3

Educational Leadership in Developing Countries and in Post-New War Countries

Introduction

While there is a growing body of work on education in conflict and post-conflict societies, it was noted over ten years ago that academic research within the area was somewhat limited (Johnson & Van Kalmthout, 2006; Tomlinson & Benefield, 2005). This is still the situation. Also, much of what does exist is derived more from monitoring and evaluating work undertaken by international development bodies in countries affected by war, than from rigorous research in the social sciences (Paulson, 2011). Therefore, a gap exists between theoretical and practical perspectives on education in conflict-affected societies (Paulson & Rappleye, 2007; Tomlinson & Benefield, 2005). This deficit calls for an urgent dialogue to take place between scholars and policy makers. It also means that more critically-informed and policy-relevant research in this emerging area of inquiry is required (Davies, 2005; Novelli & Lopes Cardozo, 2008; Paulson, 2011; Paulson & Rappleye, 2007).

While only a limited amount of research has been undertaken on education in conflict-affected societies, even less has been undertaken on leadership at the individual school level in such contexts. Certainly, a

T. Kheang et al., *Primary School Leadership in Cambodia*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-76324-8_3

wide range of research projects on educational leadership has been conducted, but much of it has concentrated on well-established and relatively stable contexts (Bush, 2014; Nawab, 2011; Oplatka, 2004). The main investigations have been on issues relating to school improvement and effectiveness (Bush, 2008, 2009, 2012; Rhodes & Brundrett, 2009), school leadership and student learning achievement (Jacobson & Ylimaki, 2011; Leithwood, Janttzi, & Steinbach, 1998; Leithwood & Massey, 2010; Louis, Dretzke, & Wahlstrom, 2010), school leadership and change (Cravens & Hallinger, 2012; Fullan, 2001; Hargreaves & Fullan, 1992), and school leadership and culture (Dimmock & Walker, 2000; Hargreaves, 1995). However, there are very few empirical studies that can be drawn upon in an attempt to understand the context and nature of school leadership in post-conflict settings at an international level (Clarke & O'Donoghue, 2013a).

This chapter now provides further contextualisation to the study reported later by providing an overview of the related academic literature. It begins with an overview of the literature on educational leadership and management generally, with a focus on general leadership theories and theories of leadership and management in education. It goes on to examine the literature on educational leadership in developing-country contexts. The literature concerning educational leadership in post-conflict nations is then considered. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the literature pertaining to educational leadership in post-conflict Cambodia.

Educational Leadership and Management

The last few decades have seen numerous education reforms and school restructuring changes aimed at improving equitable access to education, promoting education quality and enhancing learning outcomes. To this end, scholars, policy makers, and practitioners have recognised the importance of leadership and management at all levels of education, and especially at the school level (Bush, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2012, 2014). This point has been made by Wart (2003) as follows:

> Effective leadership provides higher-quality and more efficient goods and services; it provides a sense of cohesiveness, personal development, and

> higher levels of satisfaction among those conducting the work; and it provides an overarching sense of direction and vision, an alignment with the environment, a healthy mechanism for innovation and creativity, and a resource for invigorating the organisational culture. (p. 214)

Indeed, the quality of leadership, it has been argued, can help to produce significant education outcomes and especially to improve student learning achievement (Bush, 2008).

While there is an increased recognition of the importance of leadership and management as an essential component of education change efforts, it remains unclear which leadership practices can best produce the desirable outcomes (Bush, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2012, 2014). Some models of leadership have been constructed to provide school leaders with a variety of leadership practices which they can both adopt and adapt when confronting problems and dealing with daily school operations.

General Leadership Theories

Leadership theories have often focused on characteristics of leadership, on behaviours of leaders, on influence over followers, and on situational factors that determine an effective approach to leadership (Yukl, 1989). One theory of leadership which was dominant in the 19th century was entitled the 'Great Man Theory.' Well-known associated exponents of this theory who attempted to explain the qualities of great leaders were Nietzsche, James, Carlyle, and Galton (Vroom & Jago, 2007; Wart, 2003). They suggested that great leaders are born with such distinctive qualities as personal charisma, moral force, intelligence, confidence and social skills, all of which set them apart from their followers. However, some have argued that great leaders emerge as a result of time, place, and circumstances (Stogdill, 1974). Also, the 'Great Man Theory' failed to take into account the greatness of such female leaders as Joan of Arc, Elizabeth I, Clara Barton and Catherine The Great (Wart, 2003).

Another major theory of leadership that has been popular in the mainstream leadership literature throughout the 20th century is 'trait theory'. What was proposed was similar to the 'Great Man theory' in that it sought to explain leadership in terms of traits relating to personality,

physical appearance, social background, intelligence and ability (Northouse, 2007, 2013; Taylor, 1994; Yukl, 2012; Wart, 2003). Leaders, according to this theory, are endowed with superior qualities that distinguish them from their followers (Northouse, 2007, 2013; Stogdill, 1974; Yukl, 2012). While many trait studies were designed during the 1930s and 1940s, and were conducted to identify those qualities, they did not yield consistent results (Wart, 2003; Yukl, 2012). Researchers have stated that most early studies related to trait theory were inconclusive and that the traits tentatively identified as crucial in one study were not found to be crucial in another study (Northouse, 2007, 2013; Taylor, 1994; Wart, 2003). Also, while the list of traits became endless as the studies continued, they offered only limited assistance to practitioners (Northouse, 2007, 2013; Wart, 2003).

Later, the focus of leadership research shifted from seeking to explain what effective leaders are, to seeking to explain what effective leaders do. This approach, called 'behavioural leadership,' was popular in the 1950s (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2007; Yukl, 2012). The behavioural leadership studies conducted can be divided into two groups (Yukl, 2012). One group was concerned with how leaders manage their work. In particular, it investigated how leaders managed their time and documented the typical pattern of activities, responsibilities, and functions for managerial jobs, and how leaders dealt with conflicts, constraints, and requirements (Yukl, 2012). The other group attempted to identify effective leadership behaviour. The focus was on the correlation between leadership behaviour and indicators of leadership effectiveness, and on how effective leaders can differ from ineffective leaders (Yukl, 2012).

Some have argued that the leader behaviour studies failed to take account of such situational factors as different environments, different tasks, and different organisational structures, all of which can have an influence on leadership (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2007; Yukl, 2012). The focus was placed on scanning what leaders did most of the time rather than on trying to understand how contextual variables could cause a shift in behaviour (Vroom & Jago, 2007). 'Situational leadership theory' emerged as a reaction. It offered a new perspective, holding that no single leadership style, decision-making pattern, motivational strategy, or

organisational structure, is universally effective (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2007; Northouse, 2007, 2013; Wart, 2003; Yukl, 2012). It suggests that situations shape how leaders behave (Bass, 1999; Northouse, 2007, 2013; Vroom & Jago, 2007; Yukl, 2012). Therefore, an effective leader needs to understand the situation of the organisation and, in particular, the competence and skills of employees, as well as their commitment and motivation (Northouse, 2007, 2013). Having such an understanding, it is held, can enable a leader to identify the needs of the organisation and to adjust the leadership style to meet those needs.

'Situational leadership theory' has undergone several substantive changes since its inception in the late 1960s (Graeff, 1997; Northouse, 2007, 2013; Wart, 2003). One well-known variant was a model developed by Hersey and Blanchard (1977) and Blanchard (1985). Central to understanding this leadership model are the key concepts of directive behaviour (task) and supportive behaviour (relationship). Directive behaviour involves one-way communication and focuses on giving directions, instruction and guidance, developing goals and methods of evaluation, setting a timeline, defining duties and responsibilities and directing subordinates toward the attainment of goals (Northouse, 2007, 2013). Supportive behaviour involves a two-way or multidirectional communication between leaders and subordinates that can promote social and emotional support and eventually increase productivity (Northouse, 2007, 2013). Examples of such behaviour include active listening, asking for input, collaboration, use of praise, consultation, and other social and emotional support.

The directive and supportive behaviour, when combined, can be further classified into four main leadership approaches: directing (high task/low relationship), coaching (high task/high relationship), supporting (high relationship/low task) and delegating (low relationship/low task) (Northouse, 2007, 2013). These approaches, however, are not above criticism. Also, there is a lack of robust research findings to justify and support their theoretical underpinnings (Northouse, 2007, 2013). There is, for example, no clear explanation of how leaders transform the perceptions of their followers and how followers move from one level of development to another level (Northouse, 2007, 2013; Yukl, 2012). Further, the overall theory fails to address how demographic characteristics can

have an influence on subordinates' preferences for leadership. Another criticism relates to ambiguity of conceptualisation on the development level of subordinates (Northouse, 2007, 2013), and on how commitment and competence can be combined with four distinct levels of development (Graeff, 1997; Yukl, 1989).

At this point, it is apposite to recall that the diversity of leadership theories has also led to the emergence of diverse concepts. Some early definitions of leadership defined it as a focus on group processes (Bass, 1999). This suggests that the leader is at the centre, or focus, of group change and activity and embodies the collective will. Another group of definitions views leadership from a 'personality perspective'. Here, a leader is seen as a person who possesses unique traits and characteristics that enable him or her to induce others to complete a given task (Bass, 1999). Other theorists define leadership as the 'power relationship' that exists between leaders and subordinates (Bass, 1999; Northouse, 2007, 2013). This notion of leadership suggests that the leader is an individual in a position of authority, using power to make the change in others (Bass, 1999).

