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I. Executive summary

1. Introduction

Education has wide-ranging impact on a variety of aspects in a society from building human capital for economic development to helping people find meaning in life. Despite the differences in the agendas for formal education between developing countries and developed countries, the general situation in education is that it needs to constantly revise and adapt itself to contemporary changes in the global and local contexts. Amidst this constantly shifting world, leadership is often described as an indispensable force that helps navigate education through such challenges.

Leadership, in the organizational convention, however, cannot be applied as it is into the educational setting. Thus, there is a need for research in educational leadership to not only translate findings from organizational leadership but also to conceptualize educational leadership as uniquely different from the leadership of private organizations. In so doing, we can design policies and practices catered specifically to the context of education and its improvement.

This report aims to give a brief summary of research in educational leadership. Insights and synthesis statements will be made whenever possible, and readers should be noted that this is entirely subjected to the exploratory nature of the author’s attempt to inform himself and readers of the mentioned areas. This report should not be considered a comprehensive body of work on educational leadership, but rather, a quick guide to topics for further discussions.

Readers need to be aware that the report will not cover some areas in educational leadership. This might happen because of one of the following reasons: (1) a lack of studies in the literature pertinent to the area in question; (2) the leadership of certain stakeholders (such as teacher leadership or student leadership) is not considered as it would dilute the focus of the report on more important actors; (3) the author’s unsuccessful attempt to find/track the relevant lines of inquiry, which is different from an apparent lack of literature as mentioned in (1). Nevertheless, the report will make readers aware of these areas and provide references to authors working on such areas.

Throughout the report readers will encounter many instances of the word “reform” in education. When this term is invoked, it is referring to changes in curriculum and instruction, leadership styles, school organization, and so on. There are certainly global trends in reform but they will be contextualized in many circumstances. Hargreaves and Goodson (2006) (as cited by Sahlberg, 2006) summarized the three phases of global education reform: the first, up to the late 1970s, was characterized by “large-scale curriculum reforms, increased professional autonomy of teachers and school-driven improvement through innovations”; the second, from late 1970s to mid-1990s, “focused on increasing external control of schools, teachers and students through inspections, evaluations and assessments that led to an increase of regulations in schools and decreased autonomy of teachers”; the third, from mid-1990s to 2006, was dominated by standardized testing and market-oriented management style of the curriculum, with a consequent reduction in teachers’ professional autonomy. Lastly, from 2006 onwards, in the wake of the knowledge economy, education reform takes the form of increased
flexibility, creativity and networking/partnership (Sahlberg, 2006; Lumby, 2009), in the hope that such an approach will reconcile the quest for economic competitiveness and education sustainability. It will prove useful to keep in mind this chain of events as it provides the global context within which one would examine educational leadership.

2. **Method**
The report utilized an exploratory review method by starting out without making any assumption about educational leadership. Important journals in the field were identified and noted throughout the search for relevant literature. After familiarization with the literature through a few key reviews, key terms were defined, arguments were jotted down, and an initial set of themes was established. This set of themes was constantly updated and even revised as the author delved deeper into the literature. Key authors in the literature were also identified and the report attempted to track the bodies of works produced by these authors to gain further depth into their lines of inquiry. Finally, a reference list was created and each reference properly organized with a tag system based on major themes. Seven key research questions emerged from this procedure, which sets the orientation for even further readings of the literature.

3. **Key questions**

- What are the prominent types of leadership discussed by the literature? For each type, what are the dimensions? What are the similarities and differences between the types? Is there a single unifying theory of school leadership?
- What influences leadership in education? What are the outcomes of leadership in education?
- How does system-level leadership differ from school-level leadership?
- How does school leadership differ from HE leadership? What main issues are discussed in the current literature on HE leadership?
- How effective are leadership development programs described by the literature? What are the elements of a good leadership development program?
- What is the state of school/HE leadership research in East Asia and Southeast Asia? What are the challenges facing research, practice, and development of educational leadership in the two regions?
- Based on the literature review in this report, what recommendations are there for research, practice, and professional development in educational leadership?
4. **School Leadership: Types, Outcomes, and Antecedents**

The type of leadership used at any one time must be contingent on the school context. Three types of leadership – Instructional, Transformational, and Distributed – will be described. Due to the recent surging interest in Distributed Leadership, this type of leadership will be discussed in greater detail than the others.

Research on educational leadership, be it instructional, transformational, or distributed, primarily focuses on student outcomes rather than the antecedents to leadership. This is understandably so because, as Menon (2011) mentioned, “without more evidence on their effects on learning, transformational and distributed leadership runs the risk of remaining intuitive conceptualizations of leadership, with limited or no impact on educational policy and practice”. Also, Kirby, Paradise, and King (1992) noted that specific leader behaviors, rather than personality, inspire followers to higher levels of performance. This remark further justifies the significance of research on leadership and its outcomes rather than antecedents of leadership.

Leadership in education has long been thought to exert an indirect effect on student learning rather than a direct effect. More recent evidence might suggest otherwise. The report will sum up recent findings in the literature about outcomes of school leadership through the Four Paths model proposed by Leithwood, Patten and Jantzi (2010).

The report examines both personal and contextual factors as antecedents to educational leadership. Because good leadership is very much based on the context (Hallinger, 2003), little could be claimed about an overarching set of personal factors that could predict the future turnout of educational leadership. However, there is still a need to select appropriate candidates for formal leadership roles to at least minimize the influence of human factors in bringing about negative outcomes (e.g., downward student performance trend). Also, initial information about a candidate’s competencies will help with training efforts should the candidate be selected for principalship. Lastly, some antecedent variables play a role in mediating or moderating the relationship between leadership and student learning (Seashore, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, & Anderson, 2010; Hallinger, 2010).

For studies on antecedents which do not specify what specific type of leadership they are referring to, the report will consider those antecedents to be general to all types of leadership, even though this might be a less-than-rigorous assumption. Since the range of antecedents to leadership in education is very broad and merits a literature review on its own, the report will not cover all of them in detail. Interested readers might want to look at studies on specific antecedent variables for a deeper understanding.

The report will briefly discuss the recent suggestion by the literature to merge Instructional leadership and Transformational leadership under one framework. Finally, it will discuss educational leadership at the district level and other relevant issues.
5. **Higher Education Leadership**

The literature in Higher Education (HE) Leadership is dwarfed by that of School Leadership. Research has been limited in both content and methodology due to obstacles posed by the complexity of the interaction between the three factors: the institution's relationships with other sectors and stakeholders, its multi-level structure, and its various objectives. Several challenges will be described in detail.

To understand the structure within which leadership in HE functions, the report first looks at the different models of university governance and the evolution of the administrative system in universities. Then, it moves on to describe the conflict between the collegial culture of academics and the market-oriented model of governance emerging in the early 1980s, and how this conflict might be resolved through the concertive actions of Distributed Leadership.

Next, the section considers the different competencies and effective leadership behaviors observed by empirical studies on HE leadership. The section wraps up with two different promising models that can be used to conceptualize HE Leadership: one based on Distributed Leadership theories (Jones, Harvey, Lefoe, & Ryland, 2014) and the other based on Adaptive Leadership theory (Randall & Coakley, 2007).

6. **Education Leadership Development (Professional Development)**

This section first presents the limited empirical evidence for the effectiveness of Education Leadership Development. Despite the lack of empirical support, practitioners demand good professional development programs that cater to their leadership needs. Thus, elements of good programs in both leadership preparation and in-service training are described in detail for both school and HE leaders. Lastly, because leadership learning is a life-long endeavor, this section will discuss the ways in which leaders can distill learning from their everyday encounters within the education setting.

7. **Education Leadership in East Asia and Southeast Asia: Challenges for research, Practice, and Leadership development**

The state of educational leadership research in and about East Asia and Southeast Asia is sparse, limited in scope and depth, and characterized by weak methodology. Weak research capacities across universities in the regions (except for some countries) have been identified as the most important reason that explains the slow pace and low quality of education leadership research.

Besides research, this section also discusses several contextual factors that obstruct research, practice, and professional development of education leadership in the regions. These factors are Economy, Culture, Social Stability, Corruption, and University Rankings.

8. **Recommendations**

This section includes recommendations for research, practice, and leadership development provided by both the literature and the author's personal insights. The
Aims are to raise the awareness of researchers about potentially productive areas for further study and to inform leaders of best practices in the field, or point them to resource for such practices.

II. Method
Because I started with almost no background in the educational leadership literature, I decided to adopt an exploratory approach to literature review. Hallinger (2013) stated that “exploratory reviews are most suitable when a problem… is poorly understood and/or when relevant empirical research remains limited in scope”. According to Stebbins (2001), due to such lack of research or unfamiliarity with the literature, “an open-ended approach to data collection is, therefore, wholly justified.” Thus, I used grounded theory as the guideline to explore the available literature in educational leadership because this is a recognized general research method that claims to sensitize researchers with few or no exposure to the literature to existing theories and concepts early in their reviewing process and assist researchers in finding a way to generate research questions relevant to his/her interests.

I first identified popular journals in educational leadership (including Higher Education) based on h-4 index of Google Scholar and SCImago rankings. The following journals were identified (this list is not exhaustive):

- Educational Administration Quarterly
- Educational Management Administration and Leadership
- School Leadership and Management
- Leadership and Policy in Schools
- International Journal of Leadership in Education
- International Studies in Educational Administration
- Journal of Educational Administration
- Journal of School Leadership
- School Effectiveness and School Improvement
- International Journal of Educational Management
- Review of Educational Research
- Journal of Higher Education
- Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management
- Review of Higher Education
- Higher Education Quarterly
- Studies in Higher Education

I made a note of these journals for my initial search for sources. To sensitize myself to the literature, I searched Google Scholar using key words “educational leadership”, “school leadership”, “effects”, “outcomes”, “review”. I picked articles with a high number of citations by other papers, relevance (by Title and Abstract), recency, in descending order of importance. As I read the articles, I highlighted terms, concepts, and arguments made by authors; at the end of each reading I wrote a summary for the articles, noting key findings, defining terms, keeping track of authors whose works were often cited, and wrote down my own remarks and thoughts for each article.
After reading the first few articles, I started a reference list which was intended to be a storage collection of all the relevant articles I would come across in my literature search later on. I also devised a tag system which aimed to categorize the collected articles into different themes. The system was constantly revised as I read deeper into the literature. The final tag system consisted of seven themes: (1) Nature of article, which can be conceptual, empirical, practical, or review; (2) Professional development with a sub-theme of Program Evaluation; (3) Cross-cultural research and Country of studied samples; (4) Level of Education which includes K-12 and Tertiary education; (5) Level of administration which is divided into school level and system level; (6) Leadership type which includes Instructional, Distributed, Transformational, Social Justice, Adaptive, and Teacher Leadership; and (7) Methodology and Research design.

I arrived at a few conclusions about educational leadership at the end of the review process. Firstly, there are three separate but overlapping knowledge bases in educational leadership. They are School Leadership (K-12), Higher Education Leadership, and Educational Leadership Development. Second, of the three areas, the literature on School Leadership is the most mature, in both depth and scope. The literature in Higher Education leadership is much smaller. Even though Educational Leadership Development can be included as a part of the other fields, most studies in this area often focus on specific programs and their evaluation, with only a few reviews compiling the best practices in designing effective leadership development programs. Therefore I decided to separate the discussion of education leadership development from the other two.

Finally, as I have a special interest in the state of education in East Asia and Southeast Asia, I consciously looked out for any pertinent study that emerged. The findings originating from and written about these regions will contribute to the literature and practices of education leadership in the region themselves and at the same time enrich our knowledge of educational leadership across cultures.

The research questions I eventually came up with which will be tackled by this report are as follows:

- What are the prominent types of leadership discussed by the literature? For each type, what are the dimensions? What are the similarities and differences between the types? Is there a single unifying theory of school leadership?
- What influences leadership in education? What are the outcomes of leadership in education?
- How does system-level leadership differ from school-level leadership?
- How does school leadership differ from HE leadership? What main issues are discussed in the current literature on HE leadership?
- How effective are leadership development programs described by the literature? What are the elements of a good leadership development program?
• What is the state of school/HE leadership research in East Asia and Southeast Asia? What are the challenges facing research, practice, and development of educational leadership in the two regions?
• Based on the literature review of this report, what recommendations are there for research, practice, and professional development in educational leadership?

III. School leadership: Types, Outcomes, and Antecedents

1. Types and their Dimensions
   a. Instructional leadership
      According to Hallinger (2003), the concept of instructional leadership (IL) appeared in North America during the 1980s. Hallinger (2000, cited by Hallinger, 2003) introduced the most common conceptualization of instructional leadership. It consists of three dimensions, with the following descriptors:

      Table 1. Dimensions of Instructional Leadership (Hallinger, 2003)

      | Dimension | Defining the School’s mission | Managing the instructional program | Promoting a positive school-learning climate |
      |-----------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
      | Descriptors | 1. Framing the school’s goals | 1. Supervising and evaluating instruction | 1. Protecting instructional time |
      |           | 2. Communicating the school’s goals | 2. Coordinating the curriculum | 2. Promoting professional development |
      |           |                                | 3. Monitoring student progress | 3. Maintaining high visibility |
      |           |                                |                                | 4. Providing incentives for teachers |
      |           |                                |                                | 5. Providing incentives for learning |

      The Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale was developed around this conceptual framework, and served as a reliable and valid instrument for the measurement of principal IL (Hallinger, Wang, & Chen, 2015). It consists of three forms: for principals, for teachers, and for supervisors. All forms rate the IL behaviors of the principal, but from different perspectives.

      IL should be studied not only at the principal level, but also at the teaching staff level. Indeed, studies of distributed instructional leadership have been designed to address this particular boundary issue of IL (e.g. Marks and Printy, 2003; Leithwood et al., 2009; Lee, Hallinger, & Walker, 2012). This type of leadership is now known throughout the field as “Leadership for Learning”. However, as it is beyond the scope of this section to discuss this concept, interested readers might refer to Rhodes and Brundrett (2010) and Lee et al. (2012) for more information on the concept.

   b. Transformational Leadership
      Transformational leadership (TL) was first proposed by Burns (1978) as a part of the transactional – transformational leadership dichotomy. According to Bass (1985), as
cited by Menon (2011), transactional and transformational forms of leadership are separate but interdependent, and not necessarily opposite in nature. In fact, transformational forms of leadership can enhance transactional forms through their effects on follower motivation and creativity.

The five factors of transformational leadership include (1) Attributed Idealized influence, (2) Behavioral Idealized influence, (3) Inspirational motivation, (4) Intellectual stimulation, and (5) Individualized consideration. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire developed by Bass and Avolio (1995, 2000) is usually used to assess transformational leadership in quantitative studies of principal leadership.

