Chapter 9
Leadership Influence on the Twenty-First Century Teacher's Motivation for Professional Development

Maria Sit

9.1 Introduction

In a country with no natural resources other than her people, Singapore has continually invested about 20 % of the country's annual budget for the Ministry of Education (MOE), second only to the budget for the Ministry of Defence. This investment in the human resource is also reflected in schools where a healthy proportion of the school's financial resources is allocated to teacher professional development (TPD). Every teacher in an MOE-managed school is entitled to 100 h of professional, including full or partial, subsidy in terms of payment of course fees. Furthermore, teachers who attend TPD courses enjoy full pay, while they are away from their classrooms. The recently updated Teacher Growth Model (TGM), guides teachers in their TPD journey, following a professional development framework, 'The Learning Continuum'. The framework provides structured levels of gradation in learning areas that caters to the different experience levels of teachers; from the beginning teacher to the master teacher and beyond. The objective is to promote and support life-long learning that is 'meant to be across the span of…[a teacher's]…teaching career' (Academy of Singapore Teachers 2012). This is of particular importance in view of the changing landscape of twenty-first-century educational contexts, where there is a constant need for upgrading competencies and skills and to keep abreast with new technologies and developments in information and communications technology (ICT) developments.

The TGM also guides the teachers in planning their professional growth, charting out the different responsibility roles that teachers may assume in the course of their teaching career. The definition of TPD as defined by the TGM is 'a long-term process that includes opportunities and systemic experiences planned to foster growth and development in the teaching profession…. Professional development is a provision of sustained and extensive opportunities to develop practice that goes

M. Sit (✉)
National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore
e-mail: mariasit@yahoo.com

C. Koh (ed.), *Motivation, Leadership and Curriculum design,*
DOI 10.1007/978-981-287-230-2_9

well beyond traditional workshop approaches and aimed at improving teaching and learning' (Teacher Growth Model 2012). TPD, thus, provides an avenue for teachers to acquire some of the IT skills that come naturally to their Net Gen students, and thus to gain a better understanding of the latter and their concerns.

Teachers have the option of attending professional development opportunities that are fully funded or partially funded by the MOE. They also have the option of attending 'self-funded' courses, many of which can be paid from their learning development fund, an individual entitlement based on the number of years as an MOE teacher. In other words, the cost of engaging in TPD in Singapore is almost negligible to the teacher as MOE is the main body funding most of the courses directly or indirectly. While many teachers are grateful for the opportunities afforded to them, they are at times, in a dilemma as to whether to engage in their professional development. In a study of Singapore teachers conducted by Dixon and Liang (2007), teachers maintained a traditional view of their role and shared that their main objectives were to prepare their students to pass examinations, so that they are better prepared for the future (p. 28). When these teachers engage in TPD, they perceived that they had less time to complete the syllabus, less time for marking and preparation for assessments and examinations (p. 23). In the study, it was reported that preparing students to do well in their examinations was a way for teachers to show care and concern for their students. It was also a manifestation of the teachers' commitment to the job. Engaging in TPD then creates the tension on the demand for the teachers' time.

Due to this reason, there is some tension observed when teachers are sent for TPD by their schools. From the perspective of the school leaders, there is no intention to create this tension, which is a cause for concern, especially in the utilization of school funds. Funds are allocated for teachers to engage in TPD, and the responsibility lies with the principal to ensure that these funds are judiciously utilized, with teachers benefitting from their training and applying the learning after the training. When teachers are distracted and resist being involved in TPD activities, this investment in TPD is deemed to have been wasted. However, what is even more pressing is the stress caused to the teachers. There are other factors leading to this tension and dilemma faced by the teachers; and this study highlights some of the reasons, as shared by the teachers.

