Rethinking Ethics in Educative Leadership: Towards a Non-Foundational Epistemology for Western Leadership Theories

Reynold J. S. Macpherson[1]

[1] *University of Auckland, Rotorua, New Zealand*   0009-0005-7207-1347

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
	This paper provides an analysis of the ethical dimensions embedded in Western management and leadership theories in education. It explores the moral philosophies underlying key management and leadership models, including scientific, bureaucratic and human relations management, and transformational, instructional, distributed, ethical, adaptive and culturally responsive leadership. The respective strengths and limitations of these theories are examined in terms of context-specific applicability and pragmatic problem-solving capacities. The analysis reveals that these leadership theories are intricately interwoven with foundational moral philosophies, highlighting their internal conceptual coherence and cultural alignment. However, despite offering principled frameworks for ethical decision-making, this paper argues that these Western theories often lack contextual adaptability and tend to overemphasize measurable outcomes, while the subjectivity of moral character remains an underexplored limitation. Hence, the paper advocates for a non-foundational epistemology as a more flexible and pragmatic approach to theory building about educational management and leadership. This perspective enables leaders to navigate diverse and dynamic educational settings by integrating multiple ethical perspectives and refining practices based on empirical evidence. By moving beyond the constraints of foundational moral philosophies, non-foundational epistemology provides a more responsive and inclusive framework, realigning leadership theory with the complex and evolving needs of educational organisations.

1. Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to analyze the ethical dimensions embedded in Western management and leadership theories in education to identify their epistemological limitations. Western countries, often referred to as "the West," encompass nations that share cultural, political, and economic characteristics influenced by Western European traditions. These countries are typically characterized by democratic political systems, capitalist economies, and a high degree of industrialization. The concept of the West is both geographical and cultural, encompassing nations with histories deeply rooted in Western European civilization (Rietbergen, 2014).

Western countries generally include those of Western Europe, such as the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Netherlands, Belgium, Switzerland, Austria, Ireland, and Luxembourg. North America, represented by the United States and Canada, and Oceania, including Australia and New Zealand, are also considered part of the West. Additionally, other European countries often associated with the West include the Scandinavian nations of Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland, and Iceland, as well as Greece and parts of Eastern Europe such as Poland, Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia, and Slovenia. The Baltic states of Estonia,

Latvia, and Lithuania, along with certain Latin American countries like Argentina, Chile, and Uruguay, are sometimes included due to historical ties through European colonization.

Despite this diversity, Western conceptions of educational leadership have been predominantly shaped by North American perspectives. To illustrate, the US National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA, 2015) established eight professional standards outlining the roles and responsibilities of school leaders, aligning with the earlier Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards (1996). These standards also correspond with key realms of educational management and leadership practice identified in research conducted in the US and Britain (Bush, 2010).

Vision and mission development involve establishing a clear institutional direction that aligns with educational goals and values (Northouse, 2019). Strategic planning encompasses the formulation and implementation of long-term educational objectives, including curriculum development, resource allocation, and policy formation (Fullan, 2007). Instructional leadership focuses on enhancing teaching and learning by supporting teachers, refining instructional methods, and promoting effective pedagogical strategies (Hallinger & Heck, 1996). Organizational management pertains to overseeing daily operations, including staff supervision, budgeting, and facility maintenance, to foster a productive learning environment (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003). Community building requires the development of strong relationships among students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders to create an inclusive educational community (Murphy & Shipman, 1998). Change management entails leading reforms within the educational system, integrating technology, and addressing evolving challenges. Professional development emphasizes the continuous growth of teachers and staff through training, workshops, and collaborative learning initiatives (Fullan, 2007). Ethical leadership necessitates upholding high moral standards and cultivating a culture of integrity, equity, and respect within educational organizations (ISLLC, 1996).

These standards and realms of practice, predominantly derived from research in North America and the British Commonwealth, are broadly applicable to leadership in various educational settings, including schools, faculties, institutions, and education systems. However, the idea that organizations are significantly influenced by moral philosophies is rooted in the work of several key theorists who have explored ethics and organizational behavior.

Weber's theory of bureaucracy and his analysis of the Protestant work ethic illustrate the connection between organizational structures and underlying moral values. His work demonstrates how religious and ethical beliefs shape economic and organizational systems (Weber, 1905). Schein highlights the role of organizational culture in decision-making and behavior, emphasizing how deeply held values and assumptions influence institutional practices (Schein, 2010). Freeman, through stakeholder theory, argues that businesses should be accountable to all stakeholders, not just shareholders. His perspective aligns with ethical considerations concerning fairness, justice, and the common good (Freeman, 1984). Drucker, regarded as a pioneer in modern management, underscores the importance of ethical leadership and moral responsibility in decision-making. He advocates for integrity-driven leadership that prioritizes the well-being of employees, customers, and society (Drucker, 1993).

Collectively, these theorists highlight the integral role of moral philosophies in shaping organizational behavior through management and leadership practices. This paper reports research into educational management and leadership theories intended to reveal their underlying moral foundations, and the strengths and limitations of their approach to constructing theories.

2. Methodology

The research problem was to clarify the nature, strengths, and epistemological limitations of the moral philosophies that underpin Western management and leadership theories in education. Documentary analysis was used to make a systematic examination of key texts and documents—such as philosophical works, leadership theory literature, and policy papers—to inform this evaluation. The process of documentary analysis (Bowen, 2009) began many decades ago with the author's collection of relevant materials, including leadership theories and foundational philosophical texts. Documents relevant to the research purpose were assembled. Content analysis identified key concepts, principles, and assumptions that underpin both moral

philosophy and leadership theory. This identified how different moral frameworks are embedded within leadership theories.

The analysis further involved a comparative examination of various moral philosophies to determine their influence on leadership theories and their practical implications. This helped identify the strengths and limitations inherent in these moral foundations. Finally, a critical evaluation of the applicability of moral philosophies to contemporary leadership contexts was essential. Philosophical principles had to be evaluated for their coherence, relevance, and validity within modern administrative frameworks.

Documentary analysis, as a qualitative methodology, offers significant advantages. It provides a deep, historical understanding of the philosophical foundations of leadership theories without requiring empirical data collection. Additionally, it allows for a nuanced interpretation of how moral philosophies have evolved and been adapted to contemporary leadership contexts (Northouse, 2019). Documentary analysis is particularly useful for examining policy documents and educational leadership standards, as it enables a structured approach to evaluating how ethical principles are articulated in official texts and frameworks (Mogalakwe, 2006). Moreover, it is a cost-effective method that allows for an extensive review of a wide range of materials over time (Prior, 2003).

However, a major drawback of documentary analysis is the potential for subjective interpretation, as the analysis relies heavily on the researcher's understanding of both the philosophical texts and leadership contexts (Ciulla, 2005). Moreover, documentary analysis does not account for how these theories are applied in practice, which could lead to abstract conclusions that may not fully capture real-world dynamics. This limitation necessitates triangulation with other qualitative methods, such as interviews or case studies, to ensure a more comprehensive understanding of the interplay between moral philosophy and leadership practice (O'Leary, 2014). Additionally, the availability and authenticity of documents may pose challenges, as historical texts may be subject to bias or limited accessibility (Scott, 1990). Hence, conclusions drawn are regarded as provisional and indicative.

3. Findings

Scientific Management

Initially, educational leadership in Western countries was primarily authoritarian, focusing on maintaining discipline and transmitting established knowledge (Gunter, 2004). During the Industrial Revolution, leadership became more bureaucratic, emphasizing efficiency and standardization (Tyack & Hansot, 1982). The Industrial Revolution, which began around 1760 and lasted until about 1840, marked significant technological, economic, and social changes, primarily in Britain before spreading to other Western countries (Ashton, 1997).

