THE MEDIATING EFFECT OF LEADERSHIP FRAMEWORK OF ADMINISTRATORS ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEAM BUILDING AND SELF-EFFICACY OF TEACHERS

BERNADETH M. CUSTODIO [1]University of Mindanao Davao City**,** Philippines, [2] Department of Education, Governor Nonito E. Llanos, Sr. National High School, Davao del Sur Division
Email: Jeiths_627@yahoo.com

_____

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to investigate the mediating effect of leadership framework of school administrators on the relationship between team-building and self-efficacy of teachers among the 400 teachers in Davao Region. This study employed non-experimental design utilizing descriptive correlation technique. The statistical tools used were mean, pearson-r, regression technique, and medgraph using Sobel z-test. Research instruments on leadership framework of administrators, team-building, and efficacy of teachers which were validated were used as sources of data. Using pearson-r, the results revealed that there is a significant relationship between leadership framework of the administrators and team building, there is a significant relationship between leadership framework of administrators and self-efficacy, and there is a significant relationship between team building and self-efficacy. Utilizing megradph Sobel z-test, the results of the study also suggest that there is also a partial mediation on the effect of leadership framework of administrators on the relationship between team building and efficacy of teachers.

Keywords: Mediating Effect, Leadership Framework of Administrators, Team Building Self-Efficacy of Teachers, Educational Management, Non-Experimental Quantitative Design, Philippines

1. Introduction

Teacher self-efficacy is a motivational construct that mirrors competence of teacher and their beliefs for teaching tasks. Teacher self-efficacy is essential in developing the critical thinking skills of the students in order for them to navigate the 21st century learning milieu. Conversely, not every teacher possesses a high sense of efficacy in their instructional competence. There are a quite few teachers who come to school not ready in their class and fail to provide relevant learning experiences to the students. As a consequence, students do not

achieve mastery of the competence they ought to learn (Gaziel, 2007; Stewart, 2006; Vanderhaar, Munoz & Rodosky, 2006).

The importance of self-efficacy of teachers cannot be over emphasized which is the result of the interplay of a number of variables. One of them is team building. Team building is one important component for school to achieve success. As staff and teachers work in collective efforts, the school will advance. Undeniably, teamwork helps the school achieve progress. In every school, teachers are dependent to one another and this work in collaboration unites faculty and staff in achieving school goals. There is no teacher can work in solitary; one has to have colleagues to aid in accomplishing efficiently assigned tasks. When teachers and staff work in a team rather than individually, the outcome comes out to be far better as every individual can contribute in his best possible way (Aguinis, 2009; Lim & Morris, 2006; Tharenou, Saks Moore, 2007).

School heads must take every effort to establish teamwork in school knowing what progress and advantages team building can bring. However, not every teacher and staff are cohesive with one another. Some teachers and staff are divided by faction due to poor coordination between and among them which results to unsatisfactory work performance (Blanchard & Thacker, 2007; Ellis, Bell, Ployhart, Hollenbeck & Ilgen, 2005; Salas, Sims & Burke, 2005).

On the other hand, on the list of priorities for school reform, improving school leadership today ranks high. The task of leading the school community is receiving greater attention than before as schools become increasingly complex organizations. This has paved way to sustainable school leadership as essential to the academic growth of students and professional growth of faculty and staff. Understanding what sustainable leadership truly means from the standpoint of teachers will increase understanding of how specific leadership practices and processes impact those in the learning community who are directly responsible for the academic growth of students (Ballard & Bates 2008; Gosmire & Grady, 2007; Mancheno, Endres, Polak & Athanasaw, 2009).

Davis (2010) claimed that school leadership determines the success of every teacher in school, however, there are schools which are not successful in their operations due to the problems in educational administration and this stem from lack of leadership. School administrators encounter problems on teachers' efficacy because of communication problems and this create confusions. Confusion results because administrators do not have regular and open lines of communication with their teaching staff or with their superiors. Having overwhelming responsibilities, principals are less accessible, which leads to less face-to-face interaction. Instead, issues usually are addressed in general meetings because of time constraints (Christensen, 2008; Davies, 2010; Garland, 2009; Morrison & Lowther, 2010)

For Ballard & Bates (2008) teachers become efficient so long the school heads empower teachers and allow them to explore all the possibilities of developing themselves towards improving their instructional practices including their professional growth. They also added that teachers develop their full potentials when the school heads know how to tap every teacher's talent and their genius they may be for personal or professional gains.

