

Transforming Urban Public* Schools

A Challenge for School Leadership

SUNITA CHUGH**

Abstract

School leaders of urban government schools are confronted with multitude of challenges. Urban schooling is highly differentiated along socio-economic lines and government schools are perceived to be the last resort of those poor sections who cannot afford even low cost private schools. This leads to low self-esteem and low self-worth among school teachers and students. This hugely demoralises children and may drive them to engage in activities what a few sociologists term “counter culture” to school. In addition, urban schools cater to children from very diverse backgrounds ranging from language, religion, caste, region, etc. Quite often, children attending government schools are first generation learners and seldom experience literate ambience in their daily lives. Consequently, urban schools are likely to face enormous challenges in ensuring enrolment and regular attendance of children, achievement of learning levels. Further, urban government schools also suffer from inadequate and dilapidated infrastructure, school locations not conducive to children and learning, poor inspection and support systems for teachers and school leaders, etc. These challenges put enormous pressure on school leaders in ensuring that children attend schools and learn basic literacy and numeracy skills. Against this background, this paper makes an attempt to understand the distinct characteristics of urban schools and their students. The role and challenges faced by school leaders in urban areas in improving the functioning of schools

* “Public” schools used to mean “government” schools and both terms are used interchangeably. In Indian context, however, “public” is often used to refer to private schools. The present refers to government school as public school.

** Associate Professor, NCSL, Department of School and Non-formal Education, NUEPA, 17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg, New Delhi-110016.

to meet the learning and psychological needs of children are discussed. The gaps in the professional preparation of school leaders are identified. The school leaders need to be visionary and innovative for transforming the schools.

INTRODUCTION

Public (government) schools in urban areas are in a precarious situation. They are entrusted with the onerous task of educating children from poor, and of socially and ethnically downtrodden groups, migrants, who often happen to be first or at best second generation learners. School leaders of public schools encounter many challenges in discharging their responsibilities. The public school leaders do not have adequate mandate to ensure teachers do their job properly. The motivational factors within the system or leverages for a school leader within structures of urban schooling for bringing about transformation are largely absent. The segregation in urban schooling relegated public schools to residual status. Many a time, infrastructure in public schools is either bare minimum or in a dilapidated state. The public schools are either overcrowded with children or have insufficient teachers to function normally. Over and above this, the government school leaders can seldom expect cooperation or participation from the community. The community is more likely to be dispersed on wide geographical areas and also less likely to have internal cohesion. Further, the socio-economic background of children attending government schools is not distinctly lower but also diverse with multiple

forms of deprivation. Orfield and Lee (2005) observed that segregation and poverty underlie larger issues in urban education systems. Urban education system depicts not only the diversity of student population but also the social chasm between the teacher and student, as generally teachers do not belong to the community to which the children belong. This is especially true of urban schools in India. Most of the teachers belong to the middle and upper middle class, whereas the children belong to the poor socio-economic background, which creates a distance between them.

More than ever, schools have students from dozens of regional, cultural, religious and linguistic backgrounds. Diversity presents a challenge to school heads to find effective ways for integration and transforming the schools to meet the needs of all students. It places a premium on school leaders to think and act beyond their customary duties and functions and take a leadership position, in which the school vision needs to be formulated in collaboration with all the team members, which include teachers, students, parents and community. In this context, transforming urban schools to achieve better student learning outcomes and education experience for children, calls for better preparation of school leaders.

The school leadership in urban government schools is a challenging position that requires a range of highly developed competence, as well as the core values. Against the above background, the present paper makes an attempt to understand the distinct characteristics of urban schools and its students, and also focuses on how the school heads can deal with such diverse population. The paper argues that the school leaders are the centre point for bringing the transformation in schools, as has also been described in the research literature. It is also pinpointed that there is a need for capacity building of the school heads as they understand the local context and issues that their school is faced with. Gaps in the preparation of school leaders are identified and some of the ways through which the school heads can work towards bringing the transformation are discussed.

Significance of School Heads in Schools: What does the Previous Research Say?