There is much research conducted into the impact of school leaders on teacher motivation and the school environment. With reference to the work of Frederick Herzberg (1966) on the 'two-factor theory', hygiene and motivating factors, as explained in Sergiovanni (2009), both extrinsic and intrinsic rewards are important to teachers. Do teachers then view TPD as a 'hygiene' factor—one that is a given, a common and expected practice found in any school; or do they view it as a motivating factor—one that is accorded to a privileged teacher or even a recognition of the effort invested in their students? How teachers view TPD will influence their attitude towards TPD and their engagement level. There would be repercussions on the school and its students in terms of funds allocation and in the application of learning, respectively. For schools to function optimally, the 'participation investment' has to be made and continued by teachers (p. 329). In the context of education,

'participation investment' refers to the teachers going beyond their minimum expectations as teachers and, instead, sees them investing time in improving their own practice, moving beyond extrinsic motivation of a fair wage for minimum expectation, to that of wanting to 'perform'. Sergiovanni (2009) equates this 'performance' to going beyond the minimum expectation of a job. In the numerous narratives presented by Sergiovanni (2009), it is evident that this 'participation investment' is supported by 'recognition, achievement and the feelings of competence' (p. 329). In the Singapore context, all of these could be fulfilled with teachers engaging in TPD.

What then can school leaders do in order to encourage 'participant investment' in their schools? Research studies have illustrated how school leaders are influential in creating this driving force. Barends (2004) describes the role of the principal as one who transforms the school culture in order to have collaborative teachers who organize and conduct learning…without the presence of the principal (p. 1). This is but a confirmation of the role of a principal described by Fullan (1991) as the key person in creating this collaborative atmosphere in a school. Mulford (2007) in his findings, summarized that 'successful leadership was underpinned by the core values and beliefs of the principal…[that]…that informed the principals' decisions and actions regarding…capacity building at the school level, including school culture' (p. 20). The role of the principal as school leader in influencing the school culture still holds over the years. However, many of the studies quoted are situated in a context foreign to Singapore. This chapter aims to understand the beliefs and perceptions of primary school teachers about TPD as they grapple with work demands and their professional training. Minott (2010) shared how he grappled 'with the daily challenges of teaching' while at the same time seeking 'to refine…[his]…professional practice' (p. 325). He believes 'that ultimately professional development depends very much on the personal initiative of each individual teacher educator' (Minott 2010, p. 326). The TGM adopts a 'Learning Continuum' as its framework, encouraging teachers to take ownership of their professional growth.

Teachers' perceptions on TPD can be surfaced by uncovering the teachers' decisions to participate in TPD vis-à-vis the role that their principal or the school leadership team had in influencing their decision. This leadership team manifests its influence in the support provided for TPD and purposeful charting of the direction for training. This belief is supported by Leithwood et al. (2008, p. 32), who are of the opinion that 'a key task for leadership…is to influence pupil learning and achievement, is to improve staff performance', and this can be seen in the motivation level of staff, commitment, capacities and in the working environment (p. 32).

The challenge is in uncovering what school leaders actually do to motivate TPD and how teachers perceive these actions; and teachers' perceptions can be very different from that of the school leaders. This information is useful for school leaders in checking that what they perceive as "motivating" factors function as intended, failing which, may result in frustrating their teachers. However, the worst-case scenario is one where the school leaders are not even aware there is a misperception and continue to implement their 'motivational' strategies.

In order to understand the school culture that influences teacher motivation for TPD that exists within the school environment, one must study the school climate.

This is in accordance with Sergiovanni's belief (2009) that 'the interpersonal life of the school as represented by the concept of school climate is an important artifact of culture' (p. 158). By surfacing assumptions and a common understanding that are shared by the teachers, it may uncover the belief system of the teachers, that, in turn, affects their motivation for TPD and provide an insight into part of the TPD culture. Understanding the school environment will shed light on the practices of teachers and give an indication of their areas of need for TPD. At the same time, school leaders will also understand how a culture can become 'so entrenched that it becomes a constraint on innovation' (Sergiovanni 2009, p. 161).

In this study, the terms 'principal' and 'school leaders' both refer to the person and persons responsible for leading and managing the TPD plan in schools. In Singapore schools, the vice-principals and a school staff developer (SSD) support the school principal. Together, they form the school leadership team and plan the school's professional training plan. The SSD is usually tasked with the execution of the plan and works closely with the teachers, also acting as the link to the school leaders.

