KIM BESWICK

17. MANIFESTATIONS OF LEADERSHIP IN DIVERSE EDUCATIONAL SETTINGS

Leadership is fundamentally about influence. In the context of organisations it concerns influencing a group of people towards a shared goal (Northouse, 2010). Categorisations and characterisations of leadership are myriad with each offering particular insights and directing attention differentially to aspects of the contexts in which leadership is described, as well as to characteristics, including behaviours, of leaders and followers in that context. In this chapter attention is necessarily confined to those concepts from the leadership literature that are either explicitly mentioned or implicitly evident in the chapters of this section. Some of the six chapters that comprise this section deal directly with leadership in educational settings ranging from family day care to secondary schools. Others do not explicitly consider leadership but, nevertheless, refer to concepts that are inherently related to or dependent upon leadership. These include, school culture and policies, teamwork and organisational hierarchies, abuse of power, and strength based approaches. The settings are diverse and include primary and secondary schools as well as the maritime environment. Ways in which leadership impacts upon and intersects with school cultures, creativity, and quality teaching—major foci of the chapters—are discussed in light of the chapters themselves and the broader literature.

CONCEPTUALISATIONS OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

This section begins with some general observations about leadership as it relates to the chapters of this section before discussing the various conceptions of leadership that feature. The discussion is presented broadly in the order that the various approaches to leadership have become prominent in the literature. In general the trend has been away from a focus on the leader as an individual (e.g., leadership personality in Stodgill, 1948, cited in Northouse, 2010) to the leader in context (e.g., situational leadership in Hersey & Blanchard, 1969) and in relation to others (e.g., transactional leadership in Burns, 1978). Increasingly leadership research has focussed on the role of followers in shaping leadership and on the mutual impacts of leadership on both leaders and followers. For example, transformational leadership (Bass, 1990) and pedagogical leadership (Heikka & Waniganayake, 2011). As the chapters in this section illustrate this does not mean that earlier theories of leadership are no longer considered, rather newer approaches

S. Fan & J. Fielding-Wells (Eds.), What is Next in Educational Research? 185–195.
© 2016 Sense Publishers. All rights reserved.

have added additional insights into the complex nature and role of leadership while established ideas have continued to be useful and employed in a range of contexts including education (e.g., situational leadership in Mulford, Silins, & Leithwood, 2004).

At the broadest level leadership has been conceptualised in terms of either the (usually inborn) traits of the leader or as a process where the emphasis is on the leader's behaviours which in general can be learned (Northouse, 2010). All of the chapters in this section present or imply process models of leadership. In addition, leadership in all but one of the chapters, that by Nailon, Beswick and Stephenson, describes or implies leadership that is associated with the leader's position in an organisation, rather than that which emerges from the behaviours of an individual, regardless of their position, and the consequent responses of others. Nailon et al. are alone in describing a particular type of leadership, namely pedagogical leadership.

Situational Leadership in the Maritime Environment

The merchant shipping environment that forms the context of the chapter by Fan, Fei, Schriever and Fan is characterised by a hierarchical crew structure with ship Master as the overall leader. Theotokas, Lagoudis and Kotsiopoulos (2014) noted that this structure is supported by the legal context in which ships operate. In the past when a ship at sea was largely without connection to the outside world authoritarian approaches to leadership were usual but with improved communication ship Masters are able to adopt other leadership styles. Theotokas and colleagues posited situational leadership as the best tool for their examination of the leadership of ship Masters.

Situational leadership recognises the importance of both task and relationship aspects of the leader's role. Hersey and Blanchard (1969) described these as concern for production (or task) and concern for people and presented them as two axes varying from low to high that formed what they termed a "managerial grid" (later renamed in terms of leadership rather than management) comprising four quadrants. Each of the quadrants defined a particular leadership style. Hersey and Blanchard labelled them Impoverished (low task, low people), Country club (low task, high people), Team (high task, high people), and Task (high task, low people). The appropriate style for the leader to adopt depends upon what Hersey and Blanchard termed the maturity of those being led. Mulford and his colleagues (2004) described maturity in terms of followers' ability (skill, knowledge and experience) and willingness (motivation, commitment, and confidence) to take responsibility for what needs to be done. In a situation such as a ship at sea with an ethnically, culturally and linguistically diverse crew the ship Master requires considerable skill to be able to lead on a basis other than hierarchical power (Theotokas et al.). Theotokas et al. noted that weak interpersonal competence among seafarers is a reason for the prevalence of authoritarian leadership in that context

but that, at the same time, the diverse nature of crews and the inherent stresses of living and working together in relative isolation mean that more relationally focussed leadership approaches are needed. This is key to the establishing the sense of teamwork to which Fan et al. refer in their chapter.

