

EFFECTS OF COLLEGIAL PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP
AND TRUST ON COLLABORATION
AND TEACHER ROLE STRESS

by

MARLA MUCCI WILLIAMS

C. JOHN TARTER, COMMITTEE CHAIR
ROXANNE MITCHELL
DAVE DAGLEY
JOHN DANTZLER
JING PING SUN

A DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the
Department of Educational Leadership,
Policy, and Technology Studies
in the Graduate School of
The University of Alabama

TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

2015

Copyright Marla Mucci Williams 2015
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

This study examined the relationships between collegial principal leadership, trust in the principal, collaboration, and teacher role stress in rural and urban schools in North Alabama. The sample was initially comprised of schools with K-6 grade configurations, later expanded to include a variety of configurations that had a fourth grade. A total of 60 schools of varying grade configurations agreed to participate in this research and 1,665 teachers voluntarily completed surveys. The four instruments used in this study were the Collaboration Survey, and the Teacher Role Stress Survey, the Omnibus Trust Scale, and the Organizational Climate Index (OCI). Specific subsets were used from the first three instruments for this study. Of the three subsets in the Collaboration Survey, only the Collaboration with Principal and Collaboration Among Teacher Colleagues subscales were included. From the Omnibus Trust Scale, only the Faculty Trust in Principal subscale was included. The Collegial Principal Leadership subscale of the Organizational Climate Index (OCI) was also included.

The findings supported the hypotheses. Collegial principal leadership and trust in the principal were significant predictors of collaboration, but only collegial principal leadership made a unique contribution toward collaboration in multiple regressions. As predicted, trust in the principal and collegial principal leadership were inversely related to teacher role stress, with only trust in the principal making a unique contribution. Collaboration also had a significant inverse relationship to teacher role stress. Controlling for SES in multiple regressions did not demonstrate any significant differences in the data.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are several people who I need to thank for their support and encouragement as I pursued my doctoral degree. First, I would like to thank The University of Alabama professors who guided me through the dissertation process and served on my committee: Dr. John Tarter, Dr. Roxanne Mitchell, Dr. John Dantzler, Dr. David Dagley, and Dr. Jing Ping Sun. Your experience, knowledge, and guidance have helped me beyond measure and I am truly thankful to know each one of you. I would especially like to thank Dr. Tarter and Dr. Mitchell for your dedication to my research and for the countless hours you both spent answering questions, advising, and calming my nerves. I will be forever thankful to you both.

Next, I must thank my dissertation group: Tina Blankenship, Paige Terry, Les Abston, Jon Bret Smith, and Gina Baggett. I have truly loved every minute of our stressful times together. I wish each of you the best of luck with your future endeavors.

I would also like to acknowledge my parents, Giovanni and Bobbie Mucci. Dad, thank you for the many sacrifices you made so that your children could live and thrive in this country. Thank you for pushing me to go as far as I could in my education and for instilling in me the work ethic to do it. Mom, thank you for your fierce, protective nature and blunt advice. I always knew that you had my back but would be the first to straighten me out. I will be forever thankful to have been your daughter. I wish we could have had more time together. I love and miss you both.

To my twin sister, Carla McPeters, I give many thanks for always being there with your handy calculator when the statistics got a little too deep. You have been my math guru since 9th grade and I do not know how you put up with me. Thank you little sister!

I need to extend gratitude to a few members of my immediate family. To my boys, Wyatt and Sam, thank you for giving me the time and space I needed to work on this degree and thank you for knowing when I needed to be distracted. I may not have acted like it then, but I am so thankful for the countless spontaneous hugs, for always making me laugh at inappropriate times, and for running out of the room when I gave you both the angry stare. I am terribly proud of both of you and so honored to be your mom. I love you both to the moon and beyond.

Finally, I would like to thank my husband and high school sweetheart, Jason, for your unconditional love, encouragement, and support. Your faith in me is both humbling and inspiring. You never swayed from your belief that I could complete this degree, but I know without a doubt that I could not have done this without you. You are my rock and I will always be thankful you glanced my way our senior year of high school. I love you. I am now quite ready to go buy that RV and hit the road.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

α	Cronbach's Alpha of internal validity
β	Beta
df	Degree of freedom
M	Mean
P	A probability that is associated with an occurrence of the null hypothesis of a value which can be as extreme as or even more extreme than the observed value
r	Pearson's Product Correlation
t	Computed value of a t-test
$<$	Less than
$=$	Equal to

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	x
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	1
Background of the Study	1
Statement of the Problem	3
Purpose of the Study.....	5
Significance of the Study.....	6
Statement of Research Questions	7
Definition of Concepts.....	7
Limitations.....	8
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	10
Conceptual Framework.....	10
Collaboration	10
Teacher Role Stress	12
Early Research on Teacher Role Stress.....	13
Role Conflict.....	15
Role Ambiguity	18
Role Overload.....	19

Trust	20
Trust Scales.....	22
Five Facets of Trust.....	22
Collegial Trust.....	25
Collegial Principal Leadership	27
Theoretical Framework.....	30
Rationale and Hypotheses	31
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY.....	33
Overview	33
Design of Research.....	33
Data Sample.....	34
Data Collection Procedures	34
Instrumentation.....	34
Collaboration	35
Teacher Role Stress	36
Role Conflict.....	36
Role Ambiguity	36
Role Overload.....	37
Trust.....	37
Collegial Principal Leadership	38
Data Analysis.....	38
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS	39
Descriptives	39

Sample	39
Measures	40
Reliability	41
Correlations	42
Hypotheses Testing.....	43
Unhypothesized Findings	46
Summary.....	47
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION OF RESULTS	48
Statement of Findings.....	48
Theoretical Implications	49
Significance of Study.....	49
Collegial Principal Leadership	49
Trust in the Principal	51
Collaboration	52
Unhypothesized Findings	52
Practical Implications	53
Recommendations for Future Research.....	56
REFERENCES	58
APPENDICES	66
A. Collaboration Survey	66
B. Role Ambiguity, Role Conflict, and Role Overload Survey	67
C. Omnibus Trust Scale	68
D. Organizational Climate Index.....	69

E.	IRB Approval	70
F.	Principal Informed Consent.....	71
G.	Teacher Informed Consent	72

LIST OF TABLES

1.	Summary of School Configuration.....	40
2.	Descriptive Statistics of the Measures.....	41
3.	Cronbach’s Alpha for Study Variables.....	42
4.	Correlations (Pearson) Among All Variables.....	43
5.	Regression Coefficients Examining Collegial Principal Leadership and Trust in the Principal on Collaboration	44
6.	Regression Coefficients Examining Collegial Principal Leadership and Trust in the Principal on Teacher Role Stress.....	45
7.	Regression Coefficients Examining Collaboration on Teacher Role Stress	46
8.	Regression of Teacher Role Stress on Collaboration, Trust in the Principal, Collegial Principal Leadership and SES.....	46

CHAPTER I:

INTRODUCTION

This study is an investigation of collaboration, teacher role stress, trust, and collegial principal leadership. This chapter offers a background of the study, statement of the problem, and the purpose and significance of the research. Research questions are introduced and key concepts related to the research are defined. Finally, the limitations are discussed.

Background of the Study

Teaching is a difficult task and has slowly evolved from one-room autonomy into a professional community effort. This evolution was quickened by the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*, which transformed how schools provide instruction to all students. As schools began restructuring classroom practices, the organizational culture of schools evolved. Principals, teachers, and resource staff began the tedious task of identifying and implementing the latest instructional strategies to promote adequate yearly progress. Collaboration is necessary in order to meet the needs of all students.

Collaborative practices allow teachers and administrators opportunities to support and challenge each other through continual dialogue. Slavin (1995) identified collaborative practices as fostering the social cohesion in groups by improving social skills and attitudes through teamwork activities. Collaborative practices provide opportunities for teachers to establish relationships in order to share ideas, beliefs about teaching, and effective instructional practices (Musanti & Pence, 2010). Lieberman and Miller (2008) suggested collaboration “requires a commitment to time and to the conditions that support collegiality and trust” (p. 19).

Collaboration may challenge the professional autonomy expected by many teachers, thereby creating teacher role stress. Kahn and Quinn (1970) defined role stress as “anything about an organizational role that produces adverse consequences for the individual” (p. 41). Once solitary figures of authority in the classroom, teachers are now part of the collective effort and must consider differing perspectives and strategies from not only the principal, but also all stakeholders. Moving away from the norms of the familiar classroom environment into a collaborative situation may generate higher levels of uncertainty for those involved (Kahn et al., 1964). According to Achinstein (2002), “teachers, individually and collectively, hold values that shape their practice” (p. 427). Collaboration can be stressful, particularly when each collaborative member has expertise in differing areas of instruction and must now work with other instructional professionals with varying areas and levels of expertise to provide educational opportunities for students. Disagreements between individuals are natural elements of collaboration and are likely to occur in many levels of the organization (Uline, Tschannen-Moran, & Perez, 2003).

Faculty trust and collegial principal leadership are characteristics that may affect collaborative practices in schools (Tschannen-Moran, 2001). Tschannen-Moran (2001) completed a study on the relationship between collaboration and trust in schools. Findings of this research identified a “reciprocal relationship between collaboration and trust” and stressed the “importance of trust in nurturing collaborative relationships” (p. 326). When teachers have open and honest professional interactions with each other and the principal, they are more likely to develop higher levels of trust that may strengthen instructional practices. As higher levels of trust build and strengthen professional relationships, teacher stress may be reduced.

Collegial principal leadership promotes collaboration and trust among colleagues through enabling and supportive leadership styles (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001; Bryk & Schneider, 2003). This form of leadership has evolved from the traditional isolated, regimented role to a more structuring, directive, enabling, and open style of leadership (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001). Collegial principal leaders promote collaborative practices by sharing leadership responsibilities with teachers. Teachers may become stressed when they perceive their environmental demands as threatening and have no process for coping with those demands (Steinhardt et al., 2011, p. 421). Collegial leaders seek teacher input on the decisions that directly affect them. When teachers see their ideas and suggestions valued and acknowledged, trust builds and alleviates some levels of teacher role stress.

Statement of the Problem

Collaboration changes the role of the teacher by reducing the autonomy of the role. Schools are staffed with a collection of individuals brought together to achieve a nine-month goal to improve student learning. Hoy and Miskel (2008) described the staffing as quickly becoming “more than the sum of the individuals composing it” and that “behavior will be determined not only by the formal expectations of the school but also by the informal organization that spontaneously emerges as the participants interact” (p. 98). Isolated instructional practices are being replaced with collaborative learning environments in the classroom and in professional teacher learning communities.

Educators must make a variety of complex decisions regarding student instruction in a collaborative environment. Regular educational classroom teachers, who once controlled most aspects of their working environment, now must work collectively with others in the decision-making process. Inclusion brings changes in schools (Winn & Blanton, 2005). Special

educators and regular educators are required to collaborate in respect to student needs and disabilities (Griffin, Kilgore, Winn, & Otis-Wilburn, 2008). Principals, reading coaches, special education teachers, English Language Learner (ELL) teachers, and gifted teachers now have some form of control over a teacher's classroom and the decisions that are made which affect instructional practice and student learning. Within the authoritative struggle lies the problem. Individual expertise and instructional specialization vie for control over classroom instructional practices. Bacharach, Bamberger, and Mitchell (1990) elaborated,

Teachers, as professionals, expect to be recognized as possessing expertise, earning them the right to a high level of work autonomy, the ability to both regulate themselves, and to be highly involved in decision making. The rights that professional expect, however, are often in conflict with their roles as members of a bureaucratic organization. (p. 417)

Disagreements may arise as each individual attempts to exercise control over his or her area of expertise or specialization. Achinstein (2002) noted that disagreements between individuals can arise when differing beliefs and actions become exposed. With so many educators involved in collaborative efforts, uncertainty in role identity may "blur expectations and minimize predictability, placing workers in a turbulent work environment" (Bacharach, Bamberger, & Mitchell, 1990, p. 417). Beck (1974) found that "conflict in elementary schools is an ever-increasing state of affairs given the appropriate changes in school size, teaching specialization, and authority centralization" (p. 527).

Prior research has suggested that collaboration is a key component for successful working relationships across specialized educational boundaries. According to Musanti and Pence (2010), teachers must move from traditional isolated roles and create "networks of relationships through which they may reflectively share their practice, revisit beliefs on teaching and learning,

and co-construct knowledge” (p. 74). This shift requires dedicated professionals recognizing each other’s expertise and perceptions about their roles in the school and classroom.

Collaboration involves sharing resources and responsibilities for student achievement outcomes. Teacher growth rarely happens in isolation and collaboration offers opportunities for teachers to establish networks of relationships in order to share ideas and beliefs on teaching and learning (Musanti & Pence, 2010). Achinstein (2002) considered collaboration as part of a teacher professional community where “a group of people across a school who are engaged in common work; share to a certain degree a set of values, norms, and orientations towards teaching, students, and schooling; and operate collaboratively with structures that foster interdependence” (p. 421). According to Tschannen-Moran (2001), collaboration is “the extent to which teachers perceived themselves and parents to be not only involved but to exercise influence over school and classroom-level decisions” (p. 317). Uline, Tschannen-Moran, and Perez (2003) determined that “differences of opinion, individual difference, outside influences, even active discord all have the capacity to inform and advance our collective efforts” (p. 782). Influence is the key. The problem becomes how to effectively implement successful collaboration between faculty and staff.

