is practice that rests on expert, not hierarchical authority (Copland, 2003). Expert authority in part enables practices that are

less likely to break down at the point of implementation (Copland, 2003). Additionally, it suggests a leadership team operates with more knowledge and capacity then any individual, reconciling the desire of policymakers for educational improvement via leadership with the inability of individuals to consistently act with extraordinary or heroic ability (Copland, 2003).

The large-scale longitudinal study conducted by Louis and colleagues (2010), which utilizes models that exemplify both distributed and instructional leadership, also relies on a theory of reciprocal growth in leadership like that in Copland. The authors collected over six years of data from a survey of 8,391 teachers and 471 school administrators, included interview and observation data from a subset, and correlated that data with state test results using a mixed methods methodology. Broadly, they find modes of collective leadership have a stronger influence on student outcomes than individual leadership. While they do not identify a single way to distribute leadership that is most effective, they find that "the more encompassing the goal, the greater the likelihood that multiple sources of leadership will be appropriate" (Louis et al., 2010, p. 282). Leveraging the capacity of expert leadership, Louis and colleagues demonstrate how leadership teams are able to undertake new responsibilities that lead to an increased focus on the goals and expectations of student achievement.

Other studies that exemplify targeting school improvement capacity include studies by Chen (2007), Grundahl (2010), Leithwood et al. (2010), Marks and Printy (2003), and Silins & Mulford (2004). Throughout the literature, a focus on a "systems approach" (Grundahl, 2010) to improvement, or efforts to better identify routes through which schools enhance the skills of their members, such as Leithwood and co-authors' "Four Paths" model, or the discussion of leadership styles in Marks and Printy (2003), all speak of school improvement capacity's general proposition that the ability of collectives in schools to lead increases as leadership practices are enacted.

Cultivating Culture of Shared Purpose

A second set of theories of action considers the role of leadership in creating school cultures that unite staff around common goals. Culture is one of many active metaphors used to understand what an organization is and does (Smircich, 1983) and is particularly applicable to school leadership, where leaders are at least in part attempting to shift the focus of an organization's members toward a total emphasis on teaching and learning (Hallinger, 2003; Marks & Printy, 2002; Mayrowetz et al., 2007). In contrast with models that involve school improvement capacity, which refers to leadership changing what a school's members can do, cultural leadership involves changing what a school's members think about teaching and

learning. Studies that utilize these models consider division among teachers on how best to improve student outcomes a major barrier to improving those outcomes.

Other research also highlights the central role that school culture may play in improving student achievement, and the role that leaders may play in building that culture. Kim's (2010) qualitative case study examined two California charter schools noted for their positive leadership practices. Kim finds a relationship between leadership interventions and improvement on standardized tests, but also gathers and analyzes data on student behavior.

Kim focused on the relationship between principal and teacher; specifically, how changes in that relationship change institutional structures and cultures (Kim, 2010). In particular, the author explored how institutionalized practices like mentoring programs, leadership team meetings, and other development programs supported an overarching mandate from the principal to shift school culture towards collaboration for learning improvement (Kim, 2010). Because teachers at one school studied were highly committed to this culture, teacher leaders made professional development a priority schoolwide and made continuous learning about instructional improvement an expectation (Kim, 2010). This commitment in turn produced other changes in institutional practice, including participation in action research, more frequent collaboration among teachers, and greater teacher participation in hiring. By exploring student behavior factors in addition to test scores, Kim demonstrates how a culture of shared purpose impacts all members of the school community, providing an opportunity for teachers to exercise schoolwide leadership towards a common culture of achievement impacted student maturity, collaboration and attitude (Kim, 2010).

Culture is discussed, to varying level of details, in several of the studies included in the review, including studies by Akopoff (2010), Alexander (2010), Angelle (2010), Droese (2010), Foster (2005), Harris (2002), Holland (2002), Rivers (2010), and Terrell (2010). Definitions of what constitutes a culture abound in the literature. In general, these definitions seek to differentiate and consider separately the thought of an organization (and that of its members) from its behaviors.

Redesigning Teachers' Work

A third theory of action regards the re-conception of teachers' work as a key mediating element between collective leadership and student achievement. Using theories of work design, Mayrowetz and co-authors (2008) conceptualize distributed leadership as a process that begins when teachers assume new responsibilities beyond their classroom, and administrators are forced to re-conceive their own job roles as a result (p. 70). Collective

leadership entails by necessity changing the core tasks performed by teachers as part of their work. Whether a new distributed leadership model succeeds or fails, they argue, is largely dependent upon whether those teachers can make sense of their new work in their current context (sensemaking), whether the changes make teachers more excited about their work (identity) and whether the changes allow them to do their re-designed job better (learning) (Mayrowetz et al., 2008). Tasks that give teachers a strong sense of significance, identity, and autonomy best create fulfilling work, which leads to leadership.