Despite the numerous definitions of leadership, most of them share a common element, namely, that it is a process of influence. Yukl (2012, p. 2) points out that "most definitions of leadership reflect the assumption that it involves a process whereby intentional influence is exerted by one person over other people to guide, structure, and facilitate activities in a group or organisation." Northouse (2007, 2013) also refers to leadership as a process through which an individual influences a group of individuals to accomplish a shared goal. These concepts of leadership consist of a number of elements, including process, influence, and a goal or vision.

Considering leadership as a 'process' suggests that it is not a trait or characteristic that inhabits the leader (Northouse, 2007, 2013). Rather, it is a transactional event that occurs between the leader and his or her subordinates. This means that leadership is not a one-way event. Rather, it is an interactive event in which the leader can have an influence on, and be influenced by, followers (Northouse, 2007, 2013). Also, the 'process' of influence is intended to achieve goals that are shared by the leader and followers. Therefore, leadership involves directing a group of individuals toward achieving a shared goal (Northouse, 2007, 2013).

Regarding 'influence', this relates to the person exercising influence and the type of influence exercised (Northouse, 2007, 2013; Yukl, 2012). It has a neutral stance because it does not indicate what purposes or actions should be sought (Bush, 2008; Bush & Glover, 2003). The 'influence' can come from different sources, including individual traits, leader behaviour, interaction patterns, role relationships, follower perceptions, and cognitive ability (Vroom & Jago, 2007; Yukl, 1989, 2012).

'Vision' also is increasingly being regarded as an essential element of leadership (Bush, 2008; Bush & Glover, 2003). This indicates that a main task of a leader is to set a goal or vision that is shared by a group of individuals and to direct them toward accomplishing that vision (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Northouse, 2007, 2013). It is, therefore, important that a leader articulates a clear and compelling vision, sets clear goals for the organisation and creates a sense of shared mission. On this, Yukl (2012) has stated that a vision is very important, especially during radical change, as it can provide a sense of continuity for followers by linking past events and present strategies to a vivid image of a better future for the organisation. It also offers hope for a better future and the faith that it will be attained.

Leadership Theories in Education

The concepts of leadership presented above constitute a resource which scholars can draw upon when defining leadership in education. Adopting this position, Bush and Glover (2003) view school leadership as a process of influence directed towards the attainment of desired goals. This suggests that successful leadership involves constructing a clear vision based on firm professional and personal values (Bush, 2008; Bush & Glover, 2003). The vision needs to be well communicated and widely shared by teachers and other key stakeholders. Further, the leader needs to structure the school in alignment with the shared vision and direct the resources and activities of the school towards its attainment (Bush, 2008; Bush & Glover, 2003).

Some scholars have argued that the concept of leadership relates to that of management (Bush, 2008; Cuban, 1988; Yukl, 1989, 2012).

While acknowledging that management and leadership are not equivalent, Yukl (1989) suggested that the two constructs overlap. It is helpful at this point, therefore, to consider some of the differences and overlaps between these two concepts.

One view on the distinction between leadership and management relates to the assumption that they cannot occur in the same person (Yukl, 2012). This means that leaders and managers have incompatible values and different qualities. In this connection, Yukl (2012) distinguishes management from leadership as follows:

> Managers value stability, order, and efficiency, whereas leaders value flexibility, innovation, and adaptation. Managers are concerned about how things get done, and they try to get people to perform better. Leaders are concerned with what things mean to people, and try to get people to agree about the most important things to be done. (p. 5)

This view concurs with that of Bennis and Nanus (1985), who stated that to manage means to accomplish activities, while to lead means to influence others and create the vision for change. They emphasised that managers do things right and leaders do the right thing (Bennis & Nanus, 1985).

Other scholars differentiate leadership from management in terms of distinct processes (Bass, 1999; Cuban, 1988; Kotter, 1990; Rost, 1991). Rost (1991), for instance, viewed leadership as a multidirectional influence relationship and management as an authority relationship. Leadership, in this view, involves the process of developing mutual trust and purpose, leading to change in an organisation, whereas management is linked to coordinating activities to get the job done. This view is congruent with that of Kotter (1990), who distinguished leadership from management in terms of core processes and desired outcomes. He explained that the overall function of management relates to providing order and consistency in the organisation, while leadership is primarily concerned with producing organisational change and movement (Kotter, 1990).

The distinction between leadership and management is also made by Cuban (1988), who linked leadership with change and viewed management as a maintenance activity. He emphasised that leadership

involves influencing others to take action to accomplish intended outcomes. Leaders, in this view, set goals and motivate others to reach the goals (Cuban, 1988). Management, by contrast, is concerned with the effective and efficient maintenance of organisational arrangements. Cuban (1988) maintained that although good management often requires some leadership skills, the primary function is focused on maintenance rather than change. Bush and Glover (2003) offer a similar view, in which they link leadership to values and purpose, leading to change, and relate management to the implementation of policies and maintenance of school activities.

Although there are differences between leadership and management, the two do overlap in some ways. Kotter (1990), for example, pointed out that both leadership and management involve deciding what needs to be done, creating relationships to do it, and making sure it happens. Northouse (2007) indicates as follows that there is a great degree of overlap between leadership and management:

> When managers are involved in influencing a group to meet its goals, they are involved in leadership. When leaders are involved in planning, organising, staffing, and controlling, they are involved in management. Both processes involve influencing a group of individuals toward goal attainment. (p. 11)

Some scholars have also suggested that leadership and management need to be attributed equal importance if an organisation is to be successful (Bush & Glover, 2003; Kotter, 1990). On this, Kotter (1990) held that strong leadership without management can disrupt order and efficiency, and strong management without leadership can discourage risk-taking and innovation.

Finally, leadership has often been linked to effectiveness. Different scholars view leadership effectiveness differently, depending upon their perspective, the definition of effectiveness, and methodological preferences (Yukl, 1982, 2012). Many define leadership effectiveness in terms of the type of consequence or outcome produced by the leader for followers and other organisation stakeholders. These outcomes include "group performance, attainment of group objectives, group survival,

group preparedness, group capacity to deal with crises, subordinate satisfaction with the leader, subordinate commitment to group objective, the psychological well-being and personal growth of followers, and the leader's retention of his or her position of authority in the group" (Yukl, 1982, p. 2).

The concept of leadership effectiveness has been studied across organisational sectors and especially in schools in which leadership is considered vital for school effectiveness and improvement. In particular, education policy makers and researchers around the world have come to recognise that "schools require effective leaders and managers if they are to provide the best possible education for their students and learners" (Bush, 2009, p. 375). It is, therefore, not surprising that a wide range of leadership models which attempt to explain leadership behaviours and practices associated with school effectiveness and improvement, has been constructed (Bush, 2008; O'Donoghue & Clarke, 2010). These include 'transactional leadership'(Bass, 1999; Miller & Miller, 2001; O'Donoghue & Clarke, 2010)., 'transformational leadership' (Bass, 1999; Bush & Glover, 2003; Leithwood et al., 1998; Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999, 2006), 'instructional leadership' (Hallinger, 2003, 2005; Hallinger & Heck, 1996, 1998), 'managerial leadership (Bush, 2008; Bush & Glover, 2003, 2014), 'moral leadership' (Bush, 2008; Bush & Glover, 2003, 2014; Greenfield, 2004), 'distributed leadership' (Harris, 2013; Spillane, 2005), and 'contingent leadership' (Bush, 2008; Bush & Glover, 2003, 2012; Yukl, 2012), including others.

However, while the significant relationship between context and school leadership has been increasingly examined, there is still a lack of empirical research that can be used to develop a comprehensive theoretical framework to inform the field. In this regard, Vroom and Jago (2007) have indicated that while situational factors can influence leadership practice, the role of situational leadership has been largely ignored. This brings one to consider the situation of educational leadership in extraordinarily challenging circumstances, including both developing-country contexts and post-conflict contexts, where little research has been conducted aimed at understanding the nature and the context within which leaders at the individual school level work on a day-to-day basis (Clarke & O'Donoghue, 2013a).

Educational Leadership in Developing Countries

A wide range of studies on educational leadership and management has been undertaken since the early part of the 21st century because of the recognition that school leadership can make a difference in learning achievement (Bush, 2008, 2012; Hallinger, 2011). Most of these studies have focused on Western, well-established, or relatively stable contexts (Bush, 2014; Dimmock & Walker, 1998; Hallinger, 2011; Harber & Davies, 1997; Nawab, 2011; Oplatka, 2004). However, little empirical research on educational leadership in developing-country contexts has been carried out. In this connection, Hallinger and Chen (2014), in the conclusion to their review of the empirical studies associated with educational leadership and management, stated that research in the field is particularly scarce for Asian countries. As a result, there is only a limited understanding of how educational leadership and management is practised within them.

The 'developing country contexts' refer to countries with minimal industrial and international market-based economic activity. In other words, they are "more agricultural-based, and they are usually characterised by high mortality rates, high birth rates, high levels of poverty and large gaps between rich and poor" (Oplatka, 2004, p. 428). Such countries are mainly situated in Africa, Latin America and Asia. At the same time, it is important to note that the structure of education systems in these areas can differ, depending on cultural, national and sociological contexts (Dimmock & Walker, 1998). Therefore, the results of a study in one developing country do not necessarily apply to another developing country (Oplatka, 2004).