Purpose of the Study

Previous studies suggest collegial principal leadership and trust are positively associated with effective collaborative practices (Tschannen-Moran, 2009; Hoy & Miskel, 2008; Hoy, Sabo & Barnes, 1996). One purpose of this study was to test the effects of collegial principal leadership and trust in improving collaborative practices in elementary schools. A second purpose was to test the relationship of collegial leadership, trust in the principal, and collaboration to role conflict. According to Bacharach et al. (1990), much research has been

conducted concerning role stress of professionals, but very few have examined “role stress among members of the largest profession in the public sector: teachers” (p. 416). These stressors include role conflict, role ambiguity, and role overload. This study aimed to contribute to current research by identifying variables which may effectively improve collaboration among teachers and staff as well as identifying the relationship between collaboration and teacher role stress.

Significance of the Study

Alabama schools, currently in rigorous state-wide reform to meet the requirements of the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* and the *Alabama Reading Initiative*, are constantly seeking ways to improve effective instructional strategies in order to produce academic growth each year for all students. Ongoing collaboration in schools can align learning goals, instruction, and support (DiPaola, Tschannen-Moran, & Walther-Thomas, 2004). Research has also shown that schools based on models of collaboration and organizational citizenship can cultivate productivity and efficiency more than schools operating in a hierarchical manner (DiPaola, Tschannen-Moran, & Walther-Thomas, 2004). According to Uline, Miller, and Tschannen-Moran (1998), “when teachers are supported by their superiors as well as their colleagues, they are likely to experiment and take risks to improve the quality of instruction” (p. 471). Student achievement is typically the main goal for schools and healthy interpersonal relations have been linked to higher student achievement (Hoy, Tarter, & Bliss, 1990). This study contributes to the current research by determining whether collegial principal leadership and trust positively influence teacher collaboration and reduce teacher role stress.

Statement of Research Questions

Quantitative research questions relate independent variables to dependent variables (Creswell, 2009). The research questions that guided this study address the relationship between collegial principal leadership, trust in the principal, collaboration, and teacher role stress. They include the following:

1. What is the relationship of collegial principal leadership and trust in the principal to collaboration;
2. What is the relationship of collegial principal leadership and trust in the principal to teacher role stress; and
3. What is the relationship of collaboration to teacher role stress?

The theoretical answers to these research questions, which are elaborated in Chapter II, were tested using the following hypotheses:

- H1: Collegial principal leadership and trust in the principal are individually and collectively correlated with and predictive of collaboration.
- H2: Collegial principal leadership and trust in the principal are individually and collectively inversely related to and predictive of teacher role stress.
- H3: Collaboration is inversely related to and predictive of teacher role stress.

Definition of Concepts

Collaboration is “the extent to which teachers perceived themselves and parents to be not only involved but to exercise influence over school and classroom-level decisions” (Tschannen-Moran, 2001, p. 317).

Role stress is “anything about an organizational role that produces adverse consequences for the individual” (Kahn & Quinn, 1970, p. 41).

Role ambiguity is “the lack of clear, consistent information regarding rights, duties, and responsibilities of a person’s occupation and how they can be best performed” (Schwab & Iwanicki, 1982, p. 62).

Role conflicts are “incompatible role expectations from organizational members” (Conley & Woosley, 2000, p. 182).

Role overload is “an incompatibility between work demands and the time available to fulfill those demands” (Conley & Woosley, 2000, p. 187).

Trust is “an individual’s or group’s willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the confidence that the latter party is benevolent, reliable, competent, honest, and open” (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999, p. 189).

Collegial principal leadership is the “principal behavior directed toward meeting both social needs of the faculty and achieving the goals of the school” (Hoy, Smith, & Sweetland, 2002, p. 42).

Limitations

Approximately 60 public K-6 elementary schools in rural and urban areas of northern Alabama were selected to participate in this study. Schools were chosen due to proximity of researcher, but attempts were made to survey a reasonable number of teachers and principals in order to provide an adequate sample representative of the northern Alabama area. This sample does not attempt to represent the opinions of all teachers and principals in the entire state or region. Internal threats to validity include the fact that the sample is a cross-sectional study. Generalizing the results of this study to all elementary schools in the United States may be an

external threat to validity. A convenience sample was used as opposed to a random sample and completed surveys were the perceptions of the teachers completing the survey. It is possible that there are other explanations for the data results.

CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This section presents the research history and literature review of collaboration, teacher role stress, trust, and collegial principal leadership. A theoretical framework will describe how collegial principal leadership and trust in the principal reduce teacher role stress and influence collaboration between teachers and staff. Hypotheses were developed to test the theory.

Conceptual Framework

Collaboration

Recent school reform initiatives have pushed for more collaboration in schools. The 1997 and 2004 amendments to the IDEA (Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act) required placement of students with disabilities in general education classrooms to participate and progress in general education curriculum (Griffin, Kilgore, Winn, & Otis-Wilburn, 2008). The *No Child Left Behind Act* of 2001 set new guidelines for accountability of inclusive practices and participation of students with disabilities in the general education setting. Winn and Blanton (2005) suggested that “one of the major challenges regarding inclusion is the need for general and special education to work together” (p. 4). Special and general education teachers may face many hurdles for successful collaboration practices. Lack of common planning times, proper academic preparation, and poor communication are just a few of the factors, which may hinder effective collaboration (Henley, Milligan, McBride, Neal, Nichols, & Singleton, 2010). Effective collaborative practices may improve social skills and attitudes through teamwork activities, which foster the social cohesion of the group (Slavin, 1995).

Tschannen-Moran (2009) has purported that “schools need open communication to be effective, yet a bureaucratic hierarchy can have deleterious effect on the flow of communication” (p. 221). In the past, authority figures in schools have tended to use a command-and-control leadership style. The establishment of professional learning communities in schools has pushed rigid by-the-book rules and procedures to the side in favor of a collaborative and shared decision-making model. Friend and Cook (2006) defined collaboration in education as “co-equal professionals’ voluntarily co-planning to achieve common goals” (p. 60). Collaborative individuals share resources and decision-making responsibility (Carter, Prater, Jackson, & Marchant, 2009). Winn and Blanton (2005) suggested that “collaboration in teacher education by its nature, challenges faculty members to address and enrich their own grounding” (p. 8).

Tschannen-Moran (2001) described collaboration as “an important feature in the management of excellent schools” (p. 308). In order for collaboration to be successful, the maturity of the group must be considered. According to Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (1982), the maturity of the group is identified by “how well members know each other, their comfort with one another, and their ability to work constructively together” (p. 150). These group characteristics may affect group goals and activities (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1982).

Tschannen-Moran (2001) identified three collaborative processes in schools: 1) collaboration on school-level decisions between principal and teachers; 2) collaboration between teachers on classroom-level decisions; and 3) collaboration with parents (Tschannen-Moran, 2001, p. 317).

Collegial principal leadership is a vital component in effective collaborative settings. Principals, when open and accepting of teachers’ opinions and ideas, demonstrate effective collaboration practices and generate a level of trust and mutual respect. Hoy and Sweetland (2001) suggested that “administrators use their power and authority to buffer teachers and design

structures that facilitate teacher and learning” (p. 300). Ingersoll (1998) purported that “the distribution of power has a crucial impact on the degree of order or disorder and cohesion or disruption in schools” (p. 164).

Many times, however, teachers are often the ones responsible for determining the collaborative process. With some individuals, collaboration may simply mean sharing student data and setting proper accommodations for classroom instruction. Carter and her colleagues contend that “teachers may simply share information about their students rather than plan instructional adaptations and accommodations necessary for classroom success” if their collaborative practices lack structure (Carter et al., 2009, p. 61). According to DiPaola, Tschannen-Moran, and Walther-Thomas (2004), “through a process of ongoing collaboration, effective school teams reach an alignment between learning goals and instruction, effective progress monitoring, and appropriate student and teacher support” (p. 5). Tschannen-Moran (2001) summarized,

This sharing creates a situation of interdependence that participations will be motivated to avoid unless they trust their collaborative partners. Greater collaboration then holds the possibility of fostering greater trust as partners have experience with one another over time and have opportunities to witness benevolence, reliability, competence, honesty, and openness of their partners. (Tschannen-Moran, 2001, p. 315)

Kyriacou (2001) suggested that social sharing, or collaboration, can resolve some stress issues for teachers. Kyriacou (2001) stated that “simply sharing problems or engaging in some social activities with colleagues during break periods can effectively help dissipate the feelings of stress” (p. 31).

Teacher Role Stress

People experience various levels of stress daily. In an educational setting, stress is evident on many levels. Students, parents, teachers, and administrators all deal with stressful

situations and issues concerning student achievement, discipline, new educational policies and procedures, etc. Teachers are continually required to adapt to the constantly changing demands of a teaching position. Changes in curriculum requirements, state testing demands, individualized education plans for students, technology integration, and professional development are just a few of the stresses and strains required of today's classroom teachers. Heavy workloads, time-sensitive paperwork, and instructional documentation are also part of the daily demands of educators. According to Kahn and Quinn (1970), role stress is "anything about an organizational role that produces adverse consequences for the individual" (p. 41).

Early research on teacher role stress. Kyriacou and Sutcliffe (1977) were among the first researchers to use the terms "teacher stress" in the title of a research study (Kyriacou, 2011, p. 27). Kyriacou's research stemmed from his time as a teacher of mathematics in the United Kingdom in the early 1970s. Teachers in his district were paid a monetary "stress allowance" in an attempt to reduce the high rate of teacher turnover experienced in troubled and poverty-stricken schools (Kyriacou, 2011, p. 27). The term *stress* was generally used in research of the social sciences following Selye's (1956) research on psychological stress. In the 1960s and 1970s, research studies began to make references to teacher anxieties and job satisfaction, especially concerning student teachers (Kyriacou, 2011). In the late 1970s, research by Coates and Thoresen (1976) explored "potential sources of teacher anxiety" (Brown & Nasel, 2004, p. 34). Huberman's (1993) research in Switzerland involved over 160 high school teachers and compared the years of teaching experience to areas of concern or frustration that built as a teaching career evolved over time. Huberman (1993) reported that fatigue, frustration, and difficulties adapting to pupils were among the most common reasons teachers identified as reasons for ending their careers.

Early research on teacher stress suggests teachers tend to experience higher levels of stress than most professions (Coates & Thoresen, 1976; Kyriacou & Sutcliffe, 1979) with up to one-third of public school teachers citing teaching to be either a very stressful or an extremely stressful profession (Borg & Riding, 1991; Kyriacou, 2001; Steinhardt, Jagers, Faulk & Gloria, 2011). Darling-Hammond (2001) has suggested that approximately thirty percent of new teachers leave the profession within the first five years of teaching. Prior research has suggested that role stress is likely to affect various components of school effectiveness (Corwin, 1969; Kahn & Quinn, 1970; Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970; Conley & Woosley, 1999). Sutton (1984) has suggested that “job stress can have adverse effects on a schoolteacher’s psychological and physical well-being” (p. 7). Papastylianou, Kaila, and Polychronopoulos (2009) determined from studies in the field of teachers’ mental health that “many teachers experience negative emotions such as fear and anxiety, which are related to various psychological, physiological, and behavioral factors and are caused by teachers’ perception of their job situation” (p. 296).

The Transactional Model of Stress and Coping (Lazarus, 1966; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984) provides a framework for “the complex cognitive process that teachers undergo as they attempt to cope with the demands of work” (Steinhardt et al., 2011, p. 421). According to Steinhardt et al. (2011), “the experience of stress results when teachers appraise the environmental demands as threatening and feel they do not have the coping resources available to meet those demands” (p. 421). Principals, reading coaches, special education teachers, and technology specialists provide valuable direction and support for teachers through professional development and collaborative practices. Regardless, in any organization there can be “some sort of restriction in the flow of information” that can lead to confusion and “incongruities arising out of the perceptions of role requirements” (Bacharach, Bamberger, & Mitchell, 1990, p.

417). According to Conley and Woosley (1990) “role stress may thwart teachers from performing successfully, thus frustrating teachers who value the task attributes of enriched work” (p. 181). Teachers who are frustrated and emotionally exhausted tend to be indifferent or feel a lack of accomplishment at work (Maslach & Leiter, 2008). By successfully identifying and attempting to reduce teacher role stresses, it is likely administrators at the local and system level may increase teacher commitment to improving student achievement and the overall effectiveness of the organization. Sutton (1984) described the following example of teacher role stress:

Role demands may become stressful for a teacher when organizational members’ expectations about the teacher’s behavior are unclear (role ambiguity), when they are excessive (role overload), or when meeting one set of expectations make meeting other expectations more difficult (role conflict). (Sutton, 1984, p. 180)

Research studies have also cited time pressures, evaluations, dealing with colleagues, poor working conditions, role conflict, role ambiguity, and workload as sources of teacher stress (Borg, 1990; Travers & Cooper, 1996; Kyriacou, 2001; Brown & Nagel, 2004). For the purpose of this research study, three specific elements of teacher role stress were explored. They were role conflict, role ambiguity, and role overload.