Number of researchers have highlighted the significance of school heads in school transformation, especially those leading the disadvantaged schools. Scholars agree that principals are the backbone of any school and they are the central figures in schools. Sergiovanni (1995) writes that “no other school position has a greater potential for maintaining and improving quality schools” (p. 83). Beck and Murphy (1993) observe that the School Principal — also known as the middle

manager and the site administrator— is the major influence on whether education is effective or ineffective; whether morale is high or low; whether the school climate is positive or negative; whether personnel are satisfied or dissatisfied; whether students achieve or don't achieve; whether parents and the public are cooperative or uncooperative; and whether there is effective or ineffective management and leadership (p. 164).

Qualitative studies of effective schools have unequivocally established the linkage of school quality to the importance of school leadership roles and how they perform their multifaceted role. Whether they believe in *status quo* or do they lead the school with a clear vision? Do they take risk and critically reflect on the problems they encounter and try to find solutions in collaboration with their team? Hall *et al.* (2002) observe that school leaders are drivers of school improvement, determiners of achievement focus, and leaders of the school community. School leaders set the tone for their buildings, provide leadership and direction for their schools' instructional programmes and policies, and sustain professional development for school personnel and themselves, and nurture personalised school environments for all students (Tirozzi, 2001). School leaders, in sum, set forth the conditions necessary for teachers to implement change, the integral component of the school improvement process (Zepeda, 2007).

A growing body of research indicates that school leaders, particularly principals, can exert a measurable, though indirect, positive influence on student achievement (Leithwood and Riehl, 2003). Moreover, there is evidence that high quality leadership is especially important in schools serving low socio-economic youngsters who have often been at the greatest risk for academic failure (Scheerens and Bosker, 1997). In aggregate, leadership effects on student achievement appear to account for about 5 per cent of the overall variation in pupil test scores, yet this relatively low figure represents almost 25 per cent of all in-school variables over which educational policy-makers have some control (Hallinger and Heck, 1996), thus making leadership a variable of singular importance. Louis *et al.* (2010) also corroborate earlier findings and observe that leadership is second only to classroom instruction, among all school-related factors that contribute to what students learn at school. Leadership effects on student learning occur largely because leadership strengthens professional community, in turn, fosters the use of instructional practices that are associated with student achievement (Louis *et al.*, 2010, p. 10). Moreover, there is evidence that high quality leadership is especially important in schools serving low socio-economic youngsters who have often been at the greatest risk for academic failure (Scheerens and Bosker, 1997).

Sharma (2011, 2015) observes that successful leadership is not related to holding a position only, but rather acquiring leadership skills along with the ability to emphatically implement those skills. The author advocates that school leaders need humanistic skills, more than the technical skills, such as communication skills, comfort, empathy, decision-making, influence, time management, self-management and commitment. An extensive review of the researches on school leadership led Harris (2005) to believe that one of the relatively unexplored areas that remains to be studied is the understanding from contextual differences between schools and how that influences the forms of leadership that seem to operate within these schools.

However, research on school leadership in India is still in its nascent stage. The research studies are few in number. Much of the research has focused on managerial and administrative aspects of school leaders. Review of leadership studies in the past six decades has revealed that most studies revolve around studying the personal characteristics, qualities, skills, values, behaviour, and leadership styles of school leaders.

Govinda (2006) conducted a diagnostic study to obtain a comprehensive picture of the roles of head teachers in school management, in six states of India: Assam, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh (MP), Mizoram and Uttar Pradesh (UP).

The findings reveal that most of the head teachers, hamstrung by lack of a clear set of guidelines regarding their managerial role and inadequate staff strength, have not been able to evolve a decentralised internal management system. Even in the biggest schools, there is an absence of regular interaction between the teachers and the head teachers. Constrained by the external controls exercised by the Department of Education, the head teachers of government schools do not have much scope to exercise their authority in various dimensions of school management. Majority of the head teachers face a major financial problem in managing their institutions. The study also finds out that there has been inadequate monitoring of head teachers' performance. No feedback mechanism has been evolved to keep the head teachers focused on their role as managers. No idea-shared forum has been instituted to help them experiment and innovate. Another study, Diwan (2009) highlights that school principals are of crucial importance for the improvement of schools as long as the onus of taking decision for schools lay with them. According to the study, empowering the school heads who can take school-based decisions necessitates vital decisions at the policy levels. In this context, the study discusses certain policy decisions that need to be taken up in a hierarchical and bureaucratic model and the areas of capacity building exercises that

need to be conducted to help school leaders meet the demands emerging from the social and educational scenario of the country.

