

A Review of Leadership Styles and Models of Educational Management: How Does it Inform School Leadership Practices?

Emile Monono Mbua, Ph.D

*University of Bemenda, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Leadership,
Bambili, North West Region, Cameroon*

ABSTRACT

The 21st century has witnessed great interest in educational leadership partly because of the widespread belief placed on the quality of leadership in bringing significant progress to student and school improvement outcomes. This broadens the recognition and need that schools need effective and efficient leaders and managers if they are to provide the best possible outcomes. This article reviews six model of educational management (formal, collegial, political, ambiguity, cultural and subjective) and nine related leadership styles (Managerial, Emotional, Transformational, Distributed, Transactional, Postmodern, Contingency, Participative and Moral). The main purpose of this article was to establish a linkage leadership styles and models and educational management and how such a linkage can inform school leadership practices for continuous school improvement plans. The linkage does focus on the role educational leadership can play in meeting the challenges facing educational institutions today. The article concludes that the relevance of the linkage will greatly depend on the organizational context and applicability depends on the event, the situation and members within the school. The validity of this linkage will also depend on the following considerations: size of the institution; structure of the organization; nature of the leadership process; availability of resources and external environment.

KEYWORDS: *School Leadership, Leadership, Leadership Styles, Models of Educational Management.*

Introduction

Most countries are investing and giving high priority to providing high quality education. This is the issue which challenges educational leaders all over the world. School leaders are under considerable pressure to demonstrate the contribution of their work to school improvement, which has resulted in the creation of a wide range of literature which addresses leadership in the context of school improvement. This article reviews Nine (09) Leadership Styles and Six (06) Models of Educational Management and how it does inform school leadership practices. This study was enthused by the premise that no nation grows further than the quality of its educational leaders and or educational managers. In this theoretical debate, the main premise of this article is to review leadership styles and models of educational management and how it does inform school leadership practices for school improvement. It also establishes a linkage between the leadership style and the models of educational management. It focuses on the role educational leadership can play in meeting the challenges facing educational institutions and the outcry for educational reforms.

School Leadership

According to Leithwood et al. (1999), there is no universally accepted definition of leadership. The definition of leadership is "arbitrary and very subjective," according to Yukl (2002). There is no such thing as a "correct" definition, although some definitions are more useful than others." There are more than 350 definitions of leadership, but no clear and unequivocal understanding as to what distinguishes leaders from non-leaders," according to Cuban (1988). Establishing at least a working

<https://cejsr.academicjournal.io>

definition of the multifaceted concept is essential in light of the emphasis placed on school effectiveness (Daresh 1998, Sammons et al. 1995) and school improvement (Hallinger and Heck 1999).

The process of influence is an important part of how leadership is defined. "influence... seems to be a necessary part of most conceptions of leadership," according to Leithwood et al. (1999). According to Ogawa and Bossert (1995), leadership also involves influence, which they agree can be exercised by anyone in an organization. Leadership is also referred to as an influence process by Cuban (1988). The term "leadership" then refers to individuals who influence the motivations and actions of others in order to achieve particular objectives; It implies taking risks and initiative. This definition demonstrates that the process of influence is deliberate in the sense that it is designed to result in particular outcomes. This idea is bolstered by Fidler's (1997) assertion that "followers are influenced toward goal achievement." Leadership is not only understood from the point of view of "influence" but alternative constructs of leadership focus on values. Leaders are expected to ground their actions in clear personal and professional values. Wasserberg, (1999) claims that "the primary role of any leader is the unification of people around key values" From his perspective as a secondary head teacher, he argues that these core values should be:

- schools are concerned with learning and all members of the school community are learners
- every member of the school community is valued as an individual
- the school exists to serve its pupils and the local community
- learning is about the development of the whole person and happens in and out of classrooms
- People prosper with trust, encouragement and praise (Wasserberg 1999).

Over the past two decades, vision has also been recognized as an essential component of effective leadership. According to Southworth (1993), heads are encouraged to exert themselves "because their leadership is the pursuit of their individual visions." However, according to Fullan (1992), "vision building is a highly sophisticated dynamic process that few organizations are able to sustain. "The "adverse effects" of vision, according to Thoonen et al. (2011), occur when principals do not involve teachers in the process of building vision.

Leaders in schools have the ability to help students develop the skills they need to succeed in the future .According to Farr (2011), factors like classroom management, climate and culture, and academic performance emerge when school leadership is strategically examined. A school's trajectory can be altered by principals' school leadership practices. Teachers can benefit from school leaders who are reaction-oriented and action-oriented by modeling values and success in the classroom (Farr, 2011;2005 Spillane;(2010) (Townsend)According to Harris and Chapman (2002), effective leadership relies on people's willingness to collaborate in the workplace. Usually, the ability to build a relationship that lasts, improve morale and values, and encourage leaders to implement organizational change are the primary goals. School leadership should foster teamwork, effective participation in decision-making, and a collaborative working environment. Kivipold and Vadi (2008) argued that in order to improve academic performance, institutional leadership must promote the transfer of knowledge among staff, students, and parents in order to build on the effectiveness of school leaders. According to Pasternack, Williams, and Anderson (2001), institutional leadership is a resource that can help schools achieve academic excellence. The development of performance and standards is greatly aided by effective school leaders.

Leadership Styles

Leadership style is a structure of the leader who needs to motivate behaviors as required by various situations which is not a natural behavior. So leadership style is a qualification of an effective leader

<https://cejsr.academicjournal.io>

who would lead to the success of group work and products of the organization (Fiedler, 1976). Effective leaders need to be aware of their roles in order to reach the effectiveness in a certain situation. Their roles include: 1) analyze the situation and the followers 2) apply leadership style which correspond to the situation and the followers, and 3) adjust leadership style according to the situation (Fiedler, 1976). Managerial, emotional, transformational, distributed, transactional, postmodern, contingency, participative, and moral leadership styles are discussed in this section.

Emotional Leadership

Given the importance of emotional intelligence in leadership, there is a shift to the emotional perspective of leadership. The concept of emotional leadership comes from emotional intelligence (Salovey and Mayer, 1990). According to Wong and Law (2002), in order to understand better the emotions of other individuals, emotional leadership is noted as the ability to adjust ones emotional state and behavior, in accordance to the circumstances. In other words, emotional leadership is the sort that have impeccable management abilities in the following - self-emotional appraisal, regulation of emotion, others' emotional appraisal, use of emotion (Boyatzis, Goleman, & McKee, 2002). Self-emotional appraisal is a state when you can be truly objective, honest and realistic in evaluating yourself. Coming from the roots of self-emotional appraisal, regulation of emotion is managing your emotions effectively, and to be emotionally prepared despite the various on-going changes in life (Wong & Law, 2002). Through interest for others, other's emotional appraisal is about being conscious of the issues that others (different societies and communities) face; also, to reciprocate a genuine sense of psychological support. Use of emotion is the ability to connect emotions of others to one's own (Wong & Law, 2002); for leaders, such ability is vital in securing positive relations with individuals of the firm, which in turn will determine leadership capabilities of running the organization. Strong emotional leadership depends on having high levels of emotional intelligence (EI). EI is the ability to identify, assess, and control the emotions of oneself, of others, and of groups. The two most prominent approaches to understanding EI are the ability and trait EI models.

Managerial Leadership

According to Leithwood et al (1999), Managerial leadership assumes that the focus of leaders ought to be on functions, tasks and behaviors and that if these functions are carried out competently the work of others in the organization will be facilitated. Most approaches to managerial leadership also assume that the behavior of organizational members is largely rational. Authority and influence are allocated to formal positions in proportion to the status of those positions in the organizational hierarchy. They add that 'positional power, in combination with formal policies and procedures, is the source of influence exercised by managerial leadership'. Hoyle and Wallace (2005) note the relationship between managerial leadership and leadership for learning. 'Management functions to support learning and teaching, the core of the educational enterprise' Managerial leadership is the model which provides the greatest risk of a managerialist approach to school organization. By focusing on functions, tasks and behaviors, there is the possibility that the aims of education will be subordinated to the managerial aim of greater efficiency.