The magnitude of teacher's efficacy cannot be discounted and underscored. One important variable which contributes to efficacy of teacher is the school leadership of administrators as mentioned in various literatures such as that of Ballard & Bates (2008), Gaziel (2007), Nettles & Herrington (2007), Vanderhaar, Munoz, & Rodosky (2006), and Wahlstrom & Louis (2008) among others.

The researcher has not come across of a similar study especially in the local setting. This undertaking therefore can be considered as a blueprint of new knowledge and an additional document to the existing knowledge for each variable involved in the study. It is in this considerable perspective that the researcher decided to conduct the study with a hope that the results of this undertaking will be added to the rich topic on the variables studied.

2. Research Objective

The purpose of this study was to determine the mediating effect of leadership of administrators on the relationship between team building and efficacy of teachers. Specifically, the study sought to answer the following objectives:

1. To describe the level of leadership framework of administrators.

2. To describe the level of team building of teacher.

3. To describe the level of efficacy of teachers in terms of:

4. To describe the significant relationship between: leadership framework of administrators and team building, leadership framework of administrators and efficacy of teachers, and efficacy of teachers and team building

5. To determine if the leadership framework of the administrators has a significant mediating effect on the relationship between team building and self-efficacy of teachers.

3. Methodology

This study employed a non-experimental design utilizing the descriptive correlation technique of research which is designed to gather data, ideas, facts and information related to the study. This study also employs a testing of mediation. It looked into the relationship between three variables – school leadership, team building and self-efficacy of teachers (Johnson, 2012).

The general test for mediation was to examine the relation between the predictor and the criterion variables, the relation between the predictor and the mediator variables, and the relation between the mediator and criterion variables. A mediating variable is one that lies intermediate between independent causal factors and a final outcome. Mediating variables aim to estimate the way a variable Z affects the impact of X on Y (Baron & Kenny, 1986).

The interest of the study was to investigate the relationship between team-building and school leadership; the relationship between self-efficacy of teachers and school leadership; and the mediating effect of school leadership on the relationship between team building and self-efficacy of teachers.

The study was conducted in ten divisions in Region XI. This includes 400 teachers from the implementing units of the division of Compostela Valley Province, Davao del Norte, Davao del Sur, Davao Oriental, Mati City, Digos City, Davao City, Panabo City, Tagum City, and Island Garden City of Samal (IGACOS).

4.Results

4.1 Level of Leadership Framework of Administrators

The responses of the respondents on their level of leadership framework of the administrators has an overall mean score of 4.30 or very high level indicates that most of the items regarding leadership framework of the administrators are sometimes manifested. The cited overall mean score was the result obtained based on the mean scores of 4.35 or *very high* for *demonstrating personal qualities*, 4.31 or *very high* for *working with others*, 4.30 or *very high* for *managing services*, 4.30 or *very high* for *delivering the strategy*, 4.29 or *very high* for *setting direction*, 4.29 or *very high* for *creating the vision*, and 4.26 or very *high* for *improving services*.

The high level for *demonstrating personal qualities* indicated that leadership framework of administrators was often manifested by the teachers. The mean rating for this indicator which was 4.30 was the result of the high scores assigned by the teachers to the specific items in the questionnaire appended in this study. This included reflecting on how own values and principles influence behavior and impact on other, seeking feedback from others on strengths and limitations and modify behavior accordingly, planning workload and deliver commitments to consistently high standards demonstrating flexibility to service requirements, actively seeking opportunities to learn and develop, and acting in an open, honest and inclusive manner - respecting other people's culture, beliefs and abilities.

The respondents had an agreeable rating on *working with others*. Its mean rating of 4.31 described as very high level specified that the leadership framework of administrators was often times felt by the teachers. The descriptors for this particular indicator as underscored in the questionnaire were identifying opportunities

where working collaboratively with others will bring added value to constituents, listening to and take into account the needs and feelings of others, comfortably managing conflicts of interests or differences of opinion, acknowledging and appreciate the efforts of others within the team and respect

the team's decision, and actively seeking contributions and views from others.

