

Examining the Practice of Teacher Leadership Across Nevada: How Is Context Associated with Practice?

Peter D. Wiens, *University of Nevada, Las Vegas*
KaaVonia Hinton, *Old Dominion University*
Ami Pritchard, *University of Nevada, Las Vegas*

Abstract

Teacher leadership (TL) is recognized as vital to creating effective schools with demonstrated benefits to principals, teachers, and students. Teacher leadership is defined in this study as teachers leading from within and beyond the classroom in both formal and informal capacities. TL can take the form of a variety of behaviours such as professional learning, the leading of professional development, collaboration, shared leadership, and equity leadership. While there are commonalities, the practical applications of TL can vary greatly from context to context. Even within specific policy contexts, TL can vary from school to school. This article analyzed the responses of 1,274 public school teachers in Nevada using the Survey of Teacher Leadership and shows patterns in the frequency of TL practices across contexts.

Résumé

Le leadership enseignant (LE) est reconnu comme essentiel pour assurer l'efficacité d'une école, avec des avantages clairs pour les directeurs, les enseignants et les élèves. Dans cette étude, on définit le leadership par les enseignants comme la capacité de ceux-ci à diriger tant dans la salle de classe qu'au-delà, à titre officiel et officieux. Le LE peut prendre la forme de divers comportements, tels que l'apprentissage profes-

Peter D. Wiens, KaaVonia Hinton, & Ami Pritchard. (2025). Examining the Practice of Teacher Leadership Across Nevada: How Is Context Associated with Practice? *International Journal of Education Policy & Leadership* 21(3). doi:10.22230/ijepl.2025v21n3a1519

IJEPL is a joint publication of the Faculty of Education at **Simon Fraser University**, the **University of Delaware**, and **PDK International**. By virtue of their appearance in this open access journal, articles are free to use, with proper attribution in educational and other non-commercial settings 90 days after initial publication. Copyright for articles published in IJEPL is retained by the authors. More information is available on the IJEPL website: <http://www.ijepl.org>



SIMON FRASER
UNIVERSITY



sionnel, la direction du perfectionnement professionnel, la collaboration, le leadership partagé et le leadership équitable. Bien qu'il existe des points communs entre elles, les applications pratiques du LE peuvent varier considérablement d'un contexte à l'autre. Même dans le cadre de politiques spécifiques, le leadership par les enseignants peut varier d'école en école. Cet article analyse les réponses de 1 274 enseignants du secteur public du Nevada à une enquête sur le leadership enseignant et relève certaines tendances dans la fréquence des pratiques de ce leadership dans divers contextes.

Keywords / Mots clés : teacher leadership, educational context, equity, survey, teacher behaviours / leadership enseignant, contexte éducatif, équité, enquête, comportements des enseignants

Introduction

Educational decentralization has been a trend in the United States (U.S.) since the mid-1980s with a particular aim to move away from a focus on individual leaders and hierarchical structures that too often result in teachers feeling overburdened, disenchanted, and alienated (Evans, 1996; Frymier, 1987). The concept of shared governance has instead become more prevalent, whereby leadership is shared among a distributed group of professionals (Hallinger & Kovačević, 2021; Harris, 2003). One manifestation of this trend is the growing focus on teacher leadership (TL). Interest in TL as an academic field has grown in the last few decades (Pan, Wiens, & Moyal, 2023). Even with this growth in research in the field of TL, there remains a great deal of uncertainty around TL and the nature of this important construct.

The benefit of TL to schools has become increasingly clear through improvement in job satisfaction, teacher buy-in for school change, and, notably, student achievement (Nguyen, Harris, & Ng, 2020; Schott, van Roekel, & Tummers, 2020; Tsai, 2015; York-Barr & Duke, 2004). However, there continues to be a need to further understand the nature of TL. Specifically, there is a gap in the literature to understand how TL is enacted in specific contexts. Research does indicate that TL roles vary across contexts (Anderson, 2002; Wenner & Campbell, 2017). While there is growing attention to TL across global contexts (Arden & Okoko, 2022; Webber, Conway, & van der Vyver, 2022), this study focuses on TL practices in one U.S. state to understand how, even in a single state, TL practices vary. Specifically, this study examines the research question, “How is teacher leadership enacted across different schools in the state of Nevada?”

Theoretical framework

Distributed leadership (DL) offers a lens for examining TL practices across contexts in Nevada. Definitions of DL vary (Harris, 2003, 2007; Hartley, 2009; Hulpia, Devos, Rosseel, 2012). Heck and Hallinger (2010) conceive of DL as collaborative decision-making. Similarly, Spillane, Halverson, and Diamond (2001) suggest that collaboration is a key part of DL. Spillane and colleagues (2001) lean on activity theory and distributed cognition and describe DL as occurring when leadership practices are

“stretched” across several leaders in a context (p. 1). Further, Spillane and colleagues (2001) explained that within DL, “Leadership practice (both thinking and activity) emerges in and through the interaction of leaders, followers, and situation” (p. 27). Distributed leadership seeks to remove or reduce hierarchical structures. Rather than looking to one individual, those with expertise to solve the problem, regardless of role, rank, or behaviour, are tapped to help lead (Angelle, 2010; Copland, 2003; Harris, 2004). Copland (2003) maintains that “with distributed leadership, decisions about who leads and who follows are dictated by the task or problem situation, not necessarily by where one sits in the hierarchy” (p. 378). Brooks, Normore, Jean-Marie, and Hodgins (2007) agree and note that “leadership practice is a fluid phenomenon that changes from situation to situation, from context to context, and . . . evolves over time” (p. 379). Thus, context has a significant influence on TL practices, and “[l]eadership . . . cannot be divorced from the sociocultural and historical realities of the contexts in which leadership is enacted” (Miller, McCardle, Zuccaro, & Worlds, 2022, p. 147).

Distributed leadership has the potential to be successful depending on the degree to which a given context includes characteristics such as trust, collaboration, effective communication, expertise, dedication to improving teaching and learning, shared vision, and administrator support (Angelle, 2010; Copland, 2003; Spillane et al., 2001). Distributed leadership has been credited with contributing to student learning, teacher effectiveness (Choi, 2023; Harris, 2004; Heck & Hallinger, 2010), job satisfaction, teacher efficacy in general (Angelle, 2010; Harris, 2004; Hulpia, Devos, & Rosseel, 2009), and teacher efficacy in multicultural classrooms (Choi, 2023).

While DL has been shown to be effective, there are some challenges associated with the approach. The hierarchical structure of schools can hamper DL (Harris, 2004). Distributed leadership suggests power will be dispersed, and this may be difficult to accomplish (or undesirable) in some contexts (Angelle, 2010; Copland, 2003; Harris, 2004; Lárusdóttir, 2021). An increased workload might also be a negative aspect of DL (Hulpia et al., 2009). Some have also said that DL rarely takes equity or political issues into account (Maxcy & Nguyen, 2006). Others argue DL can be a tool for organizational change (Harris, 2004), including working toward inclusivity (Alyami & Floyd, 2019; Tejeiro, 2024) equity, and social justice (Berg & Parad, 2024; Miller et al., 2022). An assumption is that DL is equity-focused in that the approach welcomes diverse voices, perspectives, thoughts, and experiences while engaging in collaborative learning, decision-making, and problem-solving (Alyami & Floyd, 2019; Berg & Parad, 2024; Tejeiro, 2024). While Berg and Parad (2024) characterized DL as a potential “engine . . . for instructional equity,” particularly in urban schools (p. 1), there is still much to learn about how DL can help improve the schooling experiences of those who have been marginalized due to inequities (Choi, 2023), especially in urban schools.