Pushpanadham (2006) focuses on the principles and practices of school-based management for school effectiveness. The author highlights that educational leadership is identified as an important factor for quality education and developing countries have focused on this important factor and initiated systematic training and development programmes for their leaders. Moreover, the latest educational policies advocate decentralised educational management, and any educational reform will be successful with both an evolution of institutional structures and specialised training and development programmes for education professionals. One strategy for achieving these goals is found in School-based Management (SBM), a model of decentralised school administration that provides clear guidelines. Professional leadership is essential for successful implementation of decentralised management of education at all levels, which could be built through the capacity building programmes. At this juncture, a systematic and need-based professional preparation of principals, teachers, parents and members of the community is needed.

A renewed interest in the effects of leadership on pupil performance comes at a time when the data from various sources, such as

ASER reports and NCERT Baseline Achievement Surveys across the country reveal that the learning competency of students is very low and students do not acquire required competency corresponding to their grade. Moreover, in the recent years, decentralisation and the devolution of powers to the lowest unit, i.e., at school level is considered to be the best way to improve the effectiveness of an organisation or institution and at the school level, the role of school heads becomes pivotal in improving the quality of education. Several changes that are taking place in wider policy and in school education system in India requires school heads to play a more proactive role, as they are faced with several challenges. These include retaining all enrolled children, improving the learning achievement levels, ensuring teacher presence in schools, etc. In addition, the heads of schools now have to manage several auxiliary activities like Mid Day Meal, disbursement entitlements, scholarships, etc. Their role is not limited within the four walls of a school but they need to be responsive to community and manage interaction with community members, SMCs and other stakeholders and make them partners in the improvement of schools. It has been widely acknowledged that the heads of the schools could bring the change and transformation in the school system and create the enabling environment, so that all children could learn. The role of school heads becomes all

the more critical when they cater to the disadvantaged children living in impoverished urban areas.

What is Transformation?

Change is continuous and a well-defined shift to achieve the set goal, whereas transformation is not just to accomplish a defined change, but to reinvent the institution, keeping in view the local context and discover a new or revised strategy of change, based on a vision for the future. It is a process of change and trying out new experiments. To bring transformation in school, the leaders (primarily school heads) need to have the courage to take initiative, ability of risk-taking, problem solving, reflective thinking and strategic planning with a shared vision, with the involvement of different stakeholders. Transformation is the creation and change of a whole new form, function or structure. To transform is to create something new, responding to the changes in the context, therefore, trying out new experiment that has never existed before and could not be predicted from the past. Transformation is a “change” in the mindset. The change is knowledge-based and decision making is with the help of data and information gathered. The first step is transformation of the individual or we may call it personal transformation. Transformation occurs when leaders create a clear vision for transformation and build up a system to continually question and challenge beliefs, assumptions, patterns, habits and

paradigms, with an aim of continually developing and applying different strategies with sound knowledge and information.

In India, the public schools are not functioning satisfactorily. Besides the system level constraints like lack of funds and resources, absenteeism of teachers, large number of vacant positions of teachers, shortage of teachers in schools, high teacher-pupil ratio, the school leaders are reluctant to take new initiatives which has resulted in deteriorating quality in the public school system. Dissatisfied with the schools, parents especially belonging to middle and upper middle class, have started sending their children to private schools. Even the poor parents prefer to send their children to low fee private schools, as they feel that in private schools the school teachers and heads are more accountable and innovative. The two parallel systems of private and government have further accentuated the social and economic disparity, which creates social unrest and tensions in the society. This is an alarming situation. Government schools can improve only if the school heads begin to think beyond their administrative and managerial roles. At this juncture, the need is to transform the school to improve the quality of education and the school head is a key person who could be instrumental in bringing transformation.