The rating of 4.30 for *managing services* obtained a very high level of descriptive rating as a result of the rating given by the respondents on the following items in the research instrument: assessing the available options in terms of benefits and risks, taking action when resources are not being used efficiently and effectively, supporting team members in developing their roles and responsibilities, providing others with clear purpose and direction, and analyzing information from a range of sources about performance.

In *delivering the strategy*, the high level descriptive rating revealed that the leadership framework was oftentimes manifested by the respondents. The mean rating was 4.30 which was the outcome of the responses of teachers in the following items in the questionnaire: drawing on relevant thinking and best practice to inform strategy development, mitigating uncertainties and risks associated with strategic choices, ensuring strategic plans are translated into workable operational plans, monitoring progress of the strategic outcomes and make adjustments where necessary, and helping others to overcome obstacles and challenges in delivering the strategy.

A very high level of setting *direction* with the mean rating of 4.29 was also evident among the respondents denoting that this indicator was often times felt by the teachers. The descriptors as underscored in the questionnaire are the following: anticipating future challenges that will create the need for change and communicate these to others, influencing others to use knowledge and evidence to achieve best practice, consulting with key people and groups when making decisions taking into account the values and priorities of the service, actively engaging in formal and informal decision-making processes about the future of services, and taking responsibility for embedding new approaches into working practices.

On the other hand, the mean rating of 4.29 for *creating the vision* was high. The descriptors in the questionnaire were: actively engaging with others to determine the direction of the organization, communicating the vision with enthusiasm and clarity, taking time to build critical support for the vision, showing confidence, commitment and passion for the vision in my day to day actions, and taking into account the full range of factors that will impact upon the future of the organization.

A high level of *improving services* with the mean rating of 4.26 was also evident among the respondents denoting that this indicator was oftentimes felt by the teachers. The descriptors in the questionnaire were: reviewing practice to improve patient safety and minimize risk, working with others to constructively evaluate

our services, encouraging debate about new ideas with a wide range of people, articulating the need for change and its impact on people and services, and putting forward ideas to improve the quality of services.

Data indicated that the respondents oftentimes felt the leadership framework of the administrators. This further means that the school heads leadership framework is oftentimes manifested. The teachers and staff of implementing schools in Region XI oftentimes felt the leadership framework of the administrators. The school heads in the implementing schools in the region were high in their level of leadership framework.

4.2 Level of Team Building of Teachers

Computations revealed an overall mean score of 4.31 or very high rating for overall team building of teachers indicating that the said respondents were high in team building. The score was derived from the mean scores of 4.35 or *very high* for *team structure*, 4.35 or *very high* for *communication*, 4.30 or *very high* for *leadership*, 4.28 or *very high* for *mutual support*, and 4.27 or *very high* for *situation monitoring*.

Data revealed that the respondents had manifested a very high level of *team structure* as manifested in the following descriptors in the questionnaire: having sufficient skill so that work can be shared when necessary, are held accountable for their actions, using the resources wisely, understanding their roles and responsibilities, and operating at a high level of efficiency.

On the other hand, the respondent's level of *communication* was very high indicating that they revealed a good skill in communication. Most of the teachers and staff of implementing units in the region observed the seeking information from all available resources, explaining information regarding students' progress or failure to parents or family in lay terms, relaying relevant information in a timely manner, using common terminology when communicating with each other, and verifying information when they receive from one another.

The mean rating of 4.30 for *leadership* obtained a very high level score as a result of the rating given by the respondents on the following items in the research instrument: ensuring that adequate resources are available, resolving conflicts successfully, modeling appropriate behavior, taking time to meet the conflicts successfully, modeling appropriate behavior, taking time to meet the teachers and staff to develop plan for students' progress, and providing opportunities to discuss the staff and teachers' performance after an activity.

A high level on *mutual support* with a mean rating of 4.28 was also evident among the respondents. The mean rating was the outcome of the teachers' responses in the following items in the questionnaire: helping each other during high work load, requesting assistance from each other when they feel overwhelmed, giving feedback between each other in a way that promotes positive interactions and future change, resolving conflicts even when the conflicts have become personal, and cautioning others about potential risky situations.

On the other hand, the mean rating of 4.27 for *situation monitoring* was very high. The descriptors in the questionnaire were: effectively anticipating each other's needs, exchanging relevant information as it becomes available, meeting to evaluate students' performance, correcting each other's mistake for development, and monitoring each other's performance.