Teacher leadership is an enactment of DL in school settings whereby teachers participate meaningfully in the leadership of the school through a variety of roles. The study presented here extends this literature by considering Miller and colleagues’ (2022) claim that not only does context matter, but also research on TL has failed to capture teacher leaders’ practices that combat inequity, and this study helps to address that gap.

Review of the literature

Teacher leadership remains an area ill-defined by literature, encompassing everything from the first wave of traditional classroom roles such as department chair, to the second wave of roles leading out of the classroom (such as team leaders, curriculum developers, reading specialists, etc.), and now to the third wave of TL focused on teachers as agents of school change in and out of the classroom (Silva, Gimbert, & Nolan, 2000) with a movement toward TL as transformational classroom leadership (Pounder, 2006). This study takes a broad view of TL and recognizes that TL can be conceptualized and practiced in a variety of different ways. Teacher leadership can be practiced in both formal and informal ways (Wiens, Metcalf, & Skousen, 2024). While some scholars have identified teacher leaders as those with responsibilities both within and outside of the classroom (Wenner & Campbell, 2017), this article takes a broader view of TL. The authors define TL as teachers taking roles and responsibilities, be they formal or informal, outside of the classroom. However, some teacher leaders are fully released from classroom duties. Teacher leaders take on a whole-school perspective and can even have influence beyond the school (Gurr, 2024). However, a teacher leader would not be placed in a supervisory role in relation to other teachers. Therefore, relationship building to support colleagues is a very important aspect of successful TL (Harris, 2005).

Successful TL entails a distribution of leadership roles within the expertise areas of teachers that reduces administrative hierarchy in order to model collaboration, create cross-curricular integration, promote collegial encouragement, form consensus among faculty, and display vigilant professionalism (Lambert, 2002). Being in schools with high levels of TL is beneficial for administrators, teachers, and students. Teachers engaged in TL tend to use more research-based instructional practices (Wiens & Beck, 2022). Teachers working in schools with a culture of TL are also more satisfied with teaching and less likely to experience burnout (Engle, Xia, & Butler, 2024; Shen, Moyal, Wiens, & Zhang, 2025; Wiens & Beck, 2022). Due to teachers' professional knowledge and close relationships with students, TL also has the potential to reduce systematic inequalities in schools (Bradley-Levine, 2018; Hunzicker, 2022; Jacobs, Beck, & Crowell, 2014). Research has also shown a relationship between TL and student achievement (Sands, 2024; Shen, Wu, Reeves, Zheng, Ryan, & Anderson, 2020).

While these studies demonstrate that TL can be a powerful factor in student learning, they also indicate that TL does not occur uniformly across schools. Teachers experience different levels of TL at different schools (Wiens, Calkins, & Skousen, 2025a). Unfortunately, there is a lack of large-scale empirical research that examines TL across geographic contexts. This article seeks to understand if geographic and demographic differences in schools are associated with teachers' experiences with TL.

Teacher leadership in context

Interest in TL as a field of study has grown prodigiously over the past three decades, with scholarship coming from all over the world (Pan et al., 2023). While the concept of TL has garnered attention internationally, there is evidence that TL is context-specific (Anderson, 2002; Arden & Okoko, 2022). Culture can play a significant role in

how schools interpret educational concepts leading to differences in enactment across countries (Dimmock & Walker, 2000). In a study of TL scholars from 10 different countries, Arden and Okoko (2022) found that participants demonstrated “significant variations” in how they experienced TL (p. 65) across nine phenomena of TL. Meanwhile, Pineda-Báez, Fierro-Evans, and Gratacós (2022) conducted a study across Colombia, Mexico, and Spain to examine TL in Spanish speaking countries. They found areas of convergence and divergence across countries indicating that TL may have similarities across contexts, but important differences in practices and conceptualizations may be present.

Within the United States, where this study is situated, researchers have examined TL in specific contexts such as rural (Anderson, 2002; Cherkowski & Schnellert, 2017; Lotter, Yow, Lee, Zeis, & Irvin, 2019), suburban (Irby, Drame, Clough, & Croom, 2019; Lac & Diamond, 2019) and urban schools (Muchmore, Cooley, Marx, & Crowell, 2004; Scribner & Bradley-Levine, 2010). In a study of survey data from 13,000 teachers across the United States, Wiens et al. (2025a) found that a measure of urbanicity was not associated with TL in schools; however, smaller schools had higher levels of teacher influence, teacher agency, and shared leadership—three core TL principles. Conversely, schools with predominantly White students had teacher-reported higher levels of TL. Smaller schools might be sites of increased teacher leadership due to the need for teachers to take on a lot of different roles (Cherkowski & Schnellert, 2017; Lotter et al., 2019). Additionally, Anderson (2002) found that rural educators saw TL in unique ways and tended to engage in more informal TL roles. Meanwhile TL research has shown that TL can be effective at increasing student learning in urban contexts (Sands, 2024), but much of the research has focused on the power of TL to build racial equity in these contexts (Jacobs et al., 2014; Scribner & Bradley-Levine, 2010). Likewise, other studies have demonstrated that TL can make a positive difference in suburban schools in the United States (Irby et al., 2019; Lac & Diamond, 2019). While these studies have provided the field with important findings related to the specific context studied, they have not provided cross-context analysis. This study seeks to bring together survey data from teachers in differing contexts.

In the United States, educational policy is written at both the federal and state level leading to significant policy differences across states. However, in the U.S., research indicates that even in a similar policy environment, TL experiences can vary greatly from school to school (Cooper, Stanulis, Brondyk, Hamilton, Macaluso, & Meier, 2016; Poekert, Alexandrou, & Shannon, 2016). However, there is a lack of studies that compare across these contexts. This study examines one policy context—the U.S. state of Nevada—to understand how, in a similar policy environment, TL may be enacted in differing ways.

Teacher leadership behaviours

Many behaviours that constitute TL have been identified throughout research. Previous literature surrounding the field of teacher leadership was used as the foundation for designing the current survey (Cheung, Reinhardt, Stone, & Warren Little, 2018; Harrison & Killion, 2007; Poekert et al., 2016; York-Barr & Duke, 2004). There are different ways to examine the complex concept of TL. A common way to

examine TL behaviours is to review the practices used when teacher leaders engage in leadership roles. In their seminal literature review on teacher leadership, York-Barr and Duke (2004) identify 20 practices in teacher leadership. These practices can be organized into six categories: coordination and management; school or district curriculum work; professional development of colleagues; participation in school change/improvement; parent and community involvement; contributions to the profession; and preservice teacher education. Also, Cheung et al. (2018) designed a framework of TL instructional practices: collaborating with others to improve instruction, providing resources for effective instruction, advocating in service of effective instruction, and modelling effective instruction. In addition, Poekert et al. (2016) designed a framework that focuses on teacher growth in teacher leadership. Teacher leaders show personal growth as well as growth as a teacher, leader, and researcher. Lastly, teachers take on numerous roles that require a variety of skills. For example, Harrison and Killion (2007) define 10 roles that teacher leaders take on in leadership. These TL roles summarize the main responsibilities individual teacher leaders have while mainly focusing on teaching: professional growth, professional development leadership, collaboration, shared leadership, and equity leadership (Cheung et al., 2018).