Leithwood and Jantzi (2006) put the existing model of transformational leadership into a theory of action model for leadership practice in education. The original model comprises three main categories with nine dimensions of practice, which can be further subdivided into more specific practices depending on the context of the leader’s work setting.

Table 2: Dimensions of Transformational Leadership (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Setting Directions</th>
<th>Developing People</th>
<th>Redesigning the Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Descriptors | 1. Clarifying reasons for strategy implementation  
2. Support in goal-setting for learning and teaching  
3. Demonstrating high expectations | 1. Individual support for strategy implementation  
2. Encouraging new ideas for teaching  
3. Modeling high level of professional practice | 1. Encouraging collaboration  
2. Creating conditions for participative decision-making  
3. Developing good relationships with parents |

This framework is constantly revised and updated to inform practitioners with the latest research findings available supported by empirical evidence. It is now known as the Ontario Leadership Framework (OLF), with the latest revision in 2012 (Leithwood, 2012).

The measurement of transformational leadership in most studies used multiple instruments. The six most frequently used instruments are listed by Sun and Leithwood (2012) as follows:

- Bass and Avolio’s MLQ (as stated above);
- Nature of School Leadership survey (NSL) (Leithwood, Aitken, & Jantzi, 2001);
- Leadership Practices inventory (LPI) (Kouzes & Posner, 1995);
- Leadership Behavior Questionnaire (LBQ) (Sashkin, 1990);
A measure by Wiley (1998), developed for a model of TL detailed in the corresponding paper.

c. **Distributed Leadership**

Distributed leadership (DL) is associated with different sources of leadership (formal and informal). Proponents of this form of leadership assert that its values lie in three kinds of “power”: normative, representational, and empirical (Harris & Spillane, 2008). The normative power of DL is reflected in current changes in school leadership practice. The expansion of leadership tasks and responsibilities calls for leadership focused on teams rather than individuals. The representational power indicates the flexibility and diversity of expertise and resources that DL may capitalize on to meet the increasing demands and pressures on schools such as complex collaborative arrangements. Lastly, increasing research evidence has shown consistent results about the positive effects of DL on school outcomes and student learning (empirical power).

Prior research has focused on the heroic perspective of leadership, perhaps because it is easier to point fingers at a specific figure of authority rather than to identify many individuals responsible at the same time. This approach to leadership also makes the task of measuring key outcome variables less tedious, because instead of having to measure outcome variables with regard to a very broad and bureaucratic system, researchers can just gather this data from a few formal leaders. Accountability is also not easy to measure in a distributed system because accountability must be dispersed across many stakeholders.

However, Yukl (1999), as cited by Bolden, Petrov, and Gosling (2008) and Menon (2011), pointed out four ambiguities in transformational leadership (TL): (1) the overlap between transformational and transactional leadership, (2) the overlap and high intercorrelation between the 5 factors of TL, (3) omission of important empirically-supported behaviors of effective leadership, and (4) insufficient attention paid to the importance of contextual factors.

Spillane and Gronn provided two most popular interpretations of DL. According to Spillane (2006), DL is formed through distributed cognition and the effect of social context on human learning and behaviors. Leadership emerges as a shared practice by individuals seeking to address organizational issues and problems; in the school context, DL is the outcome of the interaction between school leaders, teaching staff, supporting staff, and their situations (Spillane, Hunt, & Healy, 2008).

Rather than identifying the various actors or stakeholders in a distributed system like Spillane, Gronn thinks of DL as collective actions (Gronn, 2002). Two forms of DL were proposed: the “additive” form, an uncoordinated leadership pattern where participants in the leadership process do not account for the leadership activities of one another; and the “holistic” form in which exists a conscious and managed collaborative patterns involving some or all leadership sources in the organization. The result of the holistic form is that “the sum of the work performed by leaders adds up to more than the parts” (Gronn, 2002).

Lee, Hallinger, and Walker (2012) brought up the issue that developing and maintaining a distributed perspective in school leadership must be intentional. This
goes in line with Harris and Spillane's (2008) review on distributed leadership and the subsequent Scottish primary school case study by Torrance (2014), which both stressed on the deliberate nature of a distributed perspective in leadership. Again there seems to be consensus in the literature (e.g. Torrance, 2014; Seashore et al., 2010) regarding the effortful ‘holistic’ form of distributed leadership proposed by Gronn.

Increasingly, research suggests that there may be a link between distributed leadership and transformational leadership. Even as Leithwood and Jantzi (2006) were discussing their empirical results with regard to transformational leadership in the primary school context, they noted that it was very important for future researchers to be mindful of the sources of transformational leadership, hinting that the indirect effect of transformational leadership from the principals/headteachers on student learning is not always consistent across all empirical studies (see Outcomes section for more details), and that the transformational elements might lie in teacher leadership, which is a part of the distributed leadership system. There is an uncanny overlap between these two ‘distinct’ concepts. Timperley (2005) brought this point into focus with an important enquiry regarding these two leadership forms: “whether one is a sub-set of the other, and if so which is a sub-set of which”. Also, Leithwood et al. (2009) presented evidence from their study that the influence of the principals in high-performing schools with high amount of distributed influence is not lowered. Rather, they found that these schools “were not hierarchically flatter. People at all levels had more influence, thereby increasing the density and intensity of leadership”. It’s hard not to concur with this notion in view of the well-founded belief that transformational changes can only happen when such changes are conducted throughout all layers of the organization.

James Pounder’s conceptualization of transformational classroom leadership provides a new way to look at teacher leadership under a distributed system (Pounder, 2006). This might also account for the perception that distributed leadership overlaps with transformational leadership. According to Pounder’s reasoning, teacher transformational leadership exerts its effects not only in the classroom (direct instructional effect on students), but also in a lateral manner. In other words, teachers not only teach but also inspire and facilitate the work of other teachers and as such reinforce a common vision and mutually agreed upon goals, and guide others in their self-development (Beachum & Dentith, 2004, as cited by Pounder, 2006).

Gronn (2008) mentioned that leadership is “hybrid” or “highly influential individuals working in parallel with collectivities”. A study on distributed leadership by Bolden, Petrov, and Gosling (2008) resounded this notion of hybridity between distributed and transformational leadership in the Higher Education context, which will be discussed further in the respective section of this report.

Most of the empirical evidence for distributed leadership so far is derived from qualitative studies, and this suffers from a major drawback: “the inability to make tight comparisons of the constitutive elements in the phenomenon being observed from the wide diverse range of contexts” (Hairon & Goh, 2014). This issue is brought up not to lower the importance of qualitative studies, but to stress on the need to operationalize the construct of distributed leadership so that further quantitative
empirical evidence for its outcomes and antecedents may be derived. This will be further discussed in the Recommendations section for future research.

2. **Outcomes**

How does principal leadership affect student learning? This is the most important question in the educational leadership literature as it decides the validity and usefulness of a leadership concept. Even though school outcomes encompass numerous variables, student learning is ultimately the single most important outcome with regard to the field of education. In this subsection, we will discuss the many variables associated with the outcomes of principal leadership.

The general consensus in the published literature is that leadership has significant but indirect effects on student learning (e.g. Menon, 2011; Sheppard, Hurley, & Dibbon, 2010; Leithwood et al., 2010; Leithwood & Riehl, 2003; Silins & Mulford, 2002). However, a recent review and meta-analysis of 79 unpublished theses and dissertations from 1998 to 2012 by Sun and Leithwood (2012) contradicts this long-held assumption. In particular, they found that principal leadership has a significant, but small, direct positive effect on student achievement (a measure of student learning). In addition, results revealed an overall non-significant indirect effect of leadership on student achievement. Research designs used to investigate the indirect effects of leadership as reviewed by Sun and Leithwood showed mixed results.

We will examine the direct and indirect effects of leadership on student learning. The indirect path will be emphasized as it is still more or less the primary focus among researchers. Drawing from the 4 Paths Model (Leithwood et al., 2010) as an overarching conceptual framework, this report will classify outcome variables (mediators) into the 4 paths (Rational, Emotional, Organizational, and Family).

a. **Direct Effect on Student Learning**

Hallinger, Bickman, and Davis (1996) found no direct effect of instructional leadership (IL) on student learning (operationalized as student achievement).

Reviews by Leithwood and Jantzi (2005) and Sun and Leithwood (2012) revealed interesting findings. Based on the “vote-counting” approach, conclusions from both reviews were undecided about whether the effect of transformational leadership (TL) on student learning is direct or not. However, by means of a meta-analysis, Sun and Leithwood (2012) found a small positive direct effect of TL on student learning, and at the same time, non-significant indirect effect of TL.

Menon’s (2011) review of the literature in distributed leadership (DL) found positive direct effect of DL on student learning (when measured as student engagement).

A meta-analysis by Karadağ, Bektas, Çoğaltay, and Yalçın (2015) of the principal leadership literature as a whole revealed a direct, medium effect of leadership on student learning (when measured as student achievement).

Given these mixed findings, it is difficult to make a conclusion on whether leadership has a direct effect on student learning or not just by looking at these results.
b. Indirect Effect on Student Learning – The Four Paths Model

The Four Paths model is proposed by Leithwood, Patten, and Jantzi (2010). It is useful as a way to organize the studies of school leadership’s indirect effects on student learning. The model probably derived its name from two aspects: the use of mediators as “bridges” between leadership and student learning and the literal path-analysis method often used to test the significance of different connections and causal directions within a theoretical network of studied variables. The following are findings of outcome-mediator variables according to each path.

The Rational Path

Leithwood et al. (2010) defined this path as “rooted in the knowledge and skills of school staff members about curriculum, teaching, and learning.” The report includes two variables to represent this path: teacher expectation and instructional quality.

Teacher expectation reflects the knowledge of teachers on curriculum’s difficulty level and the awareness of their students’ capability for learning. It is also called “academic press” in some cases (e.g. Leithwood et al., 2010). Hallinger et al. (1996) found a positive effect of IL on teacher expectation. Leithwood et al. (2010) concurs, and added that it positively correlated with and accounted for 23% variation in student achievement. This result by Leithwood and colleagues also applies to TL.

Instructional quality reflects the depth and breadth of knowledge of a curriculum, and its suitability for students. It also entails focused instruction which is a style of teaching that “incorporates deliberate pacing and content of classroom work while also providing opportunities for students to take charge of their own learning and construct their own knowledge” (Seashore et al., 2010, p. 39). Leithwood et al. (2009) found that instructional quality accounted for a significant amount of variation in student learning, while finding significant positive correlation between IL and instructional quality. They also found a direct positive effect of DL on instructional quality, through shared instructional leadership. Menon (2011) also found reports of DL’s positive effect on instructional quality in her review.

The Emotional Path

This path is defined as “the feelings, dispositions, or affective states of staff members, both individually and collectively, about school-related matters” (Leithwood et al., 2010). The report includes five variables (all are teacher-related) to represent this path: teacher commitment, teacher trust, collective teacher efficacy (CTE), teacher enthusiasm, and teacher job satisfaction.

Teacher commitment can be simply understood as “motivation for change” which consists of teachers’ interest and belief in the vision of school leaders. Reviews by Leithwood and Jantzi (2005) and Leithwood and Sun (2012) both found a positive effect of TL on teacher commitment, probably due to the critical component of Vision which characterizes TL. Menon (2011) also reported a positive effect of DL on teacher commitment.

Teacher trust, as a combined measure of both teacher-teacher trust and principal-teacher trust, is significantly affected by IL (Leithwood et al., 2009). Meanwhile, Leithwood et al. (2010) found significant positive correlation between TL
and teacher trust. Similarly, Leithwood and Sun (2012) reported moderate positive effect of TL on teacher trust.

CTE is a belief about colleagues’ ability for improving student learning within a school (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2008). Of the three leadership types, only IL does not correlate with CTE (Fancera & Bliss, 2011; CTE still positively correlated with student achievement in the study). Both TL and DL are positively correlated with CTE (Menon, 2011; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005). In particular, Leithwood et al. (2010) found that CTE, varying as a function of TL, accounted for 34% variation in student learning. Meanwhile, meta-analytic results by Leithwood and Sun (2012) revealed a small positive effect of TL on CTE.

Teacher enthusiasm is positively influenced by DL with a medium effect (Sheppard et al., 2010). In a comprehensive review on emotional factors in school leadership, Berkovich and Eyal (2015) reported a positive effect of leadership in general on teacher enthusiasm.

The final variable on this path is teacher job satisfaction. Reviews by Leithwood and Jantzi (2005) and Leithwood and Sun (2012) reported a positive effect of TL on the variable.

The Organizational Path
According to Leithwood et al. (2010), “the Organizational Path includes features of schools that frame the relationships and interactions among organizational members… Collectively, these variables encompass teachers’ working conditions, which in turn have a powerful influence on teachers’ emotions.” The report chooses three variables to represent this path: Professional Learning Community (PLC), teacher empowerment, and school culture.

PLC is a strategy in which a group of teachers meet regularly, share expertise, and work collaboratively to improve teaching skills and the academic performance of students (Stoll, Bolam, & McMahon, 2006). It is known to be effective in building school capacity for teaching and learning (Toole & Louis, 2002). Leithwood et al. (2009) and Leithwood et al. (2010) reported contrasting findings with regard to the effect of IL on PLC. While the former claimed that IL significantly predicts PLC, the latter said there was no correlation between the two. Similarly, Leithwood and colleagues’ findings on the relationship between TL and PLC also contradict one another. While Leithwood and Jantzi (2005) and Leithwood and Sun (2012) found a positive, small to moderate effect of TL on PLC, Leithwood et al. (2010) claimed no correlation between the two.

Teacher empowerment is the act of investing teachers with the right to participate in the determination of school goals and policies and to exercise professional judgment about what and how to teach (Bolin, 1989, p.82). Teacher empowerment is positively affected by both TL (Leithwood & Sun, 2012) and DL (Menon, 2011).

School culture is the set of norms, values, beliefs, and practices that shape how a school functions. School leadership affects school culture in general: according to Berkovich and Eyal (2015), a principal is able to turn a school culture that perpetuates inequality to a culture that favors social justice. In other reviews, TL
is shown to have significant effect on school culture (Leithwood & Sun, 2012; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005).

**The Family Path**
The Family Path includes any family-related factors that are considered alterable by school leadership. Leithwood et al. (2010) reasoned that, “since best estimates suggest that everything schools do within their walls accounts for about 20% of the variation in students’ achievement, influencing variables on the Family Path is likely to be a high-leverage option for school leaders.” Hence the inclusion of alterable family factors as mediators in the relationship between principal leadership and student learning. Reflecting the lack of research in this area (a notion in agreement with Leithwood et al., 2010, p. 682), the report only includes one variable: family involvement.

Leithwood et al. (2009) found that principals’ behaviors and attitudes significantly influenced family involvement. This finding is particular to IL, and the degree of instructional support principals provide parents will decide how effectively parents can help their children with schoolwork. TL also has a significant positive correlation with family involvement (Leithwood et al., 2010).