The literature on school leadership in developing countries will now be examined. First, an overview of the broad education landscape in developing countries, with a particular focus on education issues which can shape school leadership and management is presented. Attention then shifts to examining school leadership preparation, development and support in those contexts. The section concludes with a review of the characteristics of school leadership and management identified in regard to developing nations.

An Overview of the Education Landscape in Developing Countries

There has been tremendous progress in education attainment in many developing countries since the 1960s (Glewwe & Kremer, 2006), but it has not been evenly distributed geographically. In 2003, there were still more than 113 million children of primary school age not attending school (UNDP, 2003), 94 percent of whom lived in developing countries (UNESCO, 2002). More recently, repetition and school dropout rates in developing countries have been high, and the quality of education has often been low (Glewwe & Kremer, 2006; UNESCO, 2015). Many students learn much less than expected and teachers are often absent from classrooms. An overview of the related education landscape in developing countries, with special attention to access to education, problems of education quality, and matters to do with economic and educational resources in developing countries, is now presented.

Access to Education

By 2006, school enrolment rates and adult literacy had increased significantly in many developing countries (Glewwe & Kremer, 2006). In particular, there had been impressive progress towards the provision of universal primary school education and in secondary school enrolments since the implementation of the *Dakar Framework for Action (DFA), Education for All (EFA)*, which resulted from the deliberations of the *World Economic Forum (WEF)* in Dakar, Senegal, in 2000. This progress was reflected in the results published in the EFA Global Monitoring Report 2015, which showed that more children were attending school, compared to 1999 when there were 204 million out-of-school children (UNESCO, 2015).

Gross enrolment refers to the number of children enrolled in a particular level of education regardless of age, divided by the population of the age group that officially corresponds to the same level (Glewwe & Kremer, 2006). For instance, the primary school age range is usually defined as being between 6 and 11 years of age. Research has shown that gross

enrolment rates at the primary school level internationally have increased significantly over the last decades. In 1960, the gross enrolment rate at the primary school level was 65 percent in low-income countries, 83 percent in middle-income countries, and over 100 percent in high-income countries (Glewwe & Kremer, 2006).

A gross enrolment rate over 100 percent does not mean that all school-age children attend school. On this, Glewwe and Kremer (2006) explain that grade repetition increases gross enrolment rates. Secondly, gross enrolment rates are usually computed by comparing census data with Ministry of Education data obtained from reports of school principals (Glewwe & Kremer, 2006). Also, data in school principals' reports can be exaggerated.

Another way to measure progress toward universal primary education is to calculate net enrolment. This refers to the number of children enrolled in a particular level of education who belong to the age group that officially corresponds to that level, divided by the total population of the same age group (Glewwe & Kremer, 2006). In 1999, net primary school enrolment rates around the world were 80 percent in low-income countries and 88 percent in middle-income countries (Glewwe & Kremer, 2006; UNESCO, 2015). The low net enrolment rates mirror high repetition and late school-starting age. However, there has been significant progress in net enrolment at primary schools since 1999, reaching 90 percent in 2010 in many regions, and it was estimated that it would reach 93 percent in 2015 (UNESCO, 2015).

Enrolment rates at the secondary school level increased considerably in developing countries after 1960. The gross enrolment rate in low- and middle-income countries increased by almost 150 percent between 1960 and 1980, but progress slowed down to 59 percent in low-income countries and to 51 percent in middle-income countries from 1980 to 2000 (Glewwe & Kremer, 2006). The gross enrolment rate at the lower secondary education level increased from 71 percent in 1999, to 85 percent in 2012, and from 45 percent to 62 percent at upper secondary education (UNESCO, 2015). This progress, however, has varied substantially across regions. For example, although the gross enrolment rate at the lower secondary school level exceeded 95 percent in most regions in 2012, it was 89 percent in many Arab States, 81 percent in South and West Asia, and 50 percent in sub-Saharan Africa (UNESCO, 2015).

While increases in enrolment are evident, millions of primary school-age children do not attend school and do not complete primary school education. There were approximately 58 million children of primary school age not in school globally in 2012, and at least half of these children lived in sub-Saharan Africa (UNESCO, 2015). Student attriion also remains a daunting issue in many developing countries, where one in six children does not complete primary school education. The situation is critical in sub-Saharan Africa, where at least, 20 percent of children enrolled in school do not reach the final primary school grade (UNESCO, 2015). Rates of secondary school completion are even lower. This is attributed primarily to demographic pressures, conflict situations, poverty, child labour exploitation, traditional and religious beliefs, a shortage of teachers, and a lack of adequate commitment by governments (Harber & Davies, 1997; UNESCO, 2015).

Quality of Education

Some developing countries have made significant progress in both the expansion of education services and in improvement in learning outcomes (UNESCO, 2015). For example, Kenya raised the completion rate in primary school education from 42 percent in 2000 to 62 percent in 2007, and gained an increase in the percentage of those reaching the minimum-set standard in mathematics from 25 percent to 39 percent (UNESCO, 2015). A similar situation took place in Ghana, where access to education and equitable learning went hand in hand. Here, the secondary school net enrolment ratio increased from 36 percent in 2003 to 46 percent in 2009, and learning disparity has been narrowed across regions (UNESCO, 2015).

Nevertheless, the quality of education in many developing countries is very low (Glewwe, 2014; Glewwe & Kremer, 2006). Students in such countries often learn much less than what is indicated in the official school curriculum. Also, they learn much less than their counterparts in developed countries. This was indicated in an international comparison undertaken in 2009, which demonstrated that 58.1 percent of U.S. 15-year-old students achieved a literacy score of Level 3, which refers to

the ability to read tasks of moderate complexity, whereas the corresponding figures for 15-year-old students in many developing countries was much lower: 23.3 percent for Brazil, 12.2 percent for Indonesia, 20.1 percent for Jordan, and 13.1 percent for Peru (Glewwe, 2014). A larger gap was found in relation to mathematics, where Level 3 refers to the ability to execute clearly described procedures, including those that involve sequential decisions. The results were 52.2 percent for the United States, 11.9 percent for Brazil, 6.4 percent for Indonesia, 11.9 percent for Jordan, and 9.5 percent for Peru (Glewwe, 2014).

Glewwe and Kremer (2006) state that mathematics score disparities between developing and developed countries are approximately equivalent to a three-year education gap. This gap reflects the low quality of achievement in developing countries, and is deemed to result from the rapid expansion of education services, in particular at primary and secondary school level. The situation has constrained the use of financial and human resources to improve the process of education (Glewwe & Kremer, 2006).

Economic Resources and Education Systems

Developing countries are characterised by fragility, while being shaped by global economic changes (Bush, 2008). These factors can also have an impact on government expenditure on education. Glewwe (2014) points out that while increasing expenditure on education can lead to increased enrolment and learning, most developing countries experience financial constraints which make it difficult for them to allocate larger amounts in their budgets to education. Expenditure per primary school student in low-income countries was about 7 percent of per capita GDP in the late 1990s (Glewwe & Kremer, 2006). Little has changed since then (UNESCO, 2015).

Teachers' salaries account for a large percentage of government investment in education in developing countries. In many of them, it makes up at least 74 percent of government expenditure on education (Glewwe & Kremer, 2006; Rogers & Vegas, 2010). Sometimes, the figure can be higher than 80 percent of the recurrent education budget, occasionally

even reaching 95 percent (Rogers & Vegas, 2010; UNESCO, 2015). Glewwe and Kremer (2006) have explained that this is because these countries pay high teacher salaries relative to GDP per capita. Also, while recognising that there has been a decline in the student/teacher ratio in some countries, the EFA Global Monitoring Report 2015 reported that the ratio remains high in others, often exceeding 40:1 (UNESCO, 2015).

Some low-income countries have increased the percentage of trained teachers in the classrooms in the last decade, but others have not. In 2012, the ratio of students to trained teachers exceeded 100:1 in some African countries, including the Central African Republic, Chad, Guinea-Bissau and South Sudan (UNESCO, 2015). It was estimated that between 2012 and 2015, around 4 million primary school teachers would have been needed to address the scarcity of teachers involved in primary school education and to achieve universal primary education (UNESCO, 2015). This means that around 450,000 additional teachers are required each year across the developing world, with some regions needing many more teachers than others.

Many developing countries spend more on tertiary education than on secondary and primary school education. On this, Glewwe and Kremer (2006) stated that "on average, governments in low-income countries spend 34 times more on a student in tertiary education than they spend on a student in primary education and 14 times more than on a student in secondary education" (p. 962). Low spending on primary and secondary school education has two major implications for school-level stakeholders. First, it can constrain the ability of school principals to expand school facilities and teaching and learning materials, along with the number of teachers to teach disadvantaged groups and to provide quality education. Secondly, low spending on education means that households often have to take responsibility for the costs involved. While school fees have been abolished in some developing countries, parents are responsible for providing many basic learning materials, including textbooks, uniforms, transportation, and school facilities (Glewwe & Kremer, 2006).

Education systems in developing countries tend to be highly centralised (Glewwe & Kremer, 2006; Oplatka, 2004). The ministry of education in many developing countries decides on most aspects of education,

often including a central national curriculum, syllabus, teaching and learning materials, recruiting and deploying staff, and allocating the school budget (Oplatka, 2004). In this regard, Mitchell (2015) points out that while school principals in Ethiopia are expected to lead school improvement, they lack autonomy in relation to budget management, procurement of textbooks, and recruitment and training of teachers. Glewwe and Kremer (2006) have also commented that most developing countries have a single centrally-set curriculum which frequently tends to favour the needs of relatively elite students and ignores the larger population. This can result in poor academic performance in many students' tests, along with high dropout and repetition rates. Also, centralised education systems can limit the autonomy of school leaders and create a narrow definition of their roles (Oplatka, 2004).