Professional growth

Teacher leaders must also be excellent teachers (Wiens & Beck, 2022). Effective teachers engage their students and promote learning by relying on a plethora of dispositions, teaching strategies, relational approaches, and curriculum understandings. Innovative teaching strategies that improve student learning should be adopted and implemented by teachers (Ainley & Carstens, 2018). Impactful teachers also use evidence-based instructional practices (Arends & Kilcher, 2010; Rosenshine, 2012). Webber (2023) conducted an international study of TL and found that teacher leaders show a “strong self-awareness that facilitated meaningful reflection about their work” (p. 346). Stellar teachers continuously reflect on their own teaching strategies (Korthagen & Vasalos, 2005; Zeichner & Liston, 2013) and use these reflections to improve classroom practices in systematic ways (Ginns, Heirdsfield, Atweh, & Watters, 2001; Jay & Johnson, 2002). In addition to continuously reflecting on their own instructional practices, teacher leaders also strive to empower their colleagues in their professional learning (Harrison & Killion, 2007).

Professional development leadership

Teacher leaders engage their colleagues in professional learning by supporting them in pursuing personal growth and effective teaching (Cheung et al., 2018). Research shows that supporting colleagues in professional development is a core value of TL (e.g., Chen, 2022; Harrison & Killion, 2007; York-Barr & Duke, 2004). Teacher leaders participate in numerous formal and informal roles such as mentoring, coaching, and modelling instruction to support colleagues in professional development. Through mentoring, mentees are given a teacher mentor who can provide one-on-one support in professional development (Hobson, Ashby, Malderez, & Tomlinson, 2009). Most commonly, teacher mentoring is used when a novice teacher is men-

tored by an experienced teacher (e.g., Hobson et al., 2009; Shanks, Tonna, Krøjgaard, Paaske, Robson, & Bjerkholt, 2022) or a preservice teacher is mentored by an experienced teacher (e.g., Ellis, Alonzo, & Nguyen, 2020; Hobson & Maxwell, 2020). Mentoring can also take place between teachers across the experience spectrum (Jewell, 2007). Mentoring generally refers to a teacher receiving support for teaching in all areas of the teaching profession, but instructional coaching is more specifically focused on support in classroom practices. Coaching is a “mechanism for new teacher induction, ongoing teacher learning, assisting in the implementation of new initiatives, and, most recently in helping teachers understand and adapt their instruction” (Desimone & Pak, 2017, p. 4). Coaching uses a one-to-one relationship like mentoring. The primary purpose of a coach and coachee relationship is to support instructional skills (Knight & van Nieuwerburgh, 2012). Though coaching relationships can happen informally there has been an increase of formal instructional coach positions in U.S. schools. In many of these positions, coaches support teachers in a one-on-one relationship to provide school-wide professional development (Galey, 2016; Kane & Rosenquist, 2018).

Collaboration

A foundational component of TL is collaboration with other teachers. Collaboration among teacher leaders and their colleagues can include sharing resources and knowledge (Mangin & Ross, 2022). Teacher leaders activate opportunities for all teachers to develop their practices and support student learning by participating in learning communities with their colleagues (Berg, Carver, & Mangin, 2014). In formal professional learning communities, teacher leaders can collaborate with other teachers to collect and evaluate data (Farley-Ripple & Buttram, 2014; Muñoz & Branham, 2016). Teacher leaders can take on positions as formal (Marsh, McCombs, & Martorell, 2010; Marsh, Bertrand, Huguet, 2015) and informal (Mangin & Ross, 2022) instructional coaches. Overall, being a teacher leader requires being relational (Hunzicker, 2017), so it is vital for teacher leaders to develop a collaborative culture in their schools (Heikka, Pitkäniemi, Kettukangas, & Hyttinen, 2021; Muijs & Harris, 2007).

Shared leadership

Shared leadership deviates from individual leadership (Fletcher & Käufer, 2003; Lindahl, 2008) and focuses on the collaborative leadership, shared between administrators and teachers (Lindahl, 2008; Lovely, 2005). There are many benefits for students, teachers, and principals when schools use shared leadership and empower teacher leaders. Schools that have a formal or informal shared leadership and TL model are more likely to see innovation and positive school change (Printy & Marks, 2006). Teacher leadership identity can vary (Hunzicker, 2017; Sinha & Hanuscin, 2017), but if TL is thriving in a school, teachers will start to see themselves as leaders (Poekert et al., 2016). Shen and colleagues (2020) conducted a meta-analysis on TL literature and found that student achievement is most heavily influenced by the TL components of collaboration for improvements in curriculum, instruction, assessment, and policymaking. Teacher leaders have influence that expands outside the school and into families, community organizations, and businesses as they develop

relationships and create partnerships throughout the community (Crowther, Kaagen, Ferguson, & Hann, 2002).

Equity leadership

Due to the inequalities that are rooted in schools, hierarchical structures neglect some and privilege others. In contrast, each student has the “unique supports they need to succeed” in equitable schools (Atchison, Diffey, Rafa, & Sarubbi, 2017, p. 1). One individual within a school cannot equitably meet the needs of all individuals in a school because schools are complex organizations serving complex individuals. However, schools that prioritize teacher collaboration to meet individual student needs can challenge hierarchical bureaucratic models of schooling, which have traditionally produced inequity (Darling-Hammond & Friedlander, 2008). System wide, teachers need to be supported and empowered as leaders to make schools more equitable (Berg, 2021). Socioeconomic disparities can be positively influenced by teacher leaders (Hunzicker, 2022) and TL research indicates the development of a social justice stance in teacher leaders (Milner, Laughter, & Childs, 2022). Teacher leaders can champion socially just classrooms and schools by working collaboratively with others to examine and challenge inequity (Bradley-Levine, 2022).

Method

This study employed a survey research design with quantitative analysis. The article reports on a survey effort of all Nevada public school teachers not employed at charter schools. The survey study was approved by the authors’ institutional review board and was conducted in fall 2023. The gathering of data and analysis herein were designed to address the research question, “How is teacher leadership enacted across different schools in the state of Nevada?”

Participants

This article reports on the results of the survey of 1,274 Nevada public-school teachers. Nevada is a physically large state with a relatively small population. Nearly 90 percent of the population is located in two counties centred around the two largest cities in the state (United States Census Bureau, 2024). This provided the opportunity to include participants from urban, suburban, and rural locations. Additionally, the population of the state is highly diverse, especially in the southern part of the state centred around the city of Las Vegas. Participants in the study self-reported their demo-

Table 1: Participant demographics

Characteristic	% Affirmative response
Individual	
Race/Ethnicity	
African American	5.3
Asian	5.3
White	72.0
Latinx	7.4
Native American	0.7
Other	1.7
More than one race	7.7
Gender	
Female	76.2
Male	22.6
Gender non-conforming	0.8
Transgender	0.2
Gender-other	0.7

graphic characteristics, which are illustrated in Table 1. Teachers reported an average of 15.75 years of teaching in total and 6.74 years of teaching at their current school. The largest groups of teachers were White (72%) and female (76.2%). Teachers taught across all grade levels and the largest category for highest degree was a master’s degree (69.2%). Over half of teachers reported working in urban schools (51.6%). Teachers also reported working in low-income (72.0%) and diverse schools with the largest group being the group that selected “0–25% White” (51.7%).