Taylor's scientific management principles heavily influenced early 20th-century educational leadership. This approach emphasized efficiency, standardization, and hierarchical control. The moral philosophy underpinning scientific management is utilitarianism, which aims to achieve the greatest good for the greatest number by maximizing efficiency and productivity (Taylor, 1911). Utilitarianism in this context justified practices that improved operational efficiency, viewing education as a means to produce well-functioning, productive members of society.

The greatest strength of this approach was that it introduced systematic management practices and clear organizational structures, aiding in the professionalization of school management, and ensuring predictability in school operations. However, critics argued that scientific management potentially dehumanizes education by treating teachers and students as mere components of a mechanistic system, neglecting their emotional and intellectual needs (Bush, 2010).

Neo-Taylorism, a modern adaptation of Taylor's scientific management principles, emphasizes efficiency, data-driven decision-making, and performance management in educational settings. Observational studies of school administrators have found a continuing reliance on Taylor's scientific management principles (Gronn, 1982). This approach promotes productivity measures in education, but its greatest limitations are that it can neglect the holistic development of students and the professional autonomy of teachers, focusing too narrowly on measurable outcomes and efficiency. Taylorism and neo-Taylorism in educational leadership are

underpinned by utilitarianism, emphasizing efficiency, standardization, and productivity to achieve the greatest good for the greatest number.

Bureaucratic Management

Weber's bureaucratic theory significantly impacted educational leadership practices, particularly at institutional and system level. Weber advocated for a structured, rule-based approach with a clear hierarchy and division of labour. This model is underpinned by deontological ethics, which emphasize duty, rules, and the inherent rightness of adhering to organizational procedures (Weber, 1947). Deontological ethics, as articulated by Kant (1997), argue that actions are morally right if they are in accordance with established rules and duties, regardless of the outcomes.

Bureaucratic models provide clarity, predictability, and fairness through well-defined rules and roles, ensuring consistent policy application (Hoy & Miskel, 2012). This systematic approach helps maintain order and uniformity within educational institutions and systems, which can be particularly beneficial in large organizations where consistency is crucial for operational efficiency and ideological compliance.

Recent empirical studies have highlighted the limitations of rigid bureaucratic models in educational institutions. For instance, Alanoğlu and Demirtaş (2021) found that obstructive bureaucratic structures negatively impact teachers' job satisfaction, as excessive adherence to rules can hinder responsiveness to individual and contextual needs. Similarly, Shaikh and Şentürk (2023) observed that coercive bureaucratic practices contribute to a negative school climate, stifling innovation and adaptability. These findings suggest that an overemphasis on rule-following can impede educational institutions' ability to evolve in response to new challenges or opportunities.

Thus, while Weber's bureaucratic theory has contributed significantly to the structure and functioning of educational leadership as practice, it also presents limitations that must be balanced with more flexible and responsive approaches. In sum, Weberian bureaucracy is underpinned by deontological ethics, emphasizing adherence to rules, duties, and hierarchical structures to ensure order, predictability, and rational decision-making in organizational management.

The Human Relations Movement

The Human Relations Movement in educational leadership developed in the early-mid-20th century and was significantly influenced by the Hawthorne Studies, conducted by Mayo and his colleagues. These studies underscored the importance of human factors such as motivation, group dynamics, and leadership style in organizational success. The movement was grounded in a moral philosophy of humanistic ethics, emphasizing the intrinsic value of individuals and their psychological needs (Mayo, 1933).

The Hawthorne Studies, conducted at the Western Electric Hawthorne Works in Chicago during the 1920s and 1930s, revealed that workers' productivity increased not just due to changes in physical conditions but also because of the attention they received from researchers, which led to increased feelings of importance and belonging (Mayo, 1933). This discovery highlighted the significance of social and psychological factors in the workplace, challenging the previously dominant scientific management theories that focused solely on efficiency and task optimization.

Inspired by these findings, the Human Relations Movement in educational leadership began to emphasize creating a more supportive and motivating environment for both teachers and students. Key principles included recognizing the intrinsic worth of individuals, fostering positive interpersonal relationships, and addressing the psychological and social needs of staff and students (Owens & Valesky, 2011).

The Human Relations Movement introduced significant shifts in educational leadership by emphasizing the well-being, motivation, and satisfaction of teachers and students. Research has shown that prioritizing positive interpersonal relationships within schools fosters higher morale, greater job satisfaction, and improved collaboration among educators (Busher, 2020; Glisson, 2015). This shift in leadership philosophy led to practices such as teacher participation in decision-making, increased professional development opportunities, and the cultivation of a school culture that values individual contributions (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Leithwood, et al., 2017).

One of the key contributions of the Human Relations Movement was the promotion of democratic and participative leadership styles, which encouraged school leaders to actively engage with their staff and students, listen to their concerns, and foster an inclusive school environment (Spillane, et al., 2004). Empirical studies suggest that such participative leadership approaches reduce hierarchical barriers and create a sense of collective responsibility, ultimately improving school climate and student engagement (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012; Murphy & Torre, 2014). By cultivating strong interpersonal relationships, educational leaders were able to build trust and encourage collaboration, which, in turn, led to more effective teaching and learning environments (Goddard, et al., 2004).

Despite its strengths, the Human Relations Movement has faced notable criticisms. One key limitation was its potential lack of emphasis on academic performance and organizational efficiency (Hoy & Miskel, 2012; Robinson, et al., 2008). While fostering a supportive environment is crucial, research indicates that effective school leadership also requires a balance between relational leadership and strong instructional oversight to ensure high academic achievement (Hallinger & Heck, 2010). Studies suggest that an overemphasis on interpersonal relationships, at the expense of data-driven decision-making and accountability, may lead to inefficiencies in school management and inconsistent student outcomes (Leithwood et al., 2020; Supovitz, et al., 2010).

Additionally, critics argue that the Human Relations Movement sometimes failed to address structural inequalities within educational systems. Merely focusing on interpersonal relationships without addressing systemic issues such as inequities in resource allocation, implicit biases, and broader socio-political factors limited the movement's ability to enact meaningful, long-term reform (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Shields, 2010). Studies on equity-driven leadership emphasize that while positive relationships are necessary, they must be integrated with policies that tackle institutional disparities to create truly inclusive and effective learning environments (Khalifa, et al., 2016; Theoharis, 2007).

Overall, while the Human Relations Movement significantly advanced educational leadership by prioritizing collaboration, motivation, and psychological well-being, its limitations highlight the need for a more comprehensive approach. Effective leadership requires integrating relational leadership with evidence-based instructional strategies and structural reforms to ensure both supportive school cultures and high academic performance.

In sum, the Human Relations Movement significantly influenced educational leadership by highlighting the importance of human factors in achieving organizational success. By promoting a more supportive and motivating environment, it helped to improve morale and collaboration within schools. It is underpinned by care ethics, emphasizing relationships, empathy, and the well-being of teachers and students, prioritizing their emotional and social needs. However, its limitations underscore the need for a balanced approach that integrates humanistic values with a strong focus on academic outcomes and organizational efficiency. Future educational leadership practices can build on the strengths of the Human Relations Movement while addressing its limitations to create a more holistic and effective approach to school leadership.

