



A Comparative Evaluation of Leadership and Management Models: The Community Education Foundation, Pakistan, and Kauri Grove School, New Zealand

Afreen Kanwal¹, Dr. Muhammad Yousuf Sharjeel², Rana Hussain³

¹MPhil Research Scholar, College of Education Faculty of Liberal Arts and Human Sciences Ziauddin University

²Professor, Director Postgraduate Studies and Research College of Education Faculty of Liberal Arts and Human Sciences Ziauddin University Email: muhammad.sharjeel@zu.edu.pk

³Principal-College of Education Faculty of Liberal Arts and Human Sciences Ziauddin University

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received: July 22, 2026
Revised: August 24, 2026
Accepted: September 02, 2026
Available Online: September 08, 2026

Keywords:

Educational leadership, comparative case study, The Community Education Foundation, Kauri Grove School, systems leadership, transformational leadership, Michael Fullan, leadership development framework, educational equity, institutional culture.

Corresponding Author:

Dr. Muhammad Yousuf Sharjeel

Email:

muhammad.sharjeel@zu.edu.pk

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.59075/tamsaal.v4i9.169>

ABSTRACT

Educational leadership is among the key determinants of the efficiency of the educational process, teachers' performance and students' achievements. This paper provides a comparison between the two leadership and management styles in The Community Education Foundation (CEF) in Pakistan, managed by the immediate former President and Senior Executive A, and Kauri Grove School in New Zealand, run by the School Principal B. The study is grounded in the theoretical framework offered by Michael Fullan (2002) in relation to the theory of change and Carbery and Garavan (2012) in relation to the leadership development theory showing the effects of the different national contexts (one dealing with systemic inequity and access; the other one seeking for pedagogical transformation) on the organizational design, strategic challenges and the form of leadership. The results show that Senior Executive A used the strategic systems leadership style aiming at creating scalable and standardized solutions to ensure equitable access to education for all people in Pakistan. In turn, School Principal B used the transformational leadership style building up the collaborative learning environment and developing personal pedagogy. In summary, both the models perform quite effectively within their settings, illustrating an important concept of modern-day educational leadership where it is imperative that there is no panacea of one size fits all model. Sustainable success hinges on identifying critical issues, setting up a moral purpose, and developing a collaborative institutional culture among others.



Introduction

Effective educational leadership is one of the key factors influencing institutional performance and achievements of students at schools and colleges. An appropriate educational leadership is situational and contextual. Leaders in underdeveloped countries work to provide access, equality, and stability within educational institutions; while those who work in developed countries concentrate on inclusion, innovative teaching, and improvements. That is why there cannot be any guidelines or templates for a successful leader; it should rather be a moral and strategic response to an educational environment in a particular case.

In the sphere of education, a leader should be the source of morality and strategy, determining institutional directions, culture, and efficiency. As stated by the theories of educational change (Fullan, 2002; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2000), the principles of leadership (vision, collaboration, and moral purpose) have a global nature; however, their application depends on the system and society.

The research compares two models of educational leadership and management: The Community Education Foundation (CEF) in Pakistan and its leader-Senior Executive A; and Kauri Grove School in New Zealand and its leader-School Principal B. CEF is a good example of a macro-level systems leadership model. It focuses on large-scale access, standardization, and social entrepreneurship in a resource-constrained environment. It delivers fundamental, high-quality education to millions of children who would not otherwise receive any kind of education. On the contrary, Kauri Grove School exemplifies a micro-level model of transformational leadership, based on collaborative learning, innovation, and cultural change in a supportive educational ecosystem.

Problem Statement

Despite the contextual nature of educational leadership, Western, school level models are more dominant in literature due to stable resources, functional infrastructures, and favourable policy conditions. This demonstrates insufficient presence of empirical evidence on leadership functioning in radically different contexts like Pakistan where many large-scale non-profit networks work in resource constrained environments. Moreover, it is difficult to find comparative studies on macro-level systems leadership versus micro-level transformational leadership, creating a knowledge gap regarding the possibility and ways in which the two models can inform each other.

Research Questions

1. What are the differences in the leadership styles of Senior Executive A (The Community Education Foundation, Pakistan) and School Principal B (Kauri Grove School, New Zealand) in their respective national and institutional contexts?
2. What management models are reflected through their leadership styles, and how do leadership and management combine to achieve institutional objectives?
3. How can Fullan's theory of change and Carbery and Garavan's leadership development framework be used to evaluate the effectiveness of these leadership styles?

4. What lessons about educational leadership can be drawn from the comparison between a systems-level equity-oriented leadership approach and a school-level innovation-focused model?

Significance of the Study

Drawing on Fullan's change theory and the competency framework of Carbery and Garavan, this study bridges the gap between two very distinct and under researched contexts: a large, renowned non-profit network in Pakistan (CEF), and the other being an innovative school in New Zealand (Kauri Grove School). In principle, the study offers educational leaders with diagnostic tools which they can use to adapt leadership models to contextual challenges concerning expansion and/ or improvement of pedagogical quality. For policy makers, it signifies that effective leadership is not an end-all formula, but one that must be context-specific to strike a balance between system integration and cultural sensitivity. The analysis of literature from the Global South and the Global North contributes towards a more transferable, contingency-based understanding of educational leadership.