Participative Leadership

Puni and Okoe (2014) defined participative leadership as the process of making joint decisions or sharing influence in decision making by superior and subordinates in organizations. Participative leadership style makes use of collaboration, involvement and participation of employees in decision making and problem-solving process (Bhatti et al, 2019). Akpoviro et al., (2018) referred to it as democratic leadership style which is a leadership style involving all members of a team in identifying crucial goals as well as developing strategies and procedures to achieve the identified goals. In this style, leaders divide responsibilities among staff by engaging and involving them in the preparation, decision-making, and implementation phases (Wiesenthal et al, 2015). Ensuring that workers

<https://cejsr.academicjournal.io>

participate in decision making process that affects staff and their job forms part of the psychological motivational activities which could be used to improve employee's morale and productivity (Brown, 2011). Participative leadership is a leader's non-authoritative behavior that gives opportunities to subordinates to take part in the decision-making process and receive input from employees to make a quality decision. In participative decision-making, the leader encourages employees to express their ideas and suggestions while acting as a coach that facilitates an open policy of utilizing ideas for effective decision-making. A participative leader builds human capability, ability, and a sense of responsibility through involvement in decision-making. Participation in decision-making creates self-efficacy, psychological empowerment, and enables subordinates to feel that they are valuable assets of an organization.

Transformational Leadership

This model of leadership is most often associated with vision; setting directions; restructuring and realigning the organization; developing staff and curriculum; and involvement with the external community. This form of leadership emphasizes that leadership ought to be the commitment and capacities of organizational members. Higher levels of personal commitment to organizational goals, and greater capacities for accomplishing those goals, are assumed to result in extra effort and greater productivity (Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 1999). Transformational leadership has its origins in Weber's (1989) notion of charismatic leadership. This model focuses on the individual attributes of the senior leader in the organization: the CEO or principal. This individual sets out a vision and exhorts or inspires organizational members to pursue activities linked to the vision. Transformational leadership practices, as defined by Leithwood (1994), are regarded as a composite concept that has both direct and indirect effects on the progress of school restructuring initiatives and teacher-perceived student outcomes. Leithwood (1994) conceptualizes transformational leadership along eight dimensions:

- building school vision;
- establishing school goals;
- providing intellectual stimulation;
- offering individualized support;
- modeling best practices and important organizational values;
- demonstrating high performance expectations;
- creating a productive school culture; and
- developing structures to foster participation in school decisions.

According to Gunter (2001), transformational leadership entails developing a unified shared interest among leaders and followers. Kirkbride (2006) adds that leadership effectiveness is correlated with the transformational approach.

Distributed Leadership

Collegial and participative leadership were popular shared approaches in the late 1900s but distributed leadership has become the normatively preferred leadership model in the 21st century. Gronn (2010) states that 'there has been an accelerating amount of scholarly and practitioner attention accorded [to] the phenomenon of distributed leadership'. Harris (2010) adds that it 'represents one of the most influential ideas to emerge in the field of educational leadership in the past decade'. Through responsive leadership strategies and supportive interactions with followers, distributed leadership has been linked to rapid success in improving school performance (Harris & Spillane, 2008), according to extensive research conducted in the United States, England, Scotland,

<https://cejsr.academicjournal.io>

and Ireland. The theory of distributed leadership developed by Spillane in 2006 went beyond individualism and leadership to concentrate on leaders—emergent or in position—their knowledge and actions, as well as the ways in which they think and act in different situations. According to Spillane and Diamond (2007), "people in formally designated positions and those without such designations can and do take responsibility for leading and managing in the schoolhouse." On the other hand, Mayrowetz (2008) argued that distributed leadership has enabled school leaders to support teaching and learning in a variety of different ways. According to Mayrowetz (2008), the changes in leadership practices, students' academic performance, and relationships with academic staff all show the effectiveness of distributed leadership. School administrators can collectively improve performance, structure instructional work, and monitor classroom management and activities within the school environment by employing a distributed approach (Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999a, 1999b; 2005, Timperley).

Contingency Leadership

This approach assumes that what is important is how leaders respond to the unique organizational circumstances or problems ... there are wide variations in the contexts for leadership and that, to be effective, these contexts require different leadership responses ... individuals providing leadership, typically those in formal positions of authority, are capable of mastering a large repertoire of leadership practices. Their influence will depend, in large measure, on such mastery (Leithwood et al., 1999). Contingency theories of leadership focus on particular variables related to the environment that might determine which style of leadership is best suited for a particular work situation. According to this theory, no single leadership style is appropriate in all situations. Success depends upon a number of variables, including leadership style, qualities of followers and situational features (Charry, 2012). A contingency factor is thus any condition in any relevant environment to be considered when designing an organization or one of its elements (Naylor, 1999). Contingency theory states that effective leadership depends on the degree of fit between a leader's qualities and leadership style and that demanded by a specific situation (Lamb, 2013). The contingency leadership is related to the behavioral theory that challenges that there is no finest way of leading and that the style of leadership is operative in some circumstances may not be effective in others. The contingent leadership therefore provides an alternative approach, recognizing the diverse nature of school contexts and the advantages of adapting leadership styles to the particular situation rather than adopting a 'one size fits all' stance.

Moral leadership

Moral leadership is defined as "a leader's behavior that demonstrates superior virtues, self-discipline, and unselfishness" (Cheng et al., 2004). It entails "setting an example for others about the rightness or wrongness of particular actions" (Fairholm and Fairholm, 2009), and exemplifies the exercise of integrity and fulfilling obligations, never taking advantage of others, and serving as a selfless paragon (Farh et al., 2008). With business scandals due to leaders' lack of morality emerging endlessly, scholars reflected on the previous leadership research paying too much attention to leaders' traits and behaviors while ignoring leaders' morality (Kanungo and Mendonca, 1996). Moral leadership, which emphasizes leaders' virtues, has received scholarly attention. Several studies have shown that moral leadership is positively related to positive employee behavior (Farh et al., 2006), such as organizational citizenship behavior (Tang and Naumann, 2015), which may be seen as ethical behavior (Effelsberg et al., 2014). Such forms of ethical behavior may also benefit the organization.

The leadership model most closely linked to organizational culture is that of moral leadership. This model assumes that the critical focus of leadership ought to be on the values, beliefs and ethics of leaders themselves. Authority and influence are to be derived from defensible conceptions of what is right or good (Leithwood et al, 1999). Sergiovanni (1984) says that "excellent schools have central

<https://cejsr.academicjournal.io>

zones composed of values and beliefs that take on sacred or cultural characteristics". The moral dimension of leadership is based on "normative rationality; rationality based on what we believe and what we consider to be good" (Sergiovanni, 1991):

Moral leadership is consistent with organizational culture in that it is based on the values, beliefs and attitudes of principals and other educational leaders. It focuses on the moral purpose of education and on the behaviors to be expected of leaders operating within the moral domain. It also assumes that these values and beliefs coalesce into shared norms and meanings that either shape or reinforce culture. The rituals and symbols associated with moral leadership support these values and underpin school culture.

