The Changing Roles of Leadership and Management
in Educational Administration

This module has been peer-reviewed, accepted, and sanctioned by the National Council of the Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA) as a scholarly contribution to the knowledge base in educational administration.

Introduction

How the pendulum swings! The purpose of this introductory chapter is to discuss the dynamic roles of *leadership*, *management*, and *administration* as they relate to educational organizations. There has been much debate on this topic, particularly regarding the roles of leadership and management, and usually management comes out the worse for it. Typically, when education field practitioners or professors are asked about leadership and management, leadership will be thought of in a positive sense and management will likely be viewed negatively. It seems that no educational administrator wants to be seen as being a manager. Educational administration preparation programs are now usually housed in departments of educational leadership. When seeking a new principal or superintendent, the position description will very likely seek "a strong leader with vision."

Historically, in the early phases of this dialogue, the focus was on administration (see Wilson [1887] who noted that the study of administration was being added to the curriculum of universities). Then the focus was on management in school administration, as noted in Callahan's work (Cult of Efficiency). Next, and continuing until the present, the focus was on leadership. Many volumes have been written on these topics. Currently, a number of scholars and field practitioners have again been talking about the importance of management and the need

for balance between leadership and management. There are a number of reasons for these "paradigm shifts" as will be discussed in later sections.

At a professional development workshop for educational administrators, when asked to rate their perception of the terms "leader" and "manager" on a scale of 1 to 10 where one is low, their responses rated "leader" at an average of 9.2 and "manager" rated 8.8; this was by a group of school business *managers* (Dembowski, 1999)! A review of the textbooks currently used in principal and superintendent preparation programs will also highlight the dominance of leadership. However, when the actual activities on a day to day basis of principals and superintendents were analyzed in a workshop, the participants reported that the majority of their time is spent on management related tasks, "putting out fires" (Dembowski, 1999).

Leadership and management are both important functions, but they have different purposes and they seek to obtain different outcomes. About 40 years ago, Kurt Lewin (1936) put it this way, "Every organization structures itself to accomplish its goals in a way that is in tune with or responsive to its environment." Once the efficiency of the organization is established, people go about simply maintaining the system, assuming that the environment will stay the same. Management is the main focus because it keeps the organization going well with little change. But the thing is, the environment for any organization is always changing. Times like this require organizations to think more in terms of leadership. Leaders begin to ask questions like, "What is really going on here? How do we become relevant again? How do we fulfill our goals in these new times? What will prompt people to think that what we do is meaningful?" This observation continues to be relevant. Leaders seek to bring their organization more in line with the realities of their environment, which often necessitates changing the very structures,

resources, and relationships of their organization which they have worked so long and so hard to manage" (Lewin, 1936).

Warren Bennis, a professor and researcher who has devoted years to studying leadership and management, was more direct and summarized the two behaviors as follows: "Management is getting people to do what needs to be done. Leadership is getting people to *want* to do what needs to be done" (Bennis, 1994).

While the tasks and functions of management and leadership are unique, there is a link between them. It is clear that different problems require different solutions at different times. Rather than being mutually exclusive, these two competencies are interdependent. For example, once a leader articulates the intended direction, plans must be put in place to provide concrete ways to move in that direction. Once people have been hired into an organization (the structure of which was defined by a manager), a leader must align those people with a vision. Finally, the leader must motivate and inspire people to overcome the challenges that management processes of controlling and measuring have uncovered (Adamchik, n.d.).

Donna E. Shalala (1988), while serving as secretary of the U. S. Department of Health and Human Services, stated that "I think about management and leadership as linked processes. Managing in the public sector is quite different from that in the private sector. It is not really possible to think about control in an organization that has very few well-defined goals and technology and has substantial participant involvement in the affairs of the organization" (Shalala, 1998)."Success in organizations requires a balance of both leadership and management. The manager is the stone and the leader the fire. Both elements are necessary to forge a successful business. … the notion of leadership over management is being overemphasized. And

this overemphasis is often a turnoff to the very persons who need to hear the message" (Womack, n.d.).

What is the relative importance of effective leadership and management? Many scholars feel that both are equally important. "Strong leadership with weak management is no better, and sometimes actually worse, than the opposite. The challenge is to achieve a balance of strong leadership and strong management" (Maxwell, n.d.).

"Leaders manage and managers lead, but the two activities are not synonymous…. Management functions can potentially provide leadership; leadership activities can contribute to managing. Nevertheless, some managers do not lead, and some leaders do not manage." This is Bernard Bass's assessment in his 1,200 page opus, "Bass and Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership" (Bass, 1985, p. 383).

An appropriate balance of leadership and management is required to successfully operate any organization. Even leaders must appreciate the value of control, conservation of resources, and analysis of operations and outcomes. They also likely know when these management functions should be put to effective use. "Yet they must balance that appreciation with vision, communication, risk taking, and optimism, particularly in creating a new work environment or changing management philosophies" (Womack, n.d.).

However, while leadership seems to be thought of as the predominant function of administrators, it is widely recognized that efficient management is required in complex organizations in order to drive the purposes of leadership through systems for decision-making, co-ordination, reward, and accountability. In the period 1850 through 1950, the imperatives of control and accountability for resources and activities dominated public and institutional concerns, resulting in an emphasis on restraint and containment rather than on empowerment,

initiative, and creative development. It was during this period that the position of superintendent was established. Since the 1970s, the role of leadership gained ascendancy. Many scholars in the 1960s and 1970s maintained "administration" as their focus, not leadership (see for example Willower and Culbertson, 1964; English, 1994; Hoy and Miskel, 1978, 2001). Most of the current texts are centered on leadership principles and practices. See for example the nature of the chapters in Carr and Fulmer (2004). Many of their chapters focus on leadership and the failure of leadership preparation programs.

The need for, and value of, leadership and management is driven by the environmental context in which organizations exist and operate. Some conditions demand strong management while others require strong leadership. As times change, the roles of leadership and management also change. And what is "administration," the term that was predominantly used until the 1990's? Where does that fit in?

This chapter presents an overview of these topics with a focus on the roles of leadership and management, within the context of educational organizations. While leader roles are viewed here equally important as management, the comprehensive treatment of leadership has been treated well elsewhere (see Hoyle, English, and Steffy, 1998, 2005; Schwahn and Spady, 1998; and Carr and Fulmer, 2004). In the discussion that follows, the terms *management*, *leadership* and *administration* will in turn be defined, compared, and contrasted. Next, the links between them will be discussed and the conditions under which they are needed will be considered. Finally, recommendations for the future roles of these functions in both educational organizations and in training programs will be made.

What is Management?

A manager, according to the Handbook of the American Management Association (AMA), is one whose power is derived from the position he or she holds and who is accountable for achieving organizational objectives through the actions of subordinates (AMA, n.d.).

"*Manage*" comes from the Latin word meaning "*hand*" in the context of handling something. Management usually implies the handling or carrying out of policies and plans laid down by someone else (one's own self, if management and leadership are administered by the same person). It is more of a science than an art, where procedure and protocol are both important and satisfactory fulfillment of the management role is highly reliant upon calculation, statistics, methods, timetables, and routines (Stigmergicsystems, n.d.).

According to C.S. George, traditionally management has been defined in a narrow sense as the art of getting things done by others; a manager is one who accomplishes the objectives by directing the efforts of others. This definition is lacking in two ways:

(1) No realistic goal is set in this sense.

(2) A suitable internal environment is also not created. (Nature, n.d.)

Massie and Douglas (n.d.) stated "Management is the process by which a cooperative group directs actions of others towards common goals." Koontz and O'Donnell (1978) stated "Management is establishing an effective environment for the people operating in formal organizational groups." Kreitner (2004) stated: "Management is a process of working with or through others to effectively achieve organizational objectives by efficiently using limited resources in the changing environment."

Management is about the "hard skills." Management focuses on the business of the organization; it involves planning and budgeting, organizing and staffing, and controlling and measuring. "Management is not just getting things done. It is much more. It involves the whole

range of activities directed towards achieving organizational goals" (Nature, n.d.). For example, management seeks the maximum utilization of available resources in the best possible interest of an enterprise. It is a set of functions directed at the efficient and effective utilization of available resources. To be more specific, to manage means to forecast and to plan, to organize, to command, to coordinate, and to control. Thus management may be defined as "creating the internal environment of an enterprise where individuals working together in groups can perform efficiently and effectively toward the attainment of group goals." (Nature, n.d.).

Management is essential for the successful operation of an organization. It is essential in all organizations and at all levels of administration. "Without the enlightened guidance of the management; the productive resources will remain as resources only and shall never become production." (Nature, n.d.) As Edwin Robinson rightly said, "No business runs itself on momentum but needs repeated stimulus" (Nature, n.d.).

Management has a focus on efficiency. "Managers translate the strategic vision of the leaders into the tactics necessary to achieve the goals. Managers establish the specific measurable objectives that are used to monitor the organization's progress towards the goals" (Searson, 2000).

"Management is focused on maintaining standards. . . . It looks for declines in performance, in productivity, in quality. When it finds those declines it seeks to restore things to the standard. It essentially looks backward and tries to fix things that are broken" (Zeeck, 1997).

Management is a combination of an organized body of knowledge and skillful application of this knowledge. Much of this knowledge can be found in various academic disciplines, including business and the social sciences. Effective performance of various management functions is dependent on an adequate basis of knowledge and a scientific approach. Thus

management is both science and an art. It is a science because it requires continuous practice and an art because it requires personal skills (Nature, n.d.).

Like other social sciences, management is an inexact science. "Management deals with human behavior which is subject to constant changes and cannot be predicted on the basis of absolute laws and experiments. Because of this, the degree of inexactness in the case of management is quite high, and the principles of management are still evolving" (Nature, n.d.).

