Theories of Educational Management and Leadership: A Review

Majid Ghasemy

PhD Candidate (Educational Management), Faculty of Education, University Malaya, 50603 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, Tel: +6011-25620075, E-mail: majid_ghasemy@um.edu.my

Sufean Hussin

Professor at the Department of Educational Management, Planning & Policy, Faculty of Education, University of Malaya (UM), Telephone: +603-79675036, Fax: +603-79675010, E-mail: drsufean@um.edu.my

1   Abstract.

Education is the main change agent in developing and developed societies. As a result, the management of educational organizations is regarded as one of the most important management perspectives. Basically, educational management is a discipline with respect to the management of educational organizations and since this field of study has been developed on the premises of other resolutely established disciplines, there is not a unique statement to set out this subject of study. Although the process of determining organizational goals is fundamental to educational management, linking between goals and aims of education and actions of educational management may be considered as vital. The other issue of importance is the closely interlocked relation between educational management and educational leadership and a true combination of them to reach educational excellence. This paper aims to review the models of educational management and their links with the leadership styles based on the discussions as well as the typology of educational management and leadership models provided in the 4th edition of the book "Theories of Educational Management & Leadership" (Bush, 2011).

2   Theories of Educational Leadership and Management

Management is a series of actions and tasks relevant to highly well-organized and effectual application of resources within the organization in order to attain organizational objectives (Sapre, 2002, p.102) and educational management

may be regarded as a discipline with respect to the management of educational organizations (Bush, 2011, p.1).

From another perspective, Bolam (1999) believed that educational management is a function of execution for fulfilling decided policies and made a distinction between educational management and educational leadership.

However, there should be a main link between goals and aims of education and actions of educational management (Bush, 2011, p.1) and thus, the process of determining goals of organizations is fundamental to educational management (Bush, 2011, p.3).

The tag used to describe this field of study has altered over time from educational administration to educational management and finally to educational leadership (Gunter, 2004).

Theories and models of educational management have been categorized by different scholars. Cuthbert (1984) classified educational management theories to five groups including analytic-rational, pragmatic-rational, political, phenomenological and interactionist models.

Additionally, Bush (2011, p.34-35) based on four element including the level of agreement about objectives, the concept of structure, the level of environmental influences and the most appropriate strategies within the educational organizations has categorized the models of educational management into six clusters which are formal, collegial, political, subjective, ambiguity and cultural models and finally has linked these six models with nine different leadership styles in the context of educational organizations.

These nine leadership styles are managerial, participative, transformational, distributed, transactional, postmodern, emotional, contingency and moral. It is notable that since the concentration of instructional or learning-centered leadership is mostly on learning and teaching (direction of influence rather than the essence and origin of influence), it has not been linked with any of the six models of management (Bush, 2011, p.17-18).

2.1   Formal Model of Educational Management

Structural, systems, bureaucratic, rational and hierarchical models constitute the formal models of educational management (Bush, 2011, p.40-42). These models assume that the structure of the organizations is hierarchical and predefined objectives are pursued based on a rational method. The authority and power of heads is the product of their formal positions and also these managers are responsible and accountable to sponsoring bodies for the operation and execution of agreed policies in their institutions.

Formal models of educational management are linked with the managerial leadership style (Bush, 2011, p.60). This style of leadership has some assumptions such as concentration on execution of actions, tasks and activities

proficiently as a means of facilitation of other organizational members activities, high degree of rationality in the behavior of organizational members and allocation of authority and influence to formal positions based on the status of the positions within the organizational chart (Leithwood, Jantzi & Steinbach 1999, p.14).

Moreover, managerial leadership, unlike most of the leadership styles, does not encompass vision as a core concept since it is concentrated on successfully management of existing activities rather than dreaming a better future for the educational organization (Bush, 2011, p.61).

2.2   Collegial Model of Educational Management

The second models of educational management are collegial models. 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, p. 72).
Collegial models are linked with three leadership styles which are transformational leadership, participative leadership and distributed leadership (Bush, 2011, p.84-91).

The core assumptions of transformational leadership are concentration on commitments and competences of organizational members and the fact that the higher level of personal commitments to organizational objectives as well as greater capacities for goal attainment would contribute to the productivity of the organization (Leithwood et al., 1999, p. 9).