Data indicate that the teachers and staffs in all implementing units in the region have a high level of team building. This further means that the respondents have an effort in which they study their own process of working together and acts to create a climate that encourages and values the contributions of team members.

Further, the teachers and staff of implementing units in the region directed their energies toward problem solving, task effectiveness, and maximizing the use of all members' resources to achieve the team's purpose.

4.3 Level of Self-Efficacy of Teachers

For the overall level of Self-Efficacy of Teachers, computations revealed an overall mean score of 4.42 or very high rating indicating that the said respondents oftentimes manifest self-efficacy. The score was derived from the mean scores of 4.43 or *very high* for *student engagement*, 4. 43 or *very high* for *classroom management*, and 4.41 or *very high* for *instructional strategies*.

The mean rating of 4.43 for *student engagement* was very high. The descriptors in the questionnaire were: controlling disruptive behavior in the classroom, motivating students who show low interest in school work, getting students to follow classroom rules, using a variety of assessment strategies, and implementing alternative strategies in your classroom.

On the other hand, the mean rating of 4.43 for *classroom management* was very high. The mean rating was the outcome of the teachers' responses in the following items in the questionnaire: establishing routines to keep activities running smoothly, establishing a classroom management system with each group of students, responding to defiant students, making expectations clear about student behavior, and keeping a few problem students form ruining an entire lesson.

Data indicated that the teachers manifested a very high level of self-efficacy. This means that the teachers' beliefs in their abilities to organize and execute courses of action necessary to bring about desired results is high which is considered a future-oriented motivational construct that reflects teachers' competence beliefs for teaching tasks.

4.4 Correlations between Leadership Framework and Team Building

By doing an in-depth analysis, it could be gleaned that the indicators of leadership framework and team building revealed a computed r-value of 0.752 with a probability value of 0.000 which is significant at the 0.05

level. This implies that the higher the leadership framework of the respondents the higher is their team building. Thus, the null hypothesis of no significant relationship between leadership framework and team building of the respondents was therefore rejected.

As evident in the table, the r-value and p-value for the correlation between demonstrating personal qualities and team building was 0.594 and 0.000 probability value or significant. Data implied that demonstrating personal qualities was considered very important in team building. Working with others indicator was also significantly related to team building with computed r-value of 0.627 and 0.000. Mean while, managing services was also predictor of team building as revealed in the computed r-value of 0.722 and p-value of 0.000.

Another important predictor of team building was improving services as evidenced by the r-value of 0.686 whose associated p-value is 0.000 or significant. Setting direction is also significantly related to team building with computed r-value of 0.708 and p-value of 0.000. Creating the vision is also other important predictor of team building as evidenced by the computed r-value of 0.715 and p-value of 0.000. Delivering strategy was also significantly related to team building with r-value of 0.714 and p-value of 0.000.

4.5 Correlation between Leadership Framework and Self-Efficacy of Teachers

By doing an in-depth analysis, it can be gleaned that the indicators of leadership framework and self-efficacy revealed a computed r-value of 0.535 with a probability value of 0.000 which is significant at the 0.05 level. This implies that the higher the leadership framework of the respondents, the higher is their self-efficacy. Thus, the null hypothesis of no significant relationship between leadership framework and self-efficacy of the respondents was rejected.

As evident in the table, the r-value and p-value for the correlation between demonstrating personal qualities and self-efficacy was 0.432 and 0.000 probability value or significant. Data implied that demonstrating personal qualities was considered very important predictor of self-efficacy. Working with others indicator was also significantly related to self-efficacy with computed r-value of 0.426 and p-value of 0.000.

The other important predictor of self-efficacy was managing services as evidenced by the computed r-value of 0.490 whose associated probability is 0.000 or significant. Improving services was also significantly related to self- efficacy with computed r-value of 0.512 and p-value of 0.000. Setting direction was also other important predictor of self-efficacy with computed r-value of 0.512 and p-value of 0.000.

Another important predictor of self-efficacy is creating the vision as evidenced by the computed r-value of 0.513 and p-value of 0.000. Delivering the strategy indicator was also significantly related to self-efficacy with computed r-value of 0.535 and p-value of 0.000.