It is said that "the art of management starts where the science of management ends" (Nature, n.d.). Management is neither a complete science nor a complete art because only by training and practice an art can be mastered. Constant experimentation by training and practice is essential for an art. A person cannot become a successful manager without learning the systematized body of knowledge and principles of management. Similarly, a person cannot become a successful manager without learning the principles of management in a scientific manner. He also needs scientific training and practice in the field of management." (Nature, n.d.)

Nature also stated, "It is said that the manager embodies the best possible mixture of art and human sciences. In this sense of managers having to master the principles of management, we can say that 'managers are not born but made."

Many aspects of management are often viewed as a component of leadership. "Management is a thinking function. Managers must think before doing anything. For the purpose of determining organizational goals, for selecting the resources and for efficient utilization of resources, the manager needs a high degree of vision and judgment" (Nature, n.d.). However, vision is usually considered as a trait of leadership.

Kepner (1976) described the role of management as: "to create and support a culture throughout the organization where staff freely access and supply information." This approach to management utilizes expert information of staff to help develop and implement changes to enhance work processes and outcomes that are responsive to the customers' needs. However, the development of a "culture" is also often seen as a function of leadership.

The roles of leaders and managers are complementary. The role of the manager is one of stewardship, necessitating qualities of good administration, abilities to make efficient and effective use of resources. Managers like and tend to preserve the steady state. They don't like anything that "rocks the boat." They are expected to handle crises ("fire fighting"), but it is expected that they should have enough forethought to be able to avoid them. This is where leadership is necessary.

An effective manager is one who can invoke support through the channeling of a clear shared vision through the organization. "The manager is the dynamic, life-giving element in every business… above all, the quality and performance of the managers determine the success of a business; indeed they determine its survival" (Drucker, 1988).

"The senior managers in many organizations are often and correctly acknowledged as remarkably talented pioneers. The integrated structures emerging under their guidance, however, are typically so new and so dynamic that even the seasoned executives in this movement are still learning to create and operate highly integrated systems or networks" (Drucker, 1988). Managers are visionary regarding "process," leaders are visionary regarding outcomes. Managers see the here and how, and leaders project the when and if.

A manager's role is to plan, implement, monitor, and control activities over relatively short time frames from a few months to a few years. Tasks include budgeting, managing

workflows and systems, and coordinating resources (including people). Definitions, as expected, vary. For example Peter Senge (1990) viewed the manager's role as changing from one of organizing and controlling to a new dogma of shared vision, values, and mental models. Again, this is more akin to the descriptors for leadership.

The superintendent has both leadership and management roles. As manager, the superintendent attends to those functions that are mainly internal to the school district and are crucial for the day-to-day functioning of the district as an organization. In this role, rather than exercising community leadership and statesmanship skills, the superintendent must serve as the organization's chief administrative/executive officer/manager. The responsibility for the operation of the school district as an organization is delegated to the superintendent by the school board. "In both roles of leadership and management, it is essential that the superintendent provides supervision and fosters an understanding of an array of managerial approaches and tools related to the effective functioning of various managerial sub-systems" (Dembowski, 1999). What is the effect on superintendents' failure to both lead and manage? Dembowski (1998), based upon his surveys of superintendents, formulated the Superintendent's Maxim: "*You get hired for being a good leader; you get fired for being a poor manager.*"

What is Leadership?

While the complete treatment of leadership is beyond the scope of this text, a review of the definition and functions of leadership are pertinent here. For a comprehensive treatment of the subject, see Hoyle, English and Steffy (1998, 2005), Schwahn and Spady (1998), and Carr and Fulmer (2004).

"Leadership is a set of processes that creates organizations in the first place or adapts them to significantly changing circumstances. Leadership defines what the future should look

like, aligns people with that vision, and inspires them to make it happen despite the obstacles"
(Kotter, 1990, p. 25). Senge (1990) describes leaders as designers, stewards, and teachers. The
designer develops the vision and shape, the steward oversees the welfare of the organization, and
the teacher is always seeking opportunities for learning. Behavioral Scientist Bernard T. Bass
(1985) defines leadership as "the observed effect of one individual's ability to change other
people's behaviors by altering their motivations."

"The over-arching role of leaders is to have a goal to meet an agenda that permits the
organization to be responsive to the needs of its customers and stakeholders through setting new
priorities, engaging the necessary support, enacting upon a strategic agenda and sustaining the
changes implemented" (Leadership at Changing Minds, n. d).

A leader is a change agent. "Leadership is essentially innovative in character. It sees the
need to change to meet the new information age or changes in readers or the community. It wants
to create something different. It looks forward and asks how we might change to be reflective of
today's and tomorrow's needs" (Zeeck, 1999). "Leadership has a focus on effectiveness, that is,
making sure the organization is doing the right things. Leaders create the vision, or the
overriding strategic goals and objectives. Leaders specify the direction for the organization"
(Zeeck, 1999).

Effective leaders are often described as "dynamic," which is regarded as beneficial
because it denotes movement and change. The function of leadership is not only to produce
change but to set the direction of that change. Management, however, uses the function of
planning to produce orderly results to the change. Leadership is involved in developing the
vision and mission of the organization, initiating change in the organization. Management is
involved with the planning, organizing, staffing implementation, and evaluation of the change.

Leadership becomes particularly important at times of rapid change, as various authors have documented (Kanter, 1983; Peters and Austin, 1985; Kotter, 1990). "Organizations in which the leaders have no vision are doomed to follow tradition. They cannot prosper because they keep doing things as they always have." In the words of Peter Kreeft, "To be a leader you have to lead people to a goal worth having—something that's really good and really there. That is vision" (Kanter, 1983).

"Taking a leadership role, whether being promoted into it, or requesting one in a volunteer group, does not mean you are a leader. Leadership takes some fundamental understanding of the elements of leadership vs. the elements of management, which is as much a function of personality as it is learning the elements that make good leadership" (Nature, n.d.). "The best managers tend to become good leaders because they develop leadership abilities and skills through practicing good management techniques. Seldom is there an effective leader who has not been a good manager" (Maxwell, n.d.). Similarly, "managers who become successful leaders have humanized their management skills with inspiration, empowerment, and vision through a catalyst called charisma." (Maxwell, n.d.). Social scientist Alan Bryman (1986) goes so far as to suggest that management styles may set the stage for charisma.

Leadership is a role someone assumes. You do not have to be appointed as leader to be the driving force in a group or organization. There are many examples of evident leadership in schools by people (teacher leaders) other than superintendents and principals, those who have been appointed as leaders. Management responsibility, however, is more likely to be assigned by others or by the system. Both are important to a successful enterprise and are not mutually exclusive. Kotter (1990) contrasts management and leadership this way: "Management is a set of

processes that can keep a complicated system of people and technology running smoothly. The most important aspects of management include planning, budgeting, organizing, staffing, controlling, and problem solving."

> *Leadership* is about change and movement — perceiving the need for a new
> direction, figuring out where the organization needs to go, formulating a strategy
> to get there and motivating employees to make it happen. *Management* is a matter
> of consistency and order — setting goals, laying out specific plans and budgets,
> organizing and staffing with qualified people, and controlling deviations (a.k.a.
> solving problems). (Campbell, n.d.).

The Evolution of Administrative Theory and Practice

The evolution of administrative, management, and leadership models and frameworks are works in progress. The processes involved are becoming more complex, challenging conventional thinking and the wisdom of the past. More integrated models are needed to serve thinking and actions in the future, to meet increasing needs of organizations, and to ensure the future success of current and aspiring competent, ethical administrators. The following section details the evolution of administrative thought. This section has been adapted from the work of (Campbell, n.d.)

The Rational/Structural Framework

The economic surge of large scale businesses in the early nineteenth century to mid-twentieth century, prompted the need to more effectively manage and lead the administrative and productive capacity of organizations in the pursuit of capitalistic development. Wolin (in

Reed, 1961) stated, "Organizations were rationally designed to solve permanently the conflict between collective needs and individual wants that had bedeviled social progress since the days of Ancient Greece" (p. 31). Rational, scientific designs offered a way to coordinate, control, and create order from the chaos of an industrial society deeply altered by the demand and consumption of new goods and services. The gurus of the day included F. W. Taylor, H. Fayol, H. Simon, L. Urwick and E. Brech, all of whom advocated the theory of scientific management - - "the organization as a rationally constructed artifice directed to the solution of collective problems of social order and administrative management" (Reed, 1996, p. 35). The division of labor served as the foundation of all organizations and their reason for being. Hence, it was important to manage primarily through a scientific process devoid of any human emotion, beliefs, or values (Reed , 1948).

> Epistemological principles and administrative techniques translate highly contestable, normative precepts into universal, objective, immutable, and hence unchallengeable, scientific laws. The rational individual is, and must be, an organized and institutionalized individual. Human beings became raw material transformed by modern organizational technologies into well-ordered, productive members of society unlikely to interfere with the long-term plans of ruling classes and elites" (Reed quoting Simon, 1957, p. 35).

Given the social, political, and economic status of the day, most workers were probably willing to except this treatment in order to ensure food on the table and a roof over their head. In the author's experience, this rationale is still an accepted management practice in some third world countries like India and parts of China, although changing rapidly.

Frederick W. Taylor, in his 1911 book entitled, "Principles and Methods of Scientific Management," recognized the inadequacies of the military model of authority for large-scale factory productions of the day. Taylor's scientific management theory (referred to as "Taylorism") emphasized a managerial ideology "thought to aid employers or their agents in controlling and directing the activities of workers" (Reed, 1996, p. 35). The Taylor Society and its members supported and believed the principle of optimizing production through a strict division of labor, with each worker performing the same task, the same way, under strict supervision. Each task was broken into to smaller parts, and workers were trained to get the most from each motion and every second – substantiated by Taylor's time-and-motion studies (Bolman, 2003).