School Leadership Preparation and Development in Developing Countries

High quality leadership is important for school improvement and student learning (Asuga, Eacott & Scevak, 2015; Bush, 2008; Hallinger, 2011; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006; Leithwood et al., 1998). Also, providing leadership differs from being able to teach (Bush, 2008, 2011). However, school leaders in many developing countries lack formal leadership preparation and development when they progress from being classroom teachers to becoming school principals (Bush, 2008, 2011, 2012, 2013; Bush & Oduro, 2006; Bysik et al., 2015; Kitavi & van der Westhuizen, 1997; Niqab, Sharma, Wei, & Maulod, 2014; Okoko, Scott, & Scott, 2015; Onguko, Abdalla, & Webber, 2012; Oplatka, 2004). Usually, they are not required to attend any formal, pre-service leadership and management training.

School leadership appointments in many developing countries are based on a traditional apprenticeship model, which means that one has to learn one's job 'on the job' (Okoko et al., 2015; Onguko et al., 2012; Su, Adams, & Mininberg, 2000). Principals are often appointed on the basis of having a successful teaching record and a substantial length of teaching experience, rather than on having demonstrated leadership

capacity (Bush, 2008; Bush & Oduro, 2006; Gamage & Sooksomchitra, 2004; Niqab et al., 2014; Onguko et al., 2012; Oplatka, 2004; Kitavi & van der Westhuizen, 1997). This means that school leaders move from being classroom teachers to master teachers, to school administrators, and to school principals, with little or no specialist training for their new roles in each case (Bush, 2009; Donkor, 2015; Gamage & Sooksomchitra, 2004; Kitavi & van der Westhuizen, 1997; Niqab et al., 2014; Okoko et al., 2015; Su, Gamage, & Mininberg, 2003). Okoko et al. (2015) point out that in Kenya, teachers have to work for at least 20 years before they qualify to become principals. They spend at least ten years as classroom teachers, three years as senior teachers and heads of departments, and three years as deputy principals. Furthermore, in some countries, political connections and nepotism can be influential in the appointment of new school leaders, even when they lack appropriate qualifications and experiences (Donkor, 2015; Okoko et al., 2015; Onguko et al., 2012; Oplatka, 2004; Sumintono, Sheyoputri, Jiang, Misbach, & Jumintono, 2015).

School leadership positions in many developing countries tend to be male-dominated (Bush, 2008; Bush & Oduro, 2006; Niqab et al., 2014). Herriot et al. (2002) reported that 93 percent of primary school principals in Kenya in 2002 were males. Bush and Heystek (2006) found that male school principals made up 66 percent of the school principal population in the Gauteng province of South Africa in 2006. A similar situation was found in Pakistan, regarding which Niqab et al. (2014) reported that school leadership positions are largely occupied by males. This situation is mainly attributed to cultural factors (Bush, 2008; Bush & Oduro, 2006). In particular, women are often deemed to be inferior to men and are discouraged from taking up leadership positions.

There is wide recognition that school leaders need specific preparation if they are to be successful in leading and managing schools (Bush, 2009; Gamage & Sooksomchitra, 2004). Bush (2008) offers four main reasons why preparation is vital for school leaders. These are "the expansion of the role of school principal, the increasing complexity of school contexts, recognition that preparation is a moral obligation, and recognition that effective preparation and development make a difference" (Bush, 2008, p. 26). School leaders in developing countries often, however, have few

professional development opportunities following their appointment (Bush, 2008; Bush & Oduro, 2006; Donkor, 2015; Niqab et al., 2014; Okoko et al., 2015). Those professional development opportunities provided as part of the induction for newly appointed school leaders are often inadequate. For example, Tekleselassie (2002) reported in 2002, that most school principals in Ethiopia attended in-service school management training sessions, but they were perceived to be limited, ill-managed, irrelevant and repetitive, with incompetent trainers. Also, there can be a lack of capacity among those responsible for designing and delivering the training and supporting of the school leaders (Bush, 2008; Kitavi & van der Westhuizen, 1997; Tekleselassie, 2002).

The dearth of professional development opportunities can leave school principals, and especially newly appointed ones, unprepared for their responsibilities (Bush, 2008; Bush & Oduro, 2006; Onguko et al., 2012). Beginning school principals in Kenya, for example, face multiple challenges in dealing with their job. These include shortage of school facilities, students being unable to pay school fees and to buy learning materials, poor school sanitation facilities, managing staff, deciding on the language of instruction, overseeing community relations, organising professional development, and engaging in crisis management (Kitavi & van der Westhuizen, 1997; Okoko et al., 2015). Onguko, et al. (2012) also reported that school principals in Tanzania, owing to the lack of professional preparation and development, work in extraordinarily challenging situations where they have to deal with many problems, including shortages of teachers, limited availability of teaching and learning materials, low parental awareness of the importance of education, community relations' challenges, health issues, orphanage placements, and child labour.

Researchers have called for proper recruitment, preparation, development and support for school leaders in developing countries if the aim of education is to enable these countries to compete in an increasingly challenging world economy (Bush, 2008; Bush & Oduro, 2006). In 2004, Gamage and Sooksomchitra (2004) indicated that Thai school leaders required new skills, competencies and professional development to deal with challenges faced as a result of school-based management reforms. They (Gamage & Sooksomchitra, 2004) suggested that leadership and

management training should have both theoretical and practical aspects, enabling school leaders to become effective in their jobs. Drawing on insights from different countries, Bush (2008) proposed that school leadership and management training should have five core elements: instructional leadership, law, finance, human resource management, and administration.

Characteristics of School Leaders in Developing Countries

School leaders in developing countries work under challenging circumstances with little or no preparation, development and support from their governments. Challenges often include lack of economic and education resources, student dropout, low quality learning, and a shortage of qualified teachers. However, little research has been undertaken aimed at generating an understanding of leadership practices adopted in such circumstances. Oplatka (2004), back in 2004, identified three main characteristics in the approaches that school leaders adopt in developing countries. These are a focus on management and maintenance, a lack of change initiation, and an absence of instructional leadership.

The first characteristic of leadership and management that has been associated with school leaders in developing countries is that they often prioritise management and maintenance over leadership. They spend a considerable amount of time maintaining staff and student discipline, dealing with untrained staff, managing school finance and resources, arranging transportation and routine maintenance work, scheduling school activities and tasks, and dealing with the community and parents of students (Chapman & Burchfield, 1994; Harber & Dadey, 1993; Onguko et al., 2012). Okoko et al. (2015) reported that school principals in Kenya were responsible for such managerial duties as coordinating examinations, managing school finance, managing student misbehaviour, scheduling timetable, working with parents, and managing the school curriculum. Okoko et al. (2015) went on to say, however, that principals were often absent from school, leaving the day-to-day management to their deputy principals. As a result, they devoted very little time to devising long-term school development plans.

We have known for quite some time that many school principals in low-income countries also have to perform very basic managerial tasks (Oplatka, 2004). These can include dealing with kitchen-related issues, fixing school roofs, and mending water pipes (Harber & Dadey, 1993). Further, they often engage in fund-raising activities. Because of a lack of funding support provided by government, they are regularly unable to cover the cost of basic school needs, including those associated with telephone services, clean water, and physical school facilities. For instance, principals in Botswana, China, Ghana, Kenya and South Africa have often engaged school stakeholders, parents and community members in contributing labour, materials and funds (Harber & Dadey, 1993; Kitavi & van der Westhuizen, 1997; Oplatka, 2004).

Another characteristic of leadership and management linked with school leaders in developing countries is their reluctance to engage in change initiation. While school leaders in Western countries often play a role as innovators and initiators of school change, school leaders in many developing countries often lack the capacity and motivation to initiate and lead school reform (Oplatka, 2004). This situation can be attributed to some extent to the bureaucratic regulations and organisational structures which present limited opportunities for school leaders and restrict their capacity to participate in change initiation and management (Bush, 2008; Hallinger & Kantamara, 2000; Oplatka, 2004).

Cultural features also play an important role in constraining the ability of school leaders in developing countries to participate in the initiation of education change (Hallinger & Kantamara, 2000; Oplatka, 2004). What is often promoted is a proliferation of laws and rules, along with safety and security measures. This can discourage the pursuit of difference and novelty. School principals in Thailand, for example, were reported to have favoured stability and to find change disruptive (Hallinger & Kantamara, 2000). Also, in Thai culture, senior leaders or policy makers are perceived to have personal power which can influence the direction of education change. In addition, Oplatka (2004) has observed that while a number of education change initiatives, including education decentralisation and school-based management, have been introduced in education systems in developing countries, the roles of school leaders have changed little. On this, Bush (2008) has stated that school leaders in such coun-

tries tend to practise a managerial style of leadership because their primary role is to implement externally imposed policies.

A third characteristic of school leadership and management in many developing countries which has been identified is the absence of instructional leadership. Although instructional leadership has increased in popularity in the last few decades (Bush, 2015; Hallinger, 2005), it has rarely been adopted by school leaders in developing countries (Oplatka, 2004). Rather, school leaders in many of these countries tend to adopt a stance where they concentrate mainly on management and maintenance.

