TOWARD THE AFFECTIVE PROCESS OF COLLABORATIVE LEADERSHIP – A PHENOMENOLOGICAL STUDY IN MANAGING THE COMPLEX EDUCATIONAL CHANGE

Uyen-Phuong Nguyen

ACKNOWLEGDEMENT

I would like to express my deep gratitude to professor Aini-Kristiina Jäppinen, my research supervisor, for her patient guidance, enthusiastic encouragement and valuable critiques of this research work. Prof. Aini-Kristiina Jäppinen has opened wide my intellectual vision. Her intellectual vigor inspires me to challenge my pre-conceived notions about things I thought I knew. My black-and-white approach to research problems, and life, has evolved over time, becoming more complex, critical, and integrated.

I would also like to extend my thanks to the LED project's team for their help in offering me the data resources for the data collection. The paper would not exist without the substantial data resources offered by the LED's project team.

Finally, I wish to thank my best friends, Chris and Samira. Your sincere encouragement warmed my heart and it kept me going, despite the moments of seemingly desperation.

All errors are mine.

ABSTRACT

Nguyen, Uyen-Phuong. 2018. Developing collaborative leadership in long term – A phenomenological study in educational change. Master's Thesis in Education. University of Jyväskylä. Department of Education.

Collaborative leadership is one of the enthralling concepts for recent decades. A considerable amount of literature has been published on collaborative aspects of leadership as an affective process and its achievement on educational change. However, how collaborative leadership is initiated and maintained to develop long-term educational change successfully has not been widely studied. This indicates the lack of understanding regarding the experiential factors of individuals dealing with challenging problems in educational change by adopting collaborative leadership approaches. Additionally, how these experiential factors develop over time is possible to discern.

In this study, phenomenological approach, a qualitative method, is used to explore the lived experiences of exigent problems for individuals in educational change development with the focus on collaborative leadership process. This current study used the available data from the international longitudinal project titled "Collaborative Leading of The Unexpected in The Changing Education" (LED) (2015 – 2018).

This study came up with five significant themes including (*1) The Tendency toward Collaboration-facilitating Experiences; (2) The Growth in Mind-sets and Skill-sets; (3) The Improvement in Teacher Practice and Student Learning; (4) The Tendency from Individual to Collective Growth; (5) Organizations' Collaborative Initiatives Coping with Contextual Challenges.* These findings reveal important and intriguing explanations to what and how the participants experienced over time in the affective process of leadership executed in collaboration in real-life educational change circumstances.

Despite its limitations, this study could offer potential for furthering our understanding of the role of leadership and collaborative leadership as an affective process in facilitating educational change.

Keywords: collaborative leadership, affective process, educational change, phenomenological approach, lived experiences

CONTENTS

1   INTRODUCTION

> One of the tasks of leadership in the impending millennium will be to help
> teachers, pupils and parents to come to terms with three major sea
> changes: the impact of globalization, the transformation of education, and
> the new meaning of leadership (John MacBeath, 1998).

Educational change has been examined and proved as one of the key factors in societal growth. Educational change has shifted focus over the past decade to issues of large-scale sustainable change, such as at regional or state level (Fullan, Rolheiser, Mascall, & Edge, 2004). Yet, the current technological, sociocultural, economic, and political impacts of globalization have indicated the need for significant and continuous improvements in school contexts (House & McQuillan, 1998; Sahlberg, 2010). Educational change, consequently, has become an instrument to prepare learners with increasingly updated knowledge, skills, and the ability to learn and adapt with changing environment (e.g., Fullan, 2016a; Wells, Carnochan, Slayton, Allen, & Vasudeva, 2005). Although educational changes may have dramatic impacts on schools, there are critical challenges that the schools will face when accelerating changes (Harris, 2010; Fullan, 2010, Jäppinen, 2017).

The field of leadership has been a fast-growing part of educational management and organization. Educational leadership is shown to have remarkable contributions to support teaching and learning, build school capacity, and drive changes (e.g., Jäppinen, 2017; Fullan, 2010; Mulford & Silins, 2003; Wedell, 2009). Many scholars in educational leadership have tended to focus on leaders or followers such as teachers, principals, or students (e.g., Andrews & Soder, 1987; Marks & Printy, 2003; Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008). However, several studies over the past decade have explored the perspectives of viewing leadership as broad, collective and dynamic activities that are shared among several individuals under a changing environment (e.g., Archer & Cameron, 2009; Gronn, 2002; Hallinger & Heck, 2010a; Leithwood, Mascall, & Strauss. 2009). Hallinger and Heck (2010a) and Heck and Hallinger (2010) call this kind of collective and dynamic

mechanisms collaborative leadership. The type of collaborative leadership as a tool to sustain organizational and educational change has not been fully defined and developed, either in theory or in practice.

Change is about the story of time (Hargreaves, 2005; Hargreaves & Goodson, 2006). Extensive research has shown that leadership executed in collaboration has an important role in achieving sustainable organizational change. However, little is known about long-term successful educational change that employs collaborative leadership. Consequently, it is necessary to explore the experiences of the stakeholders about critical features of educational change and important factors incorporated in developing collaborative leadership.

In this current study, collaborative leadership is considered as an affective process that requires individuals to develop new mind-sets and skill-sets (Slater, 2005; Svendsen & Laberge, 2005). Understanding the role of the affective process in educational leadership will nurture and support collaborative efforts among individuals (Slater, 2005). However, the idea of the affective process that underlies real-life leadership practice has yet formulized in terms of theoretical and empirical work (Gardner, Cogliser, Davis, & Dickens, 2011).

Investigating the development of collaborative leadership might assist us in obtaining a clearer idea about peoples' experiences of events within change and dealing with challenging cases in school contexts. As Wedell states in his study (2009, p.19):

> Since the success of an educational change depends centrally on whether people are willing to play an active role in helping it happen, it is essential to consider how the process may make them feel…Planning and implementing educational change therefore needs to take people's feelings into account.

Fullan (2016b, p.97) says that "educational change depends on what teachers think and do – It's as simple as complex as that." However, analyzing the roles of other staff members, other than teachers involved in educational change has also been carried out in recent educational studies (e.g., Hargreaves, 2005; Fullan, 2016b). Every individual in a school community has different responses that can

facilitate adherence to the collaborative leadership process in order to find solutions to obstacles encountered by changing circumstances. Therefore, to achieve collaborative leadership's benefits in long-term educational change, it is helpful to explore individuals' lived experiences of dealing with challenging situations and investigate how such experiences evolve over time to accomplish educational goals.

In this thesis, I do not examine the specific utilizations of collaborative leadership approaches within educational organizations, but the idea of an affective process within collaborative leadership. I will look at what and how are the individuals experienced collaborative leadership in real-life educational change. Indeed, there is always a question about the way we experience the world in order to execute research (Van Manen, 2016). Specifically, *phenomenology* provides the richest and most descriptive approach (Streubert & Carpenter, 1999) in providing an in-depth understanding of hidden factors and meanings of a long-term leadership development, due to the lack of knowledge regarding the experiential factors and their relationships that comprise the collaborative process of achieving educational goals under change. Consequently, phenomenology has been chosen as the perspective from which the data of this study will be examined.

The purpose of this phenomenological study is to explore what specific meanings individuals describe of the experiences of dealing with challenging problems in long-term education change process in terms of collaborative leadership, and in what conditions these experiences occurred. I have employed Moustakas's (1994) phenomenological approach for this study, as it appropriately provides systematic steps in the data analysis procedures and guidelines for assembling the 'essence' of the phenomenon.

The study results are composed of five significant themes in the affective process of collaborative leadership of *(1) The Tendency toward Positive Experiences; (2) The Growth in Mind-sets and Skill-sets; (3) The Improvement in Teacher Practice and Student Learning; (4) The Tendency from Individual to Collective Growth; (5) Organizations' Collaborative Initiatives Coping with Contextual Challenges.* These

themes reveal important explanations to the affective process of collaborative leadership under real-life educational change circumstances.

Chapter 2 focuses on educational change, examined from different dimensions and within which people involve in complex endeavors deal with challenging problems. Educational change and its technical, social-cultural and political impacts are analyzed to assist to explain the challenges of change (House & McQuillan, 1998; Sahlberg, 2010). This section incorporates educational change as a complex and dynamic process. In addition, it will be discussed how managing educational change is particularly demanding along with various obstacles.

In Chapter 3, I argue that leadership executed in collaboration, or collaborative leadership approach could be a tool to lead educational change. The chapter presents the literature on the affective process of collaborative leadership in terms of certain dimensions where particular attention has to be paid in the complex and turbulent world. There, leadership is seen as a facilitative factor to keep the change process going. It enables successful conditions to develop a functional collaborative system for producing positive changes within the organization (Stoll, 2010). Leadership executed in collaboration has proved to have potential to deal with the complex and dynamic process of educational change as a "tool" to drive the change. Advocating the nature of leadership as an affective process (e.g., Crevani, Lindgren & Packenforff, 2010; Langley, Smallman, Tsoukas, & Van de Ven, 2013; Slater, 2005), we might get a clearer idea of how individuals are integrated into organizational development and change (Poole & Van de Ven, 2005). Specifically, the dimensions of individual lived experiences merit particular attention for understanding the affective process of collaborative leadership approach and dealing with the complexity of educational change. However, little is known about how educational stakeholders' lived experiences are affected by time, place, interpersonal relationships, challenging issues and collaborative endeavors.

Chapter 4 represents the research aim and objectives. This study incorporates the discovery and explanation of individuals' lived experiences, collaborative leadership in practice, and specific experiential aspects that hinder and promote collaborative leadership in long-term educational change.

Chapter 5 will present the methods and procedures to conduct the study. The importance of phenomenological approach is succinctly summarized. The data analysis strategy and process are reported. This chapter also clarifies the validity and reliability of the research, and its ethical solutions.

Chapter 6 introduces the results of the study. They include verbatim examples of data collection, data analysis and presentation into meaning units or clustered themes. The results are also explained and differentiated regarding the points of view of previous research and practice.

Chapter 7 comes up with the discussion based on the research findings. This section attempts to understand how the affective process of collaborative leadership is exhibited in the individuals' lived experiences to make sense the complex and dynamic educational change. At the same time, it provides the key ideas of the study: theory and practice pertaining to a range of key dimensions of the affective process of collaborative leadership. This chapter also discusses the study's limitations, implications for practice, and recommendations for future studies.

This is followed by the References for the study.

2   EXPERIENCING EDUCATIONAL CHANGE

2.1   Educational Change

Change has become a common theme in educational research in recent decades. It plays a pivotal role in enabling countries to meet the demands provoked by global changes (Wedell, 2009; Fullan, 2016b). Researchers have studied its technical, socioeconomic, cultural, or political meanings and impacts with an expectation for a better understanding of the needs for educational development (e.g., Fullan, 2016b; Harris, 2010; Sahlberg, 2010; Sancho, 2010).

Meanwhile, House & McQuillan (as cited in Sahlberg, 2010) believe that it needs to take into account the complexity of the network of all three main perspectives, technical, social-cultural and political, in order to understand the underlying complexity of educational change. For instance, Wedell (2009) states that socio-political development, standardization, equity, and accountability result in adapting school system, which always needs to prepare people for a continuously changing education. Sahlberg (2010) highlights the economic contextual impacts on Finnish education. Particularly, the economic sector in Finland has expected the education system to provide the needed quantities of skilled and knowledgeable professionals to deal with rapidly changing environments.

Economic and socio-political forces have put more strain on schools to produce efficacy with increasing levels of achievement (Harris, 2010). Additionally, without considering the impacts of cultural differences and societal and political forces on student learning, educational change can mean just 'an empty exercise in bureaucratic shuffling', having little influence on the learning performance in the classrooms (Nieto, 2005, p. 142). Furthermore, according to Sancho (2010), new technology is one of the strongest and continuously supportive facilitators to bring about a positive and intentional educational change, while schools and school systems have barely adapted quickly and persistently to the opportunities of technologically driven change. Bigum and Kenway (2010) add that educational organizations should be able to adapt to the changed techno-social conditions

because a number of educational problems can be solved by technological applications.

In sum, these studies outline a critical role for educational change, recognized within the complex relationships of technical, sociocultural, and political influences. This endeavor, however, raises a question how to manage educational change and ensure its long-term success.

2.2   Managing Educational Change

Despite ambitious efforts to change education for over 50 years, we have still to admit that educational changes are not always successful (Fullan, 2016b). For example, managing educational change brings momentous challenges to the sequential system of schooling (Macbeath, 1998). Turbot (2017, p.) regards educational change as a multidimensional and contesting challenge:

> Lessons taught in classrooms no longer seem relevant for our increasingly tumultuous world. Teachers are wrestling with how to break away from archaic pedagogies and curricula. Students are jumping off the education conveyor belt unequipped for an unforeseen future. Governments are eager to develop knowledge societies but grappling to find concrete strategies to get there. So indeed, to many, the plight of education may resemble the current state of our world: chaotic and ambiguous.