Transactional Leadership

In transactional leadership, a leader attempts to motivate followers to act in a particular way through a system of reward and punishment (Lussier and Achua, 2015). When followers act in a way that agrees with what the leader wants to encourage, a reward is given. Likewise, a punishment is given in the opposite case. In order to clarify what behavior is desired, and to have consistent reward and punishment, leaders require a set of rules and/or procedures (Barman, 2009). Furthermore, leaders require some way of monitoring the behavior of their followers (or at least identifying when good/bad behavior has occurred) and a method of enforcing the rules and/or procedures so that the appropriate reward and punishment can be given. Hence, this style of leadership is meant for maximizing efficiency and conformity, and is very effective at getting people to accomplish specific tasks (Lussier and Achua, 2015). However, the need to define specific expectations makes this style of leadership poor at adapting to change, especially rapid change, and handling complex or dynamic problems for which goals and necessary tasks are poorly defined. Transactional leadership in organizations plays an exchange role between managers and subordinates (Jung, 2001). Transactional leadership style is understood to be the exchange of rewards and targets between employees and management (Howell & Avolio, 1993). Bass and Avolio (1990) explained Transactional leaders motivate subordinates through the use of contingent rewards, corrective actions and rule enforcement. Bass Bernard et al (1994) explained that transactional leadership depends on contingent reinforcement, either positive contingent reward or the more negative active or passive forms of management-by-exception. Transactional leaders motivate followers through exchange; for example, accomplishing work in exchange for rewards or preferences (Yang, 2007). Kahai et al (1997), found group efficacy was higher under the transactional leadership condition. According to Burns (1978), transactional leader tends to focus on task completion and employee compliance and these leaders rely quite heavily on organizational rewards and punishments to influence employee performance.

Postmodern Leadership

The essence of postmodern leadership is challenging the status-quo to promote a better way. In postmodernism, organizations have to manage environmental uncertainty and every possible change in order to be effective. It therefore, requires that in uncertainties, organization can only survive when they offer opportunities for new ideas to ensure continuity (Ykaf, 1996). In postmodernism, decentralization is an important factor. They emphasize a wide, decentralize, flexible and flat organizing for autonomous terms. (Boje & Dennehy, 2000). Postmodernists emphasize discourse and communication among individual through creating job groups. The aim of this discourse and communication is for information exchange that makes new ways for greater participation and productivity in organization (Keough & Tobin, 2000). To the postmodernist, discourse promotes cooperation and collective actions such as increase in tolerance against opposing views develop ideas collective thoughts, and new ways to solve problems (Ahanchian,2003). Keough and Tobin (2001) provide a definition as a starting point for linking postmodern leadership to educational policy: "current postmodern culture celebrates the multiplicity of subjective truths as defined by experience

<https://cejsr.academicjournal.io>

and revels in the loss of absolute authority". This view has certain similarities with subjective or interactionist perspectives, which also stress the notion of individual experience and interpretation of events (Greenfield 1973, Bush 1995). Keough and Tobin (2001) identify several key features of postmodernism:

- Language does not reflect reality
- Reality does not exist; there are multiple realities
- Any situation is open to multiple interpretations
- Situations must be understood at local level with particular attention to diversity

Starratt (2001) promotes a "more consultative, participatory, inclusionary stance," which is consistent with collegiality and aligns postmodernity with democracy (Bush, 1995).

Linking Leadership Styles and Models of Educational Management

Leadership Styles	Models of Educational Management
Managerial	Formal
Transformational Participative Distributed	Collegial
Transactional	Political
Postmodern Emotional	Subjective
Contingency	Ambiguity
Moral	Cultural

Bush, 2015.

Leadership styles and Models of Educational Management: How does it inform School Leadership practices?

With knowledge on models in educational management, educational leaders and managers can have a better understanding of why they do what they do in managing and leading educational institutions towards achieving educational goals and objectives. Recognizing models of educational management contextualizes the decision making process and helps to rationalize and explain why certain actions are taken in given situations. Reflecting on models in educational management, leaders and managers can consider and reconsider whether and what extent they might need to make changes in their leadership styles for the betterment of the organizations.

Leadership and management need to be given equal prominence if schools are to operate effectively and achieve their objectives. "Leading and managing are distinct, but both are important ... The challenge of modern organizations requires the objective perspective of the manager as well as the flashes of vision and commitment wise leadership provides" (Bolman & Deal, 1997). Leithwood et al. (1999) make the important point that, in practice, principals in their day-to-day work are rarely aware of whether they are leading or managing; they are simply carrying out their work on behalf of the school and its learners. However, the nature of that work should reflect the school context and, in particular, its needs at any one time.

According to Bush (2011), the models of educational management can be divided into six clusters—formal, collegial, political, subjective, ambiguity, and cultural—and then linked to various leadership styles in the context of educational organizations. These six clusters are based on four factors, including the level of agreement about objectives, the concept of structure, the level of environmental influences, and the most appropriate strategies within educational organizations.

<https://cejsr.academicjournal.io>

Given the global interest in leadership and management, due to its perceived importance in developing and maintaining successful schools, school improvement plans and educational systems, there isn't much clarity about which leadership styles is most likely to produce the most favorable outcomes. In this regards, it is therefore imperative for leadership and management to be aware of alternative approaches set of tools from which they can chose when facing problems and dealing with day-to-day issues. The models discussed in this section should be regarded as alternative ways of portraying events. The existence of several different perspectives creates what Bolman and Deal (1997) describe as 'conceptual pluralism: a jangling discord of multiple voices'. Each theory has something to offer in explaining behavior and events in educational institutions. The various theories of educational leadership and management reflect very different ways of understanding and interpreting events and behavior in schools and colleges.

This section gives an overview of the six models of educational management, explains how they are connected to the various leadership styles in educational organizations, and explains how the connection does help school leadership practices for creating and maintaining successful schools and plans for continuous school improvement.

The Formal Model of Educational Management

The Formal Model (Bush, 2003) or Classical Model (Everard, Morris and Wilson, 2004) is characterized by a high degree of job specialization and is highly centralized. It has a fixed command structure, rigid hierarchy, top-down communication, firm control, strict procedures and a dogmatic approach (Everard, Morris and Wilson, 2004). People with the organization have clearly defined positions, which influence professional relationships and perpetuate the status quo. Those at the top of the hierarchy have primacy in setting goals, making decisions and formulating policy (Bush, 2003). The Formal Model has been very influential since the development of theories in educational management (Bush, 2003). With its clearly defined structure and top-down leadership, it is considered to be central to the notion of effective management and many schools and organizations have adopted, adapted and built on this model to improve efficiency of the management process. Numerous educational management systems have utilized this model extensively. The formal models of educational management are structural, systems, bureaucratic, rational, and hierarchical (Bush, 2011). These models assume that predetermined goals are pursued using a rational approach and that organizations have a hierarchical structure. Heads' formal positions determine their authority and power, and these managers are also accountable to sponsoring bodies for the implementation of agreed-upon policies in their institutions. This model has seven features:

- They tend to treat organizations as systems.
- Formal models give prominence to the official structure of the organization.
- In formal models the official structures of the organization tend to be hierarchical.
- All formal approaches typify schools as goal-seeking organizations.
- Formal models assume that managerial decisions are made through a rational process.
- Formal approaches present the authority of leaders as a product of their official positions within the organization. (Adapted from Bush, 2003)

The managerial leadership style is linked to formal educational management models (Bush, 2011). Managerial leadership assumes that the focus of leaders ought to be on functions, tasks and behaviors and that if these functions are carried out competently the work of others in the organization will be facilitated. Most approaches to managerial leadership also assume that the behavior of organizational members is largely rational. Authority and influence are allocated to formal positions in proportion to the status of those positions in the organizational hierarchy. (Leithwood et al, 1999). This leadership

<https://cejsr.academicjournal.io>

style has a number of assumptions, such as concentration on skillfully executing actions, tasks and activities as a means of facilitating the activities of other members of the organization, a high degree of rationality in the behavior of members of the organization, and the assignment of authority and influence over formal positions based on the status of positions within the organization chart (Leithwood, et al, 1999). It is significant to note that this type of leadership does not include the concept of vision, which is central to most leadership models. Managerial leadership is focused on managing existing activities successfully rather than visioning a better future for the school (Dressler, 2001). This approach is very suitable for school leaders working in centralized systems as it prioritizes the efficient implementation of external imperatives, notably those prescribed by higher levels within the bureaucratic hierarchy. In the formal models, leadership is attributed to the person on top of a complex power pyramid. Managerial leaders focus therefore on their attributes and tasks, on the management of the successful activities already in place, and exclude the vision of a better future for the school institution (Bush, 2015). The formal leader establishes the goals and formulates the policies of the school organization.