### 3. Antecedents

Researchers generally do not focus on the antecedents of principal leadership as much as they do for outcomes of principal leadership. This is partly due to the more urgent need to look at the outcomes of various leadership types to validate their conceptualizations. However, this is not the only reason for the lack of research on antecedents.

Most antecedents will not be studied in terms of a first order relationship with leadership; instead, they are considered “moderators”. The justification for this subtlety in antecedent research has never been explicitly stated in the literature, but might have been implied by Hallinger (2010) when he examined 30-years’ worth of research by unpublished doctoral dissertations: he criticized many first-order research designs because most of them were not linking the indirect effects of leadership antecedents to student learning, thus tremendously lowered the ability of those studies to inform practice. Re-framing studies of antecedents as “moderators”, on the other hand, would bring research designs to the next level of analysis as researchers get to appreciate the complex network of variables exerting their influence on leadership and its outcomes. Regardless, this section describes the conclusions from several sources that apparently reviewed research on antecedents to leadership.

A review by Hallinger (2010) summarized theoretical models used to study antecedent effects of principal demographics and school context variables from 1983 to 2010 on instructional leadership and show a consistent trend of interest in the topic.

Antecedents fall into two categories (Walker & Hallinger, 2015): personal factors such as leadership traits, years of practical experience, education level, and contextual factors such as education policy, school culture, district’s socioeconomic status (SES). This section on principal leadership antecedents will examine research
in the two categories. Since the contextual factors researchers studied for each type of leadership are different from one another, that category will be further examined in terms of general findings, and findings for each of the three described types of leadership (i.e. instructional, transformational, and distributed). There is seemingly more consensus among researchers on what to study for personal factors so findings will not be separately considered for each type of leadership.

a. Contextual factors

**General**

School principals will have to adopt leadership styles that fit the demand of educational reform and policies by the Ministry of Education. Gopinathan, Wong, and Tang (2008) tracked the development of Singapore’s school leadership matching three different phases in the country’s history. Intriguingly, but not coincidentally, the characteristics of each period roughly matched the global trend in education reform as stated by Sahlberg (2006). This reiterates the suggestion by Bottery (2006) that researchers must look into global contextual factors when studying educational leadership. In Singapore’s case, for example, as the country transitioned from a post-independence period to the contemporary era of the knowledge economy, principals gained more autonomy and were less constrained within a strict curricular compliance enforcement system established for economic efficiency, while leadership practices to promote creativity and flexibility were encouraged. Principal leadership styles changed accordingly, from “efficient implementers” (more transactional) to “innovators” (more transformational) (Gopinathan et al., 2008).

**For Instructional Leadership (IL)**

(1) School context:

Degree of IL adopted by principals is restricted by the school context variables such as school size and school SES (Hallinger, 2003). Hallinger argues that in large schools, “direct involvement in teaching and learning is simply unrealistic” because the number of students makes it impossible for the principal to pay attention to each and every child. Also, school level plays a role in determining the extent of principals’ IL as subjects taught might become more and more diverse, requiring more depth of knowledge as well as specific teaching methods, all of which the principals are less acquainted with. Nguyen and Ng (2014) found that the effect of primary school principals’ IL is higher than that of secondary school principals in Singapore.

(2) Student SES and Parent Involvement:

Hallinger et al. (1996) tested a model of IL with student SES and parent involvement among various other antecedents. They found that the two variables had positive effects on the principal’s IL, as well as teacher expectation. In contrast, Fancera and Bliss (2011) found that student SES has no correlation with IL and accounts for more variation in student achievement than IL.
**For Transformational Leadership (TL)**

1. **School culture:**
   Leithwood and Jantzi (2005) found that a school culture of flexibility often results in more collaborative values, more resources and responsive administration which are generally the behavior goals of TL.

2. **Social culture and School reform initiatives:**
   Compared to School culture, these two variables are both macro-contextual factors and hence reported together. Review by Leithwood and Jantzi (2005) found no correlation between social culture (which is the culture of the district where school leadership is studied) and TL. However, in agreement with general findings on educational policies, they found that School reform initiatives created uncertainty and introduced competition which induced more TL behaviors in principals.

**For Distributed Leadership (DL)**

No literature written on the contextual antecedents of DL could be found. Even the most recent review paper on DL (Menon, 2011) did not mention any contextual factor as moderators for the DL-student learning relationship. Future researchers in this area might consider the idea that the curriculum becomes more diverse and subjects become more specialized with greater depth (and ultimately become distinct across different disciplines in Higher Education) as school level increases. Thus, school level should be a contextual antecedent factor of DL. As Timperley (2005) puts it, education leadership will become “inevitably distributed”. The instructional role of secondary school principals and university presidents should range from weak to almost non-existent. This role is relinquished to teachers and professors/lecturers of the teaching staff, thus giving rise to DL through teacher leadership and academic leadership.

b. **Personal factors**

1. **Problem-solving expertise:**
   Consisting of six different components – problems interpretation, goal-setting, principles and values, constraints, solution processes, and mood, this personal factor was conceptualized in the OLF (Leithwood, 2012) as a cognitive resource that would help leaders find solutions to unstructured problems.

2. **Knowledge about school and classroom conditions:**
   Belonging to the same cognitive resource category as Problem-solving expertise, knowledge about school and classroom conditions entails knowing where the problems lie, and knowing which course of action to take to best tackle those problems. Leithwood (2012) suggested Four Paths (rational, emotional, organizational, family) through which leaders may use to look into and solve school problems.

3. **Emotional Intelligence (EI):**
   Berkovich and Eyal (2015) conducted a comprehensive review of both qualitative and quantitative research on emotional factors in school leadership. Their review of
emotional intelligence (as a general ability) in principals revealed that higher EI correlates positively with leadership. They reasoned that leaders with high EI are better at both understanding other stakeholders’ emotions and regulating emotions coming from themselves and from others. Leithwood (2012) also considered EI in a similar way as Berkovich and Eyal (2015), and named it a social resource for good leaders.

(4) **Principal Gender:**
Hallinger et al. (1996) found no correlation between instructional leadership and the gender of principals in their review. Similarly, a review by Leithwood and Jantzi (2005) for transformational leadership reported no such correlation either.

(5) **Principal – Teacher Trust:**
Research examining Trust as an outcome variable of leadership abounds but the same cannot be said of the literature on antecedents. The only study available on Trust as an antecedent to leadership is by Seashore et al. (2010). Using path analysis, they found significant two-way relationships between Principal – Teacher Trust and instructional leadership as well as distributed leadership.

(6) **Principal’s Self-efficacy:**
In the school context, self-efficacy is a belief about one’s own ability for improving instruction and student learning. Leithwood and Jantzi (2008) reported a significant positive correlation between instructional/transformational leadership and principal’s self-efficacy. Leithwood (2012) also listed principal’s self-efficacy as one of the three psychological resources available to an education leader.

(7) **Principal formal training experiences:**
Formal training experiences include Principal Preparation Programs and on-the-job formal training that principals participate in as part of their professional development process. These experiences have a significant effect on the transformational leadership behaviors of principals (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005).

In a qualitative study, Torrance (2014) acknowledged the formal principal preparation program in Scotland for helping interviewed principals maintain and inculcate a “distributed perspective in leadership” into the schools they were in charge of.

The lack of research on antecedents to distributed leadership might be partially explained by Seashore et al. (2010, p. 54). According to their findings, distributed leadership emergence depends on a principal’s goals for the school and on his/her preferences regarding the use of professional expertise. Since goals vary from school to school, it is difficult to formulate a fixed set of characteristics or prerequisites for distributed leadership. The study shows that the development of distributed leadership is highly situational and subjected to the will of the principal.

4. **Instructional Leadership and Transformational Leadership: Why not both?**
The 1980s saw Instructional Leadership as the “model of choice” for effective educational leadership, but that situation changed in the 1990s, which saw the rise of transformational leadership. As Hallinger (2003) observed, towards the end of the 1990s, a combination of the two leadership forms emerged, one that simultaneously made use of features characterizing both instructional and transformational leadership.

Hallinger (2003) also compared the two forms of leadership on three bases: top-down vs. bottom-up focus on school improvement, target for change, transactional vs. transformational leadership. The following table elaborates on the similarities and differences of the two leadership constructs:

Table 3: Similarities and Differences between Instructional and Transformational Leadership (based on Hallinger, 2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Similarities</th>
<th>Instructional</th>
<th>Transformational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Creating a sense of purpose in the school;</td>
<td>- Developing a climate of high expectations and a school culture focused on</td>
<td>- Shaping the reward structure of the school;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Developing a climate of high expectations and a school culture focused</td>
<td>the improvement of teaching and learning;</td>
<td>- Organizing a wide range of activities aimed at intellectual stimulation and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on the improvement of teaching and learning;</td>
<td>- Shaping the reward structure of the school;</td>
<td>personal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Shaping the reward structure of the school;</td>
<td>- Organizing a wide range of activities aimed at intellectual stimulation and</td>
<td>- Modeling the values that are being fostered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Organizing a wide range of activities aimed at intellectual stimulation</td>
<td>- Modeling the values that are being fostered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and personal development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differences

1. **Top-down or Bottom-up?**
   - Top-down: “co-ordination and control”
   - Bottom-up: staff participation in decision-making

2. **First-order or second-order?**
   - First-order: to directly impact the quality of curriculum and pedagogy
   - Second-order: to increase the capacity of others in the school to produce first-order effect on learning

3. **Transational or transformational?**
   - More transactional
   - More transformational

In concordance with this observation, Marks and Pinty (2003) conducted an empirical study to examine the mentioned form of integrated leadership. They found that transformational leadership is a necessary but insufficient condition for instructional leadership, and that when the two forms coexist, there is substantial effect on school performance, measured as quality of pedagogy and student achievement. However, it is important to note that the form of instructional leadership in question is "shared instructional leadership", which involves both the principal and teachers in designing and supervising the curriculum. So far we have only discussed the instructional role of the principals without considering this role in teachers. With the increasing interest in distributed leadership, the integration of instructional...
leadership into a distributed framework opens new ways to think about how leadership affects student learning, and how this knowledge can benefit practice. Further discussion on this can be found in section VII.

The Ontario Leadership Framework (Leithwood, 2012) added “Improving the Instructional Program” and “Securing Accountability” to its core processes. The “Developing People” and “Redesigning the Organization” dimensions in the original set of transformational leadership practices (as presented in Section 1b, above) are now “Building Relationships and Developing People” and “Developing the Organization to Support Desired Practices”, respectively. The total five dimensions of an overarching leadership practice framework as such and their more specific sets of practices allow for the expression of all three types of leadership in schools, and probably more.

Robinson, Lloyd, and Rowe (2008) meta-analysis result revealed that the average effect of instructional leadership on student outcomes was three to four times that of transformational leadership. However, this result has been subjected to much discussion in the literature (Leithwood & Sun, 2012). In particular, Leithwood and Sun criticized the methodology for meta-analysis used by Robinson and colleagues, which deviates from most other authors in the field and therefore “threatened the validity and claims of their study”. It is worth noting the finding of this meta-analysis by Robinson et al. (2008) because it seems to overestimate the effect of instructional leadership and downplay that of transformational leadership by a large margin, while the literature largely suggests the considerable overlap between these two types of leadership.

5. **Level of Administration**
   a. **The role of the district leaders in education**

It is worth treating system-level educational leadership in a separate section, both because of the distinct role it plays in education outcomes and the lack of research in the literature at this level.

The municipal level (district/city) of educational leadership plays an important role in school improvement and school effectiveness because they oversee the implementation of national/state policies on education. In the context of the global reform trend in school education, good leadership at this level is almost as important as school level leadership. Located higher in the administrative system for education, district leadership creates and modifies the district conditions in which school leaders function. Thus, district leadership directly affects the contextual factors (antecedents) that in turn influence school leadership. Even though this notion is reasonable by logical reasoning, it has also been supported empirically (e.g. Leithwood & Jantzi, 2008; Waters & Marzano, 2006).

However, there is an overall lack of research on the leadership of system-level leaders for education. Evidence for good leadership practices of educational leaders at the municipal level are not very well researched (Leithwood, 2012, p. 40): “… the evidence base used to develop this section of the OLF reflects the relatively modest amount of empirical research reported about successful system-level leadership, as compared with school-level leadership.” Leithwood et al. (2009) cited Anderson (2006) for listing 11 empirically supported district characteristics that have a positive
effect on student learning, but evidence on how these features are linked to district leadership is still “extremely thin and quite inconclusive”.

The study of educational leadership at the system level must always consider the socio-cultural and political contexts in which the education system is located. For example, Leithwood et al. (2009) found that smaller district size appeared to foster the use of instructional expertise distributed across different people in the district, maybe because it is easier for smaller districts to have closer communities, hence facilitating communication and collaborative endeavors.

Most studies on the impact of district leadership to date primarily looked at US superintendents’ effectiveness. The most important studies to date might be that of Waters and Marzano (2006) and a collection of works by Seashore et al. (2010) where they studied the effect of district leadership on student achievement. Davis’ (2014) work might be the most recent follow-up with a limited scope focusing on the correlation between student achievement and the transactional/transformational/passive avoidant leadership style of district leaders.

Waters and Marzano (2006) conducted a meta-analysis comprising 2714 districts in the US to study the impact of district leadership on student learning. They found a small effect size of .24 (p < .05) between the two variables, and concluded that the district leaders certainly have a role to play in improving student learning. Interestingly, they also found that the superintendent tenure has a weak but significant correlation with student achievement (r = .19, p < .05).

School leaders’ self-efficacy is positively correlated to district-level leaders’ (superintendents and central office staff) interpersonal support (Gareis & Tschannen-Moran, 2005, as cited by Leithwood & Jantzi, 2008). Even though causality is yet established, path analysis conducted by Leithwood and Jantzi (2008) suggested that district leadership has a significant positive effect on district conditions, which in turn affect principal’s collective and self efficacy (see Figure 1 below). A study by Seashore and colleagues (2010) found converging evidence to support this notion and extend it: district leadership practice that improves principals’ self-efficacy has positive effects on school conditions and student learning. They also found that district size is a significant moderator of this relationship: the larger the districts, the less the influence. This is consistent with Leithwood et al. (2009).

Figure 1: Modelling the Relationship among Variables related to Collective and Self Efficacy (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2008)
The latest research on district leadership and student learning was conducted by Davis (2014). This study provides converging evidence with what has been found by Waters and Marzano (2006) on principal autonomy: superintendents' passive avoidant leadership style is positively correlated with student achievement. Granted autonomy, principals are empowered to do what they need to do to improve the instruction quality at their schools.