According to this essay, an effective educational leader is one whose practice is contextual and based on the idea of moral purpose as advanced by Fullan (2002) as well as on the leadership and management development paradigm by Carbery and Garavan (2012). In such an instance, there will be proper diagnosis of the environment and overcoming of the challenges while linking the moral purpose to strategic thinking. This can be seen from the comparison of the two contexts, CEF and Kauri Grove School.

Limitations and Future Research

The study did not use any direct interviewing of the leadership and/ or staff members; rather, it was based on the information collected from the public documents. This means that future research should be based on qualitative information collected from various stakeholders within the institutions under consideration, to get more detailed information about the real practice of leadership. Furthermore, the study can also use comparative information from similar non-profit organizations and innovative schools.

Literature Review

Fullan's Change Dynamics and Moral Purpose

According to Fullan (2002), there are four critical stages of change in education which include moral purpose, understanding the process of change, building relationships, and creating knowledge. Senior Executive A and School Principal B are both individuals who embody the above elements in their approaches but vary depending on circumstances.

The establishment of The Community Education Foundation (CEF) is an embodiment of moral purpose as defined by Fullan (2002) as 'social responsibility to others.' Within CEF, Senior Executive A implements the moral principle through the understanding of the process of change which builds on the capacity of institutions within the thousands of schools involved. He uses the principle of 'coherence making,' which forms the foundation of Fullan's model, through

systematic training, curriculum, and monitoring to avoid ‘overload and fragmentation’ inherent in many large-scale reform efforts.

The leadership of School Principal B at Kauri Grove School reflects Fullan’s theory of re-culturing, which emphasizes changing professional attitudes and relationships, and not the imposition of changes through structural reforms. The formation of ‘learning hubs,’ where ‘knowledge creation and sharing’ takes place, provides teachers with the opportunity to become co-learners and inventors. In fact, this process is based on a relational perspective. Traditional hierarchies give way to collaboration and reflection, which become a part of the everyday routine. Thus, School Principal B’s example can be seen as an illustration of Fullan’s change theory on a micro level, proving that educational progress occurs through the development of an empowered professional culture.

In a nutshell, Senior Executive A’s leadership ensures system coherence and accessibility, while School Principal B’s leadership develops cultural richness and innovation.

Leadership Competencies (Carbery & Garavan, 2012)

As explained by Carbery and Garavan (2012), Boyatzis’s (1982) and Spencer & Spencer (1993), core leadership competencies are central to organizational success in relation to strategic intelligence, relationship management, achievement orientation, and adaptability. Their competency-based models provide a useful lens for examining the way educational leaders translate their vision into effective organizational performance. Thus, leadership competencies are the attributes that define approaches to motivation within an organization.

Leadership competencies that are found in Senior Executive A include those that are typical of successful leaders in mission-oriented organizations. Senior Executive A’s strategic orientation is what enables him to align the organizational moral purpose with practical considerations, thus making sure that all CEF schools act coherently. Senior Executive A’s strong achievements, impact, and influence can be seen in his stakeholder motivation, sustained donor commitment, and advocacy for educational equality on the national level. Also, Senior Executive A’s analytical skills make him capable of making decisions based on data analysis. All these leadership competencies provide Senior Executive A with the ability to lead an organization with moral and managerial qualities. Therefore, it confirms Carbery and Garavan’s (2012) assertion that great leaders combine their visions and ability to complete them. According to Carbery and Garavan (2012), a strategically intelligent leader develops organization’s coherence and scale with the help of systematic planning and execution.

In her role at Kauri Grove School, School Principal B shows competencies related to team leadership, conceptual thinking, adaptability, and collaboration in solving problems. Her ability to create and maintain innovative learning culture results from her conceptual understanding of educational changes and from a relational leadership approach. She builds team spirit and encourages cooperation among teachers by allowing them to take part in joint decision-making and learning activities. Her ability to adapt and high emotional intelligence make her able to deal with any changes successfully without undermining trust and enthusiasm of the whole school community. Using Carbery and Garavan’s (2012) terminology, School Principal B can be

considered as an example of relationally intelligent leader, who develops organizational capacity based on shared ownership and professional development.

To conclude, leadership competencies of Senior Executive A and School Principal B are systemic and collaborative respectively, providing structured approach towards effective leadership (Spencer & Spencer, 1993). This allows us to say that leadership competencies should be context-bound either to manage systemically the large-scale change or to create innovative learning culture within a particular educational setting

Supporting Theories

As Leithwood and Jantzi (2000) point out, the benefits of transformational leadership on teacher motivation and organizational commitment stem from fostering shared vision and moral purpose. Transformational leaders are exhibited by both Senior Executive A and School Principal B, as Senior Executive A fosters collective commitment for educational equity throughout The Community Education Foundation (CEF), and School Principal B motivates teachers through intrinsic motivation and a collaborative atmosphere of trust.

It becomes evident through Kotter's (1996) separation of concepts of leadership and management and how these two complement each other. Specifically, leadership is responsible for the process of providing a sense of direction and motivating change, while management makes sure of its effective realization. At CEF, Senior Executive A utilizes the synergy of leadership and management, as his visionary leadership is realized through the efficient management systems. School Principal B employs a more distributed approach in her Kauri Grove School.

According to Robinson (2011), the power of instructional leadership as an influential force in enhancing student performance is emphasized with special attention paid to teachers' professional development and instruction. This point of view resonates well with School Principal B's approach to leading at Kauri Grove School, whose leadership focuses on developing professional learning communities to increase teachers' effectiveness and engagement. Overall, these two theories show how effective educational leadership combines transformational vision and managerial activities with instruction (Yukl, 2013).