Task identity (Mayrowetz et al., 2008), a key component of work redesign in schools, speaks to the additive function of collective leadership to school practices. Traditionally, teachers experience relatively little connection to the progress and outcomes of their students after the end of a school year. Under collective leadership models, teachers participate in the construction of a model for a school's success and supervise that model over time, in no small part by monitoring students as they progress through the school's grade levels. This process, of "crafting coherence" (Mayrowetz et al., 2008, p. 81) or translating the work of school improvement into workable changes in classroom activity (Harris, 2003) is a critical element of schools asserting more agency over the outcomes of their students.

A work design theory of action is articulated in Chang's (2011) quantitative correlational study, which explores the impact of distributed leadership among 1,500 Taiwanese elementary school teachers on student outcomes. Chang posits that teachers' academic optimism (in short, the belief held by teachers that their techniques are effective and that all students can learn) facilitates the establishment of effective learning environments. With these variables identified, Chang constructs a structural equation model connecting teacher perceptions of distributed leadership practice, academic optimism and student outcomes on monthly subject examinations, using established survey instruments with a strong basis in conceptual literatures. Chang describes these leadership schemes as planned: "decentralized" leadership "disperses leadership tasks through a systematic and planned scheme to the membership, makes more individuals follow the educational objectives, and provides opportunities for participating in the operation of the school" (Chang, 2011, p. 509).

Studies that explore the composition of teachers' work include studies by Abbott and McKnight (2010), Davidson and Dell (2013), Leithwood and Jantzi (2006), and Timperley (2008). These studies may discuss creating different job roles for teachers, or simply discuss incorporating new responsibilities or opportunities into teachers' work. Studies that address teachers' work, however, address a unique set of problems that are essential considerations for the field, including the challenges teachers encounter when they attempt to span organizational boundaries (Timperley, 2008), shifts in

power that occur when teachers take on explicit leadership roles (Timperley, 2008), the need for strong district support for new teachers (Davidson & Dell, 2003), and other considerations that put the individual practice of leadership into a systemic perspective.

FEATURES OF LEADERSHIP THEORIES OF ACTION

In addition to similar theories of action, the reviewed studies also share some common features of effective leadership that cross between these boundaries. Irrespective of who leads, how they lead, and for what they lead, these features suggest what effective leaders focus on, think about, and prioritize. While leaders may have a variety of priorities, these three features are routinely highlighted in both quantitative and qualitative work reviewed here as critical components of a leaders' effectiveness and continual development. Common features include: the development of a common language among school staff, working on multiple levels of change simultaneously, and orienting the school organization's focus towards instruction.

Developing a Common Language

First, leadership theories of action often focus on how leadership practices create a common language to describe instructional practice. Instructional leaders are ultimately responsible for building culture (Hallinger, 2003). Key to the creation of a common culture is the use of a common language to describe practices: "language is culture, and vice versa" (City, Elmore, Fiarman, & Tietel, 2009, p. 34). Creating a joint understanding of how instruction works and how it needs to improve is a key prerequisite to mentoring, school-wide consideration of learning practices, or any other activity that seeks to make instructional activities a leadership issue. Through evaluation and mentoring, school leaders work together to create "sensemaking" (Louis, Mayrowetz, Smiley, & Murray 2009): An atmosphere in which teachers can describe their own and others' instructional strengths and weaknesses. A common vocabulary is required for such a discussion.

Research analyzed here suggests common language must become directly embedded in practice. Timperley (2008) undertook a mixed methods study of seven New Zealand schools involved in a school improvement initiative, using group instructional technique to improve student outcomes. Timperley showed quantitatively that literacy scores between schools were substantially different, then used an interview methodology to interpret the results of group meetings she observed. New vision statements are not in themselves sufficient to affect instructional improvement, Timperley finds;

instead, vision must be enacted through new practices. Those practices must be backed up, in turn, by ensuring the messages sent by leaders are consistent internally, with followers and with the content of artifacts such as how student achievement data is recorded and presented. Effectiveness was amplified in environments where consistency is emphasized and embedded in the analysis teachers undertake of their own and each others' practice. Leaders, then, are responsible for far more than setting an agenda: they are also responsible for recruiting and retaining the participation of other key school figures in the analysis of data and the development of responses to those findings.

For Timperley's schools, a common language serves as the building blocks that allow a diverse group of leaders to act on multiple issues at the same time without losing internal coherency. Common language also assists in resolving a tension in distributed leadership between taking advantage of a diverse set of skills on the one hand and creating a "greater distribution of incompetence" (Timperley, 2008, p. 220) on the other. A focus on boundary spanning and the activity of developing an organization-wide concept of instructional improvement helps multiple leaders focus on instruction specifically and close pre-existing gaps in teachers' "visions for and expectations of student achievement" (p. 220).

Studies that explicitly examined the development of common language included those by Chang (2011) and Droese (2011). However, developing common understandings undergirded by common language plays an implicit role in any number of studies in the review, particularly those that seek to change school cultures by targeting schools with heterogeneous views on student capabilities, or in any school where group analysis of learning problems is routine practice. These relatively few studies underline the importance of developing a common understanding of the problems of schools as prerequisites to more complete notions of collective leadership.