In practice, the OLF (Leithwood, 2012, p. 39) pointed out that system leaders must be concerned with many stakeholders in Direction setting, Developing people, Developing organization, Improving the instructional program, and Securing accountability while putting each of these dimensions into specific contexts. Additionally, the brief review of the literature by this report seems to suggest that system leaders exert their greatest influence on student learning through providing support for schools rather than getting too involved in the decision-making process of school principals.

In education systems in which policies for reform are insisted to be strictly complied by local school leaders, Leithwood and Jantzi (2006) called for accountability in student achievement attributed to policy-makers, assuming that such practices have been faithfully adhered to by school leaders. As such, the municipal educational leaders might act as the middlemen between school principals and the Ministry of Education to oversee implementation of reformative policies by school leaders and to adapt the spirit of the broad reform vision to the local context which they are more well-versed in than policy-makers at the ministerial level.

b. Other issues

Lumby (2009) discusses “collaboration” and “partnership” in an education system to conceptualize leadership. The tenet of this boundary-spanning “partnership” in education lies in the “collective aims to raise achievement for all
[schools] within a local area, rather than just those in one’s own school”. Partnership between schools can take either a ‘hard’ form, where a governing body for a certain number of schools is created, or a ‘soft’ form, where schools retain their autonomy and arrange among themselves certain initiatives to carry out this ‘partnership’. In both of these forms, the partnership would transcend the levels of administration in an education system. It is a very fluid concept/structure that deserves further study for two reasons. Firstly, it is compatible with three forms of concertive action (spontaneous collaboration, intuitive working relations, and institutionalized practices) in distributed leadership theory (Gronn, 2002). Secondly, it allows for a new way to examine distributed leadership one level higher than the school level of administration, while flexible enough to include both school-level and district-level leadership into the fray. This should have implications for the concept of distributed leadership as interpreted by Gronn (2003, as cited by Lumby, 2009).

Leadership at the ministerial/state level is not mentioned here. Even though we acknowledge the wide impact that federal/ministerial policies may have on education, this type of leadership has not been the focus of research in the field of educational leadership, likely due to its more macro nature (synonymous to an overwhelming degree of complexity) and also due to the lack of necessary sample size to make quantitative research possible. For example, Fancera and Bliss (2011, p. 366) discussed the possibility that compliance to the “No Child Left Behind” initiative, albeit raising the accountability of school leaders, had inadvertently made principals set school visions and missions that are somewhat irrelevant to school achievement, thus not employing the visionary power of leadership to enhance student learning.

Of course, there are studies on an international scale being conducted to examine the influence of this highest level of administration. This type of cross-border research has been conducted by OECD and made possible by the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) (OECD, 2009). Interested readers in leadership at this macro level may refer to various OECD reports on education systems across countries, as well as part Three of the research report by Seashore et al. (2010) which examines the interaction between the state, districts, and schools with regard to state leadership in education.

IV. Making sense of Higher Education contexts and leadership

1. Challenges in HE leadership research

If reviewing the literature on school leadership can be likened to traversing an unknown sea on a boat made of different leadership frameworks, one would find himself thrown overboard when entering the HE context indeed. This is not to say that there is no framework to sail through the treacherous water of HE leadership; it is simply the case that the school leadership boat quickly breaks down into flotsams no sooner than one enters the literature.

On a more serious note, the literature for educational leadership in HE and school-level is split and necessarily so due to the radically distinct context each of the two is situated in. In terms of outcome variables, since the primary activities of HEIs are not limited to teaching and learning like lower levels of education, more outcome variables are involved, such as number of research papers, and quality of research paper. Richards (2012) re-iterates this point as follows:
A Rudimentary Guide to Educational Leadership

A major distinguishing feature between school-based educational leaders and HE academics is that for the former teaching is core and central to the whole institution and every activity must further that goal. In the case of the latter, teaching is only one of the university’s core businesses… and only one of the ways in which scholarship is exercised… (p. 84)

Another obstacle that prevents the application of school leadership research methodologies into the HE context is the uniqueness of each academic department in a university. Research findings in education leadership collected from different schools/departments in a university cannot be generalized across departments due to distinctions in subject variables (disciplines, skills and student affinities, teaching methods, etc.). An example of this is Pounder’s study of teacher classroom transformational leadership. Because the data he was collecting was from undergraduate business students, the finding that teacher classroom leadership had a positive effect on student learning could not be generalized to other departments. This might be one of the reasons why research progress in Higher Education leadership lags so far behind that in school leadership. In her review of higher education leadership, Lumby (2012) wrote:

School effectiveness literature has reached a point where it is able to claim an assessment of the percentage of variance in student outcomes related to the principal’s leadership and to the concerted leadership of all those contributing leadership. Research on leadership in higher education has no such equivalent body of work (p. 9).

As Lumby explained, due to the various challenges posed to the field, researchers take a different approach to study leadership in HE: by exploring the perceptions of staff and partners about leadership influence on their work. In reality, this is not too different from the approach that the school leadership literature used, albeit in the earlier days of the field. After much criticism on methodology, and as the field matured, school leadership research has shifted from a self-referential approach to more sophisticated methods, or made use of multiple methods.

2. Modes of university governance

To understand leadership in higher education, one ought to be familiar with the structure and composition of university governance as these vary significantly across institutions. Dobbins, Knill, and Vögtle (2011) synthesized and summarized characteristics of the three different governance models prevalent in European universities: State-centered model, Market-oriented model, and Academic self-governance, with a note that “all higher education systems mix elements of hierarchical state control, market competition and academic self-rule”. They also proposed three key issues in governance: funding, staffing, and academic goals over which different stakeholders will differ in opinions and decisions. For example, in a market-oriented model of governance, the selection of the rector will be based on his/her management skills, while in the academic self-governance model, this selection is less based on management skills than tenure privileges.

While academic self-governance was the state of HEIs’ management in the UK (and most other countries in Europe, especially Western Europe) pre-1980s, in the wake of reduction in public funding from 1982 to 1992 (Middlehurst & Elton, 1992),
such a form of distributed leadership was no longer sustainable. Universities sought for alternative sources of funding, which would naturally include more stakeholders in the process. This means the primary objectives of universities were expanded beyond “the production, dissemination, and preservation of knowledge” and this resulted in these institutions’ increased accountability and market responsiveness. For example, the post-1992 Academic Enterprise initiative by the UK government imposed on universities the objective of knowledge transfer to business and public sector organizations through government funding (Davies, Hides, & Casey, 2001). Alongside this policy was the introduction of tuition fees in the late 1990s, which turned students into customers and essentially raised the need for a quality education. Various demands were thus placed on the universities and their limited resources (e.g. manpower, brainpower, and funding).

This saw the rise of the “managerialist approach” to university governance, also known as “market-oriented model of management” or “business-like governance”; at the same time, there was a decline of collegiality throughout the post-1980 period up to now (Middlehurst & Elton, 1992; Davies, Hides, & Casey, 2001; Yelder & Codling, 2004; Paradeise, Reale, & Goastellec, 2009; Winter, 2009). This change in university governance model was deemed by many researchers to be necessary for the efficient use of resources by means of routine operation procedures used by the corporate world, as an adaptive response to the early-1980s financial crisis. This so-called “corporatization” of the HE sector spread throughout, even though the pace has been slower for countries like France, Germany, Italy, and Switzerland (Paradeise, Reale, Goastellec, 2009).

Middlehurst and Elton (1992) was the first article that brought to my attention the concerns over the decline of the collegial culture in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) following the education reform of the 1980s. As I tracked for the works of later researchers regarding this concern, I noticed that this issue has become a full-blown debate in the field, a discourse that can be termed “collegiality vs. managerialism”. The next section will discuss this issue and its possible resolution through distributed leadership.

3. **Collegiality vs. Managerialism and Reconciliation through Distributed Leadership**

a. **Collegiality vs. Managerialism**

The collegial culture of universities consists of collaboration between academics and academic autonomy, from which the self-governing tradition of universities arose. According to Dobbins, Knill, and Vögtle (2011),

Its guiding organizational principle is described by some as ‘academic self-governance’ and by more skeptical observers as ‘academic oligarchy’, implying thus weak university management, strong self-regulation, and collegial control by the professoriate, in particular as regards study and research profiles. (p. 671)

In academic self-governance, knowledge is an end in itself, detached from any concern for applicability and economic or political benefits. It is no wonder that this mode of governance has been dubbed “The Ivory Tower”: even though it is the Utopia for research (due to the absence of market competition and a complete focus
on research), it does not perform well in everything else, including teaching (Paradeise, Reale, & Goastellec, 2009; Dobbins, Knill, & Vögtle, 2011).

Thomas Diefenbach systematically reviewed the literature on New Public Management (NPM) and its impact on public sector organizations which include universities. NPM was a movement for changes in the management of public affairs towards a more business-like model in the late 1970s (Diefenbach, 2009). It has been applied to all public service sectors, including Higher Education, and has a widespread reach around the world. It was this overarching shift in paradigm of policy-making that gave rise to the market-oriented model of governance in universities, or the “managerialism” we have mentioned. The underlying assumption is that, by following the designs and processes of the private sector, public sector organizations will be more efficient, cost-effective, high-performing, and more transparent (Diefenbach, 2009; Dobbins, Knill, & Vögtle, 2011). Knowledge is a commodity, investment, and strategic resource, according to this model.

Diefenbach criticized proponents of this model for playing up its “historical inevitability” and for its rigid and narrow strategic orientations based on demand and supply, and of which stakeholders are the higher bidders. Ultimately, it goes against the idea that public services such as education are “universal entitlements and should be provided regardless of the gravity of need, cost or ability to pay”. People with lower purchasing power tend to benefit less from the service of HEIs, and tragically this is arguably the most important stakeholder: the student.

Coming from a very different ideological ground, the market-oriented model of governance was bound to clash with the traditional academic-dominant collegial model when the two were brought together under the roof of university administration. The conflict that arises is not only in terms of ideals, it is also a conflict over interest and identity, with regard to the issues of resource distribution and target audience within the university itself. Winter (2009) describes this conflict in terms of a split in academic identity: the academic manager and the managed academic. The following table characterizes these two different identities and compares them along important bases:

Table 4: Academic manager and managed academic identities in the context of corporate managerialism (Winter, 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic identity</th>
<th>Dominant ideology</th>
<th>Values in use</th>
<th>Relationship to managers/organisation</th>
<th>Values fit to organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic manager</td>
<td>Managerialism</td>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
<td>Assimilated/connected</td>
<td>Values congruence - person-organisation fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managed academic</td>
<td>Unitary control</td>
<td>Universal</td>
<td>Subservient/Disconnected</td>
<td>Values incongruence - person-organisation misfit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>Normative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Distinctive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main concern raised by Middlehurst and Elton (1992) and Winter (2009) is that the loss of collegiality in universities will lead to disengagement of academics and the resultant drop in teaching quality as well as a strong research culture due to
the more imperative priority over profitability and the threat from performance evaluation.

Before we go further, it is necessary to clarify that even though the literature distinguishes between ‘leadership’ and ‘governance’ (e.g. Middlehurst & Elton, 1992; Lumby, 2012), both functions can be characterized either by collegiality or managerialism and they are interdependent. The following table presents a way to classify formal leadership in higher education (Yielder & Codling, 2004):

Table 5: Characteristics of managerial and academic leadership in tertiary education (Yielder & Codling, 2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODE 1 LEADERSHIP</th>
<th>MODE 2 LEADERSHIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC</td>
<td>MANAGERIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader is ‘an’ authority, based on</td>
<td>Leader is ‘in’ authority, based on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● discipline knowledge</td>
<td>● position in hierarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● experience</td>
<td>● job responsibilities (e.g. financial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● peer and professional recognition management, human resource management,</td>
<td>planning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● personal qualities</td>
<td>● control (e.g. budgets, resources,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● expertise – teaching, research, accommodation)</td>
<td>● delegated authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programme development</td>
<td>● power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● team acceptance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership context: Collegial</td>
<td>Leadership context: Corporate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formalisation: bestowed from below</td>
<td>Formalisation: appointed from above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership is vested in the PERSON</td>
<td>Leadership is vested in the POSITION,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because of their personal characteristics, and perceived expertise</td>
<td>and the person may or may not have the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capabilities to exercise this leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Distributed leadership in Higher Education

In contrast with the conscious effort to maintain and develop a distributed perspective in school leadership, distributed leadership seems to be the natural state of leadership in the university setting (Lumby, 2012). The reasons for this are due to (1) complexity of a university’s organization, and (2) collegial culture of academia. Therefore, leadership in HEIs is necessarily distributed. Eventually, it is a question of what form distributed leadership HEIs adopt. As suggested by Gronn (2002), we can imagine the two states of distributed leadership occurring within a university: the first is the “additive” form which is characterized by complete academic autonomy, uncoordinated leadership activities; the second is the “holistic” form which is characterized by “managed collaborative patterns”, or coordinated efforts.

Bolden, Petrov, and Gosling (2009) criticized distributed leadership in HE as “rhetoric” rather than having any practical consequence for the leadership process in HEIs. Their empirical study of 12 UK universities’ leadership led to a conclusion that preachers of distributed leadership merely “paint an image of a more desirable approach – one that is located, connected, engaged, clear/in-focus, close/in-touch and functional/beneficial”, in contrast to their empirical finding of an actual HE leadership experience of “dislocation, disconnection, disengagement, dissipation, distance, and dysfunctionality.” Several authors disagreed on the basis that there
was a lack of proper framework and instruments to conceptualize as well as measure the implementation of distributed leadership (e.g. Jones et al., 2014).

To study HE leadership in a systematic and meaningful way, Bolden, Petrov and Gosling (2008) proposed a comprehensive, multi-level model of leadership practice based on theories in distributed leadership. These authors argued that this model would help the thought process about tensions and difficulties arising from competing forces involved in the leadership process in HEIs. According the model, the 5 dimensions of distributed leadership in HE are:

1. Personal: This dimension refers to individual qualities, experience, preferences, which may influence the choice of leadership practices and leadership styles;
2. Social: This dimension constitutes formal and informal networks within and beyond the institution, as well as a shared sense of identity and purpose within and between groups;
3. Structural: This dimension includes organizational systems, processes, and structures (e.g. finances, human relations, IT, strategic planning, etc.). An example of leadership practice along the structural dimension is the devolution of formal power. Often this means less influence for leaders at more senior positions, but it is necessary in maintaining the autonomy of academics;
4. Contextual: This dimension refers to the external (social, cultural, political environment) and internal (organizational culture, history, priorities) contexts;
5. Developmental: This dimension refers to the temporal context and attempts to situate leadership practice at a given moment in time, while considering possible precursors and development opportunities.

