ISSN No:-2456-2165

Effects of Principal's Instructional Leadership on their Teacher Efficacy in Private Secondary School

Mahesh Kunwor
M. Phil, Educational Leadership, Kathmandu University, Nepal

Abstract:- This study examines the effects of instructional leadership behaviors on teacher efficacy. The literature review examined influenced the nature and implementation of this study. The focus is at the elementary level examining the perceptions of teachers towards principal and teacher efficacy. This research is primarily based on survey design method. The respondents of three secondary school as census method so the population was of six school only. Among all the full-time teachers of elementary level of the institutional secondary schools of Godawari, Municipality-11, Lalitpur district, 36 teachers were selected (as determined by the sampling formula) randomly as the sample. It was found that there were significant difference between principal instructional leadership and teacher efficacy.The findings of this study should add new dimensions to the educational research on instructional leadership and teacher efficacy. It should serve as a force for educators to examine their practice and craft with respect to instructional behaviors and their effects on efficacy.

Keywords:- *Instructional Leadership, Efficacy, Perception, Behavior, Elementary Level.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Education is one of the most prioritized sectors in Nepal. Parents are so worry about their wards to choose the good school. How did parents choose the school? The status of principal, teachers and goodwill of school plays important role. Each year more than 15% of the total budget is allotted to this sector. In the fiscal year 2072/73 out of the total Rs. 61.8, Rs. 9.86 billion was allotted for the education sector (Ministry of Finance, 2015) i.e. 16% budget in total and in the fiscal year 2073/74 it was more than 12% of total budget (Ministry of Finance, 2016).The budget allocations indicate that this sector has always become a highly prioritized sector of the government. Hence, this sector was chosen for the research. My concern in this research is, however, the elementary education only.

In Nepal, the teaching and learning are not effective so the students have less knowledge about basic skills. In addition the EFA Global Monitoring Report (2005) warned that, in many parts of the world, students are graduating from school without the required set of cognitive skills. It is estimated that around 250 million children in schools do not master basic skills in reading, writing and mathematics. (UNESCO Education Sector, 2016). How can school show good result and attract students and parents to their school? The one of the main cause is leadership and teaching learning process in the school. The status of principal, teachers and goodwill of school plays important role. Successful school leaders make use of a mix of leadership models, and are responsive to context, i.e. school goals, school organizational structure and culture (Leithwood, 2007; Bush, 2013). While instructional leadership is particularly useful in guiding teaching and learning, experienced leaders combine different styles, depending on school environment and the broad educational context (UNESCO Education Sector, 2016), I claim that instructional leadership enhance teacher efficacy.

There were different types of leadership theory, how and why Instructional leadership effects on teacher efficacy? In the context of Nepal, I am curious about the situation of teacher efficacy in private secondary school and how they were perceived to the principal's instructional leadership. This inquiry will help us to find the real situation of Principal's leadership style in school through teacher. Is Principal's instructional leadership effect their teacher efficacy? What were the perception of teachers towards their principal's instructional leadership?

There is an abundant and growing literature on school leadership in OECD countries; this field is still to be explored in most developing countries. The few existing research studies suggest that most developing countries still lag far behind with regard to the development of effective school leadership, despite the intentions of policy documents and discourses. For instance, a recent study by Ebot Ashu (2014), of Cameroon, stressed the need, expressed by head teachers and teachers, for the alignment of national school leadership policy development with international best practice in this area. According to the same study, head teachers and teachers also called for a structured leadership development programme to enhance the preparedness and performance of the head teachers (UNESCO Education Sector, 2016). The leader needs to know the instructional leadership theory. As, in general, head teachers are appointed from the teaching staff and receive little or no specific training, they tend to maintain the authoritarian, top-down leadership style they experienced as a teacher. I agree with these research so I claim that principal must have instructional behavior that enhance teacher efficacy.

I believe with the concept of (Rew, W.J, 2013) showed School principals can influence on student achieve and largely indirect effect on teacher's belief, knowledge, practice and competencies. The teacher needs the

inspiration, motivation and support from the leader while they have tried to give the effective teaching. That's why I did research on different school. How did the teacher perceive principal's instructional leadership and what were the effect towards the teachers? In addition Leaders have to know the institutional vision and goals. Leader should make the strategy and try to make the goals. These goals will fulfill by the help of lower level staff (teachers and non-teaching staff).

