



Revisiting the Leadership-Management Conundrum: A Case of Two 'Leaderships' One of which is 'Management'? With Exemplification from Uganda's Education Policy Literature

Gyaviira M. Genza

School of Education, College of Education & External Studies, Makerere University
P. O. BOX 7062 Kampala, Uganda

Email Address: gyaviira.genza@mak.ac.ug

Abstract

'Did you study leadership or management?' This is one of the most common questions that panelists ask during viva voce sessions in Uganda – as if leadership and management are necessarily mutually exclusive. If they are, then why are they so commonly confused with each other? Confronted with such questions, the study embarked on reviewing the leadership-management conundrum so as to make leadership more appreciated in education management. More specifically, the study examined the kind of relationship that exists between leadership and management; related educational leadership with educational management; and analysed 'leadership' usage in selected education policy literature from Uganda. It employed an exploratory systematic review design, and took a paradox theory perspective. Data analysis was by content and thematic analysis. The study discovered that it is a tripartite relationship that exists between leadership and management, with interesting implications. Though limited by a reliance on secondary data, the study makes two strong contributions. First, it exposes the conceptual drift that 'leadership' has undergone. Second, it underscores the necessity of both leadership and management in educational governance, but in contextually constructed 'mixes'.

Keywords: Educational leadership, educational management, Leadership, Management.

INTRODUCTION

Although it is reported that leadership has been studied more extensively than any other aspect of human behaviour (Young & Dulewicz, 2008), leadership is still associated with many contentious issues. Two of these are its definition, on the one hand, and its relationship with management, on the other. Whereas substantial progress towards a cogent definition of leadership has already been realised (Rost, 1991; Bass, 1990; Yukl, 2006; Bush & Glover, 2003; Silva, 2016; Magara, 2017; Genza, 2021); the relationship problem remains as controversial as before (Sharma & Jain, 2013; Bush, 2008), even qualifying to be called a conundrum (Lewis & Smith, 2014).

For example, whereas some scholars contend that leadership and management are different (Pentti, 2003; Bush, 2008); others insist that the two are the same (Neelam et al., 2017; Day & Sammons, 2016; Molnár, 2011). If the two concepts are different, how are they different, and why are they still often confused with each other? How, for example, is 'educational leadership' to be differentiated from 'educational management'? If, on the other hand, leadership and management mean the same thing – or if they are synonyms – how comes their attendant roles and functions are often

conceptualised differently, suggesting that the two represent different constructs? For example, when Earley (2013) and Yukl (2002) contend that every educational program needs to be both led and managed, what is that? Might it perhaps be the case that leadership has undergone a ‘conceptual drift’ (‘concept extension’) – “the process in which a concept widens and shifts its boundaries to include more and/or different elements, thus becoming broader and more complex in meaning” (Berenskoetter, 2016: 16)? If yes, with what implications for both research and practice?

Recent debate seems to have polarised leadership and management scholars into groups that are either for or against leadership as (being) synonymous with management, and each of the groups seems to be correct (Smyth, 2019; Killeen, 2012)! Such polarisation is characteristic of conundrums (Leslie, Li & Zhao, 2015). However, an issue that is less raised by existing research is that valid measurement and development of leadership and/or management largely depend on a clear elucidation of both constructs, and the relationship(s) between them. To-date, the relationship question still begs for answers. Thus, the current study set out both to highlight the relationship conundrum, and to attempt to bring the ‘warring factions’ together. The purpose was to leverage existing literature to review the leadership-management relationship in order to make leadership more appreciated in education management.

The study attempted to provide answers to three more specific questions (implying three objectives). First, what kind of relationship exists between leadership and management (in general)? Second, how is leadership related to management in educational governance (in particular)? Third, what is the usage of the term ‘leadership’ in selected education policy literature from Uganda? The third objective was a contextual application of the conceptual issues discussed in the first two objectives. Uganda was chosen largely for the sake of exemplifying debate. Another country could have served as well.

Background

Looking at the leadership-management relationship question, the study saw in it a conundrum – a paradox, apparent contradiction, polarity, or dilemma (Smyth, 2019; Hoekema, 2017; Qiu, 2013; Killeen, 2012; Leslie, Li & Zhao, 2015). The study therefore applied the term conundrum to mean a question that is paradoxically confusing; “contradictory yet interrelated” (Lewis & Smith 2014: 1). Such a working definition partly explains why the study title also bears some apparent contradiction; intentionally aimed at already insinuating the controversies involved.

The conundrum examined here is a relationship conundrum; namely, the relationship between leadership and management. This relationship is taken to be a conundrum because of an existence of conceptions that do not simply differ (which is potentially productive), but conceptions that even contradict each other (which is both confusing and distractive).

According to available literature, appropriate handling of such conundrums requires thinking beyond “either-or” logic (Waldmana, Putnamb, Miron-Spektorc & Siegela, 2019; Leslie, Li & Zhao, 2015); to searching both within and outside of the box, moreover in unconventional ways, and/or in ways that may seem counter-intuitive (Killeen, 2012). That way, conundrum analysis can issue in greater depths of both theoretical appreciation and practical application (Waldmana et al., 2019; Leslie et al., 2015).

The study is premised on a paradox theory perspective of conceptual analysis. Petocz and Newbery (2010) indicate that conceptual analysis is the study of “terms, variables, constructs, definitions, assertions, hypotheses, and theories. It involves examining these for clarity and coherence, critically scrutinising their logical relations, and identifying assumptions and implications” (p. 126). Conceptual analysis also often helps to expose – and to do away with – existing practical inconsistencies. Its task is therefore both “deconstructive and reconstructive” (Berenskoetter, 2016: 24).