Additionally, Leithwood (1994) has conceptualized the transformational leadership in education sector based on eight dimensions as building school vision, setting school objectives, intellectual stimulation provision, offering individualized patronage, best practices and core organizational values modeling, high performance anticipations display, productive culture creation within schools and finally encouraging participation in school decision making process by developing required structures.

Participative leadership which sometimes is described as shared, collaborative or collegial leadership is the second approach pertinent to collegial models of educational management. It has been defined as the opportunities for the organizational members to be engaged in the decision making process within the organization (Hoyle & Wallace, 2005, p.124) and this engagement is a vital action needs to be taken (Leithwood et al.,1999, p.12). As a normative theory, participative leadership is premised on three criteria which are an increase in school efficiency due to applying participative approach, justification of participation by democratic principles

and availability of leadership to any lawful stakeholders in the framework or context of site-based management (Bush, 2011, p.87).

The third leadership style related to collegial models is distributed leadership which has been at the center of attention of scholars in the 21ˢᵗ century (Gronn, 2010, p.70). Harris (2010, p. 55) also mentioned that this leadership style is one of the most significant approaches within the context of educational leadership in the past decade. This kind of leadership is detached from the positional authority and is based on the competencies and skills of members in the organizational chart. In this way, Harris (2003) stated that distributed leadership focuses on seeking and utilization of expertise wherever it exists in the organization regardless of the organizational positions of the skilled members. In summary and in the context of educational institutions, distributed Leadership is a leadership approach in which collaborative working is undertaken between individuals who trust and respect each other's contribution and happens most effectively when people at all levels engage in action, accepting leadership in their particular areas of expertise and finally requires resources that support and enable collaborative environments.

2.3   Political Model of Educational Management

The third model of educational management is the political model (Bush, 2011, p.99) 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 Micro-politics by Ball (1987) and Hoyle (1999) as well.

Baldridge (1971, pp. 23-24) 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, 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, pp. 109-111). 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.

Transactional leadership is deemed as the most relevant leadership style to political model of educational management (Bush, 2011, p.119). According to Miller and Miller (2001), transactional leadership is a process of exchange and Judge and Piccolo (2004, p.755) suggested that transactional leaders concentrate on appropriate exchange process of resources. They identified three dimensions of transactional leadership as contingent reward, which is a degree to which constructive exchange process is built between the leader and the followers; active mode of management by exception, which implies monitoring members by the leader, problems prediction and taking corrective actions; and finally passive mode of management by exception which implies the behavior of passive leaders in facing problems. These passive leaders wait until some problems caused by the behavior of members happen and then take any required actions.

It is notable that based on the concept of transactional leadership, exchange process is viewed by the members of the organization as a reputable political strategy.

2.4   Subjective Model of Educational Management

The fourth educational management model is the subjective model (Bush, 2011, pp.126-137). This model mainly stresses the aims and perceptions of individual members in the organization rather than subgroups, units or the whole organization and thus the concept of organizational objectives is rejected based on this perspective. Hence, organizations are depicted as complicated entities reflecting interpretations and understandings of its members derived from their backgrounds, beliefs, values, and experiences and are formed based on the interaction of perceptions of these organizational members rather than something unchanging, stable or preset. In other words, organizations have different meanings for their members and finally, based on subjective model, relationships with external environments are considered subservient and therefore, little attention is paid to these interactions from subjective perspective.

With respect to related leadership styles to subjective model of educational management, it may be noted that postmodern and emotional leadership are aligned with subjective model (Bush, 2011, pp.138-140). Postmodern approach as a relatively recent model of leadership have been studied by some scholars. Keough and Tobin (2001, p.2) identified several characteristics of postmodernism including multiplicity of realities, language incapability to reflect reality, stress in multiple meanings and appreciation of situations at local level with specific attention to diversity. Additionally, Bush (2011, p.139) argued that few evidences are postulated by postmodern leadership in terms of how leaders are anticipated to take action.

Emotional leadership as the second leadership style associated with subjective model is concerned with emotions and feelings. Emotion implies individual motivation and meaning of events rather than a fixed and stable concept or fact and appreciation of emotions of leadership is central to high performance and long term sustainability in headship (Crawford, 2009).