In such a context Fan et al.'s contribution of a framework of communicative competence has the potential to assist ship Masters to better assess crew members' 'maturity' in relation to particular tasks in specific situations and thus to adjust their leadership style appropriately. It encourages an holistic understanding of communication that draws on a synthesis of relevant literature and encompasses knowledge, process and use aspects of communicative competence by considering competencies across linguistic, intercultural, psycholinguistic, strategic an pragmatic domains. Effective communication between designated leaders and crew as well as between crew at the same level will open possibilities for leadership styles that go beyond the authoritarian styles that are predominant in seafaring contexts and facilitate approaches that place greater emphasis on relationships and the development of a shared vision and sense of purpose.

Transformational Leadership and Its Potential for Misuse

Although the chapters by Burgess and Williamson, Heath, J-F and Swabey, and Galloway, Reynolds and Williamson refer to leadership only incidentally, if at all, each includes evidence of the impact of school leaders on school culture or vision. The ways in which leadership is conceived are thus not clear but because of its impacts on culture, leadership that could be characterised, at least to some extent, as transformational seems likely.

Transformational leadership who described in terms of four factors by Bass, Avolio, Jung and Berson (2003). These (1) *Idealised influence* whereby the leader evokes trust and respect among followers, provides vision, and acts ethically, consistent with underlying values; (2) *Inspirational motivation* through meaningful challenge, enthusiasm and optimism; (3) *Intellectual stimulation* by questioning assumptions, and encouraging creativity and innovation; and (4) *Individualised consideration* by taking on the role of a mentor or coach in attending to the individual needs and aspirations of followers. Despite its wide use transformational leadership has been criticised for a lack of conceptual clarity and for purporting to be a process rather than trait approach to leadership even though some of the factors appear to be related to the leaders' personality. Indeed in earlier work (e.g., Bass, 1990) idealised influence was referred to as charisma – a quality commonly associated with extroverted, self-confident personalities who might be described as visionaries. Although Bono and Judge (2004) found that extroversion was associated with leadership behaviours they noted that the association might be reduced by leadership training and cited evidence that transformational leadership can be learned. Northouse (2010) also pointed out the potential for transformational leadership to be misused because it relies on the leader's vision and values being superior to the status quo – something that might

not be the case. It is also not clear how followers can challenge leaders, especially charismatic ones.

The misuse of power associated with positions of leadership in schools is the focus of the chapter by Heath et al. They focus on negative behaviours of school leaders, termed 'ogre' behaviours. These behaviours include "social segregation, exclusion, excessive control and criticism, failure to consult about changes, withholding of information, and manipulation" (Heath et al., p. 223), which are often in forms that are difficult to detect and hence to confront. These leaders use transformational leadership to exercise their influence to further their own agendas and to 'transform' followers in ways that are not necessarily in the followers' own interests or in the interests of the organisation. Heath et al. cite research that has identified jealousy of victims' qualifications or the promotion of subordinates as triggers for ogre behaviour. These triggers suggest character flaws in the leader further highlighting the possible dangers of transformational leadership. The dangers highlight the need for training programs that aim to teach behaviours associated with transformational leadership (Northouse, 2010). A specific example of the positive impacts on followers of training in transformational leadership was provided by Dvir, Eden, Avolio and Shamir (2002). The success of such training is consistent with transformational leadership being a process rather than trait based approach. It may be that such programs could be useful in addressing or preventing the emergence of ogre behaviours among school leaders, and better equip them to deal effectively with the kinds of conflicts that Heath et al. examined.