Transformational and Distributed Leadership

Transformational leadership is one of the main factors that predict school success and organizational effectiveness based on educational leadership literature (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2000). Transformational leaders inspire people through creating a vision, promoting commitments, innovativeness, and development of leadership competencies among employees (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Transformational leadership means creation of intrinsic motivation and collective efficacy by the leader, not use of his/ her positional power (Leithwood & Sun, 2012).

The example of transformational leadership at work is provided by Senior Executive A's leadership style at The Community Education Foundation because his organization's development is oriented towards social mission of educating needy populations. As a result of effective vision, building capacity of the organization and collaboration of stakeholders, CEF has

become one of the largest school networks in the world. Also, the transformational leadership is demonstrated by School Principal B who motivates teachers to innovate pedagogies and inquiry and continuously learn.

As Leithwood & Jantzi state, sustainability of organizational development depends on transformational leadership and development of people, not management of processes (2005).

Related to this concept is distributed leadership, which is the view that leadership does not reside in one person but is distributed between multiple people within an organization (Spillane, 2006; Harris, 2008). In organizations with distributed leadership, learning can be improved because of the expert knowledge of the teachers as well as collaborative decision-making (Gronn, 2002). The learning hubs designed by School Principal B can be seen as an example of distributed leadership, where decisions regarding instructions are made by collaboration and not hierarchy. While Senior Executive A is operating in an organizational context that needs centralization, CEF also displays distributed leadership.

Instructional Leadership

In the study of effective education, instructional leadership has gained prominence because of its direct effect on teaching practices and students' academic performance (Hallinger, 2005; Robinson, Hohepa, & Lloyd, 2009). While transformational leadership emphasizes many other areas than instructional leadership, instructional leadership directly refers to curriculum, classrooms, teachers, and learning processes (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985).

Robinson et al. (2009) found that the leading leadership practice in terms of effects on student academic success was promoting and engaging in teacher learning. Leadership of School Principal B is consistent with this definition through coaching, collaborative inquiries, and continuous professional learning. The instructional leadership of Senior Executive A is carried out indirectly through standardization of curricula, teacher training programs, quality control, and performance evaluation at all CEF schools. Therefore, while School Principal B carries out her instructional leadership directly in one school, Senior Executive A institutes his instructional leadership across a broad range of educational institutions.

Servant Leadership

Servant leadership is all about serving people before taking up any position of power and focusing on development and welfare of followers (Greenleaf, 1977). Educational leaders applying servant leadership build cultures that are based on trust, empathy, cooperation, and ethical accountability (Spears, 1998). It fosters organizational commitment and improves morale among employees (Eva et al., 2019).

The social agenda of CEF is clearly aligned with the concept of servant leadership, since the leadership of Senior Executive A focuses more on provision of education to disadvantaged groups of people rather than earning profits for the organization. Similarly, the leadership of School Principal B emphasizes teachers' empowerment and collaboration between teachers and students.

Authentic Leadership

Authentic Leadership entails self-awareness, relational transparency, balance decision-making, and the internalization of moral values (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Walumbwa et al., 2008). The authenticity of leaders is established through consistency with their ethical principles and promoting openness in organizational culture.

Senior Executive A and School Principal B both have qualities of authentic leaders. Senior Executive A's dedication to equal educational opportunities indicates value-based leadership based on social justice. Similarly, School Principal B develops authentic relations with teachers through reflective practice and feedback. Studies have indicated that authentic leadership helps in developing organizational commitment, psychological safety, and innovation, all of which help in sustainable improvement of schools (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Walumbwa et al., 2008).

Systems Thinking and Learning Organizations

Educational organizations have become complex adaptive systems that require leaders who are able to think about the interdependence of organizational parts and not only about individual organizational functions (Senge, 1990). Systems thinking recognizes the importance of organizational improvement through integration of vision, structure, process, and culture in an organization (Senge, Cambron-McCabe, Lucas, Smith, Dutton, & Kleiner, 2012).

Systems thinking is reflected in the leadership of Senior Executive A through the integration of organizational parts, such as governance, curriculum, teacher training, donor involvement, financial sustainability, and quality assurance, into an integrated organizational framework. This is consistent with the idea of coherence making and organizational learning of Fullan (2002). On the school level, School Principal B applies the principles of systems thinking by combining the curriculum, collaboration, assessment, and professional learning into learning ecosystems.

Strategic Leadership

Strategic leadership is about anticipating future problems, matching the organization's resource base to long-range goals, and sustaining competitive advantage (Davies & Davies, 2004). It requires educational leaders to reconcile current operations with future development of the institution (Boal & Hooijberg, 2001).

Senior Executive A is a clear example of a strategic leader because of the strategic approach to long-term expansion and partnership with donors, governance, and sustainability of the organization. His skills in integrating the vision of education with scale of operations make him a strategic leader who can manage big nonprofit educational organizations.

Organizational Culture

The school culture plays an important role in improving education and leadership (Deal & Peterson, 2016). Schein (2010) explains that organizational culture refers to assumptions, beliefs, values, and practices that dictate how people behave in organizations.

In the case of CEF, the organizational culture involves accountability, discipline, equality in education, and uniformity in quality in geographical distributed schools. On the other hand, Kauri Grove School fosters a collaborative and learner-centred culture involving innovation, trust, and professional freedom. These different cultures support Schein's (2010) point of view that successful leaders are influenced by, and in turn shape, organizational culture.