9.2 The Need for Teachers to Engage in TPD in Schools

In Singapore, the focus of education is to prepare our human resource to manage themselves and the challenges of the twenty-first century. With the changing education landscape and the need to meet the needs of the economy, there is also a need to constantly upgrade teacher competencies in order to engage the current students in learning. With globalization and the fast-changing environment that we live in, it would appear that teachers are playing 'catch up' with the different ways that students are learning. By establishing a professional learning culture among the teachers, 'schools may produce teaching that is more knowledgeable and responsive to student needs' (Darling-Hammond 1988, p. 55).

School leaders have the responsibility of planning TPD for the school and always aim to do what is best with the students in mind. TPD, therefore, is a means to enhance the learning of the students, through honing the skills and competencies of the teachers. The school principal is ultimately held responsible for the overall school management, including TPD, although he/she may not always be directly involved in the operational process. The belief systems of these school leaders will have an impact on the culture of TPD in their school. However, Cooper (1988) believes that teachers are responsible for creating this culture in spite of the school principals' belief systems. Following from this, Barth (1988) posits that 'the relationship between the teacher and principal…affects the character and quality of the school and the accomplishments of its students, more than any other factor' (p. 146). This relationship may well be the principals' attempts in motivating the teachers to attend TPD and the teachers' response to this, which will give an indication of whether teachers and principals share a common understanding for the need for professional development. While the study focuses on the school leadership and

the teachers, the beneficiaries of this study are still the students. It is then so important that school leaders create and contribute to a positive relationship between the teachers and themselves. This positive relationship will make communication easier between the teachers and school leaders, and help in encouraging teachers to attend TPD. The identification of these factors lie within the narratives of what the teachers articulate in the course of the study.

9.3 Leadership Styles

Four broad categories of basic leadership practices, as determined by the leadership styles, in the managing of effective schools were identified; and three as labeled by Hallinger and Heck (1998) are 'purposes', 'people' and 'structures and social systems'; Conger and Kanungo (1998) spoke about 'visioning strategies', 'efficacy-building strategies' and 'context-changing' strategies. Leithwood's (1994) categories are 'setting directions', 'developing people' and 'redesigning the organization' (Leithwood and Day 2007, p. 6). The fourth category of leadership practices, 'managing the instructional programme', is unique to schools and explicitly reflects concerns about the principal's role in improving instruction, resulting in research on models of instruction leadership. Successful leaders engage in all the four categories (Leithwood and Day 2007, p. 6).

Much has been researched about the influence of leadership styles on organizations. For example, the traditional belief that 'what gets rewarded, gets done' has a converse side to it, what is not rewarded will not get done. This is a form of 'transactional leadership' style operating in a bargaining environment where leaders and the people they lead are engaged in the exchange of goods and services for their own selfish reasons (Sergiovanni 1990, p. 23). If school leaders reward teachers for engaging in TPD, it may come to a point, where these rewards are seen as 'hygiene' factors and teachers will not be motivated to engage in any TPD anymore! This situation is less than ideal in the current education environment where many school leaders pride themselves to be instructional leaders part of the time, while adopting an eclectic leadership style. Depending on the situational contexts the school leaders find themselves in, they have the repertoire to apply themselves as the need calls for it, and this includes the traits of the instructional leader, the transformational leader and even the transactional leader.