Pedagogical Leadership

Pedagogical leadership draws upon theories of distributed leadership and has become widely adopted in the early childhood sector (Heikka & Waniganayake, 2011). It has been argued that traditional leadership theories that emphasise an individual positional leader are not a good fit with the collaborative culture, and focus on success for all that prevails in early childhood contexts (Kagan & Hallmark, 2001). Others (e.g., Colmer, Waniganayake, & Field, 2014) have acknowledged the importance of both the positional leadership of, for example, a child care centre director, and distributed leadership. Colmer et al. (2014) explained that distributed leadership is commonly associated with interdependence and professional learning and, in keeping with this, Nailon et al. focus on professional learning for pedagogical leadership. They adopt the definition of pedagogical leadership provided in Australia's *Early Years Learning Framework* that assigns the role of pedagogical leader to everyone working with young children who actively make decisions about teaching and learning in that context, and who contribute to the development of nurturing relationships. Given the consonance of this definition with others in the literature that take a broad view of pedagogy (e.g., Heikka & Waniganayake, 2011) the relationships referred to are presumably with fellow educators, scheme leaders, and parents as well as with children in their care.

Despite eschewing the visionary positional leader, pedagogical leadership has considerable commonality with transformational leadership in forms that emphasise the impact of leaders on followers. For example, according to Northouse (2010, pp. 185–186) "transformational leaders set out to empower followers and nurture them in change. They attempt to raise the consciousness in individuals and to get them to transcend their own self-interests for the sake of others." Rather than exercising authoritarian leadership, transformational leaders act as role models, listen to followers and consider alternate views, build trust, and foster collaboration. These aspects of transformational leadership appear entirely compatible with pedagogical leadership. It may be that a larger part of the reason for the emergence of pedagogical leadership to describe leadership in early childhood settings than appears to be currently acknowledged in the literature is the reluctance noted by Heikka and Waniganayake (2011) of early childhood educators to take on leadership in overt forms.

Given the predominance of women among employees in the child care sector (97% in the US according to Braslow, Gornick, Smith, Folbre and Presser, 2012), the issue of gender and leadership presents even more starkly in this context than in education generally. Northouse (2010) cites evidence that women's leadership styles are more transformational than those of men suggesting that women might be better suited to leadership roles in modern organisations. The situation is, however, not simple with women experiencing significant opposition from male subordinates when they take on leadership roles and hence being influenced adopt styles that militate against generating antagonism. In addition, the reluctance of early childhood educators to take on leadership roles may well be a special case of the general finding that women are less likely to put themselves forward for such roles. Again the reasons are complex, not well understood and certainly beyond the scope of this chapter to address more substantially other than to flag the issue.

Coupled with early childhood educators' reticence to lead, the tendency noted by Nailon et al., of scheme leaders in their study to see themselves in the role of leader by virtue of their positions is problematic. This suggests that there is much that remains to be learned about implementing pedagogical leadership, or an even an acceptably follower-focussed and collaborative version of transformational leadership, in child care settings. Part of the task is to address the already noted lack of conceptual clarity in relation to transformational leadership and similar difficulties with pedagogical leadership pointed out by Heikka and Waniganayake (2011).

Pedagogical leadership also shares much with forms of leadership advocated in educational contexts beyond early childhood. For example, instructional leadership, curriculum focussed leadership, and pedagogically focussed leadership all emphasise the point made by Robinson (2007), that the school principal's primary task is to ensure that the focus in classrooms is on teaching and learning. All other leadership tasks are means to this end.

LEADERSHIP AND SCHOOL CULTURE

There is extensive literature addressing school cultures including the role of leadership in determining and/or changing cultures. The term culture itself is, however, often used without definition (Fisher & Carlyon, 2015; McKinney, Labat, & Labat, 2015). This is unfortunate given the potentially important dialectical relationship between leadership and organisational culture. Bono and Judge (2004) suggest that the results of laboratory based leadership studies finding a personality basis for transactional and/or transformational leadership may be influenced by the lack of 'culture' in such contexts. In contrast to group discussions in a laboratory context, the organisations in which leadership is exercised are characterised by existing cultures including shared histories. Culture may act to suppress personality linked aspects of leadership (Bono & Judge, 2004). For the purposes of this chapter the definition of culture offered by Northouse (2010, p. 336) namely, "the learned beliefs, values, rules, norms, symbols and traditions that are common to a group of people" is reasonable. This definition bears considerable similarity to that used by McCarthy, Pittaway and Swabey who cite literature linking culture to the values, beliefs, assumptions, and behaviours of school leaders. These definitions appear to encompass the mainly implicit meanings of culture in the relevant literature as well as in the other chapters in this section.