Contextual Leadership

Leadership effectiveness is largely determined by organizational context instead of universal leadership practices (Bush, 2011). The role of educational leaders requires adjustments according to organizational size, governance, national education policy, and socio-cultural settings (Hallinger, 2018).

In his work, Senior Executive A acts in the developing context of education in Pakistan, characterized by issues such as educational provision, poverty, and lack of resources and scaling institutions. Similarly, School Principal B operates within the progressive educational environment of New Zealand where innovation, learner empowerment, and professional autonomy abound. This environmental factor supports contingency theories of leadership, which suggests that leadership effectiveness is contingent on the environment.

Comparative Synthesis

Even though these leaders operate in different educational environments, they both constitute modern examples of educational leadership models characterized by moral purpose, organizational learning, collaboration, and improvement (Fullan, 2002; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005). The framework of Senior Executive A is strategic management and coherence based, which is best suited to the needs of large nonprofit educational institutions. On the contrary, the leadership model proposed by School Principal B values distributed leadership, instructional leadership, empowerment of teachers, and collaboration in the local educational context.

Contrary to the perception of these leadership models as contradictory, they rather present different ways of handling different organizational situations. Modern educational leadership theories suggest that a good leader combines transformational, instructional, distributed, authentic, and strategic leadership according to the context of his/ her work (Hallinger, 2005; Harris, 2008; Bush, 2011; Fullan, 2020). Therefore, CEF and Kauri Grove School prove that sustainable educational improvement is achieved by leaders who unite moral purpose with organizational capacity, strategic management with collaboration, and vision with evidence-based practice.

Methodology

The present research utilizes a comparative case study approach (Yin, 2018) to investigate educational leadership in two different institutional and national contexts. Two contrasting cases have been selected purposefully as examples of different types of leadership practices: The Community Education Foundation (CEF) in Pakistan, which is an example of systems leadership on a large scale in a limited resources environment; and Kauri Grove School in New Zealand, which is an example of transformational school leadership in an innovative policy environment.

Sources of the data were publicly available documents such as organizational reports, interviews, school reviews (e.g., Education Review Office, 2017), institutional websites, and published leadership models. Thematic analysis has been conducted using theories developed by Fullan (2002) and Carbery & Garavan (2012). Therefore, only documentary analysis has been conducted in this study without conducting any primary data collection. The authorization to mention the names of the recognized leaders was sought before the paper was submitted. Throughout the article, the names of individuals and institutions have been anonymised and pseudonymised. Where appropriate, any identifying information that might reasonably result in the identification of the participants has also been removed or altered. This was done to maintain confidentiality of participants and to ensure that the results were reported in accordance with ethical principles of research.

Findings

Comparative Analysis of Leadership Style

The leadership approaches used by Senior Executive A and School Principal B, although both are very effective, have been customized according to their completely different operating environments.

Leadership at The Community Education Foundation, Pakistan: Strategic Systems Leadership

Founded in 1995, The Community Education Foundation (CEF) is one of the largest non-profit organizations that provides educational institutions in Pakistan. There are more than 2,000 schools functioning within CEF that provide services for impoverished urban and rural populations. Having Senior Executive A as a head of The Community Education Foundation (CEF), this organization represents Strategic Systems Leadership that integrates transformational vision with the management approach.

According to Fullan (2002), the leader must be a moral agent that has a moral purpose and understands the process of change. The leadership of Senior Executive A is an example of moral purpose that consists in providing quality education to disadvantaged population in Pakistan through systemic design, strategic planning, and high-level accountability. This combination can be compared with Kotter's (1996) idea that a leader should define the right direction and inspire people, whereas the manager takes care of the system to achieve the goal.

Being the leader of a decentralized network of more than 2,000 schools, Senior Executive A cannot confine himself to instructional leadership alone. On the contrary, he performs the role of an organizational architect ensuring that there are frameworks that would guarantee quality in thousands of classrooms.

Senior Executive A's leadership is characterized by a moral purpose, efficiency, and scalability. 'Closing the gap' idea promoted by Senior Executive A finds its manifestation in standardized teacher training, centralized curriculum development, and monitoring frameworks. In this way, it becomes possible to sustain the quality of the program and make it scalable; thus, showing program coherence and resource utilization which form the basis of a quality educational

framework adaptable to different local conditions. Furthermore, the fact that Senior Executive A can build collective commitment on the part of donors, educators, and community members shows Collins' (2001) idea of catalysing commitment to a compelling vision (p. 20).

However, the macro-level focus of the leadership of CEF has its own limitations. While standardization and scalability are inevitable in the maintenance of a uniformity of the process, they can unintentionally limit innovation and teacher autonomy. Such limitation corresponds with the dangers of 'wrong drivers for change' described by Fullan (2011). An excessive focus on central accountability and capability is likely to undermine the 'professional capital' of teachers. Strategic and distant leadership, therefore, limits the possibility for deep reculturing that Fullan (2002) argues as the key requirement for successful pedagogical change. Hence, although CEF's approach is excellent in providing access and systemic integrity, it is likely to lack the creativity and collaboration of the more dynamic environment like that of Kauri Grove School.