A paradox theory perspective was preferred because it is often the one applied to research problems that contain persistently contradictory yet interdependent positions (Sandberg, 2017; Lewis & Smith 2014; Waldmana et al., 2019; Cunha & Putnam, 2017). Its key strength is the concurrent espousal of ‘both A and B’ logic (both leadership and management, for example); as contrasted with a contingency perspective, which applies a logic of ‘either A or B’ (Sandberg, 2017). A paradox perspective takes a dynamic equilibrium stance (Cunha & Putnam, 2017), which implies bringing competing and/or contradicting views to the same round table for consideration and reconsideration (Lewis et al., 2014; Cunha et al., 2017). Such a stance enabled the current study to stay on the track of objectivity, not simply crystallizing into one of the already polarised positions.

Both scholars and practitioners will benefit from this study. For scholars, the study makes conceptual analyses and syntheses of the leadership and management concepts, hence refining their application as analytical categories guiding empirical studies in such fields as education. As Toor (2011) observes, “in the contemporary world, where leadership is looked at as very important and special while management is perceived as otherwise, it is even more important to clarify the meanings of these terms” (p. 2). On the side of practice, conceptual vagueness between leadership and management, has for long engendered difficulties in measuring, hiring, developing, and promoting leaders and managers (Kotter, 2006 as cited by Toor, 2011). Thus, the study’s practical contribution lies in its enhancement of foundations for measuring and developing both leadership and management. As Berenskoetter (2016) observes, leadership and management concepts are “categories of practice” (p. 5), for they guide practitioners’ ‘thought in action’ regularly. It should be possible to point at, measure and develop leadership, and do the same for management.

Particularly for objective three, which focuses on Uganda, (education) policy literature was preferred to other types because of what it is – ‘policy’ literature; that is, official documents containing the legal framework within which the business of leading and managing education is carried out (Mansur, 2009). Unlike for other types of documents, where terms may more easily be applied loosely, policy literature goes through a unique rigour (Government of Uganda, 2013), hence, hopefully, a more refined term usage (Owolabi, 2005). This literature was assumed to constitute a strong case of how ‘leadership’ and ‘management’ concepts are formally applied in a given country. It is from usage in such official literature that also researchers and practitioners often borrow.

STUDY’S METHODOLOGICAL BEDROCKS

The study employed an exploratory systematic review design (Hallinger & Hammad, 2017; Hallinger, 2013; Ndarukwa, Chimbari & Sibanda, 2019). Systematic reviews [SRs] advance disciplines by not only gathering research on a given issue, but also by comparing its milestones and synthesising them for new knowledge (Genza, 2021; Himmelfarb Library, 2020; Hallinger, 2013). Hence, assisted by Google Scholar™, the

study gathered literature on leadership and management, with “leadership and management”, on the one hand, and “educational leadership and educational management”, on the other, as the key search words. The Google Scholar™ search engine was preferred to others (such as AOL) because it typifies “a more suitable database for reviews of Educational Leadership and Management research [sic]” (Hallinger et al., 2017).

However, for the third objective (on Uganda’s education policy literature), the study assembled documents mainly from the official website of Uganda’s Ministry of Education and Sports [MoES] (<http://www.education.go.ug>). Here a variety of education policy documents (such as Acts, performance reports, and strategic plans) was sought in order to realise a wider picture of ‘leadership’ usage. The Education Act 2008 constituted the starting point (for objective three), since it is Uganda’s most recent education act. Further literature inclusion depended on both availability and relevance. Relevance was measured by content validity – whether a given document’s content reflected leadership-management subject matter or not. The documents were chronologically analysed and arranged, from the 2008 Education Act to the 2020 Performance Management Guidelines for Tertiary Institutions and Schools (MoES, 2020b).

The study utilised also Hallinger (2013)’s conceptual framework for conducting SRs in educational leadership and management. This was done by clarifying the study’s central themes (objectives) from the very beginning; stating data sources and types, analysis techniques, results and implications (Hallinger, 2013).

For validity and reliability, four of Creswell (1998)’s checks (as cited by Walters, 2009) were followed. These are: prolonged engagement with the literature (for three years), peer review (three other leadership and management scholars played the ‘devil’s advocate’), rich description (of diverse leadership-management conceptualisations), and triangulation of sources (namely, journals, books, education policy documents, and acts of parliament).

Data analysis was done thematically by first making sense of different (education) leadership and management conceptualisations; and then using narrative synthesis to integrate diverse conceptualisations (Hallinger et al., 2017; Genza, 2021). Objective three was by content analysis. Data were then presented using summary descriptions, quotations, and tables. Since only secondary data were utilised, the study did not find it necessary to seek for any ethical approvals (Ndarukwa et al., 2019).

Leadership and management relationship

The study’s first objective was to examine the kind of relationship that exists between leadership and management. Different studies conceptualise leadership differently (Day & Sammons, 2016). For Bass (1990), leadership is “an interaction between two or more members of a group that often involves a structuring or restructuring of the situation and the perceptions and expectations of the members” (pp. 19-20). Then Silva (2016: 3) defines it as “the process of interactive influence that occurs when, in a given context, some people accept someone as their leader to achieve common goals”. However, the current study borrowed Rost (1991)’s leadership conceptualisation, as refined by Genza (2021), because it was found to embody the essential elements reflected in many of the other studies. Thus, “leadership is an interactive influence relationship among different persons who agree to work together in a given situation so as to realise their mutual purposes” (Genza, 2021: 133).