In applying this model to study the leadership of different universities (or probably different HE system across countries), the authors have noted that researchers must take the different agendas of universities into consideration. Bolden, Petrov, and Gosling (2008) wrote:

The model offers a framework for describing and exploring leadership practice and sensitizing the observer to some of the competing forces likely to be encountered. Furthermore, it helps to illuminate the manner in which leadership is ‘distributed’, especially the factors outside the direct control of any one leader.

The following is the multi-level model shown in a diagram to illustrate the multi-layer nature of HE leadership:

Figure 2: A multi-level model of leadership in Higher Education
c. The reconciliation of Collegiality and Managerialism

Winter's (2009) conception of “the academic manager” and “the managed academic” is not unlike the duality of “leader” and “follower” identity which is the focus of instructional and transformational leadership as we have discussed in the section on school leadership. If we consider this to be the case, it is possible to ameliorate the divide in identity brought about by managerialism through the use of distributed leadership. In the setting of university leadership, distributed leadership occupies the middle ground between one end of “heroic top-down leadership” – the managerial approach, and the other end of “organized anarchy” – the collegial approach (Lumby, 2012). Furthermore, not just any form of distributed leadership will do: it has to be of the “holistic” form characterized by coordinated leadership activities by all actors within the university regardless of their formal or informal status of leadership. The “additive” form of distributed leadership will just revert the system to the old academic self-governing structure.

Martin, Trigwell, Prosser, and Ramsden (2003) take on the collegiality vs. managerialism debate from a different point of view. They assert that it is more important to look beyond the dichotomy “between authoritarian and collaborative management approaches”. In particular, they observed that experiences with leadership vary widely across different members of the subject teams, including heads of department, subject coordinators, and teachers. Perceptions of leadership are mixed among members of an academic department, and across departments. Furthermore, they also found an empirical relationship between the way teachers experience leadership and the way subject coordinators experience leadership:
At one extreme, subject coordinators experience leadership as focusing on the nature and content of subjects and disciplines. In this case, teachers experience leadership in terms of change being imposed on them. At the other extreme, subject coordinators focus on leadership through attention to the student experience. In this case, the teachers experience leadership in terms of collaboration. We would argue that this empirical relationship has a theoretical foundation: a focus on student experiences is consistent with a shared vision of the aims of teaching. (p. 257)

The findings by Martin and colleagues implicate the fact that perceptions of leadership across various stakeholders in HEIs entail an important set of variables which should be studied to elucidate the links between HE leadership of teaching and student learning, rather than the wholesale approach of branding academic leadership as inefficient in distributing resources, or managerial leadership as suffocating for academic freedom. Their argument is in line with the reconciliation of the traditional collegial culture and the market-oriented university governance style: “individuals within the group were empowered to pursue their own aspirations within a framework of previously agreed objectives” (Martin et al., 2003).

In their comparative study of seven nations in Europe (United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Germany, France, Italy, Switzerland, and Norway), Paradeise, Reale, and Goastellec (2009) documented the implementation of managerial governance in universities among these countries. They observed that this “organizational turn of universities” does not necessarily lead to managerialism, but rather, “it will result in a mix of these models, with varying emphasis across countries.”

To end this section, it is worth repeating the notion of hybridity mentioned by Gronn (2008). Gronn remarked that hybrid leadership is “highly influential individuals working in parallel with collectivities” and this has succinctly described the ideal leadership needed in HE. The integration of a managerial governance style into the collegial culture of universities will give rise to what might be called “distributed transformational leadership” (Muijs, Harris, Lumby, Morrison, & Sood, 2006) and this might be more suitable to characterize the current leadership landscape of HE. As to whether tension arising from “collegiality vs. managerialism” will ease or not, only effective, context-appropriate leadership can provide a satisfactory solution. The next section will list the various leadership behaviors that are considered effective.

4. Competencies and Effective Leadership Behaviors
This section will look at the competencies for effective leadership in higher education. This is one of the few main foci of research in this field (Lumby, 2012). Knowing what the relevant knowledge, skills, and abilities for leadership are will contribute to the recruitment, selection, and development of staff who are likely to participate in leadership activities and practice “good” leadership.

Drawing from a series of semi-structured interviews with ten pro-vice-chancellors from the UK universities, Spendlove (2007) proposed the following list of attitudes, knowledge, and behavior that constitute competencies of leaders in HE sector:
Reviewing the literature from three countries (the UK, the US, and Australia) on leadership effectiveness in HE at the departmental level, Bryman (2007, as cited by Lumby, 2012) identified six elements of behavior associated with effectiveness in HE leadership:

1. Garner trust and possess personal integrity;
2. Supportive (e.g. being considerate; creating a positive/colligial work atmosphere in the department; making academic appointments that enhance department’s reputation);
3. Consult others in key decisions;
4. Inculcate values that align others’ appreciation of leader’s direction;
5. Sense of direction;
6. Protective of staff (e.g. adjusting workloads to stimulate scholarship and research).

The above set of competencies implied that departmental leaders must be good at everything. Even though this is desirable, it is at the same time unrealistic, especially when HEIs need to integrate the multi-agency strength of distributed leadership into their leadership structure (‘multi-agency’ simply means multiple sources of expertise).

Smith and Wolverton (2010) developed the Higher Education Leadership Competencies Inventory (HELC) based on the result of a previous qualitative research on the topic by McDaniel (2002). This is the first time a self-report instrument for HELC was developed. Smith and Wolverton proposed and validated the instrument measuring five dimensions of leadership competency which include Analytical, Communication, Student Affairs, Behavioral, and External Relations. Testing of the instruments was conducted using samples from three groups: athletic directors, senior student affairs officers, and chief academic officers. Of the five dimensions, Analytical scored the highest on measure of reliability (alpha = .92).
other four dimensions had acceptable reliability with alpha ranging from .72 to .77. Future validation and reliability analysis are warranted so that the instrument can be used as a tool for researching leadership competency in HE. Appendix A of this report contains the Factor Loading Scores table of the HELC inventory.

5. **A Conceptual Framework for Higher Education Leadership**

Given the complexities of the university setting, it is tempting to assume that distributed leadership is the default framework of conceptualization and leadership practice in university. Despite the focus of research on distributed leadership, there has not been enough empirical evidence to support its implementation in the HE context. Distributed leadership for HE has also come under a criticism that it is probably just rhetoric from a subjectivist/interpretivist point of view that is useful for “social regulation” and quell the dissatisfaction of “the managed academics” rather than a practical framework for transformational change (Bolden, Petrov, & Gosling, 2009; Hartley, 2010). Skepticism grows as the evidence for distributed leadership effectiveness is inconsistent. Where it was found to be effective, ‘good’ practices were deemed ‘context-dependent’ thus limiting their application elsewhere; where trace of effectiveness was absent, the number of skeptics increased.

To rectify this problem, Jones et al. (2014) identified actions needed to enable a distributed leadership process from four different inter-university educational projects in Australia. Drawing from those actions and a modified conceptualization of distributed leadership by Woods, Bennett, Harvey, & Wise (2004), they utilized the action research methodology of reflexive enquiry to synthesize a distributed leadership matrix as seen in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7: Distributed Leadership matrix (Jones et al., 2014)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Table 7: Distributed Leadership matrix (Jones et al., 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs (required to move towards distributed leadership)</th>
<th>Dimensions (and elements) of distributed leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context. From power influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage involvement</td>
<td>Move from regulation to trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create process</td>
<td>Formal leaders to support informal leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop shared leadership</td>
<td>Formal leadership training to include distributed leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource collaborative opportunities</td>
<td>Time and finance for collaborative activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support engagement</td>
<td>Work-plans identify contribution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on this matrix, they crafted the Action Self Enabling Reflective Tool (ASERT) intended to be used as “a resource designed to identify actions needed to enable a distributed leadership process that is genuinely aimed at engaging staff influencing leadership decision making.” This tool will be further discussed in the Recommendation section for Higher Education leadership Practices and Professional Development.

In a separate line of research, Randall and Coakley (2007) also looked at HE leadership from a practitioner perspective. They proposed the adoption of the adaptive leadership framework by Heifetz, Kania, and Kramer (2004) to elucidate the process by which university leaders navigate the governance system of HEIs and induce changes. What is particularly intriguing about this framework is its definition of leadership as “a process rather than individual personal capabilities” (Heifetz et al., 2004). According to Heifetz and colleagues, adaptive leadership “should compel all stakeholders involved to work towards a solution through debate and creative thinking, identifying the rewards, opportunities, and challenges they will face” (Randall & Coakley, 2007). There is a considerable amount of resemblance between this type of leadership and distributed leadership, especially the concertive action idea described by Gronn (2003). The framework pushes further into prescriptive zone...
by recommending a series of steps for practitioners to follow (see Practices and Professional Development subsection under Recommendation section for details of these steps).

It is surprising that distributed leadership theory is barely, if ever, mentioned at all in the literature of adaptive leadership. It might be the case that authors studying contingency and situational leadership did not want to use the term 'distributed leadership' as a theoretical framework to guide their research to avoid the definitional ambiguity of the term. Then again, no study has ever provided full explanation for such a peculiarity so the report will leave it as a question open for discussion.

V. Educational Leadership Development

1. Empirical support for Professional Development in Leadership

There is no question about the need to improve leadership in education in view of the various and wide-reaching effects leadership has on student learning and school/institution effectiveness. According to a report by OECD, because “most principals come from a teaching background”, they usually lack the competencies necessary to deal with “the broadened roles of leadership” which are instructional, managerial, visionary, evaluative, and facilitative (Beatriz, Deborah, & Hunter, 2008). However, most research focuses on how effective leadership development programs are in achieving the goal of leadership improvement.

Just as therapies in clinical psychology improve the state of the mind, leadership development can be considered to be a form of intervention to improve the state of leadership. Similar to the requirement for clinical treatments to be empirically supported, leadership development programs need to be evidence-based. This section will present some evidence on how well leadership development programs in general and several specific programs perform.

OECD’s report on the development of school leadership across member countries revealed the following findings:

- Evidence about the effectiveness and impact of school leadership training and development is limited. There is no correlation demonstrated between leadership training and development and school outcomes;
- There is widespread consensus among practitioners, researchers and policy makers that professional training and development has an impact on participants.

Darling-Hammond, Lapointe, Meyerson, Orr, and Cohen (2007) concurred with the notion that the literature on the outcomes of leadership development programs has been sparse. Their research aimed to buttress the literature in that respect, and found that graduates from “exemplary preparation programs” offered by the Educational Leadership Development Academy (ELDA at the University of San Diego), or the University of Connecticut’s Administrator Preparation Program (UCAPP), and so on, “reported higher quality program practices, feel better prepared, feel better about the principalship as a job and a vocation, and enact more
effective leadership practices as principals do others with more conventional preparation”.

A survey of 56 principal leadership preparation programs by Hess and Kelly (2007) revealed that:

[Just 2 percent of the 2424 course weeks addressed accountability in the context of school improvement, and less than 5 percent included instruction on managing school improvement via data, technology, or empirical research. Of 360 course weeks devoted to personnel management, just 12 weeks mentioned teacher dismissal and nine mentioned teacher compensation. (p. 1)]

A study by Duncan, Range, and Scherz (2011) about Wyoming principals’ perceptions of accredited preparation programs offered by universities found that there is little consistency in program content across universities and over time periods.

To maintain distributed leadership practices in their respective primary schools, three principals interviewed by Torrance (2014) attributed their success to formal work-based postgraduate leadership preparation and experiential professional learning included in the Scottish Qualification for Headship program.

Evaluation of the Qiyada (an Arabic word for ‘leadership’) program by Hourani and Stringer (2014) through semi-structured interviews with 16 native principals in Abu Dhabi public schools showed that the leadership development program has enhanced principals' knowledge and skills' capacities, but failed to consolidate the knowledge and derived practices.

Scott, Coates, and Anderson (2008) studied the literature in Higher Education leadership development and found that in general, we are still as in the dark as we were 20 years ago when there was little research on how effective leadership development for the HE sector is. Gmelch (2000, as cited by Scott, Coates, & Anderson, 2008) found that most US department chairs took up their role with no prior administrative experience or pre-service leadership training. This finding is in agreement with that of Inman (2009) who concluded that formal professional development for leadership was relatively uncommon. “The majority of what leaders do is learnt, self-taught and acquired throughout their life history.” He also reiterated the finding that there is abysmal amount of research on leadership development effectiveness.

Despite this inconvenient truth about Higher Education leadership development, skill training for future and in-service leaders must carry on. Firstly, because of the growing complexity in relationship between HE institutions and the government, the communities, and the private sector, leadership of HEIs must be able to adapt quickly with less resource (Griswell & Martin, 2007). A second reason is that simply bringing in people from other background of leadership (e.g. corporate leaders) does not serve the best interest of the academics because these “outsider leaders” uphold different values. They may not possess the understanding of the institutional culture to successfully navigate the interpersonal aspects within the academic environment either. Here, we see the recurring theme of the “collegiality vs. managerialism” conflict. Promoting academics to positions of management might minimize this conflict, but this in turn raises the concern of how these academics can manage effectively when, albeit their familiarity with the setting, they do not possess
the competencies to do the job. This is exactly where leadership development shines as it is assumed that in-service training of academics will make them suitable for leadership duties.

Leadership development is a life-long learning process (McCarthy, 2015; Torrance, 2014; Duncan, Range, & Scherz, 2011; Beatriz, Deborah, & Hunter, 2008, p. 136), thus research is also interested in the effectiveness of different learning techniques applicable to daily encounters outside formal training programs. Apart from introducing readers to different elements of good leadership development programs, the next two subsections will discuss approaches both formal and informal leaders take to distill learning from their daily experiences.

2. Leadership Preparation Programs

School leadership development programs are often conducted on three different levels: national, provincial, or local; they are hosted by different entities, including dedicated colleges for school leadership, universities, private contractors, schools or a system of schools themselves (Beatriz, Deborah, & Hunter, 2008, p. 126).

In the university context, the institution will often find that leadership succession should be a priority, and having home-grown leaders picking up the mantle of leadership is best because these people are familiar with the school habitat and its associated factors as discussed previously. Many universities have their own in-house leadership preparation programs for faculty members (e.g. University of Hawaii, Northern Arizona University, etc.).

Beatriz, Deborah, and Hunter (2008, p. 133) listed four key elements observed in successful school leadership preparation programs:

(1) A coherent curriculum aligned to state and professional standards which emphasize instructional leadership and school improvement;
(2) Active student-centred instruction;
(3) Financial, social and professional support as well as formalized mentoring and advising;
(4) Designed internships that provide exposure.

These four elements were identified by many other studies (e.g. Shapira-Lishchinsky, 2014; Duncan, Range, & Scherz, 2011; Darling-Hammond et al., 2007). Darling-Hammond et al. (2007) also added:

(5) Research-based content aligned with professional standards;
(6) Collaboration between universities and school districts to create coherence between training and practice;
(7) Vigorous recruitment of high-ability candidates with experience and a commitment to instructional improvement.