Already four decades ago, Marris (1975) anticipated that educational change involves loss, fear, and struggle. In other words, these emotional aspects of change are nonlinear, irregular, and unexpected, that is, educational organizations have always struggled to manage change. As reported, these challenges are associated with conflict, ambiguity, risk and vulnerability that leaders and teachers have to face during the change process (Fullan, 2016; Leithwood, Menzies, Jantzi, & Leithwood, 1996), organizational culture and human capacity (Mayrowetz, 2008), leadership policies (Hallinger, 2003), the challenges of collaboration (Wells

& Feun, 2012), establishing professional learning communities (Harris, 2010), professional identity and agency (Reio Jr, 2005), and curriculum and discipline problems (Edwards & Bates, 2011).

In brief, managing change is a challenge at many educational levels and within diverse environments. Indeed, the process to manage educational change is multidimensional and complex. Harris (2010) proposes the hypothesis that educators, educational administrators, and government authorities have not succeeded in making fundamental educational change because they have failed to understand the nature of change and to apply it into practice. This is because educational change should be viewed not as a linear process but a complex, non-linear and dynamic one.

2.3   The Complex and Dynamic Process of Educational Change

There are existing and emerging theories that view educational change as a complex and dynamic process (e.g., Fullan, 2016; Harris, 2010). The nature of educational change involves reculturing people's behaviors, beliefs and acknowledging educational change as a longstanding issue. According to Wedell (2009), successful implementation of educational change takes long time as it is an ongoing process, not an event that takes place at a particular point in time.

Fullan (2016b) considers educational change as a multidimensional innovation, not a single entity. Such an innovation consists of at least three components: materials, teaching approaches and beliefs that might decide the efficacy of the right drivers to lead a successful change. Complexity can be loosely understood here as a highly composite dynamic system built up of many mutually and collaboratively interacting components, which Fullan (2016b) refers to as 'systemness' where everyone contributes to the improvement of the bigger system and benefit from it.

Complexity also means having the ability to adapt to the change. As Wedell (2009) states, the planning and implementation process of educational change is potentially complex, and the complexity of change depends on the challenges embedded in the existing educational reality. Stoll (2010) further argues that the educational environment is characterized by increasingly rapid change and complexity. Thus, employing the same change strategies everywhere might not make a difference because sustainable change depends on an ongoing process of learning by people, individually and collectively. Any group of stakeholders might be insufficient to serve the needs of all students in diverse contexts, as well as to be able to bring about the needed changes in a complex and fast-changing world.

Many researchers have studied different factors to implement and pilot an effective educational change. For instance, Saunders (2012) says educational change is such a complex and dynamic process that teachers or principals do not make change in isolation, but they work with colleagues, students and administrators in a range of different situations over a sustained period of time. According to Bryk (2018), educational organizations need to focus on developing the professional capacity of teachers, on building school climate as a safety and organization for learning, on enhancing parents and community collaboration, and on building instructional guidance system (Bryk, 2018). While Robinson (2011) emphasizes the principals' effectiveness, Cole (2012) emphasizes of shaping a learning culture where teachers collectively advance their teaching practices. An effective change process will value good ideas and promote the whole capacity and ownership among participants (Fullan, 2016b). Senge (1990) characterizes the flexible and responsive ability of organizations to pursue sustainable and competitive changes with the term 'learning organization'. He means that learning that is necessary for development and a changing environment is sustained through individual behaviors, teamwork, reflection-in-action, planning, evaluation, problem solving, communication and the other experimentations to drive changes and manage the challenges.

Mulford (2010) mentions 'the challenge of complexity' by analyzing the interrelationship between context, organization, and leaders under changing and turbulent circumstances. By drawing on the concept of the complexity, he is able to show the significance of an integrative educational leadership approach when schools wish to develop and change. He argues that successful educational leadership is so complex that "it needs to be able to see and act on the whole, as well as on the individual elements, and the relationships among them over time" (Mulford, 2010, p. 199). However, his study highlights the roles of successful leaders building capacity in a development way, without focusing on how this complexity alters over time and under collaborative endeavors. He further states that lack of time and professional isolation are the principal barriers to collaborative endeavors. Stoll (2010) concedes that a collective and collaborative organization takes time and effort to develop. These issues essentially lead to a call for an integrative approach of educational leadership to connect individual meaningfully and purposefully and to achieve systematic change over the time.

This study employs a conceptualization that is called collaborative leadership (Hallinger & Heck, 2010a, 2010b; Heck & Hallinger, 2010). In the following chapter, I suggest the approach of collaborative leadership can provide a potential tool to drive the complex and dynamic educational change, in spite of very few rigor and relevant theoretical and practical considerations (Jäppinen, 2017, 2018).

3   TOWARD THE AFFECTIVE PROCESS OF COLLABORATIVE LEADERSHIP

3.1   Collaborative Leadership Approach as a Tool to Drive Educational Change

Leadership acts as a facilitator in order to keep the change process going. It enables favorable conditions to develop a thriving and challenging learning community in which a collaborative system offers the potential for positive change within the organization (Stoll, 2010). MacBeath (1998) raises a crucial question in asking about how leaders can make sense of the changing context and how they can enable to respond effectively to the challenges of the changing world. In other words, it is crucial to value the role of leadership in terms of creating a collaborative, healthy and sustainable environment in which individuals have better chance to confront together the challenging problems and produce workable solutions that lead to successful change in the long term.

Educational leadership has proved crucial for the success of individual organizations and educational change (e.g., Bryk, 2010; Elmore, 2004; Fullan, 2006; Harris, 2008; Hubbard, Stein, & Mehan, 2013; Stoll & Louis, 2007). Specifically, educational leadership is shown to make significant impacts to contribute to teaching and learning, build school capacity for learning, and lead educational changes (e.g., Jäppinen, 2017; Fullan, 2010; Mulford & Silins, 2003; Wedell, 2009). Several studies indicate the important role of leadership because it is interconnected with educational changes (e.g., Harris & Jones 2010; Murphy, Smylie, Mayrowetz, & Louis, 2009; Stoll, Bolam, McMahon, Wallace, & Thomas, 2006). Educational leadership studies have assisted in understanding the critical complexity of educational change.

Educational leadership needs to be recognized as a collective endeavor across different educational levels (Hauge et al, 2014). Educational change challenges and affects the existing working relationships between learners, colleagues, superiors, parents and representatives of the wider society (Wedell, 2009). Leadership is not only the principal's responsibilities (Bolden, 2009; Hallinger & Heck, 2010a). However, studies of leadership have often focused on certain individuals such as principals or teachers, while the collaborative conceptions of leadership have remained outside (Hauge et al., 2014; Jäppinen, 2014). These scholars suggest that overestimating the role of leaders might risk overshadowing the meaning of complexity of organizational development as well as the dynamicity of educational change, resulting in insufficient leadership practice. Instead, the whole school community, other than school leaders, should 'make sense' of educational change. The powerful professionalism of teachers, principal, district leaders and other people should be collaborative, open, outward looking and authoritative (Fullan, 2016b).

Indeed, collaboration is a necessity for most communities, which tend to view the organization as a collective enterprise (Stoll, 2009). That is to say, directors, teachers and other stakeholders need to interact with each other, participate in critical discussions, share visions and purposes, and come up with agreements and decisions that have significant implications for the endurance of collaborative relationships and the success of educational change (e.g., Fullan, 1992; Leonard & Leonard, 2001; Pugach, Blanton, & Correa, 2011; Slater, 2005). Similarly, colleagues from different organizations, agencies or other stakeholder groups often decide collaboratively on common issues. These indicate the fact that a whole range of people in different roles is needed to work together in the long run to implement a successful educational change (Wedell, 2009). However, working in collaborative environments in educational change obviously evokes critical challenges related to time, work culture, divergent points of view, equity and the ed-

ucational meaning (Chiang, Chapman, & Elder, 2011). The success of an educational change is strongly determined by the degree of collaboration (Coronel, Carrasco, Fernandez, & Gonzalez, 2003). Therefore, educational conditions need to be created for high levels of staff and student involvement, joint planning and a commitment to inquiry in order to promote collaboration and problem solving, to improve professional practice and student learning, as well as to produce inclusive culture (Ainscow & Goldrick, 2010; Pugach et al., 2011). Collaboration can be an attractive model for educational change and development with the role of leadership in providing and securing continuous collaboration (Chiang et al., 2011). Thus, Barker and Hosking suggest a need for "a more collective and systematic understanding of leadership as a social process" (as cited in Bolden, 2011, p. 252).

For recent decades, distinctive terms of collaboration, such as distributed leadership (Gronn, 2002; Harris, 2010; Jäppinen, 2012; Tian, Risku, & Collin, 2016), shared leadership (Lambert, 2002; Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2008), collaborative leadership (Archer & Cameron, 2009; Kramer & Crespy, 2011, Heck & Hallinger, 2010; Jäppinen, 2018) and authentic leadership (Begley, 2006; George, 2003) have been employed to illustrate the more complex and extensive mechanisms of leadership for collaboration. Distributed, transformative, transformational and other sharing-emphasizing leadership approaches have broadly concluded collaboration in the literature of educational leadership as well (e.g., Bolden, 2011; Bush & Glover, 2012; Harris, 2010; Møller & Eggen, 2005).

In particular, transformational leadership focuses on building and developing the capacity of innovation in organizations, on supporting educational changes to benefit teaching and learning, on becoming purpose-oriented, and on sharing the common visions (e.g., Hallinger, 2003; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2000; Silin & Mulford, 2002). Transformational leadership helps creating and maintaining

continuous learning in organizations (Bass, 2000; Howell & Avolio, 1993). However, the effects of transformational leadership on academic achievement is shown to be non-significant (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2000).

In addition, educational leadership studies have involved distributed leadership, which primarily foregrounds leadership as situated, enacted, and distributed activities across the organization (e.g., Spillane, 2012; Spillane, Halverson, & Diamond, 2001). It focuses on the similar "notions such as shared, collective, collaborative, emergent, and co- leadership" (Bolden, 2011, p. 263) to show how leaders share workload, cognitions, responsibility, and expertise (Tian et al., 2016; Jäppinen, 2012). In this way, distributed leadership practices concern collaboration (Jäppinen, 2012). Yet, distributed leadership theory might not an ideal foundation to explore the complexity and dynamics of educational change for the following reasons:

Firstly, the major gap in the field of distributed leadership is the failure to clarify the concept, the impacts, and the application of distributed leadership empirically (Tian et al., 2016). For example, researchers have barely clarified how different agents use their initiatives to affect leadership activities at workplace (Duif, Harrison, Van Dartel, & Sinyolo, 2013), or how principals share their leadership responsibilities with the staff members without considering ethics, power, or politics (Leithwood, Patten, & Jantzi, 2010; Lumby, 2013; Woods, 2016). Additionally, in his review, Bolden also highlights the insufficiency in considering the dynamics of power and influence in distributed leadership theory and research. Without that, we might not really understand the dynamic and complex operations of organizations and leadership practice, particularly in educational change.

Secondly, Harris (2007) also claims that distributed leadership primarily targets at practice, not people. Importantly, Tian et al. (2016) also assert that studies on distributed leadership seem to neglect the perspective of how individuals could exert agency during the process of distributed leadership. Moreover, the

studies by Mayrowetz, York-Barr and Duke (cited in Bolden, 2011) point out the fact that there is little direct and strong evidence to show the impacts of distributed leadership on two crucial goals of educational leadership: school improvement and leadership development.

Another theoretical group of theories called authentic leadership has been advanced over the years (e.g., Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Begley, 2006; George, 2003; Luthans, Norman, & Hughes, 2006). Unlike distributed leadership, this overarching theory is based on the philosophical conceptions of authenticity in the organizational development and how the organization's authenticity is manifested through its leadership (Gardner et al., 2011; Novicevic, Harvey, Ronald, & Brown-Radford, 2006). According to Kernis & Goldman (2006), authenticity includes "a range of mental and behavioral processes that explain how people discover and construct a core sense of self, and how this core self is maintained across situations and over time" (as cited in Gardner et al., 2011, p. 1119).

Gardner, Cogliser, Davis, and Dickens (2011) further clarify the main assumption of the authentic leadership literature that truly authentic and ethical leaders will lead in respecting the colleagues' core values, beliefs, strengths, as well as weaknesses. Authentic leadership has been viewed as positive forms of leadership (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Luthans & Avolio, 2003) because it can promote positive organizational culture (Azanra, Moriano, & Molero, 2013) and positive psychological capital (Clapp-Smith, Vogelgesang, & Avey, 2009; Rego, Sousa, Marques, & Cunha, 2012) when they favorably perceive and experience events, contexts, people, organizations, or the future (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). For example, Luthans & Avolio (2003) suggest that leaders' confidence, optimism, hope, and resiliency are posited to develop the self-awareness and self-regulatory behaviors as the components of the self-development process. Authentic leadership is also capable of dealing with moral and ethical issues in school administration (Begley, 2006). In terms of the organizational context, the studies by Gardner, Avolio, Luthans, May, and Walumba, and Luthans and

Avolio suggest that authentic leadership has capable of being sustained and integrated into the context of turbulence, uncertainty, and challenge (as cited in Avolio & Gardner, 2005)

In my study, authentic leadership is exploited in promoting understanding the idea of the affective process of collaborative leadership. I will explain this in the following subchapter. However, I do not employ authentic leadership as the core concept to extend how the affective process of leadership executed in collaboration appears in daily leadership practice. One obvious reason for this is that the dimension of educational change appears to be missing in the literature of authentic leadership. Educational change is a complex process in which all necessary people should be involved in tackling challenging problems and accomplishing the common goals of their organization (Muijs & Rumyantseva, 2014). As mentioned earlier, leadership should be perceived and practiced as collaborative endeavors, dealing with the tensions of change, rather than certain relationships or individuals in organizations (Jäppinen, 2017). Whereas, as Gardner et al (2011) argue, empirical research in the field of authentic leadership is rare to explore the dynamic interplays of the components of authentic leadership (e.g., values, cognitions, emotions, behaviors) in particular situations in order to develop a deeper understanding of the authentic leader–follower relationships. This will require extensive employment of qualitative methods in order to obtain deep narrative descriptions of leadership processes in dynamic contexts such as educational change.