Fayol was more affected by the chaos, disruption, and conflict in organizations resulting from rapid growth and development. His principles of organization were driven by the need to coordinate and control to manage the conflict caused by "informal behavior" (Reed, 1996). "Classical organization theory is founded on the underlying belief that an organization provides a principle of structural design and a practice of operational control which can be rationally determined and formalized in advance of actual performance" (Reed, 1996, p. 36). Fayol, often called the "father of management" identified five basic functions of organization as planning, organizing, coordination, commanding, and controlling. These have evolved in to the more commonly recognized functions of planning, organizing, leading, staffing and controlling. More recently, staffing has been removed and replaced by "change".

Simon's theory of "bounded rationality" and "administrative behavior" sought to reduce any "interpretive work" done by individuals within the organization by providing cognitive processes and formalized rules and operations (Reed, 1996). With detailed policies and

procedures in place, workers were encouraged not to think, and perform according to standardized processes -- a simple extension of the assembly line and devoid of any personal or responsible power.

German economist and sociologist Max Weber's structural ideas emphasized the framework of power and domination in the form of patriarchy, rather than rationality – but still based his ideas on an organizing principle (Bolman, 2003). "Patriarchal organizations were dominated by a father figure, an individual with almost unlimited power. He could reward, punish, promote, or fire on personal whim" (p. 46). Similar to Taylor's theme, Weber identified major features of his theory as (1) a fixed division of labor, (2) a hierarchy of offices, (3) a set of rules governing performance, (4) separation of personal from official property and rights, (5) technical qualifications (not family ties or friendship) for selecting personnel, and (6) employment as primary occupation and long-term career (Bolman, 2003). This 'bureaucratic model' focused on structure and function and later resurfaced in the 1960's.

What the rationality framework failed to do was deal with the increasing complexity and dynamic changes rapidly occurring in the workplace. In short, this framework was not adaptable or flexible enough to respond to rapid change and ensure the long-term prosperity and sustainability of an organization. To avoid conflict seemed unreasonable, if not ridiculous. What was referred to in the 1960's as "Theory X management" (coercion, tight controls, threats and punishments if workers do not conform), proved to be inadequate. "The usual result is superficial harmony with undercurrents of apathy and indifference" (Bolman, 2003, p. 118). This "sickness" will result in behavioral consequences such as passivity, hostility, and even sabotage.

The Evolution of the Human Relations Framework

Mary Follett Parker made the point that "We can never wholly separate the human from the mechanical side…But you all see every day that the study of human relations in business and the stuff of operating are bound up together" (Follett, 1995, p. 27). In the 1960's a similar point made by Douglas McGregor supporting self-direction also referred to as "Theory Y management" -- "the essential task of management is to arrange organizational conditions so that people can achieve their own goals best by directing their efforts toward organizational rewards" (Bolman quoting McGregor, 1960, p. 119). Organistic thinking and those from the human relations school argued that the rationality framework failed to deal with the problems of social integration and maintaining social order in a more unstable and uncertain world (Reed, 1996). "The mission of the organization is not only to supply goods and services, but fellowship as well" (Reed quoting Wolin, 1961, p. 37). A 2004 survey on retirement by *The Economist* (2004) notes that the longer living retirees will predictably stay in the workplace longer, or re-enter the workplace for that kind of need -- "stimulus, companionship and the freedom from worry that a bit of extra money can bring."

> The whole thrust of the human relations perspective is a view of social isolation and conflict as a symptom of social pathology and disease. The 'good' society and the effective organization are defined in relation to their capacity to facilitate and sustain the socio-psychological reality of spontaneous cooperation and social stability in the face of economic, political and technological changes that threaten the integration of the individual and group within the wider community. (Reed, 1996, p. 37)

Rather than management as a set of concrete rules and tools, management was a function and a role within a larger social unit, requiring a socially skilled management within an adaptable system, focused on encouraging emergent processes capable of ensuring some form of stability and sustainability.

> Changes in organizational patterns are considered as the result of cumulative, unplanned, adaptive responses to threats to the equilibrium of the system as a whole. Responses to problems are thought of as taking the form of crescively developed defense mechanisms and being importantly shaped by shared values, which are deeply internalized in the members. The empirical focus is thus directed to the spontaneously emergent and normatively sanctioned structures in the organization. (Reed quoting Gouldner, 1959, p. 37)

This framework was about survival and the needs of a changing society at large. It was an opportunity to apply the social integration frameworks of social scientists, and the general principles of systems theory.

> By the late 1940's and early 1950's, this conception of organizations as social systems geared to the integrative and survival 'needs' of the larger societal orders of which they were constituent elements established itself as the dominant theoretical framework within organization analysis (Reed, 1996, p. 37)

Those who argued against the rational model include Roethlisberger and Dickson in their 1939 book entitled, "The Management and the Worker", and the 1933 and 1945 writings of Elton Mayo (1933). They questioned the deeply held assumption of the rational school of thought –

"that workers had no rights beyond a paycheck; their duty was to work hard and follow orders" (Bolman, 2003, pp. 113-114). An outsider and a factual idealist who was not recognized for her contributions until after her death, was Mary Follett Parker, a political and social scientist with years of practical experience in social and public affairs. Her focus was on conflict and power, and how it can be made to work for us, rather than against us (Follett, 1995). Abraham Maslow further supported the human relations framework by developing a most influential theory of human needs – physiological needs, safety needs, belongingness and love needs, esteem needs, and self-actualization needs. Academics remain skeptical and argue that the concept of need is vague, but Maslow's theory is still widely accepted among managers, some who have used these values and beliefs as core elements of progressive company policy (Bolman, 2003).

The human relations movement, later referred to by Lee Bolman in 1984 as the human resource framework, argued that organizations exist to serve people, rather than people existing to serve organizations. There must be a good fit between the individual and the system – if the fit is poor, both suffer and if the fit is good, both benefit (Bolman, 2003). Follett argued, "Of what then does the individuality of a man consist? Of his relation to the whole, not (1) of his apartness nor (2) of his difference alone" (Follett, 1995, p. 256). Where Follett focused on managers and their social system, Mayo focused on workers and their social system. Each contributed to the focus on the human relations perspective in the workplace, each with a vision of the "new" organization, driven by the need to survive.

Market-driven, Political, and Open Systems Frameworks

As a way of surviving, theorists of this era produced concepts and theories integrating some aspects of both the rational and organistic viewpoint. The rational framework assumes that

behavior is motivated by "the goal of minimizing market costs and maximizing market returns" (Reed, 1996, p. 39). The organistic viewpoint focuses on the organization "as an evolutionary and semi-rational product of spontaneous and unintended consequences" (Reed quoting Hayek, 1978, p. 39). Richard Cyert, an economist, and James G. March, a political scientist, both professors at Carnegie-Mellon in 1963, rejected the traditional economic view of an organization with the single goal of maximizing profits. Cyert and March placed decision-making and resource allocation at the core of their predictive theory of organization, viewing organizations as "coalitions made up of individuals and sub coalitions" (Bolman, 2003, p. 191). Their view implied a political framework with the central idea being, "goals emerge out of a bargaining process among coalition members" (Bolman, 2003). This includes "side payments" to keep essential coalition members satisfied, and made more challenging by limited resources.

For the manager, these political elements give rise to the need for the ability to influence others, and the need for a keen understanding of the dynamics, distribution, and exercise of power – the ability to get things done. Competing goals, scarce resources, new knowledge, the resulting conflict, and use of power to get what individuals and groups need, describes organizational politics that continues to be a key component of organizational dynamics and one that can be understood and managed.

The power framework, grounded in Max Weber's sociology of domination, describes the organization "as an arena of conflicting interests and values constituted through power struggles" (Reed, 1996, p. 40). Therefore, coalitions form, individuals with common values, beliefs, and goals, to gain power, whether by authority, the rational viewpoint, or through ethical influence, the human relations viewpoint. Regardless of tactic, the aim of mobilizing power is to get what is

needed to get things done. Although power associated with the political dynamic that is a part of every organization is often viewed as negative, the manager that acknowledges the need to "be political" can use that skill to encourage productive dialogue and learning, gain a better understanding of varying perspectives and points-of-view, and, if persistent, find a reasonable and politically sound solution to cross-functional problems. "We have to stop describing power always in the negative terms: [as in] it excludes, it represses. In fact, power produces; it produces reality" (Bolman quoting Foucault, 1975, p. 192).

Part of that reality is what Henry Mintzberg described as the "challenging and non-programmed" work of a manager (Mintzberg, 1979). Recognizing the need to align organizational structure with the organization's mission and the given environment, Mintzberg (1979 designed a five-sector blueprint or organizational chart to better manage varying missions and environments. The five sectors include the operating core of workers, the administrative elements of middle managers and supervisors that control the operation, the specialists and analysts described as the techno structure sector who standardize processes and measure outputs, the support staff who support the work of others, and the strategic apex where the important decisions about the organization are made (Bolman, 2003). From this five sector logo, Mintzberg went on to describe five organizational structural configurations, each addressing varying missions and diverse environments, and each with its own set of management challenges.

In his 1979 publication entitled "The Nature of Managerial Work", Mintzberg addresses those challenges by asking the question, "What do managers do?" (Mintzberg, 1979). His work produced a set of ten (10) basic roles, three of which are interpersonal roles, three that are informational roles, and four that are decisional roles. These ten roles would aid the manager who

"must design the work of his organization, monitor its internal and external environment, initiate change when desirable, and renew stability when faced with a disturbance" (Mintzberg, 1979, p. 169). Because of the variation in a manager's work, Mintzberg suggests a "contingency theory" – managerial actions based on a number of variables including the size of the organization, technology in use, external environmental factors, and individual needs (Mintzberg, 1979).