Management has also been conceptualised differently. Rost (1991) takes it to be “an authority relationship between at least one manager and one subordinate who coordinate their activities to produce and sell particular goods and/or services” (p. 145). However, although this definition succeeds in highlighting the fact that management is an authority relationship, it is limited by its tautological structure. The current study removes the tautology and defines management as an authority relationship between different persons who coordinate their activities to produce particular goods and/or services for the market.

What, then, is the kind of relationship that exists between leadership and management? Literature reviewed revealed that, first, the relationship is one of difference (dissimilarity). For example, whereas management is taken to presuppose an official position with authority to give orders and to be obeyed;

Leadership is not a formal position, and is not necessarily linked with the head of the organization (principal, director, head teacher, etc) [sic]. We should rather consider leadership as a key function and role, which may be present everywhere in the organizational hierarchy (Révész, 2011: 102).

Similarly, Kotter (1990) as cited by Pentti (2003), contends that,

Management and leadership are quite dissimilar things. The overriding function of management is to provide order and consistency to organizations. This means planning, budgeting, organizing, staffing, controlling and problem-solving. The primary function of leadership is to produce change and movement [progress]. This means vision building, strategizing, aligning people, communicating, motivating and inspiring... Management is then about seeking order and stability, whereas leadership is about seeking adaptive and constructive change (p. 37).

Other critical issues underpinning the ‘difference relationship’ (relationship of difference) between leadership and management are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Contrasting leadership with management

Difference between leadership & management		Critical issue(s)
1.	Management is linked to systems and ‘paper’; and leadership is about the development of people (Day et al., 2001 in Bush, 2008)	• Concern for people vs. concern for the system (bureaucracy).
2.	Leadership is about values or purpose, while management is about implementation or technical issues (Bush, 2008).	• Values vs. technical issues.
3.	“Management is task-oriented and leadership is people-oriented” (Northouse, 2001 in Pentti, 2003: 37).	• People orientation vs. task orientation.
4.	“Headship [management] as being imposed on the group but leadership as being accorded by the group” (Holloman in Bass, 1990: 18).	• Source of influence: Conviction of the led vs. imposition “from above”.
5.	“Managers are people who do things right and leaders are people who do the right thing” (Bennis & Nanus, 1985: 21).	• Difference in perspective.
6.	Leadership is a transformational activity (change); management is a maintenance one (Cuban, 1988)	• Change (renewal) vs. maintenance.

Table 1 reveals that several elements underlie the difference relationship between leadership and management. Some of these are a “people orientation” as contrasted with a “task orientation”; “change vs. maintenance”; as well as a difference in perspective (“doing things right” vs. “doing the right things”). These revelations mean that leadership and management are essentially (technically) different – they imply two different behaviours, roles and functions.

However, though basically different, the two have also much in common (Pentti, 2003) – they overlap (Bush, 2008; Bush & Glover, 2003) – and may be construed as being just two sides of one and the same coin. Thus, the second relationship between leadership and management is overlap (complementarity). This is a relationship that is often either forgotten or downplayed in leadership-management narratives, yet it is discernible in some studies. The next pages examine this overlapping relationship. The first consideration is by Sharma and Jain (2013), who note that;

Leadership and management must go hand in hand. They are not the same thing. But they are necessarily linked, and complementary. Any effort to separate the two is likely to cause more problems than it solves (p. 309).

Similarly, a study by (Pentti, 2003) came to the conclusion that;

*We used to say that there are too many managers and too few leaders in our organizations, but today we have understood that you have to be **both** a manager **and** a leader in order to be effective [sic] (p. 93).*

Sharma et al. (2013)’s and Pentti (2003)’s observations mean that for organisational excellence to be realised, both leadership and management are actually needed (not ‘either - or’). The two (should) move together, and may even be in the same person.

The complementarity relationship is also shared by Cuban (1988), who categorically states that;

I prize both managing and leading and attach no special value to either one since different settings and times call for varied responses.

This means that although managing and leading imply two different behaviours and sets of competences, they (managing and leading) may reside in the same person, who should decide when to use which set, depending on circumstances. This is further proof of the ‘two sides of the same coin’ analogy.

As Leithwood (2005) notes, even the proverbial distinction between “doing things right” (management) and “doing the right things” (leadership) is largely invalid, since organisational excellence certainly demands both leadership and management. Right things are also to be done right (Bennis et al., 1985; Leithwood, 2005)! This is particularly true in education, where there is need not only for following processes (management), but also for inspiring and convincing different stakeholders to lend a hand (leadership).

The current study therefore agrees with Earley (2013) that every school program needs to be both led and managed. Thus, although leading is essentially different from managing, both behaviours – one of personal influence, and the other of formal authority – are needed for organisational excellence, such as in schools. Assuming a dichotomy between something ‘pure’ called leadership and something ‘dirty’ called management would be disastrous for the practice of education (Bush, 2011). The school being ‘one coin’, none of its essential sides (leadership and management) should be taken away from its governance. We may even speak of a ‘mutual concurrence’ of leadership and management; both are often found in the same space and same face (person).

It is partly because of this concurrence that today the usage (day-to-day use) of the term ‘leadership’ to mean ‘management’ has become conventional; and this is the third kind of relationship that exists between the two terms (synonymous usage).

Leadership in common usage can refer to a predominant position, a group of people at the head of an organization, a set of behaviors, or a passionate stirring of emotions (Walters, 2009: 273).