Role conflict. Role conflict can be defined as “the simultaneous occurrence of two or more sets of pressures such that compliance with one would make compliance with the other more difficult” (Bacharach, Bamberger, & Mitchell, 1990, p. 417). People are in conflict when an individual’s behavior is interfering or obstructing to others (Tjosvold, 1997). Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman (1970) linked role conflict to incongruities of perceptions of individual role requirements and incompatibility of job demands. According to Rizzo et al. (1970), insufficient, inconsistent, and unclear information concerning role expectations may result in role conflict.

Eatough et al. (2011) suggested that employees, in an attempt to cope with conflict, “may try to bargain with the various sources of contradictory work expectations in order to meet all their demands” (p. 620).

Job structuring may be associated with high levels of role conflict in schools because the “attributes are likely to be perceived as incongruent with the autonomy that teachers expect as professionals” (Bacharach et al., 1990, p. 419). Regular education teachers are required to daily include instructional strategies for all students but must also follow the demands of different individualized educational plans for a variety of special education students as well as required strategies for students with low reading abilities. Special education teachers and reading coaches focus on individual student goals, not necessarily whole group instructional improvement. However, whole group instruction is left primarily up to the regular education teacher, with direction from instructional strategies mandated by special education teachers and reading coaches. Regardless of the direction of instruction, all three educators must work together on some level to promote student success.

According to Lynch and Ferguson (2010), implementation of literacy coaching in schools has preceded research on the practice. Reading coaches have been placed in schools with some limited administrative power over regular education teachers without the necessary administrative training. Many times, these reading coach positions are filled by fellow coworkers. Once a partner on the same professional level, the power over the direction of a reading program in classrooms is now administered by a new power position. Rogers and Rogers (2007) have suggested that the goal of literacy coaching in schools to be “to support the way teachers teach so that a teacher is able to work with increasingly flexibility and independence from the coach’s help” (p. 18). With any form of new positional power comes

resistance (Lynch & Ferguson, 2010). Elementary education teachers are required to teach all subjects throughout the day, yet are now being directed to focus on one subject under the supervision of a literacy coach. Teachers' perception of the literacy coach's administrative power can be a source of role conflict. Teachers may view the literacy coach position as one more administrator with the ability to require new paperwork, teaching techniques, professional training, and documentation.

Winn and Blanton (2005) postulated that general and special education teachers' "traditional isolation from each other can be, and has been, a barrier to working collaboratively to reconceptualize schooling for all learners" (p. 1). For many years, special education teachers worked solitary positions. However, the ever-increasing number of students being labeled for special education and the mandates regarding inclusion has required collaboration between regular education teachers and special education teachers. Winn and Blanton (2005) described the challenge regular education and special education teachers face:

One of the major challenges regarding inclusion is the need for general and special education teachers to work together to develop curriculum and instruction based on the characteristics of best practices and which, by their nature, are more accommodating to the needs of diverse learners, including those with special needs, than programs traditionally associated with either general or with special education. (p. 4)

Bacharach et al. (1990) identified "the one place where a teacher is granted full recognition as a professional is in the classroom" (p. 419). Yet even there, new curriculum guidelines and structured, regimented lesson requirements may stifle teacher creativity and decision-making concerning instructional practices. Winn and Blanton (2005) suggested that general and special education teachers working collaborative together may "meet more conflict because the philosophical orientations of faculty from various disciplines may differ and create communication barriers" (p. 7).

Role ambiguity. Another form of teacher role stress is role ambiguity. Prior research has conceptualized role ambiguity as lack of information that is required to fulfill any organizational or individual responsibility or duty (Kahn et al., 1964; Rizzo et al., 1970; Bacharach et al., 1990). Role ambiguity has been linked to increased tension and anxiety in the workplace as well as a decrease in overall job satisfaction (Kahn et al., 1964). Rogers and Molnar (1976) viewed role ambiguity as the condition occurring when “position incumbents lack adequate role-relevant information” (p. 599). According to Schwab and Iwanicki (1982), role ambiguity is “the lack of clear, consistent information regarding rights, duties, and responsibilities of a person’s occupation and how they can be best performed” (p. 62).

In an educational setting, each position should have a specific set of responsibilities and duties according to classical organizational theory (Rizzo et al., 1970). These responsibilities and role requirements are meant to provide teachers with direction and standards for performance and behavior. Lack of this information may create “coping behavior” where teachers “attempt to solve the problem to avoid the sources of stress, or to use defense mechanisms which distort the reality of the situation” (Rizzo et al., 1970, p. 151). According to Papastylianou et al. (2009), “role ambiguity most greatly influences the professional satisfaction of professionals” (Papastylianou et al., 2009, p. 301). Eatough et al. (2011) have suggested that role ambiguity “is most likely to be viewed as a pure hinderance” or a stressor which threatens and impedes an individual’s work achievements (p. 620).

Papastylianou et al. (2009) concluded that professionals may experience four accepted dimensions of role ambiguity: ambiguity of objectives, ambiguity of processes; ambiguity of priorities; and ambiguity of behavior. According to Papastylianou et al. (2009), ambiguity of objectives occurs when there is unclear information about what is expected and whose has the

responsibility to do what needs to be done. Ambiguity of processes concerns confusion in understanding the objectives of an organization. Ambiguity of priorities exists when there is confusion as to what needs to be done and the order in which to do it. Ambiguity of behavior deals with confusion as to which behaviors are expected within the organization (Papstylianou et al., 2009). According to Bacharach et al. (1990), principals are the primary source of information for teachers and as such, are responsible for the level of quality of that information. It is likely that when principals set clear, concise, and consistent information regarding teacher responsibilities and standards for performance, role ambiguity for teachers will decrease.

Role overload. Another component of teacher role stress is role overload. According to Brown, Jones, and Leigh (2005), “role overload is endemic in today’s fast-track organizational environments and has the potential to upset the high-performance cycle energized by self-efficiency and goal setting” (p. 972). High-performance state testing requirements and improvement in student achievement are at the core of instructional decisions in the classroom. Teachers are likely to work beyond regular instructional hours in order to fulfill the daily demands of teaching. Besides the regular testing and grading classroom procedures, teachers are now responsible for additional professional development activities meant to improve instruction and student achievement. Documentation, also identified as additional paperwork, is typically required after any new professional development activity. New professional development activities are required each year, several times a year. Due to this increase in professional development, a teacher rarely experiences a decrease in required duties and responsibilities.

Conley and Woosley (1999) have described role overload as “a particular concern for pressure to do more work, having a heavy workload that interferes with work quality, and the feeling of not being able to finish an ordinary day’s work in one day” (p. 187). Brown et al.

(2005) also determined role overload to be a “serious and increasing problem in many work environments” (p. 973). According to Sutton (1984), teachers may cope with this overload by either performing at a lower quality or simply not finishing the task. Both scenarios can be considered stressful to teachers who consider themselves professionals and capable of the demands of the teaching position. Steinhardt, Jaggars, Faulk, and Gloria (2011) determined that when teachers are overloaded, “they distance themselves emotionally and cognitively from their work in an effort to cope with feelings of exhaustion” (p. 421). When this occurs, teachers may become cynical and find little or no satisfaction or pride in their work and may develop low self-esteem (Steinhardt et al., 2011). Dissatisfaction in job performance may lead to an increase in teacher absence rates and leaves of absences, both of which affect the climate and culture of an organization and student performance.

Trust

A simple definition of trust is difficult to ascertain. Early research by Rotter (1967) defined interpersonal trust as “an expectancy held by an individual or a group that the word, promise, verbal or written statement of another individual or group that can be relied upon” (p. 651). Zand (1971) defined trust as “one’s vulnerability to another whose behavior is not under one’s control” (p. 230). For the purpose of this study, the trust is defined as “an individual’s or group’s willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the confidence that the latter party is benevolent, reliable, competent, honest, and open” (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999, p. 189).

World events prompted early studies on trust and have continually evolved over time. In response to the Cold War, 1950s researchers performed empirical studies of trust (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 2003). These studies were based in exploring the mutual benefits of cooperation and trust. The 1960s, according to Rotter (1967), identified trust as more of a

personality trait. Individual friendliness and popularity were linked to trustworthy behaviors as compared to disenchantment and rebelling against authority were considered untrustworthy behaviors. Blumberg, Greenfield, and Nason (1978) determined that teachers based levels of trust with the principal on their interpersonal relationships rather than on professional and organizational standards. The good intentions of administrators were more important than actual ability to perform administrative duties. Driscoll (1978) determined that employee satisfaction in an organization was better predicted by trust in the organizational leader's decision-making ability than by employee participation in the decision-making process. It was not until the late 1980s and early 1990s that trust in school organizations became a focus for researchers (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999). Tarter, Bliss, and Hoy (1989) determined that principals can indirectly build trust with teachers through the implementation of supportive, collegial behaviors.

Extensive research completed by Bryk and Schneider (2003) in the Chicago Public Schools found that schools with high trust were likely to exhibit marked improvements in student learning. Cosner (2009) summarized the work of Bryk and Schneider in the following:

Their work has not only documented the importance of trust in schools, but their work has also uncovered connections between collegial trust and (a) teacher willingness and efforts to innovate in the midst of reform initiatives, (b) public problems solving within schools, (c) social controls that develop within teacher communities, and (d) teacher commitment and attachment to the school and its mission. (Cosner, 2009, p. 253)

Tschannen-Moran (2009) contended that “for schools to become more professional in their orientation, conditions need to be cultivated to foster greater trust between teachers and school leaders” (p. 228). Trust matters to organizations. “Trust supports myriad forms of interactions within an organization, whether interactions are between individuals, within teams or subgroups, or among an entire staff, by reducing uncertainty and predisposing people to cooperate” (Cosner, 2009, p. 251).

Trust scales. Hoy and Kupersmith (1985) developed scales to measure faculty trust in colleagues and in principals in an early research study. Their Trust Scales (T-Scales) contained a 21-item Likert-type survey measuring faculty trust in the principal, faculty trust in colleagues, and faculty trust in the school district. The research concluded that faculty trust in the principal, faculty trust in colleagues, and faculty trust in the school district were not only related with each other, but that authentic principal behavior leads to teacher trust in the principal as well as teacher trust in the organization (Hoy & Kupersmith, 1985).

Mishra (1996), in a study concerning trust and how it relates to an organizations' response to crisis, theorized individual trust in others to include four dimensions: competence, openness, concern, and reliability. Building on the work of Mishra (1996), Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999) developed the Omnibus T-Scale and piloted their first study in elementary schools using a 37-item Likert-type survey. This scale measured five facets of trust determined by Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999) to be components of trustworthy behavior: benevolence, reliability, competence, honesty, and openness. After further validity testing, the Omnibus T-Scale was later reduced to a 34-item scale and then to the final and current 6-point, 26-item scale measuring faculty trust in the principal, faculty trust in colleagues and faculty trust in clients. The Faculty Trust in Principal subscale of the final 26-item Omnibus T-Scales will be used for this study. Research findings determined that faculty trust in the principal, faculty trust in colleagues, and faculty trust in clients were related (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999).

Five facets of trust. Trust relationships are built upon interdependence between individuals who recognize that one must rely upon another in order to achieve a task, goal, or outcome (Hoy & Miskel, 2008). Trust, however, can have a different meaning to different people. Although necessary for relationships and organizations, trust is a difficult concept to

describe, yet individuals tend to easily recognize trustworthy behaviors in others. According to Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999), there are five facets of trust a person must demonstrate in order to be considered trustworthy: benevolence, reliability, competence, honesty, and openness.

Benevolence refers to goodwill or demonstrating kindness to others and is the most common face of trust. Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999) defined benevolence as “the confidence that one’s well-being or something one cares about will be protected by the trusted person or group” (p. 187). There are certain reciprocal expectations in school relationships. Parent, student, teacher, and principal expectations are all based on benevolent behaviors and the belief that each will act in the best interests of the other. According to Cummings and Bromily (1996), benevolent individuals will not “exploit one’s vulnerability or take excessive advantage of one even when the opportunity is available” (as cited in Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999, p. 187).

Reliability refers to being trusted to do what is expected or know what to expect from others. Reliability involves benevolence and predictability. Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999) defined reliability as “the extent to which one can count on another to come through with what is needed” (p. 187). An individual’s reliability is not quickly determined, but typically evolves over a length of time (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999). Reliability is proven when, regardless of the length of time, the belief that a positive outcome is forthcoming.