In Mintzberg's view there is no science in the job of managing – it is an art. In fact, he describes the manager as in a kind of "loop" due to the pressures and complexities of the role. "We find that the manager, particularly at senior levels, is overburdened with work. With the increasing complexity of modern organizations and their problems, he is destined to become more so. He is driven to brevity, fragmentation, and superficiality in his tasks, yet he cannot easily delegate them because of the nature of his information. And he can do little to increase his available time or significantly enhance his power to manage. Furthermore, he is driven to focus on that which is current and tangible in his work, even though the complex problems facing many organizations call for reflection and a far-sighted perspective" (Mintzberg, 1979, p. 173). This could have been written in 2004 with one slight but significant change – "he" now refers to both "he" and "she".

Mintzberg, along with Katz and Kahn at the University of Michigan, and Lawrence and Lorsch at Harvard, had begun to develop an "open systems" model of organization (Quinn, 2003). Robert Quinn, while at the University at Albany, viewed the manager not only as a rational decision maker, but one who had to function in highly unpredictable environments with little time for organizing and planning. "They are, instead, bombarded by constant stimuli and forced to make rapid decisions" (Quinn, 2003, p. 8). The manager is expected to be a "creative innovator"

and "politically astute" – all in an effort to respond faster, compete more efficiently, and continually adapt to the changing environment. Key management skills have become political adaptation, creative problem solving, innovation, and the management of change – troublesome skills in a bureaucratic organization and critical skills in an "adhocracy," a self-designing organization.

The Emergence of Organizations as Cultures

In 1993, Peter Drucker, one of the most influential scholars and practitioners in the field of management, declared the end of capitalism, as we know it (Drucker, 1993):

> For two hundred and fifty years, from the second half of the eighteenth century on, Capitalism was the dominant social reality. For the last hundred years, Marxism was the dominant social ideology. Both are rapidly being superseded by a new and very different society. The new society – and it is already here – is a post-capitalist society…. The center of gravity in the post-capitalist society – its structure, its social and economic dynamics, its social classes, and its social problems – is very different from the one that dominated the last two hundred and fifty years. (p. 293-4)

Drucker declared that the knowledge that would be valued was "knowledge that could be applied systematically and purposefully" for results – for Drucker, it was the only meaningful resource and the key to personal and economic success (Boyett and Boyett, 1998, p. 299). Leading in this post-capitalist society, where knowledge was the key resource, drove theorists and scholars of the day to tackle the topic of leadership, and identify the characteristics that make an

effective leader in times like these. The shift was from an emphasis on management to an emerging interest in leadership.

In the mid-eighties, the notion of culture emerged as an additional facet of leadership, with Edgar Schein (1992) publishing "Organizational Culture and Leadership," enlightening us on the relationship between organizational culture and leadership. He defined culture as:

A pattern of shared basic assumptions that a group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and therefore to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems . . . most stable and least malleable. (Schein, 1992, p. 12)

Understanding culture, therefore, became a way of understanding what goes on inside an organization when different sub coalitions, subgroups, and varying occupational groups work together. If leaders and managers are responsible for innovation, learning, and the management of change, it only seems reasonable that managers and leaders are able to conceptualize and create a supportive organizational climate -- a culture that is supportive of innovation, learning, and constant change. It is Schein's belief that "organizational cultures are created in part by leaders, and one of the most decisive functions of leadership is the creation, the management, and sometimes even the destruction of culture" (Schein, 1992, p. 5). He offers leaders a process for analyzing culture, building or creating culture, embedding culture, and managing culture during various stages of growth and development.

Perhaps Schein's greatest contribution to the field of organizational culture was expanding the concept of the learning organization and the learning leader – the ability to build the organization's capacity to learn. "A learning culture must contain a core shared assumption that the appropriate way for humans to behave is to be proactive problem solvers and learners" (Schein, 1992, p. 364). The leader, therefore, "attempts to develop a learning organization that will be able to make its own perpetual diagnosis and self-manage whatever transformations are needed as the environment changes" (Schein quoting Bushe and Shani, 1991; Hanna, 1988; Mohrman and Cummings, 1989, p. 363). Building on the thoughts and ideas of Donald Michael (1985, 1991), Tom Malone (1987), and Peter Senge (1990), Schein (1992) describes the learning culture as one that:

> Must assume that the world can be managed, that it is appropriate for humans to be proactive problem solvers, that reality and truth must be pragmatically discovered, that human nature is basically good and in any case mutable, that both individualism and groupism are appropriate, that both authoritarian and participative systems are appropriate provided they are based on trust, that the best kind of time horizon is somewhere between far and near future, that the best kinds of units of time are medium-length ones, that accurate and relevant information must be capable of flowing freely in a fully connected network, that diverse but connected units are desirable, that both task and relationship orientations of interconnected forces in which multiple causation and over-determination are more likely than linear or simple causes. (p. 373)

What Are The Similarities and Differences Between Management And Leadership?

As seen in this evolution of administrative thought, the distinctions between management and leadership are not always obvious, since the roles of manager and leader are generally combined (see, e.g. Mintzberg, 1973; Stewart, 1986).

In "Understanding the Difference Between Management and Leadership," by Maccoby (2000), management is a function that must be exercised in any business, leadership is a relationship between leader and led that can energize an organization. Maccoby believed that leadership is a facet of management, and leadership is just one important component of the directing function of management. He stated that "Managers think incrementally, whilst leaders think radically." And "Managers do things by the book and follow company policy, while leaders follow their own intuition, which may in turn be of more benefit to the company. The manager knows how each layer of the system works. When a natural leader emerges in a group containing a manager, conflict may arise." He argued that groups are often more loyal to a leader than a manager. In "The Leader Is Followed. The Manager Rules," Maccoby summarizes by stating that "Managing and leading are two different ways of organizing people. The manager uses a formal, rational method whilst the leader uses passion and stirs emotions" (Maccoby, 2000).

Peter G. Northouse, in his 2004 publication "Leadership: Theory and Practice," presents a multitude of current approaches and theories applicable to the practice of management and leadership. His examples and case studies demonstrate applicability of leadership and management in real-life organizations and summarize these approaches, including their strengths and weaknesses.

The roles of leadership and management are clearly intertwined, so what makes a successful administrator in an educational organization? Management is an activity involving responsibility for getting things done through other people. The heart of management is the capacity to get things done with the resources available. As Green (1988) identified, the main difference between management and leadership relates to risk and vision. The leader or head provides the vision and then the deputy head or head of department, implements the vision, by motivating people to achieve the necessary goals. According to Northouse (2004):

> When managers are involved in influencing a group to meet its goals, they are involved in leadership. When leaders are involved in planning, organizing, staffing, and controlling, they are involved in management. Both processes involve influencing a group of individuals toward goal attainment. (p. 10)

Dunford, Fawcett, and Bennett (2000) made the following distinguishing points between leaders and managers:

- Leadership is concerned with the long term and the strategic, management with the immediate and short term. Vision is articulated and set by the leader, whilst the manager is required to design and implement procedures which enable the vision to be achieved
- Leaders need to engage staff by inspiring them with a vision, navigate them using the strategic plan, enable staff by reallocation resources according the needs of the organization and mobilize staff through reallocation according to skills and empowerment through inclusion in the change process and in furthering their education. Managers and leaders must encourage and support the team as well as individual changes/challenges.
- Managers and leaders need to acknowledge that complex organizational structures mean that single leaders cannot deliver the requirements alone. They need a network of leaders that are interdependent and responsive to each other's skills and needs.
- Managers and leaders need to signal the need for change. Managers and leaders should be aware of their ability to use external factors/demands as a fulcrum for motivating change within the organization.

"Leadership is changing for better results; it is challenging the status quo and looking at the long term. Management, on the other hand, is consistency for better results; it is maintaining the status quo and focusing on short-term results. Management is about completing a project on time and on budget. Leadership and management, therefore, seem to contradict each other" (Adamchik, n.d.). Management and leadership stand back to back with management examining past performance and leadership looking ahead to the next set of challenges.

The assumption that management and leadership are either coterminous or else that one is part of the other, has been challenged in the past decade by several writers, including Bryman, Bennis and Nanus (1985), Bennis (1989) and Kotter (1988, 1990). Agreement is lacking as to whether the roles can be complementary in the same person. Bennis (1989), in particular, sees clear distinctions between a manager--who maintains systems, relies on controls, has a short range view, accepts the status quo--and a leader, who energizes, motivates, has a long range and even visionary view, and challenges and changes the status quo. It is difficult to see how such different roles can be combined in the same person.

Amidon (1997) agrees with Kotter stating that "managers integrate; leaders innovate." Gilley (1997) offers a different way of contrasting managers and leaders. Instead of suggesting that they do different things, she suggests that leadership does not focus on doing at all. "Leadership is different from management. Leadership is a state of being; management is a way of doing. … The leader gives service to those who work with him or her. Managers receive service from those who work for them." Cashman (1998) states that "Managers control by virtue of their doing. Leaders lead by virtue of their being. When we are (as is often the case) rapidly alternating between management and leadership, the relationship between control and openness is

a constant dynamic" (Cashman 1998). Leaders do not do different things, they are a different way. By focusing attention on a vision, the leader operates on the emotional and spiritual resources of the organization, on its values, commitment, and aspirations. The manager, by contrast, operates on the physical resources of the organization, on its capital, human skills, raw materials, and technology (Bennis and Nanus, p. 89-92). "Managers use management processes to control people by pushing them in the right direction. Leaders motivate and inspire people by satisfying their human needs, keeping them moving in the right direction to achieve a vision" (Changingminds n.d.)