To focus down my study the researcher designs overarching questions which guide my whole research with its sub questions. The whole process of my study tried to find out the answer of the question "How the instructional leadership could probably effect on teacher efficacy?"

- *Under the Governance of the Above Mentioned Overarching Question the Following Research Questions Followed Throughout My Research:*

- What is the level of Principal's Instructional leadership?
- What is the level of teachers' efficacy?
- What is the relationship between Principals' instructional leadership and teachers' efficacy?

When I have gone through many literature and research studies, I have found that according to the situation different leadership approach have been used to make successful school. But this research tries to find out the Principal's instructional leadership condition through teacher efficacy. In my view, leader need to monitor and supervise teachers' work but in the same time they need motivation and inspiration as well.

I have followed the instructional leadership theory to find out the concept of leader or principal in the school. Instructional leadership is rare, despite the fact many principals worked as teachers before moving on to leadership roles. Principals tend, instead, to be preoccupied with routine, bureaucratic and administrative tasks, refraining from delegating tasks and empowering their teams. This deprives their schools of the significant improvements to teaching and learning and student achievement that result when principals assume instructional leadership roles (Crum and Sherman, 2008; Dinham, 2005; Leithwood and Jantzi, 2008; Southworth, 2009, as cited in UNESCO, 2016). These two theories are reviewed in detail.

- *Instructional Leadership*

My view on the definition of instructional leadership was towards Hallinger and Murphy (1987) who believed that instructional leadership using three dimensions: Defining the school mission, managing the instructional program and promoting the school learning climate.

The traditional definition of instructional leadership emphasized the principal's role as a "Master Teacher," that is, the principal as an instruction and curriculum expert (Mitchell & Castle, 2005, as cited in Finely, 2014). Leithwood (1994) had a similar view when he defined instructional leadership to only comprise the behaviors that directly affect the curriculum, teacher instruction, supervision, and staff development. Hallinger and Murphy (1987) expanded this definition when they stated that instructional leadership has to be defined by observable practices and behavior that principals can put into practice. The difference between Leithwood's (1994) and Hallinger and Murphy's definition was that Leithwood's definition excludes behaviors that are specifically focused on school climate and mission; whereas, Hallinger and Murphy's view includes the focus of a mission and school climate in its view of instructional leadership. Both definitions view the new educational standard for principals as instructional leadership (Finley , 2014).

Instructional leadership focuses on teaching and learning and on the behaviour of teachers in working with students. Leaders' influence is targeted at student learning via teachers. The emphasis is on the direction and impact of influence rather than the influence process itself (Bush, 2007).

Bush (2003) and Leithwood (1994) suggested that the key limitation of instructional leadership is its exclusive and narrow focus on teaching and learning which ignores the management functions of the principal (Grissom & Loeb, 2011), other leaders within the school (Lambert, 2002), and additional school objectives other than student achievement (Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008; Hallinger, 2003; Murphy, Hallinger, & Mitman, 1983). Notwithstanding its limitations, Robinson, Lloyd, and Rowe (2008) noted in their meta-analysis that the influence of instructional leadership on student achievement is three to four times larger than that of other prominent leadership styles (such as transformational leadership) (Rew,W.J, 2013). Instructional leadership focuses on the importance of establishing clear educational goals, planning the curriculum, evaluating teachers and teaching, and creating an enabling school environment (Stewart, 2006; Robison et. al., 2009).

- *Teacher's Self Efficacy*

Self-efficacy is the personal belief that one is capable of performing in an appropriate and effective manner to attain certain goals (Ormrod, 2006). It exists in many domains of human functioning, including both professional and private behaviour. Specifically in an educational context, teacher self-efficacy is the teacher's personal (i.e., self-perceived) belief in ability to plan instruction and accomplish instructional objectives. It is in effect the conviction the teacher has about his/her ability to teach pupils efficiently and effectively.