Transformational Leadership

The emergence of transformational leadership in educational settings can be traced to mid-20th-century progressive education movements, which emphasized democratic and child-centered approaches that encouraged leaders to support individual student needs and foster creativity (Dewey, 1938). Over time, the shift towards transformational leadership became evident, particularly as educational institutions sought visionary leaders who could inspire and engage stakeholders to drive innovation and improve educational outcomes (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005). This leadership model emphasizes collaboration, equity, and continuous improvement, aiming to create dynamic and inclusive learning environments that adapt to changing educational demands (Shatzer et al., 2014; Sun & Leithwood, 2015).

Transformational leadership is distinguished by its capacity to inspire, challenge, and support followers to achieve higher levels of performance and personal development. Leaders who adopt this approach exhibit several key characteristics. They articulate a clear and compelling vision for the future, fostering commitment among educators and students (Leithwood et al., 2020). They build strong relationships and promote teamwork, cultivating an inclusive and collaborative school culture where stakeholders feel valued and

empowered (Wang et al., 2016). Additionally, they emphasize equity and inclusion, addressing disparities in educational access and fostering a supportive learning environment for all students (Khalifa et al., 2016). Transformational leaders also encourage innovation, supporting new pedagogical methods and technological integration to enhance learning experiences (Day & Sammons, 2016). Finally, they prioritize continuous professional development for educators, ensuring that teaching practices evolve in response to emerging educational research and policy changes (Sun & Leithwood, 2015).

The strengths of transformational leadership in education are well-documented. Studies have shown that this leadership style is associated with increased teacher motivation, job satisfaction, and student achievement (Robinson et al., 2008; Shatzer et al., 2014). Transformational leaders cultivate a sense of shared purpose and commitment to collective goals, creating school cultures that prioritize continuous learning and improvement (Leithwood et al., 2020). Furthermore, by fostering adaptive and resilient educational communities, transformational leadership helps schools respond effectively to evolving educational challenges and policy reforms (Sun & Leithwood, 2015). Additionally, its focus on moral and ethical values ensures that academic excellence is pursued alongside the development of an inclusive and respectful school environment (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

However, transformational leadership is not without its limitations. One significant concern is its reliance on the leader's charisma and personal qualities, which can lead to inconsistencies in leadership effectiveness and sustainability (Day & Sammons, 2016). When the success of an institution is overly dependent on a single leader's vision and influence, the departure of that leader can disrupt progress and stability (Wang et al., 2016). Additionally, the strong emphasis on vision and inspiration may sometimes overshadow the importance of structured, data-driven approaches to school management, which are necessary for evidence-based decision-making and policy implementation (Robinson et al., 2008). The balance between visionary leadership and practical governance remains a key challenge for transformational leaders in education.

The ethical foundation of transformational leadership is deeply rooted in moral philosophy, drawing from virtue ethics, deontology, and consequentialism. Virtue ethics, particularly Aristotelian thought, emphasizes the cultivation of moral character traits such as integrity, wisdom, and courage, which transformational leaders embody to serve as ethical role models (Aristotle, 2004; Bass & Riggio, 2006). Deontological ethics, grounded in Kantian principles, underscores the importance of duty and moral imperatives, advocating for decision-making based on universal ethical standards rather than situational convenience (Kant, 1997; Burns, 1978). In educational contexts, transformational leaders apply these principles by upholding ethical integrity and ensuring that all stakeholders are treated with respect and fairness (Leithwood et al., 2020). Meanwhile, consequentialist ethics, particularly utilitarianism, informs transformational leadership's focus on maximizing positive educational outcomes, with leaders implementing strategies that enhance the overall well-being of students, teachers, and the wider school community (Mill, 2001; Bass, 1985).

By integrating these moral philosophies, transformational leadership creates a comprehensive ethical framework that guides decision-making and leadership practices. Virtue ethics shapes the leader's moral character, deontology ensures adherence to ethical standards, and consequentialism drives efforts to achieve the greatest educational benefit for all stakeholders. Burns (1978) established the foundational link between transformational leadership and moral purpose, asserting that effective leaders elevate both themselves and their followers ethically. Bass and Riggio (2006) further developed this concept by demonstrating how transformational leaders inspire and motivate through a shared vision embedded with moral values. Contemporary research continues to highlight the ethical imperatives of transformational leadership, reinforcing its role in fostering educational environments that balance innovation, inclusion, and moral responsibility (Day & Sammons, 2016; Leithwood et al., 2020).

Distributed Leadership

In the late 20th and early 21st centuries, distributed leadership emerged as a significant model in educational settings. This approach diverges from traditional hierarchical leadership paradigms by viewing leadership as a shared, collective activity rather than the sole responsibility of an individual. Distributed leadership aligns with democratic ethics, which emphasize equality, participation, and shared responsibility among all members of the educational community (Gronn, 2000).

The theoretical foundation of distributed leadership is rooted in democratic ethics. This moral philosophy promotes inclusive participation and equality, suggesting that everyone in the educational community has valuable insights and leadership potential. By distributing leadership tasks and responsibilities, this model seeks to democratize decision-making processes and ensure that diverse perspectives are considered. This approach not only fosters a more inclusive environment but also leverages the collective expertise and strengths of the community (Spillane, 2006).

One of the primary strengths of distributed leadership is its ability to encourage collaboration and shared decision-making among staff. This inclusive approach fosters a sense of ownership and accountability throughout the organization, which can enhance morale and motivation. When teachers and other staff members feel their contributions are valued and integral to the school's success, they are more likely to be engaged and committed to their work. This, in turn, can lead to higher levels of innovation and resilience within the organization (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006).

Distributed leadership also promotes a more adaptable and resilient organization. By spreading leadership responsibilities across multiple individuals, the school is less vulnerable to disruptions caused by the departure or absence of a single leader. This distributed approach ensures continuity and stability, as leadership is embedded in the collective rather than concentrated in one individual. Moreover, it facilitates the development of leadership skills among a broader group of staff, preparing the school to respond more effectively to future challenges (Day et al., 2009).

Despite its strengths, distributed leadership is not without its challenges and limitations. One significant issue is the potential for role confusion and a lack of accountability if responsibilities are not clearly defined and redefined over time. Without effective coordination and communication, the distributed model can lead to overlapping duties or gaps in leadership, which can undermine its effectiveness. To avoid these pitfalls, it is crucial to establish clear structures and processes that delineate roles and facilitate collaboration (Harris, 2009).

Another limitation is that the success of distributed leadership depends heavily on the existing school culture and the willingness of staff to engage in shared leadership. In environments where hierarchical traditions are deeply entrenched, or where staff members are resistant to taking on additional responsibilities without revising reward structures, implementing distributed leadership can be particularly challenging. Effective training and support are essential to cultivate a culture that embraces shared leadership and to equip staff with the skills needed to navigate this collaborative model successfully (Leithwood, et al., 2008).

In sum, distributed educational leadership represents a progressive approach to school leadership, emphasizing collaboration, shared responsibility, and inclusive decision-making. Rooted in democratic ethics, it seeks to leverage the collective strengths of the educational community to foster a more resilient and adaptable organization. While it offers significant benefits, including enhanced morale and organizational resilience, successful implementation requires clear role definitions, effective communication, and a supportive school culture. By addressing these challenges, educational leaders can harness the full potential of distributed leadership to drive continuous improvement and innovation in schools.