How does it inform School Leadership?

Managerial leadership of a school leader is important to manage schools effectively and efficiently to achieve quality education. As a manager, school leaders must have the ability to perform management functions as planning, organizing and controlling. Managerial leadership is both a combination of management styles and leadership skills. As a result, school leaders are expected to impact all facets of the school: motivating teachers, shaping the conditions and environment in which teaching and learning take place, and interacting with the community at wider.

School managerial leaders are expected to promote the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all the stakeholders.

Managerial school leaders should act as coaches and communicator. In a coaching role, they should provide the support teachers need to succeed in their respective roles. They should be able to communicate with others in a way that inspires team members.

School leaders are also expected to be mission-oriented leaders who focus on creating a positive school culture. By focusing on creating a culture of success, great attention should be paid to: staff morale, student behaviors and safety, esprit de corps and parental support.

School leaders should be able to influence as well as empower staff. They must feel comfortable with empowering staff members to take decisions not losing sight of the fact that they are responsible for their subordinates' decisions.

School leaders are required to learn how to learn how to motivate team members to achieve their and organizational goals. Leadership is about influencing and inspiring people to perform efficiently.

School leaders are to develop common interests and seek support. Having the same organizational interests creates room for greater cooperation, support and achievement which critical to organizational success.

Collegial Model of Educational Management

The second models of educational management are the collegial models. Collegial models include all those theories that emphasize that power and decision-making should be shared among some or all members of the organization (Bush, 2003). Major assumptions of these models are policy determination and formulation, decision making based on a process of discussions, agreements and consensus and sharing the power among some or all of the members of the organization who are considered to have a common perception of the organizational objectives (Bush, 2011).

<https://cejsr.academicjournal.io>

The Collegial Model (Bush, 2003) shares many characteristics with Everard, Morris and Wilson's, (2004). Humanistic Model in that both are based on the assumption that agreement can be reached when the staff shares common values and plays an active role in decision making. Policies emerge by consensus via committees and informal groups, in which respect is given to the needs, ideas and opinions of all participants. It is proposed that all interested parties are likely to act rationally according to how they perceive any given situation (Everard, Morris and Wilson, 2004). This model requires an organizational structure which is largely decentralized, has flexible procedures and multi-directional communication (Everard, Morris and Wilson, 2004): thus, providing for the widespread distribution of influence, rather than it being concentrated in the hands of senior management.

Collegial models have the following major features:

- They are strongly normative in orientation.
- Collegial models seem to be particularly appropriate for organizations such as schools and colleges that have significant numbers of professional staff.
- Collegial models assume a common set of values held by members of the organization.
- The size of decision-making groups is an important element in collegial management.
- Collegial models assume that decisions are reached by consensus. (Bush, 2003)

According to Bush (2011), transformational leadership, participative leadership, and distributed leadership are all linked to collegial models. The fundamental tenets of transformational leadership are that members of an organization should be focused on their commitments and abilities, and that a higher level of personal commitment to the goals of the organization and greater capabilities for achieving those goals would increase productivity (Leithwood et al., 1999). Transformational leadership in the education sector was conceptualized by Leithwood (1994) based on eight dimensions: creating a school's vision, setting goals for the school, providing intellectual stimulation, providing individualized patronage, modeling best practices and core organizational values, displaying high performance expectations, creating a productive school culture, and finally encouraging participation in the school decision-making process by creating necessary structures.

The second approach that is relevant to collegial models of educational management is participative leadership, which is also sometimes referred to as shared, collaborative, or collegial leadership. It has been defined as the opportunities for members of the organization to participate in the decision-making process within the organization (Hoyle & Wallace, 2005), and this participation is essential (Leithwood et al., 2007), 1999). Participative leadership is based on three criteria as a normative theory: an improvement in school efficiency as a result of using a participative approach, the justification of participation based on democratic principles, and the availability of leadership to any legal stakeholders in the framework or context of site-based management (Bush, 2011).

Distributed leadership is the third type of leadership that is related to collegial models and has received a lot of attention from scholars in the 21st century (Gronn, 2010). According to Harris (2010), this leadership style is one of the most important approaches to educational leadership in the last ten years. This kind of leadership is based on the competencies and skills of members in the organizational chart and is independent of positional authority. So, according to Harris (2003), distributed leadership focuses on finding and using expertise wherever it is present in the organization, regardless of the positions held by skilled members in the organization.

How does it inform school leadership?

Educational institutions today are plagued with many problems one of which is the lack of participation by all the stakeholders in decision-making process. It is therefore imperative for school leaders to establish an educational system that requires flexibility, freedom of action and more trust

<https://cejsr.academicjournal.io>

in decision-making in the area of education.

The term collegial refers to a body of person's having a common purpose requiring power and decision-making should be shared among all members of the organization (Bush, 2003). It entails educational leaders will have to establish a system that determines policies and decisions through a process of discussion leading to consensus.

Little, (1990) explains that, the reasons to pursue a study on collegiality is presumed that something is gained when teachers work together and something is lost when they don't. School leaders by implication, should establish a managerial orientation towards teamwork. They are to create an environment where teachers feel some degree of fulfillment, worthwhile contribution and self-actualization.

Collegial management styles are associated with managers developing a close relationship with subordinates in which they relate to them on personal level rather than simply a professional one. Leaders are to develop a more effective working environment, where teachers have an important say in decision-making process, while leaders guide the subordinates in making and executing important decision (Bush, 2003).

Educational leaders should know organizational effectiveness is a result of employee's participation in decision-making. Effectiveness is therefore a function of participation, thus requiring school leaders to consider more of a partnership relationship than a hierarchical relationship.

School problems are mirrored both from the society and community (Sarason, 1990). Solutions to these problems are not sufficient to come only from within the educational system, nor can solutions come from outside the schools. This calls for educational leaders to encourage participatory actions and collaboration of all persons involved in the implementation of a reform initiative is essential to its success.

Political Model of Educational Management

The third model of educational management is the political model (Bush, 2011) which assumes that educational policies and decisions in the institutions stem from a complicated process of bargaining and negotiation over the goals of subunits and specific policy objectives are pursued by interest groups through formation of alliances. Also conflict is a natural phenomenon based on this model and power accrues to coalitions with higher level of dominance instead of being the preserve of the formal leader in the organization.

The practice of this model in educational settings has been called Micropolitics by Ball (1987) and Hoyle (1999) as well. Baldrige (1971) has developed one of the classical political models. In his model, he suggested five stages in the policy process which are social structure, interest articulation, and legislative transformation, formulation of policy and finally execution of policy. Power as one of the factors representing which sub group would have victory over other sub groups in any conflicts in educational settings encompasses positional power, personal power, authority of expertise, control of rewards, coercive power and control of resources (Bush, 2011). In addition, Bolman and Deal (1991), Handy (1993) and Morgan (1997) posited some other power sources such as physical power, power of developing alliances and networks, power with regard to access to and control of agendas, power of controlling meaning and symbols, power of controlling boundaries and lastly power of gender relations management.

Bush (2003) links transactional leadership to his political model. In political models, there is conflict between stakeholders, with disagreement being resolved in favor of the most powerful protagonists. Transactional leadership is leadership in which relationships with teachers are based upon an exchange for some valued resource. To the teacher, interaction between administrators and teachers is usually episodic, short-lived and limited to the exchange transaction (Miller & Miller, 2001).