The roles of leadership and management differ depending upon the level in the administrative hierarchy. Executive management should be primarily a leadership position, secondarily a management position. Middle management positions need some leadership, but are primarily involved with management. Lower-level management positions do need some leadership and management, but are primarily involved with administrative-level activities, and perhaps secondarily with individual contribution. Once one has determined the balance of leadership, management, administrative and individual contribution activity appropriate for the position, then you can determine what is needed, i.e., how much a "manager" and how much a "leader" (Searson, 2004).

Effectiveness, results, and satisfaction are all found in an organization where the roles of leaders and managers are clearly defined to provide the following:

- Direction, including a vision, a strategic plan, and operational plans;
- Expectations of what every board and staff member, and volunteer is responsible for;

- Performance measurements of how well individuals and the organization are meeting members' needs; and

- Balance between the roles of leaders and managers. (Maxwell, n.d.)

Transactional and Transformational Leadership and Management

Management and Leadership are two different mentalities that cannot and should not be separated, because all successful organizations require managers and leaders. Many organizations are reasonably well managed, but poorly led. Competent management is essential in any organization, given the need for well-documented objectives, reports, evaluations, plans etc. Leadership is not confined to one or two people at the top of a pyramid. Strong leaders should be distributed throughout the entire organization.

According to Drucker, "managers define what the organization is about through their actions and deeds," while leadership "gives the organization meaning, defines and nurtures its central values, creates a sense of mission, and builds the systems and processes that lead to successful performance" (Drucker, 1984). Managers' actions and deeds reflect the values of the organization through the decisions they make, the people they hire, the people they fire, and how they pursue their goals. In the long run, the integrity of management reflects the ethics and morals of the organization.

While school administrators have substantial influence on shaping mission, they need to be aware of the limits on their ability to dictate vision and unilaterally shift mission focus. A frequent problem faced by school districts is the continual change of the composition of the school board, with new members desiring to impose their vision on the organization. With the typical school board term being two years, with staggered terms, every three years a new

superintendent is hired. This is because the school board that hired the old superintendent is no longer on the Board, and the new board wants a superintendent who meets their philosophy and view of how things should be done. This is one of the reasons for the rapid turnover of superintendents. Often, upheaval is caused by a new superintendent who tries to change too many things too fast. There should be constancy of purpose. The mission and vision of a school district or a school building should be developed through a group process and shared among all of the stakeholders. The leader should be a facilitator and implement the organizational vision.

Kotter (1990) stated that management is about coping with complexity, while leadership is about coping with change. The functions of management are focused on order and control in order to make the organization efficient and effective within agreed objectives. School administrators may exercise both the functions of leadership and management in support of change in the organization, but successful change cannot be imposed by fiat. It is the task of leadership to clarify the direction of change and to make the members of the organization willing, even enthusiastic partners in the change process.

Kotter (1990), these situations call in the first place, not for management to "control complexity," but for proactive leadership to "produce useful change." Such leadership must however be supported by competent management, for change creates its own complexity, with secondary and often unintended consequences.

As organizations continue to become less structured, the need to inspire performance (lead) rather than manage, will increase. As organizations become more disorganized, people will work more in project collaboration than in departments and layers. They will also be less subject to being managed and routinely directed. Organizational success comes from a balance of

management and leadership from the organizations senior team and from creating and rewarding

collaboration.

Bass (1985) conducted studies to assess the roles of management and leadership in

successful organizations. Management is a transactional process--positive and negative

reinforcement for performance. Leadership is transformational--inspiring, stimulating, and

collaborating towards a vision. The studies indicated that the negative reinforcement-style of

transactional management (often called the stick approach) usually reduced productivity over the

long term. The other side of transactional management--positive reinforcement (the carrot)--

though contributing to a more pleasant work environment, produced only marginal increases in

performance (Bass 1985).

The transformational leadership approach was found to significantly raise performance

levels and advance job satisfaction. Though the results of the Bass study will come as no surprise

to school leaders, it is interesting how few decision makers are willing to balance their

management skills with transformational-type activities. At certain times, organizations thrive

and prosper under transactional leadership, and at other times they need transformational

leadership, particularly in times of rapid change (Vera and Crossan, 2004). Based on a more

contingent view of leadership, "An ideal strategic leader would be able to identify and exercise

the leadership behaviors appropriate for the circumstances" (Vera and Crossan, 2004).

"There is evidence that leaders may possess both transactional and transformational

behaviors. Recent research has suggested that transformational leadership builds on transactional

leadership and, in particular, on contingent reward behaviors" (Avolio, 1999). Shamir and

Shamir (1995), for example, noted that by consistently honoring transactional agreements, head

administrators build trust, dependability, and an image of consistency among organizational

members. This contributes to the high levels of trust and respect associated with transformational leaders. In addition, a leader may excel at transformational behaviors but may choose transactional behaviors when needed; this is Quinn's (1988) concept of a "master manager."

Authoritarian, Transactional Style

Managers have a position of authority vested in them by the organization, and their subordinates work for them and largely do as they are told. "This management style is transactional, in that the manager tells the subordinate what to do, and the subordinate does this not because they are a blind robot, but because they have been promised a reward (at minimum their salary) for doing so" (Nature, n.d.).

Charismatic, Transformational Style

"Telling people what to do does not inspire them to follow you. You have to appeal to them, showing how following will lead them to their hearts' desire. They must want to follow you enough to stop what they are doing and perhaps walk into danger and situations that they would not normally consider risking" (Nature, n.d.).

Mintzberg (1979) suggested a contingency theory in light of the variation of a manager's work, including the size of the organization, technology in use, external environmental factors, and individual needs. Although somewhat conceptual in nature, the adaptive nature of this kind of leadership approach lends itself to differing conditions and constant changes present in organizations today. Young organizations respond favorably to transformational leadership, mature organizations to transactional leadership, and those in a decline or renewal stage need a transformational leader.

Are both transactional and transformational skills and abilities necessary for all levels of leadership? Yes! Campbell (n.d.) states:

Given the nature of the role, frontline supervisors and lower level managers should be focused on developing the competencies required for both their current role and their future role as leaders in the organization. Mid-level managers, however, are currently being asked to both manage and lead. In future, they will be asked to fill the shoes of senior leadership and should therefore be open to the notion of transformational leadership styles, including the importance of ethical influence in an environment where old problems must be thought of in a new way.

Leadership and management are two separate but complementary roles, each with their set of

skills and knowledge. However, a good leader knows when to manage and a good manager knows

how to lead. In a discussion of leadership and management, two themes of managerial leadership

that continually emerge: transactional and transformational. Not transactional or transformational,

but a combination and integration of the two approaches. There are occasionally times in the life

of a growing and changing organization when the use of transactional management is appropriate

(Womack, n.d.). Table 1 provides a synthesis of the models and frameworks previously described,

with focus on their transactional or transformational nature (Womack, n.d.)

Table 1: Leadership and Management as Transactional and Transformational

	Transactional	Transformational
Role of Manager and Leader	Planner Organizer Controller Monitor Coordinator Producer Director	Visionary Innovator Influencer Mentor Facilitator Coach and Guide Moral, Ethical Leader
Overlap of Management and Leadership	Gets things done, i.e. accomplishes goals through people – influences Plans, organizes, builds systems to encourage successful performance Integrity, professionalism, and innovation reflect values of the organization and influence actions	Gets things done, i.e. accomplishes goals through people – influences Plans, organizes, builds systems to encourage successful performance Integrity, professionalism, and innovation reflect values of the organization and influence actions

From (Womack n.d.)

Dembowski (1999) discussed how school superintendents and school principals play both roles

of leadership and management. Table 2 displays these roles.

Table 2. the Leader and Managerial Roles of Educational Administrators

	As Leader	As Manager
Superintendent	Community Leader, Chief Professional (Role Model)	Chief Executive Officer/Manager
Principal	Instructional Leader	Facility Manager

(Dembowski 1999)

Appendix 1. entitled "A Comparison of Approaches to Leadership and Management" contains a summary of this section.

While it is exciting to think of the noble roles of educational innovation and the inspiring educational leadership performed by school administrators, many of the roles related to the school administrator involve responding to unanticipated emergencies ("putting out fires") or simply holding together the day-by-day functioning of the school district. Part of the process of coping with this juggling act for all new and even seasoned administrators is to recognize the range of roles they must play and learn how to review and analyze the tasks and functions related to those roles that require special attention. (Dembowski 1999)

What is Administration?

Lastly, there is administration, the function of which is to implement policy within a framework of established systems, rules and procedures. "In this way, it can serve the purposes of either management or leadership. Put epigrammatically: management controls, leadership guides and enthuses, administration serves." (Campbell, n.d.) "Administration is about the practical ways of turning leadership and management into reality" (Green, 2000). This does not

mean that leaders do not pay attention to tasks - in fact they are often very achievement-focused. What they do realize, however, is the importance of enthusing others to work toward their vision (Green, 2000).

Achilles (1998) states that "administration has at least three elements: the why, the what, and the how." He goes on to state that the profession needs to "align the content and processes of administrator preparation programs with what administrators do, and with what theory says they should do."

Administration is considered wider in scope in comparison with management or leadership. Permalink (2004) states:

It is that activity, which lays down the organizational objectives, formulates plans and programs and takes major decisions to achieve the organizational objectives. It is an intellectual or thinking function. It represents the owners, and its decisions, are influenced by the outside world such as, government, trade unions, suppliers, and customers etc. It is responsible for the success or failure of the organization. Administration is therefore a higher level of authority. The element of administration increases as one progresses to higher ranks or positions. "Administration thus means overall determination of policies, the selling of major objectives, identification of general purposes, the laying out of road programs, major projects etc.