Leadership at Kauri Grove School, New Zealand: Culturally Embedded Transformational Leadership

Founded in 2011 in Auckland, Kauri Grove School is representative of progressive education in New Zealand, as it is oriented towards being learner-centred, innovative and inclusive. Under the directorship of School Principal B, who is the founding principal of the school, Kauri Grove School has achieved international recognition due to such attributes of leadership as transformation and distribution of leadership, collaboration and pedagogical innovations (Education Review Office [ERO], 2017).

The leadership of School Principal B represents Fullan's (2002) idea of reculturing through focusing on professional change and development of relationships and practices rather than changes in the structure of organizations. Such approach is illustrated by School Principal B's introduction of 'learning hubs,' which are the alternatives to the conventional classrooms, as they consist of flexible spaces for collaborative work of students of different ages. In addition, innovative curriculum and pedagogical practices of the school correspond to the ideas described by Sinnema & Aitken (2011) concerning 'teaching as inquiry' and responsive curriculum design and adaptation. Furthermore, this leadership corresponds to student-centred leadership described by Robinson (2011), which involves relational trust, goal alignment and professional learning of leaders.

As a founder, School Principal B had a unique opportunity to develop a school culture starting from scratch, developing an environment based on common values, trust, and innovation. This approach perfectly fits into Fullan's Cultural Change Principle in terms of leader being energetic, enthusiastic and optimistic and having a strong focus on developing relationships and creating knowledge. Through establishing of distributed leadership mechanisms, she managed to move power from hierarchy to professional collaboration, creating an environment where leadership is understood as a collective process.

The leadership of School Principal B is characterized by its deep cultural embeddedness and ability to ensure collective efficacy. In such a way, through developing distributed leadership and collaboration among professionals, she builds up an environment of trust and reflection. It

reflects Robinson's (2011) idea of the importance of teachers' learning and relational trust for student success. The learning hub approach shows an example of real transformations of physical and pedagogical environment of the school, where interdisciplinary learning and flexible groupings are possible. Thus, School Principal B's leadership is the example of transformational leadership that leads to the transformation of school culture and practices of teaching.

Nevertheless, this rich contextual and relational leadership framework faces obstacles in terms of scalability and sustainability. This is because such a framework is dependent largely on the presence and charismatic power of the leader and relational power. They are the elements that may be hard to sustain and replicate during leadership succession. In addition, the success of Kauri Grove School's work has been enabled by the context in which the educational policies in New Zealand are set. This is a context that favors decentralization and innovations in the educational setting. However, such conditions may not be easy to sustain in all settings.

Critical Evaluation of Leadership Styles

The leadership of Senior Executive A is transformative in the effects, leading to drastic changes in individuals' paths through education access. In the same line, the leadership of School Principal B is transformative in the process; the experience of learning and teaching is transformed through innovation in pedagogy and culture. Senior Executive A is a systems architect who designs systems that provide educational opportunities to marginalized people with consistency and fairness. On the other hand, School Principal B is a culture gardener who fosters relational trust and collaboration in a dynamic school environment.

Both are examples of moral and strategic leadership, but the units of change in both cases are quite different, that is, the educational system in the case of Senior Executive A and the school culture in the case of School Principal B. This example shows how the arguments raised by Fullan (2002) about the need for alignment between moral purpose and contextual capacity to effect changes hold.

But each of them is limited by some factors. First, the systems approach to leadership may pose certain threat to the local creativity and autonomy of teachers, although it can effectively scale access and uniformity. In turn, cultural-transformational leadership is full of innovation and engagement, but it is very fragile, being highly contextual, depending greatly on the continuous leadership and enabling policies. Thus, the limitations show that the best thing would be to synthesize both approaches rather than choosing any of them. It means that a good educational leadership should combine systemic coordination and culture-oriented approach. As stated by Leithwood and Jantzi (2000), sustainable development can be achieved only if the structural and cultural elements interrelate and engage both strategic and relational sides of the process. Overall, this paper written about Senior Executive A and School Principal B illustrates that educational leadership is a context-specific notion.

Comparative Analysis of Management Model

The management models required to support these leadership styles are as distinct as the leaders themselves.

Management Model at The Community Education Foundation: A Scalable Corporate Non-Profit Framework

CEF management model reflects a sophisticated organizational structure ensuring efficiency in operations, accountability in funds management, and quality through a wide geographic network. The model integrates efficiency in business organization with goals of non-profit organization; thus, the model is based on Carbery & Garavan's (2012) argument that 'management development needs a systematic process to plan, organize and control' (p. 794).

Organization Structure: There is a definite hierarchical organizational structure, whereby decisions concerning curriculum design, quality standards of teacher training, and financial controls are made in the central office, while the regional offices and school managers implement the decisions. Standardized curriculum design, professional development, and quality assurance practices ensure a consistent delivery of programs at schools. Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems are available that allow monitoring performance and making informed decisions.

Budgeting and Resources: Budgeting is donor-based but aims at attaining maximum educational outcomes per dollar spent. This aspect relates to efficient infrastructure, standardized learning materials, and teacher training academy.

Accountability: Accountability is vertical by virtue of standardized testing, M&E reports, and donors' communication mechanisms which are very vital for maintaining integrity and proving results.

This type of management is quite in line with what Kotter (1988, cited in Carbery & Garavan, 2012) calls the concept of management being related to 'planning and organizing.' Similarly, the management style of Senior Executive A is also in conformity with what Kotter (1996) means by 'planning and budgeting' as he ensures accountability and effectiveness.