Teacher self-efficacy is a construct that was developed within the context of Bandura's social cognitive theory. Bandura defined self-efficacy as the belief about one's own capabilities to organize and execute a certain task (Bandura, 1997). According to Bandura's theory, self-efficacy has two components: efficacy expectation and outcome expectancy. According to Bandura's theory, four sources" enhance development of high teacher selfefficacy: (a) mastery learning experiences, (b) vicarious experiences, (c) social persuasion, and (d) physiological and emotional states.

ISSN No:-2456-2165

- *Instructional Leadership and Teacher Efficacy Beliefs*

The researcher have found literature support that prove Principal Instructional leadership have effect on teacher efficacy. W. JOSHUA REW (2013) mentioned in his dissertation on the topic "Instructional Leadership Practices and Teacher Efficacy Beliefs: Cross-National Evidence from Talis".

By employing instructional leadership practices (such as those within the domains of defining the school's mission, managing the instructional program, and promoting a positive learning climate) school principals may positively enhance the efficacy beliefs of their teachers and, indirectly, improve classroom instruction and the achievement of their students.

Another research found that teachers with high efficacy tend to experiment with methods of instruction, seek improved teaching methods, and experiment with instructional materials (Allinder, 1994; Guskey, 1988; Stein & Wang, 1988). The researcher also believes that there is the relation between principal instructional leadership and teacher efficacy.

II. METHOD

This research is survey which is empirical study of the population. So it is quantitative research. Quantitative research is a method by which the researcher is able to explain why something occurs (Creswell, 2012). The qualitative method was an option. However, the objective of this research is to apply the findings to a large population rather than explore experiences or stories of a few people. Additionally, the review of existing literature guides the researcher throughout this study by justification of the problem and generating a hypothesis to report the findings in a specific, measureable, and observable way (Creswell, 2012). I have followed the Cross-sectional surveys that used to gather information on a population at a single point in time. A cross sectional survey would be a questionnaire that collects data on "Effect of Principal Instructional Leadership on their Teacher Efficacy." In this research, I have collected the data from the teachers through a structured questionnaire in a well manage way with discussing with the expertise and guide.

For this study my view on the definition of research design was towards Cohen et al., (2007), who believed that research design is the plan of the study which is determined by the purpose of the study. The purpose of my study was to link effect of principal instructional leadership on their teacher efficacy for which I adopted regression and correlation research design. I have collected real and independent data through scientific, observable and fact method with value free research based.

This study was conducted with elementary teachers of 6 secondary schools (36 teachers) teaching at Godawari, Municipality-11 of lalitpur district. At first 3 schools were selected by random selection and entire teachers were selected as sample. The teachers' experience range is 1-15 years. The research design of this study is survey. According to Creswell (2008), studies carried out by using the survey method is able to collect data directly from the subject under review and to make generalizations.

- *Instruments*

This study will use a set of questionnaire as the main instrument that is modified from Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) and Teachers' Sense of Teacher efficacy Scale (TSES). Researchers have obtained the permission of the original authors by email to administer the questionnaire. Items in PIMRS have been modified to 50 items and items in the inventory of teacher efficacy questionnaire contain 24 items. Questionnaires for the study consisted of two sets whereby Set A and Set B for teachers. Likert scale score is used for instructional leadership practices and teacher efficacy.

- *The Following Instruments were Utilized in this Research:*

- Principal's Instructional Measurement Rating Scale (PIMRS) by Hallinger(1985).
- Teachers' Sense of Teacher efficacy Scale(TSES) by Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001).

- *Data Collection Procedure*

The two instruments- PIMRS and TSES were simultaneously administered to teachers. I myself went to collect the primary data from the teachers through the means of questionnaire. They were given enough time and instruction to fill the questionnaires. The secondary sources of the study were the books journals, research articles, dictionaries and took some information with the help of District Education office, Lalitpur and UGC.

III. DATA ANALYSIS

The data gathered from the respondents were downloaded into the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS, 16) for quantitative analysis. Descriptive statistics were used to find the mean and standard deviation of Principal's instructional leadership and teacher efficacy, correlation between principal's instructional leadership and teacher efficacy and regression analysis.