Need for Building School Leadership for Urban schools

The need to build the leadership at the school level, both in the rural and urban areas has arisen as the Indian education system has undergone a tremendous change with the huge expansion of the number of schools, teachers and students. The number of elementary schools has increased from 5,92,969 in 1979–80 to 10,93,950 in 2013–14; and the corresponding increase in secondary and higher secondary schools has been from 42,463 in 1979–80 to 1,01,348 in 2013–14. The number of teachers has also increased both at the elementary and secondary levels. At the elementary level, the number has grown from 21,47,223 in 1979–80 to 73,54,152 in 2013–14. At the secondary and higher secondary levels the number increased from 7,94,076 to 16,20,907 during the same period. With the enactment of Right to Education Act (RTE) 2009 the enrolment has increased substantially from 8,96,41,617 in 1979–80 to 19,88,99,486 in 2013–14. Similarly, at the secondary level the enrolment has increased from 81,15,227 in 1979–80 to 1,58,71,303 in 2013–14. With the expansion in the school education sector, the need for the decentralisation was felt and the district became a unit of planning in the early 1990s. With the increase in the number of schools over the years, it became difficult for the district level officials to manage and monitor the schools. Therefore,

new structures under the SSA and RMSA were created at the block and cluster levels. The block and cluster level coordinators were given the prime responsibility for providing the administrative and academic support to schools. In reality, even these officials are also basically performing the administrative and managerial roles like collecting information and data from schools on the attendance of children, disbursement of entitlements like uniform, Mid Day Meal to the children and were not able to provide the necessary on site support to teachers or the head teachers for improving the learning levels of the children. It was soon realised that the system level reforms did not bring the desirable results and low retention rate, poor comprehension levels and the low learning levels of children, especially those belonging to disadvantaged sections still remained a major area of concern. In view of this, school based planning and management gained prominence and for this, the role of school heads is important as they have the major responsibility of leading their respective schools considering each school has its distinct characteristics and context.

The Twelfth Five Year Plan (2012–2017), for the first time, indicated that the improvement of school leadership is required in the process of school education for improving the quality of education, governance, learning outcomes, School Quality Assessment and Accreditation and

Roles in System Improvement. The programme of Leadership Development in School Education has been visualised to act as the vehicle to empower and drive critical education reforms through intensive and interdisciplinary curricular experiences, active exchange of ideas, adoption of an interactive pedagogical approach that promotes team work and collaboration, creation of opportunities for professional development of leaders in school education, identification and nurturing of talent within and outside the school system to take up leadership and establishment of a network of institutions to impart leadership education (p. 75).

Gaps in Developing the Educational Leaders for Transformation of Urban Schools

In India, the school heads are functioning without proper direction, having no vision of their own. They function in a monotonous way and routine administrative and managerial activities are being carried out. No concerted efforts are made by the head teachers to deal with the diversity and they do not function in a coordinated manner for a common goal and purpose. There has been a dearth of evidence-based research on the need for assessment of the school heads and the system level functionaries as to what kind of skills and competencies are required of them to lead and transform the school, keeping in view the local context and environment. The programmes are

supply driven, without the research evidence of the needs of the school heads.

The school head position is gained on seniority basis and not competency-based, especially at the elementary level. Even at the secondary level around 25 per cent school principals are recruited directly and 75 per cent are recruited on the seniority basis and the age of these principals is generally more than 50 years. No pre-induction capacity building programme on their skill development is organised, before they join the post of head of the school.

The hierarchy system still predominantly prevails in Indian education system and the school heads act as per the direction given by the system level functionaries. This type of leadership known as managerial or transaction leadership equates with the management of systems and processes, rather than management of people (Serigovanni 2001). The school heads, in turn, also at the school level create structures, whereby it is clear what is required of their subordinates. In India, the transactional leadership predominantly prevails as the school head is governed by the system level functionaries and hardly takes initiative to try out the new experiments and even does not provide the freedom to the teachers to try out innovations.

However, in some of the mature educational systems, school

leadership is dealing with the people and for the people. In such systems, the leadership goes beyond administering and managing day-to-day operations and is essentially concerned with cultural rather than structural changes. The school leaders try to bring transformation or change in the culture taking into consideration the strength of their team members, characteristics and background of their student population. The change is brought through team building, motivation and collaboration with teachers, community and other stakeholders, and this kind of leadership in literature is called as transformational leadership. Transformational leaders set goals and incentives to push the teachers to higher performance levels, while providing opportunities for personal and professional growth for each individual. Stephen Covey (1989) reminds us that good leadership comes from a shared vision and principles. According to Burns (1978), transformational leadership is observed when “leaders and followers make each other to advance to higher level of moral and motivation”. Through the strength of their vision and common purpose, transformational leaders are able to inspire followers to change expectations, perceptions and motivation to work towards common goals. Bass (1997) suggested that transformational leaders garner trust, respect and admiration from their followers. Leithwood *et al.* (1999, p.9)

observe that transformational leadership is about building unified common interests between leaders and followers. They set directions by building a vision and setting the goals, develop the staff through encouragement, motivation and professional development, develop the organisation and establish a school culture that embodies shared norms, values, beliefs and attitudes, promote trust, fostering shared decision-making processes and problem-solving capacities; collaborating with the parents, community and system level functionaries. Most important is that they respond positively with open mind to the opportunities and challenges of educating diverse groups of students.