<https://cejsr.academicjournal.io>

Miller and Miller's (2001) definition refers to transactional leadership as an exchange process. Exchange is an established political strategy for members of organizations. Principals possess authority arising from their positions as the formal leaders of their schools. Principals act politically as they engage in transactional behaviors while seeking to influence others to act in particular ways in order to achieve organizational objectives. However, the head requires the cooperation of educators to secure the effective management of the school. An exchange may secure benefits for both parties to the arrangement. The major limitation of such a process is that it does not engage staff beyond the immediate gains arising from the transaction. As Miller and Miller's definition implies, transactional leadership does not produce long-term commitment to the values and vision being promoted by school leaders.

How Does it Inform School Leadership?

The transactional model is based on the idea that leaders give something in exchange for what they want. It is therefore an exchange process. Exchange is an established political strategy for members of the organization. By implication, school leaders are expected to establish a social interacting process with members of the school centered on motivation and trust perceptions which are essential in the relationship.

Transactional leadership is a leadership style that encourages followers' compliance through both reward and punishment. It therefore encourages school leaders to use the transactional styles in situations of crisis and emergency, as well as when there is a special project to be done.

Transactional leadership is also called managerial leadership which calls on school leaders to focus on their roles as managers. The focus of the leader should be her/his functions, tasks and behaviors, and if these functions are carried out competently, the work of others is facilitated in the organization.

In situations of uncertainties, school leaders are encouraged to use the transactional style in managing teachers and staff through motivation to improve quality. School leaders are also expected to motivate with rewards and promises while also showing acknowledgement and appreciation for their work. This will impact the teacher's motivation and prevent burnout.

In transactional leadership, rewards and punishments are contingent upon performance; this requires school leaders to establish rules, procedures and standards which are essential components in transactional leadership. With this, he carefully monitors to enforce the established rules, reward success and punish failure.

School leaders should focus on the maintenance of the structure, letting members know exactly what is expected of them, articulating the rewards of performing a task well, explaining the consequences of failure, and offering feedback designed to keep workers on task.

Subjective Model of Educational Leadership

The fourth educational management model is the subjective model (Bush, 2011). The model basically emphasizes on the aims and perceptions of individuals in the organization than subgroups, units or the whole organization. These perspectives suggest that each person has a subjective and selective perception of the organization. In the model, the conception of organizational objectives is rejected. As a result, organizations are portrayed as complex entities that reflect the interpretations and understandings of their members based on their experiences, beliefs, values, and backgrounds. Rather than being static, unchanging, or predetermined, these organizations are formed through the interaction of these members' perceptions. To put it another way, members of organizations have different meanings, and according to the subjective model, relationships with external environments are viewed as subservient, so these interactions receive little attention from a subjective perspective. They are manifestations of the values and beliefs of individuals rather than the concrete realities

<https://cejsr.academicjournal.io>

presented in formal models (Bush, 2003):

Subjective models assume that organizations are the creations of the people within them. Participants are thought to interpret situations in different ways and these individual perceptions are derived from their background and values. Organizations have different meanings for each of their members and exist only in the experience of those members.

Subjective models became prominent in educational management as a result of the work of Thomas Greenfield in the 1970s and 1980s. Greenfield was concerned about several aspects of systems theory, which he regarded as the dominant model of educational organizations. He argues that systems theory is “bad theory” and criticizes its focus on the institution as a concrete reality (Greenfield, 1973):

Subjective models have the following major features:

- They focus on the beliefs and perceptions of individual members of organizations rather than the institutional level or interest groups.
- Subjective models are concerned with the meanings placed on events by people within organizations.
- The different meanings placed on situations by the various participants are products of their values, background and experience.
- Subjective models treat structure as a product of human interaction rather than something that is fixed or predetermined.
- Subjective approaches emphasize the significance of individual purposes and deny the existence of organizational goals. (Bush, 2003).

According to Bush (2011), postmodern and emotional leadership align with the subjective model of educational management in terms of related leadership styles. (Bush, 2011). Bush (2003) notes that post-modern leadership aligns closely with his subjective model of management. Such theories, promulgated most vigorously by Greenfield (1973), assume that organizations have no ontological reality but are simply the creatures of the people within them, who may hold very different views. Similarly, Keough and Tobin (2001:2) say that “current post-modern culture celebrates the multiplicity of subjective truths as defined by experience and revels in the loss of absolute authority”. The post-modern model suggests that leaders should respect, and give attention to, the diverse and individual perspectives of stakeholders. They should also avoid reliance on the hierarchy because this concept has little meaning in such a fluid organization. Starratt (2001:348) aligns post-modernity with democracy and advocates a “more consultative, participatory, inclusionary stance”, an approach consistent with participative leadership. Sackney and Mitchell (2001) stress the importance of ‘voice’ in post-modern leadership.

How does it inform School Leadership?

Postmodern leadership style aligns closely with the subjective model of educational management. Given the fact that educational systems are ever-changing, and as the years go by, the struggles to meet the needs of the systems are becoming challenging for educational leadership. This linkage therefore, provides school leadership with an opportunity not only to change with times, but to create an educational environment that embraces creativity. To the postmodernist, the ultimate question is, how can educational leaders’ best serve and support students? By this linkage, school leadership can engage in the following leadership practices to school improvement:

It is vital for educational leadership to communicate with all stakeholders and understand their needs. Teachers, students, administrators, counselors and the community serve as inputs for the educational institution; the students are transformed by the implementation of postmodernism through

<https://cejsr.academicjournal.io>

specialized curriculum and an overall well roundedness environment into educated graduates, who in turn contribute to society. School leaders should communicate with its parents, teachers, and students in order to receive feedback so that any problems that lie within in the school are corrected.

It also encourages educational leaders to concentrate on finding solutions to problems by taking into account all internal and external environmental factors. These factors have an influence on the success of the educational institution.

The postmodern leadership encourages leadership to create a structure wherein the student is in the center and the first priority is for educators to meet the needs of each individual student in order to maintain success. Families and community members must feel welcome and comfortable with coming into a school. School administration must cater to families, and all that encompasses. Education is about children; and therefore, should be student focused and oriented.

Postmodernism requires educational leaders to reject bureaucracy (roles, structures, orders and hierarchy) while emphasizing on creating a structure where students are at the center circled by educational stakeholders, representing that the students are the core of education. The students then become the first priority of educators since educators are they to meet the needs of each individual student in order to maintain success.

Empowerment will need to be given to all staff so that they can make constructive decisions. This allows a cohesive team that is vested in all aspects of the success of the school. The staff will also be respected for their knowledge and their contributions.

It calls on leadership to implement creative changes where the school becomes a place of rigor and excitement, where learning takes place, while meeting the needs of all students. It also requires leadership to provide a School curriculum that create a higher level of learning that challenges students, prepare students for college and beyond, thus making them productive members of society.

Educational leadership needs to break the bureaucratic tape and lead schools into the future by creating new processes and deconstructing the status quo. It will require leadership to demand for revolutionary ideas and strategies, thus encouraging practices which break free from current methods and go beyond the limits of the traditional thoughts.

While leadership of the past focused on clear hierarchies, linear solutions, and automation of processes, postmodern leaders understand that today's environment requires more collaborative and complex approaches.