As Spicker (2012) also observes, today leadership has become a “staple [main] part of the language in which management is discussed in health, education and local government” (p. 2). Some studies even state that “leadership can also be understood as management by a different name” (Spicker, 2012: 4). A good example is the UK, where the term “leadership” is reported to have replaced the term “management” concerning the running of educational institutions; to the extent of now using “school leadership” to refer to what was previously called “school management” (Day et al., 2016). Writing from a Hungarian context, also Révész (2011), throughout his work, uses the term ‘school leadership’ to mean ‘school management’. For example, he speaks of “school leaders as being overloaded with tasks far beyond their job descriptions” (Révész, 2011: 110) – these would ‘normally’ be called ‘school managers’.

Here four other samples of salient but paradoxical statements on the leadership-management relationship deserve attention. The first is from Molnár (2011), who argues that;

Leadership or management is a profession which must be learned (p. 58).

The statement’s implication is that leadership is synonymous with management.

Actually, Neelam et al. (2017: 1) goes to the extent of even positing that;

Leading and managing are not merely complementary, they are essentially the same concept used to describe different levels of a taxonomy related to performance or organizational effectiveness.

Another (third) interesting sample is from Alan (2003), as cited by Oguntibeju et al. (2014), who contends that leadership refers to;

The holders of certain formally defined positions in an organization, as when speaking of the ‘party leadership’ or the ‘union leadership’. But is also used to denote a particular type of behaviour; when someone is commended for displaying ‘outstanding leadership’ it is their actions [behaviour] that are being praised. Such a person may or may not occupy a position of leadership [sic] (p. 69). [Leadership as both a behaviour and a position].

A fourth sample is from Hašková (2011);

Contemporary school management requires a great deal of formalized education. School leaders are supposed to have a respectable level of theoretical knowledge at their disposal and be able to apply it in a creative way both in school administration and educational process management, and in school leadership and team work (p. 242).

“School leaders” as those in “school administration/management”? This (Hašková, 2011) is a good example of a study that uses the term leadership anyhow, applying it carelessly to differing organisational roles. For Hašková (2011), leadership seems to be synonymous with management, hence the use of one term or the other without bother.

This section closes with an equally revealing contention by Bass (1990);

In its conception, leadership can include headship. Defined more broadly, leadership includes the many ways it is exerted by leaders and heads and the various sources of power that make it work. With the broader definition,

heads lead as a consequence of their status – the power of the position they occupy (p. 19).

So there is a broad(er) and a narrow(er) meaning of leadership? Should scholars perhaps indicate which of the two meanings they are using in a given context? Could we perhaps also attach numerical indicators to different ‘leaderships’ (different leadership meanings), referring to one as “leadership 1” [narrow meaning], and the other as “leadership 2” [broad meaning]? The study returns to this issue later.

Borrowing from the alternative leadership conceptualisations so far discussed, the current study contends that the term leadership has two meanings (senses) – the broad (extended) meaning, and the narrow (strict) one. About twelve years ago, Bass and Bass (2009) reached the same conclusion; that “we must continue to live with both broad and narrow definitions, making sure we understand which kind is being used in any particular analysis” (p. 33). But the current study takes the narrative further; it contends that, according to current usage, there are two different but related ‘leaderships’, one of which is management! Whereas one leadership (the narrow sense) highlights the difference relationship; with the other (the extended sense), there is so much overlap between the two constructs that the difference relationship is lost.

In general, however, available literature gives an impression that the relationship between leadership and management is a tripartite one; a relationship of not only difference and complementarity but also (sometimes) a relationship of similarity (synonymous). This paradoxical relationship seems to spill over into practice in such fields as education, which is one of the disciplines in which leadership is most studied (James, Connolly & Hawkins, 2019). The study will therefore now attempt to examine more closely the meaning of the leadership-management paradox in the context of education.

Educational leadership and educational management

It is widely believed that like leadership in a strict sense, leadership in education – here referred to as Educational Leadership (EL), is essentially a relationship; an influence relationship (Genza, 2021; Cuban, 1988). Not everyone concurs with this conceptualisation, however. There are many studies, which view EL as a position or authority relationship, hence taking EL to be synonymous with Educational Management (EM) (Spicker, 2012; Révész, 2011; Walters, 2009). However, other studies such as Mayra (2016) construe the school head’s role as embodying both management and leadership, although they do not go ahead to clarify the relationship between the two constructs in the context of education. The current study objective is therefore meant to examine how EL is related to EM. For example, what is the relationship between leadership and management in the successful functioning of a school?

The study adopts the definition of EL as “an interactive influence relationship among different stakeholders who agree to work together in a given situation so as to realise their mutual purposes in general, but enhancing teaching and learning in particular” (Genza, 2021: 135). This EL has “at its core the responsibility for policy formulation and, where appropriate, organisational transformation” (Bolam, 1999, as cited by Bush, 2008: 1). As for EM, the same Bolam views it as “an executive function for carrying out agreed policy” (Bush, 2008: 1). Bolam’s conceptualisations imply that the relationship between EL and EM is one of difference; a relationship of two different constructs, behaviours, roles and functions, as if leadership and management are mutually exclusive in action. Bolam’s identification of EL with ‘organisational

transformation' points to leadership's multiple relationships of 'influence' necessary for effective change (Genza, 2021; Rost, 1991). These are largely informal relationships that are not tied to organisational hierarchy but may be found anywhere within the school organisation.

Conversely, Bolam's reference to EM as an "executive function" for policy execution implies that it (EM) is largely a position-specific function for implementing policy. However, it is not clear where Bolam places educational administration; because such an implementation role is often relegated to administration, not management. Secondly, Bolam's contention that the core responsibility of EL is policy formulation is confusing, since formulating policy is often the role of top-level (strategic) management and boards of governors. Does Bolam perhaps mean 'policy initiation' and/or 'policy revolution', which are more commonly associated with leadership (Bush, 2008; Cuban, 1988)? It might also be that Bolam is part of the conceptual mishmash (mix-up) that the current study attempts to reduce. In any case, do the two concepts, EL and EM, really categorically differ both in principle and in practice?