Characteristic	% Affirmative response
Teaching level	
Pre-School	7.1
Elementary	54.1
Middle	29.3
High	32.9
Post-secondary	4.3
Not currently teaching	4.7
Highest degree	
High school diploma	0.2
Associate’s degree	0.1
Bachelor’s degree	23.0
Master’s degree	69.2
Educational specialist degree	3.2
Terminal degree	4.3
School/community	
Urbanicity	
Rural	14.0
Suburban	34.4
Urban	51.6
School socioeconomic status	
Low income	72.0
Middle income	23.9
High income	4.2
% White/Caucasian students	
0–25%	51.7
26–50%	26.7
51–75%	16.3
76–100%	5.3

Instrument

The Survey of Teacher Leadership (STL; Wiens, Vongkulluksn, Beck, & Pearson, 2025b) assesses teachers’ experience with TL. This study uses the STL items related to the frequency of TL practices. Participants are asked to indicate how frequently they do the following TL behaviours. Twenty-five TL practices are grouped into five question factors as follows. The first

factor is “Personal growth” ($\alpha = .823$), which includes items such as, “Use evidence informed instructional and teaching practices to improve child outcomes” and “Engage in continuous self-improvement.” The second factor is called “Professional development leadership” ($\alpha = .816$) and includes items such as “Mentor other teachers either formally or informally” or “Lead professional development initiatives (e.g., workshops, training, PLCs).” The third factor is “Collaboration” ($\alpha = .805$), which includes items such as “Share research-based practices with colleagues” and “Collaborate with colleagues on understanding and use of data.” The fourth factor of the STL is “Shared leadership” ($\alpha = .766$) and includes “Adopt a leadership stance to advocate for self and others” and “Identify school challenges and initiate a process to improve them.” Finally, the fifth factor is called “Equity Leadership” ($\alpha = .814$) with items such as “Explore and challenge inequity in the educational system” and “Build alliances that advocate for best practice in socially just classrooms.” For each item, participants responded on a six-point Likert scale with the following markers: 1 = never, 2 = once a year or less, 3 = 2–4 times/year, 4 = 5–10 times/year” 5 = 1–3 times/month, and 6 = once a week or more.

Participants were also asked to provide demographic information about their schools. The first of these questions asked participants to describe the urbanicity of their school with the choices being rural, suburban, or urban. Next, participants were asked to provide information about the income status of their schools with the options being predominantly low income, predominantly middle income, or predominantly high income. Finally, participants were asked, “What percentage of your school’s students are White/Caucasian?” Answer choices were 0–25%, 26–50%, 51–75%, or 76–100%. However, due to the low number of participants that selected 76–100%, it was combined with the 51–75% group to make one group “majority White.”

Data collection

All public-school teachers in Nevada who were not teaching in charter schools were targeted for this survey. Teacher emails were retrieved from districts and from school websites. A total of 20,168 email addresses were collected and survey invitations were sent. Teachers were recruited to participate via an email that included a Qualtrics survey link during the fall of 2022. After the initial invitation, teachers were sent two follow-up reminders. Teachers were provided with information about the study and an informed consent form. In all, 1,274 teachers completed all or a portion of the survey for a response rate of 6.32 percent.

Analysis

Analysis was designed to answer the research question and understand how context within the state of Nevada is associated with TL practices. This was accomplished through Analysis of Variance (ANOVA; Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 2003). Each of the three context variables (urbanicity, income, and race) were used as grouping variables in three sets of ANOVAs. The dependent variables were the five components of the STL. Post-hoc Tukey tests were conducted where there were statistically significant relationships to better understand the observed phenomenon.

Results

To better understand our data, we conducted correlation analysis among school characteristic variables. These are shown in Table 2 and indicate that all three variables were significantly correlated with each other. Correlation values ranged from $r = -.255$ to $r = .613$ and all relationships were significant at least at $p = .01$. While the variables were strongly correlated, it was determined that there is value in examining the variables’ relationship to TL separately.

Table 2: Correlations between school characteristics*

	Urbanicity	Income	Race
Urbanicity	1		
Student income levels	-.255**	1	
Student race	-.500**	.613**	1

Note: * All correlations significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Three sets of ANOVAs were computed for this study. The first was examining if participants in schools with different levels of urbanicity reported participating in TL behaviours at different levels of frequency. Full results can be seen in Table 3. Across the five components of the STL, professional development leader ($F = 5.357, p = .005$), collaboration ($F = 6.117, p = .002$), and equity in TL ($F = 6.580, p = .001$) all had significant differences in participant mean scores. As shown in Table 4, urban schools had the highest mean frequency score in professional development ($M = 3.165$), followed by suburban ($M = 3.091$) and rural ($M = 2.778$). Post hoc tests showed that only the relationships between rural and the other two categories (urban, $p = .003$; suburban, $p = .032$) were statistically significant. In the area of collaboration, teachers at urban schools reported the highest frequency ($M = 4.25$) followed by suburban ($M = 4.078$) and rural ($M = 3.856$). The relationship between urban and rural was the only significant one ($p = .002$). Finally, in equity in TL, urban had the highest frequency ($M = 3.151$), which was statistically higher than both suburban ($M = 2.886, p = .003$) and rural ($M = 2.879, p = .037$). The results indicate that teachers in urban schools tend to more frequently participate in TL in the areas of leading professional development, collaboration, and equity. However, in the areas of personal growth and shared leadership there were no significant differences in reported participation in TL activities.

Table 3: ANOVA results for urbanicity

STL component	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Personal growth	5.578	2	2.789	2.560	.078
Professional development leader	19.885	2	9.942	5.357	.005
Collaboration	16.986	2	8.493	6.117	.002
Shared leadership	4.290	2	2.145	1.563	.210
Equity in TL	21.522	2	10.761	6.580	.001

Table 4: Mean scores of components of TL by urbanicity

TL component	Rural	Suburban	Urban
Personal growth	4.716	4.670	4.817
Professional development leader	2.778*	3.091*	3.165*
Collaboration	3.856*	4.079	4.205*
Shared leadership	2.991	2.842	2.958
Equity in TL	2.879*	2.886*	3.151*

Note: *Statistically significant difference

The second school characteristic used in this analysis was school family income levels. Full results of this analysis can be seen in Table 5. While four of the components of TL—personal growth, professional development leader, collaboration, and shared leadership—showed no difference based on school income levels, only one of the five components of the STL had significantly different results—equity in TL ($F = 4.664, p = .010$). As shown in Table 6, in this TL component, schools identified

Table 5: ANOVA results for school income

STL component	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Personal growth	.653	2	.326	.298	.742
Professional development leader	4.529	2	2.264	1.207	.299
Collaboration	4.454	2	2.227	1.593	.204
Shared leadership	1.931	2	.965	.698	.498
Equity in TL	15.363	2	7.681	4.664	.010

as low income had the highest levels of frequency of TL behaviours ($M = 3.095$), followed by middle income ($M = 2.836$) and high income ($M = 2.904$). However, only the comparison between low income and middle income was statistically significant ($p = .008$). This finding indicates that in schools with predominantly low-income students, teachers participate more frequently in TL-equity behaviours.

Table 6: Mean scores of components of TL by school income

TL component	Low income	Middle income	High income
Personal growth	4.766	4.712	4.746
Professional development leader	3.128	3.000	2.949
Collaboration	4.150	4.008	4.162
Shared leadership	2.946	2.854	2.974
Equity in TL	3.095*	2.836*	2.905

Note: *Statistically significant difference

The third school characteristic used in this analysis was school racial demographics where participants provided data about the percentage of White students in their school. This variable was broken into five categories. As illustrated in Table 7

Table 7: ANOVA results for school racial demographics

STL component	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Personal growth	1.155	2	.578	.531	.588
Professional development leader	9.763	2	4.881	2.623	.073
Collaboration	.694	2	.347	.247	.781
Shared leadership	.495	2	.248	.180	.835
Equity in TL	13.700	2	6.850	4.173	.016

the only STL component that had statistically different mean scores among the groups was equity in TL ($F = 6.850, p < .016$) while the other four components of TL indicated no statistically significant differences. As shown in Table 8, among the groups, the 0–25% White group had the highest mean frequency ($M = 3.109$) followed by 26–50% White ($M = 3.022$) and majority White ($M = 2.834$). Post hoc Tukey tests indicated that the difference between 0–25% White and majority White was statisti-

cally significant ($p = .011$). Therefore, this indicates that in schools with a more diverse student population, teachers are more frequently engaging in TL equity leadership as compared to teachers in schools with predominantly White students.

Table 8: Mean scores of components of TL by racial demographics

TL component	Percentage of White students			
	0–25%	26–50%	51–75%	76–100%
Personal growth	4.754	4.716	4.805	4.810
Professional development leader	3.118	3.171	3.022	2.617
Collaboration	4.119	4.137	4.099	3.975
Shared leadership	2.917	2.958	2.917	2.867
Equity in TL	3.109*	3.022	2.967	2.425*

Note: *Statistically significant difference

Discussion

Leadership is context-specific (Miller et al., 2022) and understanding the relationship between context and leadership behaviours can help educators understand how to support teachers. As an enactment of DL, research has shown the importance of TL to schools through improved outcomes for teachers and students (Nguyen et al., 2020; Schott et al., 2020; Tsai, 2015; York-Barr & Duke, 2004). However, the practices employed in schools are still unclear. Case study research has shown variation in how TL is enacted (Anderson, 2002; Wenner & Campbell, 2017) and perceived (Arden & Okoko, 2022) in different contexts. This study examined the differences in teacher-reported frequency of TL behaviours including professional learning, professional development leadership, collaboration, shared leadership, and equity in TL. Data from a survey of Nevada public school teachers shows differences in TL practices across contexts within a consistent policy environment.

Teachers in urban, low income, and racially diverse schools report enacting TL behaviours more frequently than teachers in other types of schools. Urban teachers reported more frequently enacting professional development leadership.

The frequency of teachers in rural schools leading professional development ($M = 2.778$) and those in suburban schools ($M = 3.091$) was less than those in urban schools ($M = 3.165$). However, there were no significant differences reported concerning personal growth or shared leadership. The literature relates that personal growth, learning, shared leadership (Cherkowski & Schnellert, 2017; Jacobs et al., 2016), and sharing professional learning with other teachers (Chen, 2022; Harrison & Killion, 2007; York-Barr & Duke, 2004) have all long been seen as integral to TL and valued by rural (Anderson, 2002; Cherkowski & Schnellert, 2017; Lotter et al., 2019), suburban (Irby et al., 2019; Lac & Diamond, 2019), and urban schools (Muchmore, 2004; Scribner & Bradley-Levine, 2010). On one hand, this finding related to rural schools seems to contradict research that says teacher leaders in rural schools have numerous opportunities to share what they have learned with other teachers (Cherkowski & Schnellert, 2017; Lotter et al., 2019). On the other hand, scholars have pointed out that within rural contexts, teacher leader roles tend to be informal, unpaid, and tenuous, leading many to reduce their participation (Anderson,

2002; Cherkowski & Schnellert, 2017; Lotter et al., 2019). Additionally, Lotter and colleagues (2019) maintain that teacher leaders in rural contexts reported that their districts rarely provided them with needed professional development. Interestingly, the suburban school had more resources for leadership development than the rural and urban schools in Eckert's (2018) study. Access to resources can help or hinder TL behaviours (Cheung et al., 2018).

School context (rural, suburban, urban) made a difference to teachers' frequency of engaging in collaboration. Urban teachers reported more frequently enacting collaboration ($M = 4.2.5$) followed by suburban ($M = 4.078$) and rural ($M = 3.856$) teachers. Teachers working collaboratively to improve instruction can be a powerful way to improve student learning (Berg et al., 2014; Farley-Ripple & Buttram, 2014; Muñoz & Branham, 2016). While studies have shown that collaboration is fundamental to teacher leadership (Heikka et al., 2021; Muijs & Harris, 2007), including distributed leadership, lack of sufficient time and the structure of schools often hinder efforts to collaborate (Harris, 2004; Jacobs et al., 2016). Researchers have noted that teacher leaders in rural contexts reported that their districts did not provide them with the time needed to collaborate and that they often took on multiple roles, which further prevented them from collaborating with others in meaningful ways (Cherkowski & Schnellert, 2017; Lotter et al., 2019). Urban schools, which tend to be larger, showed higher levels of TL in these areas. This runs contrary to previous research that has shown either no difference in TL in urban schools (Wiens et al. 2025a) or, as stated earlier, argued that smaller schools may have increased TL because teachers need to do a lot of different things (Anderson, 2002; Cherkowski & Schnellert, 2017; Lotter et al., 2019). Clearly context matters in TL; however, research does not indicate clearly if specific schools' characteristics are consistently associated with TL.

This study added new information to the literature in TL through inclusion of equity in the STL (Wiens et al., 2025b). Equity in TL was consistently different across the demographic categories used in this study with teachers in urban ($M = 3.151$), low income ($M = 3.095$), and less White schools reporting higher frequency ($M = 3.109$). Urban schools are often large and complex, and there are significant layers of poverty and marginalization to consider and confront to enact change (D'Amico, Pawlewicz, Earley, & McGeehan, 2017). As Miller and colleagues (2022) state, "Leadership is contextual and cannot be divorced from the sociocultural and historical realities of the contexts in which leadership is enacted" (p. 147). Equity leadership is also about overcoming deficit thinking about students (Miller et al., 2022). This finding is concerning because it implies that equity may not be a priority or an important part of how teacher leaders perceive their work in various contexts. However, it is also an understandable finding that is consistent with TL literature. York-Barr and Duke (2004), in their oft-cited literature review, do not mention equity as an important part of TL work, while Wenner and Campbell (2017) argue the field needed to begin to focus on equity. When Jacobs and colleagues (2016) studied teacher leaders who taught in urban, suburban, and rural schools, they found that many of the teacher leaders did not view helping other teachers develop an understanding of equity or cultural diversity as a part of their work as leaders. Some of the teacher leaders said equity was not a part of their

leadership work because there were few students of colour at their school, others said they believed their colleagues were attending to that work, while still others claimed they felt ill-equipped to take on a social justice stance and/or felt uncomfortable discussing equity (Jacobs et al., 2016). Cherkowski and Schnellert (2017) point out that teacher leaders in rural schools focus on what they perceive as the immediate needs of their local context, which is predominantly White. Similarly, Jacobs and colleagues (2014) note that context influenced equity-focused TL. They found that teacher leaders were reluctant to adopt an equity-centred approach to leadership when there was fear, isolation, or a lack of support from administrators within their context (Jacobs et al., 2014). As Wenner and Campbell (2017) asserted nearly a decade ago, we need more research on this.

Limitations

In order to protect the identity of participants, the researchers were limited in the demographic data they could collect on individual schools. Therefore, the survey asked participants to provide data about the urbanicity, socioeconomic status, and race of students in the school. These three grouping variables provide some broad data on the individual schools. As indicated in our analysis, these three variables were significantly correlated. This is why they were analyzed individually. However, it is important to acknowledge the overlap in these variables.

Conclusion

The primary goal of this study was to examine how different schools in the state of Nevada enacted TL behaviours such as professional learning, leading professional development, collaboration, shared leadership, and equity leadership. Nevada public school teachers not employed at charter schools were surveyed using the Survey of Teacher Leadership. Previous studies have shown how TL can be effective in rural (Cherkowski & Schnellert, 2017; Lotter et al., 2019), suburban (Irby et al., 2019; Lac & Diamond, 2019), and urban schools (Muchmore, 2004; Scribner & Bradley-Levine, 2010) in the United States. However, previous studies have focused on one specific context. The study presented in this article was able to compare across multiple contexts. It is critical that policymakers understand the current state of TL so that appropriate measures can be taken to support TL, which has the potential to serve as a step toward remedying some of the harms associated with schooling. In Nevada, there appears to be a need for more resources and support for TL in high-income, rural, and predominantly White schools. Further research needs to be conducted to further understand how TL is enacted in similar and dissimilar schools across individual states to build on current comparative studies in TL.

References

- Ainley, J., & Carstens, R. (2018). *Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) 2018 conceptual framework*. OECD education working papers no. 187. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. doi:10.1787/799337c2-en
- Alyami, R., & Floyd, A. (2019). Female school leaders' perceptions and experiences of decentralisation and distributed leadership in the Tatweer system in Saudi Arabia. *Education Sciences*, 9(1), 25. doi:10.3390/educsci9010025

- Anderson, K.D. (2002). Changing roles and teacher leadership in schools. *Rural Educator*, 23(3), 1–6.
- Angelle, P.S. (2010). An organizational perspective of distributed leadership: A portrait of a middle school. *RMLE Online: Research in Middle Level Education*, 33(5), 1–16. doi:10.1080/19404476.2010.11462068
- Arden, C., & Okoko, J.M. (2022). Exploring cross-cultural understandings of teacher leadership: A phenomenological study. In C.F. Webber (Ed.), *Teacher leadership in international contexts* (pp. 51–84). Springer. doi:10.1007/978-3-031-25763-6_3
- Arends, D., & Kilcher, A. (2010). *Teaching for student learning: Becoming an accomplished teacher*. Routledge.
- Atchison, B., Diffey, L., Rafa, A., & Sarubbi, M. (2017). *Equity in education: Key questions to consider*. Education Commission of the States.
- Berg, J.H. (2021). To lead for equity, learn from teachers. *The Learning Professional*. <https://learningforward.org/journal/leading-for-equity/to-lead-for-equity-learn-from-teachers/> [October 11, 2024].
- Berg, J.H., Carver, C.L., & Mangin, M.M. (2014). Teacher leader model standards: Implications for preparation, policy, and practice. *Journal of Research on Leadership in Education*, 9(2), 195–217. doi:10.1177/1942775113507714
- Berg, J.H., & Parad, B.D. (2024). Advancing equity through instructional leadership teams: A theoretical model. *Urban Education*. doi:10.1177/004208592412447
- Bradley-Levine, J. (2018). Advocacy as a practice of critical teacher leadership. *Journal of Teacher Leadership*, 9(1), 47–62.
- Bradley-Levine, J. (2022). *Promoting teacher advocacy as critical teacher leadership*. Routledge.
- Brooks, J.S., Normore, A.H., Jean-Marie, G., & Hodgins, D.W. (2007). Distributed leadership for social justice: Influence and equity in an urban high school. *Journal of School Leadership*, 17(4), 378–408. doi:10.1177/194277510900400103
- Chen, J. (2022). Understanding teacher leaders' behaviours: Development and validation of the Teacher Leadership Inventory. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 50(4), 630–648.
- Cherkowski, S., & Schnellert, L. (2017). Exploring teacher leadership in a rural, secondary school: Reciprocal learning teams as a catalyst for emergent leadership. *International Journal of Teacher Leadership*, 8(1), 6–25.
- Cheung, R., Reinhardt, T., Stone, E., & Warren Little, J. (2018). Defining teacher leadership: A framework. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 100(3), 38–44.
- Choi, S. (2023). Distributed leadership promotes teacher self-efficacy in multicultural classrooms through school capacity building: A multilevel SEM approach using U.S. teaching and learning international survey. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 59(4), 811–844. doi:10.1177/0013161X231189196
- 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
- Cooper, K.S., Stanulis, R.N., Brondyk, S.K., Hamilton, E.R., Macaluso, M., & Meier, J.A. (2016). The teacher leadership process: Attempting change within embedded systems. *Journal of Educational Change*, 17, 85–113. doi:10.1007/s10833-015-9262-4
- Crowther, F., Kaagen, S.S., Ferguson, M., & Hann, L. (2002). *Developing teacher leaders: How teacher leadership enhances school success*. Corwin Press.
- D'Amico, D., Pawlewicz, R.J., Earley, P.M., & McGeehan, A.P. (2017). Where are all the black teachers? Discrimination in the teacher labor market. *Harvard Educational Review*, 87(1), 26–49. doi:10.17763/1943-5045-87.1.26
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Friedlander, D. (2008). Creating excellent and equitable schools. *Educational Leadership*, 65(8), 14–21.
- Desimone, L.M., & Pak, K. (2017). Instructional coaching as high-quality professional development. *Theory into Practice*, 56(1), 3–12. doi:10.1080/00405841.2016.1241947
- Dimmock, C., & Walker, A. (2000). Developing comparative and international educational leadership and management: A cross-cultural model. *School Leadership & Management*, 20(2), 143–160. doi:10.1080/13632430050011399

- Eckert, J. (2019). Collective leadership development: Emerging themes from urban, suburban, and rural high schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 55(3), 477–509.
- Ellis, N.J., Alonzo, D., & Nguyen, H.T.M. (2020). Elements of a quality pre-service teacher mentor: A literature review. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 92, 103072. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2020.103072
- Engle, J. Xia, J., & Butler, S.J. (2024). Teacher leadership, wellbeing, and intent to leave in US rural schools: Evidence from the 2020–21 National Teacher and Principal Survey. *Education Sciences*, 14(7), 758. doi:10.3390/educsci14070758
- Evans, R. (1996). *The human side of school change*. Jossey-Bass.
- Farley-Ripple, E.N., & Burrtram, J.L. (2014). Developing collaborative data use through professional learning communities. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 42, 41–53. doi:10.1016/j.stueduc.2013.09.006
- Fletcher, J.K., & Käufer, K. (2003). Shared leadership: Paradox and possibility. In C.L. Pearce & J. A. Conger (Eds.), *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership* (pp. 21–47). Sage.
- Frymier, J. (1987). Bureaucracy and the neutering of teachers. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 69(1), 8–14. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20403522>
- Galey, S. (2016). The evolving role of instructional coaches in U.S. policy contexts. *The William & Mary Educational Review*, 4(2), 54–71. <https://scholarworks.wm.edu/wmer/vol4/iss2/11> [January 22, 2025].
- Ginns, I., Heirdsfield, A., Atweh, B., & Watters, J.J. (2001). Beginning teachers becoming professionals through action research. *Educational Action Research*, 9(1), 111–133. doi:10.1080/09650790100200140
- Gurr, D. (2024). Teacher and middle leader research: Considerations and possibilities. *Education Sciences*, 14, 875. doi:10.3390/educsci14080875
- Hallinger, P., & Kovačević, J. (2021). Science mapping the knowledge base in educational leadership and management: A longitudinal bibliometric analysis, 1960 to 2018. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 49(1), 5–30. doi:10.1177/1741143219859002
- Harris, A. (2003). Distributed leadership in schools: Leading or misleading? *Management in Education*, 16(5), 10–13. doi:10.1177/089202060301600504
- Harris, A. (2004). Distributed leadership for school improvement: Leading or misleading. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 32(1), 11–24. doi:10.1177/1741143204039297
- Harris, A. (2005). Teacher leadership: More than just a feel-good factor? *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 4(3), 201–219. doi:10.1080/15700760500244777
- Harris, A. (2007). Distributed leadership: Conceptual confusion and empirical evidence. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 10(3), 315–325. doi:10.1080/13603120701257313
- Harrison, C., & Killion, J. (2007). Ten roles for teacher leaders. *Educational Leadership*, 65(1), 74–77.
- Hartley, D. (2009). Education policy, distributed leadership and socio-cultural theory. *Educational Review*, 61, 139–150. doi:10.1080/00131910902844721
- Heck, R., & Hallinger, P. (2010). Testing a longitudinal model of distributed leadership effects on school improvement. *Leadership Quarterly*, 21, 867–885.
- Heikka, J., Pitkaniemi, H., Kettukangas, T., & Hyttinen, T. (2021). Distributed pedagogical leadership and teacher leadership in early childhood education contexts. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 24(3), 333–348. doi:10.1080/13603124.2019.1623923
- Hinkle, D.E., Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S.G. (2003). *Applied statistics for the behavioral sciences*. Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Hobson, A.J., & Maxwell, B. (2020). Mentoring substructures and superstructures: An extension and reconceptualization of the architecture for teacher mentoring. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 46(2), 184–206. doi:10.1080/02607476.2020.1724653
- Hobson, A.J., Ashby, P., Malderez, A., & Tomlinson, P.D. (2009). Mentoring beginning teachers: What we know and what we don't. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25(1), 207–216. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2008.09.001

- Hulpia, H., Devos, G., & Rosseel, Y. (2009). The relationship between the perception of distributed leadership in secondary schools and teachers' and teacher leaders' job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 20(3), 291–317. doi:10.1080/09243450902909840
- Hulpia, H., Devos, G., & Rosseel, Y. (2012). Dimensions of distributed leadership and the impact on teachers' organizational commitment: A study in secondary education. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 42(7), 1745–1784. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2012.00917.x
- Hunzicker, J. (2017). From teacher to teacher leader: A conceptual model. *International Journal of Teacher Leadership*, 8(2), 1–26.
- Hunzicker, J. (2022). Equity-focused teacher leadership: Using equity audits to positively influence socioeconomic disparities. In N. Bond (Ed.), *The power of teacher leaders: Their roles, influence, and impact*, (pp.197–212). Routledge.
- Irby, D.J., Drame, E., Clough, C., & Croom, M. (2019). “Sometimes things get worse before they get better”: A counter-narrative of white suburban school leadership for racial equity. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 18(2), 195–209. doi:10.1080/15700763.2019.1611869
- Jacobs, J., Beck, B., & Crowell, L. (2014). Teacher leaders as equity-centered change agents: Exploring the conditions that influence navigating change to promote educational equity. *Professional Development in Education*, 40(4), 576–596. doi:10.1080/19415257.2014.896272
- Jacobs, J., Gordon, S.P., & Solis, R. (2016). Critical issues in teacher leadership: A national look at teachers' perception. *Journal of School Leadership*, 26(3), 374–406. doi:10.1177/105268461602600301
- Jay, J.K., & Johnson, K.L. (2002). Capturing complexity: A typology of reflective practice for teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18(1), 73–85. doi:10.1016/S0742-051X(01)00051-8
- Jewell, M.J. (2007). What does mentoring mean to experienced teachers? A phenomenological interview study. *The Teacher Educator*, 42(4), 289–303. doi:10.1080/08878730709555408
- Kane, B.D., & Rosenquist, B. (2018). Making the most of instructional coaches. *Kappan*, 99(7), 21–25.
- Knight, J., & van Nieuwerburgh, C. (2012). Instructional coaching: A focus on practice. *Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice*, 5(2), 100–112. doi:10.1080/17521882.2012.707668
- Korthagen, F., & Vasalos, A. (2005). Levels in reflection: Core reflection as a means to enhance professional growth. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 11(1), 47–71. doi:10.1080/1354060042000337093
- Lac, V., & Diamond, J. (2019). Working for racial equity at the margins: Teacher-leaders facilitate a book study on race in a predominantly white suburban high school. *Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership*, 22(2), 54–67. doi:10.1177/1555458919833107
- Lambert, L. (2002). A framework for shared leadership. *Educational leadership*, 59(8), 37–40.
- Lárusdóttir, S.H., & O'Connor, E. (2021). School leadership for social justice. *Journal of Educational Leadership & Policy Studies*, 5, 1–24. doi:10.1108/09578231011067767
- Lindahl, R. (2008). Shared leadership: Can it work in schools? *The Educational Forum*, 72(4), 298–307. doi:10.1080/00131720802361894
- Lotter, C., Yow, J.A., Lee, M., Zeis, J.G., & Irvin, M.J. (2019). Rural teacher leadership in science and mathematics. *School Science and Mathematics*, 1(20), 29–44. doi:10.1111/ssm.12383
- Lovely, S.D. (2005). Making the leap to shared leadership. *Journal of Staff Development*, 26(2), 16–21.
- Mangin, M., & Ross, C. (2022). Informal teacher leadership: Reculturing schools and the profession. In N. Bond (Ed.), *The power of teacher leaders: Their roles, influence, and impact*. 2nd ed. (pp. 7–21). Routledge. doi:10.4324/9781003123972-3
- Marsh, J.A., Bertrand, M., & Huguet, A. (2015). Using data to alter instructional practice: The mediating role of coaches and professional learning communities. *Teachers College Record*, 117(4), 1–40. doi:10.1177/016146811511700411