Inferential analysis will be applied to generalize the sample to the population. In this study, inference analysis is used to describe the independent and dependent variables of the instructional leadership of principals and demographic factors. The dependent variable is teacher efficacy in schools. The data was analyzed using, Mean Score, Standard Deviation and Pearson Correlation and regression.

ISSN No:-2456-2165

IV. FINDING AND DISCUSSION

- *Descriptive Statistics*

In the Study Area there were Teachers having Different Years of Experience which was Described in Given Table 1

Table 1 Teachers' Experience in Teaching

Experience in Years	Frequency	Percent
1	15	41.7
2-4	8	22.2
5-9	8	22.2
10-15	5	13.9
Total	36	100.0

Table 1 shows that the termination of teachers is 41.7% which indicates that teachers were not satisfied with the school that's why there is 41.7% new teachers having one years' experience. There are just 13.9% teachers having experience between 10- 15 years.

- *RQ 1: What Status / Level of Principal's Instructional Leadership in their Institution?*

In order to give answer of RQ1 regarding with the status/ level of Principal Instructional leadership in school, I have gone through mean and standard deviation as given table 2

Table 2 Description of Principal Instructional Leadership Principal Instructional Index

Statistics	Value
N	36
Mean	3.5167
Std. Deviation	.62111
Skewness	.193

Since, the value of coeff. Of Skewness is equal to 0.193 which is less than 0.5. It means the distribution follows nearly the normal distribution. The value of s.d of principal's instructional leadership is 0.62 which shows that most of the respondent's opinion is nearly same. The mean value is 3.5167 which indicates that Principal's instructional leadership in this area is not much frequently.

- *The Researcher had Tried to Find Out the Level/Status of Principal Instructional Leadership on Different Factors as Shown in Table 3*

Table 3 Description of Principal Instructional Leadership in Term of its Component

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Defining_school_mission	36	2.00	4.60	3.6444	.74083
Managing_instructionall_program	36	2.27	4.73	3.5667	.72497
Developing_school_learning_climate_program	36	2.44	4.68	3.4356	.62032
Valid N (listwise)	36				

These ratings were then combined into three domains. Table 3 showed that Defining the school's mission ranked as the highest domain amongst the principals (M=3.64, SD=0.74083). Managing the instructional program was the next highest rated domain (M=3.56, SD=0.72497) with little difference between the two. Following closely was the third ranked domain of positive school climate (M=3.43, SD=0.620). Teachers rated principal instructional leadership as having a moderate sense of effectiveness across the domains of instructional leadership.

- *RQ 2. How do Teachers Perceive their Efficacy In Teaching?*

The Perception of Teachers Towards the Teacher Efficacy is Shown in Table 4

Table 4 Description of Teacher Efficacy Teacher Efficacy Index

Statistics	Value
N	36
Mean	7.0139
Std. Deviation	1.15113
Skewness	0.387

ISSN No:-2456-2165

Since, the value of coeff. of Skewness is equal to 0.387 which is less than 0.5. It means the distribution follows nearly the normal distribution. The value of s.d of principal's instructional leadership is 1.15 which shows that most of the respondent's opinion is nearly same. The mean value is 7.0139 which indicate that the perception of teachers towards teacher efficacy is quite a bit. It indicates that principal's instructional leadership is not so effective in these schools.

- *The Researcher had Further Gone Through the Components of Teacher Efficacy Separately as in Table 5*

Table 5 Description of Teacher Efficacy in the Term of its Components

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Efficacy_students_engagement	36	4.38	8.38	6.9375	1.03919
Efficacy_instructional_strategies	36	4.50	8.62	6.7153	1.15016
Efficacy_classroom_management	36	4.62	17.75	7.3889	2.07790
Valid N (listwise)	36				

In analyzing the quantitative data regarding teachers' perception of their efficacy, the researcher found that classroom management resulted in the highest mean (M=7.3889, SD=2.077) of all the efficacy categories. Students engagement yielded the next highest mean score (M=6.9375, SD=0.03919). Instructional strategies yielded the lowest mean (M=6.7153, SD=1.15016). These responses indicated that teachers had a high sense of efficacy within their daily practice. These responses also indicated that the mean scores were closely aligned with little difference between the significance of each domain. Teachers rated each of the indicators as having similar importance.