Management on the other hand involves implementing decisions, executing policies and plans. The manager extracts work from the subordinates and converts the policies and plans into reality by implementing the decisions of the administration. Thus, management does the job of executing the policies, plans and programs of the administration. Therefore, at entry or middle

management positions, the execution of policies is greater while at higher levels of management, there is greater administration in the sense of formulating policies and plans.

"Administration" is a more general term, and should be used more widely. It does not connote an emphasis on either leadership or management. Instead, the administrator is concern with the overall functioning of all aspects of an organization. Willower and Culbertson (1964) and English (1994) with the use of the term "Educational Administration," more accurately reflected the scope of the duties and responsibilities of the administrator in an educational organization. The use of "administration," such as educational administration, school administrator or Department of Educational Administration should be used more widely to more accurately reflect the nature of those roles and activities.

<div align="center">Summary</div>

There Is a Need For Both Leadership And Management in Educational Administration. For an educational administrator, balancing responsibilities between leadership and management is key. While balance will be defined differently in every organization, it is safe to say that an organization cannot be too leadership-driven or too management-driven and be successful. Too leadership-driven (Board) and the staff of the organization will likely be micro-managed. Too management-driven and the board will be isolated and out of touch. "People don't often need, or respond well to, being managed. They are best led to higher performance. Places, things, and processes, however, are to be managed. Resources must be managed. Tangibles must be controlled. Leading people and managing processes is usually the preferred balance of authority" (Quinn 2002). The two "complementary systems of action," that is management and leadership, are always likely to be in a state of dynamic tension (Kotter, 1990). In times of scarcity or uncertainty, emphasis will be placed on monitoring, assessment and reporting, in order to rein in

the activities of individuals and groups. Often during this period, leadership of a directive and exhortative kind supports the managerial thrust. In happier times, there is likely to be more freedom for leadership at departmental and work-group levels to forge distinctive paths, stimulated by enabling management frameworks and a facilitative leadership style at the institutional level. It is only recently that we have begun to describe the two roles in conjunction with each other. Managerial leadership describes managers as leaders and leaders as managers, a combination that compliments and balances the needs of changing organizations, and a combination that suggests the need for combined models and multiple frameworks to strategically and tactically navigate the future before us.

An effective school administrator needs to be both a leader and a manager. Management tasks can be delegated to other members of the staff, as can certain aspects of leadership, but both ultimately remain the responsibility of the administrator. The administrator must ensure that good communication systems are in place within the school and that expectations are clear and applied in a consistent way. Procedures need to be clear and unambiguous, suiting their purpose and policies must be clearly understood and appropriate. The implementation of these must also be monitored and reviewed if the organization is to be effective (Dembowski, 1999).

Complete mastery of all leadership and management roles is the ideal for school administrators. Individuals, each with their unique mix of personal training and professional experiences, often favor some of these roles, and have limited knowledge of and tolerance for other roles. Accordingly, superintendents often attempt to delegate a major portion of their undesired roles to associates. For instance, the superintendent who favors the leader or public roles will frequently delegate managerial roles to an assistant superintendent for administration, business manager or someone in a related position. The argument made here is that effective

school administrators must strive for balance, achieving mastery of all roles and paying diligent attention to all roles (Dembowski, 1999).

Administrators need both skills and roles. As the old adage says, "leadership is doing the right thing; management is doing things right." The difference between the two is not as well defined as the saying would suggest, and both are required for effective organizational growth. Leadership risk taking creates opportunities while management structure and discipline turns opportunities into tangible results. However, "if your organization is not on a journey don't bother about leadership - just settle for management", advises John Adair. "There is a direct correlation between the way people view their managers and the way they perform" (Adair, 1997).

ReferencesAchilles, C.M. (1988). Unlocking some mysteries of administration and administrator preparation reflective prospect. In Griffiths, D. Stout and P. Forsyth (Eds.), Leaders for America's schools (pp.41-67). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing.

Adair, J. (1997). Decision making and problem solving. London: CIPD Publishing.

Adamchik, W. (n.d.). Leadership vs. management: Tastes great. Retrieved July 8, 2005 from http://www.beafirestarter.com/id24.html

Air Command and Staff College (1995). *Guidelines for command: A handbook on the leadership of people for Air Force commanders and supervisors* [Electronic version]. Air Force Base, Alabama: Air University Press.

American Management Association (n.d.). *About AMA.* Retrieved July 8, 2005 from http://www.amanet.org/aboutama/index.htm

Amidon, D. (1997). *Innovation strategy for the knowledge economy.* San Francisco: Butterworth Heinemann.

Arment, A. (n.d.). *Leadership vs. management: Finding the balance for genuine effectiveness.* Retrieved July 10, 2005 from http://www.abc.org/user-assets/Documents/Events/handouts/LdrpvMgtbyArment.doc

Avolio, B.J. (1999). *Full leadership development: Building the vital forces in organizations.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ayers, M. (n.d.). *The roles of leadership and management.* Retrieved July 15, 2005 from http://64.233.161.104/search?q=cache:cpI-h_amlG8J: www. thecommonwealthpractice.com/Change%2520and%2520Resistance%2520and%2520Leadership.pdf+%22the+roles+of++leadership+and+management%22+andhl=enandie=UTF-8

Ayers, Michael (2000). *Change and resistance and leadership* (The nature of leadership section). Retrieved July 6, 2005 from http://64.233.161.104/search?q=cache:cpI-h_amlG8J:www.thecommonwealthpractice.com/Change%2520and%2520Resistance%2520and%2520Leadership.pdf+%22the+roles+of++leadership+and+management%22+andhl=enandie=UTF-8

Balutis, A. (1992). Leadership in a time of change: The public manager. *The New Bureaucrat, 21*(3).

Bass, B. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations..* New York: Free Press.

Beckhard, R. (1969). *Organization development: Strategies and models.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Bennis, W (1989). *On becoming a leader.* London: Hutchinson Business Books.

Bennis, W. (1993). *An invented life: Reflections on leadership and change*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Bennis, W. (1994). *On becoming a leader* (2nd ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Bennis, W., and Biederman, P. (1997). *Organizing genius: The secrets of creative collaboration.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Bennis, W., and Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper and Row.

Bing, J. (2002). Hofstede's consequences: The impact of his work and on consulting and business practices. *The Academy of Management Executive, 18*(1), 80-87.

Birnbaum, R. (1988). *How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Birnbaum, R. (1989). The cybernetic institution: Toward an integration of governance theories. *Higher Education*, *18*, 239-253.

Bolman, L., and Deal, T. (1997). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice and leadership* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bolman, L., and Deal, T. (2003). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice and leadership* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Botkin, J. (1999). *Smart business*. New York: Free Press.

Boyette, J., and Boyette, J. (1998) *The guru guide*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Bridges, W. (1992). *The character of organizations*. Palo Alto, CA: Davies-Black.

Brighouse, B., and Woods, D. (1999). *How to improve your school*. London: Routledge.

Bryman, A. (1986). *Leadership and organization.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Bryman, A. (1992). *Charisma and leadership in organization*. Hewbury Park, CA: Sage.

Bush, T. (1995). *Theories of educational management* (2nd ed.). London: Paul Chapman Educational Publishing.

Campbell, N. (2004). *The practice of management and the ideas of leadership*. Retrieved July 16, 2005 from http://www.incitelearninginc.com/twiki/pub/Main/InciteLearningArticles/ThePracticeofManagementandtheIdeaofLeadership.doc

Carr, C., and Fulmer, C. (Eds.). (2004). *Educational leadership*: *Knowing the way, going the way, showing the way.* Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Education.

Cashman, K. (1998). *Leadership from the inside out*. Provo, UT: Executive Excellence.

Changingminds (n.d.). *Leadership vs. management*. Retrieved July 8, 2005 at http://changingminds.org/disciplines/leadership/articles/manager_leader.htm

Cohen, M.D., and March J.G. (1986). *Leadership and ambiguity: The American college president* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.

Collins, J. (2001). *Good to great: Why some companies make the leap…and others don't*. New York: HarperCollins.

Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals (CVCP) (1985). *Report of the steering committee for the efficiency studies in universities.* (The Jarratt Report). London: CVCP.

Council for Industry and Higher Education (CIHE) (1991). *The business contribution to higher education*. London: CIHE.

Crawford, M., Kydd, L., and Riches, C. (1997). *Leadership and teams in educational management.* Philadelphia: Open University.

David, W. (1994). *The heart aroused*. New York: Currency Doubleday.

Davies, B., and Ellison, L. (1997). *School leadership for the 21st century*. London: Routledge.

De Geus, A. (1997). *The living company*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School.

Dembowski, F. (1997). The roles of leadership and management in school district administration. *The AASA Professor, 20*(2).

Dembowski, F., and Eckstrom, C. (1999). *Effective district management*: *A self-review instrument and guide.* Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Drucker, P. (2005). Leadership vs. management: Finding the balance for genuine effectiveness. *How can I be an effective leader-manager?* (page 4). Retrieved July 5, 2005 from http://www.abc.org/user-assets/Documents/ Events/handouts/ LdrpvMgtbyArment.doc

Drucker, P. (1988, January-February). The coming of the new organization. *Harvard Business Review, 28,* 45-53.

Dunford, J., Fawcett, R., and Bennett, D. (2000). *School Leadership*. London: TES.

Dusya, V., and Crossan, M. (2004). Strategic leadership and organizational learning. *The Academy of Management Executive, 29*(1), 222-240.

Elton, L. (1988). Accountability in higher education: The danger of unintended consequences. *Higher Education, 17*, 377-390.

Elton, L. (1991). Enterprise in higher education: Work in progress. *Education and Training. 33*(2), 5-9.

Elton, L. (1992). Quality enhancement and academic professionalism. *The New Academic, 1*(2), 26-29.