- Marsh, J.A., McCombs, J.S., & Martorell, F. (2010). How instructional coaches support data-driven decision making. *Educational Policy*, 24(6), 872–907. doi:10.1177/0895904809341467
- Maxcy, B.D., & Nguyen, T.S. (2006). The politics of distributing leadership: Re-considering leadership distribution in two Texas elementary schools. *Educational Policy*, 20(1), 163–196. doi:10.1177/0895904805285375
- Miller, H., McCardle, T., Zuccaro, E., & Worlds, M. (2022). Beyond managerial and bureaucratic: Developing teacher leaders for social justice. In N. Bond (Ed.), *The power of teacher leaders: Their roles, influence, and impact* (pp. 144–154). Routledge.
- Milner, H.R., Laughter, J., & Childs, J. (2015). Developing teacher leadership for equity in urban schools. In M. Khalifa, C. Grant-Overton, N.W. Arnold, & A.F. Osanloo (Eds.), *Handbook of urban educational leadership* (pp. 86–90). Rowman & Littlefield.
- Muchmore, J.A., Cooley, V.E., Marx, G.E., & Crowell, R.A. (2004). Enhancing teacher leadership in urban education: The Oak Park experience. *Educational Horizons*, 82(3), 236–244. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/42926504>
- Muijs, D. & Harris, A. (2007). Teacher leadership in (in) action: Three case studies of contrasting schools. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 35(1), 111–134. doi:10.1177/1741143207071387
- Muñoz, M.A., & Branham, K.E. (2016). Professional learning communities focusing on results and data-use to improve student learning: The right implementation matters. *Planning and Changing*, 47(1/2), 37–46.
- Nguyen, D., Harris, A., & Ng, D. (2020). A review of the empirical research on teacher leadership (2003-2017). *Journal of Educational Administration*, 58(1), 60–80. doi:10.1108/JEA-02-2018-0023
- Nieto, S. (2005). *Why we teach*. Teachers College Press.
- Pan, H-L.W., Wiens, P.D., & Moyal, A. (2023). A bibliometric analysis of the teacher leadership scholarship. *Teaching and Teacher Education*. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2022.103936
- Pineda-Báez, C., Fierro-Evans, C., & Gratacós, G. (2022) The role of teamwork in the development of teacher leadership: A cross-cultural analysis from Colombia, Mexico, and Spain. In C.F. Webber (Ed.), *Teacher Leadership in International Contexts* (pp. 109–141). Springer. doi:10.1007/978-3-031-25763-6_5
- Poekert, P., Alexandrou, A., & Shannon, D. (2016). How teachers become leaders: An internationally validated theoretical model of teacher leadership development. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, 21(4), 307–349. doi:10.1080/13596748.2016.1226559
- Pounder, P. (2006). Transformational classroom leadership: The fourth wave of teacher leadership? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 34(4), 533–545.
- Printy, S.M., & Marks, H.M. (2006). Shared leadership for teacher and student learning. *Theory Into Practice*, 45(2), 125–132. doi:10.1207/s15430421tip4502_4
- Rosenshine, B. (2012). Principles of instruction: Research-based strategies that all teachers should know. *American Educator*, 36(1), 12–39.
- Sands, S. (2024). *Democratic policymaking in schools: The influence of teacher empowerment on student achievement*. (EdWorkingPaper: 24-989). Retrieved from Annenberg Institute at Brown University. doi:10.26300/m3mz-ga88
- Schott, C., van Roekel, H., & Tummers, L.G. (2020). Teacher leadership: A systematic review, methodological quality assessment and conceptual framework. *Educational Research Review*, 31, 100–352. doi:10.1016/j.edurev.2020.100352
- Scribner, S.M.P., & Bradley-Levine, J. (2010). The meaning(s) of teacher leadership in an urban high school reform. *Education Administration Quarterly*, 46(4), 491–522. doi:10.1177/0013161X10383831
- Shanks, R., Tonna, M.A., Krøjgaard, F., Paaske, K.A., Robson, D., & Bjerkholt, E. (2022). A comparative study of mentoring new teachers. *Professional Development in Education*, 48(5), 751–765. doi:10.1080/19415257.2020.1744684
- Shen, J., Wu, H., Reeves, P., Zheng, Y., Ryan, R., & Anderson, D. (2020). The association between teacher leadership and student achievement: A meta-analysis. *Educational Research Reviews*, 31(1–19). doi:10.1016/j.edurev.2020.100357

- Shen, J., Moyal, A., & Wiens, P., & Zhang, S. (2025). Principal-teacher gaps in school climate perception and their impact on teacher job satisfaction in U.S context: A self-other agreement theory perspective. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*. doi:10.1080/15700763.2025.2481220
- Silva, D.Y., Gimbert, B., & Nolan, J. (2000). Sliding the doors: Locking and unlocking possibilities for teacher leadership. *Teachers College Record*, 102(4), 779–804.
- Sinha, S., & Hanuscin, D.L. (2017). Development of teacher leadership identity: A multiple case study. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 63, 356–371. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2017.01.004
- Spillane, J.P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J.B. (2001). Investigating school leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Educational Researcher*, 30(3), 23–28. doi:10.3102/0013189X030003023
- Tejeiro, F. (2024). Distributed leadership and inclusive schools. *International Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*. 12(1), 36–56. doi:10.17583/ijelm.10997
- Tsai, K.C. (2015). A preliminary meta-analysis of teacher leadership. *Journal of Education and Literature*, 3(3), 131–137.
- United States Census Bureau. (2024). QuickFacts: Washoe County, Nevada; Clark County, Nevada; Nevada. <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/washoecountynevada,clarkcountynevada,NV/PST045223>
- Webber, C.F. (2023). Teacher leaders: Cautions and questions. In C.F. Webber (Eds.), *Teacher leadership in international contexts* (pp. 345–348). Springer.
- Webber, C.F., Conway, J.M., & van der Vyver, C.P. (2022). International study of teacher leadership: A rationale and theoretical framework. In C.F. Webber (Ed.), *Teacher Leadership in International Contexts* (pp. 27–50). Springer.
- Wenner, J.A., & Campbell, T. (2017). The theoretical and empirical basis of teacher leadership: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 87(1), 134–171. doi: 10.3102/0034654316653478
- Wiens, P.D., & Beck, J.S. (2022). But are they good teachers? Examining who takes up teacher leadership and how their instruction differs from their peers. *School Leadership & Management*, 42(4), 381–401. doi:10.1080/13632434.2022.2111413
- Wiens, P., Metcalf, K., & Skousen, J. (2024). Understanding teacher leadership: A survey of the field. *Research in Educational Administration & Leadership*, 9(4), 585–618. doi: 10.30828/real.1492398
- Wiens, P.D., Calkins, L., & Skousen, J. (2025a). Examining teacher leadership in the United States: How do BIPOC teachers and white teachers in urban environments experience shared leadership? *Urban Education*, 60(8), 2223–2248. doi:10.1177/00420859231198171
- Wiens, P.D., Vongkulluksn, V., Beck, J., & Pearson, B. (2025b). Understanding teacher leadership: Development and testing of the Survey of Teacher Leadership. *Social Sciences and Humanities Open*. doi:10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.101738
- York-Barr, J., & Duke, K. (2004). What do we know about teacher leadership? Findings from two decades of scholarship. *Review of Educational Research*, 74(3), 255–316. doi:10.3102%2F00346543074003255
- Zeichner, K.M., & Liston, D.P. (2013). *Reflective teaching: An introduction*. Routledge.