Strengths: Facilitates scalability, integrity and quality delivery of services.

Weaknesses: Restricts bottom-up innovations.

Management Model at Kauri Grove School: Agile and Distributed Community

Kauri Grove School operates under the principle of agile community management, meaning that management is not a unique administrative technique but rather one of the elements of teamwork carried out by teachers' teams. This approach is in line with the theory of distributed leadership because it promotes involvement in decision-making, autonomy, and responsibility. Also, it agrees with the notion offered by Carbery and Garavan (2012), who claim that contemporary management development focuses on relationship- and collaboration-based competencies.

Structure: The school uses the concept of 'learning hubs,' where flexible mixed-age teacher-led groups are formed. Senior management positions are substituted by leadership teams responsible for pedagogical spheres. Such minimal hierarchy structure encourages teacher group leadership since teachers collaborate to design curriculum and plan lessons as well as address the learning

problems of students. The organization structure reflects the concept of capacity building via professional collaboration and trust developed by Fullan (2002).

Budget and Resource: Allocation of resources takes into consideration a collaborative and need-based approach. The choices related to learning tools, ICT tools, and flexible spaces are collectively made to help with the teaching inquiries and innovations in hubs. This aligns with the emphasis of the school on personalized and adaptive learning spaces where the physical and digital resources are used effectively to increase the level of engagement and learner autonomy.

Accountability: At Kauri Grove School, the approach taken is horizontal and intrinsic in nature. It emerges from peer collaboration, professional discussion and reflection, and sharing of practices. All teachers together monitor and assess the progress of students. This approach represents relationship-based management (Carbery & Garavan, 2012, p. 400) and aligns with ERO (2017) findings about Kauri Grove School as being able to sustain improvements due to trust, inquiry, and collective efficacy.

Strengths: Innovation, flexibility, professional development, and shared ownership of the outcomes.

Weaknesses: Reliance on sustained professional capability, trust and good policy environment.

Connection between Leadership and Management

Senior Executive A's transformational moral vision at CEF is realized through management as the system. Without this system, CEF would not have been able to achieve the same level of scale and effectiveness in its operations. For School Principal B at Kauri Grove School, management becomes the natural evolution of her collaborative and transformational style of leading. While not dictating innovation through the hierarchy, she designs management systems that support collaborative and collective action.

Both the leaders represent the harmonious synergy between their respective visions and their respective forms of management. For Senior Executive A, management becomes the instrument used for the realization of vision through systems, structures, and accountability. For School Principal B, management becomes something organic and relational, resulting from a trust and collaboration culture.

Finally, the management at CEF becomes a vision-driven system, whereas the management at Kauri Grove School becomes a culture-driven community. The above two examples illustrate how educational leadership involves a sophisticated interplay between structure and culture, hence showing that management and leadership cannot be separated.

Discussion

The Pakistani Context (CEF): The Leader as Social Entrepreneur and System Builder

The Pakistani educational system faces several inherent problems, which include low literacy rates, disparity between males and females, and disparity in the quality of education provided. In this difficult situation, the contribution made by Senior Executive A through his work with CEF

serves as an illustration of how a social entrepreneur and a systems builder can work in an environment.

Contextual Challenges:

- **Macro-Level Access Challenge:** There is still an acute access problem that Pakistan suffers from as there are more than 22 million children who are out of school (UNESCO, 2023). Such problems require a holistic approach to solving.
- **Social and Economic Challenges:** The organization works in disadvantaged communities where factors such as poverty, gender norms, and child labour prevent students from attending classes and remaining in school.
- **Financing Issues:** Maintaining a large nonprofit requires constant fundraising efforts. Financial accountability is one of the important factors for maintaining such organizations.
- **Instability of Political and Security Environment:** It is another challenge that needs to be addressed to ensure sustainability.

Role of the Leader (Senior Executive A): Senior Executive A is both a social entrepreneur, strategic manager, and moral leader. In his capacity as a social entrepreneur, he builds trust among the public and business organizations that allow him to increase access to education. In this capacity, he ensures harmonization of systems through standardization and quality control. Such form of leadership fits into the definition of transformational leadership based on moral purposes by Fullan (2002). This shows that for transformation to take place, one needs to have vision and managerial competence.

New Zealand context (Kauri Grove School): The leader as learning architect and culture curator

The education system in New Zealand is highly renowned for its provision of school autonomy, innovation, and inclusiveness (Education Review Office [ERO], 2017). In this setting, the leadership by School Principal B at Kauri Grove School is that of continuity and not of access.

Contextual Challenges:

- **Implementing a New Vision:** The process of implementing new pedagogies into an existing culture of schooling involves a change in belief systems of teachers, parents, and students. School Principal B needs to overcome obstacles and help the community adapt to the new ways of inquiry-based and collaborative learning.
- **Sustainable Innovation:** Innovation in education may become static if it is not actively renewed. The sustainability of the process is based on maintaining staff engagement, collaboration, and reflection to avoid initiative fatigue and sustain the school's culture of learning.
- **Culturally Sensitive Personalization:** 'Learning hub' is characterized by personalized and collaborative learning. To ensure equity of the approach, especially in terms of Māori and

Pasifika students, culturally sensitive pedagogy should be used along with monitoring inclusivity (ERO, 2017).