Educational Leadership in Post-conflict Countries

While many post-conflict countries are situated in developing countries, they often also have unique characteristics. This section of the chapter provides an overview of educational leadership and management in such settings. It starts with an overview of the education contexts in post-conflict countries which can have an impact on the practice of leadership and management at the school level. These include the legacies of conflict on an education system and approaches to education reconstruction in post-conflict contexts. It then moves on to examine school leadership situations in different post-conflict environments.

The Impacts of Conflict on Education Systems in Post-conflict Contexts

The education landscape in post-conflict contexts can be complex. Thus, it requires critical analysis before any education reform initiatives can be developed and implemented. In this connection, the World Bank (2005) explained that post-conflict contexts can provide both opportunities and challenges for education reconstruction and transformation. The opportunities can include replacement of new political systems supportive of reconstruction, a sense of high expectation for change and renewal in education, weakened bureaucratic systems, and available resources for

education reconstruction (World Bank, 2005). These can also turn into challenges for the reconstruction of education in post-conflict situations. Such challenges can include a lack of political direction and leadership due to the new political authorities being weak and unstable (Buckland, 2006; World Bank, 2005). Also, there is often a lack of effective administration. This can obstruct the implementation of education reforms. Further, within post-conflict societies the civil society may be disorganised and focused more on oppositional politics than on policy development (Buckland, 2006; World Bank, 2005). Another challenge relates to the unpredictability and constraint of financial flows.

Substantially destructive effects of conflict can also impose significant burdens on education reconstruction within post-conflict contexts. A number of related challenges relate to insufficient domestic revenue to operate the education system, a severe shortage of qualified teachers, an oversupply of under-qualified teachers, a lack of skills training for youth, poor record keeping, a high rate of illiteracy, corruption, and a lack of accountability and transparency in educational management (Buckland, 2006; O'Malley, 2010; Seitz, 2004; World Bank, 2005).

To illustrate the long-term legacy of conflict on education reconstruction, O'Malley (2010) identified five broad outcomes. First, teachers and education personnel are often murdered or flee overseas during armed conflict because of their connection with a state authority. This situation eventuated in many conflict-affected countries, including Burundi, Cambodia, Columbia, Pakistan, Rwanda, Sudan and Thailand (O'Malley, 2010; Seitz, 2004; UNESCO, 2011; World Bank, 2005). These circumstances can not only impede education provision during conflict, but can also impose a considerable impediment on education reconstruction (Buckland, 2006; O'Malley, 2010; Smith, 2009, 2010; UNESCO, 2011; World Bank, 2005) through both a shortage of trained teachers and an oversupply of under-qualified or unqualified teachers (Buckland, 2006; UNESCO, 2011; World Bank, 2005). Further, those teachers remaining can often experience psychological trauma and may also lack motivation in teaching.

Another long-term effect of conflict on education reconstruction in post-conflict settings relates to students and their learning (Buckland, 2006; O'Malley, 2010; Seitz, 2004; Smith, 2010; UNESCO, 2011;

World Bank, 2005). Student enrolment and attendance rates are frequently low during times of conflict as a result of violent attacks and closure of schools. Moreover, the situation does not tend to improve much in the post-conflict environment. The immediate return of children to education after conflict is often not seen as being important by many parents because of the destruction of school facilities, shortage of teachers, and damage to industries, markets and other infrastructure (Justino, 2014; World Bank, 2005). Furthermore, students in such contexts may be traumatised as a result of psychological and physical abuse (O'Malley, 2010; Seitz, 2004; UNESCO, 2011; World Bank, 2005).

Post-conflict nations also regularly confront a lack of education infrastructure to accommodate education recovery (Justino, 2014; O'Malley, 2010; World Bank, 2005). While some schools may be open, others often require substantial rehabilitation or reconstruction, which can take years to accomplish. In this regard, O'Malley (2010) has indicated that in Sierra Leone education infrastructure was largely destroyed during its years of conflict, and 60 percent of primary schools and 40 percent of secondary schools needed major reconstruction three years after the conflict ended. Additionally, many schools in post-conflict contexts may lack basic classroom facilities and such resources as desks, chairs, textbooks, chalk, and blackboards, and there can often also be a shortage of proper toilets, clean water and electricity (O'Malley, 2010).

A further complication is that education systems in post-conflict contexts tend to be highly centralised and may lack transparency (O'Malley, 2010; World Bank, 2005). This situation can be attributed to a shortage of technical expertise and capacity to implement education reforms because of the lack of teachers and of education officials (Brown, 2011; Buckland, 2006; Justino, 2014; O'Malley, 2010; World Bank, 2005). Furthermore, education records and information systems are often poorly managed because of the destruction of government institutions, including teacher training colleges (O'Malley, 2010; World Bank, 2005). As a result, education reconstruction can lead to grievances emerging over perceived inequality in the provision of resources (Smith, 2010).

The situation may be compounded because people in post-conflict contexts can suffer a great deal from symbolic effects. This refers to psychological effects of and social experiences as a result of violent attacks (O'Malley, 2010). These violent attacks can result in high levels of fear

and anxiety for students during the course of conflict, which can have a negative impact on learning (O'Malley, 2010; Seitz, 2004; World Bank, 2005). Teachers and education officials may also experience negative psychological effects as a result of loss of relatives, colleagues and students during conflict. This situation can, in turn, affect the way teaching is conducted (O'Malley, 2010).

Approaches to Education Reconstruction in Post-conflict Contexts

Given the pervasive impact of conflict, education systems need to be resilient and incorporate policies and strategies that address broad social reconstruction and transformation initiatives, from building peace and social cohesion, to facilitating economic recovery and getting the country on to an accelerated development path (Justino, 2014; Smith, 2010; Weinstein, Freedman, & Hughson, 2007; World Bank, 2005). To this end, the World Bank (2005) provided a framework for approaching the reconstruction of education in such challenging situations. The framework emphasises the undertaking of the following:

- Sound policies and committed leadership at the country level, supported by appropriate expenditure frameworks, effective budget execution, and good governance;
- Adequate operational capacity at all levels, including capacity of communities to participate effectively, and the right incentives so that countries can translate sound policies and strong leadership into effective action;
- Financial resources to scale up programmes that work and measures to ensure that these reach the services delivery level;
- Relentless focus on results and accountability for learning and outcomes, so that policies and programmes are built on the bases of empirical evidence of problems and solutions that work. (World Bank, 2005, p. 30)

If successfully addressed, these could help post-conflict countries to achieve a rapid expansion of education provision and, in particular, primary school education.

Studies also point to specific areas of education policy and practice in post-conflict contexts that require special attention. One area is that of physical reconstruction. This refers to such matters as the construction of education facilities, engaging in emergency repair strategies, providing for needs associated with refugee education, and solving issues to do with landmine safety (Arnhold, Bekker, Kersh, McLeish, & Phillips, 1996; Justino, 2014; O'Malley, 2010; Smith, 2010; World Bank, 2005). Reconstruction could provide a sense of normalcy and encourage children and teachers to return to school. Also, good governance of education systems could provide an important pathway to achieving equity, inclusion and social cohesion (Smith, 2010; World Bank, 2005). It should include encouraging responsible control of education systems, adopting transparent practices for funding, procurement and employment, and promoting accountability and ownership (Smith, 2010; World Bank, 2005).

Another area of post-conflict education reconstruction is concerned with identity factors important for understanding conflict (Arnhold et al., 1996; Bush & Saltarelli, 2000; Davies, 2005; Smith, 2010). Given that education can generate conflict, special consideration should be given to aspects of education that are closely linked to identity formation. In particular, four aspects warrant attention. These are separate schooling, language policies, faith-based education, and civic and citizenship education (Bush & Saltarelli, 2000; Davies, 2005; Smith, 2005). If successfully developed and implemented, these aspects of education could promote positive values of tolerance and respect for diversity, inclusiveness, and peace building.

A further area of education reconstruction that requires special attention relates to the curriculum (Arnhold et al., 1996; O'Malley, 2010; Smith, 2010; UNESCO, 2011; World Bank, 2005). This can require strong and clear political leadership, authentic consultation and considerable technical expertise (World Bank, 2005). Therefore, comprehensive training is critical for relevant education stakeholders, including teachers. The focus should be on learning activities, teaching approaches, and resources. On this, Smith (2010) indicated that education reform frequently pays particular attention to three factors, namely modernising the curriculum, replacing existing textbooks, and improving the quality

of teaching through improved teaching approaches and investment in teacher education. In addition, the curriculum should promote the teaching of history and the role of peace education and democracy, and address issues associated with loss of morale and confidence, as well as those associated with depression and trauma (Brown, 2011; Smith, 2005; UNESCO, 2011; Weinstein et al., 2007; World Bank, 2005). Some researchers also suggest that the area should be combined with identity reconstruction in the curriculum (Weinstein et al., 2007).

Yet another area of reconstruction in post-conflict education that warrants careful attention is concerned with teachers and teacher education. Teachers play a most important role in education reconstruction and especially in determining the quality of learning (Smith, 2010; World Bank, 2005). In particular, they can have an impact on values and thus make a significant contribution to constructing social identity. Therefore, education reconstruction should strive to promote the status of teaching within society by addressing issues relating to qualifications, teacher preparation and development, rates of pay, and terms and conditions of employment (Smith, 2010; World Bank, 2005). It should also focus on issues associated with diversity-sensitive recruitment and deployment by ensuring there is adequate recruitment of male and female teachers from different ethnic groups, where relevant, and an adequate supply of teachers (O'Malley, 2010; Smith, 2010; World Bank, 2005).