Further documentary review revealed that although EL and EM are conceptually different, in practice the two are like birds of the same feather – they flock together; hence a complementary relationship. For example, Bush et al. (2003) clarifies that;

Leadership is a process of influence leading to the achievement of desired purposes. It involves inspiring and supporting others towards the achievement of a vision for the school which is based on clear personal and professional values. Management is the implementation of school policies and the efficient and effective maintenance of the school's current activities. Both leadership and management are required if schools are to be successful (p. 10).

In tune with the paradox theory, these findings imply that the relationship between EL and EM is not of the 'either - or' type whereby either leadership or management should be used to run a school. Rather, the relationship is a complementary (paired) one. Since every educational program needs to be both led and managed (Earley, 2013; Yukl, 2008), it is understandable why EL and EM are reported to go hand-in-hand in education governance. Northouse (2001), as cited by Pentti (2003), even views EL and EM as "two paths of leading" (p. 37), which is quite contentious, except if used in the context of two 'leaderships', one of which is (conventional) management. Even more precisely, however, Révész (2011) indicates that;

Creating functioning and successful schools needs leadership, management and administration as well. These roles complement each other (p. 102).

Similarly, Bush (2008) contends that;

Leadership [EL] and management [EM] need to be given equal prominence if schools and colleges are to operate effectively and achieve their objectives. While a clear vision may be essential to establish the nature and direction of change [EL], it is equally important to ensure that innovations are implemented efficiently and that the school's residual functions are carried out effectively [EM] while certain elements are undergoing change [EL] (p. 6).

The above insights by Révész (2011) and Bush (2008) give further support to the complementary relationship view. One only wonders how these two conceptually different constructs and roles can concretely operate together mutually. Do they not outcompete each other, resulting in anarchy, for example?

Mayra (2016) thinks that it depends on given situations, with flexibility as the key; and that effective education leaders and managers can easily interpret the circumstances and adapt accordingly. Cuban (1988) concurs, and even goes ahead to concretely elaborate on the mutual roles of each of the two, and how a mix is not only desirable but also possible;

By leadership [EL], I mean influencing others' actions in achieving desirable ends. Leaders are people who shape the goals, motivations, and actions of others. Frequently they initiate change to reach existing and new goals. Occasionally they lead in order to preserve what is valuable, such as, protecting core school functions... Managing [EM] is maintaining efficiently and effectively current organizational arrangements. While managing well often exhibits leadership skills ..., the overall direction is toward maintenance rather than change. I prize both managing and leading and attach no special value to either one since different settings and times call for varied responses (Cuban, 1988: xx).

However, according to Berg (2011), although in principle school heads are both managers and leaders at the same time, the practice is that whereas some heads incline more towards “administrative chiefship” (management), others tend more towards educational leadership. Fairholm (2002) concurs, opining that “headship is not always leadership” (p. 34). These revelations seem to imply that although Mayra (2016) and Cuban (1988) think that experienced school heads are good at reading between lines to apply leadership or management to given contexts, in reality, things are more complicated than that. No wonder, of late there are indications in many countries that “the principal’s managerial role has expanded and intensified to the detriment of their educational leadership role” (Branson, 2011: 67). Yet the “apparently ideal situation is of course one where the formal chief [school head] is also the informal leader” (Berg, 2011: 92).

In general, therefore, regarding the relationship between EL and EM, a more compelling position adapted by the current study is that although EL is conceptually different from EM, the two are complementary in the successful functioning of educational institutions. Organisational excellence requires a delicate balance in the application of both to different educational spaces in differing mixes. How exactly this can be done is an issue that deserves more scholarly attention. But how prepared are different countries’ education landscapes to support leadership and management roles concurrently, and with what implications? The next section utilizes education policy literature from Uganda to shed light on these issues.

Usage of the term leadership in Uganda’s education policy literature

The study’s third objective focused on the usage of the term leadership in selected education policy literature from Uganda. The objective attempted to provide answers to the following questions. How many times does a given education policy document apply the term ‘leadership’ to mean an ‘influence relationship’ (leadership in a strict sense)? How many times is the term used to mean ‘management’ (authority relationship)? What is the prevalence of an ambiguous application of the term to imply either an influence or an authority relationship, or both? Table 2 presents documentary review results on these issues.

Table 2: Usage of the term leadership in selected education policy literature

	Sampled education policy document	Usage of the term leadership		
		Influence relationship	Authority relationship	Ambiguous usage
1	Education Act 2008 (84 pages)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)
2	Basic requirements and minimum standards indicators for education institutions [BMEI] (MoES, 2009a) (37 pages).	1(50%)	1(50%)	0(0%)
3	The National Teacher Policy (MoES, 2009b) (26 pages)	1(10%)	7(70%)	2(20%)
4	Guidelines for establishing, licensing, registering and classification of private schools/institutions in Uganda (MoES, 2014) (54 pages)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)
5	Statistical abstract 2017 (MoES, 2017a) (222 pages)	1(50%)	0(0%)	1(50%)
6	Education & sports sector annual performance (FY 2016/2017) [ESSAPR 2016/2017] (MoES, 2017b) (230 pages)	6(22%)	13(48%)	8(30%)
7	Education & sports sector annual performance (FY 2018/2019) [ESSAPR 2018/2019] (MoES, 2019) (250 pages)	3(43%)	4(57%)	0(0%)
8	Education & sports sector strategic plan 2017-2020 (MoES, 2020a) (150 pages)	5(38%)	2(15%)	6(46%)
9	Performance management guidelines for tertiary institutions and schools (2020) (MoES, 2020b) (107 pages)	1(20%)	1(20%)	3(60%)
	Overall frequency	18(27%)	28(43%)	20(30%)

Table 2 reveals that in Uganda's education policy literature, by simple majority, most of the time the term 'leadership' is applied to mean an 'authority relationship' (43%), which implies 'management'. Conversely, only about a quarter of times (27%) is the term used to mean an 'influence relationship' – leadership in a strict sense. These findings point to a less appreciation of interactive influence relationships in education policy literature in Uganda, and perhaps to an equally less appreciation of these relationships in education governance practice itself.