Elton, L., and Partington, P. (1991) *Teaching standards and excellence in higher education: Developing a culture for quality.* Occasional Green Paper No. 1. London: Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals.

English, F. (1994). *Theory in educational administration*. New York: HarperCollins.

Ferguson, G. (2000). *Leadership or management: How does the tertiary manager cover the new territory?* Retrieved July 10, 2005 from http://www.anu.edu.au /facilities/atem-aappa/full_papers/Ferguson-101545ATEM3.html

Fitzwater, I. (1991). *You can be a power leader*. San Antonio, TX: Watercress.

Follett, M. (1995). *Prophet of management*. Boston: Harvard Business School.

Frankl, V. (1992). *Man's search for meaning*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Fussell, P. (1994, May 23). How the leaders led. *Newsweek*, *23,* 38.

Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.

Gordon G. (1999). *Report of UCoSDA management survey: An overview of good practice.* London: University of Strathclyde.

Grady, J. (2004). Understanding the roles of management and leadership in nonprofit arts organizations [Electronic version]. *Arts Reach, 12*(5), pp54-65.

Green, M. (1988). *Leaders for a new era*. New York: ACE Macmillan.

Green, F. (2000). *The head teacher in the 21st century*. London: Pearson.

Handy, C. (1984). Education for management outside business. In S. Goodlad (Ed.), *Education for the Professions* (pp.289-296). Guildford : The Society for Research into Higher Education and NFER-Nelson.

Handy, C. (1987) *The making of managers*. MSC/NEDO/BIM: London: Penguin.

Handy, C. (1990). *The age of unreason*. London: Arrow Books.

Handy, C. (1985). *Understanding organizations*. London: Penguin.

Hawley, J. (1993). *Reawakening the spirit in work*. New York: Fireside.

Hickman, C. (1985). *Mind of a manager, soul of a leader*. New York: Wiley and Sons.

Hirsh, W., and Bevan, S. (1988). *What makes a manager?* London: Brighton Institute of
    Management Studies.

HMI (1991). *Aspects of education in the USA*. London: HMSO.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences*. Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. New York: McGraw
    Hill.

Holloman, C.R. (1984). Leadership and headship: There is a difference. In W.E. Rosenbach and
    R.L. Taylor (Eds.), *Contemporary issues in leadership* (pp.109-116). Boulder, CO: West
    Vice Press.

Hymowitz, C. (2004, February 10). The best leaders have employees who would follow them
    anywhere. *The Wall Street Journal*, p. B1.

Gilley, K. (1997). *Leading from the heart*. Boston: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Greenleaf, R. (1977). *Servant leadership*. New York: Paulist Press.

Jackson, R. (1988). Higher education in Britain. *Higher Education Review, 42*, 111-118.

Hitt, W. (1988). *The leader-manager: Guidelines for action*. Columbus, OH: Battelle.

Hoy, W., and Miskell, C. (2001). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice*.
    New York: McGraw Hill.

Hudson, R. (n.d.). *Leadership: Providing direction and purpose*. Retrieved July 10, 2005 from
        http://www.cybertext.net.au/tct/papers/week4/hudson_r.htm

Kanter, R. (1983). *The change masters*. London: Unwin.

Koazes, J., and Posner, B. (1987). *The leadership challenge*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Koontz and O'Donnell, (1978). *Essentials of management* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Kotter, J. (1988). *The leadership factor*. New York: Free Press.

Kotter, J. (1990, May-June). What leaders do. *Harvard Business Review*, p. 103-111.

Kotter, J. (1990). *A force for change: How leadership differs from management*. New York: Free Press.

Kotter, J. (1996). *Leading change*. Cambridge: Harvard Business School.

Kouzes, J., and Posner, B. (1990, July-August). The credibility factor: What followers expect from their leaders. *Business Credit*, p. 47.

Kreitner, R. (2004). *Management* (9th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Lawrence, P., and Nohria, N. (2002). *Driven: How human nature shapes our choices.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lewin, K. (1936). *A dynamic theory of personality*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lindner, R. (n.d). *Role definitions: Leading versus managing*. Retrieved on July 8, 2005 from http://www.bostrom.com/solutions/Solutions1-1.htm

Lohmann, U. (1994, Summer). Leadership Education Lessons Learned. *The Public Manager: The new Bureaucrat,* p. 8.

Lynch, R. (1993). *Lead!* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Maccoby, E. (2000). Understanding the difference between leadership and management [Electronic version*]. Research Technology Management, 43* (1), 57-59.

Macnair, G. (1990). The British enterprise in higher education initiative. *Higher Education Management, 2*, 60-71.

Mangham, L. and Silver, M. (1986), *Management Training: Context and Practice*, University of Bath.

Manning, Elsabé (n.d.). Leadership vs. management. *Success Factory*, January 8. Retrieved July 2, 2005 from http://www.successfactory.co.za/ index2.php?option= contentanddo_pdf=1andid=43

Marquis, B., and Huston, C. (1996). *Leadership roles and management functions in nursing* (2nd ed.). Wickford, RI: Lippincott-Raven.

Mason, J. (1992, October). Leading the way into the 21st century. *Management Review, 81*, 19.

Massey, J. (n.d.). *A vision and a future*. Retrieved July 9, 2005 from http://www.bizlife.com.au/visionfuture.htm

Mckonkey, D. (1989). Are you an administrator, a manager or a leader? *Business Horizon, 32*(5), 15-21.

Middlehurst, E. (1992). Leadership and management in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education, 17*(3), 251.

Middlehurst R. (1992). *Leadership development in universities, 1986-88, final report to the Department of Education and Science*. Guildford, England: University of Surrey.

Middlehurst, R. (1991). *The changing roles of university leaders and managers: Implications for preparation and development.* Universities' staff development and training unit/UCoSDA.

Mintzberg, H. (1973). *The nature of managerial work*. New York: Harper and Row.

Nancy, C. (2004, March). *The practice of management and the idea of leadership: An overview of theory and practice*. Retrieved July16, 2005 from http://www.incitelearninginc.com/twiki/pub/Main/InciteLearningArticle/ThePracticeofManagementandtheIdeaofLeadership.doc

Nanus, B. (1992, September-October). Visionary leadership: How to re-vision the future. *The Futurist, 26*, 23.

National Advisory Body for Public Sector Higher Education (NAB) (1987). *Management for a purpose*. London: NAB.

Northouse, P. (2003). *Leadership: Theory and practice.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pearce, C. (2004). The future of leadership: Combining vertical and shared leadership to transform knowledge work. *The Academy of Management Executive, 18*(1), 47-57.

Peters, T. (1987). *Thriving on chaos: Handbook for a management revolution*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Peters, T. (1988). *Thriving on chaos*. New York: HarperCollins.

Peters, T. (1991). *Beyond hierarchy*. London: Macmillan.

Peters, T. and Austin, N. (1985). *A passion for excellence: The leadership difference*. Glasgow: Fontana/Collins.

Peterson, M., Dill, D., Mets, L., (Eds.) (1997). *Planning and management for a changing environment: A handbook on redesigning postsecondary institutions*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pitcher, P. (1997). *The drama of leadership*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Pollitt, C. (1990). *Managerialism and the public services: The Anglo-American experience*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Postman, N., and Weingartner, C. (1969). *Teaching as a subversive activity*. New York: Dell.

Prewitt, E. (2004, November). *Leaders vs. management*. Retrieved July 29, 2005 from http://tatler.typepad.com/nose/2004/11/leadership_vs_m.html

Quinn, R. Faerman, S., Thompson, M., and McGrath, M. (2003). *Becoming a master manager: A competency framework*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Reed, M. (1996). Organizational theorizing: A historically contested terrain. In S. Clegg, C. Hardy, and W. Nord (Eds.). *Handbook of organizational studies* (pp31-56). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Scarlat, C. (n.d.). *Administration vs. management*. Retrieved July 18, 2005 from http://www.aubg.bg/ria/en/papers/16_Scarlat.doc

Schein, E. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossy-Bass.

Schwahn, C., and Spady, W. (1998). *Total leaders: Applying the best future-focused change strategies to education*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Searson, R. (2000). *Manager or leader?* Retrieved July 10, 2005 from http://64.233.161.104/search?q=cache:X-ifYT33jgAJ:www.noacc.org /Manager% 2520or%2520Leader.doc+%22the+roles+of+management+and+leadership%22+andhl=ena ndie=UTF-8

Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art of practice of the learning organization*. New York: Random House.

Shalala, D. (1998, July/August). Are large public organizations manageable? *Public Administration Review, 58*(4), 284-289.

Shamir, M., and Shamir, J. (1995). Competing values in public opinion. *Political Behavior, 171*, 107-133.

Small, P. (2000). *Draft chapters of the book: The ultimate game of strategy*. Retrieved July 10, 2005 from http://www.stigmergicsystems.com/stig_v1 /books/ugs /toc.html?156 02

Snyder, N., and Graves, M., (1994, January-February). Leadership and vision. *Business Horizons*, 37.

Spivak, W. (n.d.). *Leaders and leadership: Being the former doesn't necessarily mean you exhibit the latter*. Retrieved July 20, 2005 from http://www.auxguidanceskills.info /leadership/leaders.html

Stewart, R. (1986). *The reality of management*. London: Pan Books.

Taylor, F. (1997). Scientific management. In M. Shafritz and A. Hyde. *Classics of public administration* (pp.?). Orlando: Harcourt Brace.

Taylor, R., and Rosenbach, W. (1984). *Military leadership in pursuit of excellence*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Taylor, W. (1987). *Universities under scrutiny* . Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Thompson, K. (1985). *Essays on leadership: Comparative insights*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Thomsen-Moore, L. (2005, May). Leadership vs. management [Electronic version]. *Management Today,* 25-28.