Ambiguity Model of Educational Management

Bush (2011,) presented ambiguity model as the fifth educational management model in his classification which stresses in turbulence, confusion, instability and complexity of organizational life, loose coupling within the groups, uncertainty and unpredictability, sensitivity to the signals emanated from the external environment, emphasis on decentralization, lack of clarity of organizational objectives and low level of appreciation of processes due to the problematic technology utilized within the organization and a fluid participation of members in decision making process. Ambiguity Model (Bush, 2003) takes into account the fact that organizations are often faced with unpredictable problems which may not be solved through a rational process. Managers' skills in making rational choices depend on whether or not they are able to select an option from a range of alternatives which have been prepared to deal with predictable situations (Bush, 2003). However, in fact, managers are often faced with unforeseen circumstances presented by the internal and external environment for which they are unprepared. These pressures may require decisions to be made which appear to be irrational when seen in the context of an organization's long-term objectives. It is this 'mix of rational and anarchic processes' (Bush, 2003) which defines the Ambiguity Model. It is a model which offers little guidance for managers, but one which does help to explain the sometimes

<https://cejsr.academicjournal.io>

contradictory, ambiguous, and seemingly irrational actions taken by management on occasion.

According to Bush (2011), the contingency model of leadership is the type of leadership that is most appropriate for the ambiguity model of educational management. It emphasizes the advantages of applying a single leadership style to a variety of situations rather than adapting one style to each one. This involves assessing the circumstances and responding appropriately to them. Yukl (2002), in support of a contingent approach to situations and settings, argued that effective leaders constantly analyze situations to determine how to modify their behavior based on them because managerial jobs are too complex, unstable, and unpredictable to be dependent on predefined standardized responses to events.

How does it inform School Leadership?

The ambiguity model of Educational Management aligns to the contingency model of leadership. This model emphasizes on a very special kind of approach which looks at the fact the success of a leader does not only depend on his abilities. There are many other factors related to the work environment, organizational culture and employees which impact a leader's success in the process of leadership. According to Fred Fiedler, the success of a leader depends mainly in two factors, that is control of the situation and manager's set of skills. Thus the abilities/skills of the manager remains fixed whereas the situation keeps changing. A leaders effectiveness is contingent on the leader's style matching the situation and not adapting it.

This model encourages leaders to understand certain key contingency factors including follower's development, situational urgency and task structure dictates which of the several leadership approaches can be chosen.

Modern organizations faced unprecedented challenges in today's information-based competitive environment. Organizations are moving towards decentralization and members taking greater responsibility of their job tasks and work behaviors. This tend requires school leaders to adapt a more participatory management concept which encourages employees empowerment. It calls on educational leaders to encourage self-leadership which is the primary mechanism to facilitate employee empowerment. The model suggests that an empowering leadership style that encourages follower self-leadership is appropriate when follower development is currently high or continued long-term development is important, when there is low urgency and no immediate crisis, and when the task is unstructured or complex. Self-leadership is a systematic set of strategies through which individuals can influence themselves towards higher levels of performance and effectiveness.

This model also calls on educational leaders to integrate these contingency factors, leadership approaches and outcomes into a single integrative model. It urges leaders to understand the conditions under which leadership approach is likely to be most effective. The model also helps to inform and guide leaders to know when and under what conditions self-leadership should be encouraged.

Cultural Model of Educational Management

According to Bush (2011), the cultural model is the sixth model of educational management. Organizations based on this model are thought to be centered on a few ideas, norms, values, attitudes, rituals, traditions, and ideologies. Members of those organizations act and evaluate the behavior of other members based on these ideas. Additionally, it emphasizes the importance of incorporating member perspectives and comprehensions into common organizational meanings. According to Bush (2003), proponents of the Cultural Model contend that when attempting to comprehend management procedures within organizations, the informal norms and rituals that define them may be just as significant as the formal structures.

Moral leadership is the type of leadership that is most in line with the cultural models of educational

<https://cejsr.academicjournal.io>

management. According to Bush (2011), moral leadership places an emphasis on the values, beliefs, and morals of the organization's leaders. The conduct of a leader that exemplifies strong moral values, selflessness, and integrity is emphasized in moral leadership. In moral leadership, decision-making is guided by an inherent ethical system and moral goal. Emotional intelligence, or the leader's capacity to read, comprehend, and manage their own emotions while also recognizing and influencing those of those around them, is one of the most important characteristics of moral leadership. Understanding how your own principles and values align with those of your organization and remaining true to them when making important decisions are the values that drive moral leaders. Moral leadership is essential for boosting employee morale and establishing a healthy work environment of trust and respect.

How does it inform school leadership?

Leadership is widely acknowledged to play an important role in the success of an organization. This model encourages leaders to engage in a “Transformative Philosophy” (TP) to guide their moral decision-making and interrelationship in today’s demanding and competitive world. Leadership scholars emphasize the importance of moral behaviors of leaders because it is recognized as a foundation element of trust.

The TP introduced in 2018 is a framework that guides leaders and organization on how to pursue virtuous results as well as provides value-based standards to be adhered to in the governance process. Hooper and Caldwell (2018) defined TP as “an ethically-based way of thinking, feeling, and interacting that earns the respect, trust, and commitment of others by effectively aligning purpose, principles, policies, people, practices, and priorities in the constant pursuit of long-term value creation and performance excellence. It calls on educational leaders to understand the world is constantly evolving and more innovative and survival greatly depends upon proactively anticipating that change and being able to respond quickly. It therefore requires leaders to create organizational conditions to improve the likelihood of competing successfully in this changing world.

This model suggests leaders have a duty to create a change receptive organizational culture as well as adopt practices and strategies to anticipate, respond to, and initiate change. It therefore requires leaders to create cultures and strategies that acknowledge the need to anticipate, respond to, and initiate change as they will be regarded as more ethically responsible. This encourages employee commitment and engagements.

This model also suggests leader and their employees must constantly engage in learning in order to compete. Leaders should focus on the concepts of “learning organization” and “human capital” as critical organizational assets and a key to employee development, organizational success, and value creation.

This model also emphasizes the importance of the leaders’ role in creating internal integration organization systems, processes, practices and cultures that will enable the organization to perform efficiently and to accomplish intended tasks. This has a powerful impact in creating team commitment and reinforcement of organizational values. Leaders are urged to play a critical role in reinforcing organizational values and in modeling those values. With such, the leader understands his ability to perform effectively is a moral obligation and responsibility to all its stakeholders.

Synthesis and Conclusion

This article reviews school leadership, nine leadership styles and six models of educational management. It further links each leadership style to a model of educational management as follows: Managerial leadership to formal model; transformational, participative and distributed leadership to collegial model; transactional leadership to political model; postmodern and emotional leadership to subjective model; contingency leadership to ambiguity; and moral leadership to cultural model. It

<https://cejsr.academicjournal.io>

further explores how the linkage can inform school leadership practices. Managerial leadership linked to the formal model, looks at school leadership as an essential component for successful school by ensuring the implementation of the school's vision and strategy. Transformational, participative and distributed leadership styles linked to the collegial model advocate on a vision as a central dimension of leadership. In order for school leaders to succeed, it is necessary to provide a high level commitment to achieve the goals of the organization related to vision in cooperation with the staff. Moral leadership which is linked to the cultural model is based on the values, beliefs and ethics of leadership. Leaders are required to act with integrity and to develop and support goals reinforced by explicit values. Contingency leadership linked to ambiguity model calls of school leaders to acknowledge the diverse nature of school contexts and adapting leadership styles to particular situations. Given the challenges facing leadership today and unpredictable environment, it is not possible to take a one-size-fits-all leadership approach to all issues and events. Leaders are expected to properly diagnose educational problems and adopt the foremost leadership style. Transactional leadership, linked to the political models is based on the idea that leaders give something in exchange for what they want. It is therefore an exchange process. Exchange is an established political strategy for members of the organization. By implication, school leaders are expected to establish a social interacting process with members of the school centered on motivation and trust perceptions which are essential in the relationship. The postmodern and emotional leadership linked to the subjective model look at educational systems are ever-changing, and as the years go by, the struggles to meet the needs of the systems are becoming challenging for educational leadership. This linkage therefore, provides school leadership with an opportunity not only to change with times, but to create an educational environment that embraces creativity. The relevance of this linkage will greatly depend on the organizational context while its applicability will depend on the event, situation and members of the school. The validity of this linkage also depends on the following considerations: size of the institution; structure of the organization; nature of the leadership process; availability of resources and external environment (Bush, 2015).