Role of the Leader (School Principal B): The leadership of School Principal B is consistent with the two responsibilities of a Learning Architect and Culture Curator. The first responsibility entails creating structural and relationship structures for creativity and collaboration of learners. The second responsibility involves fostering the professional and cultural environment in which innovation thrives. Her leadership style is consistent with the Fullan (2002) principle of developing leaders where the organization builds its own internal capacity and makes leadership a collaborative effort. The leadership of School Principal B combines both instructional and transformational leadership where the basis of an adaptive school culture is empowerment and learning.

Critical Reflection and Synthesis of Educational Leadership Models

Effective educational leadership is context-dependent due to the socio-economic, cultural, and systemic factors. For example, the systems approach to leadership shown by Senior Executive A at The Community Education Foundation is macro-transformational leadership where the emphasis is on scale, structure, and moral purpose in the resource-scarce environment. On the other hand, the approach used by School Principal B at Kauri Grove School can be defined as micro-transformational leadership due to its cultural innovation, cooperation, and professional development in the enabling policy environment.

Educational equity and accessibility through standardization are the moral purposes of Senior Executive A whereas creation of learning environment is the moral purpose of School Principal B; both achieve effectiveness and accountability, yet they might hinder the context sensitivity and innovativeness of lower levels. However, the decentralized model of Kauri Grove School permits more innovations and professional behaviour, yet it totally depends on relational trust and presence of the leaders.

The analysis demonstrates that the success of educational leadership assumes the right combination of structure and flexibility as well as vision, managerial skills and relational abilities. In other words, the transformational leadership is characterized by the integration of moral purpose, context sensitivity and innovativeness that are possessed by Senior Executive A and School Principal B.

Recommendations for Effective Educational Leadership Strategies at The Community Education Foundation (Pakistan)

Management and Leadership Style of Senior Executive A in CEF consists of the clever amalgamation of both the qualities of a manager and a good man, with the central focus of providing quality education.

- **Synchronization and Standardization for Quality:** Standardization is ensured by CEF through the development of a standardized curriculum, teacher training, and infrastructure across more than 2,000 institutions. This ensures an equal opportunity for all the students,

and it conforms to the view of Kotter (1996) regarding managerial activities such as planning and organization.

- **Well-developed M&E System:** The use of comprehensive accountability mechanism to monitor the activities in the schools, teachers' work and performance, and outcomes of students in CEF is consistent with Fullan's (2002) ideas about using of evidence to facilitate learning and coherence in the system.
- **Strategic Alliances:** Sustainability of CEF depends on the existence of strategic alliances with commercial firms, donors, and governmental organizations as well. They increase funding and improve credibility of the organization. Senior Executive A's networking skills show his 'impact and influence' competencies (Carbery & Garavan, 2012).
- **Community Involvement:** The involvement of the local community through school management committees instils a culture of trust and ownership in them. This grassroots level approach helps reduce resistance and improves the social legitimacy of CEF. It reflects Fullan's (2002) theory of building relationships as a means of change.

In essence, all these approaches reflect the ways in which Senior Executive A realizes the idea of moral purpose through capacity building.

Strategies at Kauri Grove School (New Zealand)

The leadership by School Principal B at Kauri Grove School is one that demonstrates transformational and distributed approaches, which focus on collaboration, innovation and inclusion. The strategies adopted by School Principal B reflect a vision of education that is based on learners' empowerment, teacher empowerment and culturally responsive practice. These are important components of the progressive education theory of New Zealand.

- **Learning Hub Approach:** The school of Kauri Grove School uses the concept of learning hubs that are not based on age but rather involve collaboration, inquiry and personalization as a learning process. This strategy allows for the use of adaptive teaching techniques and reflects the notion of 're-culturing' suggested by Fullan (2002).
- **Distributed Leadership:** Leaders at the school include teachers, who lead certain aspects of pedagogy or innovation. This distributed approach to leadership allows teachers to develop their professional skills, to collaborate and reflect, which is what is stressed by Carbery and Garavan (2012).
- **Visible Learning and Collaboration:** School Principal B encourages visibility and exchange of ideas through co-teaching, professional learning walks and the sharing of classroom practice. This makes teaching a collaborative process and thus conforms to the model of instructional leadership proposed by Robinson (2011).
- **Building Learning Capacity:** Another important strategy adopted by School Principal B is building the learning capacity of students through learning skills such as resilience, collaboration, and self-regulation. It supports the New Zealand curriculum's key competencies and School Principal B's identity as a 'learning architect.' Building learning capacity is a strategy that aligns with the notion by Sinnema and Aitken (2011) that metacognitive awareness and learner agency arise when teachers conduct iterative inquiry processes that modify pedagogical practices through evidence and reflection.

- **Culture Responsiveness:** The curriculum followed by Kauri Grove School has a good representation of Māori values, learner voice, and cultural responsiveness that helps promote equity and identity. The strategy is aligned with the moral purpose of education that was suggested by Fullan (2002).

These strategies exemplify School Principal B's leadership as relational and adaptive leadership that involves culture, collaboration, and professional learning leading to continuous improvement and innovation in a community of practice (Carbery & Garavan, 2012).

Conclusion

The comparison of Senior Executive A of The Community Education Foundation and School Principal B of Kauri Grove School highlights the point that there is no such thing as universal model of educational leadership. Instead, leadership happens through the convergence of vision, management and the reality of context. The Strategic Systems Leadership framework of Senior Executive A is a macro approach that highlights how access and equity can be achieved in Pakistan through large-scale change made possible by both moral purpose and effective management. At the same time, the Culturally Embedded Transformational Leadership framework of School Principal B is a micro approach that draws its foundation from innovative pedagogy and trust building.