Due to the lack of research on higher education leadership development programs, we will combine the discussion of both preparation and on-the-job leadership development. According to Scott, Coates, and Anderson (2008), the key elements of a good program are:
(1) Modelling the approaches to learning that are now being advocated for use with higher education students (‘practice what we preach’);
(2) Focusing directly on the capabilities that count using case-based and problem-based learning situated in the context of each particular role;
(3) Developing more targeted support networks for people working in the same role;
(4) Fostering self-managed and just-in-time, just-for-me learning by means of a common survey available to all new and experienced leaders alike to compare their results.

Below is a diagram showing how academic leaders ‘learn’ leadership: Figure 3: Learning Academic Leadership process and elements (Scott, Coates, & Anderson, 2008)

![Diagram of Learning Academic Leadership process and elements](image)

Even though the predominant view has been that traditional career pathways leading into management and executives roles in HE were often not planned, and many did not undertake any formal education in how to manage and lead others (Hempsall, 2014), that view will soon change due to recent increasing recognition by governments and other funding bodies of the importance of leadership development for senior university personnel (Fielden, 2009).

3. **On-the-job leadership development**
   a. Formal programs
Beatriz, Deborah, and Hunter (2008, p. 133) stated that “successful training of practicing principals involves them having a training curriculum, which includes pre-service, induction and in-service”. They reported two additional elements of on-the-job leadership training:

1. Leadership learning grounded in practice, including analysis of classroom practice, supervision and professional development using on-the-job observation;
2. Collegial learning networks such as principals’ networks, study groups and mentoring or peer coaching that offer communities of practice and ongoing sources of support.

The most important element of on-the-job professional development is the collaboration and partnerships between colleges that prepare principals and the districts that employ them (Duncan, Range, & Scherz, 2011). Thus, it is likely that a crucial component of on-the-job professional development is the development of professional learning communities (PLC) within and between schools. However, based on the mixed findings in the literature (as seen in the Outcomes section of school leadership above), the relationship between PLC and school leadership seems to be unclear.

With the exclusion of elements (4) and (7) in the above elements of good school leadership preparation programs, the rest all apply to on-the-job training programs for principals. However, given the time available in-practice, individual course-taking and conference-going were “typically the few opportunities for learning available” for school leaders (Darling-Hammond et al., 2007). This lends justification for the deployment of PLC in spite of unclear evidence about its connection with leadership just mentioned. Darling-Hammond and colleagues’ study of in-practice leadership development revealed the formation of PLCs among principals across schools and the activities they conducted within the PLCs. These activities include:

1. Meetings to discuss shared readings;
2. Coordinating opportunities for principals to learn from and evaluate one another;
3. Meeting regularly in a group to work on instructional issues.

Beatriz, Deborah, and Hunter (2008) mentioned that PLCs not only challenge a principal to look “beyond their assumptions and to expand or change their original thinking through disciplined analysis and rigorous discourse and challenging texts on difficult or controversial issues” but they also “provide a safe setting in which principals can dare to risk, fail, learn and grow.”

Little could be said of PLCs in Higher Education Leadership development. The literature does not explicitly discuss PLC as a term in Higher Education, but refers to various approaches associated with PLC. For example, Scott, Coates, and Anderson (2008) mentioned 4 PLC-related approaches to building leadership capability that have “at least a medium level of effectiveness in helping to develop leadership capability”:
(1) Ad hoc conversations about work with people in similar roles;
(2) Participating in peer networks within the university;
(3) Being involved in informal mentoring/coaching;
(4) Participating in peer networks beyond the university.

These four approaches can also apply to on-the-job school leadership development to build PLCs in the school settings, which makes one wonder if there is any substantive difference between establishing PLCs in Higher Education Institutions and in Schools. Then again, this question is probably not important; the more important thing to ask is how such practices translate into student learning.

b. Informal leadership development
Learning leadership can be done every day, both on-the-job and off-the-job. This section will briefly discuss three ways by which leaders, formal and informal alike, distill learning from their daily activities and encounters. These consist of networks of learning, learning from self-reflection, and learning from experience.

Jackson (2000), as cited by Hallinger (2003), concluded that characteristics of transformational leadership, namely collaborativeness, interactivity, and uncertainty, are not those readily developed on management training courses nor are they located in one individual; they come about as voices from many stakeholders of the school. This point reinforces the importance of on-the-job professional development which stresses on the ability of the principal to build networks that support peer learning, learning from mentors, and learning beyond one’s school. This also implicates the perpetual development of a distributed perspective in leadership.

Torrance (2014) asserted that informed reflection on practice and ongoing support can benefit headteachers of primary schools beyond initial preparation for headship. An impression from the case study is that self-reflection is the most important, if not the only important activity that a leader should do constantly and often used as a tool for school improvements and evaluations of such improvements. The interviewed headteachers attributed constant self-reflection on their practices to be instrumental in maintaining and developing a distributed perspective in leadership.

Using concept mapping among school leaders, Pegg (2007) found that “the language used to describe concepts of learning reflected generic and everyday concepts, rather than the language of pedagogy or concepts used in professional training.” It was a surprise as most participants did not mention reflective practice (as emphasized in Torrance, 2014), learning cycles (seen through the diagram above by Scott, Coates, & Anderson, 2008), or PLCs, which seemed to be the trendy terms in leadership development recently. Pegg noted that the absence of these technical terms might be indicative of their inappropriateness in describing everyday learning from experience, which is the focus of her study.

The report will not elaborate more on leadership learning in every day practice because this is not a goal it sets out to accomplish. Informal leadership learning is mentioned here to bring the attention of readers to the fact that such cognitive activities, albeit natural-occurring, can become deliberate practices if leaders are conscious of the learning processes and what enables such processes.
VI. Education Leadership in East Asia/Southeast Asia (SEA)

1. State of research in educational leadership

Research capacities at universities in East Asia/SEA are generally low, with the exceptions of Singapore, Hong Kong, Japan, and Korea (Hallinger, 2011; Walker & Hallinger, 2015). Of the educational leadership literature about and from three regions (West, South, and East Asia) reviewed by Hallinger and Bryant (2013), they found that West and East Asia generated the majority of the literature; in particular, Israel and Hong Kong were considered two knowledge centres on educational leadership in their respective regions as their contributions were the largest. The scope and depth of the Asian knowledge base appear to be highly constrained and remain ‘primitive’. This is not completely due to inadequacies in their research capacities, however, because they found that research in the natural sciences has been very productive. This can be a matter of setting priorities in research: countries in the regions might want to get ahead in the ‘hard sciences’ so as to gain a competitive advantage in economic growth; education is regarded more of a long-term investment and its impact will not be realized until some time has passed.

Hallinger and Bryant (2013) wrote:

“In the absence of a critical mass of empirical research generated from within the region, policymakers were left with no choice other than to rely on findings from research conducted in Western contexts.” (p. 308)

A case in point that illustrates the above concern is research on educational leadership at the district level. We can only hypothesize that leadership patterns should vary due to the different manners resources for schools are managed across countries, and should differ from the way US superintendents exercise their leadership activities. However, due to the fact that the majority of research investigating leadership on this level is embedded in the US education system, practitioners elsewhere can only rely on that body of work to design the set of leadership practices they would use for their national local context, knowing that studies on school district leadership in the US can only apply to a limited extent. The two authors remarked that “the region’s policymakers and school leaders are largely ‘flying blind’ when it comes to making decisions…”

Hallinger (2011) described many Commonwealth countries as adopting educational leadership development programs from British and Australian universities without localizing these programs to the socio-cultural contexts of the countries. In evaluating leadership development for Abu Dhabi’s school system, Hourani and Stringer (2014) expressed the same concern for the adoption of such programs, citing Walker (2003) that since teaching and learning take place in a certain social context, professional development needs to be associated with the socio-cultural constructs appropriate to the context.

Walker & Hallinger (2015) reviewed and synthesized findings in school leadership from five societies: Singapore, Hong Kong, Taiwan, China, and Vietnam where either of them (or both) collaborated with local scholars to review the existing
literature for each society. Table B1, B2 and B3 in Appendix B summarized these findings about the state of research and practice in each country. For leadership development, they observed the following:

1. Principal development received the greatest emphasis in Hong Kong and Singapore, followed by China, Taiwan, and Vietnam, in descending order;
2. Singapore was particularly active in establishing and refining a system-wide approach to principal preparation and development starting in the mid-1990s;
3. Hong Kong literature focused on the design of a new leadership competency framework for the school system. The framework would guide the design and implementation of new requirements and programs of pre- and in-service leadership development;
4. China government maintains control of the ideological foundations of principal development, but greater flexibility in terms of content, pedagogy, and curriculum is beginning to emerge.

Interested readers will find all these reviews and the synthesis paper in Issue 4, Volume 53 of the Journal of Educational Administration. This collection of reviews is most informative as it reported research findings on principal leadership in China, Vietnam, Taiwan, Singapore, and Hong Kong over the past 30 years. No precedent for such a comprehensive body of work has been done before for East Asia and SEA.

2. Challenges to Educational Leadership research, practice, and development
East Asia and SEA is characterized by diversity in terms of economy, culture, social stability, and degree of corruption. This poses a major challenge to collaborative efforts across nations in the regions for the improvement of education. However, some of these factors also contain potentials and opportunities for each country to heighten the quality of its education system. Thus, the real challenge for educational leaders is how to turn their unique circumstances into strengths and resources. This subsection will discuss how, for each nation, their economy, culture, social stability, and degree of corruption present obstacles for research, practice, and development in educational leadership. The subsection will end with a discussion of University Ranking, an international standard that exerts a different kind of pressure on the leadership of each education system.

a. Economy
Difference in levels of economic development means different challenges to countries with regard to education. For developing countries like Indonesia, Thailand, Vietnam, and so on, the goals of education must align with continuing economic growth to improve standard of living. This means policymakers in these countries tend to (and they should) focus on skill-training to build a competent workforce. On the other hand, developed countries like Singapore, Hong Kong, or Japan whose
economies have matured are more likely to focus on the goal of innovation to create boundary-pushing knowledge in the new knowledge economy.

As an example of a developing country, Vietnam needs to focus on developing its Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) sector (OECD, 2013). According to OECD, the demand for skilled workers was too high as compared to the supply: around 47% of firms claimed that the education system failed to meet the skill needs of the workplace. Also more than 83% of workers in Vietnam are still untrained. Solving the lack of skilled workers problem, therefore, must be the government’s priority.

As for the case of a developed country in the region, Singapore should serve as a good example. According to Gopinathan, Wong, and Tang (2008), Singapore’s constant evaluation of trends in the world economy has led its government to reform the education system from a modernization-efficiency paradigm to one that can adapt to the rapid changes that characterizes the knowledge economy. The school system has shifted from a content-heavy to a more process-oriented curriculum focusing on critical and creative thinking. Specialist schools like the Sports School, the NUS Science and Mathematics school, and a school for the Arts were established. These are just a few of the many reforms that have been rolled out, aiming at increasing diversity, choice, and distributed leadership, all with the expectation of a new generation of workers with competencies suitable for the new economy.

b. Culture

Analysis and evidence from studies of various socio-cultural backgrounds show that the same construct of leadership can manifest differently and the variations can be accounted for by cultural differences. This might be rooted in the theory of distributed cognition (Cole and Engestrom, 1993, cited by Timperley, 2005). For example, Salo, Nylund, and Stjernstrom (2014) attributed the emergence of shared instructional leadership in compulsory schools (Grades 1-10) to the Nordic culture because “there is a strong tradition of democracy and codetermination within the school community”. Hansen and Lárusdóttir (2014) studied instructional leadership in 20 Icelandic schools and also found that Icelandic principals “provided limited direct supervision” of classroom instruction, and relied on collaboration with staff and teachers more to achieve indirect instruction supervision. This is iterative evidence asserting the collectivistic culture of the Nordic nations in education leadership, in contrast to the focus of “Anglo-American” culture which “highlights the role and function of the principal in performing successful instructional leadership”, or a focus on the individual. Indeed, in a study of teachers and school administrators in the US, Leithwood et al. (2009) supports this notion of an individualistic culture, stating that “a collaborative approach to instructional leadership… appeared to be uneven or rare in the schools in our study”.

Culture can affect the creation and maintenance of PLCs. Toole and Louis (2002) argued that countries without a precedence of PLCs should learn from those that have established PLCs. However, they also warned that:
While countries clearly can and should learn from one another in this area, cultural differences preclude any international “paint by number” plan that educators can follow. (p. 259)

In addition, Toole and Louis claimed that the creation of PLCs can be facilitated by certain cultures. For example,

“China and Japan are examples of countries that have strong collectivist traditions underlying their educational systems and providing cultural support for joint teacher work. Collegial practices like the Chinese jiaoyanzu (teacher research group) and the Japanese kenkyuu jugyou (the research or study lesson) have deep national roots… while the exact structural arrangement varies among schools, the commitment to joint work is uniform. Collaboration… represents “not practices, but ideals.” (p. 258)

c. Social stability

It seems intuitive that social stability creates an environment favorable for education. Singapore’s emphasis on social stability has served her well for economic development and the peace the country needs to focus resources on other aspects of development including education. On the other hand, social unrest does the opposite and is harmful for education as it puts undue pressures on school leaders, teachers, and students.

Political unrests and violence occur in several countries across East Asia/SEA, such as Myanmar, China’s Tibet, Hong Kong, and Thailand. An example of how educational leadership coped with the convergence of educational reform and violent unrest was expounded by Nitjarunkul, Sungtong, and Placier (2014). They studied the challenges posed to school leaders in several Southern Thailand regions with insurgency. Apart from the usual pressures from educational reform, leaders had to deal with difficulties mostly emerging from safety concerns and low morale: (1) reduced instructional time; (2) fear and lack of encouragement; (3) security risks; and (4) lack of trust among teachers and the communities.

It seems that this unfortunate situation has also given researchers the opportunity to examine the leadership characteristics and behaviors emerging from such socially unstable contexts. The researchers in this case study of Thailand, for instance, found three such adaptations: (1) reinforcing positive behavior through patience, dedication, and enthusiasm; (2) changing instructional methods to be more child-centered and localized; and (3) building collaboration with stakeholders. This has provided the literature with a hard-to-come-by case study of how educational leadership adapts to an unfavorable macro-contextual factor.

d. Corruption

After the colonial era, governments in most Asian countries took over the management and distribution of resources and infrastructures while the general public had no stake in those bases of power. Such power imbalance, coupled with the gap between supply and demand of resources incentivized government officials to be corrupt and thus “provided rooms for a deeply rooted connection between the
states and businesses”, and established the norms of corruption practice (Lee & Oh, 2007).