The structures that are put in place in an organization reflect the prevailing leadership style of its leaders. As working conditions are dynamic, the impact of the different styles of leadership may affect the teaching environment within the school, as well as the teachers' motivation for participation in TPD. In the work of the Far East Lab as quoted by Sergiovanni (2009), the behaviours of school principals have a direct effect on the school's overall climate and on its instructional organization (p. 196). However, this begs the questions of how the teachers identify with their school leaders' style and work together towards the school's vision, or not. Sergiovanni (2009) suggests that school leaders assume different roles when

leading in different contexts. They can assume the role of an expert during training or that of a colleague when engaged in professional development with their staff. Teachers would then view their school leaders accordingly. Both leadership roles assumed by the school leaders, do not compromise the attention to honing teacher competencies and meeting the students' needs; yet the former promotes collegiality through the sharing of expert knowledge, while the latter may build on the level of trust between the school leaders and their teachers. Having said that, studies such as that conducted by Ben-Peretz (1998) has shown that 'teacher collegiality is considered to be a critical element of school cultures which, foster collective learning' (p. 53). Future research could focus on how teachers interpret 'collegiality' and whether it is a critical element in their schools' TPD culture.

9.4 Instructional Leadership and TPD

In the Singapore context, where academic achievement is a major component in the measure of school success, school leaders are held accountable for student outcomes, especially so by the parents. However, even if parents do not hold the school leaders responsible, these school leaders take responsibility for their students' academic performance and will do whatever it takes in their power to ensure that their schools succeed. School leaders have a tendency of adjusting their leadership styles to ensure that positive student outcomes are improved, or, at the least, sustained. In such instances, the school leaders adopt the stance of a coach with the purpose of building teacher capacity 'in such a way that each encounter results in reciprocal learning' for both the teacher and the school leader (Sergiovanni 2009, p. 309). According to Louis and Wahlstrom (2012), 'leadership practices targeted directly at improving instruction have significant effects on teachers' working relationships and indirectly on student achievement' (p. 25). The three areas of leadership practices are setting direction, developing people and redesigning the organization. Focusing on the practice of people development specifically, school leaders would have to stimulate their teachers intellectually, provide teachers with individualized support and providing teachers with an appropriate TPD model to guide them. In the Singapore context, the TGM guides teachers in all schools. In the area of people development, Louis and Wahlstrom related their work to that of Hallinger's instructional leadership and the principal's role in providing guidance that improves the teachers' classroom practices.

Hallinger (2011) affirms that 'both education and school improvement are about the development of human capacity' and that 'leadership for learning' is a component of this capacity building (p. 137). It is, therefore, no wonder that many school leaders in Singapore are observed to hone their instructional leadership and pedagogical knowledge; and engage in joint learning with their teachers, so as to better engage with their teachers in having shared experiencing a common instructional language for the school. It is common for Singapore schools to organize annual staff retreats that incorporate professional development as well as activities for

staff bonding. This practice of whole-school approach to TPD is best explained by Darling-Hammond (1988), 'that shared knowledge and shared commitment to extend that knowledge depend in large part on shared membership in a group, that articulate and supports their pursuit' (p. 68).

Robinson et al. (2008) found that the largest effects of instructional leadership were derived through the principals' support of and involvement in the professional learning of the teachers. 'Involvement' in the Singapore context in TPD, points to team learning where both the principals and their teachers attend the same training. More often than not, one of the objectives of such sessions is to short-circuit the process of jointly familiarizing with a same vocabulary for a particular initiative. However, principals also use these training sessions as platforms to reinforce a common vision and shared experience to foster unity. In aligning schools to MOE's focus of a student-centric education, the moral purpose of education cannot be dismissed, that of 'making a difference in the lives of students' (Fullan 2010, p. 414). It is thus important to examine the link between moral purpose and leadership. For changes to be sustained and teachers to be engaging in TPD, the moral purpose would have to be understood and shared by all in school.

Louis and Wahlstrom (2012) also found that both principal instructional leadership[1]—and shared leadership[2]—have significant effects on teachers' working relationships, with particular reference to the 'professional community', and on focused instruction (p. 37). 'Professional community' refers to the learning teams within a school consisting of teachers addressing a common concern. Professional community is closely associated with organizational learning, and the term 'professional learning communities' (Louis and Wahlstrom 2012, p. 33). Many schools in Singapore have embarked on their professional learning community (PLC) journey, and embracing the presence of a professional community appears to foster collective learning of new practices, especially so, when there is principal leadership (Louis and Wahlstrom 2012, p. 33). Louis and Wahlstrom (2012) 'emphasized' the importance of professional community, largely because accumulating evidence shows that it is related to improved instruction, student achievement and shared leadership. When viewed in the light of 'shared values, a common focus and collective responsibility for student learning, reflective dialogue about improvement, and the purposeful sharing of practices', building the professional community 'may be thought of as distributed leadership' (Louis and Wahlstrom 2012, p. 33). Leithwood (2005) in an earlier study 'identified "professional development experiences" as one of the factors that stimulate successful leadership' (p. 622). Following the results of the two studies cited, principals have a significant role in leading TPD as a means of ensuring that schools grow increasingly more effective in delivering positive student