References

1. Ahanchian, M.R. (2003), Education in the postmodern condition. Tehran: Tahoori.
2. Akpoviro, K. S., Bolarinwa, K. I., & Owotutu, S. O. (2018). Effect of Participative Leadership Style on Employee's Productivity. *Business Trends* 8(2); 48–58.
3. Ball, S. J. (1987). *The micro-politics of the school. Towards a Theory of School Organization.* New York. Metheun.
4. Baldrige, J. V. (1971). *Power and conflict in the university: research in the sociology of complex organizations.* J. Wiley.
5. Barman, K.,(2009), *Leadership Management: Achieving Breakthroughs*, Global India Publications., *Ethics* 120, 81–93. doi: 10.1007/s10551-013-1644-z
6. Bass B. M. and Avolio B. J., (1990) *Developing transformational leadership: 1992 and beyond*, *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 14 , 21–27
7. Bass Bernard M. and Avolio(1994) Bruce J., *Improving organizational effectiveness -Through transformational leadership*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California
8. Bhatti, M. H., Ju, Y., Akram, U., Bhatti, M. H., Akram, Z., & Bilal, M. (2019). Impact of Participative Leadership on Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Mediating Role of Trust and Moderating Role of Continuance Commitment: Evidence from the Pakistan Hotel Industry. *Sustainability* 5(2); 34-44.
9. Boje, D & Dennehy, R. (2000). *The Story of Post Modern Management.* Sage Publication.

<https://cejsr.academicjournal.io>

10. BOLAM, R. (1999). Educational administration, leadership and management: towards a research agenda. In T. Bush, L. Bell, & R. Bolam (Eds.), *Educational management: Redefining theory, policy and practice* (pp. 192-205). SAGE Publications Ltd, <https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781446219676.n15>
11. Burns J. M., (1978), *Leadership*, Harper & Row, New York
12. Bush, T., 2015. *Leadership și management*. Iași: Editura Polirom.
13. Bush, T. (2011). *Theories of educational leadership and management*: Sage.
14. Bush, T. (2003). *Theories of Educational Leadership and Management* (3rd ed.), London: Sage Publishing Ltd.
15. Bush, T. (1995), *Theories of Educational Management: Second Edition*, London, Paul Chapman.
16. Bush, T. (1986), *Theories of Educational Management*, London, Harper and Row.
17. Charry, K. (2012). *Leadership Theories - 8 Major Leadership Theories*. Retrieved March 23, 2014 from <http://psychology.about.com/od/leadership/p/leadtheories.htm>
18. Cherry, K. (2011). *What is a theory?* Retrieved March 19, 2014, from <http://psychology.about.com/od/tindex/f/theory.htm>.
19. Cheng, B. S., Chou, L. F., Wu, T. Y., Huang, M. P., and Farh, J. L. (2004). Paternalistic leadership and subordinate responses: establishing a leadership model in Chinese organizations. *Asian J. Soc. Psychol.* 7, 89–117. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-839x.2004.00137.
20. Cuban, L. (1988) *The Managerial Imperative and the Practice of Leadership in Schools*. State University of New York Press, Albany, NY.
21. Daresh, J. (1998), *Professional development for school leadership: the impact of US educational reform*. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 29 (4), 323–33.
22. Dressler, B. (2001). *Charter school leadership*. *Education and Urban Society*, 33(2), 170-185.
23. Effelsberg, D., Solga, M., and Gurt, J. (2014). *Transformational leadership and follower's unethical behavior for the benefit of the company: a two-study investigation*. *J. Bus.*
24. Everard, K.B., Morris, G., & Wilson, I. (2004). *Effective School Management* (4th ed.), London: Sage Publishing Ltd.
25. Fairholm, M. R., and Fairholm, G. W. (2009). *Understanding Leadership Perspectives: Theoretical and Practical Approaches*. New York, NY: Springer.
26. Farh, J. L., Cheng, B. S., Chou, L. F., and Chu, X. P. (2006). "Authority and benevolence: employees' responses to paternalistic leadership in China," in *China's Domestic Private Firms: Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Management and Performance*, eds A. S. Tsui, Y. Bian, and L. Cheng, (New York, NY: M.E. Sharpe), 230–260.
27. Farr, S. (2011). *Leadership, not magic*. *Educational Leadership*, 68(4), 28-33. Retrieved from www.ascd.org
28. Fidler, B. (1997), *School leadership: some key ideas*, *School Leadership and Management*, 17 (1), 23–37.
29. Fidler, B. (2000), *A situational approach to leadership*, *School Leadership and Management*, 20(4), 403–05.
30. Fullan, M. (1992a), *Successful School Improvement*, Buckingham: Open University Press.

<https://cejsr.academicjournal.io>

31. Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2002). *Primal Leadership: Realizing the Power of Emotional Intelligence*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
32. Greenfield, T. (1991) 'Reforming and revaluing educational administration: whence and when cometh the phoenix', *Educational Management and Administration*, 19(4): 200–17.
33. Greenfield, T. (1973), *Organisations as social inventions: rethinking assumptions about change*, *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 9(5), 551–74.
34. Greenfield, T. and Ribbins, P. (eds) (1993) *Greenfield on Educational Administration: Towards a Humane Science*, London: Routledge
35. Gronn, P. (2010), 'Where to next for educational leadership?', in Bush, T., Bell, L. and Middlewood, D. (Eds.), *The Principles of Educational Leadership and Management*, London, Sage.
36. Gunter, H. (2001), *Leaders and Leadership in Education*, London, Paul Chapman.
37. Hallinger, P. (2003), 'Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership', *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33 (3): 329-350.
38. Hallinger, P. and Heck, R. (2010), 'Leadership for learning: Does collaborative leadership make a difference in student learning? *Educational Management, Administration Leadership* 38 (6): 654-678.
39. Hallinger, P. and Heck, R. (1999), *Next generation methods for the study of leadership and school improvement*, in Murphy, J. and Louis, K. (eds.), *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration*, 2nd edition, San Francisco, Jossey Bass, (141–62).
40. Hallinger, P. and Murphy, J. (1985), *Assessing the instructional management behaviour of principals*, *The Elementary School Journal*, 86(2), 217–47
41. Handy, C. (1993). *Understanding organizations*: Penguin UK.
42. Harris, A. (2010). *Distributed leadership: evidence and implications*. *The Principles of Educational Leadership & Management*, 55-69.
43. Harris, A. (2010), 'Distributed leadership: Current evidence and future directions', in Bush, T., Bell, L. and Middlewood, D. (Eds.), *The Principles of Educational Leadership and Management*, London, Sage.
44. Harris, A. (2003). *Distributed leadership in schools: leading or misleading?* *Management in Education*, 16(5), 10-13.
45. Harris, A., & Chapman, C. (2002). *Effective leadership in schools facing challenging circumstances*. Retrieved from <http://www.nscl.org.uk>
46. Harris, A., & Spillane, J. (2008). *Distributed leadership through the looking glass*. *Management in Education*, 22(1), 31-34. doi:10.1177/0892020607085623
47. Hooper, H. & Caldwell, C., (2018). "A Transformative Philosophy: Insights to Excellence) in *Human Resource Management: A Transformative Approach*, Caldwell, C. & Anderson, V. (Eds.) Hauppauge, NY: NOVA Publications, Chapter Three.
48. Howell J. M. and Avolio B. J.,(1993), *Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated -business unit performance*, *J. Serv. Mark .*, 16, 487-502
49. Hoyle, E. (1999). *The two faces of micropolitics*. *School leadership & management*, 19(2), 213-222.