2.5 Ambiguity Model of Educational Management

Bush (2011, pp.147-154) 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.

Based on an empirical study by Cohen and March (1986) in the context of higher education institutions in the US, it was suggested that the ambiguity is the main feature of universities and the garbage can as the most popular perspectives of ambiguity was developed which rejected the rational process of decision making introduced in formal models. Based on this concept, the decision making process and choice opportunities within it is considered as a fundamental ambiguous activity similar to a garbage can into which different types of problems and solutions are dumped. These scholars argued that on the premise of the garbage can, the decisions would be made based on the four fairly independent streams and interaction between them which are problems, solutions, participants in the process of decision making and the choice opportunities.

While the participation of leaders in policy making process or forsaking direct involvement in that process are regarded as two leadership strategies to deal with ambiguous situations (Bush, 2011, p.164), the most appropriate leadership style aligned to ambiguity model of educational management would be the contingency model of leadership. This leadership style primarily stresses the advantages of adapting leadership styles to the specific situations by assessing the situations as well as reacting appropriately to them rather than applying one style to diverse situations.

Yukl (2002, p.234) in support of exerting contingent approach to setting and situations argued that the managerial jobs are so complicated, instable and unpredictable to be dependent on predefined standardized responses to events and effectual leaders are permanently analyzing situation for evaluating how to change their behaviors based on them.

2.6 Cultural Model of Educational Management

The sixth model of educational management is cultural model (Bush, 2011, p.170). Based on this model, some concepts such as ideas, beliefs, norms, values, attitudes, symbols, rituals, traditions and ideologies are considered as central to organizations and the members behave and assess the behavior of other members based on them. Moreover, it focuses on how understanding and viewpoints of members are integrated into common organizational meanings.

The most relevant leadership style to be aligned with cultural models of educational management is moral leadership which stresses in the values, beliefs and ethics of leaders in the organization (Bush, 2011, p.184). Some other terms has also been used by scholars to define moral or values-based leadership including ethical leadership (Starratt, 2004; Begley, 2007), authentic leadership (Begley, 2007), spiritual leadership (Woods, 2007), and poetic leadership (Deal, 2005).

3 Synthesis and Conclusion

Enderud (1980) reflected on the inadequacies of each of the theories described, and developed an integrative model as an attempt at synthesis the models of educational management and incorporated ambiguity, political, formal and collegial perspectives as a sequence into his integrative model based on time management of a successful decision making process. Another synthesis has been done by Theodossin (1983, p.88) linking subjective model with formal model. Hybrid model of Gronn (2010) is also another synthesis linking singular and distributed leadership.

It is obvious that the environment of educational institutions is completely opaque and turmoil and there has been always a need for adaptation to the environment as well as reorientation in policy making in this sector. In fact, charting change and transformation programs is a must for educational institutions to be successful and survive. Based on this, although the typology provided by Bush (2011, p.36) has been a great contribution to the field of educational management, however change-oriented leadership style, which is pertinent in turbulent environments (Ekvall and Arvonen, 1991; Yukl, 1999), has not been linked with any educational models. This style of leadership concerns about identification of threats and opportunities through monitoring the environment, proposing new strategies as well as building new visions, innovative thinking encouragement and risk taking for advancement of change initiatives within the organization (Yukl, Gordon & Taber, 2002).

It may be argued that transformational leadership implies charting transformations in organizations. However, based on the comparison made by Yukl (2004) between transformational, charismatic and change-oriented leadership, the latter leadership style has some specific features that do not exist in transformational and charismatic leadership and thus, change-oriented leadership is conceptualized as a more comprehensive leadership style in a turbulent environment.

It must be noted that change-oriented leadership is based on the belief that human society keeps on evolving continuously, therefore learning lessons of the past and anticipating what is going to happen in future become the necessary beginning point. Trend analysis seems to be the first step. Change-oriented leadership seeks to improve the entire education system of a country or a school organization which has been afflicted with hindrances, conflicts, and turmoil that have prevented it from progressing forward and becoming better.

Any model or theory on leadership becomes irrelevant if it does not bring improvement. Change for the better is difficult to do. Resistance to change by individuals in an organization, or divisions in a bureaucratic system, is a common phenomenon, because change causes revamping of habits, values, and ways of doing things. Individuals first want to know what they can get from a change. Other than that, change requires resources, retraining, management, and commitment.