Multiple Levers of Change

Second, leadership theories of action often consider how leaders undertake multiple levers of change simultaneously. One of the key differences between instructional and transformational leadership as they are traditionally understood is their mechanism of change: Instructional leadership targets "first-order" variables that directly impact instruction, while transformational leadership influences "second-order" variables that regulate the capacity of others to make change (Halliuger, 2003). Authors featured in this review are, largely, interested in reconciling these two approaches: they seek to understand how these two variables work simultaneously.

Marks and Printy (2003) explore multiple levers of change, using a diverse data set—the School Restructuring Survey—to test their hypothesis that second-order changes are necessary but insufficient conditions for school improvement. Using a hierarchical linear model, the authors sort questions on the survey into those representing transformational leadership and those representing shared instructional leadership; the latter, they argue, emphasizes the practical need for principals to engage teachers when crafting instructional change. While the study's schools have widely variant scores on both leadership measures, Marks and Printy find no schools with high shared instructional leadership and low transformational leadership, implying the latter is a prerequisite to the former. High scores on both measures, however, explain 26% of the differences in pedagogical quality and 57% of the difference in student achievement between subject schools.

Other studies that describe first- and second-order leadership effects include those by Angelle (2010), Chen (2007), Copland (2003), Grundahl (2010), Harris (2002), Holland (2002), Leithwood and Mascall (2008), and Louis et al. (2010). In many of these cases, authors attempt to characterize the effects leaders have on schools in general and study the relationship between these effects and student learning. Quantitative methods can provide valuable tools for understanding where leaders ought to, therefore, place the emphasis of their work. Cases, however, are equally informative, particularly inasmuch as they describe how the various roles of leaders interact with—and at times contradict—one another in the pursuit of school improvement.

A Collective Focus on Instruction

Finally, leadership theories of action often ensure that leadership practices are focused on instruction and improving student outcomes.

Through both an interpretation of the teacher leadership literature, and their own findings, Silins and Mulford argue teachers generally have little interest in leadership opportunities that do not include influence over curriculum and instruction (Silins & Mulford, 2002). The perceived benefits of transformational leadership—primarily, the organizational legitimacy that comes from the active involvement of teachers in decision-making—carries with it the implicit assumption that schools operate as learning organizations (Silins & Mulford, 2002). Even in high schools, where content knowledge is fairly diverse, Silins and Mulford find the strongest correlation between student achievement and group learning processes around instruction (Silins & Mulford, 2002).

Other studies that emphasize the importance of a collective focus on instruction include those by Abbott and McKnight (2010), Akopoff (2010), Davidson and Dell (2003), Foster (2005), and the work of Hallinger and Heck (2009a, 2009b, 2010a, 2010b). As instructional leadership scholars have long understood, curriculum and instruction is the common ground on which teachers and principals come together to think and act on school improvement. A focus on instruction undergirds several group leadership practices common in education, such as inquiry teams, professional learning communities, and peer evaluation (Abbott & McKnight, 2010). Additionally, the prioritization of instruction by a principal or other non-instructional leader provides the space through which instructors can do the same (Abbott & McKnight, 2010). That focus on teaching and learning—what Marks and Printy (2003) call the "core technology" of schools (p. 377)—differentiates educational leadership from other forms of leadership and makes necessary places at the leadership table for career educators.

LIMITATIONS

Several elements of the approach to this review may limit its utility. First, the review's broad approach to understanding student outcomes may include several studies where the relationship between leadership and student outcomes is more opaque. While appropriate, therefore, for discussing how scholars apply leadership frameworks, this review may not be appropriate for determining which leadership style or approach is the best for students. Similarly, requiring that studies require clear conceptions of leaders, leadership behaviors, and student outcomes inherently excluded studies which meet part or none of the conditions of a "theory of action" as this study understands it. Finally, because this study allows theories of action and features of leadership to emerge from the literature, these ideas are naturally enlarged or constrained as this specific literature applies. These constructs may, therefore, not apply to other types of leadership studies, or be less effective in describing many of the studies excluded from the second stage of analysis.

Further, this chapter does not argue that collective leadership is the only or the best method of leading schools. That task is instead best left to large scale quantitative and mixed methods evaluations, some of which (Hallinger & Heck, 2010; Louis et al., 2009) are reviewed here. Much of leadership scholarship focused on collectivity, however, has sought to demonstrate not that collectivity ought to exist, but that it does. To the extent that diffuse sources of expertise and influence will inevitably exist in complex organizations like schools, understanding how those diverse sources can best work toward common ends is an essential and continuing task for leadership research in the years ahead.