Notwithstanding the great efforts shown by post-conflict governments and the international community in reconstructing education, some researchers have argued that education reconstruction in post-conflict settings can lack sensitivity to local issues when education proposals are being introduced (O'Malley, 2010; Weinstein et al., 2007). The needs and voices of the most affected groups, including children, parents, teachers and school leaders, are often not sufficiently reflected in associated education development plans (Weinstein et al., 2007). The content of the curriculum and the teaching approaches proposed may not, as a result, address the practical concerns of key stakeholders. In this connection, it has been concluded that the absence of stakeholder representation at meetings on important policy initiatives can be a factor contributing to a failure to achieve Education for All (EFA) (World Bank, 2005).

The reconstruction of education in post-conflict societies is also often more informed by theoretical assumptions than by rigorous research-based evidence (Paulson & Rappleye, 2007; Tomlinson & Benefield, 2005). This can mean that those paying attention to theoretical positions do not consider the situation where education projects are being executed. Also, those paying attention to practical insights often ignore the theoretical positions which could provide guidance in the formation and execution of education reconstruction. Therefore, more critically-informed and policy-relevant research in this emerging area of inquiry is desirable (Davies, 2005; Novelli & Lopes Cardozo, 2008; Paulson, 2011; Paulson & Rappleye, 2007).

The literature further indicates that priority is often given to the reconstruction of basic education over other levels of education (Buckland, 2006; World Bank, 2005). This raises concern about the need to ensure balanced development of education systems by equally supporting the reconstruction of secondary school education, and technical, vocational and adult education (World Bank, 2005). There is sometimes also a lack of opportunity for children and youth whose education was interrupted during conflict to return to school (Justino, 2014; World Bank, 2005). This calls for an expansion of education beyond basic formal education. Accordingly, those influencing education reconstruction could advocate for the implementation of non-formal education to provide social training programmes and life skills' training for youth so that they can participate in economic activities (Justino, 2014).

Portrait of School Leadership in Post-conflict Contexts

School leaders in post-conflict contexts work under extraordinarily challenging circumstances in their day-to-day work. Clarke and O'Donoghue (2013b) have focused on three main learning agendas in seeking to portray the complexities and challenges involved. These are 'organisational learning', 'teacher learning' and 'student learning'. Each of these areas is now considered.

Organisational Learning

A number of factors have influenced the way in which leaders at the individual school level in post-conflict contexts operate their organisational learning agenda. The first relates to the external environment. Clarke and O'Donoghue (2013b) indicate that school leaders tend to exercise their leadership within the parameters of the broad education system. This determines what they can do within their schools to deal with the turbulent circumstances that characterise post-conflict contexts. Some studies illustrate that school leaders in post-conflict countries have limited discretion and inclination to lead and manage their schools. Maebuta (2013), for example, reports that school leaders in the Solomon Islands work in a dysfunctional education system which constrains their ability to deal with challenges resulting from ethnic conflict in the country.

Davies (2013) illustrates how school leaders in Angola have struggled to promote the capacity of their schools and communities in an education system which has been influenced by political and economic inequality and a widespread culture of corruption. She points especially to the corruption involved in the use of oil and other resources, by the government and to political tensions around this that have developed over many years, all of which have a negative influence on the education system in the country. Datoo and Johnson (2013) explored the complexity of school leadership following the post-2007 election violence in Kenya, which changed the way in which education in the country operates. School leaders had to face a wide range of challenges, including the displacement of students and teachers, a need for trained counsellors, and very limited resources.

Another factor that can constrain the exercise of leadership at the individual school level in post-conflict contexts is the school-specific situation. The challenge here is with "providing the appropriate conditions and opportunities for bringing to fruition the hidden capital of everyone associated with the organisation" (Clarke & O'Donoghue, 2013b, p. 194). There is also the importance of school culture, which can either promote or impede school improvement plans. Datoo and Johnson (2013), for instance, indicate that school leaders in Kenya have striven to

challenge cultural issues concerning ethnic tension, fear, aggression, and prejudice. This situation is similar to that in the Solomon Islands. In this context, Maebuta (2013) has reported that school leaders in multi-ethnic schools fear the return of ethnic violence and thus community gatherings are avoided. Such a situation can have a very negative impact on schooling, resulting in low and uneven access to education, high levels of student dropout, and low levels of learning achievement (Maebuta, 2013).

Lack of basic physical infrastructure can also limit the capacity of school leaders in post-conflict contexts to create a productive organisational learning agenda (Clarke & O'Donoghue, 2013b). For example, Beck and Araujo (2013) indicate that schools in Timor-Leste largely depend on outside agencies for the provision of all their needs, ranging from buildings to basic classroom materials and facilities, including desks, chairs, blackboards, and chalk. These authors emphasised that school leaders are challenged by "inadequate sanitation, lack of basic furniture, poor playing areas and an absence of technological resources that would help them to provide a more holistic education for their students" (Beck & Araujo, 2013, p. 171). A similar situation is found in Sri Lanka, a post-conflict, as well as a post-tsunami nation. Here, as Earnest (2013) has reported, school buildings are not equipped with such basic resources as water, latrines and sanitation facilities. In the case of post-conflict Lebanon, Maadad (2013) has noted that school leaders work in very challenging circumstances, as evidenced by a lack of basic classroom facilities, including desks, chairs, and blackboards.

Teacher Learning

The organisational learning agenda can shape the development of the professional and intellectual capacities of teachers. On this, Clarke and O'Donoghue (2013b) note that discussion on teacher learning in post-conflict contexts needs to be conducted by considering both the macro-level of the education system and the micro-level of the school. As stated already, education systems in post-conflict settings can experience a shortage of trained teachers and an oversupply of under-qualified teachers who often experience psychological trauma as a result of conflict

(Buckland, 2006; Clarke & O'Donoghue, 2013b; UNESCO, 2011; World Bank, 2005). Further, they may work under such challenging circumstances as a lack of proper physical buildings, classrooms, classroom resources, electricity, drinking water, internet, and basic amenities (MacBeath & Swaffield, 2013). The situation is often exacerbated by the low level of salaries, leaving some teachers with no option but to seek a second source of income.

School leaders can also play a crucial role in creating an environment that is conducive to the professional and intellectual development of teachers. While recognising the importance of teacher professionalism in the provision of quality education in Angola, Davies (2013) points out that school leaders in this context have struggled to promote an understanding of the importance of professionalism among teachers and to keep them motivated. She highlights that efforts have been constrained by such teacher-related factors as high absenteeism, sexual harassment, drunkenness, corruption, and the long distances between teachers' homes and their schools (Davies, 2013). Maadad (2013) also offered an insight into teacher professionalism in Lebanon, stating that school leaders in this context have struggled to provide support for teachers who have difficulties in adopting the learner-centred approaches recommended in the school curriculum. On post-conflict Timor-Leste, Beck and Araujo (2013) have indicated that teachers are often absent from school and tend largely to teach their students using exclusively teacher-centred approaches.

Student Learning

Students' learning in post-conflict contexts can be constrained as a result of their experience of trauma associated with psychological and physical abuse during conflict (Clarke & O'Donoghue, 2013b; O'Malley, 2010; Seitz, 2004; UNESCO, 2011; World Bank, 2005). Maadad (2013), for example, has explained as follows how war in Lebanon left many people, and especially students, psychologically traumatised:

> An entire society still lives in denial. Some do not talk about what happened, some are afraid to return to their villages and original homes and

> some are disabled physically and scared. Others are still grieving the loss of family members, friends and neighbours, and others yet again are refusing to even step outside of their homes. (p. 134)

This observation concurs with that of Earnest (2013), who reported that the impact of conflict and a tsunami in Sri Lanka placed many students in difficult situations, including displacement, loss of family, physical abuses, exploitation and violence. She also highlighted the difficulty that school leaders can face in reintegrating former child soldiers into the schooling system.

While many students in post-conflict contexts have suffered from psychological trauma, little psychological support has been available for them to deal with it. On this, Maadad (2013) indicated that many learners and teachers in Lebanon who were traumatised did not receive any counselling. Similarly, Datoo and Johnson (2013) have reported that some school principals in Kenya were not even able to recognise the psychological effects of conflict on students and teachers. The lack of such awareness, compounded by a shortage of resources and support from relevant authorities, can result in associated issues being unresolved. This situation, in turn, can contribute to generating a hostile learning environment that may encourage violence, misbehaviour, and humiliation.

Educational Leadership in Post-conflict Cambodia

A considerable number of empirical studies have focused on education in post-conflict Cambodia. In regard to this body of work, Ayres (1999, 2003) has provided insightful commentary, with a specific emphasis on the crisis of education in the country. In particular, he examined the disparity between the education system and the economic, political, and cultural contexts. Clayton (2002) examined foreign language policy in the country, explaining the widespread use of the English language in Cambodia, alongside French efforts to counteract its spread in favour of French. Dy and Ninomiya (2003) reviewed education policies and strate-

gies to explain the progress and challenges of basic education development and change in Cambodia in the 1990s.