UCoSDA Task Force One (1994). *Higher education management and leadership: Towards a national framework for preparation and development.* Occasional Green Paper No. 9. London: USDU/CVCP.

University of Cambridge, University Health Judge Institute of Management. (2001, November). *Role of leadership and management when implementing quality changes in diabetes*. Retrieved July 19, 2005 from the University of Cambridge Web site: http://www.jims.cam.ac.uk/research/health/downloads/cuhprojects_reality_b.doc

Vera, D., and Crossan, M. (2004). Theatrical improvisation: Lessons for organizations. *Organization Studies, 25*, 727-749.

Wasser, H. (1990). Changes in the European university: From traditional to entrepreneurial. *Higher Education Quarterly, 44*, 110-123.

Wildman, L. (1997). *School administration: The new knowledge base NCPEA 1997*. New York: Lewis Publishers.

Willower, D., and Culbertson, J. (Eds.) (1964). *The professorship in education administration*. Colombia, MO: University Council for Educational Administration.

Wilson, W. (1997). The study of administration. In M. Shafritz and A. Hyde. *Classics of public administration* (pp.?). Orlando: Harcourt Brace

Winterberry Group (2004, September). *The roles of leadership and management*. Retrieved July 22, 2005 from http://www.winterberrygroup.com/ WGVDB_Leadership AndValueCreation_0904.pdf

Wittmeyer, C. (2003, August). The practice of management: Timeless views and principals. *The Academy of Management Executive, 17*(3), 13-15.

Womack, L. (n.d.). *Leading collaboration*. Retrieved July 9, 2005 from
    http://larrywomack.com/LEADING%20COLLABORATION.htm

Zahra, S. (2003, August). The practice of management: Reflections on Peter F. Drucker's
    landmark book. *The Academy of Management Executive, 17*(3), 16.

Zeeck, D. (1997, September). Leadership vs. management.

Appendix 1. A Comparison of Approaches to Leadership and Management

Leadership Approach	Description	Key Theorists	Strengths	Weaknesses
Trait Approach	Identifies leadership traits or characteristics essential to effective leadership; focuses on leader not followers	Stogdill, Mann, Lord, Kirkpatrick and Locke	Is intuitively appealing, well researched, focuses on role of leader, provides us with assessment material	List of traits is endless, does not consider situation, highly subjective determination of what is "most important", not useful for training up and coming leaders
Skills Approach	Focuses on skills and abilities rather than personality characteristics – technical, human, and conceptual competencies	Katz, Mumford, Zaccaro, Harding, Jacobs, Fleishman, Yammarino	Suggests that many individuals have the potential for leadership, stresses importance of developing specific leadership skills, presents multi-faceted picture of leadership, and useful in leadership education	Too broad in scope as is addresses more than just leadership, does not explain how variations in a particular skill affects performance, claims not to be a trait model but includes individual attributes which are trait-like, and skills approach was developed using a large sample of military personnel

Leadership Approach	Description	Key Theorists	Strengths	Weaknesses
Style Approach	Focuses on what leaders do and how they behave – actions of leaders toward subordinates in various situations; two styles or behaviors are task behaviors and relationship behaviors; Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire and Management Grid developed to describe how leaders reach their purposes – concern for production and concern for people – prescriptive rather than descriptive	Stodgill, Blake and Mouton, Ohio and Michigan studies	Expanded our understanding of leadership by researching what leaders do in various situations, substantiated by a multitude of studies offering a viable approach to the leadership process, key to being an effective leader is balancing task and relationship, and prescriptive	Research does not link style with performance outcome, failed to identify a universal style that could be effective in every situation, and implies most effective style as high task, high relationship – this remains questionable and unclear
Situational Approach	Based on different situations requiring different kinds of leadership; leader must adapt style to the demands and different situations; effective	Hersey and Blanchard	Accepted and used by practitioners as a credible model for training up and coming leaders, practical and easy to use and understand, prescriptive value, and emphasizes the	Lack of strong body of research, four levels of subordinate development ambiguous and without theoretical basis, concern with how subordinate

	leaders recognize the need to change the degree to which they are directive (task) or supportive (relationship) to meet changing needs of subordinates		concept of leader flexibility	commitment is composed – not clear how confidence and motivation combine to define commitment, studies fail to support the prescriptions suggested in the model, did not correlate education, experience, age, etc. with how they influence leader-subordinate prescriptions of the model, more research needed to explain how leaders can adapt their styles simultaneously to the development levels of individual group member and the whole group, and questionnaire appears biased in forced response to questions in favor of model
Contingency Theory	Concerned with both styles and situations and referred to as leader-match	Fiedler	Supported by much empirical research, shifts emphasis from leader to	Unclear as to why certain leadership styles are more effective in

	theory; leaders effectiveness depends on how well the leader's style fits the context; leadership styles are described as task motivated or relationship motivated; situations are characterized by assessing leader-member relations, task structure, and position power; suggests that certain styles will be effective in certain situations		leadership context and the link between the two, predictive and useful in predicting type of leadership that will be most effective in certain situations, does not demand that the leader fit every situation, and provides data on leaders' styles that could help develop leadership profiles	some situations than other, some question of validity of LPC scale, instructions on the LPC scale are not clear, cumbersome and to use in real-world settings and complex, and fails to explain what organizations should do when there is a mismatch between the leader and situation.

Leadership Approach	Description	Key Theorists	Strengths	Weaknesses
Path-Goal Theory	How leaders motivate subordinates to accomplish goals; the link between the leader's style and the motivational needs of the subordinate within the work setting; leader can choose from directive, supportive, participative, and achievement-oriented behaviors to impact subordinates motivation	Evans, House, Dessler, Mitchell	First situational-contingency theory of leadership to explain how task and subordinate characteristics affect the impact of leadership on subordinate performance, uniquely designed to keep us asking, "How can I motivate subordinates to feel that they have the ability to do the work?", and practical in that it reminds leaders to guide and coach subordinates along a path to achieve a goal	Difficult to use and complex, claims of theory are tentative because of partial support for empirical research studies, fails to describe how a leader can employ various styles directly to help subordinates feel competent and trusted, and path-goal theory could create a dependent relation between leader and subordinate failing to recognize the full abilities of the subordinate
Leader-Member Exchange Theory (LMX)	Focuses on the quality of exchanges between leaders and members; high-quality exchanges produce less turnover, more positive performance, greater organizational commitment, better attitudes,	Dansereau, Graen, Haga, Cashman, Uhl-Bien	Strong descriptive in that it describes work units in terms of those who contribute more and those who contribute less, only theory that makes the concept of the dyadic relationship the core of the leadership process, directs	Conflict with value of fairness by dividing the work unit into two groups: in-group and out-group – gives the appearance of discrimination, support the development of privileged groups in the

	greater participation, and can be used for "leadership making"; three phases of exchange are stranger phase, acquaintance phase and partner phase; both describes and prescribes leadership		our attention to the importance of effective communication, and well-researched to support how LMX is related to positive organizational outcomes	workplace although LMX suggests that members of the out-group are free to become members of the in-group – question is how one gains access; needs further development, and few empirical studies regarding the measurement of leader-member exchanges

Leadership Approach	Description	Key Theorists	Strengths	Weaknesses
Transformational Leadership	Distinguishes between two types of leadership: transactional and transformational; transactional is the bulk of the models whereas transformational refers to the process that raises the level of motivation and ethics in both the leader and the follower; tries to help follower reach their fullest potential, raises their hopes and in the process changes himself/herself	Burns, Downton, Bryman, Lowe and Gardner, Bass, House, Bennis and Nanus, Tichy and DeVanna	Widely researched from many different perspectives, intuitively appealing in that leader provides vision, treats leadership as a process between leaders and followers, expands picture of leadership by moving beyond transactional elements, strong emphasis on needs and values of followers, and strong evidence that is an effective form of leadership	Too broad, lacks conceptual clarity, questions around how transformational leadership is measured, some claim this model treats leadership as a personality trait or someone with special qualities which makes it difficult to teach, can be perceived as elitist and anti-democratic as leader acts independently as heroes, based largely on qualitative data collected from leaders at the top of organizations questioning its use with lower-level leaders, and it may have a tendency to be abused if the leadership is not challenged on values and vision

Leadership Approach	Description	Key Theorists	Strengths	Weaknesses
Team Leadership	Two functions of leadership: task behaviors and maintenance behaviors, i.e. team performance and team development, with both an internal and external focus; most current research discusses teams with single-leadership vs. and shared leadership	Porter and Beyerlein, Ilgen et al, Zaccaro, Larson and LaFasto, Hackman,	Focuses on real-life organizational work in helping them stay competitive and effective, guide to help leaders design and maintain effective teams, recognizes changing roles of leaders and followers, and helps in selecting team leaders who are up to the task	Not completely tested or supported, complex model in nature that does not provide practical approach or address issues of shared leadership or usual situations, and difficult to teach and develop skills
Psychodynamic Approach	Leaders are more effective when they have insight into their own makeup and can gain a better understanding of their needs, predispositions, and emotions; they are also more effective when they have insight into the same elements of their subordinates; focuses more on learned and deep-seated emotional responses that	Freud, Jung, Zaleznik	Results in a better understanding of the relationship between leader and follower, applicable cross-culturally and exhibits a universality, emphasizes the need for insight into self and encourages the pursuit of personal growth and development, and ultimately results in the leader becoming a teacher and counselor as well as carrying out traditional	Bias is toward abnormal or dysfunctional being, highly subjective, research is clinical in nature and often culturally biased by psychologists, lacking inclusion of diverse cultures and populations, does not take into account organizational factors, and is not adaptive to training in the classroom

	one may not be aware of – and not able to change, the key being acceptance of these quirks and the quirks of others		leadership role	

(adapted from Northouse 2004)