An individual’s competence refers to the ability to do something well or have the skills required to complete a task. Competence is an ability to perform as expected or as measured by expected standards within the organization (Mishra, 1996). Good intentions are not always good enough (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999). When an individual has the skills and expertise to aid another but has a “poor performance record” may cause others to view that individual as

untrustworthy (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999, p. 188). An individual's untrustworthy behavior or poor competence, regardless of good intent, can create distrust in a relationship or organization.

Honesty refers to being known as truthful in words and actions. Honesty involves integrity and authenticity. An individual's honesty is demonstrated through a commitment to responsible actions, truth, and character. Rotter (1967) defined trust as an "expectancy that the word, promise, verbal, or written statement of another individual or group can be relied upon" (p. 651). Honest individuals take responsibility for their actions and behaviors.

Openness refers to freely allowing others all relevant information in a transparent way. Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999) described openness as "the extent to which relevant information is not withheld; it is a process by which individuals make themselves vulnerable by sharing information with others" (p. 188). By making themselves vulnerable to others, individuals trust that others will react and respond in like manner in a reciprocal relationship. According to Kramer, Brewer, and Hannah (1996), individuals unwilling to have honest and open relationships may end up in isolation. Research has suggested that openness in the climate of schools in combination with healthy interpersonal relationships may create and promote a climate of trust (Hoy et al., 1996; Tarter et al., 1989, 1995; Tschannen-Moran 2001; Bryk & Schneider, 2002).

Research indicates that trust creates productive attitudes and behaviors among employees and is positively related to teachers' commitment to the school (Cosner, 2010; Bryk & Schneider, 2002). These facets of trust may develop an "interdependence between principals, teachers, students, and parents" and may "make a significant contribution to judgments of trust" (Tschannen-Moran, 2001, p. 314). Trust has also been found to increase teacher empowerment

(Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Hoy, Smith, & Sweetland, 2002), which can positively influence student achievement in elementary schools. According to Tschannen-Moran (2001), a “climate of trust bestows a variety of benefits to the organizations that can foster it” (p. 313). When teachers have a sense of mutual respect and support, they become more willing to commit to the goals and objectives of the organization, thereby obtaining a sense of ownership of their educational domain.

Hoy and Miskel (2008) have stated that “individual’s intuitively know what it is to trust – it means making one-self vulnerable to others with confidence that the others will not act in ways detrimental to you – but trust is complex with many faces” (p. 191). Teachers who perceive their participation has little influence over decisions or outcomes tend to become skeptical about future participation and often become resentful of the time and effort spent on contrived collaboration. Distrust in an organization can lead to contrived collaboration, where teachers feel their participation has no real influence on the decisions that directly affect them. According to Bacharach et al. (1988), in a nation-wide survey, teachers responded that they felt “they should be more involved in school and district decision making, especially with respect to issues directly affecting their immediate teacher responsibilities” (as cited in Tschannen-Moran, 2001, p. 309). Cosner (2009) also stated that collegial trust “acts as a support for conflict resolution” (p. 252).

Collegial trust. In 2001, the *No Child Left Behind Act* transformed how schools provide instruction. Schools began to restructure the organizational foundation of schools and modify classroom practices to implement the latest instructional strategies. Through this process, collaboration became a necessity. Successful collaboration requires that teachers “learn how to successfully interact and it requires initiatives from both teachers and principals to create

conditions for rich dialogue about improvement” (Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008, p. 463).

Cummings and Bromiley (1996) defined trust as

an individual’s belief or a common belief among a group of individuals that another individual or group (a) makes good-faith efforts to behave in accordance any commitments both explicit or implicit, (b) is honest in whatever negotiations preceded such commitments, and (c) does not take excessive advantage of another even when the opportunity is available. (Cummings & Bromiley, 1996, p. 303)

Good-faith efforts in behavior and honest negotiations between colleagues may promote effective communication. Individuals who feel trust in those with whom they interact are “more likely to disclose more accurate, relevant, and complete data about problems” (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000, p. 581). Research completed by Costa (2003) also found that collaboration influenced levels of trust. Costa (2003) determined that “trust within teams is essentially created through positive interactions among members” (p. 120). Supportive teacher-teacher relationships and interactions enable colleagues to “assume various roles with one another as mentor, mentee, coach, specialist, advisor, facilitator, and so on” (Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008, p. 463). When teachers sense support from their colleagues and trust one another as professionals, they feel safe to experiment with new practices in the classroom (Tarter, Sabo, & Hoy, 1995; Bryk & Schneider, 2003). Teachers are more likely to place trust in their colleagues with whom they have healthy, supportive relationships. Bryk and Schneider (2003) stated

Through their words and actions, school participants show their sense of their obligations toward others, and others discern these intentions. Trust grows through exchanges in which actions validate these expectations. Even simple interactions, if successful, can enhance collective capacities for more complex subsequent actions. In this respect, increasing trust and deepening organizational change support each other. (p. 43)

Teacher trust in their leader or principal is also a vital component in educational settings. According to Hoy and Sabo (1998), trust in organizations is a reciprocal relationship. Daly and Chrispeels (2005) purported that “trust is an interactive process” (p. 14). By placing trust in

their teachers' capabilities and decisions, the principal is modeling trusting and collaborative practices. Principals who treat teachers as professional colleagues and practice shared decision making and collaborative practices in schools tend to be viewed as open, honest, and trustworthy (Forsyth et al., 2011). According to Mitchell, Ripley, Adams, and Raju (2011), it is likely that "trust in the principal helps establish a culture of trust within the school" (p. 166). When teachers trust in the decisions of their principal, they are "likely to also have trust in their colleagues and to feel like they are able to have influence over school level decisions" (Mitchell et al., 2011, p. 158).

Collegial Principal Leadership

Schools are bureaucratic in nature. There is a visible hierarchy of authority and established rules, policies and procedures (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001). The responsibility of ensuring quality educational practices rests at the top of the organization (Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008). However, for many years, reform proposals and school improvement initiatives have consistently called for distributing some leadership roles among teachers and staff in schools (Brookover, Schweitzer, Schneider, Beady, Flood, & Wisenbaker, 1978). According to Pounder (1999), sharing leadership may increase teacher commitment and participation while reducing feelings of isolation. McLaughlin and Talbert (2001) described shared leadership as "a fundamental principle and dynamic of learning communities" (p. 121). McLaughlin and Talbert (2001) also purported that, through the sharing of leadership, principals may "spread responsibility and ownership for community values throughout the district, school, or department" (p. 121). The principal, as the leader in the organization, identifies and promotes acceptable values and norms for the professional relationships in schools.

Research completed by Hoy and Sabo (1998) identified collegial leadership as being one of four major components of a healthy school climate. Uline, Miller, and Tschannen-Moran (1998) described the health of a school in the following manner:

Just as a healthy person feels good and has the capacity to be productive, a healthy school is a place where it feels good to be and where the school has the capacity to fulfill its mission. The faculty places strong emphasis on academic achievement, and sets high expectations for their students. The faculty enjoys friendly and supportive relationships with one another. The principal also has a positive, collegial relationship with the rest of the staff. (Uline, Miller & Tschannen-Moran, 1998, p. 470)

Collegial principal leadership is a significant factor in establishing the standards of professional behavior and collegiality in schools. An enabling and supportive leadership style promotes collaboration and trust among colleagues (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001; Bryk & Schneider, 2003). Hoy, Smith, and Sweetland defined collegial leadership in the following manner:

Collegial leadership is principal behavior directed toward meeting both social needs of the faculty and achieving the goals of the school. The principal treats teachers as colleagues, is open, egalitarian, and friendly, but at the same time sets clear teacher expectations and standards of performance. (Hoy, Smith & Sweetland, 2002, p. 42)

Gordon (2004) purported principals who demonstrate a willingness to share their power can be described as “change agents” within their respective schools (p. 166). When principals share their authority, a climate of acceptable change may occur in the organization. Through the sharing of authority, collegial leadership allows for more decision-making opportunities for teachers. Teachers have an expectation to be treated as professionals with expertise in their field of study and fully capable of making educated decision about the policies and practices that may affect them or their position within the organization. Collegial principal leadership is based on an openness and supportive nature of the principal toward the faculty and staff. Openness refers to principal acceptance of the ideas and opinions of the faculty and the willingness to allow these ideas and opinions to guide the decision-making process within the school.

Principals who promote enabling practices, such as flexible rules, guidelines, and procedures, may help subordinates deal with surprises and crises (Adler & Borys, 1996). According to Hoy and Sweetland (2001), “enabling procedures invite interactive dialogue, view problems as opportunities, foster trust, value differences, capitalize on and learn from mistakes, and delight in the unexpected; in brief, they facilitate problem solving” (p. 298). DiPaola, Tschannen-Moran, and Walther-Thomas (2004) described the job of an effective principal as “multifaceted” (p. 3). Tschannen-Moran (2009) has suggested that collegial principal leadership orientation “affects the quality and vitality of the entire professional community in a school, as evidenced by supportive administrative practices, high-quality interpersonal relationships, and adaptive implementation of school policies”(p. 227). Tschannen-Moran (2001) also purported that “principals are more likely to reap the benefits of participation when the process is carefully structured to include teachers in decisions that matter to them, and when their knowledge and expertise leads to real changes in the outcome” (p. 309). According to Bryk and Schneider (2003), principals may “establish both respect and personal regard when they acknowledge the vulnerabilities of others, actively listen to their concerns, and eschew arbitrary actions” (p. 43). Wahlstrom and Louis (2008) described practiced and experienced leadership in the following manner:

Leadership practices that share power are credited with creating greater motivation, increased trust and risk-taking, and building a sense of community and efficacy among its members. However, peer relationships established among adults may have an equal or greater impact on classroom practice. (Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008, p. 467)

Experienced principals understand the importance and significance of their relationships with the teachers within their schools. Principals must guide teachers in the collaborative process by demonstrating an acceptance of differing opinions and beliefs and a willingness to

step outside the norm in an attempt to improve the educational outcome. Full collaboration exists when teachers are trusted to do what is expected and demonstrate a proven commitment to their organization. When this is evident, Hoy and Tarter (1995) have suggested that principals share the decision-making authority with others in the organization. By doing so, principals allow themselves to be vulnerable and trusting of others' ideas and expertise and, hopefully, encourage teachers to do the same.

Theoretical Framework

The theory of this research is that collegial principal leadership and trust in the principal promote effective collaborative practices in schools and reduces teacher role stress. Research suggests it is likely that collegial principal leadership and trust are positively associated with collaboration. It is proposed that collegial principal leadership and trust in the principal will have a positive effect on collaboration in an organization. Earlier research has identified trust as a characteristic of a healthy school climate (Smith, Hoy & Sweetland, 2001).

Collaborative practices will allow teachers to develop a vulnerable disposition and a willingness to acknowledge and understand differing opinions and beliefs. When the principal leadership is collegial and teachers trust each other, they will be more likely to collaborate with each other. When educators view themselves as exhibiting trustworthy behavior and characteristics, they are more likely to accept the ideas, opinions, and beliefs of others. In doing so, disagreements can be reduced and collaborative practices will increase. An increase in collaborative practices has been shown in research to improve student learning and increase test scores. It is likely collegial principal leadership and trust in the principal may improve collaborative practice, thereby decreasing teacher role stress.

Rationale and Hypotheses

This research hypothesizes a relationship between collegial leadership and trust in the principal and an increase in collaboration.

Trust is a communal element. When trust is extended to others, it is typically reciprocated. This cyclical process is likely to increase communication and shared values. According to Hoy and Sweetland (2001), teachers must “do more than trust each other if they are to be innovative and effective; they must trust their leader” (p. 310).

H1: Collegial principal leadership and trust in the principal are individually and collectively correlated with and predictive of collaboration. Research supports that teacher and principal communication and contact is likely to impact teacher role stress (Rizzo et al., 1970; Sutton, 1984; Bacharach, et al. 1990; Conley & Woosley, 1999). Teacher perceptions of one another are representative of the amount of trust in their professional relationships. Sharing common ideals, goals, and behaviors helps to solidify relationships and provide a foundation upon which to build collaborative practices. As collegial principal leadership and trust increase among the faculty, effective collaborative practices may also increase and reduce teacher role stress. Sutton (1984) determined role demands to become stressful for a teacher when organizational members set unclear expectations (role ambiguity), excessive expectations (role overload), or when one set of expectations make meeting another set of expectations more difficult (role conflict).

H2: Collegial principal leadership and trust in the principal are individually and collectively inversely related to and predictive of teacher role stress. Collaboration is a process where responsibilities and accountability are shared (Musanti & Pence, 2010; Mitchell et al., 2011). Effective collaborative practices allow teachers to move from traditional isolated roles

and develop professional relationships where there is recognition of others' skills, beliefs, and expertise. Collaboration may add meaning and value to professional relationships. According to Tschannen-Moran (2001), collaboration "holds the possibility of fostering greater trust as partners have experience with one another over time and have opportunities to witness benevolence, reliability, competence, honesty, and openness of their partners" (p. 315). Research complete by Kyriacou (2001) has suggested that collaboration can resolve some stress issues for teachers.