Rose-Ackerman (2009) reviewed the consequences of corruption in developing countries and found that “highly corrupt countries tend to under-invest in human capital by spending less on education… and can undermine programs designed to help the poor”, including educational reforms aiming at social justice.

McCornac (2012) studied the case of corruption practices in Vietnam’s Higher Education and found that corruption is the norm in the country’s HE sector. Below is a diagram tracing the trail of corruption practices in the system:

Figure 4: A trail of corruption in education (McCornac, 2012)

Boehm (2011, as cited by McCornac, 2012) identified leadership as one of four pillars of anti-corruption (the other three are Risk Assessment, Management, and Collective Action). The challenge for leaders in higher education in Vietnam is not simply becoming the models for anticorruption (even though this is probably the necessary first step), but enlisting the help of various stakeholders in HE. To the extent that corruption is a systematic problem, it is logical that any solution must extend its reach to all the people functioning in and interacting with the system. This is definitely not easy and will pose a serious challenge to educational leadership for a long time, not just in Vietnam, but in other East Asian societies where corruption is the norm and not the exception as well.

e. University Rankings

The following section will detailed the impact of global university rankings on Higher Education in East Asia and SEA. This will be considered a new challenge to Higher Education Institutions and state policymakers.

Hallinger (2014) examined this problem in-depth. He wrote:
“Pressure to perform on the world university rankings is carrying universities towards goals that may threaten long-term capacity development and societal contribution of many of the region’s universities. (p. 231)”

Hallinger identified the problem with university rankings as a systemic problem, meaning it involves interaction and connection between many different stakeholders in higher education. Quantitative measurements themselves are amoral; it is the people who interpret these numbers and the attitudes of those who receive these interpretations that make meanings and induce changes out of those measurements, for better or for worse.

The stakeholders in Hallinger’s framework to examine the impact of university rankings include Ranking Organizations, Rating Agencies, Journals, System Leaders, University Leaders, Faculty, Students and Society. We will only look at what Hallinger has to say about System Leaders and University Leaders as these are the two most important groups that have “the final say” on policies for Higher Education and directions for universities (similar to Liu & Cheng, 2011).

In discussing the role of system leaders, Hallinger noted that reaching the top 100 status for universities has become the priority of national educational leaders in China, Hong Kong, Singapore, Malaysia, Taiwan, and Thailand. He observed that year by year these countries have been “realigning their human resource policies… with this goal (of research productivity)”. Hong Kong, in particular, adopted the Research Assessment Exercise from the UK which emphasizes research productivity of universities as a criterion to allocate funds for research. This will inevitably result in the rejection of candidates for faculty members who cannot meet the required publication output.

Given the policies handed down by the Ministry of Education in each country, it is easy to predict the natural course that university leaders will take. Hallinger wrote:

Whatever their personal beliefs and values, they must formulate and carry out practical responses to these new national goals and strategies or risk the loss of funding and legitimacy. Leakage from the world university rankings has found its way into new performance management systems being put into place by the region’s universities. (p. 237)

Even in countries where universities are granted more autonomy, actions of their leaders might still veer towards research output as many journals and journal databases are rewarding cash to published researchers whose papers have high impact indices. This will redirect the attention of university leaders towards activities that bolster the prestige of their institutions through research.

As resources are limited, the activities of teaching might suffer the most. This is because of two reasons: first, faculty members have to devote more of their time to doing research thus allocating less time to teaching; second, world university rankings do not have viable measures of teaching quality, which further shifts the weight of measurement towards research. As teaching quality is not attended to, students are the group of stakeholders who stand to lose the most. Ironically, this is the group which would boost research capacity in the long-term, but might not be invested in adequately.
Here we can see the repercussion of the “collegiality vs. managerialism” conflict again. The market-oriented governance model takes measurements of performance very seriously, which means they will direct university strategic planning towards the approximation of such ratings. This is only effective when such measurements are valid, reliable, and representative of all aspects of a university. Sadly, this is often not the case for world university rankings.

VII. Recommendations for Research, Practices, and Professional Development

1. **Research**
   a. **Source of information**
   One of the suggestions by Leithwood, Patten, and Jantzi (2010) is that researchers should also “look to evidence beyond their field”. Correlational studies on leadership and student outcome variables can be found in fields like curriculum and instruction, social psychology, sociology, and political science. For example, apart from reviewing findings from core journals on educational leadership, Berkovich and Eyal (2015) also looks for supporting evidence from various journals of Psychology related to education to sum up, in the most comprehensive manner, the current state of knowledge on emotions in education leaders. Such commendable effort is indeed an arduous task, but a much-needed task to be conducted in order to veritably inform researchers about navigating the field.

   The literature on educational leadership tends to draw only on published research and data while ignoring the large bodies of post-graduate theses written about the matter. According to Leithwood and Sun (2012), this will lead to the “file-drawer” problem that might distort the knowledge base of the field. Several studies (e.g. Leithwood & Sun, 2012; Hallinger, 2010) examined the unpublished database on instructional and transformational leadership research to gain a more comprehensive view. While findings in these works were appreciated, criticisms of their research methodologies are often invoked, which is probably why most established authors in the field would avoid citing evidence garnered from unpublished sources in the first place. Nevertheless, as it may return surprising results and conclusions contradicting mainstream research, this body of research should still be considered valuable, especially when the literature is still very sparse for distributed leadership and leadership in Higher Education.

   b. **Research methodology and design**
   Hallinger (2010) criticized the weak study designs that are still prevalent in the instructional leadership literature. Most studies on antecedents of instructional leadership still employ a two-factor design without, for example, linking effects of principals’ personal factors (antecedents) to the impact of his/her leadership. He urged future research to design studies that investigate second order effect of leadership on student learning or school outcomes (Model C) and reciprocal effects between leadership and other variables (Model D) (see Figure 5).
Hallinger (2013, 2014) investigated the methodologies of literature reviews in educational leadership and found that “there remains considerable room for improvement”. He suggested that:

1. Reviews often omitted the criteria and procedures used in identification of sources for review and failed to describe the nature of the sample of studies analyzed in the review.
2. Reviews often omitted some or all information concerning methods of data collection, extraction, evaluation, and analysis that were used to “make sense” of information extracted from the body of studies.
3. Reviews often failed to clarify how methodological choices made in conducting conditioned the interpretation of the findings.

For the purpose of exploratory research, however, the methodology guidelines for systematic reviews as detailed by Hallinger (2013) might not be suitable, due to either a lack of empirical knowledge in the field, or a lack of knowledge on the investigated topic of the researchers. So often, systematic reviews would limit their sources to the so-called “core” journals (Hallinger, 2014), which might exclude relevant empirical evidence existing outside those journals and eventually lead to a perception of the literature being “inadequate”.

Harris and Spillane (2008) pointed to the necessity of conducting leadership research (especially distributed leadership) in an applied context so that “distributed
leadership is not to join the large pile of redundant leadership theories”. Menon (2011) reiterated this sentiment, saying that “the key question for any leadership model remains whether it can contribute significantly to student outcomes.” Failing the test of reality means a leadership model is at best rhetoric talk in the guise of ‘vision’, and at worst an unfortunate enterprise.

Timperley (2005) set an example of explicitly galvanizing efforts by educational leadership researchers into this issue of practicality. The latest meta-analysis of unpublished research by Leithwood and Sun (2012) revealed that researchers should pay more attention to the impact of specific leadership practices and less to leadership models due to the overlap in practices recommended by these models.

c. Research into Integrated forms of leadership

There exist studies which compare two of the three forms of leadership (e.g. Hallinger, 2003; Timperley, 2005; Menon, 2011). Some even suggest the integration of two forms (e.g. Marks & Printy, 2003; Lee, Hallinger, & Walker, 2012). However, few have explicitly proposed the possibility for an overarching framework where all three forms of leadership concurrently operate in a school or an HEI. The development of such a model will aid school/district/HEI leaders to have a comprehensive lay of the land of the school contexts and features useful for their practice. For research, however, the use of such a model might be too clunky and render any attempt at scale development necessarily tedious.

Ever since Marks and Printy (2003) proposed the integration of shared instructional and transformational leadership, such an idea has gained traction, and signs of this incipient enterprise has started to show in the literature. Most notable is the work of Leithwood and his colleagues. They sought to integrate their practical framework for school transformational leadership with both elements from distributed leadership and instructional leadership. Leithwood et al. (2009) reviewed evidence from their previous study (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004) and from a large then-ongoing study of US schools (Leithwood et al., 2009; Seashore et al., 2010). Apart from “setting directions”, “developing people”, and “redesigning the organization”, their model now includes the “managing the instructional program” component of Hallinger’s instructional leadership model (Hallinger, 2000, 2003). They also suggest that their updated model is selectively distributed: “developing people” and “managing the instructional program” are more likely to be distributed, whereas “setting directions” and “redesigning the organization” are mostly the preserve of formal leadership roles. This might very well be the first step in the right direction for a unifying theoretical and/or practical model of school leadership. Interested readers will be most eager to look out for the next work by Leithwood and colleagues.

In a paper titled “The future of distributed leadership” by Gronn (2008), Gronn expressed his concerns about the conceptual basis of distributed leadership and pondered the appropriateness of the term “hybrid” over “distributed”. On the other hand, he also expressed confidence in the potential and usefulness of distributed leadership in analyzing different education systems and informing practices in education.
d. Instrumentation

Menon (2011) commented, while Transformational Leadership research has been facilitated by the MLQ, no equivalent form of inventory to operationalize Distributed Leadership has been devised. Here, by “equivalent” she meant that the usage of those instruments has not been as widespread. Two instruments for measuring distributed leadership have been developed: one by Hulpia, Devos, and Rosseel (2009) from a Belgian sample, and the other one by Hairon and Goh (2014) from a Singaporean sample. While the former, due to its being published earlier, has been cited by 72 articles (according to Google Scholar up to the date this report is submitted), the latter has been cited by none, despite its extensive literature review and rigorous scale development procedure. Due to indications of low usage, this report did not include these two instruments in the section discussing Distributed Leadership. Given that these instruments were invented only recently, it is expected that they will be used more in future studies in different education environments.

e. Research scope

Bottery (2006) wrote:

“That whilst national context is a necessary part of understanding the study and practice of leadership in education, there is a further need for a more global understanding of the forces that impact upon such leadership, and that such a global context might well provide new perspectives for research into this field. (p. 169)"

Surely, global reforms more or less affect education policies and leadership in each and every country, due to the forces facilitating globalization. We saw this through various examples mentioned throughout the report so far: the adaptation of a principal professional development program in Abu Dhabi (Hourani & Stringer, 2014); the advent of the market-oriented management model in the UK’s Higher Education sector, amidst the global economic recession of the early 1980s (Middlehurst & Elton, 1992; Davies, Hides, & Casey, 2001; Diefenbach, 2009); the (mostly) negative effect of neoliberal policies on principals’ emotions (Berkovich & Eyal, 2015), among others. Researchers should heed this call to attention to include the investigation of the global context in future studies.

It is necessary to expand cross-cultural research on educational leadership as this may benefit the formulation of professional development programs and their modification for cross-cultural application. Besides the earlier example of leadership in Nordic countries behaving differently from American leadership, clearer supporting evidence for cross-cultural research can be found in the study of Park and Ham (2014), which examined teacher collaboration in three countries (Australia, Malaysia, and South Korea). They found that teachers become more likely to collaborate with other teachers when a principal’s self-evaluation of his/her instructional leadership diverges less from teachers’ perception of the leadership in all three countries. This study points to the need to pay more attention to principal-teacher perceptual agreement as this factor may be a universal variable to consider when designing professional development programs for principal or teachers. The most recent review
by Leithwood and Sun (2012) on transformational leadership concerns this perceptual agreement: they found that teacher-perceived leader effectiveness correlates positively with principals’ self-reported leadership practice evaluation.

f. Research in Higher Education Leadership
Despite exciting developments in the school leadership literature, its counterpart in HE seems quite underwhelming. Reasons for this state of the literature have been presented in a previous section. Based on the literature review conducted by this report, the impression is that research in HE leadership is still a young field, and understandably so, in view of the many structural and methodological obstacles. Currently the field is not yet past the debate on collegiality vs. managerial governance, while the other two main points of focus are on collating effective leadership practices and tailoring a model for HE leadership based on the existing theory of distributed leadership.

The analytical framework by Dobbins et al. (2011) presented in the Higher Education Leadership section provides a tool for researchers to conduct comparative studies of university governance across countries. Contextual factors including socio-cultural, economic, and political factors must be considered before a study can apply such a framework, especially when it is used for countries located outside Europe. As the authors have noted, longitudinal case studies can make use of the framework as well to track the changes in the structure/operation of university governance and to see what events might have contributed significantly to such a change. For example, one of these events might be changes in leadership or the consequences of such changes.

Last but not least, Hallinger (2011) observed the weak research culture in educational leadership of East Asia and suggested that “by developing a clear agenda of research topics, preferred lines of inquiry and specific models that can be followed in order to produce high quality research”, researchers in East Asia can “use the more limited financial and human resources available in their local settings towards greater medium and long term effect.”

g. An upcoming large-scale research project
Alma Harris is undertaking a large, cross-national comparative research project to explore educational leadership practice and development in “7 differentially performing education systems” including Australia, England, Hong Kong, Indonesia, Malaysia, Russia, and Singapore. Through a series of collaborative research efforts and publications, she hopes to add to the international educational improvement literature (“7 System Leadership Study”, n.d.). This series of research works promises a great contribution of empirical evidence to the literature coming from the contexts of many distinct cultures and socioeconomic settings which will potentially increase the generalizability of findings for more practical values.

2. Practices and Professional Development
a. For School Leadership:
Practitioners need to take precautions when using research as evidence for crafting and implementing leadership practices. Also, they must clearly identify their goals of
education so that appropriate evidence may be drawn from the literature to build a strong foundation for such evidence-based practices. For example, if one is more interested in making students more interested in schools, one should look at Menon’s review as it used student engagement as a measure of student learning. On the other hand, if one wants to improve students’ grades, results by Karadağ et al. (2015) would be more appropriate as they used student achievement to measure student learning.

Review on the outcomes of transformational leadership practices by Sun and Leithwood (2012) concluded that some practices “make much larger contributions to student achievement than do others”. In that review, the authors found that *Building Collaborative Structures* and *Providing Individualized Consideration* had the largest effect on student achievement while the remaining sets of transformational practices either had small effects or were non-significant. This finding certainly shows the need to emphasize those practices as fundamentals to good transformational leadership, but as the authors have warned, such finding is no reason for neglecting other practices due to firstly, the unique context of each school, and secondly, the different study designs that may not have operationalized those practices in the “paths” they are supposed to exert their effects. As a result, research done in such a manner would not do “non-significant” practices justice. Practitioners of educational leadership must, therefore, be careful and discrete in choosing their evidence to tailor different practices to their schools’ circumstances.