[1] Instructional leadership as defined by Louis, Dretzke and Wahlstrom (2010) refers to those actions that a principal takes, or delegates to others; to promote growth in student learning.

[2] Shared leadership, used interchangeably with distributed leadership, as defined by Louis, Dretzke and Wahlstrom (2010) refers to the broad support for expanding teachers' participation in leadership and decision-making tasks.

outcomes; and this role may involve the principals' relinquishing their leadership role and empowering their teachers instead to take over this role.

Leithwood and Day (2007) identified four essential components of a school leader's repertoire classified as 'setting directions, developing people, redesigning the organization and improving the instructional programme. Almost all leadership practices considered instructionally helpful by principals and teachers are specific enactments of these core practices' (p. 57). Teachers and principals agree that the most instructionally helpful specific leadership practices are:

a. Focusing the school on goals and expectations for student achievement.
b. Keeping track of teachers' professional development needs.
c. Creating structures and opportunities for teachers to collaborate (Leithwood 2012, p. 57).

9.5 Transformational Leadership and TPD

Gurr and Drydale (2007) found that 'the "strong" leaders used a combination of influence and support strategies to achieve their school goals'. The source of the support strategies may be either top-down or bottom-up, but it was established that principals were characteristically 'hands-on' and acted as role models. The leadership style was inclusive in the way they were able to bring people along (p. 44). By adopting the inclusive and participative leadership style 'cleared a pathway for people to be involved and achieve by removing blockages and providing a clear vision serviced by adequate resources. Staff felt empowered within a structured yet supportive environment' (Gurr and Drydale 2007, p. 44). The principals established good relationships with a range of stakeholders that allowed them to develop strong networks and alliances.

The study conducted by Gurr and Drydale (2007) in Victoria, Australia, principals acted purposefully and strategically in three areas identified as student outcomes, teaching and learning; and school capacity building (p. 45). The principals in the study noted that they were the 'curriculum leaders' and purposefully aligned teachers to a particular teaching pedagogy (Gurr and Drydale 2007, p. 45), and engaging in TPD to put the whole school on the same journey.

TPD is a means to building school capacity and as explained by Gurr and Drydale (2007) refers to the development of the personal, professional, organizational and community; while teaching and learning refers to the quality of instruction as seen through the pedagogy, curriculum design, assessment and student learning (andragogy; p. 47). It is thus no surprise that TPD can be categorized under these areas.

'The primary aim of these practices is capacity building, which is understood to accomplish organizational goals, but also the disposition that staff members need to persist in applying such knowledge and skills. People are motivated by what they are good at. And mastery experiences, according to Bandura (1986), are the most powerful sources of efficacy. Building capacity that leads to a sense of mastery is

therefore highly motivational as well' (Leithwood 2012, p. 60). It is paramount that TPD must be meaningful to the teachers and meets the purpose of the school. In that way, teachers will experience that their commitment to the school is further enhanced by the TPD they are engaged in. It is then a spiral effect with success building upon past successes and reinforcing it.