Heath et al. explain that leaders who exhibit ogre behaviours can use policy and procedures to support school cultures in which their ogre behaviours are able to go unchallenged. The majority of leadership research has focussed on the ways in which school leaders can positively influence school cultures. This is also the perspective taken by the other papers in this section. Burgess and Williamson, for example, include in their summary of Australian research on successful school leadership that such leaders contribute to a culture of care, and reported that informants in their study of improving secondary schools often mentioned a culture of professionalism as part of their understanding of quality teaching. Burgess and Williamson do not, however, define these terms nor offer suggestions as to how such cultures might be cultivated. They do, however, refer to Fullan and Hargreaves (2012) notion of professional capital, discussed in the following section, and this has the potential to provide some insights. Nailon et al. also mention a culture of professionalism and similarly provide no definition. They do, however, offer some insights into how such a culture might be built, noting that in their study some educators modelled professional practice and took advantage of networking events to engage in professional conversations with colleagues and scheme managers.

Galloway et al. identify the development of a strengths-based school culture as one of three approaches to strengths-based teaching and learning evident in the literature. Their findings are consistent with the literature in terms of how such a culture could be developed. Specifically, teachers' practice needs to be informed by knowledge of students' strengths, both teachers and students need to share a strengths rather than deficit mindset, and teachers, students and parents must adopt a shared

language around strengths. The importance of language in relation to culture also emerges from Fan et al.'s study of maritime leaders. They most frequently referred to culture in terms of the backgrounds of diverse crew members and noted the link between culture and language. In that context they mention the creation of a culture of safety as an aim of cultural and communication training. They claim that key to such a culture of safety is the establishment of a just culture and an open reporting culture, in which all crew feel able to report incidents and problems knowing that the issues will be dealt with fairly and appropriately. Creating such a culture relies on trust between leaders and followers – a point also made by McCarthy et al. who put the onus of trust on school leaders. That is, school leaders can contribute to the development of what McCarthy et al. term a positive culture by trusting teachers to be innovative and to solve problems. In both the school and maritime environments it seems that trust is crucial to establishing a culture in which followers are empowered to perform at their best.

Johnson et al. (2012, cited in McCarthy et al.) identified four cultural conditions associated with enhancing resilience among early career teachers. These were: promotion of belonging and social connectedness; empowering processes, both formal and informal induction processes; and the development of a professional learning community. Although the term is not used in McCarthy et al.'s chapter these factors may go some way towards unpacking what is meant by a culture of professionalism in schools. In particular, the importance of relationships to building a sense of belonging and social connectedness is consistent with the emphasis on effective communication that is unavoidable in a context in which people of diverse language backgrounds must work together effectively (e.g. the maritime environment described by Fan et al.) but present in more subtle ways in school and family day care contexts in which a common language background might be safely assumed. This appears to be assumed in all of the other chapters of this section although it might not be a safe assumption even for teachers in all schools within Australia and New Zealand. A professional learning community provides an indication of the focus of communication, that is, on mutual learning that will assist teachers/educators collectively to more effectively facilitate students' learning.

LEADERSHIP, CREATIVITY, AND QUALITY TEACHING

One of the four factors that describe transformational leadership is intellectual stimulation that includes encouraging creativity and innovation (Bass et al., 2003). According to the Commonwealth of Australia (2015) innovation is about the creation of new "products, processes and business models…creating a culture that backs good ideas and learns from taking risks and making mistakes" (p. 1). The linking of innovation and creativity underlines the importance of avoiding associating creativity exclusively with the arts curriculum. Rather, as McCarthy et al. point out, creativity should characterise all curriculum areas. Transformational school leaders will ensure that this is the case.