Concerning 'leadership' usage to mean an authority relationship, documentary review yielded such examples as;

- *Local Government Leadership* [sic] (MoES, 2020: ix).
- *There should be at least two general learners' meetings each term with their student leadership* (MoES, 2009a: 23).
- *Trained key education actors especially the District Leadership* (MoES, 2017b: 151).
- *To induct school leadership in effective management practices* (MoES, 2017b: 7).

In each of the cases above, where the term 'leadership' appears, the term 'management' or 'administration' could as well have been used without losing meaning. For example, 'local government administration' and 'school management' instead of 'local government leadership' and 'school leadership', respectively. Instead of speaking of programs "to induct school leadership in effective management practices" (MoES, 2017b: 7); why does literature not speak of "inducting school administration [or management] in effective leadership practices? The bigger question therefore seems to be: Why does current usage prefer the term 'leadership' to such

terms as ‘management’ and/or ‘administration’? Whereas conceptual drift, careless application and innocent (uninformed) usage may provide tentative answers, empirical research is needed to uncover more convincing rationales that may not be so explicit in existing literature.

Otherwise, for usage of ‘leadership’ to portray an influence relationship (leadership in a strict sense), we have these two examples;

- *Encourage a sense of service, duty and leadership for participation in civic, social and national affairs* (MoES, 2019: 3).
- [Institutions should have a] *suggestion box for the learners’ leadership* (MoES, 2009a: 23).

However, most of the instances where an ‘influence relationship’ was interpreted in literature’s usage of the term ‘leadership’, (these) were instances containing both words ‘leadership’ and ‘management’. Examples of such concurrent usage abound;

- *Improving leadership and school management knowledge* (MoES, 2019: 163).
- *To provide leadership and management in service delivery* (MoES, 2017a: 4).
- *With a special focus on the quality of leadership, [&] management* (MoES, 2020a: xi).
- *Training of school managers (head teachers) [sic] in school management and leadership* (MoES, 2017b: 113).
- *Poor Management and leadership capacity of ECD proprietors* (MoES, 2017b: 110).
- [Held] *an international management and leadership conference* (MoES, 2019: 109).

The researcher interpreted these instances to mean that since, in such cases, an authority relationship is already implied by the term ‘management’, an inclusion of the term ‘leadership’ is purposively meant to bring out the additional idea of leadership as interactive influence. However, this is the optimistic interpretation. Otherwise, it could also be that in some of those cases the (additional) inclusion of the word ‘leadership’ is ‘by accident’ (careless application). Should this be the case, the proportional representation of ‘influence relationships will reduce from 27% (Table 2) to an even smaller percentage.

Another revelation from Table 2 is that only one education policy [the Education and Sports Sector Strategic Plan 2017-2020], of all the nine policies sampled (11%), has more instances of leadership usage to mean an ‘influence relationship’ (38%) than an ‘authority relationship’ (15%). While on the one hand this also implies an overabundance of education policies couched in ‘management overtones’, even where it is the word ‘leadership’ used; on the other hand, it is positively surprising that there is such an ‘exception document’. The existence of such a promising outlier implies that thinking in terms of open influence relationships is not an entirely lost case.

Table 2 further shows that there are many instances in Uganda’s education policy literature where the term “leadership” is ambiguously applied (30%). These are instances where it was obscure if the term meant an influence or an authority relationship, if not both. Examples are;

- [Delivering] *leadership at all levels* (MoES, 2009b: 8).
- *Effective leadership and accountability systems* (MoES, 2020a: 7).
- *5 weeks of Leadership and Community placement [sic]* (MoES, 2017b: 41).

Such findings remind both researchers and practitioners that not every (written or oral) mention of the term ‘leadership’ is actually a reference to an interactive influence

relationship. It is wise to always first consider and reconsider the *Sitz-im-leben* (the particular context).

Finally, it is also interesting to note also that Table 2 bears some policies, which do not mention the word 'leadership' at all. An outstanding example is the Education Act 2008. This is a document of 84 pages, none of which mentions "leadership", although 'management' is mentioned as many as 138 times; that is, more than once (1.6 times) per page! This means that this policy does not contain any 'misuse' of the term 'leadership'. Perhaps other writings could equally avoid using the term 'leadership' instead of either 'misusing' it or using it vaguely. In one African language (Luganda) we say that "Asirika tiyejjusa" (Remaining silent is safer than speaking only to reveal your ignorance!).

CONCLUSION

First, going by leadership's strict (narrow) meaning, the relationship between leadership and management is essentially one of difference, since then the two concepts imply different roles and behaviours. Even then, however, leadership and management are also further characterised by a complementary relationship; that is, the successful functioning of institutions such as schools requires that the two (should) go hand in hand. This complementarity is a relationship that is often either forgotten or downplayed by both research and practice.