Another crucial reason is that authentic leadership primarily focuses on leaders' authenticity/self/identity such as self-awareness, self-regulation, self-determination, or self-consistency that targets at positive self-development (e.g., Luthans, Youssef & Avolio, 2007; Ilies, Morgeson, & Nahrgang, 2005; Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing, & Peterson, 2008). Despite concentrating on leaders and followers' expression of authenticity, emotions, experiences

(Gardner et al., 2011), authentic leadership studies seem to neglect the perspectives of collaboration and collaborative endeavors in organizations. Only the leaders' relations with others have been expressed (Avolio & Gardner, 2005).

For the reasons mentioned above, I will take into consideration the concept of collaborative leadership although it has not been rigorously described and theoretically defined in previous studies. Collaborative leadership can be understood as leadership for and in collaboration that is shared among teachers, administrators, and others and focuses on strategic school-wide actions and student learning fostering school improvement (Heck & Hallinger, 2010; Slater, 2005). Educational leadership executed in collaboration tends to view the organization as a collective enterprise across different educational levels (Hauge et al., 2014; Stoll, 2009). Collaborative leadership has been shown to generate the growth in positive impacts on student learning indirectly through building school academic capacity for teacher practice, the professional learning of the staff, and student learning (Hallinger & Heck, 2010b). They further suggest measuring collaborative leadership based on teachers' perceptions of school leadership, collaborative decision-makings, participations across school, and academic development. As mentioned earlier, I do not study either collaborative leadership or its components. Instead, I employ the conceptualization of collaborative leadership and examine its capability in dealing with the obstacles of educational change through the angle of the affective process.

3.2 The Affective Process of Collaborative Leadership within Educational Change

Firstly, researchers have investigated and advocated the process of leadership. Creavani et al (2010) challenge the current research by clarifying the ontological and epistemological nature of leadership, in bringing the conception of leadership into the center of organizational process studies. They argue that

overestimating the individual leaders, we might neglect the interactions and practices involved in the process of leadership (Crevani et al. 2010). This process does not dismiss individual leader development because a collaborative leadership process will concern both the individual members and the entity they form. Besides, Day (2000) and Day, Fleenor, Atwater, Sturn and McKee (2014) add that researchers should approach leadership development as a process that transcends in complex interactive relationships between individuals and external environment.

According to Poole and Van de Ven (2005), exploring the perspective of process can offer a flexible mode of inquiry that is ideally suited to explore critical features of organizational change and development. Thus, looking at leadership as a process can develop a social scientific explanation how individuals evolve into development and change. Especially, Langley et al. (2013) state that approaching change in organizations from the angle of process can draw attention to how and why things emerge, develop, grow, or terminate over time. Therefore, they further highlight the patterns of change in educational contexts, and the roles of several other factors such as emotions, tensions, interactions, or mindsets. Kramer and Crespy (2011) examines the processes of collaborative leadership in which the participants' attitudes, behaviors, and communication support collaboration and create a collaborative culture.

Several researchers have currently highlighted the importance of emotions in the leadership process (e.g., Ashkanasy & Tse, 2000; Brief & Weiss, 2002; Lord, Klimoski & Kanfer, 2002; Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans, & May, 2004). The theory of an affective process has been applied into the field of leadership (e.g., Gardner, Fischer, & Hunt, 2009; Hall & Lord, 1995; Hannah & Luthans, 2008; Michie & Gooty, 2005). The applications are based on affective events theories by Weiss and Cropanzano, multi-level theory of emotions by Ashkanasy, morality and emotions theory by Oakley, theory of emotional intelligence by Goleman,

and Asforth's and Humphey's theory of emotional labor (as cited in Gardner et al., 2011).

However, researchers have jet to formulize subsequent theoretical and empirical work of the affective processes that underlie daily leadership practice (Gardner et al, 2011). Alternatively, leadership researchers should further study how to measure affective processes based on emotional, cognitive, or behavior elements responding to the contextual conditions (Lord & Brown, 2003).

Slater (2005) regards leadership for collaboration as an affective process. She supposes that understanding the role of the affective process in educational leadership can nurture and support collaboration among individuals through supportive communication skills, valuing people, and displaying the emotional capacity of understanding, self-awareness, developing relationship. Slater further explains that such an affective process in the educational change is linked to the emotional experience of leadership in collaboration and calls for a necessary development of the stakeholders' *mind-set and skills-set*. Nevertheless, Slater (2005) does not attempt to show how the stakeholders' emotional experience alters over the time and under the impact of collaborative context, and neither provides a clear exploration how leadership within collaborative initiatives gets other staff members involved in the process. However, these ideas should be considered crucial in examining and developing the understanding of collaborative leadership.

3.3 Lived Experiences emerging out of the Collaborative Process in the Educational Change

Lived experiences are mediated and co-constructed in social interactions and directly linked to organizational, cultural and social ambiences (e.g., Denzin 1984; Fineman, 2000; Hargreaves, 2001; Lord & Harvey, 2002; Saunders, 2013). The idea of the significance of individuals' lived experiences under a school

change is widely accepted (e.g., Kaniula, 2010; Saunders, 2013; Van Veen & Sleegers (2009). Kaniuka (2010) posits that educational leadership should include personal experiences as a powerful tool to build school capacity for effective change outcomes. Cross and Hong (2009) give an account of the interchange between teachers' positive and negative emotions during change efforts, which is proved to possibly influence the educational reform outcomes

In this study, I suggest that the lived experiences during educational change need to be further explored and understood in order to better understand the idea of the affective process of leadership in collaboration. For example, Saunders (2013) discovers that teachers' experiences of change evoke emotional and behavioral responses. He further emphasizes building relationships and activating interactions among teachers and their emotions as vital activators during the change process. Vitale and Kaniuka (2009) found that teachers who lack supportive experiences become a barrier to a successful school reform.

Saunders (2013) and Van Veen and Sleegers (2009) attempt to frame the lived experiences of teachers in changing environments. Although emotional aspects are neglected in educational change (Hargreaves, 2005), it has been proved that teachers' emotional responses toward change issues related to curriculum planning, teaching and learning, or school structure. Elmore (2004) reports on the importance of ambience and suggests that teachers are lacking opportunities to collaborate and discuss the problems that they face in their schools. These emotional reactions also depend on the relationships with the changing environment (Troman & Woods, 2001; Zembylas, 2010).

Educational change initiatives do not only affect teachers, but also the whole web of significant and meaningful relationships that make up the work of schools (Hargreaves, 2005). Hence, educational change is a complex and dynamic process, and the collective experiences are manifested in this process (Zembylas, 2010). Teachers do not implement educational operations in isolation. They work with colleagues, students and administrators in a range of different situations

over a sustained period of time (Saunders, 2013). The experiential aspects of educational change cannot be properly described without the integrations of all individuals in schools.

Zembylas (2010) raises a question how educational organizations build the environments in ways that hinder or promote teachers' emotional responses. In particular, teachers' collegiality and trust create distinctive emotional geographies that influence reform efforts in helping teachers to cope with change in a nonthreatening ambience. Working conditions, social relations, and personal values and concern engage teachers emotionally with the reform effort where teachers need the emotional and social support to take reasonable risks to cope with reform (Zembylas, 2010). The researcher further notes that the success of reform efforts based on collaboration among teachers is directly related to the relationships that these teachers develop.

Moreover, Kramer and Crespy (2011) recognize the quest for the circumstances in which collaborative leadership is implemented by all individuals involved is also about how their attitudes, behaviors, and communications promote collaboration and create a collaborative culture. Their study recognizes the favorable outcomes of collaboration among members. For example, the participants felt positive, vested, satisfied, and motivated. They were willing to risk offering ideas and asking questions. However, creating such circumstances for collaboration can be challenging to leaders and other members (Watkins, 2005). As Kramer and Crespy discovered, the tensions in collaboration might include the reluctance to share opinions, unsureness regarding goal achievement, disagreement, dissatisfaction and unhappiness about collaborative practice and outcomes.

Collaborative leadership provides an explanation on how individuals respond to contextual challenges and make sense of educational change by school capacity improvement (e.g., Archer & Cameron, 2009; Hallinger & Heck, 2010a, 2010b). However, little is known what and in what settings/contexts are

the individual experiences that have an effect on educational leadership and individuals' experiential responses at different times, in different places, and with different people. For example, Saunders (2013) reveals a range of emotions that teachers experience when they adapt new instructional processes and when the emotions are affected by time, place, and interpersonal relationships. Crevani, Lindgren, and Packenforff (2010) highlight the importance of interactional contexts in which leadership process is constructed and performed to make significant and positive contributions. Nevertheless, Crevani and his colleagues barely look at the perspective of human lived experiences and how these experiences change over time.

4　RESEARCH AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

This study aims at exploring the affective process of collaborative leadership under real-life educational change circumstances. Employing Moustakas's (1994) phenomenological approach, I have attempted to unravel the essence of the affective process of collaborative leadership that is embedded in the lived human experiences of dealing with the challenging educational change. By answering the questions that are presented below and examining the findings, I hope to get a greater understanding for the idea of the affective process in delivering collaborative leadership as an effective driver for long -term educational change.

The main research question is:

How the affective process of collaborative leadership appears in real-life educational change circumstances?

The two subquestions for understanding the idea of the affective process of collaborative leadership are:

1. What are the lived experiences of educational organizations' staff members in coping with challenging issues in long-term educational change?

2. How are the collaborative initiatives in real-life educational change circumstances?

5   IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STUDY

5.1   The Participants

The current study utilized the data gathered for an international longitudinal project titled "Collaborative Leading of The Unexpected in The Changing Education" (LED) (2015 – 2018). Briefly, the LED project investigated how 12 educational organizations in Finland, Canada, Sweden and New Zealand collaboratively led the unexpected - educational change and resolve change-related challenges. (The organization in New Zealand ceased its participation in the middle of the project due to administrative reasons.) This thesis explores the lived experiences of leadership in collaboration within 4 organizations that provided a rich data for my study purposes.

All LED organizations were committed to execute long-term processes of collaborative leadership for the study's purposes. The data exploited in this study consisted of the participants' descriptions of their own collaborative leadership processes that they uploaded onto the project's protected website, based on the common guidelines that were given to the organizations in the beginning of the project. Otherwise, the organizations were free to load on the website the descriptions and narratives of their processes perceived by their own opinions. I had a free access to this data in order to answer to my research questions and analyze the data.

The participants of the study experienced different educational change-related challenges. These include reducing the number of course cancellations, developing new teaching methods, conducting marketing campaigns, planning courses, changing school locations, organizing educational events, teaching and learning evaluations, improving student learning, collaborating different subjects, and developing leadership.

5.2   The Research Design and Procedure

I employed Moustakas's (1994) phenomenological approach for this study. The method appropriately provides systematic steps in the data analysis procedure and guidelines for assembling the textual and structural descriptions, was employed in this study. The major procedural steps, which were simplified in Creswell (2018), were utilized as follows:

1. Considering if the research aims could be examined by using a phenomenological approach. Exploring the individuals' lived experiences through the phenomenological approach can assist to understanding the idea of the affective process of collaborative leadership in real-life education change.

2. Exploring from the literature the phenomenon of experiencing educational challenges within change, related to leadership in collaboration.

3. Analyzing the narratives from the LED data, provided by four organizations in experiencing challenges within change and executing collaborative leadership in practice. The contextual challenges vary from decreasing the number of course cancellations, developing and utilizing new teaching methods, running marketing campaigns, planning courses, relocating school, organizing educational events, teaching and learning evaluations, improving student learning, interdisciplinary teaching, and developing leadership.

4. Generating themes from the analysis of significant statements and developing textual and structural descriptions.

5. Presenting the 'essence' of the phenomenon and explaining it by using a composite description in a written form.

There were two broad and general methodological issues to be considered before starting to analyze the data: 1) What did the participants experience in terms of

the phenomenon? and 2) How did the experiences happen? (Moustakas, 1994). These two open-ended questions focused attention on choosing the kind of data that would lead to a textual and structural description of the experiences, and ultimately provide an understanding of the common experiences of the participants (Creswell, 2018).

In addition, Colaizzi (1978) notices that the success of phenomenological research questions depends on the extent to which the questions touch lived experiences distinct from theoretical explanations. In this current study, the participants provided their narratives about their experiences of their organizational changes, as well as their collaborative leadership policies and actions for around three years.

In phenomenology, Merleau-Ponty also posits that the research transcends or suspends past knowledge and experience in order to create a better understanding of a phenomenon at a deeper level (as cited in Creswell, 2018). It is an attempt to approach lived experiences with a sense of 'newness' to elicit rich and descriptive data. It is necessary for the researcher to acknowledge and attempt to bracket those experiences in an open and plausible way (Creswell, 2018).

For around three-year period, the participants were encouraged to describe their experiences in collaboratively resolving challenging issues related to educational change and upload their stories in terms of narratives, pictures, and graphs. In this study, this data was integrated for data analysis. The strategy was supposed to allow following the overarching collaborative leadership domains under real-life educational changes. Moreover, it aims to explain the affective process that is manifested in the lived experiences of the participants over time.

5.3   Data Analysis

The use of Colaizzi's strategy (1978) in phenomenological data analysis, mentioned by Moustakas (1994), was employed. Summarized by Creswell (2018), this approach follows the general guidelines of analyzing the data for significant

phrases, developing meanings and clustering them into themes, and presenting an exhaustive description of the phenomenon.

I began with a full description of the experiences in the narrative data. Thereafter, I identified and listed the significant statements in the data sources (in-depth narratives, descriptions of experiences, and reports) which described what and how (in what contexts and settings) the individuals were experiencing the issues. These significant statements were formulated in terms of the meanings interpreted by the researcher and their structures were modified grammatically and lexically. For example, a significant statement, such as "We still have the same wicked problem. I think that now we have a better chance to solve this problem." was modified into "Although change is difficult and results in unfavorable experience, collaborative leadership brings about positive outlook." In other words, this step attempted to transform these statements into sensitive and meaningful expressions regarding the phenomenon. Table 1 contains the examples of significant expression with their formulated meanings.

TABLE 1. Selected examples of significant statements of individuals' experiences and related formulated meanings	
Significant Statement	Formulated Meaning
The need and the will to reform, courage to do things in another way, experiment culture.	Under the application of collaborative leadership, the individuals are disposed to recognize the need for change and the challenges of change.
The focus of the team has been on formal and organic collaboration among learners of our team. Positive, constructive as well as descriptive feedback is at the center of such collaboration, which also happens among all learners (students, teachers, administrators and outside experts).	Collaborative leadership has capacity to transform people and organizations in a literal sense. The participants recognized the transformation from individuals to all.

The projects make it possible.	Collaborative leadership improves the efficacy in the participants in taking over the challenges and uncertainty of their organization's changes.
We hope that this will be a good continuation of what we´ve done so far…	Educational change comes along with fears and tensions, but also with hope under collaborative leadership.
We think it´s time to change the groups because when you meet new people you get new knowledge and start to listen in a new way again.	Collaborative leadership embraces the circle of continuous learning in the organizations simultaneously and constantly.

The next phase was to organize these formulated meanings into bigger units of information, clusters of meaning, so that it possibly established the foundation for data interpretation. For example, table 2 illustrates a theme cluster of *The Improvement in Teacher Practice and Student Learning* emerged from their associated formulated meanings.

TABLE 2. Examples of the theme of *The Improvement in Teacher Practice and Student Learning* **with their associated formulated meanings**
Improving teaching methods
Becoming more aware and reflective in teaching
Developing teachers' thinking
More creative and productive teaching
Benefitting for all students
Improving students' writing
Students becoming more active
Upgrading Students Results

Thereafter, the description which included textual and structural descriptions of the experience were targeted at presenting what was experienced, and in what settings and contexts the experiences occurred. Finally, the textual and structural descriptions were integrated into a composite synthesis of the phenomenon.

5.4   Reliability and Validity

In this study, the initial phenomenological component of the data analysis was to review the written narratives several times to obtain an overall view about their content. The significant phrases and sentences that pertained directly to the experiences of the phenomenon were identified and extracted. Then, I formulated meanings by clustering them into common themes in the participants' transcripts. The results were transferred into an in-depth and exhaustive description of the phenomenon. Reliability and validity standards were achieved through diverse literature searches, adhering to the phenomenological method, bracketing past experiences, clarifying the my bias, keeping field notes, using adequate samples, discovering negative cases, and following the whole process timeline (More, Barrett, Mayan, Olson, & Spiers, 2000; Meadows & Morse, 2001). The phenomenon was grounded and supported by corroborating evidence multiple data sources.

However, there are disadvantages in terms of being bound to an existing data and large study that had a ready-made research design. First, I did not collect the data, as it was available online. Consequently, I was not able to be in contact with the participants for further explorations and understandings. Second, the ambiguity in perceiving language and person-related particularities might not have been fully recognized when I analyzed the data without other evaluators. According to the triangulation method used to inspect the validity of qualitative research, these disadvantages might weaken the opportunity for me to uncover and explain deeper and clearer meanings of the phenomenon (Patton, 2002; Thurmond, 2001). Third, the data that was analyzed was obtained only

from four organizations. Thus, the findings might not be extended and applied to wider populations (Atieno, 2009).

5.5 Ethical Solutions

The first concern in studying the affective process in an educational organization is the possibility that this might raise issues of power and risk to the researcher, the participants, and the site (Creswell, 2018). To deal with this issue, the organizations willingly took part in the collaborative activities over the period of data collection and uploaded their stories on the LED project's online platform in the form of text-based and open-ended diaries. There were also non-disclosure agreements that had been made between the responsible University of Jyväskylä and the organizations before the project started. The agreement ensured participants' privacy protection, power differentials, ownership of the data, authenticity, and trust in the data collected (e.g., Creswell, 2018; Marshall & Rossman, 2014; Nicholas et al., 2010). For this particular phenomenological study, the data was collected from the diverse manifestation of leadership in collaboration such as in-depth narratives, documents, and photographs uploaded onto the site (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000).

Moreover, the online platform also provided participants with time and space in terms of flexibility that allowed them more time to consider and respond to requests for information (Creswell, 2018). All the interactions on this web-based platform were visible and reviewed only by the participants and the research team. The transparent platform helped create a safe and free flowing environment (Nicholas et at., 2010; Creswell, 2018). The data was also organized and stored using the digital-based storage methods, which involved in obtaining the organizations' authorization and approvals.

I was allowed to access the data to conduct the analysis for my master thesis. I analyzed and stored the data in my private digital files. The participants and the organizations remain anonymous and their information is kept confidential

in the thesis. Finally, all data that could reveal the origin will be destroyed when my master thesis is published.

6   RESULTS

From the data of four educational organizations, 279 remarkable statements were extracted based on Moustakas' phenomenological analysis (cited in Cresswell, 2018). My primary focus was to explicate the essence of the lived experiences of the participants in the particular LED project. Therefore, the statements about what and how the individuals were experiencing the phenomenon were analyzed into the following five themes: (*1*) *The Tendency toward Collaboration-facilitating Experiences; (2) The Growth in Mind-sets and Skill-sets; (3) The Improvement in Teacher Practice and Student Learning; (4) The Tendency from Individual to Collective Growth; (5) Organizations 'Collaborative Initiatives coping with the Contextual Challenges.* The Table 3 summarizes the number of each theme.

TABLE 3. The five themes and the number of the significant statements of the individuals' lived experiences with their formulated meanings	
Theme	**The number of the significant statements**
Theme 1. The Tendency toward Collaboration-facilitating Experiences	43
Theme 2. The Growth in Mind-Sets and Skill-Sets	122
Theme 3. The Improvement in Teacher Practice and Student Learning	12
Theme 4. The Tendency from Individual to Collective Growth	11
Theme 5: Organizations' Collaborative Initiatives Coping with the Contextual Challenges	91

The first three themes answer to the first research sub-question concerning what the lived experiences of the staff members in coping with changing environments in a long-term educational change are. Whereas, the fourth and fifth themes explain the second research sub-question referring to how the collaborative initiatives in real-life educational change circumstances are. Table 4, 6, 7, 8, and 9

contain the examples of the theme clusters revealed from their associated meanings.

6.1 The lived experiences of educational organizations' staff members in coping with changing issues in a long-term educational change

The tendency toward positive experiences for facilitating collaboration in the organizations, the growth in mind-sets and skill-sets, and the improvement in teacher practice and student learning emerged from the lived experiences of the participants in dealing with educational change challenges.

6.1.1 Theme 1: The tendency toward collaboration-facilitating experiences

In this theme, the lived experiences of the participants were associated with the tendency toward collaboration-facilitating experiences. First, the individuals evoked diverse lived experiences in educational change circumstances ranging from ambiguous, vulnerable, or risky experiences to joyful, hopeful, or surprising ones in dealing with challenges in educational change, which is aligned with the literature (e.g., Fullan, 2016b; Barkker & Schayfeli, 2008; Saunders, 2013). Table 4 shows the common meanings among these experiential responses.

TABLE 4. The responses of *Collaboration-inhibiting and -facilitating Experiences* with their modified meanings	
Collaboration-inhibiting Experiences	Collaboration-facilitating Experiences
Feeling risky in front of others	Finding the events productive, rewarding, and fruitful
Not heading in the right direction	
Not having enough time	Embracing disagreements
Lacking confidence in sharing with groups	Achieving common understanding

Feeling doubtful of their success	Feeling highly appreciated collaborative discussions
Feeling worried about external demands	Learning a lot from each other
Being afraid of failures	More collaboration leading to more effective working
	Willing to help others and ask questions
	Realizing the divergent directions positively
	Having many ideas and offering different perspectives
	Adaptability
	Feeling surprised, hopeful, satisfied and happy
	Believing in having flexible thinking and connecting people

On the one hand, a number of participants in this study exhibited unfavorable experiences associated with "disappointment," "concerns," "fears," "sense of hurry," "limitations," "wondering," and "demands" under the situations that demanded their collaboration engaging the challenges of educational change. These unfavorable experiences included uncertainty, fear, reluctance, worries, lack of confidence, and anxiety. As mentioned in the literature review, many studies have confirmed that educational change entails uncertainty and ambiguity, fear and distress, and other negative emotions (e.g. Fullan, 2016b; Hargreaves, 2004; Kramer & Crespy, 2011; Marris, 1975; Leithwood et al., 1996; Reio Jr, 2005). In addition, aligned with the literature (e.g., Wells & Feun, 2013), the participants mentioned the challenges of collaboration. Evidently, the climate of uncertainty of educational change in these organizations resulted in the feeling of risk and the concern of time as the challenges of collaboration, which is supported by Chiang, Chapman, and Elder (2011), Kramer and Crespy (2011), Mulford (2010), or Reio Jr (2005). Evidently, some participants felt risky in front of others, and lack confidence in sharing with groups. Additionally, they were doubtful about their success, afraid of external demands, lack of time and heading in wrong ways.

On the other hand, facing critical situations of change with the application of collaborative leadership was also assisted with more spontaneously encouraging responses. What I found is a remarkable inclination of the individuals toward promoting collaboration and contributing collaborative culture. This tendency manifested in the lived experiences over the time was evident in the changing experiential responses over time (Table 4). These positive responses, according to the literature (Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi, 2000), are viewed as the tendency to perceive and experience favorably and encouragingly the occurring events, contextual conditions, people, organizations, and the future. These individuals appeared to preferably express their encouraging experiences of collaboration, in responding to the changing environments and the contextual challenges that they experienced with the application of collaborative leadership. They focused on the effective, buoyant and promising aspects of occurrences. These findings are aligned with few studies found in my reviewing, such as Avolio and Gardner (2005), Bandura (1997), Clapp-Smith, Vogelgesang, and Avey (2009), and Luthans et al. (2006). In particular, a study in collaborative leadership by Kramer and Crespy (2011) recognizes the favorable effects for facilitating collaboration and promoting a collaborative leadership culture such as individuals feeling positive, vested, satisfied, and motivated. They were willing to risk sharing ideas and asking questions. Meanwhile, the scholars (e.g., Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Luthans et al., 2006) who advocate authentic leadership have found the positive experiences embedded in the affective process. For example, they explain that confidence, hope, and optimism stem from the leaders' values, belief, and actions alignments across contextual challenges.

However, I hardly locate the consideration for the other individuals in the literature concerning the affective process of authentic leadership in order to explain the individuals' positive and collaboration-benefiting experiences. As my discovery (Table 5), these participants mostly had the willingness to collaborate such as asking for help, raising questions, embracing disagreements and achieving common understandings. They looked at divergent directions positively, focused on collaborations, enjoyed the events, felt happy and satisfied. They said,

"What I saw made me happy", "The teachers are very satisfied", "What a productive and rewarding day!" or "This pedagogical day was very fruitful." They also expressed hope and surprise regarding the outcomes of collaboration. For example, the sense of embracing disagreements and achieving common understanding were evident in the statements as "Collaborative competence that allows us to use our disagreements and think beyond them" and "a common understanding…is taking place." Moreover, the sense of surprise was found in some statements such as "interesting comment made today by an unexpected teacher: Working abilities and aptitude are what we should be focusing on, rather than content. [It is] really nice to hear this statement from our teachers." The word of 'hope' was repeated several times. For example, "we hope that this will be a good continuation of what we've done so far."

Feeling risky in front of others	⟶ Willing to help others and ask questions
Not heading in the right direction	⟶ Realizing the divergent directions positively
Not having enough time	⟶ More creative and productive teaching
Lacking confidence in groups-sharing	⟶ Having many ideas and offering different perspectives
Feeling doubtful of their success	⟶ Adaptability
Feeling worried about external demands	⟶ Feeling surprised, hopeful, satisfied and happy
Being afraid of failures	⟶ Believing in having flexible thinking and connecting people

TABLE 5. The Tendency toward Collaboration-Facilitating Experiences

6.1.2   Theme 2: The growth in mind-sets and skill-sets

In this cluster, the data revealed the reinforcing ability of the respondents to develop their mind-sets and skill-sets responding to the changing environments. This finding appears to confirm the literature on the affective process of collaborative leadership within educational change (e.g., Kramer & Crespy, 2011; Langley et al., 2013; Slater, 2005). Ninety significant statements were analyzed

and clustered into five senses. The examples of this theme were extracted in Table 6.

TABLE 6. Examples of the theme of *The Growth in Mind-sets and Skill-sets* with their associated formulated meanings
The ability to recognize the need for change and to understand the environmental challenges
Communicating the need of change
Valuing the whole capacity, collegiality, professionalism and collaborative endeavors
Collective Efficacy/Confidence Growth

First, the sense of the individuals' ability to recognize the need for change and to understand the environmental challenges was described through a list of questions that the participants raised. For example, "What change do we have to prioritize?", "What does the community expect?", "How to improve?", "How can we develop our processes…?", "What are the transferable competences needed…?" Furthermore, they "raised up the question". They 'found"', "understood", "realized", "identified", and "noticed" their problematic situations. Aligned with the literature (e.g., Slater, 2005), the evidence indicates the development of the affective process in these individuals' self-awareness and understanding under leadership for collaboration.

Second, the development of the individuals' skill-sets emerged from their communicating the need of change, which is supported by the literature (e.g., Kramer & Crespy, 2011; Slater, 2005; Watkins, 2015). This sense was visible in noteworthy expressions such as "more need for cooperation", "It's time to change", "It has always been a challenge" or "The change of paradigm is needed." One person stated "the need and the will to reform, courage to do things in another way…" These expressions also describe the understanding and self-awareness of these participants about the critical organizational conditions and the need for collaboration.

Third, the sense of the individuals valuing the whole capacity, collegiality, professionalism and collaborative endeavors was evident in a number of the participants' expressions. They called for the development of the whole organization for effective change processes. This finding is consistent with many studies by Fullan (2016b), Jäppinen (2017), Mulford (2010), and Zembylas (2010). Evidently, "the management does not lead the change; the staff doesn't go along with the change...How do we reach everyone to come along?" Another said, "the purpose is to learn from your colleagues and find ways to do things ever better than before." Another reported, "Our focus is to intellectually engage learners at school". He asked, "How to be different in education and how to relate all subjects". A person called for "more need for cooperation". These expressions symbolized the willingness of the staff as individuals in the educational organizations to lead the change.

Fourth, the growth in mind-sets of these participants was also illustrated in the collective efficacy/confidence growth which seems to be missing from the literature. There is evidence in the data indicating a certain degree of efficacy among the participants was built and boosted. The significant meanings standing out from the data include finding easy to continue with future projects, believing that they had a better chance to solve problems, believing in the possibilities of change, just the matter of time, ensuring that the solutions will be found with effective collaboration, being certain that they are on the right way, believing that they are doing very well, and really understanding what they need to do. The notion of efficacy in educational organizations and leaders' confidence have been mentioned in a number of the reviewed studies (e.g., Bandura, 1977; Fullan, 2016b; Harris, 2010; Luthans, 2002; Luthans & Avolio, 2003). However, the participants did not describe their self-efficacy (belief in their own capacity to succeed in performing specific tasks) or their self-confidence. Instead, they alluded to the collective efficacy - a collective perception of the organization's members emerged from a process (Hipp, 2016). The participants talked about "we". They expressed their 'can-do' attitude through some notable statements and sentiments. For instance, "the preliminary work has been carried out successfully, so

it is easy to continue." "We still have the same wicked problem. [But] I think that now we have a better chance to solve problem…" "I am sure that we are on the right way." "Those changes were made possible." This significant finding insists on an explanation for the development of collective efficacy or organizational confidence regarding the affective process of collaborative leadership in the context of educational change.

6.1.3 Theme 3: The improvement in teacher practice and student learning

In this theme, the improvement in teacher practice and student learning was revealed from the data. Table 7 presents the examples of this theme with their associated modified meanings.

TABLE 7. Examples of the theme of *The Improvement in Teacher Practice and Student Learning* with their associated formulated meanings
Improving teaching methods
Becoming more aware and reflective in teaching
Developing teachers' thinking
More creative and productive teaching
Benefitting for all students
Improving students' writing
Students becoming more active
Upgrading Students Results

Striking out from the data, the participants who are teachers mentioned the development in their professional practice such as improving teaching methods, becoming more aware, reflective, creative and productive in teaching, developing their thinking over time. This was exhibited in these references, such as "I reflect more about my teaching", "I am more aware of the importance of planning my lessons", "[After] the first year, the teachers noticed how they had changed their own teaching." In addition, the sense of benefitting student

learning was evident in a number of explanations. For example, "The pupils raise their results in the national tests this year", "The pupils write better texts", "The pupils are more active", "The education becomes more available for all", "Working like this helps, especially the pupils who find school hard and difficult. It is good for all pupils" and "They could see the difference it made with the pupils". As can been noted, the participants seemed to be satisfied and delighted with their contributions to students' learning as well as their students' progress. This finding is consistent with a number of studies scrutinized in the literature that educational leadership for collaboration makes sense of educational change by school capacity improvement (e.g., Archer & Cameron, 2009; Bryk, 2018; Fullan, 2016b; Hallinger & Heck, 2010a, 2010b; Wells & Feun, 2012). According to Bryk (2018) and Fullan (2016b), developing the professional capacity of teachers and building a supportive and collaborative school climate as a safety and organization for learning are key to an effective educational change. Meanwhile, Cole (2012) explains that a learning culture helps teachers collectively advance their teaching practices. Wells and Feun (2012, p. 254) further assist that teachers are integrated into "a journey of reflective growth" and an increasing capacity of leadership with improving student learning.

6.2 The collaborative initiatives in real-life educational change circumstances

Leadership in collaboration was shown to promote the growth from individual to collective levels in these four organizations. In the same vein, a variety of organizational initiatives were conducted to foster the collaborative culture leading educational change.

6.2.1 Theme 4: The tendency from individual to collective growth

In this theme, the data showed that the participants were able to recognize the growth or transformation from themselves as individuals to the whole

organizations during the collaborative leadership processes. Table 8 presents some examples of this theme with there associated formulated meanings.

TABLE 8. Examples of the theme of *The Tendency from Individual to Collective Growth* with their associated formulated meanings
Confirming that they learned from each other more
Realizing they knew and understood each other better
Considering the challenges of change as everyone's business
The focuses of school projects changed from teachers and administrators to students
The changes starting with the staff into students learning performances

In order to manage the complex and dynamic process of educational change, the literature has evinced that educational leadership needs to evaluate and improve on both the individual and systematic level (e.g., Fullan, 2016b; Kim, 1997; Mulford, 2010; Stoll, 2010). Aligned with the literature, the participants discovered the shift starting from the staff to the students' learning performances. For example, one a teacher said, "The first year the teachers noticed how they had changed their own teaching, and after year two [the second year] they could see the difference it made with the pupils. Very interesting." As Hargreaves (2005), Mulford (2010) and Stoll (2010) state, it is imperative to practice an integrative and collaborative approach of educational leadership to connect individual meaningfully and to achieve the whole systematic change over the time. Additionally, Fullan (2016b) and Wedell (2009) say that promoting the whole capacity and ownership among participants is crucial to a successful educational change.

However, the literature barely provides a sufficient explanation of such transformation from individual to collective level in these organizations under the adaption of collaborative leadership. From the data, collaborative leadership practice appeared to encourage the participants to consider the challenges of change as everyone's business. This sense was described with "all learners",

"everyone's business", "everybody", or "each other" in the respondents' answers. Some of the participants also conceded that they recognized the shift in school goals targeted at all individuals. For example, one principal said, "the focus of the school has been on formal and organic collaboration among learners of our team…which also happens among all learner (students, teachers, administrators and outside expert[s])." Moreover, the participants realized that their ability to learn and understand each other was becoming better. This sense was embedded in some teachers' statements. They said, "the teachers have appreciated these discussions very much", "they have learned from each other", or "they got to know each other and get better understanding of each other's work in different classrooms and grades".

6.2.2 Theme 5: Organizations' collaborative initiatives coping with contextual challenges

In this theme cluster, 91 significant expressions were analyzed regarding the contexts in which the individuals experienced the phenomenon (Creswell, 2018). Table 9 contains a number of the examples of this theme with their associated formulated meanings.

TABLE 9: Examples of the theme of *Organizations' collaborative initiatives coping with the contextual challenges* with their associated formulated meanings
Discussing their organization's wicked problems
Conducting workshops, implementing projects, having meetings
Communicating collaborative leadership
Applying new theories into collaboration and teaching
Developing pedagogical methodologies
Promoting professional learning communities
Establishing new units
Organizing leadership training sessions for students

To make the 'essence' of the lived experiences, these activities and characters of the contextual conditions might reveal the patterns or indicators of collaborative leadership endeavors in reality to implement educational changes and respond to contextual conditions (e.g., Bolden, 2011; Fullan, 2002; Hallinger, 2010). As mentioned in my reviewing, educational conditions need to be created for high levels of staff and student involvement, joint planning, problem solving and a commitment to promoting collaboration, professional practice and student learning, as well as to producing inclusive culture (e.g., Ainscow & Goldrick, 2010; Pugach et al., 2011). Therefore, these initiatives and conditions could be a series of concrete steps, activities, policies, plans or knowledge-sharing processes for consideration. Some of them were modified regarding meanings as follows: discussing their organization's wicked problems, conducting workshops, implementing projects, communicating collaborative leadership, having meetings, applying new theories into collaboration and teaching, developing pedagogical methodologies, promoting professional learning communities, establishing new units, organizing leadership training sessions for students, making decisions, analyzing and evaluating achievements. These activities can be conceptualized as the common patterns or indicators of the collaborative leadership practice fostering continuous learning in the four educational organizations (e.g., Hallinger & Heck, 2010a, 2010b; Senge, 1990). They contained individual behaviors, teamwork, reflection-in-action, planning, evaluation, problem solving, communicating, and continuous experimentations toward innovations.

Significantly, there emerged a sense of utilizing innovations in the data. As can be seen, there is some limited literature (Bass, 2000; Fullan, 2016b; Howell & Avolio, 1993) examining continuous learning, such as utilizing innovations, as collaborative initiatives in the context of managing complex educational change. This sense was evident in explanations as follows: One said, "We used the book-let title 'A Land of People Who Love to Learn". One reported, "We learned more about the project's method by reading 'Successful Together'! Talking about all of

the ten keys and collaborative leadership within a community." Another participant wrote: "The school want to promote intellectual engagement of learners. In order to achieve this goal, they (management team) developed two action theories. If we develop collaboratively the expertise of students and teachers in our school, thus the descriptive feedback will be at the heart of the learning process of learners. If the descriptive feedback is centered on the learning process of learners, thus learner[s] will try to excel."

In summary, approaching the individuals' lived experiences has opened up the path to deepen this research on the affective process of collaborative leadership in the challenging circumstances of educational change. A number of findings are well supported by the literature such as the diverse experiences regarding educational change and collaborative leadership, the growth in mind-sets and skill-sets, the improvement in teacher practice and student learning. In contrast, some results appear to be absent from the reviewing and further explanations will be needed. They are the tendency toward positive and collaboration-facilitating experiences, collective efficacy/confidence growth, and the transformation from the individual to collective level in the context of collaborative initiatives dealing with educational change.

7   DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to investigate the affective process of collaborative leadership in the critical challenges of educational change. In my literature review on the subject, I have found some scarce amount of literature examining the sub-questions concerning what and how people experienced the difficult circumstances of educational change under the adaption of collaborative leadership. In my study, I attempted to seek explanation for two research sub-questions by analyzing the available data extracted from The International Longitudinal Project of Collaborative Leading of The Unexpected in The Changing Education (LED) (2015 – 2018). I have arrived at five major themes: *1) The Tendency Toward Collaboration-Benefiting Experiences; 2) The Growth in Mind-sets and Skill-sets; 3) The Improvement in Teacher Practice and Student Learning; 4) The Tendency from Individual to Collective Growth; and 5) Organizations' Collaborative Initiatives Coping with Contextual Challenges.* This discovery contributes to the greater understanding of the practice and the impact of collaborative leadership in reality. These individual experiences further contribute to exploring and understanding the affective process of collaborative leadership, and hopefully, a potential perspective for long-term educational change by utilizing the affective process of collaborative leadership emerged.

7.1   The Affective Process beyond Authenticity

My study indicates that collaborative leadership can be considered as an affective process, and partly explains how the participants evoke diverse experiences of educational changes with the tendency toward benefiting collaboration over time. Aligned with a variety of research (e.g., Ashkanasy, Dasborough, & Ascough, 2009; Barkker & Schaufeli, 2008), an individual's lived experience extends between discouraging and encouraging ones that might inhibit and facilitate collaboration in dealing with challenges in educational change, respectively. While educational change entails uncertainty and ambiguity, it also

involves others unfavorable experiences in an unpredictable and turbulent world, such as loss, uncertainty, fear, reluctance, worries, lack of confidence, vulnerability, and anxiety (e.g. Fullan, 2016b; Hargreaves, 2004; Marris, 1975; Leithwood et al., 1996). Remarkably, a number of the participants in this study also exhibited discouraging experiences under the situations that demanded their collaboration engaging the challenges of educational change such as the concern of time, taking risk, and building collaborative culture (citation). These findings are also observed in other studies (Reio Jr, 2005; Watkins, 2005; Wells & Feun, 2013). I would say that negative affective experiences can inhibit the behaviors needed for change such as for risk taking (Reio Jr, 2005), and for creating the desired level of collaboration (Kramer & Crespy, 2011) because educational change evokes the climate of uncertainty. Finding time to work collaboratively and building a collaborative culture are usually challenging for not only leaders but also members (Chiang et al., 2011; Watkins, 2005).

On the other hand, the data also showed that all of the participants were likely to become aware, confident, hopeful, optimistic, and goal-oriented over time. According to Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi (2000), these positive responses are viewed as the tendency to perceive and experience favorably and encouragingly the occurring events, contextual conditions, people, organizations, and the future. This finding is aligned with the literature regarding leadership for collaboration such as Slater (2005), Kramer & Crespy (2011) and Chiang, Chapman and Elder (2011), and a plethora of authentic leadership studies (e.g., Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Bandura, 1997; Clapp-Smith, Vogelgesang, & Avey, 2009; Luthans et al., 2006; Luthans, 2002). For example, Slater (2005), who advocates collaborative leadership as an affective process, explains that the affective process nurtures and supports collaboration among individuals through supportive communication skills, valuing people, understanding, self-awareness, and developing relationships. Meanwhile, in a review of authentic leadership by Avolio & Gardner (2005), confidence, hope, and optimism are stemmed and developed from the values, belief, and actions alignments during the affective process across contextual challenges.

Nonetheless, while emphasizing the importance of the affective process to the experiences of authentic leadership and leaders' development, this leadership discipline barely explains the collective gains in favorable experiences of all individuals for collaboration during arduous time. As I mentioned in the literature review, Gardner et al. (2011) highlight the need for further explorations of the affective processes underlying the authentic relationships between leaders and followers. The results confirm that discussions and publication in authentic leadership have yet explained the complexity of such relationships and the collective development in affective experiences of all individuals. One explanation is that authentic leadership primarily focuses on leaders' authenticity/self/identity such as self-awareness, self-regulation, self-determination, and self-consistency that target at positive self-development and leave the other individuals aside (e.g., Luthans, Youssef & Avolio, 2007; Ilies, Morgeson, & Nahrgang, 2005; Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing, & Peterson, 2008). Instead, collaborative leadership does not separate leaders from other individuals. Collaborative leadership domains have indicated the importance of the collective growth in an organization. Hence, my first finding is that collaborative leadership is capable of bringing about the collective gains in positive experiences to sustain educational change and the tendency of an individual real-life experiences toward favorable experiences for promoting collaboration.

7.2 Collective Efficacy Growth emerged through the Affective Process of Collaborative Leadership

I was surprised to find that that the growth in collective efficacy/confidence (Bandura, 1977) came out as an element of the affective process of collaborative leadership. Here it seems that leadership for collaboration has an ability to build and develop collective efficacy/confidence among the participants which lead to the positive outcomes for teacher practice and student learning. As mentioned earlier, the notion of efficacy in educational organizations and leaders' confidence has appeared in the literature (e.g., Bandura, 1977; Fullan, 2016b;

Harris, 2010; Luthans, 2002; Luthans & Avolio, 2003). However, the participants in this study hardly mentioned their self-efficacy - belief in their own capacity to succeed - or their self-confidence. Alternatively, they talked about the collective efficacy. The theory of collective-efficacy is extended based on the concept of self-efficacy, where Bandura (1997) emphasizes efficacy as a pervasive and important component that fosters a community's motivational commitment to the organizational mission, resilience to impediments, and achievements of desired changes. Collective efficacy is also defined as a collective perception of the organization's individuals that develops from a process (Hipp, 2016). One explanation is that the sense of collective efficacy can be resulted from the participants' engagement in cycles of collaborative inquiry where educators work together systematically to increase student learning (Bandura, 1993; Bruce, Esmonde, Ross, Dookie, & Beatty, 2010; Butler, Schnellert, & MacNeil, 2014). The individuals who are integrated into collaborative inquiry by working collaboratively tend to be innovative, willing to take risks, and persistent through the challenges of change (Butler & Schnellert; Cochran-Smith & Lytle; Van Horn, as cited in Butler et al., 2014). Leadership for collaboration creates a collaborative culture in which educators contribute the common value, belief, understanding, and motivation (Anderson, 2002). Collective efficacy is mastered though these experiences (Bandura, 1997). Additionally, a strong sense of efficacy in organizations brings about the increasingly creative and innovative environment, the desired outcomes of student learning (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001), and improvements for teachers (Butler et al., 2014). Therefore, it is possible to state that collective efficacy is nurtured and developed as a component of the affective process of collaborative leadership. The existence of this element also helps explain why the meaning of utilizing innovations and the positive effects on student learning and teacher practice occurred in these organizations.

Moreover, the clarification of the growth in collective efficacy or organizational confidence is also supported by a number of studies involving the concept of confidence that reflects certainties about a performance or perception without

clear targets and empirical data (e.g., Bandura, 1997). The organizational confidence is formed in the long term and changes very slowly (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000). It contributes to the harmony and success in an organization and individuals (Adams & Wiswell, 2008; Laschinger and Finegan, 2005). In this way, it belongs deeply to the affective process of collaborative leadership. This is confirmed by Caglar (2011) that collaborative leadership provides organizations the ability to create an environment in which employees have relations based on confidence to cope with the challenges. Confidence within educational organizations has been proved to create significant effects on creating cooperative environment, open school culture, team loyalty, student learning, and school leadership (e.g., Barth, 1990; Tschannen-Moran, 2001, Goddard, Tschannen-Moran, & Hoy, 2001). According to Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001) and Tschannen-Moran et al. (1998), confidence is an important factor in attaining the pedagogical success in schools and in establishing a healthy of relations between teachers and administrators.

Taken together, collective efficacy and organizational confidence are satisfactory and significant findings about the affective process of collaborative leadership regardless of challenging circumstances of the educational changes that the staff has been through. Collective efficacy is developed in collaborative culture, such as collaborative enquiry, which strengthens teacher practice and positive outcomes for student learning. However, the remaining question is to what specific contexts and extent that efficacy or confidence develops and transfers extensively (Tschannen-Moran, & Hoy, 2001). This could be subjected to further studies of collaborative leadership.

7.3 Transformational Change emerged through the Affective Process of Collaborative Leadership

I will employ the concept of transformation in discussing about the affective process of collaborative leadership. Initially, one finding is the transformation from the individuals to the collective level recognized from the data, which is

aligned with limited literature (Kim, 1997). This kind of multilevel transformation requires shifting the focus of learning on many levels (O'Sullivan, 1997). Senge (1990) characterizes an ideal organization as one that has the ability to be flexible and responsive to changes – termed 'learning organization'. Generally, it is agreed that the learning is necessary for any organization to pursue sustainable and competitive development in the future and especially toward a changing environment. In my study, although there is no concrete assessment of learning organization, the common patterns – individual behaviors, teamwork, reflection-in-action, planning, evaluation, problem solving, communicating the need for change, and the other experimentations to drive changes and manage the challenges – were detected among the four educational organizations. For example, collaborative leadership brings about the collective efficacy of the staff through cycles of collaborative inquiry that create, construct, and nurture a new kind of learning atmosphere, culture, and climate (Coopey, 1995; Bryler et al., 2014; Kools & Stoll, 2016).

My discoveries of the growth from individual to collective levels as well as the improvement in teacher practice and student learning regarding the affective process of collaborative leadership seem to have much in common with the theory of transformational leadership in creating and maintaining continuous learning in organizations (Bass, 2000; Howell & Avolio, 1993). Transformational leadership focuses on building and developing the capacity of innovation as the change agency so that organizations become purpose-oriented and share common visions (e.g., Hallinger, 2003; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2000; Silin & Mulford, 2002). Meanwhile, leadership approaches under the collective endeavor principally involve more contributions to all staff and student engagement (Ainscow & Goldrick, 2010), fostering school capacity, and especially student learning (Hallinger & Heck, 2010a) through building and sustaining collaborative learning in organizations (e.g., Bass, 2000; David, Ellett, & Annunziata, 2092; Prewitt, 2003; Senge, 1990). In contrast, the studies conducted by Leithwood and Jantzi (2000) and Leithwood et al. (2004) indicate that the effects of transformational leadership practices on student engagement is weak and small, and those that focus on

academic achievement are non-significant. This quests further concrete explanation why the concept of transformational leadership does not satisfactorily decode this multilevel transformation regarding positive effects on student learning.

Jackson (2000) uses the term of 'shared transformational leadership' to point out the lacking perspective of the personal or individual level in this theory where uncertainty and ambiguity increase as well as leadership are practiced within the school community, parents, and students. He argues that implementing transformational leadership requires the comprehensive understanding of the personal capacities and performances during transformational leadership operations. In contrast, my study reveals different facets of collaborative leadership, and how it is strongly targeted on the individuals' lived experiences within the turbulence of educational changes. Considering educational change as a complex process and leadership as a collaborative entity, collaborative leadership provides an enterprise for a whole range of people in different roles to work together, dealing with critical obstacles for long-term success.

I finally suggest that collaborative leadership has a true potential and ability to implement a transformational change in an educational organization. Not only its leaders, but also other individuals develop through change circumstances with the application of collaborative leadership. They strengthens collective efficacy and confidence, embrace discouraging experiences, value individuals, focus on student outcomes, promote a culture of collaborative inquiry, and support continuous learning and innovation.

7.4   Implications of the Results and Suggestions for Further Research

So far, my study has contributed to extend understanding of collaborative leadership by exploring the idea of the affective process to deal with the complexity and dynamics of educational changes. Educational leadership needs to be studied as a collective and affective process so that it would contribute to

further explanations and understanding of leadership executed in collaboration and for collaboration. Collaborative leadership that is perceived and practiced under the challenges of educational change goes beyond individualism and authenticity. I suggest that a novel and affective perspective for leadership research is worth to be adopted. Next, I will suggest some implications of the results in this study for further study and research.

Firstly, according to Crevani, Lindgren, and Packenforff (2010), there is an urgent need for an alternative understanding of daily leadership practices that explore all interactions occurring in organizations rather than among individual leaders and leadership ideals. They believe that the nature of leadership is constructive, interactive, and processual. I would suggest that the affective process can assist in understanding daily leadership practices. Secondly, aligning with the notion that authenticity manifests through leadership enacted under change (Novicevic, Harvey, Buckley, Brown, & Evans, 2006), collaborative endeavors of leadership strongly focuses on the lived experiences of all individuals and resulting in positive experiential developments in spite of demanding changes (Conoley & Conoley, 2010; Lewis, 2000). Thirdly, while producing plausible solutions to tackle the internal and external issues of educational change, leadership executed in change and in collaboration should be considered transformational as well because it has the capacity to implement change initiatives, respond to contextual conditions, and foster school capacity for learning for long-term success (Bogler, 2001; Fullan, 2002; Jackson, 2000; Hallinger, 2010).

Although my study does not provide a final conclusion of the affective process of collaborative leadership, it is able to highlight the three main elements: the tendency toward favorable experiences for promoting collaboration, the growth in collective efficacy/confidence, and transformations. These perspectives should be seriously considered in order to determine and examine the discernible patterns of the affective process of collaborative leadership.

The potential implication for future research lies in examining the capability of collaborative leadership that can turn a school under the potential crisis of educational change into collective learning place. In addition, I have argued that

collaborative leadership is also the leadership for learning because it has the ability to strengthen leadership and learning's mutual connections. As Walker and Downey (2012) have noted, teaching, leading, and learning are collaboratively developed. Further research is recommended in order to measure how collaborative leadership is a leading tool for educational change. For instance, I would suggest quantitative methods and process studies to examine how collaborative leadership domains help the individuals manage their emotional, cognitive, and behavioral responses to changing environments over time, and how their experiences will affect their long-term academic success.

It is critical to value the individuals' lived experiences in collaborative leadership and within educational change. This phenomenological study provided a deeper understanding of collaborative leadership, experienced by a diverse collective of individuals across different cultural contexts and geographies (Creswell, 2018). This study corroborates the perspective that collaborative leadership approach is an affective process (Slater, 2005) and can provide valuable insights into how collaborative leadership can be theorized and how it has an impact on the individuals' experiences in managing educational change. Both favorable and unfavorable experiences that are aligned with the affective process of collaborative leadership approach could lead to success or failure of real-life educational change (Cross & Hong, 2009; Saunders, 2013).

Being authentic does not always bring about feasible solutions to everyday struggles in working with colleagues. One question might be how the educational staff understand the struggle rationally and acquire suitable skill-sets to manage their emotional and behavioral reactions. In other words, leading educational change in the domain of collaborative leadership requires involving into a process that develop skill-sets and mind-sets, such as understanding other, self-awareness, managing emotions, and networking (Slater, 2005) in a flexible and purposeful way, rather than avoiding them. Indeed, the affective domain of collaborative leadership will be a promising research area in understanding leadership to build effective organizational capacity within educational change.

Finally, I would suggest that focusing on the nature of educational change and collaborative leadership as complex and dynamic processes, we might be acquainted with a suitable approach to understand such processes regarding their invisible factors and underlying consumptions and come up with unexpected discoveries. Thus, I strongly suggest that the future research about the affective process should invest in longitudinal data and look at several variables in collaborative leadership. This research would provide unique insights into how the affective process changes over an extended period or at certain points of time.

7.5   Limitations

There are also limitations inherent in my study. Firstly, the cultural and organizational differences of the four educational organizations may result in particular forms of collaborative leadership approaches. Secondly, although the four organizations selected in this research provided enough long-term data for the study, participants in long-term studies are generally likely to drop out, such as the New Zealand situation. Finally, the form of text-based and open-ended online diaries may have created possibilities where participants may edit the narratives during the writing and uploading them on the LED project's online platform.

REFERENCES

Adams, S. H., & Wiswell, A. K. (2008). Further Exploration of Organizational Trust Factors. *Online Submission*.

Ainscow, M., & Goldrick, S. (2010). Making sure that every child matters: Enhancing equity within education systems. In *Second international handbook of educational change* (pp. 869-882). Springer, Dordrecht.

Anderson, R. D. (2002). Reforming science teaching: What research says about inquiry. *Journal of science teacher education*, *13*(1), 1-12.

Andrews, R. L., & Soder, R. (1987). Principal leadership and student achievement. *Educational leadership*, *44*(6), 9-11.

Archer, D., & Cameron, A. (2009). *Collaborative leadership: How to succeed in an interconnected world*. Routledge.

Ashkanasy, N. M., & Tse, B. (2000). Transformational leadership as management of emotion: A conceptual review.

Ashkanasy, N. M., Dasborough, M. T., & Ascough, K. W. (2009). Developing leaders: Teaching about emotional intelligence and training in emotional skills. In S. J. Armstrong & C. V. Fukami (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of management learning, education and development* (pp. 161–185). London: SAGE.

Atieno, O. P. (2009). An analysis of the strengths and limitation of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms. *Problems of Education in the 21st Century*, *13*(1), 13-38.

Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *The leadership quarterly*, *16*(3), 315-338.

Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Walumbwa, F. O., Luthans, F., & May, D. R. (2004). Unlocking the mask: A look at the process by which authentic leaders

impact follower attitudes and behaviors. *The leadership quarterly*, *15*(6), 801-823.

Azanza, G., Moriano, J. A., & Molero, F. (2013). Authentic leadership and organizational culture as drivers of employees' job satisfaction. *Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones*, *29*(2).

Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2008). Positive organizational behavior: Engaged employees in flourishing organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *29*, 147–154.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological review*, *84*(2), 191.

Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational psychologist*, *28*(2), 117-148.

Bandura, A. (2000). Exercise of human agency through collective efficacy. *Current directions in psychological science*, *9*(3), 75-78.

Bandura, A., & Wessels, S. (1997). *Self-efficacy* (pp. 4-6). W.H. Freeman & Company.

Barth, R. S. (1990). *Improving schools from within: Teachers, parents, and principals can make the difference*. Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 350 Sansome Street, San Francisco, CA 94104-1310.

Bass, B. M. (2000). The future of leadership in learning organizations. *Journal of leadership studies*, *7*(3), 18-40.

Begley, P. T. (2006). Self-knowledge, capacity and sensitivity: Prerequisites to authentic leadership by school principals. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *44*(6), 570-589.

Begley, P. T. (2006). Self-knowledge, capacity and sensitivity: Prerequisites to authentic leadership by school principals. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *44*(6), 570-589.

Bigum, C., & Kenway, J. (2005). New information technologies and the ambiguous future of schooling—some possible scenarios. In *Extending educational change* (pp. 95-115). Springer, Dordrecht.

Bogler, R. (2001). The influence of leadership style on teacher job satisfaction. *Educational administration quarterly*, *37*(5), 662-683.

Bolden, R. (2011). Distributed leadership in organizations: A review of theory and research. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *13*(3), 251-269.

Brief, A. P., & Weiss, H. M. (2002). Organizational behavior: Affect in the workplace. *Annual review of psychology*, *53*(1), 279-307.

Bruce, C. D., Esmonde, I., Ross, J., Dookie, L., & Beatty, R. (2010). The effects of sustained classroom-embedded teacher professional learning on teacher efficacy and related student achievement. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *26*(8), 1598-1608.

Bryk, A. (2018). *Charting Chicago school reform: Democratic localism as a lever for change*. Routledge.

Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2012). Distributed leadership in action: Leading high-performing leadership teams in English schools. *School leadership & management*, *32*(1), 21-36.

Butler, D. L., Schnellert, L., & MacNeil, K. (2015). Collaborative inquiry and distributed agency in educational change: A case study of a multi-level community of inquiry. *Journal of Educational Change*, *16*(1), 1-26.

Caglar, C. (2011). An Examination of Teacher's Occupational Burnout Levels in Terms of Organizational Confidence and Some Other Variables. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, *11*(4), 1841-1847.

Chiang, C. K., Chapman, H., & Elder, R. (2011). Overcoming challenges to collaboration: nurse educators' experiences in curriculum change. *Journal of Nursing Education*, *50*(1), 27-33.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research.

Clapp-Smith, R., Vogelgesang, G. R., & Avey, J. B. (2009). Authentic leadership and positive psychological capital: The mediating role of trust at the group level of analysis. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *15*(3), 227-240.

Colaizzi, PF. (1978). Psychological research as the phenomenologist views it. In: Valle RS, King M (Eds) *Existential phenomenological alternatives for psychology*. Oxford University Press, New York.

Cole, P. (2012). Linking effective professional learning with effective teaching practice. *Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership, Melbourne*.

Conoley, J. C., & Conoley, C. W. (2010). Why does collaboration work? Linking positive psychology and collaboration.

Coopey, J. (1995). The learning organization, power, politics and ideology introduction. *Management learning*, *26*(2), 193-213.

Coronel, J. M., Carrasco, M. A. J., & Ferna´ndez, M. (2003). Qualities of collaboration, professional development and teaching improvement: an experience in the university context. *Journal of Education for Teaching: International research and pedagogy*, *29*(2), 125-147.

Cramer, R. J., Neal, T., & Brodsky, S. L. (2009). Self-efficacy and confidence: Theoretical distinctions and implications for trial consultation. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, *61*(4), 319.

Creswell, J. W. (2018). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions.

Crevani, L., Lindgren, M., & Packendorff, J. (2010). Leadership, not leaders: On the study of leadership as practices and interactions. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, *26*(1), 77-86.

Cross, D. I., & Hong, J. Y. (2009). Beliefs and professional identity: Critical constructs in examining the impact of reform on the emotional experiences of teachers. In *Advances in teacher emotion research* (pp. 273-296). Springer, Boston, MA.

Davis, D. R., Ellett, C. D., & Annunziata, J. (2002). Teacher evaluation, leadership and learning organizations. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, *16*(4), 287-301.

Day, D. V. (2000). Leadership development: A review in context. *The Leadership*

Day, D. V., Fleenor, J. W., Atwater, L. E., Sturm, R. E., & McKee, R. A. (2014). Advances in leader and leadership development: A review of 25 years of research and theory. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *25*(1), 63-82.

Denzin, N. K. (1984). Toward a phenomenology of domestic, family violence. *American journal of sociology*, *90*(3), 483-513.

Duif, T., Harrison, C., Van Dartel, N., & Sinyolo, D. (2013). Distributed leadership in practice: A descriptive analysis of distributed leadership in European schools. *School leadership as a driving force for equity and learning. Comparative perspective. EPNoSL Project, Del*, 4.

Edwards, M. M., & Bates, L. K. (2011). Planning's core curriculum: Knowledge, practice, and implementation. *Journal of planning Education and Research*, *31*(2), 172-183.

Elmore, R. F. (2004). *School reform from the inside out: Policy, practice, and performance*. Harvard Education Press. 8 Story Street First Floor, Cambridge, MA 02138.

Fineman, S. (Ed.). (2000). *Emotion in organizations*. Sage.

Fullan, M. (1992). *Successful school improvement: The implementation perspective and beyond*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).

Fullan, M. (2002). The role of leadership in the promotion of knowledge management in schools. *Teachers and Teaching*, *8*(3), 409-419.

Fullan, M. (2006). The future of educational change: System thinkers in action. *Journal of educational change*, *7*(3), 113-122.

Fullan, M. (2010). Positive pressure. In *Second international handbook of educational change* (pp. 119-130). Springer, Dordrecht.

Fullan, M. (2012). *Change forces: Probing the depths of educational reform*. Routledge.

Fullan, M. (2016a). The elusive nature of whole system improvement in education. *Journal of Educational Change*, *17*(4), 539-544.

Fullan, M. (2016b). *The new meaning of educational change*. Routledge.

Fullan, M., Rolheiser, C., Mascall, B., & Edge, K. (2004). Accomplishing large scale reform: A tri-level proposition. In *Social geographies of educational change* (pp. 1-13). Springer, Dordrecht.

Gardner, W. L., Avolio, B. J., Luthans, F., May, D. R., & Walumbwa, F. (2005). "Can you see the real me?" A self-based model of authentic leader and follower development. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *16*(3), 343-372.

Gardner, W. L., Cogliser, C. C., Davis, K. M., & Dickens, M. P. (2011). Authentic leadership: A review of the literature and research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *22*(6), 1120-1145.

Gardner, W. L., Fischer, D., & Hunt, J. G. J. (2009). Emotional labor and leadership: A threat to authenticity?. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *20*(3), 466-482.

George, B. (2003). *Authentic leadership: Rediscovering the secrets to creating lasting value*. John Wiley & Sons.

Goddard, R. D., Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, W. K. (2001). A multilevel examination of the distribution and effects of teacher trust in students and parents in urban elementary schools. *The Elementary School Journal*, *102*(1), 3-17.

Gronn, P. (2002). Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis. *The leadership quarterly*, *13*(4), 423-451.

Hall, R. J., & Lord, R. G. (1995). Multi-level information-processing explanations of followers' leadership perceptions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *6*(3), 265-287.

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. H. (2010a). Collaborative leadership and school improvement: Understanding the impact on school capacity and student learning. *School leadership and management*, *30*(2), 95-110.

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (2010b). Leadership for learning: Does collaborative leadership make a difference in school improvement?. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 38(6), 654-678.

Hannah, S. T., & Luthans, F. (2008). A cognitive affective processing explanation of positive leadership. *Affect and emotion: New directions in management: Theory and research*, 97.

Hargreaves, A. (2001). Emotional geographies of teaching. *Teachers college record*, *103*(6), 1056-1080.

Hargreaves, A. (2005). Educational change takes ages: Life, career and generational factors in teachers' emotional responses to educational change. *Teaching and teacher Education*, 21(8), 967-983.

Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (2012). *Professional capital: Transforming teaching in every school*. Teachers College Press.

Hargreaves, A., & Goodson, I. (2006). Educational change over time? The sustainability and nonsustainability of three decades of secondary school change and continuity. *Educational administration quarterly*, *42*(1), 3-41.

Harris, A. (2007). Distributed leadership: conceptual confusion and empirical reticence. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *10*(3), 315-325.

Harris, A. (2008). Distributed leadership: According to the evidence. *Journal of educational administration*, *46*(2), 172-188.

Harris, A. (2010). Leading system transformation. *School leadership and management*, *30*(3), 197-207.

Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2010). Professional learning communities and system improvement. *Improving schools*, *13*(2), 172-181.

Hauge, T. E., Norenes, S. O., & Vedøy, G. (2014). School leadership and educational change: Tools and practices in shared school leadership development. *Journal of Educational Change*, *15*(4), 357-376.

Heck, R. H., & Hallinger, P. (2010). Collaborative leadership effects on school improvement: Integrating unidirectional-and reciprocal-effects models. *The Elementary School Journal*, *111*(2), 226-252.

Hipp, J. R. (2016). Collective efficacy: How is it conceptualized, how is it measured, and does it really matter for understanding perceived neighborhood crime and disorder?. *Journal of criminal justice*, *46*, 32-44.

House, E. R., & McQuillan, P. J. (1998). Three perspectives on school reform. In *International handbook of educational change* (pp. 198-213). Springer, Dordrecht.

Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control, and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated-business-unit performance. *Journal of applied psychology*, *78*(6), 891.

Hubbard, L. A., Stein, M. K., & Mehan, H. (2013). *Reform as learning: School reform, organizational culture, and community politics in San Diego*. Routledge.

Ilies, R., Morgeson, F. P., & Nahrgang, J. D. (2005). Authentic leadership and eudaemonic well-being: Understanding leader–follower outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *16*(3), 373-394.

Jackson, D. S. (2000). The school improvement journey: Perspectives on leadership. *School Leadership & Management*, *20*(1), 61-78.

Jäppinen, A. K. (2012). Distributed pedagogical leadership in support of student transitions. *Improving Schools*, *15*(1), 23-36.

Jäppinen, A. K. (2014). Collaborative educational leadership: The emergence of human interactional sense-making process as a complex system. *Complicity: an international journal of complexity and education*, *11*(2).

Jäppinen, A. K. (2017). Analysis of leadership dynamics in educational settings during times of external and internal change. *Educational Research*, *59*(4), 460-477.

Kaniuka, T. S. (2012). Toward an understanding of how teachers change during school reform: Considerations for educational leadership and school improvement. *Journal of Educational Change*, *13*(3), 327-346.

Kim, D. H. (1997). The link between individual and organizational learning. In *The strategic management of intellectual capital* (pp. 41-62).

Kools, M., & Stoll, L. (2016). What makes a school a learning organisation?. OECD Education Working Paper No. 137. Paris: OECD Publishing. Retrieved from: http://www.oecd.org/education/school/school-learning-organisation.pdf

Kramer, M. W., & Crespy, D. A. (2011). Communicating collaborative leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *22*(5), 1024-1037.

Lambert, L. (2002). A framework for shared leadership. *Educational leadership*, *59*(8), 37-40.

Langley, A. N. N., Smallman, C., Tsoukas, H., & Van de Ven, A. H. (2013). Process studies of change in organization and management: Unveiling temporality, activity, and flow. *Academy of management journal*, *56*(1), 1-13.

Laschinger, H. K. S., & Finegan, J. (2005). Using empowerment to build trust and respect in the workplace: A strategy for addressing the nursing shortage. *Nursing economics*, *23*(1), 6.

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2000). The effects of transformational leadership on organizational conditions and student engagement with school. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *38*(2), 112-129.

Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2008). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership. *School leadership and management*, *28*(1), 27-42.

Leithwood, K., Mascall, B., & Strauss, T. (Eds.). (2009). *Distributed leadership according to the evidence*. Routledge.

Leithwood, K., Menzies, T., Jantzi, D., & Leithwood, J. (1996). School restructuring, transformational leadership and the amelioration of teacher burnout. *Anxiety, stress, and coping*, *9*(3), 199-215.

Leithwood, K., Patten, S., & Jantzi, D. (2010). Testing a conception of how school leadership influences student learning. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *46*(5), 671-706.

Leithwood*, K., Jantzi, D., Earl, L., Watson, N., Levin, B., & Fullan, M. (2004). Strategic leadership for large-scale reform: the case of England's national literacy and numeracy strategy. *School Leadership & Management*, *24*(1), 57-79.

Leonard, P. E., & Leonard, L. J. (2001). The collaborative prescription: Remedy or reverie?. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *4*(4), 383-399.

Lewis, K. M. (2000). When leaders display emotion: How followers respond to negative emotional expression of male and female leaders. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, *21*(2), 221-234.

Lord, R. G., & Brown, D. J. (2003). *Leadership processes and follower self-identity*. Psychology Press.

Lord, R. G., & Harvey, J. L. (2002). An information processing framework for emotional regulation. *Emotions in the workplace: Understanding the role of emotions in organizational behavior*, 115-146.

Lord, R. G., Klimoski, R. J., & Kanfer, R. (Eds.). (2002). *Emotions in the workplace: Understanding the structure and role of emotions in organizational behavior* (Vol. 7). Pfeiffer.

Lumby, J. (2013). Distributed leadership: The uses and abuses of power. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *41*(5), 581-597.

Luthans, F. (2002). The need for and meaning of positive organizational behavior. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 695-706.

Luthans, F., Norman, S., & Hughes, L. (2006). Authentic leadership. *Inspiring leaders*, 84-104.

Luthans, F., Youssef, C. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2007). Psychological capital: Investing and developing positive organizational behavior. *Positive organizational behavior*, *1*(2), 9-24.

MacBeath, J. (Ed.). (1998). *Effective school leadership: Responding to change*. Sage.

Marks, H. M., & Printy, S. M. (2003). Principal leadership and school performance: An integration of transformational and instructional leadership. *Educational administration quarterly*, *39*(3), 370-397.

Marris, P. (1975). *Loss and change.* New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2014). *Designing qualitative research.* Sage publications.

Mayrowetz, D. (2008). Making sense of distributed leadership: Exploring the multiple usages of the concept in the field. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *44*(3), 424-435.

Meadows, L. M., & Morse, J. M. (2001). Constructing evidence within the qualitative project. *The nature of qualitative evidence*, 187-200.

Michie, S., & Gooty, J. (2005). Values, emotions, and authenticity: Will the real leader please stand up?. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *16*(3), 441-457.

Møller, J., & Eggen, A. B. (2005). Team leadership in upper secondary education. *School Leadership and Management*, *25*(4), 331-347.

Morse, J. M., Barrett, M., Mayan, M., Olson, K., & Spiers, J. (2002). Verification strategies for establishing reliability and validity in qualitative research. *International journal of qualitative methods*, *1*(2), 13-22.

Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Sage.

Muijs, D., & Rumyantseva, N. (2014). Coopetition in education: Collaborating in a competitive environment. *Journal of Educational Change*, *15*(1), 1-18.

Mulford, B. (2010). Recent developments in the field of educational leadership: The challenge of complexity. In *Second international handbook of educational change* (pp. 187-208). Springer, Dordrecht.

Mulford, B., & Silins, H. (2003). Leadership for organisational learning and improved student outcomes—What do we know?. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *33*(2), 175-195.

Murphy, J., Elliott, S. N., Goldring, E., & Porter, A. C. (2007). Leadership for learning: A research-based model and taxonomy of behaviors. *School Leadership and Management*, *27*(2), 179-201.

Murphy, J., Smylie, M., Mayrowetz, D., & Louis, K. S. (2009). The role of the principal in fostering the development of distributed leadership. *School Leadership and Management*, *29*(2), 181-214.

Nicholas, D. B., Lach, L., King, G., Scott, M., Boydell, K., Sawatzky, B. J., ... & Young, N. L. (2010). Contrasting internet and face-to-face focus groups for children with chronic health conditions: Outcomes and participant experiences. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *9*(1), 105-121.

Nieto, S. (2005). Cultural difference and educational change in a sociopolitical context. In *Extending educational change* (pp. 138-159). Springer, Dordrecht.

Novicevic, M. M., Harvey, M. G., Ronald, M., & Brown-Radford, J. A. (2006). Authentic leadership: A historical perspective. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *13*(1), 64-76.

O'Sullivan, F. (1997). Learning Organisationsreengineering schools for life long learning. *School Leadership & Management*, *17*(2), 217-230.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. SAGE Publications, inc.

Poole, M. S., & Van de Ven, A. H. (Eds.). (2005). *Handbook of organizational change and innovation*. Oxford University Press.

Prewitt, V. (2003). Leadership development for learning organizations. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *24*(2), 58-61.

Pugach, M. C., Blanton, L. P., & Correa, V. I. (2011). A historical perspective on the role of collaboration in teacher education reform: Making good on the promise of teaching all students. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, *34*(3), 183-200.

Rego, A., Sousa, F., Marques, C., & e Cunha, M. P. (2012). Authentic leadership promoting employees' psychological capital and creativity. *Journal of business research*, *65*(3), 429-437.

Reio Jr, T. G. (2005). Emotions as a lens to explore teacher identity and change: A commentary. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *21*(8), 985-993.

Robinson, V. (2011). *Student-centered leadership* (Vol. 15). John Wiley & Sons.

Sahlberg, P. (2010). Educational change in Finland. In *Second international handbook of educational change* (pp. 323-348). Springer, Dordrecht.

Sancho, J. M. (2010). Digital technologies and educational change. In *Second international handbook of educational change* (pp. 433-444). Springer, Dordrecht.

Saunders, R. (2013). The role of teacher emotions in change: Experiences, patterns and implications for professional development. *Journal of Educational Change*, *14*(3), 303-333.

Seligman, M. E., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). *Positive psychology: An introduction* (Vol. 55, No. 1, p. 5). American Psychological Association.

Seligman, M. E., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). *Positive psychology: An introduction* (Vol. 55, No. 1, p. 5). American Psychological Association.

Seligman, M. E., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). *Positive psychology: An introduction* (Vol. 55, No. 1, p. 5). American Psychological Association.

Senge, P. M. (1990). The art and practice of the learning organization.

Silins, H., & Mulford, B. (2002). Leadership and school results. In *Second international handbook of educational leadership and administration* (pp. 561-612). Springer, Dordrecht.

Slater, L. (2005). Leadership for collaboration: An affective process. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *8*(4), 321-333.

Spillane, J. P. (2012). *Distributed leadership* (Vol. 4). John Wiley & Sons.

Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. B. (2001). Investigating school leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Educational researcher*, *30*(3), 23-28.

Stoll, L. (2009). Capacity building for school improvement or creating capacity for learning? A changing landscape. *Journal of educational change*, *10*(2-3), 115-127.

Stoll, L. (2010). Connecting learning communities: Capacity building for systemic change. In *Second international handbook of educational change* (pp. 469-484). Springer, Dordrecht.

Stoll, L., & Louis, K. S. (2007). *Professional learning communities: Divergence, depth and dilemmas*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).

Stoll, L., Bolam, R., McMahon, A., Wallace, M., & Thomas, S. (2006). Professional learning communities: A review of the literature. *Journal of educational change*, *7*(4), 221-258.

Streubert, H. J., & Carpenter, D. R. (1999). Triangulation as a qualitative research strategy. *Qualitative research in nursing: advancing the humanistic imperative*, *5*.

Svendsen, A. C., & Laberge, M. (2005). Convening Stakeholder Networks. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, (19).

Thurmond, V. A. (2001). The point of triangulation. *Journal of nursing scholarship*, *33*(3), 253-258.

Tian, M., Risku, M., & Collin, K. (2016). A meta-analysis of distributed leadership from 2002 to 2013: Theory development, empirical evidence and future

research focus. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 44(1), 146-164.

Troman, G., & Woods, P. (2001). *Primary teachers' stress*. Psychology Press.

Tschannen-Moran, M. (2001). Collaboration and the need fortrust. *Journal of Educational administration*, *39*(4), 308-331.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and teacher education*, *17*(7), 783-805.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, W. K. (2000). A multidisciplinary analysis of the nature, meaning, and measurement of trust. *Review of educational research*, *70*(4), 547-593.

Tschannen-Moran, M., Hoy, A. W., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of educational research*, *68*(2), 202-248.

Turbot, S. (2017). Education: change is here, but are you ready for it? *Forbes*. Retrieved from https://www.forbes.com/sites/sebastienturbot/2017/03/08/make-education-great-again/#3b746a9ad253

Van Manen, M. (2016). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy*. Routledge.

Van Veen, K., & Sleegers, P. (2009). Teachers' emotions in a context of reforms: To a deeper understanding of teachers and reforms. In *Advances in teacher emotion research* (pp. 233-251). Springer, Boston, MA.

Vitale, M. R., & Kaniuka, T. S. (2009). Exploring Barriers to the Role of Corrective Reading in Systemic School Reform: Implications of a Three-Part Investigation. *Journal of Direct Instruction*, *9*(1), 13-33.

Wahlstrom, K. L., & Louis, K. S. (2008). How teachers experience principal leadership: The roles of professional community, trust, efficacy, and shared responsibility. *Educational administration quarterly*, *44*(4), 458-495.

Walumbwa, F. O., Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Wernsing, T. S., & Peterson, S. J. (2008). Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure. *Journal of management*, *34*(1), 89-126.

Watkins, P. (2005). The principal's role in attracting, retaining, and developing new teachers: Three strategies for collaboration and support. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, *79*(2), 83-87.

Wedell, M. (2009). *Planning for educational change: Putting people and their contexts first*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Wells, A. S., Carnochan, S., Slayton, J., Allen, R. L., & Vasudeva, A. (2005). Globalization and educational change. In *Extending educational change* (pp. 42-68). Springer, Dordrecht.

Wells, C. M., & Feun, L. (2013). Educational change and professional learning communities: A study of two districts. *Journal of Educational Change*, *14*(2), 233-257.

Woods, P. A. (2016). Authority, power and distributed leadership. *Management in Education*, *30*(4), 155-160.

Zembylas, M. (2010). The emotional aspects of leadership for social justice: Implications for leadership preparation programs. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *48*(5), 611-625.