Instructional Leadership

Instructional leadership has become a distinctive approach in educational management, emphasizing the core activities of teaching and learning. Leaders who adopt this model take an active role in shaping educational practices and outcomes, striving to improve the quality of instruction and student achievement. This approach is informed by consequentialist ethics, which prioritize actions that lead to the best educational outcomes for the greatest number of students (Hallinger, 2003). Instructional leadership encompasses several critical dimensions:

- *Defining the School's Mission:* This involves developing a clear vision and mission focused on student learning and achievement. Leaders communicate these goals effectively to ensure all stakeholders are aligned with the school's educational objectives (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985).
- *Managing the Instructional Program:* Leaders take responsibility for the quality of the instructional program, which includes supervising and evaluating teaching practices, coordinating the curriculum, and ensuring the use of effective teaching strategies (Southworth, 2002).

- *Promoting a Positive School Learning Climate:* Instructional leaders foster an environment conducive to learning by establishing high expectations, providing professional development opportunities, and encouraging collaboration among teachers (Leithwood, et al., 2008).
- *Monitoring Student Progress:* Effective instructional leaders use data to monitor student performance, identify areas needing improvement, and make informed decisions about instructional practices (Hallinger, 2003).

The moral philosophy underpinning instructional leadership is consequentialism, specifically utilitarianism. This ethical framework evaluates actions based on their outcomes, aiming to maximize overall benefit. In the context of instructional leadership, this means prioritizing practices that lead to the best educational outcomes for the largest number of students. By focusing on student achievement and instructional quality, leaders strive to enhance the educational experiences and future opportunities for all students (Hallinger, 2003). There are many strengths of instructional leadership:

- *Focus on Core Educational Activities*: By focussing on teaching and learning, instructional leadership ensures that the primary mission of the school—student achievement—remains at the forefront. This focused approach helps maintain high standards of instructional quality and academic performance (Hallinger, 2003).
- *Data-Driven Decision Making:* Instructional leaders use data to inform their decisions, allowing for targeted interventions and continuous improvement in teaching practices. This evidence-based approach leads to more effective strategies for enhancing student learning (Southworth, 2002).
- *Professional Development:* Emphasizing ongoing professional growth, instructional leaders provide teachers with opportunities to refine their skills and adopt new instructional methods. This commitment to professional development fosters a culture of continuous improvement and innovation (Leithwood et al., 2008).

Despite its strengths, instructional leadership can have certain limitations:

- *Narrow Focus on Academic Outcomes:* The intense focus on academic achievement can sometimes overlook other important aspects of school life, such as pastoral care, social development, and extracurricular activities. This narrow emphasis may neglect the holistic development of students (Southworth, 2002).
- *High Demands on Leaders:* Instructional leadership requires leaders to possess a deep understanding of curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment, as well as the ability to analyse and interpret data. These demands can be overwhelming, leading to potential burnout and reducing the leader's capacity to manage other responsibilities (Southworth, 2002).
- *Implementation Challenges:* Effective instructional leadership requires a supportive school culture and a shared commitment to improvement. In schools where there is resistance to change or a lack of collaborative spirit, implementing instructional leadership practices can be challenging (Leithwood et al., 2008).

Instructional leadership is an important approach that prioritizes teaching quality and student achievement, driven by consequentialist ethics. While it offers significant strengths, including a focused commitment to educational excellence and data-driven decision-making, it also presents challenges, such as potential neglect of non-academic aspects and high demands on leaders. Balancing instructional leadership with a holistic view of student development and ensuring adequate support for leaders can help maximize its effectiveness in educational settings.

Ethical Leadership

There has been a growing emphasis on ethical leadership in education in the late 20th and early 21st centuries. This trend was significantly accelerated by Greenfield's (1975) critique of viewing schools and educational systems as natural systems. He asserted that leaders should be held accountable for the ethical mix of priorities in their purposes and the moral consequences of their decisions and actions. Bates (1980) furthered this perspective by advocating socially critical values from New Sociology to inform the ethics of educational leadership in communities exhibiting inequities.

A holistic, pragmatic, and non-foundational epistemology for decision-making by educative leaders in state education schools was recommended by Australian theorists and practitioners engaged in the Educative Leadership Project (Duignan and Macpherson, 1992). They emphasized the importance of leaders being educative, guiding their decisions by determining what is morally right and important. The primary moral philosophies evident in this approach include:

- *Pragmatism:* Emphasizes practical outcomes and solutions that work in real-world contexts.
- *Holistic Epistemology:* Encourages understanding knowledge as interconnected and context-dependent, promoting comprehensive and inclusive decision-making.
- *Virtue Ethics:* Focuses on the character and virtues of leaders, such as wisdom and moral integrity, as they make decisions.
- *Consequentialism:* Considers the outcomes of decisions, aiming for the greatest good and practical benefits for the educational community.
- *Non-Foundational Epistemology:* Rejects absolute, universal principles, instead advocating for contextually informed, flexible approaches to knowledge and decision-making.

These philosophies guide educational leaders in making morally sound and contextually relevant decisions that reflect the diverse needs and goals of their institutions. Similarly, when Begley, Johansson and others reviewed the importance of values and ethics in guiding Canadian educational leaders, they focussed on reflective practice, community, inclusiveness, and cross-cultural perspectives, which aligned with several moral philosophies:

- *Virtue Ethics:* Reflective practice encourages leaders to cultivate virtues such as empathy, integrity, and wisdom, essential for ethical leadership.
- *Deontological Ethics:* Emphasizes duty and adherence to principles of fairness and respect for all individuals, underpinning inclusiveness and community-building.
- *Consequentialism:* Focuses on the outcomes of actions, advocating for decisions that maximize positive impacts for diverse groups within the educational community.
- *Communitarianism:* Stresses the importance of social values, community engagement, and collective well-being, reflecting the interconnectedness of individual and communal interests (Begley & Johansson, 2003).

When Starratt (2004) called for ethical pluralism, he recommended that ethical leadership in education should integrate elements of several moral philosophies:

- *Deontological Ethics:* This perspective emphasizes the importance of adhering to rules, duties, and obligations. Leaders guided by Kantian deontological ethics focus on the inherent rightness of actions and the adherence to principles, regardless of the outcomes.
- *Virtue Ethics:* This approach, favoured by Socrates and Aristotle, centres on the character and virtues of the leader. Ethical leaders strive to embody qualities such as honesty, integrity, and courage, and to inspire similar virtues in others. This perspective prioritizes moral character over specific actions.
- *Care Ethics:* Care ethics emphasizes relationships, empathy, and the importance of caring for others. Leaders who adopt this philosophy focus on nurturing and supporting their staff and students, prioritizing their well-being and personal development.

One of the key strengths of ethical leadership is its capacity to foster trust, integrity, and a positive organisational culture. When leaders act ethically, they create an environment where staff and students feel valued and respected, which can enhance both well-being and performance (Begley & Johansson, 2003). Ethical leaders who prioritize moral decision-making and integrity set a standard for the institution and its community, promoting a culture of honesty and ethical behaviour. This can lead to a more cohesive and collaborative environment, where ethical considerations are embedded in everyday practices and decision-making processes (Begley, 2006).

Ethical leadership also supports the holistic development of students and staff by emphasizing the importance of moral and ethical education. By incorporating ethical principles into the curriculum and school policies, leaders help students develop a strong moral foundation, preparing them to navigate complex ethical issues in their personal and professional lives.

Ethical leadership also presents several challenges. One of the greatest limitations is the difficulty of navigating complex ethical dilemmas and balancing competing interests and values in diverse school communities. Leaders often face situations where there is no clear right or wrong answer, requiring them to make difficult decisions that may not satisfy all stakeholders (Begley, 2006). This complexity demands a high level of ethical reasoning and the ability to weigh multiple perspectives and potential consequences.