The researcher have found literature support that prove Principal Instructional leadership have effect on teacher efficacy. W. JOSHUA REW (2013) mentioned in his dissertation on the topic "Instructional Leadership Practices and Teacher Efficacy Beliefs: Cross-National Evidence from Talis"

By employing instructional leadership practices (such as those within the domains of defining the school's mission, managing the instructional program, and promoting a positive learning climate) school principals may positively enhance the efficacy beliefs of their teachers and, indirectly, improve classroom instruction and the achievement of their students (Rew, W.J, 2013).

- RQ 3. To what Extent does Principal's Instructional Leadership have an Effect on Teacher Efficacy?
  Hypothesis: There is no significant difference between Principal Instructional leadership and teacher efficacy.

- Pearson Correlation Test was Used to Find the Effect of Principal Instructional Leadership on Teacher Efficacy in Table 6

Table 6 Correlation between Principal Instructional Leadership and Teacher Efficacy

Variables	Teacher Efficacy		
Principal Instructional Index	N	Correlation Coefficient (r)	Sig.Value
	36	.492**	.002

From table 6 the relation between Principal Instructional leadership and teacher efficacy is moderately positive as r= 0.492. The relation is also significant as p-value (=0.002) is less than α(= 0.05) than is level of significance. Hence, the research hypothesis is retained. It means that when Principal increased their instructional leadership style then teacher efficacy also increased. However correlation does not explain us causal relation between Principal Instructional leadership and teacher efficacy. Furthermore the researcher have tried to find the relation through regression analysis.

- Hypothesis: There is positive effect of Principal Instructional leadership (x) on teacher efficacy (y) skills of students.

- The following regression model is used to examine the effect of Principal Instructional Leadership on teacher efficacy:
- ✓ y = a + bx, where y=teacher efficacy,
- ✓ x= Principal Instructional leadership,
- ✓ a is constant and b is regression coefficient of the line on y on x.

➢ *The Result from Regression Analysis is Presented in the Following Table:7*

Table 7 Regression of Principal Instructional Leadership on Teacher Efficacy

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	3.805	.988		3.853	.000
	Principal Instructional Index	.913	.277	.492	3.298	.002
a. Dependent Variable: mean of overall teacher efficacy						

- From the table 7 the regression model is: PIL (Y) = 3.805(a)+ 0.913 TE(X).

From the model, if the PIL is increased by one unit then TE will be increased by 0.913 units. The result is significant as p-value (0.002) is less than alpha value (0.05). Hence, the research hypothesis is retained that means Principal Instructional Leadership effects on teacher efficacy. This finding is also supported by Leitner (1994) noted that instructional leadership provides the theoretical support for the principal's indirect influence on student learning and direct influence on the instructional behaviors, beliefs, knowledge, practices, and competencies of teachers (Hallinger, 2005; 2003; Blase & Blase, 2000; 1999; Heck, Larsen, & Marcoulides, 1990).

V. CONCLUSION

The findings of this study should add new dimensions to the educational research on instructional leadership and teacher efficacy. It should serve as an force for educators to examine their practice and craft with respect to instructional behaviors and their effects on efficacy. This research proved that there are moderately effects of Principal instructional leadership on their teacher efficacy.

By employing instructional leadership practices, school principals may positively enhance the efficacy beliefs of their teachers and, indirectly, improve classroom instruction and the achievement of their students (Rew, W.J, 2013). A unique contribution of this study is that the findings point to the fact that, despite perception differences between principals and teachers in instructional practices that impact teacher efficacy, principals and teachers have had a great common goal in educating students entrusted under their care. This will eventually lead to enhanced teacher efficacy to improve student achievement. Hallinger & Murphy (1985) state that instructional leadership behaviors convey through serious thought and execution the implementation of an effective instructional program that is far from the state and national mandates imposed on schools, and are mechanisms in which the whole school is empowered to achieve academic success. As instructional leaders are more confident in designing and communicating the school goals and instituting instructional management programs, teachers in turn are more apt to exhibit leadership, confidence and efficacy in their teaching behaviors. Principal need to supervise, monitor, and guide continuously to their teacher to enhance their efficacy which help to grab the quality outcome of students.