Wahlstrom (2012) discovered that 'principals engage in two complementary behaviours to influence instruction. One behaviour aims to set a tone or culture in the building that supports continual professional learning (instructional ethos). The second behaviour involves taking explicit steps to engage with individual teachers about their own growth (instructional actions)' (p. 68). According to Gurr and Drysdale (2007), culture building in a school invokes 'a sense of confidence; providing a positive direction through their vision and enthusiasm; holding high expectations of staff and students; focusing on student and families; empowering staff; aligning the community, staff and school goals; promoting change in teaching and learning; and building capacity' (p. 42). The reason why school leaders spend much time in culture building is explained by Leithwood and Jantzi (2012) who found that 'school leaders have an impact on student achievement primarily through their influence on teachers' motivation and working conditions' (p. 1). Sergiovanni (2009) views 'cultural leadership' in terms of manipulation and control (p. 18). The challenge for school leaders is how they impress upon their teachers that TPD is a form of motivation, not manipulation; and that some form of control is necessary in the school, as with any other organizations.

On the other hand, transformative leadership sees both the leaders and their followers 'united in pursuit of higher-level goals common to both' (Sergiovanni 1990, p. 24). In such environments, both the leaders and their followers build on each other's successes. The psyche of collective achievement as a team effort eventually converges; and leads to better working relationships among the staff. Sergiovanni (1990) found that 'leadership by bonding' is a response to 'human needs as the desire for purpose, meaning and significance in what one does (p. 24) and is the 'cornerstone…in inspiring extraordinary commitment and performance' (p. 27). This finding is especially useful when planning TPD.

Transformational school leaders create a climate in which teachers engage in continuous learning and in which they routinely share their learning. These leaders also work with other teachers in the school community to identify personal goals and then to link these to the broader educational goals (Hallinger 2010, p. 338). In the long run, the objective is to create an environment that will motivate teachers to take responsibility for their TPD and work towards school improvement without much direction from the principal. The principal's role in TPD is to foster group goals, and modelling desired behaviour (Hallinger 2010, p. 339). Despite the principals' attendance at training sessions together with the teachers, the knowledge gleaned from these sessions remain as information until it is transformed and applied or shared with fellow teachers for application in the context of the respective schools (Fullan 2010, p. 410). In my opinion, it would be beneficial for schools to adopt Fullan's 'Knowledge Sharing Paradigm' (Fullan 2010, p. 411) so that the information interacts with the school environment and is then transformed to knowledge critical for school improvement.

9.6 Learner-Centred Education and TPD

The shift in results-oriented approach to that of a more student-centric focus in the recent Singapore's education landscape has seen many school leaders also shifting to a more learner-centred education (LCE) for their schools. This approach builds on the school leaders' knowledge as an instructional leader. The areas to be further honed include that of guiding, supervising and evaluating of teachers (Barends 2004, p. 1). How the school leaders relate to the teachers becomes an area of attention, as there has to be a balance between the evaluative role and the developmental role of the school leaders.

Related to the transformational leadership approach, is the shift of the learning culture within the school. By encouraging teachers to be leaders to develop their areas of learning, leaders within these areas will emerge, recognized by their peers. The school leader's role is then more of a collaborative leader, linking the different areas of learning into meaningful segments that will serve the school's needs.

As the students are central to this approach, teachers have to be cognizant of the emerging and new literature on motivating and managing present-day children. This will involve much reading and searching for innovative techniques to engage students in their learning. While technology can assist with the tools to facilitate learning, the teachers and the school leaders must have a more open mindset to experimenting with technology and new methods of teaching that may not be sufficiently supported by empirical research. Teachers must therefore possess an updated set of facilitation skills, as they must be prepared to learn alongside their students, as they may not possess all the answers.

The above practices have implication on TPD as teachers must adopt a more adventurous stance to teaching while remaining focused on a learner-centred goal. Having said this, teachers' knowledge in instructional pedagogy must be of a level sufficient to facilitate student learning and also to recognize opportunities for innovation. The challenge of being an effective teacher just became even more challenging, and teachers must be convinced in their foundational beliefs of their students, that all children are able to learn, despite them requiring new skills. Perhaps in keeping with the preparation of the students of the unknown future, the LCE is an approach that brings educators back to the basics of 'people needing to think and learn for themselves' (Carl Rogers, as quoted by Barends (2004), p. 3).