Moreover, the emphasis on ethical behaviour and decision-making can sometimes slow down processes and create conflicts, as ethical considerations may require more time and deliberation compared to more pragmatic approaches. Leaders must be adept at managing these complexities and finding ways to uphold ethical standards without compromising efficiency and effectiveness.

In sum, ethical educational leadership represents a morally critical approach to leadership, emphasizing the importance of ethical decision-making, integrity, and the well-being of the broader community. Grounded in deontological, virtue, and care ethics, this approach fosters a positive and ethical school culture. However, the challenges of navigating complex ethical dilemmas and balancing competing interests highlight the need for leaders to develop strong ethical reasoning skills and the ability to handle these complexities effectively.

Adaptive Leadership

Adaptive leadership is a leadership framework that focuses on the ability to navigate complex challenges by fostering change and learning within an organization. The approach was initially developed within the field of public administration and organizational theory but has since been widely applied to educational leadership. In the educational context, adaptive leadership emphasizes the need for leaders to guide schools through uncertain, fast-changing environments by encouraging collaboration, facilitating learning, and responding to the evolving needs of students, teachers, and communities (Heifetz, et al., 2009).

The concept of adaptive leadership is grounded in the distinction between technical and adaptive challenges. Technical challenges refer to problems that can be solved through existing expertise, standard procedures, or established protocols. In contrast, adaptive challenges require new learning, the restructuring of relationships, and a change in values and behaviors. In educational settings, adaptive leadership is particularly valuable because schools frequently face challenges that cannot be addressed with simple solutions or conventional approaches. These challenges include dealing with diverse student needs, shifting policy landscapes, and the need for continuous professional development in response to changing pedagogical practices (Fullan, 2011).

One of the primary strengths of adaptive leadership is its focus on cultivating an organization's capacity for change and learning. Rather than relying solely on hierarchical authority, adaptive leadership emphasizes the importance of collective problem-solving and the engagement of all members of the organization. In schools, this means involving teachers, students, and parents in the decision-making process, fostering a culture of open communication and shared responsibility. Empirical studies show that schools led by adaptive leaders tend to experience higher levels of innovation, improved collaboration, and a stronger sense of community among staff (Fullan, 2011; Harris, 2013).

Moreover, adaptive leadership helps to build resilience by preparing schools to respond proactively to challenges, rather than merely reacting to crises. By emphasizing learning and adaptability, adaptive leadership positions schools to better handle the unexpected and complex issues that often arise in education (Heifetz et al., 2009).

Additionally, adaptive leadership promotes the development of critical thinking and problem-solving skills among educators and students alike. When leaders frame challenges as opportunities for learning, they encourage a mindset that is open to experimentation, reflection, and growth. This mindset not only improves the overall climate of the school but also empowers teachers to innovate in their classrooms. Research shows that schools that foster a culture of innovation and adaptive thinking are more likely to improve student outcomes, particularly in contexts where students face significant social and economic challenges (Louis, et al., 2010).

However, despite its strengths, adaptive leadership also presents some limitations. One key challenge is that adaptive leadership requires a high level of trust and collaboration among stakeholders, which may not always be present in educational settings. Schools often face entrenched power dynamics, resistance to change,

and low levels of engagement among staff members. In such environments, the shift toward a more collaborative and learning-focused leadership approach can be met with skepticism and resistance, particularly when it requires a change in long-standing practices or beliefs (Robinson, et al., 2008). As such, the success of adaptive leadership in education depends heavily on the existing culture of the school and the willingness of staff to embrace new ways of working.

Another limitation is that adaptive leadership can be demanding for school leaders, as it requires ongoing reflection, flexibility, and the ability to manage complex and evolving challenges. It can be difficult for leaders to balance the demands of adaptive leadership with the more immediate, technical aspects of school management, such as budgetary concerns, policy compliance, and standardized testing. Moreover, adaptive leadership calls for leaders to engage in difficult conversations and confront uncomfortable truths, which can lead to conflict and stress. For leaders who are unprepared or unsupported, these challenges can undermine their effectiveness (Heifetz et al., 2009; Spillane, 2006).

In sum, adaptive leadership provides an important framework for leading schools through complex and uncertain challenges. Its emphasis on learning, collaboration, and shared problem-solving equips schools to address the dynamic needs of students and educators. However, the model's effectiveness depends on a supportive school culture, the willingness of stakeholders to engage in the change process, and the ability of leaders to balance long-term adaptability with short-term operational demands.

Culturally Responsive Leadership

Culturally responsive leadership (CRL) is an approach to educational leadership that prioritizes the recognition, validation, and incorporation of students' cultural backgrounds, identities, and experiences into the leadership process. It emerged in response to growing recognition that traditional educational leadership practices often failed to meet the needs of diverse student populations, particularly those from marginalized communities (Khalifa, et al., 2016). The origins of CRL can be traced back to research in culturally relevant pedagogy, social justice education, and critical race theory, all of which seek to address issues of equity, inclusion, and the need for systemic change in schools.

CRL is rooted in the belief that leadership practices must be attuned to the cultural context of the communities served by the school. It recognizes that culture—shaped by race, ethnicity, socio-economic status, language, and other factors—plays a crucial role in the educational experience of students. Culturally responsive leaders work to create educational environments where students feel valued, understood, and respected, regardless of their cultural backgrounds.

One of the key concepts of CRL is the idea of cultural competence, which refers to the ability of leaders to understand, communicate with, and effectively interact with people across cultures (Gay, 2010). Culturally competent leaders are able to navigate cultural differences, understand the historical and social contexts that shape students' lives, and use this understanding to inform decision-making and practice.

Another critical concept in CRL is social justice, which emphasizes the importance of dismantling oppressive structures within education that perpetuate inequalities. Culturally responsive leaders are committed to addressing issues of racial, ethnic, and social inequality in schools and promoting policies and practices that foster fairness and inclusivity (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Khalifa et al., 2016).

Culturally responsive leadership also involves building relationships with students, families, and communities, recognizing that effective leadership is not only about what happens within the school but also about how the school interacts with the broader community. By fostering strong partnerships with families and community members, leaders can ensure that the school's educational practices are culturally relevant and responsive to the needs of its students (Theoharis, 2007). Moreover, CRL involves advocating for a curriculum that reflects the diverse histories, languages, and perspectives of students, thereby creating a more inclusive and equitable learning environment.

The strengths of culturally responsive leadership lie in its capacity to promote inclusivity, equity, and student engagement. By recognizing the value of cultural diversity and addressing the specific needs of diverse student populations, CRL leads to greater educational outcomes for students from historically marginalized groups. Empirical studies have shown that when students see their cultures represented in the curriculum and

leadership practices, they are more likely to feel a sense of belonging and demonstrate improved academic performance (Khalifa et al., 2016; Theoharis, 2007). This sense of belonging fosters greater engagement in school activities and a stronger connection to the learning process, ultimately enhancing student motivation and achievement.

Another strength of CRL is its potential to build more inclusive school cultures. By promoting culturally relevant pedagogical practices and creating learning environments that respect and celebrate diversity, CRL helps to mitigate the effects of racial and cultural isolation, which can contribute to school disengagement and underachievement. Research has shown that students from diverse backgrounds, particularly those from lower-income and minority communities, perform better in schools that have leaders who actively foster an inclusive, culturally responsive environment (Khalifa et al., 2016). Additionally, CRL empowers teachers to incorporate diverse perspectives into their teaching, which benefits all students by broadening their worldview and fostering empathy and understanding across cultural lines (Gay, 2010).