It is proposed here that change-oriented leadership must involve the following steps:
- Trend analysis
- Organizational development thinking, i.e. diagnosis of problems and necessary changes to be made
- Values to be acquired
- Outcomes and benefits to be attained
- Plan and strategies for change
- Resources for change

References

1. Baldridge, J. V. (1971). Power and conflict in the university: Research in the sociology of complex organizations: Wiley New York.
2. Ball, S. J. (1987). The micro-politics of the school. London: Methuen, 67, 79.

3. Begley, P. T. (2007). Editorial Introduction Cross-cultural Perspectives on Authentic School Leadership. Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 35(2), 163-164.
4. Bolam, R. (1999). Educational administration, leadership and management: towards a research agenda. Educational Management.
5. Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1991). Reframing organizations (Vol. 130): San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
6. Bush, T. (2011). Theories of educational leadership and management: Sage.
7. Cohen, M. D., & March, J. G. (1986). Leadership and ambiguity: The American college president: Harvard Business Press.
8. Crawford, M. (2009). Getting to the heart of leadership: Emotion and educational leadership: Sage.
9. Cuthbert, R. (1984). The Management Process, E324 Management in Post Compulsory Education, Block 3, Part 2: Buckingham: Open University Press.
10. Deal, T. (2005). Poetical and political leadership. The essentials of school leadership, 110-121.
11. Ekvall, G., & Arvonen, J. (1991). Change-centered leadership: An extension of the two-dimensional model. Scandinavian Journal of Management, 7(1), 17-26.
12. Enderud, H. (1980). Administrative Leadership in Organized Anarchies. International Journal of Institutional Management in Higher Education, 4(3), 235-253.
13. Gronn, P. (2010). Where to next for educational leadership. The principles of educational leadership and management, 70-86.
14. Gunter*, H. (2004). Labels and labelling in the field of educational leadership. Discourse: studies in the cultural politics of education, 25(1), 21-41.
15. Handy, C. (1993). Understanding organizations: Penguin UK.
16. Harris, A. (2003). Distributed leadership in schools: leading or misleading? Management in Education, 16(5), 10-13.
17. Harris, A. (2010). Distributed leadership: evidence and implications. The Principles of Educational Leadership & Management, 55-69.
18. Hoyle, E. (1999). The two faces of micropolitics. School leadership & management, 19(2), 213-222.
19. Hoyle, E., & Wallace, M. (2005). Educational leadership: Ambiguity, professionals and managerialism: Sage.
20. Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: a meta-analytic test of their relative validity. Journal of applied psychology, 89(5), 755.
21. Keough, T., & Tobin, B. (2001). Postmodern leadership and the policy lexicon: from theory, proxy to practice. Paper presented at the

Proceedings of the 2001 Pan-Canadian Education Research Agenda Symposium Teacher Education/Educator Training: Current Trends and Future Directions.

22. Leithwood, K. (1994). Leadership for school restructuring. Educational Administration Quarterly, 30(4), 498-518.

23. Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Steinbach, R. (1999). Changing leadership for changing times: McGraw-Hill International.

24. 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.

25. Morgan, G. (1997). Images of organization.

26. Sapre, P. (2002). Realizing the Potential of Education Management in India. Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 30(1), 101-108.

27. Starratt, R. J. (2004). Ethical leadership (Vol. 8): Jossey-Bass.

28. Theodossin, E. (1983). Theoretical perspectives on the management of planned educational change. British Educational Research Journal, 9(1), 81-90.

29. Woods, G. (2007). The 'Bigger Feeling' The Importance of Spiritual Experience in Educational Leadership. Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 35(1), 135-155.

30. Yukl, G. (1999). An evaluative essay on current conceptions of effective leadership. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 8(1), 33-48.

31. Yukl, G. (2004). Tridimensional leadership theory: A roadmap for flexible, adaptive leaders. Leading in turbulent times, 75-91.

32. Yukl, G., Gordon, A., & Taber, T. (2002). A hierarchical taxonomy of leadership behavior: Integrating a half century of behavior research. Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 9(1), 15-32.

33. Yukl, G. A. (2002). Leadership in organizations.