The role of the school leader in supporting LCE is then of helping to 'establish, develop and maintain a teaching staff, which will provide the best possible opportunities for teaching and learning' (Chetty 1993, p. 89). TPD can help in facilitating the shift from a teacher-controlled instruction style to that of LCE. The challenge is how the school leaders communicate this to their teachers and inspire them believe that LCE will benefit their students, and how engaging in TPD will help the teachers expand their repertoire of teaching competencies.

9.7 Importance of Trust and Collegiality in TPD

Much of the success in school leadership has been attributed to the level of trust in a school environment (Sergiovanni 2009; Hallinger 2003; Handford and Leithwood 2013). In examining the relationship between school leaders and their teachers, trust has been identified as 'a critical concept for leaders to understand and develop because it serves as a "lubricant" for most interactions in their organizations' (Handford and Leithwood 2013, p. 194). 'Teachers highlighted the importance of building mutual trust between students, between students and teachers, and between teachers and leaders. Mutual trust and respect were at the core of what they thought should count as a successful school' (Møller et al. 2007, p. 82). However, as to what constitutes 'trust', it appears that this definition is context specific and differs from school to school, depending on the relationship that the principal has with the school and the time that the principal has been with the school. While trust takes time to build, it also takes time to unpack; ironically, depending on the level of trust between the principal and their staff.

An alignment of beliefs between principals and teachers would be a good place to start in their trust relationship. It is, therefore, paramount that teachers be given an opportunity to clarify their doubts and check their understanding of the communication between the principal and the school. This would establish the shared values of the school community and promote understanding among the staff. A sense of community is important as it strengthens the school's commitment and efforts toward improving connections, coherence, capacity and collaboration (Sergiovanni 2009, p. 119).

In promoting teachers' commitment to the school, principals are encouraging continual TPD, vital to keep the staff nimble and adaptive to the changes in the wider community (Sergiovanni 2009, p. 120). Commitment, when linked to loyalty, points to the trust that teachers have in the school and the school leadership. As described by Sergiovanni (2009), 'leadership play by different rules' (p. 123), referring to the contextual factors that impact and influence school-based decision. Therefore, in order to understand the local context of the antecedents of successful leadership practices, more research has to be conducted in the local schools.

In unpacking what constitutes 'trust', Handford and Leithwood (2013) identified among other components, the traits of competence, openness, consistency and reliability. In their study, the teachers surveyed indicated that the trustworthiness of principals had much influence in their work; and that the perceived competence of the principals' ability to lead affected the level of trust (p. 201). The same teachers also associated trust with the principals' personal dedication to the school and actions in leading the school to some desired shared outcome. Conversely, the teachers do not trust a principal who appears to be consistently pursuing his own narrow self-interests (Handford and Leithwood 2013, p. 197).

Collegiality is an indication of the level of trust within the school. Collegial conversations and support involves the teachers helping each other in addressing issues and concerns related to their teaching practice. It is not to be confused with congenial conversations that deliberately avoid discussions of existing problems (Nelson et al. 2010, p. 176)

A platform that many Singapore schools use to promote collaboration among the teachers, is that of the PLC. As many schools already have this platform in place, it will be used as a point of discussion on demonstrations of collegiality when teachers are engaged in TPD.

9.8 Future Research

Cindi Rigsbee, a North Carolina Teacher of the Year (2009), shared that effective principals are those who equip their teachers to be leaders in the classroom and strongly encourage their teachers to engage in TPD. Her principal, who made her 'want to be a better teacher', inspired her. This points to the relationship between the teachers and the school leaders as a source for motivation for teachers to engage in TPD. Leithwood and Jantzi (2012) findings in shared leadership between teachers and school leaders, affirms Rigbee's personal sharing. Future research could thus focus on exploring issues related to school leadership styles that influence and impact teachers' outlook toward TPD. Further to this, the investigation can extend to finding aspects of the relationship between school leaders and their teachers that could support the latter in their active pursuit of professional development.

References

Academy of Singapore Teachers (2012). *Teacher Growth Model*. Singapore: Ministry of Education.