Culturally responsive leadership also plays a significant role in addressing systemic inequalities in education. By advocating for changes to school policies, practices, and structures that perpetuate racial and social inequities, CRL promotes social justice within educational systems. This approach challenges the status quo, questioning the assumptions that underpin traditional educational practices and calling for transformative changes that benefit all students (Ladson-Billings, 1995). For example, CRL leaders might advocate for greater representation of minority groups in the curriculum, push for disciplinary policies that reduce racial disparities, and ensure that students from underrepresented communities have access to the same educational opportunities as their peers (Theoharis, 2007).

Despite its strengths, CRL faces several limitations and challenges. One major limitation is that implementing CRL requires a fundamental shift in the culture of schools, which can be met with resistance from teachers, staff, and administrators who are accustomed to traditional leadership practices. This resistance can be particularly strong in communities where cultural diversity is not widely valued or where there are entrenched biases and stereotypes about marginalized groups (Khalifa et al., 2016). Overcoming this resistance requires sustained professional development, awareness-raising, and support for school leaders, as well as a willingness to confront uncomfortable truths about institutionalized racism and inequality in education (Theoharis, 2007).

Another challenge is the potential for superficial or tokenistic implementation of CRL. In some cases, schools may adopt culturally responsive practices in a way that does not challenge the underlying structures of power and inequality. For example, a school might implement a diversity training program or add multicultural books to the curriculum without addressing deeper issues such as the lack of minority representation in leadership positions or the disparities in educational outcomes between different groups of students. Without systemic changes and a sustained commitment to equity, CRL may fail to achieve its transformative potential (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Khalifa et al., 2016).

Additionally, CRL requires leaders to possess a high level of cultural competence and understanding of the diverse communities they serve. This may be challenging for leaders who lack personal experience with the cultural backgrounds of their students or who are unfamiliar with the nuances of culturally responsive practices. Effective CRL demands that leaders engage in ongoing learning about cultural diversity and adapt their practices to the specific needs of their communities (Gay, 2010).

Culturally responsive leadership offers a powerful framework for creating equitable and inclusive educational environments that respect and celebrate the cultural diversity of students. By fostering a deep understanding of cultural differences, promoting social justice, and advocating for systemic change, CRL has the potential to transform schools and improve educational outcomes for marginalized groups. However, its success depends on overcoming significant challenges, including resistance to change, the risk of tokenism, and the need for sustained professional development. Despite these limitations, CRL remains a critical approach for educational leaders committed to creating more just and inclusive schools.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

In contemporary Western educational management and leadership theories, various moral philosophies provide foundational ethical frameworks that apparently shape their practical applications, while also

presenting unique strengths and limitations. Scientific management, rooted in consequentialist utilitarianism, emphasizes efficiency, standardization, and productivity. This approach proves beneficial for optimizing operational aspects of educational institutions. However, it faces criticism for its inability to account for immeasurable elements of education, such as students' holistic learning experiences, the professional development of teachers, and the diverse services offered by administrators.

Bureaucratic management, which draws upon deontological ethics, prioritizes functional organizational structures, rational decision-making, and consistent adherence to policies. These strengths promote organizational stability and coherence. Nevertheless, the rigid hierarchical nature of this model can hinder responsiveness to changing circumstances, stifling adaptability in the face of emerging educational challenges. The human relations movement is grounded in humanitarianism, underscoring the importance of motivation, group dynamics, and leadership style in fostering organizational success. While this theory highlights the value of interpersonal relationships and psychological well-being, it can inadvertently prioritize these aspects over more tangible educational outcomes, such as addressing inequities or maintaining organizational efficiency.

Transformational leadership integrates virtue ethics, deontological ethics, and consequentialism to inspire collaborative, equitable, and innovative practices within educational settings. Its strengths lie in its capacity for fostering continuous improvement and inclusive leadership. However, an over-reliance on the leader's personal virtues can sometimes overshadow empirical data and practical constraints, particularly when the context shifts.

Distributed leadership, underpinned by democratic ethics, promotes inclusive decision-making that harnesses the collective strengths of the learning community. While this approach enhances participation, it can also lead to role confusion and diminished accountability if effective coordination and communication are not maintained.

Instructional leadership, informed by consequentialist utilitarianism, focuses on improving student learning outcomes, teacher professional development, and school culture. Its strong emphasis on measurable results can be beneficial, but it risks narrowing the scope of educational success to academic outcomes, placing excessive demands on leaders and potentially provoking resistance among teachers.

Ethical leadership adopts an ethical pluralism approach, combining deontological, virtue, and care ethics to foster ethical cultures and policies in schools. While it supports moral decision-making in complex educational environments, it struggles with reconciling competing values and interests, especially in diverse school communities where ethical dilemmas are prevalent.

The strengths of adaptive leadership's moral philosophies lie in their focus on flexibility, inclusivity, and addressing complex challenges. However, limitations include potential difficulties in implementation due to ambiguity in decision-making and the challenge of balancing diverse stakeholder interests, which may lead to inconsistency or conflict.

Culturally responsive leadership's moral philosophies emphasize equity, inclusion, and respect for diverse cultural perspectives, fostering fairness and community engagement. Limitations include potential challenges in addressing deeply rooted systemic inequalities and the risk of oversimplifying cultural differences, which may undermine the complexity of diverse educational contexts. A key challenge here is that theories of educational management and leadership that rely on foundational moral philosophies present both epistemological strengths and limitations. Epistemology, the study of knowledge, plays a crucial role in assessing the validity, scope, and applicability of such theories.

Hence, one significant strength of theories based on foundational moral philosophies is their grounding in well-established ethical frameworks, which offer consistency and universality. Deontological ethics, for instance, rooted in Kantian principles, provides a rational basis for decision-making that can be consistently applied across contexts (Strike, 2007). This universal applicability offers educational leaders a structured and principled approach, particularly when making policy decisions or resolving moral dilemmas (Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2016).

Consequentialist utilitarianism, another foundational moral philosophy, brings an empirical dimension to leadership by focusing on the outcomes of actions (Rawls, 1971). This approach emphasizes measurable results, allowing educational leaders to assess the success of their strategies through clear metrics, such as student performance or organizational efficiency. The ability to draw on empirical data strengthens the claim to objective knowledge and evidence-based decision-making (Bush, 2010).

Virtue ethics, drawing on Aristotle's moral philosophy, emphasizes the character and moral integrity of leaders, framing leadership as a practice of moral virtue (Begley, 2006). This perspective aligns with contemporary leadership ideals that value ethical cultures and authentic leadership, thereby fostering trust and collaboration in educational communities (Robinson et al., 2008). By focussing on moral development, virtue ethics encourages epistemic humility, promoting leaders' recognition of their own limitations and the need for lifelong learning (Starratt, 2004).

However, relying on foundational moral philosophies in leadership theories can also lead to epistemological constraints. One key limitation is the challenge of contextual application. Foundational ethical theories, particularly those grounded in deontological ethics, often assume that universal principles can be applied irrespective of context (Strike, 2007). This assumption can be problematic in diverse educational environments where cultural, social, and situational factors may demand flexible, context-sensitive approaches (Dantley, 2005).

Consequentialist theories can also encounter epistemological limitations due to their emphasis on measurable outcomes. Educational leadership involves complex, multi-dimensional goals, many of which cannot be easily quantified. Relying solely on utilitarian calculations may lead to an overemphasis on what is measurable, neglecting important qualitative factors such as student well-being, equity, and community engagement (Biesta, 2010).