CONCLUSIONS

This chapter explores the convergence of recent literature on educational leadership around collectivity: The notion that multiple individuals, across time and contexts, lead together to influence student achievement. Examining literature across models identified as instructional leadership, transformational leadership, teacher leadership, and distributed leadership, it identifies three key "theories of action," or ways of understanding the relationship between leadership and outcomes: targeting school improvement capacity, cultivating a culture of shared purpose, and redesigning teachers' work. This review also identifies three common features of these theories of action: developing a common language, exploiting multiple levers of change, and creating a collective focus on instruction. While relatively little research on collective leadership ties to student outcomes, studies that do form a set of common and coherent arguments regarding how leadership functions in schools that can be understood outside of individual models of leadership.

In keeping with a growing body of work over the last several years, this review finds that relatively few studies in the field connect leadership activities with student outcomes and, of those that do, wide variation exists in leadership's effects, in part based on how researchers understand leadership activities. Further clarifying how leadership functions, in theory and practice, can lay the groundwork for studies with more relevance to policymakers and practitioners. These should include both qualitative and quantitative studies that seek to get "inside" collective leadership practice, understanding how leaders do what they do in schools, and how those actions work together to form cohesive visions for and foci on instruction and school improvement. The theories of action and features of theories of action outlined here can provide a guide for researchers considering how to initially approach collective leadership environments to maximize the instances of leadership upon which they can collect data.

This review also suggests the need for work that more thoroughly explores how models of educational leadership work can be understood together. This work has already begun among some theoretical scholarship: integrated models such as "distributed images of instructional leadership" (Portin & Knapp, 2014), or "shared instructional leadership" (Printy & Marks, 2006), should become more common components of empirical work. However, the long term goal of theoretical work should be the integration, rather than the multiplication, of models for understanding school leadership. More than a decade later, a "bewildering array of definitions" (Harris, 2003, p. 318) still mark this field, complicating conversation between scholars and practitioners. Particularly as educational leadership scholars look to amplify the voice of practitioners, through methodological tools such as action research and increased participation for teachers and administrators in journals and professional conferences, overly subtle distinctions between models of leadership create a barrier to the democratization of this field of study.

For educational leaders, this chapter reiterates the need for strong and clearly articulated theories of action. In exemplary studies in this review, effective leadership programs clearly defined what constitutes a leader, what practices are employed by leaders, and how those practices are expected to improve instruction. A common focus on instruction and instructional improvement echoes throughout the studies examined here, and should continue to serve as a strong focus for educational leader preparation and for leaders themselves. These studies also suggest that this focus comes hand-in-hand with collective leadership, ensuring more of the adults in a school building have a voice in the organization's vision and operations. For leaders as well as scholars, collective leadership as an idea mediates what leadership models call for and changes in student outcomes.

Famously, leadership is said to change little about outcomes for students, outweighed by the effects of teaching and parenting. However, as demands both for school accountability and the further individualization of instruction increase, it is clear that future school leaders will be expected to do more with less, to steer school improvement even as they control relatively few of its products. The introduction of multiple leaders working together can decrease the burden of these demands, as well as potentially blur the line between leadership and instruction. This ambiguity can, and should, be embraced: As studies examined here demonstrate, good leading travels together with good teaching.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was completed while the author was conducting graduate work sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences (#R305B090012). The author is, however, solely responsible for the paper's content.

REFERENCES

Brower, R., & Balch, B. V. (2005). *Transformational leadership & decision making in schools.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

City, E. A., Elmore, R. F., Fiarman, S. E., & Teitel, L. (2009). *Instructional rounds in education: A network approach to improving teaching and learning.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Copland, M. A. (2003). Leadership of inquiry: Building and sustaining capacity for school improvement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 25*(4), 375–395. doi:10.3102/01623737025004375

Davidson, B. M., & Dell, G. L. (2003). A school restructuring model: A tool kit for building teacher leadership. *American Educational Research Association* annual conference.

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

Firestone, W. A., & Cecilia Martinez, M. (2007). Districts, teacher leaders, and distributed leadership: changing instructional practice. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 6*(1), 3-35. doi:10.1080/15700760601091234

Gronn, P. (2002). Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly, 13*(4), 423–451. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(02)00120-0

Grumdahl, C. R. (2010). *How schools can effectively plan to meet the goal of improving student learning.* University of Minnesota.

Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 33*(3), 329–352. doi:10.1080/0305764032000122005

Hallinger, P. (2005). Instructional leadership and the school principal: A passing fancy that refuses to fade away. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 4*(3), 221–239. doi:10.1080/15700760500244793

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (2011). Conceptual and methodological issues in studying school leadership effects as a reciprocal process. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 22*(2), 149–173.

Hallinger, P. (2013). A conceptual framework for systematic reviews of research in educational leadership and management. *Journal of Educational Administration, 51*(2), 126–149. doi:10.1108/09578231311304670

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1987). Assessing and developing principal instructional leadership. *Educational Leadership, 45*, 54–61.