4.6 Correlation between Team Building and Self-Efficacy of Teachers

By doing an in-depth analysis, it could be gleaned that the indicators of team building and self-efficacy revealed a computed r-value of 0.736 with a probability value of 0.000 which is significant at the 0.05 level. This implies that the higher the team building, the higher is the self-efficacy. Thus, the null hypothesis of no significant relationship between team building and self-efficacy was rejected.

As evident in the table, the r-value and p-value of the correlation between team structure self-efficacy was 0.645 and 0.000 probability value or significant. Data implied that team structure was considered very important predictor of self-efficacy. Leadership indicator was also significantly related to self-efficacy with computed r-value of 0.522 and p-value of 0.000.

The other important predictor of self-efficacy was situation monitoring as evidenced by the computed r-value of 0.676 whose associated p-value of 0.000 or significant. Mutual support also was significantly related to self-efficacy with computed r-value of 0.680 and p-value of 0.000. Communication was also other important predictor of self-efficacy with computed r-value of 0.648 and p-value of 0.000.

4.7 Mediation Analysis of the Three Variables

Data was analyzed with linear regression method as input to the medgraph. Mediation developed by Baron and Kenny (1986) is the mediating effect of a third variable in the relationship between two variables. There are four steps to be met for a third variable to be acting as a mediator. In table 7 these are categorized as Steps 1 to 4. In Step 1 team building as the independent variable (IV) significantly predicts self-efficacy, the dependent variable (DV). In step 2 team building significantly predicts school leadership framework, the mediator (M). In step 3 school leadership framework significantly predicts self-efficacy.

In step 4 the combined effect of team building and school leadership framework on self-efficacy is significant. Since the four steps are significant, further mediation analysis through medgraph is warranted. However, if any of the four steps yielded non-significant result, then mediation analysis will be discontinued. In this case, the four steps were satisfied, hence mediation analysis was carried on using the medgraph by Jose (2003) involving the Sobel test to assess the significance of mediation effect. Sobel test is known for the most reliable results in mediation (Ozden, Simsek & Cangul, 2007). Mediation will be achieved if the effect of the IV (team building) on DV (self-efficacy) is significantly lessened after controlling M (school leadership framework).

It could be noted that the mediation is null with a p value of 0.377 that is very much greater than p of 0.05, hence the acceptance of the null hypothesis that school leadership framework had no mediating effect on self-efficacy of teachers. The indirect path through school leadership frame was very small (0.033). The figure

was obtained by multiplying path a (0.752) and path c (0.535). Inclusion of the mediating variable did not reduce the basic relationship (0.736) to a significant degree but increased instead, even higher (0.769) than the basic relationship. That result disclosed that mediation did not occur. A non significant Sobel z (0.883) revealed that no reduction in the beta for the basic relationship was achieved. The ratio index yielded a value of 0.044, indicating that only a negligible amount (about 4%) of the total effect was explained by the indirect path through school leadership framework. The non-significant Sobel value with p = 0.377 with the very small indirect/total ration tells us that no significant mediation occurred with the involvement of three variables. Engagement of school leadership framework did not explain any significant portion of the basic relationship between team building and self-efficacy.

The above mentioned result support the main context of the study on the mediating effect of school leadership framework on the relationship between team building and self-efficacy of teachers. The study conforms with the proposition of Brand and Wilkins (2007), which pointed that teacher's educational skills are important to teachers' efficiency at work. These abilities are targeted for specific content area teachers but are more broadly based for general classroom teachers. When teachers display a high level of instructional competence, they become efficient in delivering their lessons as mastery of teaching the competencies to the students become easy and comprehensible. In the same manner, the result substantiated the proposition of Ganad (2014) who maintained that team building is associated with self-efficacy of teachers, which according to her, is a measure of school effectiveness. She furthered that effect of leadership of school administrators are vital to their team building, which has a spillover effect on the self-efficacy of teachers. This purports that team-building has both significant causation on the leadership of the administrators and the efficacy of teachers. However, the study confirms the proposition of the prediction model of school effectiveness in terms of teacher performance and efficacy, stating that both leadership and team-building practices significantly causes efficacy to rise, holding other variables constant. However, in their reported R2, the degree of alienation was still large, accounting for a bigger room for other explanatory power of some variables not included in the study (Chavez, 2013; Ganad, 2008; Ganad, 2014).