In contrast, virtue ethics and care ethics, while valuable for fostering ethical leadership, often lack clear criteria for action in specific situations (Starratt, 2004). The emphasis on moral character and relationships can be too subjective, leading to difficulties in defining what constitutes a "virtuous" or "caring" leader across different contexts (Noddings, 2005; 2013). This lack of epistemic precision can make it challenging to establish a shared understanding of effective leadership practices, particularly in diverse educational settings.

Moreover, theories that integrate ethical pluralism, which blend multiple moral philosophies, may struggle to reconcile competing ethical principles. Leaders may face dilemmas where conflicting values—such as the balance between individual rights and communal well-being—create tensions that are difficult to resolve epistemologically (Begley, 2006). This can lead to a form of ethical relativism, where leaders are unable to draw on clear, objective standards for decision-making, weakening the epistemic foundations of leadership practices.

Non-foundational epistemology, as proposed by Evers & Lakomski (2013), offers an important alternative to traditional foundational approaches in the development of educational management and leadership theories. Non-foundational epistemology challenges the idea that knowledge and truth are grounded in unchanging, universal principles, emphasizing instead the fluid, contextual, and pragmatic nature of knowledge that exists as webs of belief (Quine and Ullian, 1970). This perspective can advance theory development in educational leadership by addressing the limitations of foundational moral philosophies and offering more adaptive, flexible approaches to leadership practice.

Evers & Lakomski (2013) advocate for a naturalistic coherentism in educational leadership, which posits that knowledge is not based on fixed, immutable foundations but rather on a network of interconnected beliefs that are tested and revised through experience and practice. This approach allows for greater adaptability and responsiveness to context, a key strength in advancing educational leadership theories. Unlike foundational moral philosophies that may struggle with contextual variations (e.g., rigid applications of deontological ethics or utilitarianism), a non-foundational epistemology acknowledges that educational leadership is a dynamic, evolving field that requires flexible, context-sensitive solutions.

For instance, in contrast to deontological ethics that prioritize universal rules, a non-foundational approach allows leaders to consider situational factors, engaging in practical reasoning that draws from a variety of perspectives and experiences. This flexibility is crucial in diverse educational environments where rigid

application of moral rules may fail to accommodate cultural, social, and institutional complexities (Biesta, 2010). Evers and Lakomski's rejection of foundational certainty thus enables a more inclusive and pluralistic framework for educational leadership, wherein leaders can integrate multiple ethical perspectives depending on the specific challenges they face.

Non-foundational epistemology is closely aligned with pragmatism, a philosophy that emphasizes the practical consequences of ideas as the criterion for their truth and usefulness (Biesta & Burbules, 2003). Pragmatism, as applied to educational leadership, encourages leaders to focus on outcomes and experiences, constantly testing and refining their approaches based on real-world results. This empirical, action-oriented method of inquiry allows for continuous learning and theory refinement, which is particularly useful for addressing the limitations of foundational ethical theories that may become outdated or irrelevant in changing educational contexts (Evers & Lakomski, 2013).

Pragmatism also allows leadership theories to move beyond the limitations of moral absolutism, creating space for ethical pluralism where leaders can draw from diverse moral and philosophical traditions without being constrained by the need for consistency with a single foundational theory. This adaptability allows leaders to better navigate complex ethical dilemmas, such as balancing individual needs with collective welfare, or reconciling competing values in multicultural educational environments (Greenfield & Ribbins, 2014).

Another key contribution of non-foundational epistemology is its emphasis on coherence and empirical verification. Evers and Lakomski (2013) argue that knowledge in educational leadership should be based on a coherent system of beliefs that are supported by empirical evidence and subject to constant revision. This view challenges the assumption that moral principles alone are sufficient for guiding leadership practices. Instead, leadership theories must be grounded in practical experience and empirical research, allowing for the integration of new insights as educational challenges evolve.

By emphasizing coherence and empirical verification, a non-foundational approach encourages interdisciplinary research and cross-contextual applications of leadership theories. Leaders are empowered to incorporate knowledge from fields such as cognitive science, psychology, and organizational studies, creating more robust and comprehensive frameworks for effective leadership (Lakomski, 2005). This epistemic flexibility is particularly valuable in addressing the limitations of traditional ethical theories, which often prioritize abstract reasoning over practical outcomes (Biesta, 2010).

Provisional Conclusion

Western theories of educational management and leadership that draw on foundational moral philosophies acquire significant epistemological strengths by providing coherent, principled frameworks for ethical decision-making. However, their limitations, particularly in terms of contextual adaptability, over-reliance on measurable outcomes, and the subjectivity of moral character, highlight the need for more flexible, context-sensitive approaches in leadership theory.

Non-foundational epistemology advances theory development in educational management and leadership by offering a more flexible, pragmatic, and empirically grounded approach. This epistemological perspective enables leaders to adapt to diverse and dynamic educational contexts, integrating multiple moral and ethical perspectives, and continuously refining their practices based on real-world evidence. By moving beyond the limitations of foundational moral philosophies, non-foundational epistemology offers a more responsive and inclusive framework for leadership theory development and practice.

5. References

Alanoğlu, M., & Demirtaş, Z. (2021). The effect of bureaucratic school structure on teachers' job satisfaction: The mediator role of organizational justice. *Research in Educational Administration & Leadership*, 6(2), 420–453. https://doi.org/10.30828/real/2021.2.7

Aristotle. (2004). *Nicomachean ethics* (J. A. K. Thomson, Trans.). Penguin Classics.

Ashton, T. S. (1997). *The industrial revolution: 1760-1830*. Oxford University Press.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Free Press.

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bates, R. J. (1980). New sociology of education. *International Review of Education, 26*(2), 151–163.

Begley, P. T. (2006). Self-knowledge, capacity, and sensitivity: Prerequisites to authentic leadership by school principals. *Journal of Educational Administration, 44*(6), 570–589. https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230610704814

Begley, P. T., & Johansson, O. (Eds.). (2003). *The ethical dimensions of school leadership*. Springer.

Biesta, G. (2010). *Good education in an age of measurement: Ethics, politics, democracy*. Routledge.

Biesta, G., & Burbules, N. C. (2003). *Pragmatism and educational research*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40. https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027

Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. (2002). *Trust in schools: A core resource for school reform*. Russell Sage Foundation.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. Harper & Row.

Bush, T. (2010). *Theories of educational leadership and management* (4th ed.). SAGE.

Busher, H. (2020). The human relations movement and educational leadership. In *Educational leadership and management* (pp. 45-61). Springer.

Ciulla, J. B. (2005). *The ethics of leadership*. Thomson Wadsworth.

Dantley, M. E. (2005). Moral leadership: Shifting the management paradigm. In F. W. English (Ed.), *The handbook of educational leadership: Advances in theory, research, and practice* (pp. 33–46). Sage.

Day, C., & Sammons, P. (2016). *Successful school leadership*. Education Development Trust.

Day, C., Harris, A., & Hadfield, M. (2009). *Successful leadership in times of change*. Open University Press.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. Macmillan.

Drucker, P. F. (1993). *Managing for the future: The 1990s and beyond*. Penguin.

Duignan, P. A., & Macpherson, R. J. S. (1992). Creating new knowledge about educative leadership. In P. A. Duignan & R. J. S. Macpherson (Eds.), *Educative leadership: A practical theory for new administrators and managers* (pp. 1–19). Falmer.

Evers, C. W., & Lakomski, G. (2013). *Naturalistic decision making and leadership: Managing complexity in educational leadership*. Routledge.

Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Pitman.

Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change* (4th ed.). Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. (2011). *Change leader: Learning to do what matters most*. Jossey-Bass.

Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.). Teachers College Press.

Glisson, C. (2015). The human relations movement and its impact on organizational change in schools. *Educational Researcher, 44*(1), 34–47. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654314567082

Goddard, R. D., Hoy, W. K., & Hoy, A. W. (2004). Collective teacher efficacy: Its meaning, measure, and impact on student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal, 41*(3), 657–676. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312041003657

Greenfield, T. B. (1975). Theory about organization: A new perspective and its implications for schools. In M. G. Hughes (Ed.), *Administering education: International challenge* (pp. 71–99). Athlone Press.

Greenfield, W., & Ribbins, P. (2014). Educational leadership and management. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (pp. 161–187). Wiley.

Gronn, P. (1982). Neo-Taylorism in educational administration. *Journal of Educational Administration, 20*(2), 21–31.

Gronn, P. (2000). Distributed properties: A new architecture for leadership. *Educational Management & Administration*, 28(3), 317–338. https://doi.org/10.1177/174114320003000305

Gunter, H. M. (2004). *Rethinking educational leadership: Challenging the conventions*. Routledge.

Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 33*(3), 329–351.

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1996). Reassessing the principal's role in school effectiveness: A review of empirical research, 1980-1995. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 32*(1), 5–44.

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (2010). Leadership for learning: Does collaborative leadership make a difference in school improvement? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 38*(6), 653–674. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143210379061

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. *The Elementary School Journal, 86*(2), 217–247.

Hargreaves, A., & Ainscow, M. (2015). The top and bottom of leadership and change. *Phi Delta Kappan, 97*(3), 42–48.

Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (2012). *Professional capital: Transforming teaching in every school*. Teachers College Press.

Harris, A. (2009). Distributed leadership: What we know. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(2), 349–360. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2009.01.002

Harris, A. (2013). Distributed leadership: Friend or foe? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 41*(5), 545–554.

Heifetz, R. A., Grashow, A., & Linsky, M. (2009). *The practice of adaptive leadership: Tools and tactics for changing your organization and the world*. Harvard Business Press.

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2012). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice* (9th ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC). (1996). *Standards for school leaders*. Council of Chief State School Officers.

Kant, I. (1997). *Groundwork of the metaphysics of morals* (M. Gregor, Trans.). Cambridge University Press.

Khalifa, M. A., Gooden, M. A., & Davis, J. E. (2016). Culturally responsive school leadership: A synthesis of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 86(4), 1272–1311. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654316630383

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*(3), 465–491. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312032003465

Lakomski, G. (2005). *Managing without leadership: Towards a theory of organizational functioning*. Elsevier.

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2006). A review of transformational school leadership research 1996-2005. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 5(3), 177–199. https://doi.org/10.1080/15700760600808587

Leithwood, K., & Riehl, C. (2003). *What we know about successful school leadership*. In A. Hargreaves, A. Lieberman, M. Fullan, & D. Hopkins (Eds.), *International handbook of educational change* (pp. 609–631). Springer.

Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership. *School Leadership & Management, 40*(1), 35–48. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1683172

Leithwood, K., Sun, J., & Pollock, K. (2017). How school leadership influences student achievement: A review of the evidence. *Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, 46*(1), 1–19.

Leithwood, K., Sun, J., & Pollock, K. (Eds.). (2020). *How school leaders contribute to student success: The four paths framework.* Springer.

Louis, K. S., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K. L., & Anderson, S. E. (2010). *Investigating the links to improved student learning: Final report of research findings*. Wallace Foundation.

Mayo, E. (1933). *The human problems of an industrial civilization*. Macmillan.

Mill, J. S. (2001). *Utilitarianism* (G. Sher, Ed.). Hackett Publishing. (Original work published 1863)

Mogalakwe, M. (2006). The use of documentary research methods in social research. *African Sociological Review*, 10(1), 221–230. https://doi.org/10.4314/asr.v10i1.23233

Murphy, J., & Shipman, N. (1998). *Community schools and school improvement: Focus on the future*. Sage.

Murphy, J., & Torre, D. (2014). *Leadership for learning: A guide to the human relations movement*. Corwin.

National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA). (2015). *Professional standards for educational leadership*. Author.

Noddings, N. (2005). *The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education*. Teachers College Press.

Noddings, N. (2013). *Caring: A relational approach to ethics and moral education* (2nd ed.). University of California Press.

Northouse, P. G. (2019). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (8th ed.). Sage.

O'Leary, Z. (2014). *The essential guide to doing your research project* (2nd ed.). Sage.

Owens, R. G., & Valesky, T. C. (2011). *Organizational behavior in education: Leadership and school reform* (10th ed.). Pearson.

Prior, L. (2003). *Using documents in social research*. SAGE Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9780857020222

Quine, W. V. O., & Ullian, J. S. (1970). *The web of belief*. Random House.

Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Belknap Press.

Rietbergen, P. (2014). *The idea of the West: The evolving concept of the West in modern thought*. Routledge.

Robinson, V. M. J., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5), 635–674. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X08321509

Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Scott, J. (1990). *A matter of record: Documentary sources in social research*. Polity Press.

Shaikh, G., & Şentürk, İ. (2023). Evaluation of the effect of educational bureaucracy on school administration: A blunting school climate for teachers. *Osmangazi Journal of Educational Research*, *10*(Special Issue), 115–130. https://doi.org/10.59409/ojer.1365959

Shapiro, J. P., & Stefkovich, J. A. (2016). *Ethical leadership and decision making in education: Applying theoretical perspectives to complex dilemmas* (4th ed.). Routledge.

Shatzer, R. H., Caldarella, P., Hallam, P. R., & Brown, B. L. (2014). Comparing the effects of instructional and transformational leadership on student achievement: Implications for practice. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 50(3), 435–468. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X13509375

Shields, C. M. (2010). Transformative leadership: A framework for improving school culture and leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration, 48*(1), 62–84. https://doi.org/10.1108/09578231011014568

Southworth, G. (2002). Instructional leadership in schools: Reflections and empirical evidence. *School Leadership & Management, 22*(1), 73–91. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632430220143042

Spillane, J. P. (2006). *Distributed leadership*. Jossey-Bass.

Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. B. (2004). Towards a theory of leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 36*(1), 3–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/0022027032000303174

Starratt, R. J. (2004). *Ethical leadership*. Jossey-Bass.

Strike, K. A. (2007). *Ethics and educational policy*. Routledge.

Sun, J., & Leithwood, K. (2015). Direction-setting school leadership practices: A meta-analytical review of evidence about their influence. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement,* 26(4), 499–523. https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2015.1005106

Supovitz, J. A., Sirinides, P., & May, H. (2010). How principals and peers influence teaching and learning. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 46*(1), 31–59. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654310358495

Taylor, F. W. (1911). *The principles of scientific management*. Harper & Brothers.

Theoharis, G. (2007). Social justice educational leaders and resistance: Toward a theory of anti-oppressive leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *43*(2), 221–258.

Tyack, D., & Hansot, E. (1982). *Managers of virtue: Public school leadership in America, 1820–1980*. Basic Books.

Wang, F., Pollock, K., & Hauseman, D. C. (2016). School principals' job satisfaction: The effects of work intensification. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, 185, 73–90.

Weber, M. (1905). *The Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism*. Scribner.

Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization* (A. M. Henderson & T. Parsons, Trans.). Oxford University Press.