

# Teacher-teacher and teacher-principal collaborations in the public schools of Albanian educational pre-university system

Valbona Nathanaili

Dr.Sc. Valbona NATHANAILI

## Abstract

This paper aims to measure the degree of teacher-teacher and teacher-principal collaborations, in the public schools of Albanian educational pre-university system, and a second aim is to evaluate the relationship, - if any exists, - between those collaborations and school performance, too. The study has quantitative nature and is based on a questionnaire with 13 articles. The questionnaire is compiled by the author, based on the literature. The questionnaire is with self-report, based on the perceptions that teachers have regarding those collaborations. It is fulfilled by teachers, in-service full time, that teach at 20 public schools in the pre-university educational system in Albania, respectively in Tirana, Kamëz, Elbasan and Shkodra. The schools were chosen based on the performance criteria: schools with highest performance and schools with lowest performance. Teacher-teacher collaboration is evaluated through 7 articles (N=7, Cronbach's Alpha=.802); teacher-principal collaboration is evaluated through 6 articles (N=6, Cronbach's Alpha=.812). For symmetry reasons, the questionnaires for evaluation of both collaborations are constructed in similar manner, based on the philosophy of councils that teachers and principals give and take with each-other. Teachers' self-reported collaboration was measured by a scale from 1 to 5 (Never 1; Rarely 2; Sometimes 3; Often 4;

[www.dx.doi.org/10.21113/iir.v7i1.292](http://www.dx.doi.org/10.21113/iir.v7i1.292)

ILIRIA International Review – Vol 7, No 1 (2017)

© Felix-Verlag, Holzkirchen, Germany and Iliria College, Pristina, Kosovo

Always 5). The data are analysed through SPSS. According to data, teachers report a higher scale of collaboration with their colleagues and a lower scale of collaboration with their principals: teacher-teacher collaboration is higher for issues related with students' behaviour and lower for issues related with the school curricula or school aims; teacher-principal collaboration is higher for issues related with students' behaviour and lower for issues related with their profession. From the data, there is not any statistically significant difference between level of collaboration and school performance, which stands for the high degree of teacher atomization at school. One important conclusion is that principals have a small portion of decision-making for important issues that influence directly school performance.

**Keywords:** teacher - teacher collaboration; teacher - principal collaboration; Albanian pre-university educational system; school performance

## **1. Introduction of political school principals *versus* isolated teachers**

Inspectorial State of Educational, in a 2013 report (IShA, 2013:15) about school ethical climate in some Albanian public schools, found that in one of school inspected: "There is no collaboration at all between the school principal and its deputy. For this reason, deputy principal was excluded from the participation process of compiling the yearly school program and was excluded too, from exercising her duties. This fact is reflected in a deep dysfunction of school staff." Albanian Educational System has to offer a lot of other similar examples. One important reason is that school principals usually are appointed by the politics, - they are militants in one political party or another, - and often without the needed qualification for that job. The situation is worst in suburban areas.

From the other side, teachers continue to be isolated, atomised in their efforts to be more professional and less individual, without the help of institutionalised efforts to be more involved in the school communities, more present in decision-taking and part of school accountability.

Studying how collaborations work out at our schools today and trying to measure it, are a very good way to encourage a critical thinking about the perspective.

## 2. Literature review

According to Kochhar-Bryant & Heishman (2010: 14), Kochhar-Bryant (2008) collaboration is widely described as a process of participation through which people, groups and organizations form relationships and work together to achieve a set of agreed-upon results. For Peter-Koop *et al* (2006: viii), collaboration means exchange of ideas and philosophy, strategy construction and commitment taken, and, in field of education, is more than a process, it means support and encouragement, "sharing of leadership and control over decisions about what group members will do, how and to what extent they will participate in leadership and decision making while working on a project or towards a goal, which everyone sees as important and worthwhile."

Morrissey (2010:36) offers some strategy that helps encourage teacher collaboration with each-other, including regular staff meeting planned ahead, structured about a specific topic; making time for staff discussion about their learning and teaching practice; examination of state standards and their implementation in the classroom curriculum; creating a professional learning community, through engaging the staff in ongoing inquiry and learning. In the same work, Morrissey emphasizes that collaborative communities are characterized by respect and truth that teachers have for each-other and are motivated by school objectives for improvement. Teacher collaboration can strengthen skills, competence, and a school's overall social capital, - emphasize Leana (2011).

Zavadsky (2009: 98) while studying Boston public, for the struggling teachers, refers that they are receiving support from their principal, the Collaborative Coaching and learning model, instructional directors, mentors and additional professional development. For Johnson (1976) collaboration in school environment is less routine and leads to greater interaction between principals and teachers, and further, teachers involved in team teaching and joint teaching demonstrate considerably more influence in school decisions on personnel, administration, pupil management, curricula and teaching methods than teachers where there is no collaboration. Based on the extensity of collaboration and intensity of collaboration and the principal reports, Johnson (*Ibid*) defines five school typologies, from type 0 (with not collaborating), to type 4 (with both high intensity and extensity).

In the Goddard, Goddard & Tschannen-Moran work (2007: 877- 96), "A theoretical and empirical investigation of teacher collaboration for school improvement and students achievement in public elementary schools" out of 452 teachers from 47 elementary schools in USA found that teacher collaboration may improve schools' ability to foster student achievement, as an indirect relationship, because the most important outcome of teacher collaboration may be that teachers learn how to improve their instructional practice: "On the one hand, low levels of collaboration may indicate teachers' unwillingness to take personal risks, especially those teachers who have worked in isolation for many years. Collaboration, on the other hand, encourages teachers to move beyond reliance on their own memories and experiences with schooling and toward engagement with others around important questions of teaching and learning." (*Ibid*: 892) They suggest that schools with greater levels of teacher collaboration did indeed have significantly higher levels of student achievement.

In order to improve school performance, for Elmore (2008) is important to know, understand and study how to build accountability system inside school and how to involve teachers in its mechanisms. When school expectations are collective, then we can have a better performance. Rubie-Davis (2015:219-20) see staff collaboration as one of the best opportunities in promotion of high expectations for each students at school. In a collaborating environment, school objectives are related with those of class, and teacher can ask colleagues for advice without the fear of prejudice.

### **3. Methodology and methods**

The purpose of this study is to measure teacher-teacher and teacher-principal collaborations in the public schools of Albanian educational pre-university system, from the perspective of teachers, and a second aim is to evaluate the relationship, - if exists any, - between those collaborations and school performance, too. Principal perspective is avoided, because the institution of school principal in Albanian public school is unstable and most of people in this position are with political background, - they usually have the same cycle with that of the elections. Further, it is the fear that they are not sincere and supportive in this kind of initiatives, because they have the mandate to lead the school, but not the desire to change *status quo*.

### **3.1. Research questions**

- How much teachers collaborate with each-other? What are the most frequent issues for which they ask for advice, or give advice?
- How much teachers collaborate with their principal? What are the most frequent issues for which they ask for advice from them?
- To what extent collaboration is related with school performance?

### **3.2. Sample**

The study has quantitative nature and is based on a questionnaire with 13 articles. It is responded by 521 teachers, in-service full time, that teach at 20 public schools in the pre-university educational system in Albania, respectively in Tirana, Kamëz, Elbasan and Shkodra. The schools were chosen based on the performance criteria: schools with highest performance and schools with lowest performance. School performance is evaluated by Educational Directory of each city, where the schools are operating, according to legislation obligation to make such a kind of ranking. Data analyses are based on descriptive and correlational approaches by aggregating individual responses to school and sample levels.

**Table 1: Schools where the data are drawn, based on level of performance, grades and location**

City	Low secondary (9 years school)		High secondary school (gymnasium)	
	Lowest performance school	Highest performance school	Lowest performance school	Highest performance school
Tiranë	Mysine Kokalari	Emin Duraku	Aleks Buda	Petro Nini Luarasi
	Ahmet Gashi	Dëshmorët e Lirisë	Myslym Keta	Sinan Tafaj
Kamëz	Dom Nikollë Kaçori (Babrru, suburb area)	Ahmet Zogu (Bathore, suburb area)	Ibrahim Rugova. (Kamëz, center)	Mustafa Qemal Ataturk (Zallher, suburb area, - a new school)
Elbasan	Hamit Mullisi (Rrapisht, suburb area)	Sulë Harri	Mahir Domi	Dhaskal Todri
Shkodër	Martin Camaj	Ismail Qemali	Kolë Idromeno	28 Nëntori

**Source:** Author’s own calculations

The process of administration of the questionnaire is done by the author, in order to minimize, as much as possible, the variation of prejudices and behaviours from the reporters. The questionnaires are filled at the school site, during the working day.

### 3.3. Survey

Articles 20-31, regarding teacher-teacher collaboration are adapted by the questionnaire developed by Spillane and his associates (2010: 157-8). The authors make a good explanation about the validity of the articles ( $\alpha = .83$ , Number of items = 10, Number of cases = 92).

In this study is made a small change from the cited one: teacher-teacher collaboration was measured by teacher reports to a seven-item questionnaire (N=7, Cronbach’s Alpha=.802). From the Spillane *et al* questionnaires are not used items regarding teachings Math & English. Based on symmetry reasons, the questionnaire for evaluation of teacher-

principal collaborations is constructed in a similar manner, based on the same philosophy, - that of advices that teachers and principals give and take with each-other. So, teacher-principal collaboration is measured again by teacher reports, but to a six-item questionnaire (N=6, Cronbach's Alpha=.812).

Shortly, the collaboration is seen by two aspects (teacher-teacher & teacher-principal) and one dimension (advice):

*First aspect of collaboration: Teacher-teacher collaborations.* This school year, how often you had conversation with colleagues about the following topics:

1. 19 To get advice about better ways of implementation of a new initiative undertaken by school?
2. 20 To get advice about the content of your teaching course/ topics? (Adapted by Spillane *et al.* In original: your math instruction)
3. 21 To give advice about the content of teaching course/ topics to your peers?
4. 28 What helps students learn the best (Spillane *et al.*)
5. 29 Development of new curriculum (Spillane *et al.*)
6. 30 The goals of this school (Spillane *et al.*)
7. 31 Managing classroom behaviour (Spillane *et al.*)

*Second aspect of collaboration: Teacher-principal collaborations:* This school year, how often you had conversation with school principals about the following topics:

8. 22 To take advices about better ways of implementation of a new initiative undertaken by school?
9. 23 To take advices about the content of your teaching course/ topics?
- 10.32 What helps students learn the best
- 11.33 Development of new curriculum
- 12.34 The goals of this school
- 13.35 Managing classroom behaviour

Teachers' self-reported collaboration was measured by a Likert scale from 1 to 5 (Never 1; Rarely 2; Sometimes 3; Often 4; Always 5). The data are analyzing through SPSS.

At the end, are created 2 new variables, collaboration teacher - teacher (resultant) and collaboration teacher-principal (resultant), to be easier to

evaluate any possible relation with the school performance. This transformation of variables is made possible by the SSPS (*transform, compute variable*).

The used analyses are mostly descriptive, so they tend to evaluate mean, median and standard deviation for each article.

### **3.4. Limitation**

Except the fact that this study is based on self-report and we all are aware about the limitations that this kind of study has, we would like to add three other important limitations:

1. Recently, in Albanian Educational System, in each city, schools are under yearly evaluation from the respective educational directory, based on a short criteria list, included students results. These lists produce schools with better and worst performance for each city, but even it means that those criteria are the same; we cannot say that highest or lowest performance schools are the same for each city, or we are not sure how well, *the well* for each city is.
2. In the study is not taken in consideration the school size, or the open space that they offer for teacher formal /informal meetings, a condition that plays the role of one of the variables in the Johnson's study.
3. In this study is not taken in consideration the fact that the teacher has worked before in another job, whether it be as a teacher or not.

## **4. Results**

In this study, the number of teacher incorporated is significant, consisting 521 teachers in-service in 20 schools, respectively, 407 women or 78.1% of sample and 69 male or 13.2% of sample (from the sample, 45 individuals or 8.6 %, doesn't report about this article). According the data, 307 teachers or 58.9% of sample teach in highest performing schools, and 214 teachers or 41 % of sample teach in lowest performing schools. From 521 teachers that responded the survey, 371 (71.2%) teachers report that teaching has always been their only job, or they have started as a teacher and continued in this profession without any change; 119 (22.8%) teachers report that, before working as teacher, they had another job, outside educational system; 31 (6%) teachers don't give information about this article. Table 1 contains the information about Teachers participation



according to level of school performance and city. While the numbers of schools is the same for each city, the number of responders is the highest in Tirana, where the school sizes are greater.

**Table 2:** Teachers participation according to level of school performance and city

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Tiranë, highest performing schools	112	21.5	21.5	21.5
	Elbasan, highest performance schools	53	10.2	10.2	31.7
	Shkodër, highest performing schools	54	10.4	10.4	42.0
	Kamëz, highest performing schools	88	16.9	16.9	58.9
	Tiranë, lowest performing schools	128	24.6	24.6	83.5
	Elbasan, lowest performing schools	30	5.8	5.8	89.3
	Shkodër, lowest performing schools	38	7.3	7.3	96.5
	Kamëz, lowest performing schools	18	3.5	3.5	100.0
	Total	521	100.0	100.0	

**Source:** Author's own calculations with the results of questionnaire: teacher - teacher and teacher-principal collaboration

Table 2 provides the mean and median of all teachers' reports, regarding teacher-teacher collaboration, independently the type of school performance. In each of the columns are the reports for the every kinds of collaboration, or for every article 19-31.

**Table 3:** Mean and median for articles related with teacher-teacher collaboration

Teacher-teacher collaboration (Descriptive)		19	20	21	28	29	30	31
N	Valid	507	517	516	514	512	512	512
	Missing	14	4	5	7	9	9	9
Mean		3.2505	3.1257	3.2558	3.9241	3.9590	3.8633	4.2305
Median		3.0000	3.0000	3.0000	4.0000	4.0000	4.0000	4.0000
Std. Deviation		1.0380 0	1.1367 9	1.0903 2	.77238	.79644	.92416	.88342
Percentiles	25	2.0000	2.0000	3.0000	3.0000	4.0000	3.0000	4.0000
	50	3.0000	3.0000	3.0000	4.0000	4.0000	4.0000	4.0000
	75	4.0000	4.0000	4.0000	4.0000	4.7500	5.0000	5.0000

**Source:** Author’s own calculations

Table 3 provides the mean and median of all teachers’ reports, regarding teacher-principal collaboration, independently the type of school performance. In each of the columns are the reports for the every kinds of collaboration or for every article 22-23 & 32-35.

**Table 4:** Mean and median for articles related with teacher-principal collaboration

Teacher-principal collaboration (Descriptive)		22	23	32	33	34	35
N	Valid	508	511	505	506	508	511
	Missing	13	10	16	15	13	10
Mean		3.1358	2.6223	3.6693	3.7549	3.7854	3.8885
Median		3.0000	2.0000	4.0000	4.0000	4.0000	4.0000
Std. Deviation		1.04308	1.18165	.94046	.92234	.99467	1.06885
Percentiles	25	2.0000	2.0000	3.0000	3.0000	3.0000	3.0000
	50	3.0000	2.0000	4.0000	4.0000	4.0000	4.0000
	75	4.0000	4.0000	4.0000	4.0000	5.0000	5.0000

**Source:** Author’s own calculations

In order to evaluate the relationship between teacher-teacher collaboration and teacher-principal collaboration, are created three new variables (thanks to SSPS): teacher-teacher collaboration (resultant of 7 articles, a transforming of all articles 19- 21 & 28-31, in one), teacher-principal collaboration (resultant of 6 articles, a transforming of all articles 22-23 & 32-35, Min=1.71, Max=5) and teacher collaboration at school (resultant of all 13 articles, Min.=1.85, Max.=5). Table 4 contains the data for mean, standard deviation, variance and *skewness* for each aspect of collaboration, Table 5 contains the data for collaboration as result of reduction of 13 articles, while at the Table 6 are found the data for correlations.

**Table 5:** Mean for articles related with teacher-teacher collaboration (resultant) and teacher-principal (resultant)

Descriptive Statistics	N		Range		Mean		Std. Deviation		Variance		Skewnes	
	Stat.	Std. Error	Stat.	Std. Error	Stat.	Std. Error	Stat.	Std. Error	Stat.	Std. Error	Stat.	Std. Error
Teacher-teacher collaboration	484		3.29		3.6485		.65010		.423		-.244	.111
Teacher-principal collaboration	489		4.00		3.4741		.74123		.549		-.161	.110
Valid N (listwise)	463											

**Source:** Author's own calculations

**Table 6:** Mean and standard deviation of level of collaboration

Descriptive Statistics	N		Range		Mean		Std. Deviation		Variance		Skewness	
	Stat.	Std. Error	Stat.	Std. Error	Stat.	Std. Error	Stat.	Std. Error	Stat.	Std. Error	Stat.	Std. Error
Collaboration	463		3.15		3.5631		.63643		.405		-.039	.113
Valid N (listwise)	463											

**Source:** Author’s own calculations

**Table 6** Correlations between teacher-teacher collaboration, teacher-principal collaboration and collaboration (resultant) and collaboration

Correlations		Teacher-teacher collaboration	Teacher-principal collaboration	Collaboration
Teacher-teacher collaboration	Pearson Correl.	1		
	Sig. (2-tailed)			
	N	484		
Teacher-principal collaboration	Pearson Correl.	.657**	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		
	N	463	489	
Collaboration	Pearson Correl.	.912**	.908**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	463	463	463

**Source:** Author’s own calculations with the results of questionnaire: teacher - teacher and teacher-principal collaboration regarding school performance

In order to evaluate the relationship between teacher-teacher collaboration, teacher-principal collaboration and collaboration itself from school performance (Range: Max. = 5) the data are evaluated statistically.

**Table 7** Mean and standard deviation of level of teacher-teacher collaboration and teacher-principal collaboration regarding to school performance

Descriptives		N	Mean	Std. Deviat.	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min.	Between - Component Variance	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
Teacher-teacher collaboration	Highest performing schools	285	3.6456	.63860	.03783	3.5712	3.7201	2.00		
	Lowest performing schools	199	3.6525	.66781	.04734	3.5592	3.7459	1.71		
	Total		484	3.6485	.65010	.02955	3.5904	3.7065	1.71	
	Model	Fixed Effects			.65076	.02958	3.5903	3.7066		
Random Effects					.02958 <sup>a</sup>	3.2726 <sup>a</sup>	4.0243 <sup>a</sup>		-.00178	
Teacher-principal collaboration	Highest performing schools	289	3.4556	.70700	.04159	3.3737	3.5374	1.67		
	Lowest performing schools	200	3.5008	.78911	.05580	3.3908	3.6109	1.00		
	Total		489	3.4741	.74123	.03352	3.4082	3.5400	1.00	
	Model	Fixed Effects			.74165	.03354	3.4082	3.5400		
Random Effects					.03354 <sup>a</sup>	3.0479 <sup>a</sup>	3.9002 <sup>a</sup>		-.00130	
Collaboration	Highest performing schools	271	3.5490	.62426	.03792	3.4743	3.6236	1.85		
	Lowest performing schools	192	3.5829	.65435	.04722	3.4898	3.6761	2.00		
	Total		463	3.5631	.63643	.02958	3.5049	3.6212	1.85	
	Model	Fixed Effects			.63690	.02960	3.5049	3.6212		
Random Effects					.02960 <sup>a</sup>	3.1870 <sup>a</sup>	3.9391 <sup>a</sup>		-.00123	

## **5. Discussion of results & conclusions**

### **5.1. Teacher-teacher collaboration**

Collaboration of teachers with each-other is measuring through how often they take advices about: better ways of implementation of a new initiative undertaken by school, the content of teaching course, what helps students learn the best, development of new curriculum, the goals of this school and managing classroom behaviour.

From teachers reports, teachers collaborate more for issues that are related with managing classroom behaviour (M= 4.2305) and less for taking advices about the content of teaching course (M=3.1257). In general, teachers collaborate with their colleagues for issues related with student behaviours and, further, for the way of improving student's progress, for curricula and school aims.

### **5.2. Teacher-principal collaboration**

Collaboration of teachers with principal is measuring through the same articles.

From teacher reports, teachers evaluate this aspect of collaboration at lowest level for each article compared with those of teacher-teacher collaboration. Concretely, from the data, teachers report a highest collaboration with the principal for issues that are related with managing classroom behaviour (M=3.8885 and Median = 4) and lowest for issues regarding the content of course teaching (M=2.6223 and Median=2). For Johnson (1976: 65), the isolation of most teachers in non-collaborative working arrangements has meant that most principals have had little saying in matters that are at the heart of the educational process. In Johnson's study, 88 percent of the principals questioned, rated themselves as "very" or "extremely" influential in carrying out district policies; only 23 percent rated themselves as "very" or "extremely" influential in determining the methods used by teachers in their daily work. In their work, Seifert & Vornberg, J. (2005: 95) found that teacher-principal collaboration is very important in improving teaching models, with the aim that each student be at the centre of teaching. So, influencing in changing the school culture. Directive Nr. 799, date 22.7.2009 (Qendra e Publikimeve Zyrtare, 2009: 6208) "For approval of National Strategy of pre-University Education, for the period 2009-2013", Chapter I: Current development of pre-university education, explicitly declare the inability of principals to assist teachers in

issues that are related directly with learning process: "School Principal contribution on teacher professional development is almost zero. Speaking generally, they substitute advices for professional development with control and hierarchical authority."

The transformation of each group of aspects of collaboration in one, confirm the same fact: in total, teacher collaborate more with their peers and less with the principal. Teacher-teacher collaboration has a mean of 3.6485, while the mean for teacher-principal collaboration is 3.474. The mean as result of all articles is 3.5631. The difference between these numbers is relatively slow, but is a point that the collaboration has a misbalance. These numbers give reasons to find the trend flows of collaboration (see, figure 1).

**Figure 1:** The trend flows of level of collaboration

*From the lower*

*To the highest*

Teacher-principal collaboration (M=3.4741) Collaboration (M=3.5631)  
Teacher-teacher collaboration (M=3.6485)

### 5.3. The connection between collaboration and school performance

The second aim of this study was to identify any relation, at statistical level, between collaboration and school performance. Based on the data, we have to confirm that in the above schools there is not any sensitive statistical relationship between collaboration and school performance. The collaboration, independently if we are referring that teacher-teacher or teacher-principal, is almost the same for both types of schools: with highest and lowest performance.

The most of study have found not a direct relation between collaboration and student achievement. They usually emphasize the collaboration at school as a good opportunity to improve the way of teaching, to encourage teachers to go behind personal experience of teaching and, together with the peers, to involve and make commitment for important issues of teaching and learning. The fact that in Albanian educational system, at schools with different levels of performance, or at the two sides of achievements, - highest and lowest, - the collaboration is at the same level, show that the achievement, more than the result of

collective efforts, is result of individual efforts, and often of families. In Albanian educational system the level of atomization of teacher continue to be high.

From the data, there is not any statistically significant difference between level of collaboration and school performance, which stands for the high degree of teacher atomization at school. One important conclusion is that principals have a small portion of decision-making for important issues that influence directly school performance.

### **List of Reference**

- Elmore, R. F. (2008) *School reform from the inside out. Policy, Practice and Performance*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard Education Press.
- Inspektorati Kombëtar i Arsimit Parauniversitar (2013). Raport vlerësimi "Vlerësimi i fushave "Klima dhe Etika në shkollë" dhe "Kujdesi ndaj nxënësit". Retrieved from [http://isha.gov.al/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/RAPORT\\_VLERESIMI\\_PER\\_FUSHAT\\_KLI MA\\_DHE\\_ETIKA\\_DHE\\_KUJDESI\\_NDAJ\\_NXENESIT.IKAP1\\_.pdf](http://isha.gov.al/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/RAPORT_VLERESIMI_PER_FUSHAT_KLI MA_DHE_ETIKA_DHE_KUJDESI_NDAJ_NXENESIT.IKAP1_.pdf), 29.7.2015.
- Johnson, R. (1976). *Teacher collaboration, Principal Influence and Decision Making in Elementary Schools*. Technical report No. 48. Stanford University, Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED126083.pdf>, 23.07.2015.
- Kochhar-Bryant, C. & Hieshman, A. (2010). *Effective collaboration for educating the whole child*. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin.
- Leana, C.R. (2011, Fall). *The missing link in school reform*. Stanford Social Innovation Review, 9(4), 34. Retrieved at <https://www2.ed.gov/programs/slcp/2011progdirtg/mislinkinrfm.pdf>
- Lindeman, C., E. 1926. *The meaning of adult education*. Retrieved from <https://archive.org/stream/meaningofadulsted00lind#page/117/mode/2up>
- Seifert, E. & Vornberg, J. (2005). *The new School leader for the 21st Century: The principal*. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Education
- Spillane J.P., Healey K. & Kim M.c. (2010). Leading and managing instruction. Forma land informal aspects of the elementary school



- organization. In Daly A. J. (ed.). *Social network theory and educational change* (129-158) . Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard Education Press
- Vendim Nr. 799, dt. 22.07.2009 *Për miratimin e Strategjisë Kombëtare të Arsimit Parauniversitar për periudhën 2009-2013*. Fletorja zyrtare e Republikës së Shqipërisë, nr. 133, 10 shtator 2009. Retrieved from [http://www.qbz.gov.al/botime/fletore\\_zyrtare/2009/PDF-2009/133-2009.pdf](http://www.qbz.gov.al/botime/fletore_zyrtare/2009/PDF-2009/133-2009.pdf), 27.03.2017.
- Zavadsky, H. (2009). *Bringing school reform to scale*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard Education Press.