Second, since it has become increasingly common for 'leadership' to be used as a synonym for 'management' (and/or 'administration') – as indicated by leadership's broad meaning, the study concludes that the concept has undergone (and is perhaps still undergoing) conceptual drift. It has already taken on a synonymous relationship with management, hence the conundrum of "two 'leaderships' one of which is 'management'"! The conceptual drift may be partly explained by existence of different academic disciplines that use different academic languages, however implying similar things.

Thus, in general, the relationship between the two concepts is a tripartite one; a relationship of difference, complementarity and (even) similarity (synonyms). This implies that there is an even more critical need for researchers and practitioners to clarify the kind of meaning they are attaching to 'leadership' in their various communications. To further reduce ambiguity and vagueness, the feasibility of using the terminology of 'leadership 1' and 'leadership 2' for the narrow and broad meanings of leadership, respectively, could be tried.

For the relationship between EL and EM, the study concludes that it is also a tripartite one: EL as different from EM, but complementary to it, and sometimes even synonymous with it. In practice, however – also as an indication of conceptual drift – complementary and synonymous usages have superseded the relationship of difference. Even in Uganda's education policy literature, a synonymous usage of 'leadership' to mean 'management' and/or 'administration' is becoming the norm. The discovered complementarity concurs with the paradox theory, which discourages an 'either - or' logic, in preference for the logic of 'both A and B'. This points to the necessity of both leadership and management in the successful functioning of educational institutions. However, not any leadership-management 'mix' or 'dose' will work; institutional excellence seems to require a delicate balance in concurrent application of both to different educational settings. Further research is still needed to come up with different contextually constructed 'mixes'.

Finally, the study concludes that it is when both terms ‘leadership’ and ‘management’ appear concurrently in a sentence that the term ‘leadership’ most likely bears an interactive influence relationship (leadership 1). When the term is used alone in a sentence – without ‘management’ alongside it – most likely it is an authoritarian perspective that is meant, hence management.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Researchers should further devise ‘leadership jargon’ that indicates more precisely whether it is the narrow or the broad sense of leadership that is meant. The proposed use of ‘leadership 1’ and ‘leadership 2’ terminology is just the first attempt.
2. Since both leadership and management roles are necessary for the effective running of educational programs and institutions; education officers should utilise the complementary relationship between leadership and management to take schools to another level.
3. However, more scholarly attention needs to be given to the question of a concurrent and mutual application of both EL and EM. For example, how ready is Uganda’s education legal framework (policies) to accommodate active leaders and active managers in the same school, without critical crashes?
4. Like the case with Uganda’s Education Act 2008, which does not use the term ‘leadership’ at all, researchers and practitioners should equally omit it and use ‘management’, if they want to refer to a ‘formal position’ or role. It is such a meticulous use that will reduce both ‘misuse’ and ambiguous usage of the term ‘leadership’.

REFERENCES

- Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass & Stodgill’s handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (3rd Ed.). The Free Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Bass, R. (2009). *The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research and managerial applications* (4th Ed). Free Press.
- Bennis, W.G., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Berenskoetter, F. (2016). Approaches to concept analysis. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 45(1), 1-24.
- Berg, G. (2011). The complexity of school leadership. In: Baráth, T. & Szabó, M. (eds). *Does leadership matter? Implications for leadership development and the school as a learning organization*. HUNSEM, University of Szeged.
- Branson, C. M. (2011). Educational systems leadership: Creating coherence or contestation? In: Baráth, T., & Szabó, M. (eds). *Does leadership matter? Implications for leadership development and the school as a learning organization*. HUNSEM, University of Szeged.
- Bush, T. (2008). *Leadership and management development in education*. SAGE.
- Bush, T. (2011). *Theories of educational leadership and management* (4th Ed.). SAGE.
- Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2003). *School leadership: Concepts and evidence*. University of Reading, NCSL.
- Cuban, L. (1988). *The managerial imperative and the practice of leadership in schools*. New York Press.
- Cunha, M. P., & Putnam, L. L. (2017). Paradox theory and the paradox of success. *Strategic Organization*, 17(1), 95-106.
- Day, C., & Sammons, P. (2016). *Successful school leadership*. Education Development Trust.
- Earley, P. (2013). Leading and managing change: Why is it so hard to do? In Kollias, A. (Ed.). *Critical Factors in the discourse on School Leadership from the perspective of equity and learning*. Lifelong Learning Programme of the European Union.
- Fairholm, M. R. (2002). *Defining leadership: A review of past, present, and future ideas*. Center for Excellence in Municipal Management, George Washington University.
- Genza, G. M. (2021). But what is leadership? A systematic review of the leadership concept in view of heightened educational leadership in Africa. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 12(9), 127-137.
- Government of Uganda (2013). *A Guide to policy development and management in Uganda*. Author.
- Hallinger, P. (2013). A conceptual framework for systematic reviews of research in educational leadership and management. *Journal of Educational Administration*, (51), 126-149.