Barth, R. S. (1988). School: A community of leaders. In A. Lieberman (Ed.), *Building professional culture in schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Barends, A. (2004). Better instructional leadership can implement learner-centred education (LCE). *Reform Forum*, September.

Ben-Peretz, S. (1998). Informal Learning Communities and their effects. In K. Leithwood & K.S. Louis (Eds.), *Organizational learning in schools*. Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Chetty, D. R. (1993). *Measures of school effectiveness: Analysing Soweto's effective school*. Pretoria: HSRC Report.

Cooper, M. (1988). Whose culture is it anyway? In A. Lieberman (Ed.), *Building professional culture in schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1988). Policy and Professionalism In A. Lieberman (Ed.), *Building professional culture in schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Dixon, M. & Liang, R. (2007). *Singapore teachers espoused beliefs. Final research report.* Singapore: Centre for Research in Pedagogy and Practice, National Institute of Education.

Fullan, M. (2010). The role of leadership in the promotion of knowledge management in schools. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 8*(3), 409–419.

Gurr, D., & Drysdale, L. (2007). Models of successful principal leadership: Victorian case studies. In C. Day & K. Leithwood (Eds.), *Successful principal leadership in times of change*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Hallinger, P. (2010). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 33*(3), 329–352.

Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning: Lessons from 40 years of empirical research. *Journal of Educational Administration, 40*(2), 125–142.

Hallinger, P. (2003) Leading Educational Change: reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 33*(3), 329–352.

Hallinger, P. & Heck, R. (1998). Exploring the principal's contribution to school effectiveness: 1980-1995. *School effectiveness and school improvement, 9,* 157–191.

Handford, V. & Leithwood, K. (2013). Why Teachers trust School Leaders. *Journal of Educational Administration, 51*(2), 194–212.

Leithwood, K. (2005). Understanding successful principal leadership: Progress on a broken front. *Journal of Educational Administration, 43*(26), 619–629.

Leithwood, K. (2012). Core practices. In K. Leithwood & K. S. Louis (Eds) *Linking leadership to student learning*. San Franscisco, CA: Josey-Bass.

Leithwood, K., & Day, C. (2007). Starting with what we know. In C. Day & K. Leithwood (Eds.), *Successful principal leadership in times of change*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2008). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership. *School Leadership & Management: Formerly School Organisation, 28*(1), 27–42.

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2012). Collective leadership. In K. Leithwood & K. S. Louis (Eds) *Linking Leadership to Student Learning*. San Franscisco, CA: Josey-Bass.

Louis, K. S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2012). Shared and instructional leadership. In K. Leithwood & K. S. Louis (Eds) *Linking leadership to student learning*. San Franscisco, CA: Josey-Bass.

Minott, M. A. (2010). Reflective teaching as self-directed professional development: Building practical or work-related knowledge. *Professional Development in Education, 36*(1–2), 325–338.

Møller, J., Eggen, A., Fuglestad, O. L., Langfeldt, G., Presthus, A., Skrøvset, S., Stjernstrøm, E., & Vedøy, G. (2007). Successful leadership based on democratic values. In C. Day & K. Leithwood (Eds.), *Successful principal leadership in times of change*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Mulford, B. (2007). Successful school leadership in Tasmania. In C. Day & K. Leithwood (Eds.), *Successful principal leadership in times of change*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Nelson, T. H., Deuel, A., Slavit, D., & Kennedy, A. (2010). Leading deep conversations in collaborative inquiry groups. *The Clearing House, 83,* 175–179.

Robinson, V., Lloyd, C., & Rowe, K. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the different effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44,* 635–674.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1990). Adding value to leadership gets extraordinary results. Educational leadership. *Proquest Educational Journals, 47*(8), 23–27.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (2009). *The principalship—a reflective practice perspective*. Boston: Pearson.

Wahlstrom, K. (2012). An up-close view of instructional leadership. In K. Leithwood & K. S. Louis (Eds) *Linking leadership to student learning*. San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass.