



Full Length Research Article

MANAGERIAL APPROACHES ADOPTED AT SCHOOLS AND THEIR EFFECTS ON THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHERS

¹Sait Akbaşlı, ²Lütfi Üredi and ^{*3}Hakan Ulum

1 Hacettepe University, Faculty of Education, Turkey

2 Mersin University, Faculty of Education, Turkey

3 Ministry of Turkish National Education, Turkey

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 24th April, 2016

Received in revised form
26th May, 2016

Accepted 29th June, 2016

Published online 31st July, 2016

Key Words:

Managerial approaches,
School managers,
Teachers' professional development,
School administration,
Principals.

ABSTRACT

One of the determinant factors contributing to the professional development of teachers is the school manager, since the school managers' administration manner determines the speed and capacity of development. With this study, the managerial approaches adopted at schools and their effects on teachers' professional development are aimed to be found out. That's to say, within the context of the study, it's aimed to have a general knowledge of management approaches adopted by the directors at educational institutions and also to clarify the contribution of the managers to the professional development of the teachers. Parallel to the research objective, various research questions were formulated. Since the research aims to explain the substantial situation as it exists, it has descriptive quality. Besides, in the study, single and relational screening models are employed. The research results show that schools often use classical and neoclassical management approaches. Additionally, according to the teachers participated in the study, the school principals adopt classical management approach mostly in comparison to neoclassical management approach. If we look at the professional development of the teachers from the viewpoint that it is a contribution for the professional development, we understand that the school principals are close to the neoclassical approach.

Copyright©2016, *Sait Akbaşlı et al.* This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

INTRODUCTION

The educational administration is the process of using all the available circumstances and manpower resources to provide expected differences in human behaviors. Three important human-driven resources in the educational administration are the school principal, the teacher, and the students (Çelik, 2005, p.23). These three resources always interact with each other while educational institutions perform primary tasks like revealing manpower for information and technology age, and training individuals who can respond to the expectation of the public (Yıldız *et al.*, 2015). While planning and carrying out these activities, the school principals lead the way. Furthermore, the school principals whose importance in society is high have to play various roles. The school organizations have to plan activities carefully to accomplish their objectives.

The school principals making a plan to achieve the objectives of their schools, maintaining the process of communication and coordination with the teachers and the other staff well and carrying out the process which will provide the evaluation of all kinds of plans and activities carefully, have an important role in accomplishing the objectives of schools (Büte and Balcı, 2010, p.489). There stands many services under the role of a school director; the education leadership at school, personnel services, student services, budget services, management of general services, coordinating the relationship between school and environment. In addition to this, there has to be a management change operative. The principals' point of view for innovation and the leadership at this point affects other personnels (Özdemir, 2009, p.6). The school principals should help the personnels to be motivated for what they are doing, because the personnels who are dedicated to their works and pay particular attention for this may contribute to achieve the goals of their organizations. The school principals achieve success by means of using the knowledge, ability, and power of school personnels for reaching the school's

***Corresponding author: Hakan Ulum**
Ministry of Turkish National Education, Turkey

objectives so they should motivate their personnel in accordance with this purpose (Kocabaş and Karaköse, 2005). Undoubtedly differentiations appearing in the structure and management of the school have highly changed the roles of managers directing the school. The traditional management mentality of school principals doesn't respond to today's requirements. It is hard to play a director's roles for the director who haven't been trained in educational. Additionally, since expectances of people has increased and their behaviors have become more complicated, people become more tense at the organizational settings. The school principals carrying the people of future into the information society should have new roles. Now, today's teachers and students are more different than the teachers and the students of yesterday. The school principal should improve himself in order to meet the expectations of teachers and students at school and increase the productivity of school (Akbaşlı and Balıkcı, 2013, p.367).

The role of school principals in Turkey changes, just like it is changing globally. Even if the governing structure of the country is either centralized administration or decentralized, education and training are carried out at schools. For this reason, many school principals say that "A school is only a school as much as its principal." This opinion can be criticized by saying that the administration concept comes to the forefront too much. The school can be efficient when all human resources can be activated together. It shouldn't be forgotten that at the top of decision-making period, there stands the school principal. If the school principal is a competent leader, he can activate human and physical resources of the school (Özdemir, 2009, p.7). Besides, the school principal activates the resources in coordination. The school principals mustn't forget that school is an education place not only for students, but also for teachers, parents, personnels and society. A school principal is an individual who provides sources for learning, prepares the environment, makes learning practical and so on (Şişman, 2014). While the school principals are performing their roles, they may be naturally influenced by the fundamental principles of management. Educational administration, which has been subject to scientific researches since 19th century, has been generally influenced from both the traditional and modern management principals (Aslanargun, 2007).

The classical theory, also called as traditional organization theory, showed up in the 19th century when industrialization increased. The theory arises from the traditional economy doctrine and sees that humans behave in a rational way as well as focusing on the formal structure of the institution (Yüksel, 1997). The classical theory sees the human as a machine by keeping activeness and productivity in the center. The classical theory, which regards the human as an object and supports that all the relationship should be formed according to the purposes of the organization, ignores the personality, natural group and the decision-making period. The organization, which puts the concept of efficiency and economy into the center of attitude dynamics, and ignores the social environment and the personnels, has seen the organization more superior than human. According to this theory, hierarchy is determinant while the personnels' participation in decision making is out of question. The decisions are made and put into practice by the

principals (Kaya, 1990, p.50; Bursalıoğlu, 1998, p.17; Aydın, 1998, p.87). Neo-classical theory is a theory which has been formed as a reaction to classical organization theory. It provides a place for behavioral sciences in the organization theory, knows and states the importance of the natural organization, and explains why and how individuals behave, as well as explaining the relationship between structure and behavior (Demirtaş and Güneş, 2002, p.108). Before making a change, the Behavioristic Organizational Theory applies participative management by negotiating with the workers and the group. Changing the proposals after receiving the opinions of the staff and discussions, sense of participation in the group appears. The increase in efficiency can be explained by participation (Aydın, 1998, p.107). Behavioristic approaches have been criticized because of the fact that they reveal the informal dimension of the organization and they form unorganized people (Mihçioğlu, 1970). In behavioristic approach, communication among people and participation are in question.

While the approaches called as classical management approaches had become influential up until 1950s-1960s, the approaches caring the human relations became influential afterwards (Eren, 2004, p.11-12). Additionally, it was understood in a short time that the school formed with classical organization and management principles wouldn't respond to the understanding of education and training perceptions. For this reason, it's alleged that so many people and groups from inside or outside of school remain incapable of dealing with or solving the problems of the current bureaucratic structure, especially of the public education. Moreover, scientists stated that existing organization and management structures prevented learning and they did not have flexibility to meet the needs of the students living in the information society (Murphy, 1998). The management approaches adopted by the school principals are determining factors in terms of the quality of education. When it's thought that the way of reaching quality preeminently depends on developing and managing human resources through preparing environments for people as they deserve it. This is the mission of principals at school setting (Açıklın, 1999: 17). While doing this, the management approach adopted by the principals shows their service quality.

Nowadays, the roles and tasks of school principals, as well as expectations from them are gradually getting complicated. It is expected from the principals, who will successfully move school forward in a rapidly changing environment, that they analyse school and society properly, and that they should lead school to make it more successful and consistently improve themselves as well (Bertell and Birch, 1995). The school principal improving himself is the one who has learned all the management approaches from the past to the present, and who has made contributions to the professional development of teachers by taking these approaches into consideration.

Aim of the Study

The objectives of this research are having information about the management approaches adopted by school principals working in educational institutions, determining the

contribution of school principals to professional development of teachers, and offering suggestions which will provide benefit for the development of teachers. In accordance with the research objectives, answers for the following questions were investigated:

- What are the perspectives of teachers working at state schools on how often school principals use classical and neo-classical management approaches?
- In which level, and in what aspects do the management approaches adopted by the school principals affect the professional development of teachers?
- Does the adoption of the classical management approach by school principals show meaningful difference according to educational institutions variable?
- Does the adoption of neo-classical management approach by school principals Show meaningful difference according to educational institutions variable?

Research Method

Since this research study aims to axpla in already existing condition as it really is, it represents a descriptive characteristics. Besides, this study benefited from single and relational screening models. Single screening models aim to determine the formation of factors as one by one, species, or quantity, while requiring descriptive statistical techniques (median, mode, standard deviation, variance, frequency, percentage etc.). Additionally, relational screening models are used to determine change and/or level of two or more factors. They also try to figure out whether variables differ together or not in correlational relationships, and if there is such a difference, how it happens is tried to be diagnosed (Karasar, 2014, p. 79-82). In this research, while determining the management approaches adopted by school principals, single screening model was used; while analyzing the relationship between the approaches adopted by school principals and the professional development of teachers, relational screening model was used.

Sample

The sample of this research consists of 404 teachers from Mersin and Adana cities, in Turkey. The sample has been chosen through simple random sampling. In simple random sampling, unbiased choice is made by taking into account the probability of being equal and independent (Balcı, 2007). As determining the number of sample (Christensen *et al.*, 2015, p.175), required assets have been taken into consideration. The aim here is to form a minor sample and reflecting the diversity of the individuals who can be a part to the problem worked in the sample (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2013).

Data Collection Tools

In the research, a survey shortened and reviewed by the researchers has been used as the data collection tool. The survey with 60 items developed by Ada and Ercoşkun (2009)

has been reduced to 40 items in order to determine the school principals' mode of administration. According to the study results, the survey's Cronbach Alpha reliability co-efficiency was found .76, however, the cronbach alpha reliability should be .70 and above, which is acceptable (Seçer, 2013). As a result of the factor analysis, KMO (Kaiser Mayer Olkin) was found.92, while Barlett test value was 8857.365 ($p < .001$). As KMO (Kaiser Mayer Olkin) was above .60, and Barlett test was found to be meaningful, the items of the scale were seen to be factoralised (Büyüköztürk, 2014). With this process, it was seen that a three factor structure has clarified 49,261% of total variance. In social science, if this rate is 40% and over, it's an allowable value.

Table 1. Gender Variation

Gender	f	%
female	207	51,2
male	197	48,8
Total	404	100

Table 2. Major Variation

Major	f	%
Class teacher	217	53,7
English	48	11,9
Social Sciences	25	6,2
Science and Technology	19	4,7
Turkish	20	5,0
Maths	21	5,2
Others	54	13,4
Total	404	100

Table 3. Institution Variation

Institution	f	%
Primary School	230	56,9
Secondary School	159	39,4
Middle School	15	3,7
Total	404	100

The 1st, 3rd, 7th, 9th, 11th, 13th, 15th, 17th, 21st, 23rd, 25th, 27th, 31st, 33rd, 34th, 37th, 38th items in the survey form is related to classical management approach, while the 2nd, 4th, 6th, 8th, 10th, 12th, 14th, 16th, 18th, 20th, 22nd, 24th, 26th, 30th, 32nd, 35th, 36th, 39th, 40th items are related to neoclassical management approach. The 5th, 19th, 28th, and 29th items are related to professional development of teachers. According to Likert 5, every question item in the survey has been coded as: strongly agree (5), agree (4), neutral (3), disagree (2), strongly disagree (1), and the data entry has been made. Also, the information of gender, educational institutions, and major have been asked from the participants. The questions in the survey has been revised by the experts. During the conduction of the study, the participants have been informed and research objectives have been explained.

Data Analysis

Analysis of data has been carried out by using SPSS 22 (Statistical Package For Social Science) packaged software. In the first stage, reliability and validity of survey form has been made by computerized data. In this direction, it was analyzed

by Cronbach Alpha Technique with regard to reliability. KMO and Barlett tests have been carried out and the descriptive total variance has been found out. In the second stage, the data have been analyzed in accordance with sub-problems. One sample Kolmogorov Simirnov test has been carried out to determine whether it has normal distribution or not. The data was found to represent normal distribution. As single screening model was adopted to determine management approaches followed by school principals, descriptive statistical techniques (frequency, percentage, arithmetic average) have been used for the analysis of data. The aim of descriptive analysis is to present it to the reader by regulating and interpreting the obtained findings (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2013). As relational screening model has been adopted while analyzing the relationship between management approaches adopted by school principals and professional development of teachers, Pearson Correlation Analysis has been calculated to find and interpret the degree of relationship between two variables in analysis of data. The continuation of both variables and co-distribution of variables are effective here in the study (Büyüköztürk, 2014, p.31). ANOVA has been used to examine whether school principals' adoption of classical and neoclassical management approaches shows significant difference according to educational institutions factor. As the data display normal distribution, using one sided ANOVA test from parametric tests was suitable. Impermanent answer choices in the scale have been made permanent with a developed scale to interpret the obtained results by statistical processes. The range of the scale is 4/5=80. Accordingly, the numeration of the scale is as follows:

- 1.0 -1.80 Strongly Agree
- 1.81 -2.60 Disagree
- 2.61 - 3.40 Neutral
- 3.41 - 4.20 Agree
- 4.21 -5.00 Strongly Agree

FINDINGS

When chart 4 is analyzed, the average scores of the answers given by 404 teachers in different fields and working in various educational institutions, about how the school principals are close to classical management approach from the adopted approaches, can be seen.

Table 4. Findings on Classical Approach

	N	\bar{X}	SS
Classical Management Approach	404	3.417	.304

Table 5. Findings on Neo-classical Approach

	N	\bar{X}	SS
Neo-classical Management Approach	404	2.687	.720

The average score of the given answers related to stated classical management approach in the features of data collection tool is 3.417 ($x=3.417$). The teachers participated in the research expressed their opinion as "Agree" for the

classical management approach's closeness to the school principals in various schools. When chart 5 is analyzed, the average score of the answers given by 404 teachers in different fields and working in various educational institutions, about how the school principals are close to neo-classical management approach, can be seen. The average score of the given answers related to stated neo-classical management approach is 2.6877 ($x=2.687$). The teachers participated in the research expressed their opinion as "Neutral" for neo-classical management approach's closeness to school principals in various schools.

Table 6. Findings on Professional Development

	N	\bar{X}	SS
The highly expertised personnel at school, the expectation of densely shared works affect me negatively in terms of my professional development.	404	3.153	1.250
Dense hierarchy affects me negatively in terms of my professional development.	404	3.617	1.094
Participation in decision making gives me a word and supplies me in making proper decisions.	404	3.571	1.076
The perspective seeing the school staff like a machine affects me negatively in terms of my professional development.	404	3.657	2.266

When chart 6 is analyzed, the participants has stated their opinions as ($x=3.158$) "Neutral" for the item 'The highly expertised personnel at school, the expectation of densely shared works affect me negatively in terms of my professional development'. Besides, the participants have stated their opinions as ($x=3.167$) "Agree" for the item 'Dense hierarchy affects me negatively in terms of my professional development.' Furthermore, the participants have expressed their opinions as ($x=3.571$) "Agree" for the item "Participation in decision making gives me a word and supplies me in making proper decisions." Lastly, as to the item 'The perspective seeing the school staff like a machine affects me negatively in terms of my professional development', the participants stated their opinions as ($x=3.657$) "Agree."

Table 7. Findings of the effects of management approaches on teachers' professional development

	Professional Development	
	Pearson Correlation (p)	N
Classical approach	-.677**	404
Neo-classical approach	.696**	404

According to chart 7, the existing correlation between the means of classical and neo-classical approaches, and the means of the effects on Professional development, as well as Pearson correlation were counted while the criterions of 0.70-1.00 high; 0.69-0.30 medium and 0.29-0.00 low were considered (Büyüköztürk, 2012).

According to this, as long as school principals adopt the classical management approach, professional development of the teachers will be affected negatively and reasonably. As long as school principals adopt neo-classical management

approach, professional development of the teachers will be affected positively and reasonably.

Table 8. Descriptive Statistics of the Scores of the Adoption of School Managers

Institution	N	\bar{X}	SS
Primary	230	3.420	.49
Secondary	159	3.454	.40
Middle	15	3.352	.37

The descriptive statistics of the school principals' classical management adoption scores are presented in the chart 8 while Anova results according to educational institution are stated in chart 9. Analysis results show that there isn't significant differences between adoption level of classical management approach and educational institutions, $F(2,391)=.480, p>.01$. In other words, the classical management approach adopted by school principals doesn't represent significant difference depending on the educational institutions worked in.

Table 9. Anova Results on School Principals' Adoption of Classical Approach according to Institution Factor

Variance	total	sd	mean	F	p
Between Groups	0.197	2	.099	.480	.619
Within Groups	80.468	391	.206		
Total	80.665	393			

Table 10. Descriptive Statistics of the School Principals' Adoption of Neo-classical Approach

Institution	N	\bar{X}	SS
Primary	230	2.738	.73
Secondary	159	2.670	.69
Middle	15	2.589	.65

Descriptive statistics of the school principals' adoption of neo-classical management approach score are on Table 10, while ANOVA results according to educational institutions are given on chart 11. Analysis results show that there isn't significant difference between adoption level of neo-classical management approach and the educational institutions, $F(2,391)=.550, P >.01$. In other words, neo-classical management approach adopted by school principals doesn't Show significant difference depending upon the educational institutions.

Table 11. Anova Results on School Principals' Adoption of Neo-classical Approach according to Institution Factor

Variance	total	sd	mean	F	p
Between Groups	.619	2	.309	.598	.550
Within Groups	202.602	391	.518		
Total	203.222	393			

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Within the context of this research, having knowledge about the management approaches adopted by school principals working in educational institutions, and contribution of school principals to the professional development of teachers were tried to be clarified. Obtained findings from the research show that school principals often use classical and neo-classical

management approaches. According to teachers, school principals adopt classical management approach more, compared to the neo-classical management approach. Also school principals who are close to neo-classical management approach get more positive effects in terms of contributing to professional development of teachers. According to teachers, there isn't significant difference among the school principals working in different educational institutions. According to Özdemir (2014), school principals and teachers should always be side by side and involved in an interaction in every educational environment. This research showed that teachers found school principals lower on such skills lying under taking initiatives like listening, human relations, conflict management, motivation, fairness than other skills (Şekerci and Aypay, 2009). In this respect, it is beneficial that school principals be together with teachers, form interaction with them, take initiative, make decisions together with teachers as well. The principles of neo-classical approach enable enables this, and our research results support the related literature within this respect. In other words, this research study supports the research results carried out by Ada and Ercoşkun (2009) to determine school principals' manner of practicing classical and neoclassical management approaches. The research results by Ada and Ercoşkun (2009) revealed that school principals frequently use classical and neo-classical management approaches. This result supports our research results as well. School principals' being close to classical management approach brings with an organizational structure which moves effectiveness and productivity into center, sees human as a machine, ignores the qualities of human, shapes the organization, cares about natural group and decision process. Naturally, the professional development of teachers can't be satisfactory in such a structure. Changing the suggestions after taking teachers' opinions, and discussions causes the feeling of group participation to arise. School principals who are close to neo-classical management approach will contribute more to the professional development of teachers compared to the school principals who are close to classical management approach.

Suggestions

Some suggestions in the light of the research results are as in the following:

- School principals should have in-service education in order to adopt and implement more modern management theories.
- Having post graduate education on the subject of Educational Administration and Inspection should be provided for the school principals.
- Seminars should be given and reports should be published by the Ministry of National Education in order to introduce modern management approaches to school principals.

REFERENCES

- Açıkalın, A. 1999. *İnsan kaynağının yönetimi-geliştirilmesi*. Ankara: PegemA Yayınları.

- Ada, Ş. and Ercoşkun, M. H. 2009. Okul Müdürlerinin Klasik ve Neo-Klasik Yönetim Yaklaşımlarını Uygulama Biçimleri. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 13(2), 171–182.
- Akbaşı, S. and Balıkcı, A. 2013. Okul Yöneticisi ve Öğretmen Görüşlerine Göre Okul Yöneticiliğinin Meslekleşmesinin Değerlendirilmesi. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 9(2), 366–377.
- Aslanargun, E. 2007. Modern Eğitim Yönetimi Anlayışına Yönelik Eleştiriler ve
- Aydın, M. 1998. *Eğitim yönetimi*. Ankara: Hatiboğlu Yayınevi.
- Balcı, A. 2007. *Sosyal Bilimlerde Araştırma*. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık
- Bartell, C. A. and Birch, L. W. 1995. Restructuring administrator preparation for California. *Thrust for Educational Leadership*, 24(5), 28-31.
- Bursalıoğlu, Z. 1998. *Okul yönetiminde yeni yapı ve davranış*. Ankara: Pegem Özel Eğitim ve Hizmetleri.
- Büte, M., and Balcı, A. F. 2010. Bağımsız Anaokulu Yöneticilerinin Bakış Açısından Okul Yönetimi Süreçlerinin İşleyişi ve Sorunlar. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 16(4), 485–509.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. 2014. *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı: İstatistik, araştırma deseni, SPSS uygulamaları ve yorum* (20. Baskı). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Çelik, V. 2009. *Okul kültürü ve yönetimi*. Pegem Akademi.
- Christensen, L. B., Johnson, R. B., and Turner, L. A. 2015. Değişkenlerin Ölçülmesi ve Örneklem. İçinde In A. Aypay (Ed.), *Araştırma Yöntemleri Desen Ve Analiz* (2. Baskı, ss. 149–180) (Çev : Sever, M., Yurtseven, Z. A.). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Demirtaş, H., and Güneş, H. 2002. Eğitim yönetimi ve denetimi sözlüğü. Anı.
- Eren, E. 2004. *Örgütsel Davranış ve Yönetim Psikolojisi*. İstanbul: Beta Basım.
- Karasar, N. 2014. *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi: kavramlar, ilkeler, teknikler* (27. Baskı). Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Kaya, Y. K. 1999. *Eğitim yönetimi* (7. Baskı) . Ankara: Bilim Yayıncılık.
- Kocabaş, i., and Karaköse, T. 2005. Okul müdürlerinin tutum ve davranışlarının öğretmenlerin motivasyonuna etkisi (özel ve devlet okulu örneği). *Türk eğitim bilimleri dergisi*, 3(1), 79-93.
- Mihçioğlu, C. 1970. Halkla İlişkiler Nedir. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, III, 1(4), 99.
- Murphy, J. 1998. What's Ahead for Tomorrow's Principals. *Principal*, 78(1), 13.
- Özdemir, S. 2009. *Türk eğitim sistemi ve okul yönetimi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Özdemir, S. 2014. Türk Eğitim Sisteminin Yapısı, Eğilimleri ve Sorunları. İçinde In S. Özdemir (Ed.), *Türk Eğitim Sistemi ve Okul Yönetimi* (3. Baskı, ss. 7–52). Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Postmodern Eğitim Yönetimi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 50(50), 195–212.
- Seçer, İ. 2013. *SPSS ve LISREL İle Pratik Veri Analizi : Analiz ve Raporlaştırma* (1. Baskı). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Şekerci, M., and Aypay, A. 2009. İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin yönetim becerileri ile grup etkililiği arasındaki ilişki. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 15(57), 133–160.
- Şişman, M. 2014. *Öğretim liderliği*. (5. Baskı). Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.
- Yıldırım, A. and Şimşek, H. 2013. *Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri* (9. Baskı). Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.
- Yıldız, B., Akbaşı, S., and Üredi L. 2015. *Kurum Müdürlerinin Yaptığı Rehberlik Ve Denetim Uygulamalarına İlişkin Öğretmen Görüşlerinin Değerlendirilmesi*. VII. Uluslararası Eğitim Denetimi Kongresi, İzmir, Türkiye. 20-22 Mayıs.
- Yüksel, Ö. 1997. Örgüt kuramlarındaki gelişmelerin insan kaynakları yönetimine etkileri. *Amme idaresi dergisi*, 30(2), 31-43.