H3: Collaboration is inversely related to and predictive of teacher role stress.

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

Overview

This chapter provides a description of the methodology involved in this research study. The description includes information concerning the research sample, population, data collection procedures, and measurement instruments. Data analysis procedures are explained and conclusions are discussed.

Design of Research

This research used a non-experimental quantitative survey design that measured the relationship between collegial principal leadership, trust in the principal, collaboration and teacher role stress in schools. Schools were the unit of analysis. Aggregated scores were representative of the overall results of each individual school. The *independent variables* for this study were the teachers' perceptions of the levels of trust in the principal, collegial principal leadership, and collaboration within their schools. The *dependent variables* for this study were the teachers' and principals' perception of collaboration and teacher role stress in schools. The *control variable* for this study was the socioeconomic status of schools (SES). The socioeconomic status of the school was determined by information available on the Alabama State Department of Education website for all schools included in the study. The *Statistical Package for the Social Science* (SPSS) was used for analysis of the survey responses. Descriptive, correlation, and block entry regression analyses were used to determine individual and collective relationships between the independent and dependent variables.

Data Sample

The sample consisted of approximately 60 public schools of varying grade configurations in rural and urban districts of northern Alabama. The focus was on elementary schools with an arrangement of K-6 grades. Data for this quantitative study was collected from each participating school contingent on superintendent, principal, and teacher permission.

Data Collection Procedures

After acquiring permission from the superintendents and principals in the participating school systems, the researcher requested and obtained permission to administer surveys at predetermined faculty meetings. The researcher presented a short explanation of the survey, its purpose, and information concerning protecting participant confidentiality. Teachers were assured that they did not have to respond to any part of the survey or questions, which made them uncomfortable. Teachers were informed they could opt-out of the survey process entirely or stop at any point they felt necessary. Four survey forms were used and coded using the Alabama State Department school identification codes for individual schools participating in this research.

Instrumentation

Four separate instruments were combined and used to collect the quantitative data for this research. The instruments included the following: (a) the Collaboration with Principal and Collaboration with Teacher Colleagues subscales of the Collaboration Survey (Tschannen-Moran, 2001); (b) the Role Ambiguity, Role Conflict, Role Overload Survey (Conley & Woosley, 1999, as adapted from Rizzo et al., 1970); (c) the Faculty Trust in Principal subscale of the Ominbus Trust Scale (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999); and (d) the Collegial Principal Leadership subscale of the Organizational Climate Index (Hoy, Smith, & Sweetland, 2002).

Collaboration

Collaboration consists of several elements, most of which center around the process of sharing. Sharing values, goals, resources, and responsibilities are all part of the collaborative process. Constitutively, collaboration was defined as “the extent to which teachers perceived themselves and parents to be not only involved but to exercise influence over school and classroom-level decisions” (Tschannen-Moran, 2001, p. 317). While parental collaboration with schools is important, only teacher perceptions concerning collaboration was used for this research study. Operationally, effective collaboration was measured using the Collaboration Survey developed by Tschannen-Moran (2001).

The Collaboration Survey measured the involvement and influence of principals, teachers, and parents on the collaborative process. The Collaboration Survey was a 26-item, six-point Likert-type scale with three subscales, which measured collaboration with the principal, collaboration among teacher colleagues, and collaboration with parents. Only the first two subscales measuring collaboration with principal and collaboration among teacher colleagues were used for this research study. The subscale used to measure collaboration with parents was not used. The items were assigned values ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 6 (*very much*). The following were sample statements used to measure to what extent do teachers have over the outcome of principal decisions: (2) determining criteria for selecting personnel; (4) evaluating personnel; and (6) determining how to allocate space. Sample statements to measure collaboration among teacher colleagues included: (1) planning professional development activities; (4) selecting instructional methods and activities; and (8) developing procedures for reporting student progress to parents. When used in previous studies, this instrument’s reliabilities were considered good. In the Tschannen-Moran (2001) study, collaboration with the

principal concerning school decision was .87, and collaboration with teacher colleagues concerning classroom decision was .88 (Tschannen-Moran, 2001). Later research by Mitchell et al. (2011) determined the reliability of the subscale for collaboration with the principal to be .78. The subscale for collaboration with teacher colleagues was .85 (Mitchell et al., 2011).

Teacher Role Stress

Constitutively, teacher role stress was defined as “anything about an organizational role that produces adverse consequences for the individual” (Kahn & Quinn, 1970, p. 41). For the purpose of this study, teacher role stress was measured using Conley and Woosley’s (1999) survey which combined three scales adapted from the original Rizzo et al. (1970) items which measured role conflict, four additional items which measured role ambiguity, and two items from the study completed by Bacharach et al. (1990) to measure role overload. The items were assigned values ranging from 1 (*very false*) to 7 (*very true*).

Role conflict. Role conflict was constitutively defined as “incompatible role expectations from organizational members” (Conley & Woosley, 2000, p. 182). Operationally, role conflict was measured using three items designed by Conley and Woosley (1999), as adapted from Rizzo et al. (1970). Sample items included the following: (1) I often work under incompatible policies and guidelines; (2) I often have to buck a rule or policy to carry out an assignment; (3) I often receive incompatible requests from two or more people. When use in previous studies, Cronbach’s alpha for role conflict was .83.

Role ambiguity. Role ambiguity was constitutively defined as “the lack of clear, consistent information regarding rights, duties, and responsibilities of a person’s occupation and how they can be best performed” (Schwab & Iwanicki, 1982, p. 62). Operationally, role ambiguity was measured using four items designed by Conley and Woosley (1999), as adapted

from Rizzo *et al.* (1970). Sample items measuring role ambiguity included the following: (1) I feel certain about how much authority I have; (2) I know that I have divided my time appropriately; (3) I know what my responsibilities are; and (4) I know exactly what is expected of me. Cronbach's alpha for role ambiguity was .72.

Role overload. Role overload was constitutively defined as “an incompatibility between work demands and the time available to fulfill those demands” (Conley and Woosley, 2000, p. 187). Role overload was operationally measured using two items designed by Conley & Woosley (1990), as adapted from Bacharach *et al.* (1999). Sample items included: (1) There isn't enough time during my regular workday to do everything that is expected of me; and (2) I am rushed doing my job. Cronbach's alpha for role overload was .80.

Trust

Constitutively, trust was defined as “an individual's or group's willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the confidence that the latter party is benevolent, reliable, competent, honest, and open” (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999, p. 189). Operationally, trust was measured using the Faculty Trust in Principal subscale of the Omnibus Trust Scale developed by Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999, 2003). The Omnibus Trust Scale is a six-point Likert-type scale which consisted of 26-items and three subscales. Eight items measured teacher trust in the principal, ten items measured teacher trust in parents and students, and eight items measured teacher collegial trust. All 26 items were measured in values from one to six with one identified as *strongly disagree* and six as *strongly agree*. Sample items of the Faculty Trust in Principal subscale included the following: (1) Teachers in this school trust the principal; (5) The principal in this school typically acts in the best interest of the teachers; (6) Teachers in this school can rely on the principal; and (25) The principal in this school is competent in doing his or her job

(Hoy and Tschannen-Moran, 2003). When used in previous studies, this instrument demonstrated the trust in the principal subscale as ranging from .84 to .97 (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 2003, p. 202).

Collegial Principal Leadership

Collegial principal leadership was constitutively defined as “principal behavior directed toward meeting both social needs of the faculty and achieving the goals of the school” (Hoy, Smith, & Sweetland, 2002, p. 42). Operationally, collegial principal leadership was measured using the Collegial Principal Leadership subscale of the Organizational Climate Index (OCI) developed by Hoy, Smith, and Sweetland (2002). The Collegial Principal Leadership subscale of the OCI was a four-point Likert-type scale containing seven items. The items were assigned values from 1 (*rarely occurs*) to 4 (*very frequently occurs*). Sample items included the following: (3) The principal treats all faculty members as his or her equal; (13) The principal maintains definite standards of performance; and (20) The principal puts suggestions made by the faculty into operation. When used in previous studies by Hoy and colleagues, the alpha reliability coefficient for Collegial Principal Behavior was .94 and Professional Teacher Behavior was .88 (Hoy, Smith, & Sweetland, 2002).

Data Analysis

Quantitative methodology was applied in this research investigation. The unit of analysis for this study was the school. The responses to each survey item were entered by the researchers into the *Statistical Package for the Social Science* (SPSS) for analysis. Descriptive, correlation, and block entry regression analyses were used to determine individual and collective relationships between the independent and dependent variables. The results of these statistical analyses are presented in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV:

RESULTS

This chapter reports the findings of the relationships between collaboration, teacher role stress, trust in the principal, and collegial principal leadership. This chapter presents descriptive statistics, descriptions of reliabilities, correlations, and tested hypotheses. Free and reduced lunch data per individual school were used to control for SES.

Descriptives

Sample

The study examined public schools in rural and urban districts in northern Alabama. Of the 77 schools contacted, 60 schools agreed to participate in this study. The desired K-6 configuration was problematic, as schools and school districts in northern Alabama have inconsistent grade configurations. A summary of the school configurations of participating schools is presented in Table 1. From these 60 schools, 1,655 teacher participants completed surveys. A minimum of 15 surveys were required to count schools in the sample. After acquiring superintendent and principal permission, survey instruments were administered and collected by the researcher during regularly scheduled faculty meetings. All research participants were assured anonymity and participation in the study was completely voluntary. The unit of analysis was the school and each school was given a seven-digit identifying code to be used for comparative analysis.

Table 1

Summary of School Configurations

Configuration	Total	Percent of Total
P-K	1	2
P-2	2	3
K-3	1	2
K-4	6	10
K-5	7	12
K-6	9	15
K-8	5	8
1-2	2	3
3-5	2	3
3-6	1	2
4-8	1	2
5-6	1	2
5-8	2	3
6-8	5	8
6-12	2	3
K-12	13	22

Measures

The four instruments used in this study were the Collaboration Survey, the Teacher Role Stress Survey, the Omnibus Trust Scale, and the Organizational Climate Index (OCI). Specific subsets were used from the first three instruments for this study. Of the three subsets in the Collaboration Survey, only the Collaboration with Principal and the Collaboration Among Teacher Colleagues subscales were included. From the Omnibus Trust Scale, only the Faculty Trust in Principal subscale was included. The Collegial Principal Leadership subscale of the

Organizational Climate Index (OCI) was included. Data collected from these instruments were analyzed to determine if correlational relationships existed among the factors of collaboration, teacher role stress, trust in the principal, and collegial principal leadership. Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics of the measures, including the range, mean, and standard deviation for all the variables used in this study.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics of the Measures

Variable	N	Minimum	Maximum	M	SD
Collaboration	60	2.01	4.03	3.00	.46
Teacher Role Stress	60	3.68	5.53	4.66	.37
Trust in the Principal	60	3.98	5.95	5.13	.49
Collegial Principal Leadership	60	2.59	4.35	3.39	.36
SES	60	.10	.92	.43	.18

Reliability

Cronbach's alpha (α) coefficients were calculated for each measure used in this study to test for internal reliability. The first two subsets of the Collaboration Survey were used for this study. The Collaboration with the Principal and Collaboration Among Teacher Colleagues subsets are both 6-point Likert-type scales measuring values from *not at all* to *very much*. Collaboration with Principal is a 7-item response survey while Collaboration Among Teacher Colleagues is a 10-item response survey. The Role Ambiguity, Role Conflict, and Role Overload survey is a 9-item, 7-point Likert-type scale measuring values identified as *very false* to *very true*. The Faculty Trust in Principal subset of the Omnibus Trust Scale is an 8-item response survey where teachers respond to a 6-point Likert-type scale. Responses are measured in values from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. The Collegial Principal Leadership subset of

the OCI is a 4-point Likert-type scale consisting of a 7-item response survey measuring values from *rarely occurs* to *very frequently occurs*. Table 3 shows Cronbach's alpha for each variable and the number of items measured in each instrument (Collegial Principal Leadership, Trust in the Principal, Collaboration, and Teacher Role Stress).

Table 3

Cronbach's Alpha for Study Variables

Variable	Cronbach's alpha	Number of Questions
Collaboration	.93	17
Teacher role stress	.88	9
Trust in the principal	.95	8
Collegial principal leadership	.83	7

Correlations

Correlation analyses were run on among all test variables in this study. All variables were shown to have a significant correlation and supported the hypotheses. Positive correlations were found between collegial principal leadership and trust in the principal ($r = .65, p < .01$), collaboration and trust in the principal ($r = .38, p < .01$), and collegial principal leadership and collaboration ($r = .48, p < .01$). Significant negative correlations were demonstrated between collegial principal leadership and teacher role stress ($r = -.41, p < .01$), trust in the principal and teacher role stress ($r = -.55, p < .01$), and collaboration and teacher role stress ($r = -.41, p < .01$), further supporting the inverse relationships suggested in Hypotheses 2 and 3. Table 4 presents the findings of the correlations of these variables. The significant correlations provided a rational to continue with hypotheses testing.

Table 4

Correlations (Pearson) Among All Variables

Variable	CPL	TRUST	COL	TRS	SES
CPL	1	.65**	.48**	-.41**	-.07
TIP		1	.38**	-.55**	-.13
COL			1	-.41**	.07
TRS				1	.03
SES					1

Note: ** $p < .01$

Note: Collegial Principal Leadership (CPL), Collaboration (COL), Trust in the Principal (TIP), Teacher Role Stress (TRS), Socioeconomic Status (SES).

Hypotheses Testing

Hypothesis 1 predicted collegial principal behavior and trust in the principal are individually and collectively correlated with and predictive of collaboration. Each independent variable had individually significant relationships with collaboration. Collegial principal leadership had a correlation ($r = .48, p < .01$) indicating a slightly higher relationship to collaboration than trust in the principal ($r = .38, p < .01$). Table 4 provides an illustration of these relationships.

A block entry regression analysis was performed with collegial principal leadership and trust in the principal as independent variables and collaboration as the dependent variable while controlling for SES. Table 5 illustrates the unstandardized coefficients, standardized coefficients, (β), standard error, t , and significance. The two independent variables collectively explained 22% of the variance in collaboration ($R = .51, p = .01$) when controlling for SES. Only collegial principal leadership made a unique contribution to collaboration ($\beta = .40, p < .01$).

Table 5

Regression Coefficients Examining Collegial Principal Leadership and Trust in the Principal on Collaboration

Predictor Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	β	Std. Error	β	<i>t</i>	Sig.
Step 1					
(constant)	2.93	.16		18.50	.000
SES	.17	.34	.07	.49	.623
<i>R</i> = .07, <i>R</i> ² = .00, Adj. <i>R</i> ² = -.01					
Step 2					
(constant)	.47	.62		.76	.451
Collegial Principal Leadership	.53	.19	.40	2.66	.010
Trust in the Principal	.13	.14	.14	.91	.369
SES	.29	.30	.11	.96	.339
<i>R</i> = .51, <i>R</i> ² = .26, Adj. <i>R</i> ² = .22					

Note: Significant at $p < .01$.

Hypothesis 2 predicted collegial principal behavior and trust in the principal are individually and collectively inversely related to and predictive of teacher role stress. Collegial principal leadership had a correlation ($r = -.41, p < .01$) indicating an inverse yet significant relationship to teacher role stress. Trust in the principal had a slightly higher inverse relationship to teacher role stress ($r = -.55, p < .01$). Table 4 provides an illustration of these relationships.

A block entry regression analysis examined the effects of collegial principal leadership and trust in the principal on teacher role stress while controlling for socioeconomic status. Table 6 illustrates the unstandardized coefficients, standardized coefficients, (β), standard error, *t*, and significance. Both predictors explained 27% of the variance in teacher role stress ($R = .56, p <$

.01) while controlling for SES. Only trust in the principal made a unique contribution to teacher role stress ($\beta = -.50, p < .01$). Table 6 illustrates these findings.

Table 6

Regression Coefficients Examining Collegial Principal Leadership and Trust in the Principal on Teacher Role Stress

Predictor Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	β	Std. Error	β	<i>t</i>	Sig.
Step 1					
(constant)	2.88	.16		.94	.000
SES	.07	.34	.03	.21	.837
<i>R</i> = .03, <i>R</i> ² = .00, Adj. <i>R</i> ² = -.02					
Step 2					
(constant)	5.76	.60		9.54	.000
Collegial Principal Leadership	-.11	.19	-.09	-.60	.550
Trust in the Principal	-.47	.14	-.50	-3.39	.001
SES	-.12	.29	-.05	-.40	.690
<i>R</i> = .56, <i>R</i> ² = .31, Adj. <i>R</i> ² = .27					

Note: Significant at $p < .01$.

Hypothesis 3 predicted collaboration is inversely related to and predictive of teacher role stress. Collaboration had a correlation ($r = -.41, p < .01$) indicating a significant inverse relationship. A block entry regression analysis was conducted to determine the relationship of collaboration to teacher role stress while controlling for SES. The inverse relationship held.

Table 7 provides an illustration of these results.

Table 7

Regression Coefficients Examining Collaboration on Teacher Role Stress

Predictor Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	β	Std. Error	β	<i>t</i>	Sig.
(constant)	4.10	.39		10.54	.000
SES	.14	.32	.05	.44	.659
Collaboration	-.41	.12	-.41	-3.38	.001

$R = .41, R^2 = .17, \text{Adj. } R^2 = .14$

Note: Significant at $p < .01$.

Unhypothesized Findings

A regression was performed using teacher role stress as the independent variable and collaboration, trust in the principal, collegial principal leadership, and SES as dependent variables. Only trust in the principal made a unique contribution to reducing teacher role stress ($\beta = -.50, p < .05$). Table 8 presents these findings.

Table 8

Regression of Teacher Role Stress on Collaboration, Trust in the Principal, Collegial Leadership, and SES

Independent Variables	Standardized Beta	Significance
Collaboration	-.11	.45
Trust in the Principal	-.50**	.00
Collegial Leadership	.24	.16
SES	-.07	.58

Adj. $R^2 = .12, **p < .05$

Summary

The results of this study supported all three hypotheses. The measures used in the study were found to be reliable. All three hypotheses were supported using correlational and multiple regression analysis. Both collegial principal leadership and trust in the principal were proven to be predictors of collaboration, with only collegial principal leadership making a unique contribution. Collegial principal leadership and trust in the principal made significant inverse contributions toward teacher role stress, with only trust in the principal making a unique contribution. Collaboration was also found to have a significant inverse contribution to teacher role stress. These results will be further discussed in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V:
DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

This chapter will discuss the findings of this research, and examine the theoretical and practical implications of these findings. Finally, recommendations for further research are presented.

Summary of Findings

1. Significant positive correlations were found between collegial principal leadership, trust in the principal, and collaboration.
2. Significant negative correlations were found between collegial principal leadership, trust in the principal, and teacher role stress.
3. Collegial principal leadership and trust in the principal did combine to predict collaboration, but only collegial principal leadership made a unique contribution.
4. Collegial principal leadership and trust in the principal did combine to predict an inverse relationship to teacher role stress, but only trust in the principal made a unique contribution.
5. Collaboration was found to have an inverse relationship to teacher role stress.
6. Controlling for SES made no significant difference on any of the variables in this study.
7. Collegial principal leadership and trust in the principal had the highest correlation ($r = .65, p < .01$) among all of the variables in this study.

Theoretical Implications

Significance of Study

When the study was in its earliest stages, the interest was in the relationship between special education teachers and regular education teachers and the role stress that sometimes occurs when these individuals are required to work together to provide educational opportunities for students. Upon discovering there was limited research available for this relationship, the decision was made to expand the study to include principal collegial leadership, trust in the principal, and collaboration as additional variables with teacher role stress. This is the first time, which I am aware, of any researcher using these four variables and measurements together in a research project.

Collegial Principal Leadership

The first hypothesis predicting collegial principal leadership and trust in the principal are individually and collectively correlated to and predictive of collaboration was supported. Both variables were significant predictors to collaboration (see Table 4). In the regression model, both predictors explained 22% of the variance for collaboration before and after controlling for SES. However, only collegial principal leadership made a unique contribution to collaboration. In interpreting these findings, the data suggests teachers consider collaboration in schools to be enhanced more so by collegial principal leadership than by the level of trust in the principal.

Collegial principal leadership promotes effective collaborative practices (Sabo & Barnes, 1996; Hoy & Miskel, 2008; Tschannen-Moran, 2009). This study confirms previous studies that determined that an enabling and supportive leadership style promotes collaboration and trust among colleagues (Hoy, Smith, & Sweetland, 2001; Bryk and Schneider, 2003; Forsythe et al., 2011). Collegial leaders work to establish professional behaviors, rules, policies, and procedures

in a professional manner and relationship with teachers while working to achieve both the goals of the school and the social needs of the faculty (Hoy, Smith, & Sweetland, 2002). Collegial principal leaders also recognize the importance of providing physical support to teachers. Locating resources teachers need for daily instructional purposes, such as textbooks, workbooks, copying paper, laminating film, and extra desks for new students are just a few of the ways that collegial leaders can provide such physical support. Collegial principal leaders are approachable and are not afraid to share in the demands of the day-to-day operations. By working with teachers to secure needed resources and sharing in the physical demands and responsibilities, collegial leaders effectively promote collaborative practices.

Collegial principal behavior is demonstrated through an open and accepting relationship, where the principal understands the importance and significance of colleagues' ideas and opinions. Collegial principal leaders are likely to consider teachers' expertise and knowledge and include teachers in the decisions that matter to them (Tschannen-Moran, 2001). In doing so, teachers may develop a sense of ownership in the outcome, thereby creating a stronger commitment to the organization and its goals. Collegial leaders treat teachers as professionals with expertise, and encourage them to use that expertise to make educated decisions about policies and practices that matter to them. In doing so, collegial principal leaders promote effective collaboration.

Both collegial principal leadership and trust in the principal were significant predictors to collaboration. Recall Hoy and Tschannen-Moran's (1999) five facets of trust: benevolence, reliability, competence, honesty, and openness. Some of these elements of trust can be found in the descriptors of collegial leaders. Forsythe et al. (2011) purported that principals, who treat teachers as professional colleagues and practice shared decision making and collaborative

practices, tend to be viewed as open, honest, and trustworthy. Consider the words used above describing collegial leaders: supportive, enabling, open, accepting, honest, trustworthy, and understanding. Although collegial principal leadership was the only predictor that made a unique contribution to collaboration during the multiple regressions, trust cannot be discounted, as it is intertwined in the dimensions of collegial principal behavior.

Trust in the Principal

The second hypothesis predicting collegial principal leadership and trust in the principal are individually and collectively inversely related to and predictive of teacher role stress was supported. Both variables were significant predictors to teacher role stress (see Table 4). In the regression model, both predictors explained 28% of the variance for teacher role stress after controlling for SES. However, only trust in the principal made a unique contribution to teacher role stress.

Both collegial principal leadership and trust in the principal were significant inverse predictors to teacher role stress, but only trust in the principal made a unique contribution to teacher role stress in multiple regressions. The literature provided in Chapter II supports the inverse relationship between trust and teacher role stress. Previous studies have shown that trust creates productive attitudes and behaviors among employees (Cosner, 2010; Bryk & Schneider, 2002). When teachers trust that others are being truthful in their actions, behavior, and comments, they are more likely to disclose accurate and relevant information in return (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000). Trust in an organization is reciprocal (Hoy & Sabo, 1998). Principals who promote truthful actions and behaviors lead by example. When teachers have relationship of mutual respect and support with their colleagues and principal, they may become

more willing to commit to the goals and objectives of the organization. Trust increases teacher empowerment (Bryk & Schneider, 2002) and is a support for conflict resolution (Cosner, 2009).

Collaboration

The third hypothesis predicting collaboration is inversely related to and predictive of teacher role stress was also supported. Interpreting this relationship suggests that collaborative practices reduce teachers level of stress in schools. Previous research supports these findings. Adler and Borys (1996) determined that enabling practices may help colleagues deal with surprises and crises. When teachers have developed effective collaborative relationships with others, they have a network of support to fall back on when a personal or professional crisis occurs. According to Pounder (1999), sharing leadership may increase teacher commitment and participation while reducing feelings of isolation. Collegial principal leaders play important roles in reducing feelings of isolation by promoting collaboration in schools. Kyriacou (2001) found that social sharing, or collaboration, can resolve some stress issues for teachers. Collaborative practices allow for teachers to establish friendships and relationships where they can share ideas and beliefs about teaching and instructional practices (Musanti & Pence, 2010).

Unhypothesized Findings

An additional regression was completed of teacher role stress on collaboration, trust in the principal, collegial principal leadership, and SES. In this regression, 12% of the variance in teacher role stress was explained ($Adj. R^2 = .12, p < .05$). Only trust in the principal made a unique contribution to reducing teacher role stress ($\beta = -.50, p < .01$).

Practical Implications

In order to discuss the practical implications of this research, first consider the significance of the relationship between collegial principal leadership and trust in the principal. Collegial principal leadership and trust in the principal had the highest correlation ($r = .65, p < .01$) among all of the variables in this study. Collegial principal leadership characteristics include trustworthiness. Hoy and Sabo (1998) identified collegial leadership as being one of the four major components of a healthy school climate. However, role stress is likely to affect various components of school effectiveness (Corwin, 1969; Kahn & Quinn, 1970; Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970; Conley & Woosley, 1999). Hoy and Kuper-Smith (1985) found that authentic principal behavior leads to teacher trust in the principal as well as teacher trust in the organization. Therefore, collegial principal leadership influences trust in the principal. Bryk and Schneider (2003) suggested that student learning would increase within schools that demonstrate high levels of trust.

Collegial leaders share in the decision-making process and work together collaboratively. Principals can allow teachers to participate in the decision that matter to them. Teachers who feel their participation has little influence over decisions or outcomes can easily become skeptical and resentful of their wasted effort. One way that teachers can participate would be to develop an accepted school-wide lesson plan form if one is not required from the district level. Creating effective lesson plans and an effective lesson plan format can be a vital component for successful instruction. This process would also encourage teachers to work collaboratively together and share ideas across grade levels. By trusting the teachers to use their expertise and knowledge to develop a form that fits the needs of the school, collegial leaders demonstrate a vulnerable and trusting nature and trust is a reciprocal relationship.

Another way that collegial principal leaders can increase teacher participation in the decision-making process is to allow teachers to help with the master schedule. Scheduling physical education classes, music classes, lunch periods, and such are quite often tedious tasks and many times considered a chore to be completed. To teachers, however, the schedule can be the most important part of planning a successful year. For K-3 teachers, finding a prime time allotment for an undisturbed reading block is vital, whereas some may prefer a specific morning or afternoon P.E. time. A collegial principal leader listens to teacher ideas and requests for scheduling and puts those requests into action. In doing so, the principal is viewed as supportive in nature.

Collegial principal leaders can also use effective collaborative practices to influence levels of trust in schools. Collaboration can influence trust through positive interactions among members of the organization (Costa, 2003). Collegial principal leaders can promote collaborative practices by scheduling teachers within grade levels the same planning periods to which they can use to work together on lessons for the week or to discuss student achievement goals and weaknesses. Collegial principal leaders could also schedule time on professional development days to allow for cross-grade level meetings, where teachers can meet with their current students' former teachers and future teachers. This allows teachers the opportunity to share pertinent information, such as which instructional strategies worked for difficult students. By working collaboratively together, teachers share ideas, knowledge, and expertise and build respect for each other's positions within the organization. Collegial principal leaders recognize the importance of this and seek effective ways to develop collaborative days or activities for teachers.

Collegial principal leaders must also find ways to reduce the levels of teacher role stress in schools. Huberman (1993) found fatigue, frustration, and difficulties adapting to students were among the most common reasons teachers identified as reasons for ending their careers. Even through collegial principal leaders practice shared decision-making, schools are still bureaucratic in nature and there is a visible hierarchy of authority. Collegial principal leaders must provide teachers with clear and precise expectations about what needs to be done and the order in which to do it. This may help resolve the feelings of role ambiguity teachers may experience by not knowing exactly what is expected of them.

Role conflict is another component of teacher role stress that collegial principal leaders must address. Role conflict results from incompatible role expectations from organization members. Collegial principal leaders can schedule collaborative meeting times throughout the school year for classroom teachers and those from specialized roles, such as reading coaches or special education teachers, who will be required to work together collaboratively with the same students. This allows these teachers the opportunity to discuss instructional strategies, behavior modification, and identify goals for student achievement.

One of the most difficult areas of teacher role stress to address is role overload, or the work demands and the time available to fulfill those demands. Teachers are overloaded with the demands of their jobs. Grading papers, filing, student documentation, faculty and grade level meetings, parent contact and conferencing, and planning lessons are just a few of the weekly requirements teachers face. Collegial principal leaders can attempt to limit the number of demands on teachers, such as outside duties or limiting redundant paperwork.

Recommendations for Further Research

This study provides information to assist administrators in improving collaboration and reducing teacher role stress in schools. Knowledge of how collegial principal leadership and trust in the principal affect collaborative practices can assist administrators and teachers identify areas needing improvement in their own organizations. However, there are a multitude of research studies available on collegial principal leadership, trust in the principal, and even collaboration. One area that needs further research is the area of teacher role stress.

As stated earlier, there is limited research available identifying role stress created by special education and regular education teachers working together. More attention needs to be given to this relationship. These teachers are required to work together daily to provide educational opportunities for students. Special education teachers and regular education teachers work collaboratively extensively throughout the school year, not only regarding instructional practices, but also behavior modification for specific students as well. Conflicts between these teachers may and have occurred regarding the best methods of instruction or discipline for those students who are now in full inclusion in the regular educational setting. Because these relationships are vital to the effectiveness of instruction for specific individual students at all grade levels, more research needs to be completed concerning role stress as created by the Special education and regular education teacher collaborative relationship.

Research is needed in the area of identifying ways to reduce teacher role stress in schools. Teachers tend to experience higher levels of stress than most other professions (Coates & Thoresen, 1976; Kyriacou & Sutcliffe, 1979). Collegial principal leadership, trust in the principal, and collaboration each demonstrated individually significant inverse relationships to teacher role stress. While not disregarding the importance of these relationships, more research

is needed to identify the specific causes of stress for teachers. Specific causes may be from job demands, unsatisfactory leadership, poor collegial relationships, and fulfilling the “other duties as assigned” as required in most schools. The study should also be expanded to include the maturity of the individuals being surveyed, as first year teachers may experience higher levels of stress than more experienced teachers and vice versa. Experienced teachers can easily experience higher levels of stress and find themselves in uncomfortable and unfamiliar territory when required to learn new technology or learning strategies for students. The research should also be expanded to identify the stressors for elementary, middle school, and high school teachers.

REFERENCES

- Achinstein, B. (2002). Conflict amid community: The micropolitics of teacher collaboration. *Teachers College Record, 104*(3), 421-455.
- Adams, C., & Forsyth, P. (2007). Promoting a culture of parental collaboration and trust: An empirical study. *Journal of School Public Relations, 28*(1), 32-56.
- Adler, P., & Borys, B. (1996). Two types of bureaucracy: Enabling and coercive. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 41*, 61-89.
- Bacharach, S., Bauer, S., & Shedd, J. (1988). The work environment and school reform. *Teachers College Record, 88*, 241-256.
- Bacharach, S. B., Bamberger, P., & Mitchell, S. (1990). Work design, role conflict, and role ambiguity: The case of elementary and secondary schools. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 12*(4), 415-432.
- Beck, E. (1974). Conflict, change, and stability: A reciprocal interaction in schools. *Social Forces, 52*, 517-531.
- Beck, E., & Betz, M. (1975). A comparative analysis of organizational conflict in schools. *Sociology of Education, 48*(1), 59-74.
- Beehr, T. (1995). *Psychological stress in the workplace*. London: Routledge.
- Blumberg, A., Greenfield, W., & Nason, D. (1978). The substance of trust between teachers and principals. *NAASP Bulletin, 62*(9), 76-88.
- Borg, M., & Falzon, J. (1990). Coping actions by Maltese primary school teachers. *Educational Research, 32*, 50-58.
- Borg, M., & Riding, R. (1991). Occupational stress and satisfaction in teaching. *British Educational Research Journal, 17*(3), 263-281.
- Brookover, W., Schweitzer, J., Schneider, J., Beady, C., Flood, P., & Wisenbaker, J. (1978). Elementary school social climate and school achievement. *American Educational Research Journal, 15*, 301-318.
- Brown, S., Jones, E., & Leigh, T. (2005). The attenuating effect of role overload on relationships linking self-efficacy and goal level to work performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(5), 972-979.

- Bryk, A., & Schneider, B. (2002). *Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Bryk, A., & Schneider, B. (2003). Trust in schools: A core resource for school reform. *Educational Leadership*, 60(6), 40-44.
- Carter, N., Prater, M. A., Jackson, A., & Marchant, M. (2009). Educators' perceptions of collaborative planning processes for students with disabilities. *Preventing School Failure*, 54(1), 60-70.
- Coates, T., & Thoresen, C. (1976). Teacher anxiety: A review with recommendations. *Review of Educational Research*, 46, 159-184.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Dudley-Marling, C. (2012). Diversity in teacher education and special education: The issues that divide. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 63(4), 237-244. doi:10.1177/0022487112446512
- Conley, S., & Woosley, S. A. (2000). Teacher role stress, higher order needs and work outcomes. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38(2), 179-201.
- Corwin, R. G. (1969). Patterns of organizational conflict. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 14(4), 507-521.
- Cosner, S. (2009). Building organizational capacity through trust. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 45(2), 248-291.
- Cosner, S. (2010). Drawing on a knowledge-based trust perspective to examine and conceptualize within-school trust development by principals. *Journal of School Leadership*, 117-144.
- Costa, A. (2003). Understanding the nature and the antecedents of trust within work teams. In B. Nooteboom & F. Six (Eds.), *The trust process in organizations: Empirical studies of the determinants and the process of trust development* (pp. 105-124). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Creswell, J. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cummings, L., & Bromiley, P. (1996). The Organizational Trust Inventory (OTI): Development and validation. In R. Kramer, & T. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research* (pp. 302-330). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Daly, A. J., & Chrispeels, J. (2005). From problem to possibility: Leadership for implementing and deepening the process of effective schools. *Journal for Effective Schools*, 4(1), 7-25.

- Darling-Hammond, L. (2001). The challenge of staffing our schools. *Educational Leadership*, 8, 12-18.
- Dijkstra, M. T., Beersma, B., & Evers, A. (2011). Reducing conflict-related employee strain: The benefits of an internal locus of control and a problem-solving conflict management strategy. *Work and Stress*, 25(2), 167-184. doi:10.1080/02678373.2011.593344
- DiPaola, M., Tschannen-Moran, M., & Walther-Thomas, C. (2004). School principals and special education: Creating the context for academic success. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 37(1), 1-10.
- Driscoll, J. (1978). Trust and participation in organizational decision making as predictors of satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 21(1), 44-56.
- Eaton, E. M., Chang, C., Miloslavic, S., & Johnson, R. (2011). Relationships of role stressors with organizational citizenship behavior: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(3), 619-632. doi:10.1037/a0021887
- Ellish-Piper, L., & L'Allier, S. (2010). Exploring the relationship between literacy coaching and student reading achievement in grades K-1. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 162-174. doi:10.1080/19388070902913289
- Forsythe, P., Adams, C., & Hoy, W. (2011). *Collective trust: Why schools can't improve without it*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Friend, M., & Cook, L. (2006). *Interactions: Collaboration skills for professionals* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Geist, J., & Hoy, W. (2004). Cultivating a culture of trust: Enabling school structure, teacher professionalism, and academic press. *Leading and Managing*, 10, 1-18.
- Gilmer, B. (1966). *Industrial psychology*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Goddard, R. D., Hoy, W. K., & Woolfolk, H. A. (2000). Collective teacher efficacy: Its meaning, measure and impact on student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 37(2), 479-507.
- Griffin, C. C., Kilgore, K. L., Winn, J. A., & Otis-Wilborn, A. (2008). First-year special educators' relationships with their general education colleagues. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 141-157.
- Helterbran, V. (2008). Professionalism: Teachers taking the reins. *The Clearing House*, 123-127.

- Henley, J., Milligan, J., McBride, J., Neal, G., Nichols, J., & Singleton, J. (2010). Outsiders looking in? Ensuring that teachers of the gifted and talented education and teachers of students with disabilities are part of the 'In-Crowd'. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 37(3), 203-209.
- House, R. J. (1970). Role conflict and multiple authority in complex organizations. *California Management Review*, 7(4), 53-60.
- Hoy, W. K. (1990). Organizational climate and culture: A conceptual analysis of the school workplace. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 1(2), 149-168.
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2008). *Educational administration: Theory, research and practice*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Hoy, W. K., Smith, P. A., & Sweetland, S. R. (2002). The development of the organizational climate index for high schools: Its measure and relationship to faculty trust. *The High School Journal*, 86(2), 38-49.
- Hoy, W., & Sabo, D. (1998). *Quality middle schools: Open and healthy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Hoy, W., & Sweetland, S. (2001). Designing better schools: The meaning and measure of enabling school structures. *Educational Administrative Quarterly*, 37, 296-321.
- Hoy, W., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (1999). Five faces of trust: An empirical confirmation in urban elementary schools. *Journal of School Leadership*, 9(3), 184-208.
- Hoy, W., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2003). The conceptualization and measurement of faculty trust in schools: The omnibus T-scale. In W. Hoy, & C. Miskel, *Studies in Leading and Organizing Schools* (pp. 181-208). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Hoy, W., Sabo, D., & Barnes, K. (1996). Organizational health and faculty trust: A view from the middle level. *Research in Middle Level Education Quarterly*, 21-39.
- Hoy, W., Tarter, C., & Bliss, J. (1990). Organizational climate, school health, and effectiveness: A comparative analysis. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 26, 260-279.
- Humberman, M. (1993). *The lives of teachers*. London: Cassell.
- Hurst, B., & Reding, C. (2000). *Professionalism in teaching*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Ingersoll, R. M. (1996). Teachers' decision-making power and school conflict. *Sociology of Education*, 69, 159-176.

- Kahn, R., & Quinn, R. (1970). Role stress: A framework for analysis. *Occupational Mental Health*, 50-115.
- Kahn, R., Wolf, D., Quinn, R., Snoek, J., & Rosenthal, R. (1964). *Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity*. New York: Wiley.
- Klassen, R. M., & Chiu, M. M. (2010). Effects on teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction: Teacher gender, years of experience, and job stress. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 102(3), 741-756. doi:10.1037/a0019237
- Kyriacou, C. (2001). Teacher stress: Directions for future research. *Educational Review*, 53(1), 27-36.
- Kyriacou, C., & Sutcliffe, J. (1979). Teacher stress and satisfaction. *Educational Research*, 21(2), 89-96.
- Lazarus, R. (1966). *Psychological stress and the coping process*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Lazarus, R., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Lee, J., & Shute, V. J. (2010). Personal and social-contextual factors in K-12 academic performance: An integrative perspective on student learning. *Educational Psychologist*, 45(3), 185-202.
- Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (2008). *Teachers in professional communities*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Lynch, J., & Ferguson, K. (2010). Reflections of elementary school literacy coaches on practice: Roles and perspectives. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 33(1), 199-227.
- Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. (2008). Early predictors of job burnout and engagement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(3), 498-512. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.93.3.498
- Mishra, A. (1996). Organizational responses to crisis: The centrality of trust. In R. Kramer, & T. Tyler (Eds), *Trust in organizations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Mitchell, C., & Castle, J. B. (2005). The instructional role of elementary school principals. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 28(3), 409-433.
- Mitchell, R. M., Ripley, J., Adams, C., & Raju, D. (2011). Trust an essential ingredient in collaborative decision making. *Journal of School Public Relations*, 32, 145-170.
- Morrow, P. (1988). Professionalism as a form of work commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 32, 92-111.

- Musanti, S. I., & Pence, L. (2010). Collaboration and teacher development: Unpacking resistance, constructing knowledge and navigating identities. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 73-89.
- Papastylianou, A., Kaila, M., & Polychronopoulos. (2009). Teachers' burnout, depression, role ambiguity and conflict. *Social Psychology Education*, 295-314. doi:10.107/s11218-008-9086-7
- Pounder, D. G. (1999). Teacher teams: Exploring job characteristics and work-related outcomes of work group enhancement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35(3), 317-348.
- Rizzo, J., House, R., & Lirtzman, S. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15, 150-163.
- Rogers, D., & Molnar, J. (1976). Organizational antecedents of role conflict and ambiguity in top-level administrators. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21, 598-610.
- Rotter, J. (1967). A new scale for the measurement of interpersonal trust. *Journal of Personality*, 35, 651-665.
- Schwab, R., & Iwanicki, E. (1982). Perceived role conflict, role ambiguity, and teacher burnout. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 18(1), 60-74.
- Selye, H. (1956). *The stress of life*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Slavin, R. (1995). *Cooperative learning (2nd ed.)*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Sockett, H. (1993). *The moral base for teacher professionalism*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Steinhardt, M. A., Jagers, S., Faulk, K. E., & Gloria, C. T. (2011). Chronic work stress and depressive symptoms: Assessing the mediating role of teacher burnout, stress, and health. *Stress and Health*, 27, 420-429. doi:10.1002/smi.1394
- Sutton, R. (1984). Job stress among primary and secondary school teachers: its relationship to ill-being. *Work and Occupations*, 11(1), 7-28.
- Sutton, R. I. (1984, February). Job stress among primary and secondary schoolteachers. *Work and Occupation*, 2(1), 7-28.
- Tarter, C., & Hoy, W. K. (2004). A systems approach to quality in elementary schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 42(5), 539-554. doi:10.1108/09578230410554052
- Tarter, C., Bliss, J., & Hoy, W. (1989). School characteristics and faculty trust in secondary schools. *Education Administration Quarterly*, 25(3), 294-308.

- Tarter, C., Sabo, D., & Hoy, W. (1995). Middle school climate, faculty trust, and effectiveness: a path analysis. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 29, 41-49.
- Tichenor, M., & Tichenor, J. (2009). Comparing teacher and administrator perspectives on multiple dimensions of teacher professionalism. *SRATE Journal*, 18(2), 9-18.
- Tichenor, M., & Tichenor, J. M. (2004-2005). Understanding teachers' perspectives on professionalism. *The Professional Educator*, XXVII(1 & 2), 89-95.
- Tjosvold, D. (1997). Conflict within interdependence: Its value for productivity and individuality. In C. De Dreu, & E. Van de Vliert (Eds.), *Using conflict in organizations* (pp. 23-37). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Travers, C., & Cooper, C. (1996). *Teachers under pressure: Stress in the teaching profession*. London: Routledge.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. (2001). Collaboration and the need for trust. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 39(4), 308-331.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. (2009). Fostering teacher professionalism in schools: The role of leadership orientation and trust. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 45(2), 217-247. doi:10.1177/0013161X08330501
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. (2000). Collaborative learning: A memorable model. *The Teacher Educator*, 36(2), 148-165.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, W. (1998). A conceptual and empirical analysis of trust in schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 36, 334-352.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., Parish, J., & DiPaola, M. (2006). School climate and state standards: How interpersonal relationships influence student achievement. *Journal of School Leadership*, 16, 386-415.
- Uline, C. L., Tschannen-Moran, M., & Perez, L. (2003). Constructive conflict: How controversy can contribute to school improvement. *Teachers College Record*, 105(5), 782-816.
- Uline, C., Miller, D., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (1998). School effectiveness: The underlying dimensions. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 34(4), 462-483.
- Wahlstrom, K. L., & Louis, K. S. (2008, October). 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

Winn, J., & Blanton, L. (2005). The call for collaboration in teacher education. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 38(2), 1-10.

Zand, D. (1971). Trust and managerial problem solving. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17, 229-239.

APPENDIX A

COLLABORATION SURVEY

Please indicate the level of influence you perceive each of the following groups has over various decision domains.

Collaboration with the principal: *To what extent do teachers have influence over the outcome of these decisions?*

	Not at All			Very Much		
1. Selecting personnel	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Determining criteria for selecting personnel	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Assigning and reassigning personnel	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Evaluating personnel	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Determining personnel needs	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Determining how to allocate space	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Designing building modifications	1	2	3	4	5	6

Collaboration among teacher colleagues: *To what extent do teacher committees influence decisions of this kind?*

	Not at All			Very Much		
1. Planning professional development activities	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Resolving student behavior problems	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Determining professional development	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Selecting instructional methods and activities	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Determining student placement	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Resolving curriculum and programs	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Evaluating curriculum and programs	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. Developing procedures for reporting student progress to parents	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. Developing consequences for rule breaking	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. Determining school rules	1	2	3	4	5	6

APPENDIX B

ROLE CONFLICT, ROLE AMBIGUITY, AND ROLE OVERLOAD SURVEY

Conley & Woosley, as adapted from Rizzo et al. (1970). <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2391486>

Role Ambiguity	Very False				Very True		
1) I feel certain about how much authority I have.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2) I know that I have divided my time appropriately.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3) I know what my responsibilities are.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4) I know exactly what is expected of me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Role Conflict							
1) I often work under incompatible policies and guidelines.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2) I often have to buck a rule or policy to carry out an assignment.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3) I often receive incompatible requests from two or more people.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Role Overload							
1) There isn't enough time during my regular workday to do everything that is expected of me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2) I am rushed in doing my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

APPENDIX C

OMNIBUS TRUST SCALE

Faculty Trust in the Principal Subscale

Directions: Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements about your school from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Your answers are confidential.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
8. Teachers in this school trust the principal.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. The teachers in this school are suspicious of most of the principal's actions.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. The teachers in this school have faith in the integrity of the principal.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. The principal in this school typically acts in the best interests of teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. The principal of this school does not show concern for the teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. Teachers in this school can rely on the principal.	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. The principal in this school is competent in doing his or her job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
23. The principal doesn't tell teachers what is really going on.	1	2	3	4	5	6

(Copyright© Hoy and Tschannen-Moran, 2003)

APPENDIX D
ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE INDEX

Collegial Leadership Subtest

Directions: The following are statements about your school, Please indicate the extent to which each statement characterizes your school from **rarely occurs** to **very frequently occurs**.

	Rarely Occurs	Sometimes Occurs	Often Occurs	Very Frequently Occurs
1. The principal explores all sides of topics and admits that other opinions exist.	1	2	3	4
3. The principal treats all faculty members as his or her equal.	1	2	3	4
5. The principal is friendly and approachable.	1	2	3	4
10. The principal lets faculty know what is expected of them.	1	2	3	4
13. The principal maintains definite standards of performance.	1	2	3	4
20. The principal puts suggestions made by the faculty into operation.	1	2	3	4
27. The principal is willing to make changes.	1	2	3	4

(Copyright© Hoy, 2003)

APPENDIX E

IRB APPROVAL

March 20, 2014



Jon Bret Smith
ELPTS
College of Education
The University of Alabama

Re: IRB # EX-14-CM-040 "An Investigation of School Characteristics in Northwest Alabama"

Dear Mr. Smith:

The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board has granted approval for your proposed research.

Your protocol has been given exempt approval according to 45 CFR part 46.101(b)(2) as outlined below:

- (2) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless:
 - (i) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and
 - (ii) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

Your application will expire on March 19, 2015. If your research will continue beyond this date, complete the relevant portions of Continuing Review and Closure Form. If you wish to modify the application, complete the Modification of an Approved Protocol Form. When the study closes, complete the appropriate portions of FORM: Continuing Review and Closure.

Should you need to submit any further correspondence regarding this proposal, please include the assigned IRB application number.

Good luck with your research.

Sincerely,



Carparkato T. Myles, MSM, CEM, CIP
Director & Research Compliance Officer
Office for Research Compliance
The University of Alabama



APPENDIX F

PRINCIPAL INFORMED CONSENT

Principal Informed Consent Form

You have been invited to take part in a research study to learn more about the effects of school culture in Northwest Alabama. This study will be conducted by Jon Bret Smith or another member of the research team investigating these school characteristics. All of these researchers are doctoral students at the University of Alabama and this research is a part of his/her dissertation.

If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to do the following:

1. Complete a questionnaire about the effects of school culture.

Participation in this study will involve approximately 15 minutes of your time to complete the questionnaire. There are no known risks associated with your participation in this research. Although you will receive no direct benefits, this research may help the investigator to understand effects of positive school culture in Northwest Alabama.

Confidentiality of your research records will be strictly maintained. You will not be asked to record any identifying information on the survey forms. Surveys will be collected by the researcher or one of his colleagues at a staff meeting. Participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate simply by not completing the survey. If there is anything about this study or your participation that is unclear or that you do not understand, or if you have questions or wish to report a research related problem, you may contact Jon Bret Smith at 256-905-2420 or jbsmith@lawrenceal.org or at East Lawrence Middle School, 99 County Road 370, Trinity, AL 35673.

If you have questions about your rights as a person taking part in a research study, or if you would like to make suggestions or file complaints and concerns, you may call Ms. Tanta Myles, the Research Compliance Officer of the University at (205)-348-8461 or toll-free at 1-877-820-3066. You may also ask questions, make suggestions, or file complaints and concerns through the IRB Outreach Website at http://osp.ua.edu/site/PRCO_Welcome.html. You may email us at participantoutreach@bama.ua.edu.

Agreement to Participate

By completing the survey you are consenting to participate in this research study.

This is your copy of the consent document to keep for your own personal records.

UA IRB Approved Document
Approval date: 3-20-14
Expiration date: 3-19-15

APPENDIX G

TEACHER INFORMED CONSENT

Teacher Informed Consent Form

You have been invited to take part in a research study to learn more about the effects of school culture in Northwest Alabama. This study will be conducted by Jon Bret Smith or another member of the research team investigating these school characteristics. All of these researchers are doctoral students at the University of Alabama and this research is a part of his/her dissertation.

If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to do the following:

1. Complete a questionnaire about the effects of school culture.

Participation in this study will involve approximately 15 minutes of your time to complete the questionnaire. There are no known risks associated with your participation in this research. Although you will receive no direct benefits, this research may help the investigator to understand effects of positive school culture in Northwest Alabama.

Confidentiality of your research records will be strictly maintained. You will not be asked to record any identifying information on the survey forms. Surveys will be collected by the researcher or one of his colleagues at a staff meeting in the absence of the principal. Participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate simply by not completing the survey. If there is anything about this study or your participation that is unclear or that you do not understand, or if you have questions or wish to report a research related problem, you may contact Jon Bret Smith at 256-905-2420 or jbsmith@lawrenceal.org or at East Lawrence Middle School, 99 County Road 370, Trinity, AL 35673.

If you have questions about your rights as a person taking part in a research study, or if you would like to make suggestions or file complaints and concerns, you may call Ms. Tanta Myles, the Research Compliance Officer of the University at (205)-348-8461 or toll-free at 1-877-820-3066. You may also ask questions, make suggestions, or file complaints and concerns through the IRB Outreach Website at http://osp.ua.edu/site/PRCO_Welcome.html. You may email us at participantoutreach@bama.ua.edu.

Agreement to Participate

By completing the survey you are consenting to participate in this research study.

This is your copy of the consent document to keep for your own personal records.

UA IRB Approved Document
Approval date: 8-20-14
Expiration date: 3-19-15