<https://cejsr.academicjournal.io>

50. Hoyle, E. and Wallace, M. (2007), 'Educational reform: An ironic perspective', *Educational Management, Administration and Leadership*, 35 (1): 9-25
51. Hoyle, E. and Wallace, M. (2005), *Educational Leadership: Ambiguity, Professionals and Managerialism*, London, Sage.
52. Jung D. I., (2001) Transformational and transactional leadership and their effects on creativity in groups, *Creativity Research Journal*, 13, 185-195
53. Kahai S. S., Sosik J. J. and Avolio B. J., (1997), Effects of Leadership Style and Problem Structure on Work Group Process and Outcomes in an Electronic Meeting System Environment, *Personnel Psychology*, 50, 1-146
54. Kanungo, R. N., and Mendonca, M. (1996). *Ethical Dimensions of Leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
55. Keough T & Tobin B. (2000). Postmodern leadership and the policy lexicon: from theory proxy, to practice. Quebec: Level University, 8-91.
56. Kirkbride, P. (2006), "Developing transformational leaders: the full range leadership model in action", *Industrial and Commercial Training*, Vol. 38 No. 1, pp. 23-32.
57. Kivipold, K., & Vadi, M. (2008). A tool for measuring institutional leadership and its implementation for the evaluation of organization leadership. *Working Papers in Economics*, 25(168-180), 55-71.
58. Lamb, R. (2013). How can Managers Use Participative Leadership Effectively? Retrieved March 17, 2014, from <http://www.task.fm/participative-leadership>
59. Leithwood, K. (1994). Leadership for school restructuring. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 30(4), 498-518.
60. Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D. and Steinbach, R. (1999), *Changing Leadership for Changing Times*, Buckingham, Open University Press.
61. Lussier, R., and C. Achua (2015), *Leadership: Theory, application, & skill development*, Cengage Learning.
62. Mayrowetz, D. (2008). Making sense of distributed leadership: Exploring the multiple usage of the concept in the field. *Education Administration Quarterly*, 44(3), 424-435.
63. Miller, T. W., & Miller, J. M. (2001). Educational leadership in the new millennium: a vision for 2020. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 4(2), 181-189.
64. Naylor, J. (1999). *Management*. Harlow, England: Prentice Hall.
65. Ogawa, R. T., & Bossert, S. T. (1995). Leadership as an organizational quality. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 31, 224-243.
66. Ogawa, R. T., & Hart, A. (1985). The effect of principals on the instructional performance of schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 22, 59-72.
67. Pasternack, B. A., Williams, T. D., Anderson, P. F. 2001. Beyond the Cult of the CEO – Building Institutional Leadership. *Strategy & Business*, Vol. 22, 69–79..
68. Rhodes, C.P. and Brundrett, M. (2008) What makes my school a good training ground for leadership development? Classroom Teachers from 70 Contextually Different Primary and Secondary Schools in England. *Management in Education*, 22(1), pp. 21-27.
69. Rhodes, C.P. and Brundrett, M. (2010) Leadership for Learning. In: T. Bush and L. Bell, *The*

<https://cejsr.academicjournal.io>

Principles and Practice of Educational Management (2nd ed). London: Sage Publications.

70. Rhodes, C.P., Brundrett, M. and Nevill, A. (2008) Leadership Talent Identification and Development. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 36(3), pp. 311-335.
71. Robinson, V. M. J. (2001). Embedding leadership in task performance. In K. Wong & C. Evers (Eds.), *Leadership for quality schooling: International perspectives* (pp. 90-102). London: Falmer.
72. Robinson, V. M. J. (2007). *School leadership and student outcomes: Identifying what works and why*. Winmalee, NSW: Australian Council for Educational Leaders: (Monograph 41, ACEL Monograph Series Editor David Gurr) 28 pages. Reprinted in SPANZ: *The Journal of the Secondary Principals Association of New Zealand*, December 2008.
73. Sackney L & Mitchell C (2001) . Postmodern expressions of educational. In : K L eith wood & P Ha lling er (e ds). *The Second International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
74. Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, 9(3), 185-211.
75. Sarason, S. B.(1990).*The predictable failure of educational reform: Can we change course before it's too late?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
76. Sammons, P., Hillman, J. and Mortimore, P. (1995) *Key Characteristics of Effective Schools. A Review of School Effectiveness Research*. Institute of Education, London.
77. Sergiovanni, T. (1991). *The Principalship: A Reflective Practice Perspective*. Needham Heights, MA: AllynBacon.
78. Sergiovanni, T. (1984). Leadership and excellence in schooling. *Educational Leadership*, 41(5), 4-13.
79. Sheppard, B. (1996), Exploring the transformational nature of instructional leadership, *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, XLII(4), 325–44.
80. Southworth, G. (2002), Instructional leadership in schools: reflections and empirical evidence, *School Leadership and Management*, 22 (1), 73–92.
81. Southworth, G. (1993) 'School leadership and school development: reflections from research', *School Organisation*, 12 (2): 73–87
82. Spillane, J. P. (2005). Distributed leadership. *Education Forum*, 69, 143-150. Retrieved from <http://distributedleadership.org>.
83. Spillane, J. P. (2006). *Distributed leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
84. Spillane, J. P. (2008, October). Leading and managing educational change: Engaging the challenge in practice. Presentation at NCCA conference, Carrickmacross, CO: Monaghan.
85. Spillane, J. P., & Diamond, J. B. (2007). *Distributed leadership in practice*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
86. Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. (2000). Towards a theory of leadership practice: A distributed perspective. Evanston, IL: Institute of Policy Research
87. Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. B. (2001). Investigating school leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Educational Researcher*, 30(3), 23-28. Retrieved from <http://distributedleadership.org>

<https://cejsr.academicjournal.io>

88. Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. B. (2004). Towards a theory of leadership: A distributed perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 36(1), 3-34. doi:10.1080/0022027032000106726
89. Starratt, R. J. (2001), Democratic leadership theory in late modernity: an oxymoron or ironic possibility? *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 4 (4), 333–52.
90. Tang, C., and Naumann, S. (2015). Paternalistic leadership, subordinate perceived leader-member exchange and organizational citizenship behavior. *J. Manag. Organ.* 21, 291–306. doi: 10.1017/jmo.2014.84
91. Thoonen EEJ, Slegers PJC, Oort FJ, et al. (2011) How to improve teaching practices: the role of teacher motivation, organizational factors, and leadership practices. *Educational Administration Quarterly* 47: 496–536.
92. Timperley, H. S. (2005). Distributed leadership: Developing theory and practice. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 37(6), 395-420. doi:10.1080/00220270500038545
93. Townsend, T. (2010). Educating school leaders to think and act both locally and globally. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 13(3), 335-348. doi:10.1080/1363124.2010.505300
94. Wasserberg, M. (1999), Creating the vision and making it happen, in Tomlinson, H., Gunter, H. and Smith, P. (Eds.), *Living Headship: Voices, Values and Vision*, London, Paul Chapman.
95. Wiesenthal, A. M., Kalpna, J., McDowell, T., & Radin, J. (2015). The new physician leaders: Leadership for a dynamic health. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 1(3) 567-571.
96. Wong, C. S., & Law, K. S. (2002). The effects of leader and follower emotional intelligence on performance and attitude: An exploratory study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13(3), 24274.
97. Yang Jen-Te, (2007), Knowledge sharing: Investigating appropriate leadership roles and collaborative culture, *Tourism Management*, 28, 530-543
98. Ykaf, R., (1996). *Interactive Planning (Management in accordance with revolution for the future development of the organization)*, Translation by Sohrab Khalili Shorini. Tehran: Maad Publication.
99. Yukl, G. A. (2002). *Leadership in organizations (5th ed.)*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.