The Indian education system still needs to move in this direction. The idea of “distributed leadership” in which there are several key players in the formulation of vision and carrying forward the common purpose of education still has not taken off in India. The distributed leadership perspective focuses on how leadership practice is distributed among formal and informal leaders. As Benett *et al.* (2003, p.3) describe it “distributed leadership is not something done by an individual ‘to others’ ... rather it is an emergent property of a group or network of individuals in which group members pool their expertise”. The underlying principle of distributed leadership is collaborative rather than bureaucratic which also means identifying the potential and strengths

of the team members and tapping their strengths and also developing new skills and a new gamut of approaches that fit the new role. It also means involving all the teachers according to their merit and not the select few that could create conflicts and tensions in the school. Distributed leadership gives an opportunity to all the stakeholders to work towards a common goal. It is also said that distributed leadership in reality is a form of work re-appropriated, in which the staff feel more responsible for their work, are given greater autonomy and are provided with adequate feedback on performance. The challenge is to develop and foster distributed model of leadership that can transform schools and school systems. If the school heads are able to distribute their work, they will be able to devote time in engaging with the instructional activities like taking classes, monitoring the teaching-learning process, being the mentor to the teachers, etc. It could be said that instructional or pedagogical leadership is an essential component of the transformational leadership. These leaders are able to focus on the teaching-learning process and provide mentoring or coaching to teachers if needed.

In India, it has been seen that the glut of paperwork and expectations of the system level functionaries have burdened the school heads who do not spend time on supporting the teachers in the teaching-learning process. Research has shown that

teachers are the most important school-based determinant of student learning, in turn, the teacher success is directly linked to the effectiveness of the school head and his or her ability to create an environment where teachers can thrive. They need to play a role of instructional leader who must create conducive school culture for learning, drive instructional change by helping teachers to improve their teaching competency, use data-driven analysis of student achievement and actively engage with the students as well as with their parents. They need to acquire the skills for providing feedback to the teachers and encourage improvement. This kind of instructional leadership is almost missing and therefore, though with the improvement in infrastructural facilities, the learning level of children remains. The need is to prepare school leaders to take initiative and formulate the school vision in collaboration with students, teachers and other stakeholders. To make the school a learning organisation, the school heads need to focus on the professional development of self and also of the teachers. In this context, the system should provide flexibility and freedom to school heads for taking initiative and be innovative for improving the learning of all children.

Challenges in Transforming Urban Schools

The urban school system is faced with both structural and cultural challenges. Structural challenges

are specific system-level and school-level policies and practices which do not encourage the children to participate actively in the school and fail to adequately address students' needs, e.g., the national norm for establishment of school is uniform though the context of urban areas is different, teacher deployment is done without taking into consideration the linguistic background of the children. Cultural challenges are those policies, practices and set of beliefs that contribute to dysfunctional perceptions of students' intellectual abilities—particularly those students who are culturally and linguistically diverse (Noguera, 2003), e.g., teachers' perception is that these urban disadvantaged children cannot learn, parents do not know the importance of education. The role of school heads becomes critical as he/she is the focal point who has to respond to these challenges in the context of local concerns and larger policies. The above discussion reveals that leading an urban government school can be a difficult and demanding task even for the most experienced and competent head teacher. The educational realities, negative effects of poverty and human misery that often depress marginalised communities can prove to be quite overpowering for many head teachers.

The salient characteristics of the Indian urban schools catering to disadvantaged children could be summarised as follows:

- enormous cultural-linguistic diversity;
- high immigrant/refugee population;
- high population of students whose first language is different from school language;
- high incidence of poverty;
- variety of social problems (e.g., drugs, alcoholism, dysfunctional families);
- violence in the family or in the neighbourhood;
- children craving emotional attention;
- high level of stress;
- high dropout rate of students;
- irregular attendance of children;
- low achievement level of children;
- lack of parent involvement within the school programme;
- inadequate infrastructural, ancillary facilities in the schools;
- low motivation and enthusiasm of teachers.