Harris, A. (2003). Teacher leadership as distributed leadership: Heresy, fantasy or possibility? *School Leadership & Management, 23*(3), 313–324. doi:10.1080/1363243032000112801

Harris, A. (2004). Distributed leadership and school improvement: Leading or misleading? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 32*(1), 11–24. doi:10.1177/1741143204039297

Harris, A. (2008). Distributed leadership and knowledge creation. In K. A. Leithwood, B. Mascall, & T. Strauss (Eds.), *Distributed leadership according to the evidence* (pp. 253–266). New York, NY: Routledge.

Hill, P. T., & Celio, M. B. (1998). *Fixing urban schools.* Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

Hudson, P., Hudson, S., Gray, B., & Bloxham, R. (2013). Learning about being effective mentors: Professional learning communities and mentoring. *Social and Behavioral Sciences, 93*(21), 1291–1300.

Knapp, M. S. (2014). Introduction: The evolution of learning-focused leadership in scholarship and practice. In *Learning-focused leadership in action: Improving instruction in schools and districts* (pp. 1–20). New York, NY: Routledge.

Leithwood, K. A., & Duke, D. L. (1999). A century's quest to understand school leadership. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of research on education administration: A project of the American educational research association.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Leithwood, K. A., & Jantzi, D. (1999). The relative effects of principal and teacher sources of leadership on student engagement with school. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 35*(5), 679–706. doi:10.1177/0013161X99355002

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2005). A review of transformational school leadership research 1996–2005. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 4*(3), 177–199. doi:10.1080/15700760500244769

Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Steinbach, R. (2009). *Changing leadership for changing times.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Lord, B., & Miller, B. (2000). *Teacher leadership: An appealing and inescapable force in school reform?* Newton, MA: Commission on Mathematics and Science Teaching for the 21st Century..

Louis, K. S., Mayrowetz, D., Smiley, M., & Murphy, J. (2009). The role of sensemaking and trust in developing distributed leadership. In A. Harris (Ed.), *Distributed leadership: Different perspectives* (pp. 157–179). New York, NY: Springer Science.

Mangin, M. M., & Stoelinga, S. R. (2008). Teacher leadership: What it is and why it matters. In M. M. Mangin & S. R. Stoelinga (Eds.), *Effective teacher leadership: Using research to inform and reform* (pp. 1–9). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

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. doi:10.1177/0013161X03253412

Mayrowetz, D. (2008). Making sense of distributed leadership: Exploring the multiple usages of the concept in the field. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44*(3), 424–435. doi:10.1177/0013161X07309480

Mayrowetz, D., Murphy, J., Louis, K. S., & Smylie, M. A. (2007). Distributed leadership as work redesign: Retrofitting the job characteristics model. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 6*(1), 69–101. doi:10.1080/15700760601091275

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications.

Murphy, J., Elliott, S. N., Goldring, E., & Porter, A. C. (2007). Leadership for learning: A research-based model and taxonomy of behaviors. *School Leadership & Management, 27*(2), 179–201. doi:10.1080/13632430701237420

Neumerski, C. M. (2013). Rethinking instructional leadership, a review: What do we know about principal, teacher, and coach instructional leadership, and where should we go from here? *Educational Administration Quarterly, 49*(2), 310–347. doi:10.1177/0013161X12456700

Northouse, P. G. (2007). *Leadership: Theory and practice.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Portin, B. S., & Knapp, M. S. (2014). Team-based leadership of instructional improvement in demanding school contexts. In *Learning-focused leadership in action: Improving instruction in schools and districts* (pp. 23–51). New York, NY: Routledge.

Printy, S. M. (2007). Leadership for teacher learning: A community of practice perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44*(2), 187–226. doi:10.1177/0013161X07312958

Printy, S. M., Marks, H. M., & Bowers, A. J. (2009, September). Integrated leadership: How principals and teachers share transformational and instructional influence. *Journal of School Leadership, 19*.

Robinson, V., Hohepa, M., & Lloyd, C. (2009). *School leadership and student outcomes: Identifying what works and why.* Wellington: New Zealand Ministry of Education.

Robinson, V. M. J., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44*(5), 635–674. doi:10.1177/0013161X08321509

Scheerens, J. (2012). *School leadership effects revisited: Review and meta-analysis of empirical studies.* (J. Scheerens, Ed.). London, England: Springer.

Sheppard, B. (1996). Exploring the transformational nature of instructional leadership. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 42*(4), 325–344.

Silins, H., & Mulford, B. (2002). Schools as learning organizations: The case for system, teacher and student learning. *The Journal of Educational Administration, 40*(5), 425–446.

Smircich, L. (1983). Concepts of culture and organizational analysis. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 28*(3), 339–358.

Spillane, J. P. (2006). *Distributed leadership.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Spillane, J. P., Camburn, E. M., & Pareja, A. S. (2008). School principals at work: A distributed perspective. In K. A. Leithwood, B. Mascall, & T. Strauss (Eds.), *Distributed leadership according to the evidence* (pp. 87–110). New York, NY: Routledge.

Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. B. (2004). Towards a theory of leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 36*(1), 3–34. doi:10.1080/0022027032000106726

Timperley, H. S. (2005). Distributed leadership: Developing theory from practice. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 37*(4), 395–420. doi:10.1080/0022027050003854 5

Urick, A., & Bowers, A. J. (2014). What are the different types of principals across the United States? A latent class analysis of principal perception of leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 50*(1), 96–134. doi:10.1177/0013161X13489019

York-Barr, J., & Duke, K. (2004). What do we know about teacher leadership? Findings from two decades of scholarship. *Educational Research, 74*(3), 255–316.

Yukl, G. (1994). *Leadership in organizations.* Englewood, NJ: Prentice Hall.

REVIEWED STUDIES

Abbott, C. J., & McKnight, K. (2010). Developing instructional leadership through collaborative learning. *Journal of Scholarship and Practice, 7*(2), 20–27.

Akopoff, T. (2010). *A case study examination of best practices of professional learning communities.* Walden University.

Alexander, J. (2010). *An examination of teachers' perceptions regarding constructivist leadership and teacher retention.* Walden University.

Alig-Mielcarek, J. M., & Hoy, W. K. (2005). Instructional leadership: Its nature, meaning and influence. In *Educational Leadership and Reform* (pp. 29–51). Greenwich, CT: IAP.

Angelle, P. S. (2010). An organizational perspective of distributed leadership: A portrait of a middle school. *Research in Middle Level Education, 33*(5).

Beycioglu, K., & Aslan, B. (2010). Teacher leadership scale: A validity and reliability study. *Elementary Education Online, 9*(2), 764–775.

Brown, D. J., & Keeping, L. M. (2005). Elaborating the construct of transformational leadership: The role of affect. *The Leadership Quarterly, 16*(2), 245–272. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.01.003

Cerit, Y. (2009). The effects of servant leadership behaviours of school principals on teachers' job satisfaction. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership,* 37(5), 600–623. doi:10.1177/1741143209339650

Chang, I.-H. (2011). A study of the relationships between distributed leadership, teacher academic optimism and student achievement in Taiwanese elementary schools. *School Leadership & Management, 31*(5), 491–515.

Chen, Y. (2007). *Principals' distributed leadership behaviors and their impact on student achievement in selected elementary schools in Texas.* Texas A&M University.

Christianson, A. (2010). *A case study examining principal leadership behaviors that promote shared responsibility for English language learners.* Edgewood College.

Copland, M. A. (2003). Leadership of inquiry: Building and sustaining capacity for school improvement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 25*(4), 375–395. doi:10.3102/01623737025004375

Curtis, R. (2013). *Finding a new way: Leveraging teacher leadership to meet unprecedented demands.* Washington, DC: Joyce Foundation.

Davidson, B. M., & Dell, G. L. (2003). *A school restructuring model: A tool kit for building teacher leadership.* American Educational Research Association annual conference.

Dean, D. R. (2005). Thinking globally: The National College of School Leadership: A case study in distributed leadership development. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education, 2*(1), 1–62.

Deike, M. A. (2009). *The principal as an instructional leader within the context of effective data use.* The University of Texas at Austin.

Donaldson, M. L., Cobb, C. D., & Mayer, A. P. (2010). Contested terrain: Principal and teacher leadership at Grove Street Elementary School. *Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership, 13*(2), 29–38. doi:10.1177/1555458910372654

Droese, S. M. (2010). *Lesson study in the U.S.: Is it a mechanism for individual and organizational change? A case study of three schools.* University of Wisconsin-Madison

Edge, K., & Mylopoulos, M. (2008). Creating cross-school connections: LC networking in support of leadership and instructional development. *School Leadership & Management, 28*(2), 147–158. doi:10.1080/13632430801969823

Eyal, O., & Kark, R. (2004). How do transformational leaders transform organizations? A study of the relationship between leadership and entrepreneurship. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 3*(3), 37–41.

Fancera, S. F., & Bliss, J. R. (2011). Instructional leadership influence on collective teacher efficacy to improve school achievement. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 10*(3), 349–370. doi:10.1080/15700763.2011.585537

Feeney, E. J. (2009). Taking a look at a school's leadership capacity: The role and function of high school department chairs. *The Clearing House, 82*(5), 212–219. doi:10.3200/TCHS.82.5.212-219

Firestone, W. A., & Cecilia Martinez, M. (2007). Districts, teacher leaders, and distributed leadership: Changing instructional practice. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 6*(1), 3–35. doi:10.1080/15700760601091234

Foster, R. (2005). Leadership and secondary school improvement: Case studies of tensions and possibilities. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 8*(1), 35–52. doi:10.1080/1360312042000299233

Goldring, E., Huff, J., Spillane, J. P., & Barnes, C. (2009). Measuring the learning-centered leadership expertise of school principals. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 8*(2), 197–228. doi:10.1080/15700760902737170

Good, T. L. (2008). In the midst of comprehensive school reform: Principals' perspectives. *Teachers College Record, 110*(11), 2341–2360.