Interested researchers or practitioners in the field of education may refer to the OLF (Leithwood, 2012) for detailed sets of best practices catered to both the school level and district-wide level of administration. It should be used under the precaution that it was designed to serve Canada’s school system (maybe somewhat applicable to the US system) and might not be compatible with education systems elsewhere. Nevertheless, it would be interesting to apply the OLF to comparative studies in principal leadership practices in regions outside the US and Canada.

The OLF is probably the first working model of and comprehensive guidelines for school and district-level educational leadership. Even though it does not explicitly indicate elements of instructional and distributed leadership concepts built into the original transformational leadership framework (as seen in Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006), tracking the development of the school leadership literature revealed this “breakthrough” feature of the framework (see previous ‘Research’ section for a discussion of this issue). The inclusion of a Personal Leadership Resources in the OLF is “intended to be especially relevant for purposes of leadership recruitment and selection”. A guide to the OLF was published the following year (2013). It is written in a more usable and intuitive format for practitioners (principals, superintendents, etc…).

Similar to the precaution on the cross-national usage of the OLF, contextual factors are equally important when considering the implementation of PLC internationally (Toole & Louis, 2002). The two authors mentioned the following set of considerations for any educational leader who wants to create PLCs:

1. **Culture**: Educational leaders will need to be sensitive to local context to successfully shepherd PLCs;
(2) Educational priorities: Educational leaders need to know what matters to focus the potential of PLCs on;
(3) Top down policy: Educational leaders must be aware of the larger policy context, and inform policymakers of the gap between policy and practice;
(4) Boundaries: Educational leaders must integrate both on-site PLCs and interaction with experts outside of their schools and school systems;
(5) Conceptualization of a Good Colleague: Educational leaders must make explicit the criteria of a good colleague;
(6) Authenticity: Educational leaders need to model the types of collegial behavior that they want to see in their teachers;
(7) Students’ Voice: Educational leaders need to find ways to enlist students in the activities of PLCs;
(8) Autonomy: Educational leaders must balance the self and the group within the imperatives of the larger culture;
(9) Power and Inclusion: Educational leaders must decide if their schools’ PLCs are going to mirror the biases, power relationships, and inequalities of the larger society, or the opposite;
(10) Implementation: Educational leaders usually use multiple strategies to promote the formation of PLCs.

b. For HE Leadership
In general, the creation of any effective program for leadership development must be preceded by analysis of needs which helps pinpoint the exact areas for improvement, “to assure that the right development is offered to the right leaders” (Collins & Holton, 2004, as cited by Beatriz, Deborah, & Hunter, 2008). There are studies attempting to create evaluative frameworks for such a purpose. For example, London (2011) created a tool for evaluating the competencies of middle-leaders in university which he hoped to see more uses by practitioners in the future.

For solving unstructured problems, a step-by-step procedure recommended by Randall and Coakley (2007) based on the adaptive leadership framework is presented in the following table:
Table 8: Dimensions of Adaptive Leadership (Randall & Coakley, 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Tool Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step one</td>
<td>Identify the type of problem Technical: every day issues with common solutions; adaptive: challenging, new, uncommon situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step two</td>
<td>Focus attention Get people to pay attention to key issues. Secure commitments from those who will help you sell the initiative. Engage those who have yet to climb on board with the change issue. Adopt the behavior you expect from others, and take responsibility for problems facing the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step three</td>
<td>Frame the issues Determine the time when issues must be presented to stakeholders, and focus on the opportunities such problems can provide. Employ the “discovery process” - step back and see the big picture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step four</td>
<td>Secure ownership Sustain the conditions through which stakeholders take responsibility for problem solving. Place the work where it belongs. Challenge employees’ expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step five</td>
<td>Manage stakeholder conflict and maintain stress Stakeholders with different agendas need to be aligned to achieve a higher purpose, while confronting conflict resulting from stakeholders’ personal issues. This may be accomplished establishing “rules of engagement” for discussing heated issues, and defining reporting structures. Furthermore, it is often necessary to uphold the productive stress required for change to occur; especially as adaptive problems often require time to resolve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step six</td>
<td>Create a safe haven Counterproductive measures need to be minimized by slowing pace of change when possible and by creating a secure place to discuss disparate perspectives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Action Self Enabling Reflective Tool (ASERT) was developed by Jones et al. (2014) based on the distributed leadership matrix presented in the previous section on Higher Education Leadership. The tool consists of two parts: an action tool and a series of reflective prompts. These are presented in the following two tables:

Table 9: Action self-enabling reflective tool for distributed leadership (Jones et al., 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria for distributed leadership</th>
<th>Dimensions and values to enable development of distributed leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People are involved</td>
<td>Expertise of individuals is used to inform decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individuals participate in decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All levels and functions have input into policy development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expertise of individuals contributes to collective decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes are supportive</td>
<td>Informal leadership is recognised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decentralised groups engage in decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All levels and functions have input into policy implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communities of practice are modelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development is provided</td>
<td>Distributed leadership is used to build leadership capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentoring for distributed leadership is provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leaders at all levels proactively encourage distributed leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration is facilitated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources are available</td>
<td>Space, time and finance for collaboration are available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership contribution is recognised and rewarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility is built into infrastructure and systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities for regular networking are provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In advising against the use of world university rankings as a compass for directions to develop universities, Hallinger (2014) recommended two approaches. First, new rankings that cater to a smaller number of and more regional universities should be created so that more universities can meet the goal of being the top 100. Changing the weightage for different aspects of universities or even changing the criteria for rankings is another approach of the so-called “changing the game” response to world university rankings problem. Second, a more difficult response to manage would be to “shift the paradigm of university quality”. Through stimulating explicit discussions of these rankings, it is hoped that the academic community can offer empirical evidence of the damaging effects rankings can have over the long term, especially to teaching and learning quality. All in all, it is a challenge to “put one’s money where one’s mouth is” that university leaders and national HE leaders need to seriously consider.

VIII. Conclusion
Judging from the current trends in leadership research for both school and HE settings, one might confidently claim that there is a great preference for the
reconciliation of the three forms of leadership – instructional, transformational, and distributed (Leithwood & Sun, 2012; Leithwood et al., 2009; Winter, 2009; Bolden, Petrov, & Gosling, 2008; Hallinger, 2003).

Researchers need to shift their sight more towards practice (Leithwood & Sun, 2012; Harris & Spillane, 2008; Timperley, 2005). The purpose of this is twofold – firstly, as education is a highly applied and professional field, it makes sense to adopt an evidence-based approach to designing policies and best practice guidelines (Leithwood, 2012); second, research on the relationships between leadership and school and student outcomes provides much needed empirical evidence to validate certain leadership concepts, especially distributed leadership (Harris & Spillane, 2008).

The current situation where universities want to become more market-oriented like businesses, implicates a point of compromise, a balance in the administration style of these institutions. This is probably the single most important reason for the existence of the hybrid model so frequently mentioned nowadays in the HE leadership literature, but still so inadequately studied.

This report has not investigated the moderators of leadership, as has been mentioned in the Antecedents section. Future reviewers of school leadership should take note to look for both the key words “antecedent” and “moderator” in their literature search so as to gather more sources written about leadership’s antecedents acting as moderators.

This report did not discuss the social justice aspect of educational leadership. Interested readers may refer to the works of Capper and Young (2014) and Theoharis and Causton (2014). Further information can also be found in Issue 2, Volume 53 of the journal Theory Into Practice, a special issue on Inclusive Schooling and Leadership for Social Justice.

The report did not delve into the topic of sustainability. However, it should be noted that professional development is a part of the sustainability literature in education. Pasi Sahlberg authored a growing body of work on this topic in educational leadership that would be worth examining (e.g. Sahlberg, 2006; Sahlberg & Oldroyd, 2010; Sahlberg, 2010).

The report did not touch on the leadership for TVET (Technical and Vocational Education and Training) also known as Further Education in some countries. Interested readers may refer toMuijs et al. (2006) for an empirical study on the relationship between leadership and leadership development in the UK’s further education institutions; Gleeson and Knights (2008) for distributed and transformational leadership for the sector in the UK; and Albashiry, Voogt, and Pieters (2015) for the sector’s instructional leadership in Yemen.

The report has not examined leadership development comprehensively. In particular, issues concerning the importance of leadership development, processes of leadership development, and the current state of leadership development provision across countries have not been discussed. Interested readers will find Chapter 4 in OECD’s report on Improving School Leadership most informative on those topics (Beatriz, Deborah, & Hunter, 2008).

In an attempt to make sense of leadership in education, several authors have used the adaptive leadership framework proposed by Heifetz et al. (2004). Campbell-
Evans, Gray, and Leggett (2014) applied the framework to examine cases of Australian primary schools while Randall and Coakley (2007) used the framework to explain how HEIs initiate changes within an increasingly market-oriented academic environment. The potential use of this leadership model in the HE context has been detailed in the respective section. Its application in school leadership appears relatively new, however, and this might probably pique the curiosity of interested practitioners in education.
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Appendix A

Factor Loading Scores of New Five-Component Model (Smith & Wolverton, 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Competencies</th>
<th>Analytical</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Student Affairs</th>
<th>Behavioral</th>
<th>External Relations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analytical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fosters the development and creativity of learning organizations</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates understanding of academics</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engages multiple perspectives in decision making</td>
<td>.622</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learns from self-reflection</td>
<td>.602</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerates ambiguity</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>-.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustains productive relationships with networks of colleagues</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>-.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applies analytical thinking to enhance communication in complex situations</td>
<td>.640</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitates the change process</td>
<td>.586</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates resourcefulness</td>
<td>.499</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates ability to diplomatically engage in controversial issues</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>-.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates negotiation skills</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks to understand human behavior in multiple contexts</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurately assesses the costs and benefits of risk taking</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitates effective communication among people with different perspectives</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates understanding of complex issues related to higher education</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.445</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responds appropriately to change</td>
<td>.586</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presents self professionally as a leader</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.529</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicates vision effectively</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicates effectively</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.693</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expresses views articulately in multiple forms of communication</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicates effectively with multiple constituent groups in multiple contexts</td>
<td>.415</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responds to issues and needs of contemporary students</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.590</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>-.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is attentive to emerging trends in higher education</td>
<td>.456</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.545</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates understanding of student affairs</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates understanding of legal issues</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes the value of a sense of humor</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>.673</td>
<td>.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports leadership of others</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td>-.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates unselfish leadership</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.751</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learns from others</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not take self too seriously</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td>.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relates well with governing boards</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applies skills to affect decisions in government contexts</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>-.297</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates understanding of advancement</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>-.118</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates understanding of athletics</td>
<td>-.229</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works effectively with the media</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of variance accounted for</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative variance accounted for</td>
<td>20.48</td>
<td>8.71</td>
<td>8.31</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>7.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Boldface type indicates highest factor loading score for each variable/category correlation.
Appendix B. Findings by Walker and Hallinger (2015)
Table B1. Structural Patterns of Research by Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Singapore</th>
<th>Hong Kong</th>
<th>Taiwan</th>
<th>China</th>
<th>Vietnam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timeframe and Language</td>
<td>12-30 years English</td>
<td>12-30 years English, Chinese</td>
<td>12-30 years Chinese, English</td>
<td>12-30 years English</td>
<td>12-30 years Vietnamese, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of sources</td>
<td>- Articles from 8 core Educational Leadership (EduLead) journals, and postgraduate (postgrad) theses</td>
<td>- Articles from 8 core EduLead journals</td>
<td>- Articles from 8 core EduLead journals, local journals, and postgrad theses</td>
<td>- Articles from 8 core EduLead journals plus 3 comparative educational journals and book chapters</td>
<td>- Exhaustive review -- international and local journals, local master theses and international doctoral dissertations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Balance between local and international (intl) sources</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Balance between local and intl sources</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Least rigorous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>- Mostly empirical</td>
<td>- Mostly empirical</td>
<td>- Mostly empirical</td>
<td>- Mostly empirical</td>
<td>- Mostly empirical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Qualitative -- mostly use case study design</td>
<td>- Qualitative -- mostly use case study design</td>
<td>- Qualitative -- mostly use case study design</td>
<td>- Qualitative -- mostly use case study design</td>
<td>- Qualitative -- mostly use case study design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Quantitative -- cross-sectional survey designs, analyses use descriptive/ more advanced inferential statistical methods</td>
<td>- Quantitative -- cross-sectional survey designs, analyses use descriptive/ basic inferential statistical methods</td>
<td>- Quantitative -- cross-sectional survey designs, analyses use descriptive/ basic inferential statistical methods</td>
<td>- Quantitative -- cross-sectional survey designs, analyses use descriptive/ basic inferential statistical methods</td>
<td>- Few references to global literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Regular reference to globally accepted conceptual models and applied to local context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Lacking in a self-critical perspective and seldom looked outside of the approved policies for solutions to educational problems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B3. Principal leadership practices by Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competencies and styles</th>
<th>Singapore</th>
<th>Hong Kong</th>
<th>Taiwan</th>
<th>China</th>
<th>Vietnam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Focus on Development</td>
<td>- Focus</td>
<td>- Similar</td>
<td>- Almost nothing</td>
<td>- Less likely than the Vietnamese literature to refer to ideology or policy for justification</td>
<td>- Considerable effort spent on identifying KSAOs relevant to successful leadership, but with weak foundations or evidence (using political ideology)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Testing of the relevant KSAOs</td>
<td>on Development and Testing of the relevant KSAOs</td>
<td>to Singapore, but to a lesser extent</td>
<td>- Almost nothing</td>
<td>- Not prominent</td>
<td>- Not prominent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Vision                  | - Principals exercise hierarchical leadership during the initial phase of the reform and transition to facilitative leadership as reform gains traction | - Similar to Singapore, but to a lesser extent | - Almost nothing | - Almost nothing | - Almost nothing |

| Influences on teaching and learning | - Prominent - Similar to Taiwan, but stronger instructional role of principals | - Prominent - Linked emerging patterns of principal practice to the changing policy context of Hong Kong education - No significant effect of principal leadership on student learning | - Prominent - Principals as source of support and buffer for teachers | - Not prominent | - Not prominent - Focus on perceptions of principal practice related to teaching and learning - Weak designs - Discrepancy between ideal practice and actual practice |

| Shared decision making | - Principals “comparatively hesitant” to involve teachers in school change decisions – “bounded empowerment approach” | - Evidence of patchy implementation of reform despite mandated stakeholder involvement | - Evidence of patchy implementation of reform despite mandated stakeholder involvement | - “Mobilizing collective brainpower” – but principals lack the flexibility to adjust practices → formalistic and circumscribed staff involvement in decision making | - “Mobilizing collective brainpower” – but principals lack the flexibility to adjust practices → formalistic and circumscribed staff involvement in decision making |