Chhinh and Dy (2009) investigated the context of education change and associated processes at the basic education level in Cambodia. Their findings indicated that the government made significant progress, in providing physical infrastructure and access to education. However, they also indicated a lack of political will and commitment to allocate an adequate budget for education development, with the result that the quality of education suffered (Chhinh & Dy, 2009). Keng (2009) also reported on the failure of the government to take seriously the official comprehensive education change-agenda in order to improve the quality of education. Further, while acknowledging the efforts of government to implement the three education priorities, namely, ensuring equitable access to education, increasing the quality and efficiency of education, and promoting institutional development and capacity building for decentralisation, Tan (2007) reported a number of barriers related to low enrolment, high dropout rates, and high repetition rates. These include the high cost of schooling, unofficial school fees, lack of transparency, and lack of accountability.

Very few empirical studies with a specific focus on educational leadership in the post-conflict era, however, have been undertaken in Cambodia. Shoraku (2006) conducted a study aimed at generating an understanding of the impact that culture has had on education change in the public schools. Lim (2008) investigated the extent to which secondary school principals in Phnom Penh used instructional practices in their daily school operations. More recently, Long (2014) assessed the leadership development needs of school principals and deputy principals at the primary school level. The next chapter is one of the three chapters presented in relation to a major related study conducted by the current authors.

References

Arnhold, N., Bekker, J., Kersh, N., McLeish, E., & Phillips, D. (1996, June). *Education for reconstruction – Report for the overseas development administration*. Oxford, UK/London: DFID.

Asuga, G., Eacott, S., & Scevak, J. (2015). School leadership preparation and development in Kenya. *International Journal of Educational Management, 29*(3), 355–367.

Ayres, D. (1999). The Khmer rouge and education: Beyond the discourse of destruction. *History of Education, 28*(2), 205–218.

Ayres, D. (2003). *Anatomy of a crisis: Education, development, and the state in Cambodia 1953–1998*. Chiang Mai, Thailand: Silkworm Books.

Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organisational Psychology, 8*(1), 9–32.

Beck, M., & Araujo, S. (2013). Timor-Leste: The now in the not yet of school leadership. In S. Clarke & T. O'Donoghue (Eds.), *School level leadership in post-conflict societies: The importance of context* (pp. 159–174). London/New York: Routledge.

Bennis, W. G., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: HarperCollins.

Blanchard, K. H. (1985). *SLII: A situational approach to managing people*. Escondido, CA: Blanchard Training and Development.

Brown, G. K. (2011). The influence of education on violent conflict and peace: Inequality, opportunity and the management of diversity. *Prospects, 41*(2), 191–204.

Buckland, P. (2006). Post-conflict education: time for a reality check? In M. Couldrey & T. Morris (Eds.), *Forced migration review. Supplement. education and conflict: Research, policy and practice* (pp. 7–8). Oxford, UK: University of Oxford, Refugee Studies Centre.

Bush, K. D., & Saltarelli, D. (2000). *The two faces of education in ethnic conflict towards a peacebuilding education for children*. Florence: UNICEF.

Bush, T. (2007). Educational leadership and management: Theory, policy, and practice. *South African Journal of Education, 27*(3), 391–406.

Bush, T. (2008). *Leadership and management in education*. Los Angeles/London/New Delhi, India/Singapore: Sage.

Bush, T. (2009). Leadership development and school improvement: Contemporary issues in leadership development. *Educational Review, 61*(4), 375–389.

Bush, T. (2011). Succession planning and leadership development for school principals: Comparing English and South African approaches. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 41*(6), 785–800.

Bush, T. (2012). International perspectives on leadership development: Making a difference. *Professional Development in Education, 38*(4), 663–678.

Bush, T. (2014). Educational leadership and leadership development in Africa: Building the knowledge base. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 42*(6), 787–791.

Bush, T. (2015). Understanding instructional leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 43*(4), 487–489.

Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2003). *School leadership: Concepts and evidence*. Nottingham, UK: National College for School Leadership.

Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2012). Distributed leadership in action: Leading high-performing leadership teams in English schools. *School Leadership & Management, 32*(1), 21–36.

Bush, T., & Heystek, J. (2006). School leadership and management in South Africa: Principals' perception. *International Studies in Educational Administration, 34*(3), 63–76.

Bush, T., & Oduro, G. K. T. (2006). New principals in Africa: Preparation, induction and practice. *Journal of Educational Administration, 44*(4), 359–375.

Bysik, N., Evstigneeva, N., Isaeva, N., Kukso, K., Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2015). A missing link? Contemporary insights into principal preparation and training in Russia. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 35*(3), 331–341.

Chapman, D. W., & Burchfield, S. A. (1994). How headmasters perceive their role: A case study in Botswana. *International Review of Education, 40*(6), 401–419.

Chhinh, S., & Dy, S. S. (2009). Educational reform context and process in Cambodia. In Y. Hirosato & Y. Kitamura (Eds.), *The political economy of educational reforms and capacity development in southeast Asia: Cases of Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam* (pp. 113–129). New York: Springer.

Clarke, S., & O'Donoghue, T. (2013a). The case for studying educational leadership at the individual school level in post-conflict societies. In S. Clarke & T. O'Donoghue (Eds.), *School level leadership in post-conflict societies: The importance of context* (pp. 1–8). London/New York: Routledge.

Clarke, S., & O'Donoghue, T. (2013b). Educational leadership in post-new war societies: Insights from the field into challenges and possibilities. In S. Clarke & T. O'Donoghue (Eds.), *School level leadership in post-conflict societies: The importance of context* (pp. 192–207). London/New York: Routledge.

Clayton, T. (2002). Language choice in a nation under transition: The struggle between English and French in Cambodia. *Language Policy, 1*(1), 3–25.

Cravens, X. C., & Hallinger, P. (2012). School leadership and change in East Asia: Building capacity for education reform. *Peabody Journal of Education, 87*(2), 157–161.

Cuban, L. (1988). *The managerial imperative and the practice of leadership in schools*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Datoo, A. A., & Johnson, D. (2013). Kenya: School leadership and the 2007 post-election violence. In S. Clarke & T. O'Donoghue (Eds.), *School level leadership in post-conflict societies: The importance of context* (pp. 95–109). London/New York: Routledge.

Davies, L. (2005). Evaluating the link between conflict and education. *Journal of Peacebuilding & Development, 2*(2), 42–58.

Davies, L. (2013). Angola: Fostering teacher professionalism and safe schools. In S. Clarke & T. O'Donoghue (Eds.), *School level leadership in post-conflict societies: The importance of context* (pp. 30–48). London/New York: Routledge.

Dimmock, C., & Walker, A. (1998). Towards comparative educational administration: Building the case for a cross-cultural school-based approach. *Journal of Educational Administration, 36*(4), 379–401.

Dimmock, C., & Walker, A. (2000). Globalisation and societal culture: Redefining schooling and school leadership in the twenty-first century. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 30*(3), 303–312.

Donkor, A. K. (2015). Basic school leaders in Ghana: How equipped are they? *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 18*(2), 225–238.

Dy, S. S., & Ninomiya, A. (2003). Basic education in Cambodia: The impact of UNESCO on policies in the 1990s. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 11*, 48.

Earnest, J. (2013). Sri Lanka: School leadership in the conflict-affected north and east. In S. R. P. Clarke & T. A. O'Donoghue (Eds.), *School level leadership in post-conflict societies: The importance of context* (pp. 64–77). London/New York: Routledge.

Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gamage, D. T., & Sooksomchitra, P. (2004). Decentralisation and school-based management in Thailand. *International Review of Education, 50*(3), 291–308.

Glewwe, P. (2014). Overview of education issues in developing countries. In P. Glewwe (Ed.), *Education policy in developing countries* (pp. 1–12). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Glewwe, P., & Kremer, M. (2006). Schools, teachers, and education outcomes in developing countries. In E. A. Hanushek & F. Welch (Eds.), *Handbook of the economics of education* (Vol. 1, pp. 945–1017). Amsterdam: Elsevier Science.

Graeff, C. L. (1997). Evolution of situational leadership theory: A critical review. *The Leadership Quarterly, 8*(2), 153–170.

Greenfield, W. D. (2004). Moral leadership in schools. *Journal of Educational Administration, 42*(2), 174–196.

Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 33*(3), 329–352.

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.

Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning: Lessons from 40 years of empirical research. *Journal of Educational Administration, 49*(2), 125–142.

Hallinger, P., & Chen, J. (2014). Review of research on educational leadership and management in Asia: A comparative analysis of research topics and methods, 1995–2012. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 43*(1), 5–27.

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

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1998). Exploring the principal's contribution to school effectiveness 1980–1995. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 9*(2), 157–191.

Hallinger, P., & Kantamara, P. (2000). Educational change in Thailand: Opening a window onto leadership as a cultural process. *School Leadership & Management, 20*(2), 189–205.

Harber, C., & Dadey, A. (1993). The job of the headteachers in Africa: Research and reality. *International Journal of Education Development, 13*(2), 147–160.

Harber, C., & Davies, L. (1997). *School management and effectiveness in developing countries: The post-bureaucratic school*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. G. (1992). *Understanding teacher development*. New York: Continuum International Publishing.

Hargreaves, D. H. (1995). School culture, school effectiveness and school improvement. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 6*(1), 23–46.