Gopalan, P. (2004). Integrating districts in comprehensive school reform in the middle-grades: Lessons from middle start CSR. Policy. New York, NY: Academy for Educational Development.

Griffith, J. (2004). Relation of principal transformational leadership to school staff job satisfaction, staff turnover, and school performance. *Journal of Educational Administration, 42*(3), 333–356.

Grumdahl, C. R. (2010). *How schools can effectively plan to meet the goal of improving student learning.* University of Minnesota.

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (2010). Collaborative leadership and school improvement: Understanding the impact on school capacity and student learning. *School Leadership & Management, 30*(2), 95–110. doi:10.1080/13632431003663214

Harris, A. (2002). Effective leadership in schools facing challenging contexts. *School Leadership & Management, 22*(1), 27–39. doi:10.1080/13632430220143024

Heck, R. H., & Hallinger, P. (2009). Assessing the contribution of distributed leadership to school improvement and growth in math achievement. *American Educational Research Journal, 46*(3), 659. doi:10.3102/0002831209340042

Heck, R. H., & Hallinger, P. (2010). Testing a longitudinal model of distributed leadership effects on school improvement. *The Leadership Quarterly, 111*(2), 226–252. Retrieved from http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1048984310001293

Hill, V. (2009). *Evaluating a strategy for enriching the professional learning community of a secondary school through support for teacher leadership.* Cambridge, UK: teacher leadership.org.uk.

Holland, N. E. (2002). *Small schools making big changes: The importance of professional communities in school reform.* In Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the National Association of African American Studies, the National Association of Hispanic and Latino Studies, the National Association of Native American Studies and the International Association of Asian Studies.

Huffman, J. B., & Hipp, K. A. (2000). *Creating communities of learners: The interaction of shared leadership, shared vision and supportive conditions.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 24–28, 2000).

Hulpia, H., & Devos, G. (2009). Exploring the link between distributed leadership and job satisfaction of school leaders. *Educational Studies, 35*(2), 153–171. doi:10.1080/03055690802648739

Hulpia, H., Devos, G., & Van Keer, H. (2011). The relation between school leadership from a distributed perspective and teachers' organizational commitment: Examining the source of the leadership function. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 47*(5), 728–771. doi:10.1177/0013161X11402065

Hur, J. (2011). *Sustainability of professional development in a post-reform context: A qualitative study of shared leadership. Leadership.* University of Minnesota.

Ishimaru, A. (2012). From heroes to organizers: Principals and education organizing in urban school reform. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 49*(1), 3–51. doi:10.1177/0013161X12448250

Jacobson, S. (2011). Leadership effects on student achievement and sustained school success. *International Journal of Education Management, 25*(1), 33–44.

Kelley, J. D. (2011). *Teacher's and teacher leaders' perceptions of the formal role of teacher leadership.* Policy Studies. Georgia State University.

Kennedy, A., Deuel, A., Nelson, T. H., & Slavit, D. (2011, May). *Requiring collaboration or distributing leadership?* Phi Delta Kappan.

Kim, G. (2010). *Investigating promising school leadership practices in two California charter schools.* University of Southern California.

Lambert, L. (2006, Spring). Lasting leadership: A study of high leadership capacity schools. *The Educational Forum, 70,* 238–254.

Leithwood, K. A., & Jantzi, D. (2000). Principal and teacher leadership effects: A replication. *School Leadership & Management, 20*(4), 415–434. doi:10.1080/13632430020003210

Leithwood, K. A., & Jantzi, D. (2006). Transformational school leadership for large-scale reform: Effects on students, teachers, and their classroom practices. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 17*(2), 201–227. doi:10.1080/09243450600565829

Leithwood, K. A., & Jantzi, D. (2008). Linking leadership to student learning: The contributions of leader efficacy. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44*(4), 496–528. doi:10.1177/0013161X08321501

Leithwood, K. A., & Mascall, B. (2008). Collective leadership effects on student achievement. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44*(4), 529–561. doi:10.1177/0013161X08321221

Leithwood, K. A., Patten, S., & Jantzi, D. (2010). Testing a conception of how school leadership influences student learning. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 46*(5), 671–706. doi:10.1177/0013161X10377347

Loder, T. L., & Spillane, J. P. (2005). Is a principal still a teacher?: US women administrators' accounts of role conflict and role discontinuity. *Leadership, 25*(3). doi:10.1080/13634230500116348

Louis, K. S., Leithwood, K. A., Wahlstrom, K. A., & Anderson, S. E. (2010). Investigating the links to improved student learning: Final report of research findings. New York, NY: Wallace Foundation.

Lovett, S., & Cameron, M. (2011). Career pathways: Does remaining close to the classroom matter for early career teachers? A study of practice in New Zealand and the USA. *Professional Development in Education, 37*(2), 213–224.