REFERENCES

[1]. Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. Psychological Review, 84(2), 191-215.
[2]. Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. New York: W. H. Freeman and Company.
[3]. Best, J. W. & Kahn, J. V. (2007). *Research in education.* New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India Private Limited.
[4]. Bush, T. (2007). Educational leadership and management: theory, policy, and practice. *South African Journal of Education, 27*(3), 397. Retrieved from tony.bush@ntlworld.com
[5]. Cambridge. (n.d.). Educational Leadership.
[6]. Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research methods in education.* London: RoutledgeFalmer.
[7]. Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design.* New Delhi: SAGE.
[8]. Finley , M. (2014). AN EXPLORATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEACHERS' PER. *Educational Admini*. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2149
[9]. Grissom, J. A., & Loeb, S. (2011). Triangulating principal effectiveness: How perspectives of parents, teachers, and assistant principals identify the central importance of managerial skills. American Educational Research Journal, 48(5), 1091-1123.
[10]. Hallinger, P., and Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. The Elementary School Journal, 86, 217 – 247
[11]. Halverson, R., Kelley , C., & Shaw, J. (2014). A CALL for improved school leadership.
[12]. *How Do Leaders Approach Trauma-Informed Organizational Change…Twice?*

[13]. Ibrahim, M. S., Ghavifekr, S., Ling, S., Siraj, S., & Azeez, M. I. (2014). Can transformational leadership influence on teachers' commitment towards organization, teaching profession, and students learning? A quantitative analysis. *Asia Pacific Education, 15*(2). doi:doi:10.1007/s12564-013-9308-3.
[14]. *JOSTOR, 95*. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/24374514.
[15]. Kursunoglu, A. (2009). The relationship between teachers' perceptions towards instructional leadership behaviors of their principals and teachers' attitudes towards change. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 1*(1), 252-258. doi:org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2009.01.046.
[16]. Middleton, Harvey & Esaki (2015): Transformational Leadership and Organizational Change:
[17]. National Evidence from Talis (2013). Doctor of Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies.
[18]. Northhouse, P. G. (2010). *Leadership Theory and Practice*. New Delhi: SAGE.
[19]. Pearce, Michelle L., "The Effects of Instructional Leadership on Teacher Efficacy" (2017).
[20]. Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership for Learning Dissertations. Retrived from: http://digitalcommons.kennesaw.edu/educleaddoc_etd/5.
[21]. Rew,W.J, " Instructional Leadership Practices and Teacher Efficacy Beliefs: Cross-National Evidence from Talis" (2013). Doctor of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies Dissertation.
[22]. O'Callaghan, B. R. (2004). *Calculators, attitudes, and success.* Lousisiana: Southeastern Louisiana University.
[23]. Olurotimi , O. J. (2015). Motivational Factors and Teachers Commitment in Public. *Journal of Education and Practice, 6*(15). Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1079975.pdf
[24]. Pihl-Thingvad, S. (2014). Is self-leadership the new silver bullet of leadership? An empirical test of the relationship between self-leadership and organizational commitment. *JSTOR, 25*(2). Retrieved 2017, from http://www.jstor.org/stable/24709919
[25]. Pearce, Michelle L., "The Effects of Instructional Leadership on Teacher Efficacy" (2017). Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership for Learning Dissertations.
[26]. Richards, K. (2003). *Qualitative inquiry in TESOL*. London: Macmillan.
[27]. Ritchie, J. & Lewis. J. (Eds.). (2003). Q*ualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers* (pp. 75 – 79). London: Sage.
[28]. *Spotlight.* (2008). Retrieved from The Knowledgeloom: http://knowledgeloom.org.
[29]. Tschannen-Moran, M. (2001). Collaboration and the need for trust. Journal of Educational Administration, 39(4), 308-331.