Therefore, leading these low-income, urban, multicultural schools is different from leading private schools located within the same geographical location, as the government schools have children whose parents do not actively participate in the education of their children, whereas private schools have more parental support and more homogeneous as well as stable student populations.

One of the major issues faced by urban public schools is linguistically diverse students, those students whose home language is different from the school language. Poverty and diversity present challenge to teacher

and school leaders to find effective ways for integration and inclusion of all children. As the children belong to harsh environmental and socio-economic circumstances, the school leaders need to be empathetic and need to make an effort to help overcome their barriers.

School leadership positions are likely to be the most effective if the school leaders have the personal attributes like ability to take initiative and risk, optimism and resilience, emotional intelligence, self reflection, critical thinking and the most important is to understand the emotional and psychological needs of these children. The main competences required by people in leadership roles especially serving the urban public schools is that they need to have a sound knowledge of the educational developments, programmes and schemes initiated by the State. At the same time, they need to act keeping in view the local context and environment in which the school is situated. The school leaders need to demystify their perception that these children have low intelligence and capability. The first prerequisite for transformation is the willingness of school leaders to change their perceptions and pre-conceived notions

The school leaders need to be innovative and critical thinkers to meet the needs of all students. They must develop culturally sensitive activities through plays, dramas and stories that integrate multicultural

viewpoints and histories. The school head should encourage the teachers to apply instructional strategies that help all students to learn and acquire the necessary competence, knowledge and skills. In fact, finding committed and dedicated quality teachers in the schools serving diverse population is a major national concern, especially in view of the enactment of Right to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009.

Haberman (1993) argues that successful teaching in low-income, urban, multicultural schools is a different order of teaching. He proposes that urban schools should look for character more than training in hiring teachers and head teachers for the poverty-stricken children. Heads of school serving diverse students in low-income urban schools need to be having the qualities such as caring relationships with students, commitment to acknowledging and appreciating student effort, commitment to inclusion, and support accountability for at-risk students.

An important issue is how to create awareness and sensitivity among the school heads towards the specific environmental, socio-economic and educational problems of the urban disadvantaged. The question is what kind of orientation may be given to these school heads so that they can create a friendly, joyful and conducive environment for these children in school. How do they create an enabling environment that the schools do not become an institution

which create social and economic chasm. The school heads have to come out of their pre-conceived notions, which Senge (1990) calls as mental model that these children cannot learn. They need to go beyond the boundaries of school and try to understand their socio-economic environment and build relationship with parents and community to create awareness about the importance of education. The school leaders need to communicate to the teachers that they need to adopt different teaching methods as the children have different cognition and learning styles.

Summing Up

The foregone discussion highlights that the practice of school leadership in India is limited to carrying out routine functions like maintenance of discipline in school, maintenance of school records, submitting information to higher authorities, overseeing distribution of incentives under various schemes, etc. The school leaders in India are not visualising themselves as change-makers. They have not been able to acquire either the required knowledge and skills or aptitude. It appears that the system itself is either indifferent to school leaders who take initiative or attempt bringing changes in the practice of school leadership, or even hostile in some cases. Consequently, the tendency to be indifferent to performance of schools is deep-rooted in the system. This can only be dealt by initiating changes at multiple levels.

The system should be geared to value innovation and initiatives by school leaders with opportunities to correct themselves when things go wrong. In the absence of some systemic changes, no amount of training in knowledge and skills is helpful in bringing change and transformation. Secondly, the school leaders are required to be equipped with necessary knowledge and skills. Thirdly, and more importantly, the mechanisms to develop school leaders' aptitude to

take charge and direct school activities as per the specific context have to be found out. The school leaders need to move from transaction leadership, to transformational leadership in which they have to prepare the vision of their own school, set goals and evolve strategies to improve the school functioning. For this, they need to collaborate with all the stakeholders to regain the faith of the people in public schools.