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

Herriot, A., Crossley, M., Juma, M., Waudo, J., Mwirotsi, M., & Kamau, A. (2002). The development and operation of headteacher support groups in Kenya: A mechanism to create pockets of excellence, improve the provision of quality education and target positive changes in the community. *International Journal of Educational Development, 22*(5), 509–526.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1977). *Management of organisation behaviour* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Jacobson, S. L., & Ylimaki, R. M. (2011). Comparative perspectives: An overview of seven educational contexts. In R. M. Ylimaki & S. L. Jacobson (Eds.), *US and cross-national policies, practices, and preparation: Implications for successful instructional leadership, organisational learning, and culturally responsive practices* (pp. 1–16). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Johnson, D., & Van Kalmthout, E. (2006). Editorial. *Education and conflict: Research, policy and practice*. Forced Immigration Review.

Justino, P. (2014). Barriers to education in conflict-affected countries and policy opportunities. In*Paper commissioned for Fixing the Broken Promise of Education for All: Findings from the global initiative on out-of-school children (UIS/ UNICEF, 2015)*. Montreal, Canada: UNESCO.

Keng, C. (2009). Basic education in Cambodia: Quality and equity. In Y. Hirosato & Y. Kitamura (Eds.), *The political economy of educational reforms and capacity development in southeast Asia: Cases of Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam* (pp. 131–152). New York: Springer.

Kitavi, M. W., & Van Der Westhuizen, P. C. (1997). Problems facing beginning principals in developing countries: A study of beginning principals in Kenya. *International Journal of Educational Development, 17*(3), 251–263.

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

Leithwood, K., Janttzi, D., & Steinbach, R. (1998). Leadership and other conditions which foster organisational learning in schools. In K. Leithwood & K. S. Lousis (Eds.), *Organisational learning in schools* (pp. 67–92). Lisse, The Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (1999). Transformational school leadership effects: A replication. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 10*(4), 451–479.

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2006). Transformational school leadership for large-scale reform: Effects on students, teachers, and their classroom practices. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 17*(2), 201–227.

Leithwood, K., & Massey, L. (2010). Developing leadership to improve student outcomes. In B. Davies & M. Brundrett (Eds.), *Developing successful leadership* (pp. 77–98). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Lim, P. (2008). *Analysis of principals' instructional leadership behaviour in selected Cambodian secondary schools*. Master thesis, De La Salle University.

Long, N. (2014). *Leadership development needs of Cambodian primary school principals and deputy principals.* Master thesis, Unitec Institute of Technology.

Louis, K. S., Dretzke, B., & Wahlstrom, K. (2010). How does leadership affect student achievement? Results from a national US survey. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 21*(3), 315–336.

Lunenburg, F. C., & Ornstein, A. C. (2007). *Educational administration: Concepts and practices* (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.

Maadad, N. (2013). Lebanon: Post-civil war implications for schools. In S. Clarke & T. O'Donoghue (Eds.), *School level leadership in post-conflict societies: The importance of context* (pp. 127–144). London/New York: Routledge.

Macbeath, J., & Swaffield, S. (2013). Ghana: Resolving the tensions between colonial value and contemporary policies. In S. Clarke & T. O'Donoghue (Eds.), *School level leadership in post-conflict societies: The importance of context* (pp. 49–77). London/New York: Routledge.

Maebuta, J. (2013). Solomon Islands: Adaptive leadership strategies in schools. In S. Clarke & T. O'Donoghue (Eds.), *School level leadership in post-conflict societies: The importance of context* (pp. 110–126). London/New York: Routledge.

Miller, T. W., & Miller, J. M. (2001). Educational leadership in the new millennium: A vision for 2020. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 4*(2), 181–189.

Mitchell, R. (2015). The implications of school improvement and school effectiveness research for primary school principals in Ethiopia. *Educational Review, 67*(3), 328–342.

Nawab, A. (2011). Exploring leadership practices in rural context of a developing country. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 1*(3), 181–189.

Niqab, M., Sharma, S., Wei, L. M., & Maulod, S. B. A. (2014). Instructional leadership potential among school principals in Pakistan. *International Education Studies, 7*(6), 74–85.

Northouse, P. G. (2007). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Northouse, P. G. (2013). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (6th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Novelli, M., & Lopes Cardozo, M. T. A. (2008). Conflict, education and the global south: New critical directions. *International Journal of Educational Development, 28*(4), 473–488.

O'Donoghue, T., & Clarke, S. (2010). *Leading learning: Process, themes and issues in international contexts*. London/New York: Routledge.

O'Malley, B. (2010). *The longer-term impact of attacks on education on education systems, development and fragility and the implications for policy responses*. Paper commissioned for the EFA Global Monitoring Report 2011, The hidden crisis: Armed conflict and education. Retrieved from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0019/001912/191226e.pdf

Okoko, J. M., Scott, S., & Scott, D. E. (2015). Perceptions of school leaders in Nairobi about their leadership preparation and development. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 18*(3), 279–304.

Onguko, B. B., Abdalla, M., & Webber, C. F. (2012). Walking in unfamiliar territory. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 48*(1), 86–115.

Oplatka, I. (2004). The principalship in developing countries: Context, characteristics and reality. *Comparative Education, 40*(3), 427–448.

Paulson, J. (2011). Introduction: Education, conflict and development. In J. Paulson (Ed.), *Education, conflict and development* (pp. 7–14). Oxford: Symposium Books.

Paulson, J., & Rappleye, J. (2007). Education and conflict: Essay review. *International Journal of Educational Development, 27*(3), 340–347.

Rhodes, C., & Brundrett, M. (2009). Leadership development and school improvement. *Education Review, 61*(4), 361–374.

Rogers, F. H., & Vegas, E. (2010). Teachers in developing countries. In P. Peterson, E. Baker, & B. McGaw (Eds.), *International encyclopaedia of education* (3rd ed., pp. 504–511). Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Rost, J. (1991). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. New York: Praeger.

Seitz, K. (2004, December). *Education and conflict: The role of education in the creation, prevention and resolution of societal crises – Consequences for development cooperation*. Bonn, Germany/Eschborn, Germany: Deutsche Gesellschaft fur Technische Zusammenarbeit.

Shoraku, A. (2006). School leadership and management in Cambodia: National culture and its impacts on leading educational changes. *Journal of International Cooperation, 13*(3), 111–142.

Smith, A. (2005). Education in the twenty-first century: Conflict, reconstruction and reconciliation1. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 35*(4), 373–391.

Smith, A. (2009). *Education and conflict. Think piece commissioned for the EFA Global Monitoring Report 2011, The hidden crisis: Armed conflict and education*. Retrieved from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0019/001913/191338e.pdf

Smith, A. (2010). *The influence of education on conflict and peace*. Paper commissioned for the EFA Global Monitoring Report 2011, The hidden crisis: Armed conflict and education. Retrieved from http://unesco.atlasproject.eu/unesco/file/08577c2a-f356-4c63-93b1-a72cc7ce2e27/c8c7fe00-c770-11e1-9b21-0800200c9a66/191341e.pdf

Spillane, J. P. (2005). Distributed leadership. *The Educational Forum, 69*(2), 143–150.

Stogdill, R. M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership: A survey of the literature*. New York: Free Press.

Su, Z., Adams, J. P., & Mininberg, E. (2000). Profiles and preparation of urban school principals: A comparative study in the United States and china. *Education and Urban Society, 32*(4), 455–480.

Su, Z., Gamage, D., & Mininberg, E. (2003). Professional preparation and development of school leaders in Australia and the USA. *International Education Journal, 4*(1), 42–59.

Sumintono, B., Sheyoputri, E. Y. A., Jiang, N., Misbach, I. H., & Jumintono. (2015). Becoming a principal in Indonesia: Possibility, pitfalls and potential. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 35*(3), 342–352.

Tan, C. (2007). Education reforms in Cambodia: Issues and concerns. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, *6*(1), 15–24. http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0019/001912/191226e.pdf

Taylor, P. (1994). Leadership in education. *Emergency Librarian, 21*(3), 9.

Tekleselassie, A. (2002). The deprofessionalisation of school principalship: Implications for reforming school leadership in Ethiopia. *International Studies in Educational Administration, 30*(3), 57–64.

Tomlinson, K., & Benefield, P. (2005). *Education and conflict: Research and research possibilities*. Slough, UK: National Foundation for Educational Research.

UNDP. (2003). *Human Development Report 2003 – Millennium Development Goals: A compact among nations to end human poverty*. New York: UNDP.

UNESCO. (2002). *EFA Global Monitoring Report 2002: Is the world on track?* Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO. (2011). *EFA Global Monitoring Report 2011: The hidden crisis – Armed conflict and education*. Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO. (2015). *EFA Global Monitoring Report 2015: Education for all 2000–2015 – Achievements and challenges*. Paris: UNESCO.

Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A. G. (2007). The role of the situation in leadership. *American Psychologist, 62*(1), 17–24.

Wart, M. V. (2003). Public-sector leadership theory: An assessment. *Public Administration Review, 63*(2), 214–228.

Weinstein, H. M., Freedman, S. W., & Hughson, H. (2007). School voices: Challenges facing education systems after identity-based conflicts. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice, 2*(1), 41–71.

World Bank. (2005). *Reshaping the future: Education and post-conflict reconstruction*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Yukl, G. (1982). *Managerial leadership and the effective principals*. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED224179.pdf

Yukl, G. (1989). Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. *Journal of Management, 15*(2), 251–289.

Yukl, G. A. (2012). *Leadership in organisations* (8th ed.). Harlow, UK: Pearson Education.