- Hallinger, P., & Hammad, W. (2017). Knowledge production on educational leadership and management in Arab societies: A systematic review of research. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*; pp. 1-17. Doi: 10.1177/1741143217717280
- Hašková, A. (2011). School leaders' competencies: Results of research carried out in Slovakia In: Baráth, T. & Szabó, M. (eds). *Does leadership matter? Implications for leadership development and the school as a learning organization*. HUNSEM, University of Szeged.
- Himmelfarb Library (2020). Meta-Analysis. <https://himmelfarb.gwu.edu/tutorials/studydesign101/metaanalyses.cfm>
- Hoekema, A. (2017). The conundrum of cross-cultural understanding in the practice of law. *The Journal of Legal Pluralism and Unofficial Law*, 49 (1), 67-84
- James, C., Connolly, M., & Hawkins, M. (2019). Reconceptualising and redefining educational leadership practice. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*. DOI: [10.1080/13603124.2019.1591520](https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2019.1591520)
- Killeen, T. J. (2012). *The Cardamom conundrum: Reconciling development and conservation in the kingdom of Cambodia*. NUS Press.
- Leithwood, K. (2005). *Educational Leadership: A review of the research*. Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education. <http://www.temple.edu/lss>.
- Leslie, J. B., Li, P. P., & Zhao, S. (2015). *Managing paradox: Blending East and West philosophies to unlock its advantages and opportunities*. Center for Creative Leadership.
- Lewis, M. W., & Smith, W. K. (2014). Paradox as a meta-theoretical perspective. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 50(2), 127-149.
- Magara, J. (2017). *Positioning Africa for the 21st century: the pivotal role of leadership and think tanks*. Beeranga Mwesigwa Foundation.
- Mayra, G. (2016). *Managerial and leadership approaches of primary school headteachers*. London Metropolitan University.
- Mansur, Y. (2009). *A guide to successful policy formulation*. Syria SME Support Programme.
- MoES [Ministry of Education and Sports] (2008). *Education Act 2008*. Government of Uganda.
- MoES (2009a). *Basic requirements and minimum standards indicators for education institutions [BMEI]*. Government of Uganda.
- MoES (MoES, 2009b). *The National Teacher Policy*. Government of Uganda.
- MoES (2014). *Guidelines for establishing, licensing, registering and classification of private schools/institutions in Uganda*. Government of Uganda.
- MoES (2017a). *Statistical abstract 2017*. Government of Uganda.
- MoES (2017b). *Education & sports sector annual performance (FY 2016/2017)* [ESSAPR 2016/2017]. Government of Uganda.
- MoES (2019). *Education & sports sector annual performance (FY 2018/2019)* [ESSAPR 2018/2019]. Government of Uganda.
- MoES (2020a). *Education & sports sector strategic plan 2017-2020*. Government of Uganda.
- MoES (2020b). *Performance management guidelines for tertiary institutions and schools*. Government of Uganda.
- Molnár, I. (2011). Meaning of leadership in different corporate environments. In Baráth, T., & Szabó, M. (Eds). *Does leadership matter? Implications for leadership development and the school as a learning organization*. HUNSEM, University of Szeged.
- Ndarukwa, P., Chimbari, M. J., & Sibanda, E. N. (2019). Protocol on a systematic review of qualitative studies on asthma treatment challenges experienced in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Systematic Review*, 8(149), 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-019-1068-7>
- Neelam, A., Glenn, H. A., Amie, B., Oscar, G., Christine, O., Misty, M. S., & Jenelle, L. S. (2017). Leadership and management are one and the same. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 81 (6), 1-5.
- Oguntibeju, J., Ibitoye, O., Atoyebi, K. O., & Falana, A. A. (2014). Leadership, corporate governance and entrepreneurship development in Nigeria: A mutual link. *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development*, 5(25), 67-82.
- Owolabi, J. (2005). *Policy making and educational policy analysis*. Makerere University.
- Pentti, S. (2003). *Intelligent leadership and leadership competencies: Developing a leadership framework for intelligent organizations*. Helsinki University of Technology.
- Petocz, A., & Newbery, G. (2010). On conceptual analysis as the primary qualitative approach to statistics education research in psychology. *Statistics Education Research Journal*, 9(2), 123-145.
- Qiu, J. (2013). Conundrums approached from the cognitive perspective of "the impartment and inheritance of connotation and denotation". *English Language Teaching*, 6(7), 122-127.
- Révész, E. (2011). Leadership for improving learning – some lessons learned from the OECD "Improving School Leadership" activity. In: Baráth, T., & Szabó, M. (Eds). *Does leadership matter? Implications for leadership development and the school as a learning organization*. HUNSEM, University of Szeged.
- Rost, J. C. (1991). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. Praeger.

- Sandberg, E. (2017). Introducing the paradox theory in logistics and SCM research - examples from a global sourcing context. *International Journal of Logistics*, 20(5), 459-474.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13675567.2017.1280007>
- Sharma, M. K., & Jain, S. (2013). Leadership management: principles, models and theories. *Global Journal of Management and Business Studies*, 3(3), 309-318.
- Silva, S. (2016). What is Leadership? *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly* 2016, 8(1), 1-5.
- Smyth, S. M. (2019). The Facebook conundrum: Is it time to usher in a new era of regulation for big tech? *International Journal of Cyber Criminology*, 13(2), 578-595.
- Spicker, P. (2012). "Leadership": A perniciously vague concept. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 25(1), 34-47.
- Toor, S. (2011). Differentiating leadership from management: An empirical investigation of leaders and managers. *Leadership and Management in Engineering*, (10), 1-13.
- Waldmana, D. A., Putnamb, L. L., Miron-Spektor, E., & Siegela, D. (2019). The role of paradox theory in decision making and management research. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2019.04.006>
- Walters, D. C. (2009). Exploring a definition of leadership and the biography of Dr. Frank B. Wynn. *Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers*.
<https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd/1299>
- Young, M., & Dulewicz, V. (2008). Similarities and differences between leadership and management: High-performance competencies in the British Royal Navy. *British Journal of Management*, (19), 17-32.
- Yukl, G. (2002). *Leadership in Organizations* (5th Ed.). Prentice Hall.
- Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in organizations* (6th Ed.). Pearson-Prentice Hall.