McCarthy et al. adopt Plucker and Beghetto's (2004, p. 156) definition of creativity, namely "the interplay between ability and process by which an individual or group produces an outcome or product that is both novel and useful as defined within some social context." Resilence is defined as a capacity to successfully adapt to challenging situations (Masten, Best, & Garmezy, 1990, cited in McCarthy et al.). According to McCarthy et al. resilient and creative thinkers have in common being flexible, reflective, persistent, optimistic, emotionally intelligent, and courageous. They maintain supportive relationships, act independently, take risks, and see difficult tasks as challenges. They have problem solving skills, high levels of personal efficacy, and a sense of agency.

Some aspects of this list (e.g., tendencies to be reflective, optimistic and persistent) might be considered traits of individuals and hence things that leaders can do little to alter but McCarthy et al. cite evidence that creativity can be taught and suggest that teachers whose creativity is fostered may be more likely to nurture creativity among their students. It may be that just as context, in this case the overall culture of an organisation, might militate against the effects of personality traits on leadership behavior (Bono & Judge, 2004), culture might also diminish the dependence of creativity on the traits of individuals. The responsibility of leaders is, therefore, to promote a culture in which creativity is the norm.

In their study of quality teaching—understood as a collective characteristic of schools rather than a feature of individual teachers—Burgess and Williamson considered the influence of school leaders on a range of teacher capacity domains. They draw on Fullan and Hargreave's (2012) concept of professional capital that represents a broadening of the idea of human capital beyond individual capacities of teachers and school leaders. Fullan and Hargreaves added to human capital the concept of social capital to acknowledge the fact that effective education occurs when students encounter effective teachers one after another, a situation facilitated by teachers and school leaders working together coherently and with a shared vision. Finally, they acknowledged the crucial role that teachers' everyday decisions and judgments play in creating and maintaining effective classrooms by adding decisional capital. The notion of professional capital has potential to inform understandings of what a culture of professionalism (Burgess & Williamson) might be, and what might be the substance of professional conversations (Nailon et al.). Burgess and Williamson make the important finding that, in addition to individual (human), social and decisional capacities, quality teaching in the improving secondary schools that they studied was associated with teachers' innovative capacity. Just as the Commonwealth of Australia (2015) linked innovation and creativity, Burgess and Williamson found evidence in these successful schools of "freedom to pursue new ideas, be creative, and embrace innovative pedagogy."

The qualities of resilient and creative thinkers listed by McCarthy et al. refer to characteristics of individuals but one can readily imagine that individuals with these characteristics would likely have, in addition to substantial human capital, considerable social capital as a result of being flexible, emotionally intelligent,

and maintaining supportive relationships. They might also be expected to have decisional capital as a result of such qualities as high levels of self-efficacy, independence and a sense of agency. Teachers and leaders who are creative thinkers could be expected to have considerable professional capital and vice versa. However, caution is needed because both human and decisional capital are at least in part context specific as Callingham, Beswick and Ferme (2015) illustrated. They used Fullan and Hargreaves (2012) concept of professional capital to analyse three studies of approaches to developing teachers' understanding of numeracy. They found that teachers' human and decisional capitals were limited by their lack of mathematical knowledge. Heikka and Waniganayake (2011, p. 509) similarly noted that "early childhood teachers have a sound knowledge base or expertise in child development, curriculum, early learning and educational pedagogy," thereby acknowledged implicitly the knowledge that underpins leadership in that context.

CONCLUSION

Taken together the chapters in this section highlight commonalities in the leadership literature and suggest that effective leadership in educational settings might be developed in one of three ways, all of which include an emphasis on relational and particularly communicative competence. These are 1) by cultivating the four factors that contribute to transformational leadership (Bass, 1990), 2) by developing the professional capital of all teachers and school leaders, and 3) by enhancing the creative capacity of teachers and school leaders. In terms of the first, the emphasis from pedagogical leadership on collaboration and modelling rather than positional leadership is a useful reminder of a need to emphasise the follower-focussed aspects of transformational leadership. This is especially the case in schools where both teachers and their positional leaders are professionals with a shared responsibility for educating students.