Margolin, I., Ezer, H., & Karton, R. (2000). *Constructing a professional community of teacher educators during a curriculum-in-action process.* American Educational Research Association annual conference. New Orleans, LA.

Margolis, J. (2008). When teachers face teachers: Listening to the resource "right down the hall." *Teaching Education, 19*(4), 293–310. doi:10.1080/10476210802425628

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. doi:10.1177/0013161X03253412

McDonald, D. H., & Keedy, J. L. (2002). *Principals as teacher leaders in the Kentucky education reform act era: Laying the groundwork for high-achieving, low income schools.* American Educational Research Association annual conference. New Orleans, LA.

Murphy, J., Smylie, M., Mayrowetz, D., & Seashore Louis, K. (2009). The role of the principal in fostering the development of distributed leadership. *School Leadership & Management, 29*(2), 181–214. doi:10.1080/13632430902775699

Park, V., & Datnow, A. (2009). Co-constructing distributed leadership: District and school connections in data-driven decision-making. *School Leadership & Management, 29*(5), 477–494. doi:10.1080/13632430903162541

Penuel, W. R., Riel, M., Joshi, A., Pearlman, L., Kim, C. M., & Frank, K. A. (2010). The alignment of the informal and formal organizational supports for reform: Implications for improving teaching in schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 46*(1), 57–95. doi:10.1177/1094670509353180

Pitts, V. M. (2009). Using social network methods to study school leadership. *International Journal of Research and Method in Education.* Northwestern University.

Printy, S. M. (2007). Leadership for teacher learning: A community of practice perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44*(2), 187–226. doi:10.1177/0013161X07312958

Printy, S. M., Marks, H. M., & Bowers, A. J. (2009, September). Integrated leadership: How principals and teachers share transformational and instructional influence. *Journal of School Leadership,* 19.

Rivers, S. D. (2010). *Leadership as a distributed phenomenon: A study of shared roles and 3rd grade student achievement.* Capella University.

Rogers, M. P., Abell, S., Lannin, J., Wang, C.-Y., Musikul, K., Barker, D., & Dingman, S. (2006, September). Effective professional development in science and mathematics education: Teachers' and facilitators' views. *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 5*(3), 507–532. doi:10.1007/s10763-006-9053-8

Senesac, D. R. (2010). *Narrowing the achievement gap and sustaining success: A qualitative study of the norms, practices, and programs of a successful high school with urban characteristics.* University of Southern California.

Shatzer, R. H. (2009). *A comparison study between instructional and transformational leadership theories: Effects on student achievement and teacher job satisfaction.* Leadership. Brigham Young University.

Shatzer, R. H., Caldarella, P., Hallam, P. R., & Brown, B. L. (2013). Comparing the effects of instructional and transformational leadership on student achievement: Implications for practice. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 42*(4), 445–459. doi:10.1177/1741143213502192

Sheppard, B., Hurley, N., & Dibbon, D. (2010). *Distributed leadership, teacher morale, and teacher enthusiasm: Unravelling the leadership pathways to school success.* American Educational Research Association annual conference.

Silins, H., & Mulford, B. (2004). Schools as learning organizations—Effects on teacher leadership and student outcomes. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 15*(3), 443–466.

Somech, A. (2010). Participative decision making in schools: A mediating-moderating analytical framework for understanding school and teacher outcomes. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 46*(2), 174–209. doi:10.1177/1094670510361745

Spillane, J. P., Healey, K., & Parise, L. M. (2009). School leaders' opportunities to learn: A descriptive analysis from a distributed perspective. *Educational Review, 61*(4), 407–432.

Terrell, H. P. (2010). *The relationship of the dimensions of distributed leadership in elementary schools of urban districts and student achievement.* The George Washington University.

Timperley, H. S. (2008). Distributed leadership to improve outcomes for students. In K. A. Leithwood, B. Mascall, & T. Strauss (Eds.), *Distributed leadership according to the evidence* (pp. 197–222). New York, NY: Routledge.

Urick, A., & Bowers, A. J. (2011). What influences principals' perceptions of academic climate? A nationally representative study of the direct effects of perception on climate. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 10*(3), 322–348. doi:10.1080/15700763.2011.577925

Wahlstrom, K. A., & Seashore Louis, K. (2008). How teachers experience principal leadership: The roles of professional community, trust, efficacy, and shared responsibility. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44*(4), 458–495. doi:10.1177/0013161X08321502

Watson, S. T. (2005). *Teacher collaboration and school reform: Distributing leadership through the use of professional learning teams.* Learning. University of Missouri-Columbia.

Wells, C. M., Maxfield, C. R., Klocko, B., & Feun, L. (2010, September). The role of superintendents in supporting teacher leadership: A study of principals' perceptions. *Journal of School Leadership, 20,* 669–694.

Williams, R. B. (2006). Leadership for school reform: Do principal decision-making styles reflect a collaborative approach? *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy, 53,* 1–22.