REFERENCES

- BASS, M. 1997. Does the Transactional/Transformational Leadership Transcend Organisational and National Boundaries. *American Psychologist*. Vol. 52, No 2. pp. 130–39.
- BECK, L.G. AND J. MURPHY. 1993. *Understanding the Principalship: Metaphorical Themes 1920-1990*. New York Teacher College Press.
- BENETT, N.W. CHRISTINE PHILIP AND J.A. HARRY. 2003. *Distributed Leadership. A Review of Literature*. National College for School Leadership.
- BURNS, J.M. 1978. *Leadership*. New York: Harper 4. Row.
- COVEY, STEPHEN. 1989. *The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People*. Free Press.
- DIWAN, R. 2009. Resilience in Promotion of Schools as Learning Organisations: Reflections on Karnataka Experience. *Journal of Indian Education*. Vol. XXXV, No. 2.
- ORFIELD, GARY AND CHUNGMEI LEE. 2005. *Why Segregation Matters: Poverty and Educational Inequality*. The Civil Rights Project at Harvard University.
- GOVINDA, R. 2006. *Role of Head Teachers in School Management in India, Case Studies from Six States*. ANTRIEP, NUEPA, New Delhi.
- GRINT, KEITH. 1997. *Leadership: Classical, Contemporary and Critical Approach*. Oxford University Press.
- HABERMAN, M.J. 1993. Diverse Context for Teaching: Impeachers and Reflectors. In M.J. O'Hair and S.J. Dell (Eds.), *Diversity and Teaching*. Fort Worth, TX: Ha-court Brace.
- HALL, JOHN, SHANNON JOHNSON, ALLEN WYSOCKI, KARL KEPNER, DERECK FARNSWORTH, AND JENNIFER L. CLARK. 2002. *Transformational Leadership: The Transformation of Managers and Associates*. University of Florida.
- HALLINGER, P. AND R. H. HECK. 1996. Reassessing the Principal's Role in School Effectiveness A Review of Empirical Research, 1980-1995. *Educational Administration Quarterly*. Vol. 32. No. 1. pp. 5–44.

- HALLINGER, PHILIP AND JUNJUN. CHEN. 2015. Review of Research on Educational Leadership and Management in Asia: A Comparative Analysis of Research Topics and Methods, 1995–2012. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*. Vol. 43. No. 1. pp. 5–27.
- HARRIS, ALMA. 2005. Leading from the Chalk-face: An Overview of School Leadership in Leadership. Vol. 1. p. 73.
- HARRIS, ALMA AND SPILLANE JAMES. 2008. Distributed leadership through the Looking Glass. *Management in Education*. Vol. 22. No.1. 31–34.
- LEITHWOOD, KENNETH A. AND CAROLYN RIEHL. 2003. What We Know about Successful School Leadership. National College for School Leadership.
- LEITHWOOD, KENNETH AND KAREN SEASHORE LOUIS. 2012. *Linking Leadership to Student Learning*. Jossey-Bass.U.S.
- LOUIS, K.S., K. LEITHWOOD, K.L. WAHLSTORM, AND S.E. ANDERSON. 2010. Learning from Leadership: Investigating the Links to Improved Student Learning. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Ontario.
- NOGUERA, P. 2003. *City Schools and the American Dream: Reclaiming the Promise of Public Education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- PUSHPANADHAM, K. 2006. Educational Leadership for School based Management. *ABAC*. Vol. 26. No. 1. (January–April), pp. 41–48.
- SCHEERENS, J. AND R. BOSKER. 1997. *The Foundations of Educational Effectiveness*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- SENGE, PETER M. 1990. *Fifth Discipline: Art and Practice of the Learning Organisation*. Random House, South Africa.
- SERGIOVANNI, T. 1995. *The Headteachership: A Reflection Practice Perspective*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- . 2001. *Leadership: What's in it for Schools?* London, Routledge, Falmer.
- SHARMA, S. 2011. Attributes of School-Principals-Leadership Qualities and Capacities in International Congress for School Effectiveness and Improvement, 04-07, January. Limassol Cyprus.
- . 2015. Do Leadership Qualities Determine Competent Principals. *Innovare Journal Of Education*. Vol. 3. No. 1.
- TIROZZI, G.N. 2001. The Artistry of Leadership: The Evolving Role of the Secondary School Principal. *Phi Delta Kappan*. Vol. 82. No. 6. pp. 434–39.
- ZEPEDA, S.J. 2007. Instructional Supervision Applying Tools and Concepts. Larchmont, New York, *Eye on Education*.