What is crucial for the educational leaders around the world is the need to diagnose precisely what is the key barrier to learning in each context, whether this is inequity or pedagogical inertia and to choose leadership and management frameworks accordingly Yukl (2013). Both CEF and Kauri Grove School serve as exemplars of leadership that responds to the context: one through scale of equity and other through depth of quality.

In conclusion, educational leadership is situational, relational, and flexible. Senior Executive A is a good example of systems thinking-based moral purpose through managed design; on the other hand, School Principal B is an excellent example of collaboration-based transformation through cultural revitalization. Using the concepts of change management presented in Fullan's (2002) model and Carbery & Garavan's (2012) competency approach, it is possible to see that both leaders manage to establish a deep coherence between their moral purpose and practices within organizations.

References

1. Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 315–338. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.03.001>
2. Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Free Press.
3. Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Sage Publications.
4. Boal, K. B., & Hooijberg, R. (2001). Strategic leadership research: Moving on. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 11(4), 515–549. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(00\)00057-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(00)00057-6)
5. Boyatzis, R. E. (1982). *The competent manager: A model for effective performance*. John Wiley & Sons.

6. Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. Harper & Row.
7. Bush, T. (2011). *Theories of educational leadership and management* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
8. Carbery, R., & Garavan, T. N. (2012). *Human resource development: A concise introduction*. Palgrave Macmillan.
9. Carbery, R., & Garavan, T. N. (2012). Leadership and management development. In T. N. Garavan, P. Costine, & N. Heraty (Eds.), *International human resource development* (pp. 387–406). Routledge.
10. Collins, J. (2001). *Good to great: Why some companies make the leap...and others don't*. HarperBusiness.
11. Davies, B., & Davies, B. J. (2004). Strategic leadership. *School Leadership & Management*, 24(1), 29–38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1363243042000172804>
12. Deal, T. E., & Peterson, K. D. (2016). *Shaping school culture* (3rd ed.). Jossey-Bass.
13. Education Review Office. (2017). *Stonefields School: 2017 ERO report*. <https://www.ero.govt.nz>
14. Eva, N., Robin, M., Sendjaya, S., van Dierendonck, D., & Liden, R. C. (2019). Servant leadership: A systematic review and call for future research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 30(1), 111–132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2018.07.004>
15. Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. McGraw-Hill.
16. Fullan, M. (2002). The change leader. *Educational Leadership*, 59(8), 16–20.
17. Fullan, M. (2011). Choosing the wrong drivers for whole system reform (Seminar Series Paper No. 204). Centre for Strategic Education. <https://michaelfullan.ca/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/13396088160.pdf>
18. Fullan, M. (2020). *Leading in a culture of change* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.
19. Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Paulist Press.
20. Gronn, P. (2002). Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13(4), 423–451. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(02\)00120-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(02)00120-0)
21. Hallinger, P. (2005). Instructional leadership and the school principal: A passing fancy that refuses to fade away. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 4(3), 221–239. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15700760500244793>
22. Hallinger, P. (2018). Bringing context out of the shadows of leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 46(1), 5–24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143216670652>
23. Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. *The Elementary School Journal*, 86(2), 217–247. <https://doi.org/10.1086/461445>
24. Harris, A. (2008). *Distributed leadership: According to the evidence*. Routledge.
25. Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading change*. Harvard Business School Press.
26. Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2000). The effects of transformational leadership on organizational conditions and student engagement. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38(2), 112–129. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230010320064>
27. Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2005). A review of transformational school leadership research: 1996–2005. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 4(3), 177–199. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15700760500244769>

28. Leithwood, K., & Sun, J. (2012). The nature and effects of transformational school leadership: A meta-analytic review. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 48(3), 387–423. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X11436268>
29. Robinson, V. M. J. (2011). *Student-centered leadership*. Jossey-Bass.
30. Robinson, V. M. J., Hohepa, M., & Lloyd, C. (2009). *School leadership and student outcomes: Identifying what works and why (Best Evidence Synthesis Iteration)*. New Zealand Ministry of Education.
31. Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
32. Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. Doubleday.
33. Senge, P. M., Cambron-McCabe, N., Lucas, T., Smith, B., Dutton, J., & Kleiner, A. (2012). *Schools that learn* (Updated and rev. ed.). Doubleday.
34. Sinnema, C., & Aitken, G. (2011). Teaching as inquiry in the New Zealand curriculum: Origins and implementation. *Changing Trajectories of Teaching and Learning*, 29–48.
35. Spears, L. C. (Ed.). (1998). *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant-leadership*. John Wiley & Sons.
36. Spencer, L. M., Jr., & Spencer, S. M. (1993). *Competence at work: Models for superior performance*. John Wiley & Sons.
37. Spillane, J. P. (2006). *Distributed leadership*. Jossey-Bass.
38. UNESCO. (2023). *Global education monitoring report 2023: Technology in education*. <https://gem-report-2023.unesco.org/>
39. Walumbwa, F. O., Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Wernsing, T. S., & Peterson, S. J. (2008). Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure. *Journal of Management*, 34(1), 89–126. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206307308913>
40. Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications* (Vol. 6). Sage.
41. Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in organizations* (8th ed.). Pearson Education.