Both transformational leadership and creativity are consistent with innovation – a fact that is timely in Australia given the government's recognition of its centrality to the nation's competitiveness. The addition by Burgess and Williamson of innovative capacity to Fullan and Hargreaves (2012) notion of professional capital adds to the consistency of this notion with both transformational leadership and creativity. Pedagogical leadership and related constructs provide important reminders that the raison d'etre for leadership in any educational context is teaching and learning.

Although not mentioned in any of the chapters of this section and only implicitly referred to in the literature cited here, the exercise of leadership by anyone in a teaching role is dependent upon them having the necessary expertise. This fact becomes increasingly important as the focus moves from broad organisational goals to the day-to-day specific tasks and domains of teaching. A teacher able to exercise pedagogical leadership, or who has adequate professional capital and the capacity to be creative in one context; one in which they have expertise, may not be able to

lead effectively in another. This reminds us of the ongoing relevance of situational leadership.

Education is a difficult and complex business and so it is not surprising that leadership in educational contexts is similarly complex and difficult. The chapters in this section present research that has the potential to move our understandings of educational leadership forward, not by presenting a single or a best way but rather by highlighting the contributions that a diverse range of leadership research and constructs might make to our shared enterprise.

REFERENCES

Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics, 18*(3), 19–31.

Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. I., & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(2), 207–218.

Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2004). Personality and transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(5), 901–910.

Braslow, L., Gornick, J. C., Smith, K., Folbre, N., & Presser, H. B. (2012). *Who's minding their kids? US child care workers child care arrangements: An assessment using SIPP.* Presented at the Population Association of America, New Orleans, LA. Retrieved from http://paa2012.princeton.edu/papers/120870

Burns, J. M., (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.

Callingham, R., Beswick, K., & Ferme, E. (2015). An initial exploration of teachers' numeracy in the context of professional capital. *ZDM Mathematics Education, 47*, 549–560.

Colmer, K., Waniganayake, M., & Field, L. (2014). Leading professional learning in early childhood centres: Who are educational leaders? *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood, 39*(4), 103–113.

Commonwealth of Australia. (2015). *National innovation and science agenda.* Retrieved from http://innovation.gov.au/system/files/case-study/National%20Innovation%20and%20Science%20Agenda%20-%20Report.pdf

Dvir, T., Eden, D., Avolio, B. J., & Shamir, B. (2002). Impact of transformational leadership on follower development and performance: A field experiment. *Academy or Management Journal, 45*(4), 735–744.

Fisher, A., & Carlyon, T. (2015). School leaders growing leadership from within: A framework for the development of school leaders. *Waikato Journal of Education, 19*(2), 93–102.

Fullan, M., & Hargreaves, A. (2012). Reviving teaching with 'professional capital'. *Education Week, 31*(33), 30–36.

Heikka, J., & Waniganayake, M. (2011). Pedagogical leadership from a distributed perspective within the context of early childhood education. *International Journal of Leadership Education, 14*(4), 499–512.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. (1969). Life-cycle theory of leadership. *Training and Development Journal, 23,* 26–34.

Kagan, S. L., & Hallmark, L. G. (2001). Cultivating leadership in early care and education: Reaping the harvest of a new approach to leadership. *Child Care Information Exchange, 7*, 7–11. Retrieved from http://www.waynecc.edu/sherryg/wp-content/uploads/sites/10/Cultivating-Leadership.pdf

McKinney, C. L., Labat, M. B., & Labat, C. A. (2015). Traits possessed by principals who transform school culture in national blue ribbon schools. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal, 19*(1), 152–166.

Mulford, W., Silins, H., & Leithwood, K. (2004). *Educational leadership for organisational learning and improved student outcomes*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.

Northouse, P. G. (2010). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Plucker, J. A., & Beghetto, R. A. (2004). Why creativity is domain general, why it looks domain specific, and why the distinction does not matter. In R. J. Sternberg, E. L. Grigorenko, & J. L. Singer (Eds.), *Creativity: From potential to realization* (pp. 153–167). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Robinson, V. (2007). *The impact of leadership on student outcomes: Making sense of the evidence.* Retrieved from http://research.acer.edu.au/research_conference_2007/5

Theotokas, I., Lagoudis, I. N., & Kotsiopoulos, N. (2014). Leadership profiling of ocean going ship masters. *The Asian Journal of Shipping and Logistics, 30*(3), 321–343.