5. Conclusion

With considerations on the findings of the study, conclusions are drawn in this section. The respondents give a high level of leadership framework of the administrators, high level of team building, and high level of self-efficacy. The results of the study also confirms that there is a significant relationship between leadership framework of the administrators and team building, there is a significant relationship between leadership

framework of administrators and self-efficacy, and there is a significant relationship between team building and self-efficacy. The results of the study also suggest that there is also a partial mediation on the effect of leadership framework of administrators on the relationship between team building and efficacy of teachers.

6. Recommendations

The study found a significant relationship between leadership framework of administrators and team building. The researcher therefore recommends that the school administrators may continue to leadership practices in order to maintain the team building experienced by the teachers and the staff in all implementing units in the region. The study also reveals a significant relationship between leadership framework of administrators and self-efficacy of teachers. The researcher therefore recommends that administrators may continue to practice their leadership framework practices to maintain or even improve the self-efficacy of the teachers. The study also reveals that there is a significant relationship between team building and self-efficacy of teachers and the researcher recommends that the school administrators may create team building activities so that teachers are at all times have a sense of self-efficacy.

References

1. Aguinis H. (2009). *Performance Management*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall. 2nd ed.

2. Ballard, K., & Bates, A. (2008). Making a connection between student achievement, teacher accountability, and quality classroom instruction. *The Qualitative Report*, *13*(4), 560–580.

3. Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *51*, 1173-1182.

4. Blanchard PN, Thacker JW. (2007). *Effective Training: Systems, Strategies, and Practices*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall. 3rd ed

5. Christensen, C. M. (2008). Disrupting Class: How Disruptive Innovation Will Change The Way The World Learns. New York, Ny: Mcgraw-Hill.

6. Davies, P. M. (2010). On School Educational Technology Leadership.   Management In Education, 24(2), 55-61. Doi:10.1177/08920206 10363089.

7. Ellis APJ, Bell BS, Ployhart RE, Hollenbeck JR, Ilgen DR. (2005). An evaluation of generic teamwork skills training with action teams: effects on cognitive and skill-based outcomes. *Pers. Psychol*. 58:641– 72

8. Garland, V. E. (2009). Emerging technology trends and ethical practices for the school principal. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems, 38*(1), 39-50.

9. Gaziel, H. (2007). Re-examining the relationship between principal's instructional/educational leadership and student achievement. *Journal of Social Science*, *15*(1), 17–24.

10. Gosmire, D., & Grady, M. L. (2007). A Bumpy Road: Principal As Technology Leader. Principals. 7(6), 16-21.

11. Johnson, B. (2012). *Toward a new classification of nonexperimental quantitative research.*   Sage Journals.

12. Lim DH, Morris ML. (2006). Influence of trainee characteristics, instructional satisfaction, and organizational climate on perceived learning and transfer training. *Hum. Resour. Dev*. Q. 17:85–115

13. Mancheno, S. L., Endres, G. M., Polak, R., & Athanasaw, Y. (2009). The individual cultural values and job satisfaction of the transformational leader. *Organization Development Journal, 27* (3), 9-21.

14. Morrison, G., & Lowther, D. (2010). *Integrating computer technology into the classroom: Skills for the 21st century* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Pearson.

15. Nettles, S., & Herrington, C. (2007). Revisiting The Importance Of The Direct Effects Of School Leadership On Student Achievement: The Implications For   School   Improvement   Policy. Peabody Journal Of Education, 82(4), 724–736.

16. Salas, E., Sims, D. E., & Burke, C. S. (2005). Is there a "big five" in teamwork? *Small Group Research, 36*(5), 555-599.

17. Stewart, J. (2006). Transformational leadership: An evolving concept examined through the works of Burns, Bass, Avolio, and Leithwood. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, *54*(1), 1–29.

18. Tharenou P, Saks AM, Moore C. (2007). A review and critique of research on training and organizational-level outcomes. *Hum. Resour. Manag*. Rev. 17:251–73

19. Vanderhaar, J., Munoz, M., & Rodosky, R. (2006). Leadership as accountability for learning: The effects of school poverty, teacher experience, previous achievement, and principal preparation programs on student achievement. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, *19*(1–2),17–33.

20. Wahlstrom, K., & Louis, K. (2008). How Teachers Experience Principal Leadership: The Roles Of Professional Community, Trust, Effi Cacy, And Shared Responsibility. Educational Administration Quanterly, 44(4), 458-495.