



UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

***INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP AND DEVELOPMENT OF
INSTRUCTORS AT MALAYSIAN RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES***

MEHRNAZ FAHIMIRAD

FPP 2016 42



**INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP AND DEVELOPMENT OF
INSTRUCTORS AT MALAYSIAN RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES**

By

MEHRNAZ FAHIMIRAD

**Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia,
in Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

October 2016

COPYRIGHT

All material contained within the thesis, including without limitation text, logos, icons, photographs and all other artwork, is copyright material of Universiti Putra Malaysia unless otherwise stated. Use may be made of any material contained within the thesis for non-commercial purposes from the copyright holder. Commercial use of material may only be made with the express, prior, written permission of Universiti Putra Malaysia.

Copyright © Universiti Putra Malaysia



Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfillment
of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

**INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP AND DEVELOPMENT OF
INSTRUCTORS AT MALAYSIAN RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES**

By

MEHRNAZ FAHIMIRAD

October 2016

Chairman : Associate Professor Khairuddin Bin Idris, PhD
Faculty : Educational Studies

From the original idea of the university, changes and developments have deeply affected and shaped universities teaching and learning. As the focus on instructional leadership continues, questions have risen concerning leadership role and identifying capabilities and effective practices of instructional leaders in learning and teaching at Research Universities in Malaysia. Instructional leaders inspire, motivate, facilitate, lead, and direct other academic members in the higher education institutions to achieve organizational goals.

This study provides an in-depth look at the practices of leadership in Malaysian Research Universities. This study employs a qualitative research approach. Data were collected through in-depth interview with people who hold leadership positions and have good influence on teaching and learning at research universities and analysis of relevant documents. This analysis produced the emerging themes of the study. The findings of this study support the fundamental elements that have been previously identified by researchers and professional organizations, as instructional leadership. Instructional leaders focus on learning and teaching for students in relation to instructor development. Based on the findings of this study the following conclusions were made: leadership works towards the future of the university through the development and involvement of instructors to facilitate teaching and learning at research universities.

Malaysian research universities planned through sustained programs of educational development to link theory with practice. Academics can learn to use these principles effectively in designing learning environments for students. Secondly, academics need a supportive culture if they are to put these principles into practice. And, finally, creating a learning culture depends not only on well-educated, well-meaning individual academics, but also on an academic community working together to create a student-centered learning orientation. However, the findings revealed that research universities place less emphasis on leadership of teaching and learning for students'

development and understandably concentrate on research. The Best practices of Malaysian instructional leaders were identified and presented as general guidelines for good and effective teaching that are supported by research.

Professional development of instructors and the integrity of beliefs in pursuing organizational vision and strong professional development will support effective implementation of instructional leaders' work. Instructional leaders provide opportunity for professional development of instructors at higher education. Finally, a number of recommendations have been offered towards future research and teaching and learning practices by instructional leaders.



Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk Ijazah Doktor Falsafah

KEPIMPINAN INSTRUKSIONAL DAN PEMBANGUNAN INSTRUKTOR DI UNIVERSITI PENYELIDIKAN MALAYSIA

Oleh

MEHRNAZ FAHIMIRAD

Oktober 2016

Pengerusi : Profesor Madya Khairuddin Bin Idris, PhD
Fakulti : Pengajian Pendidikan

Daripada idea asal universiti, perubahan dan pembangunan amat mempengaruhi dan membentuk pengajaran dan pembelajaran di universiti. Oleh fokus terhadap kepimpinan pengajaran membawa persoalan terhadap peranan kepimpinan dan mengenal pasti kapabiliti dan amalan yang efektif terhadap pemimpin instruksional dalam pembelajaran dan pengajaran di Universiti Penyelidikan di Malaysia. Kepimpinan instruksional merujuk pada fungsi dan peranan kepimpinan dalam sektor pendidikan tinggi. Pemimpin instruksional menggalakkan, memotivasikan, membimbing, memimpin dan mengarah ahli akademik di institusi pendidikan tinggi untuk mencapai matlamat organisasi.

Kajian ini memberi pandangan yang mendalam mengenai amalan kepimpinan di Universiti Penyelidikan di Malaysia yang telah dikenal pasti sebagai mengamalkan kepimpinan instruksional. Dapatan kajian ini menyokong elemen asas yang telah dikenal pasti sebelum ini oleh penyelidik dan organisasi profesional, sebagai kepimpinan instruksional. Lebih khusus lagi, pemimpin instruksional memberikan fokus pada pembelajaran dan pengajaran untuk pelajar dalam hubungannya dengan pembangunan instruktur.

Kajian ini menggunakan pendekatan penyelidikan kualitatif. Data dikumpul melalui temu bual yang mendalam dengan responden yang memegang jawatan kepimpinan dan mempunyai pengaruh dalam pengajaran dan pembelajaran di universiti penyelidikan serta analisis dokumen yang berkaitan. Analisis ini akan menjawab beberapa persoalan dalam kajian ini.

Berdasarkan dapatan kajian, kesimpulan berikut telah diperoleh: pemimpin bekerja ke arah masa hadapan universiti melalui pembangunan dan penglibatan para instruktur bagi memantapkan pengajaran dan pembelajaran di universiti penyelidikan.

Universiti penyelidikan di Malaysia merancang melalui program yang terjamin bagi pembangunan pendidikan untuk mengaitkan teori dan amalan supaya para akademik dapat mempelajari prinsip tersebut dalam mereka bentuk persekitaran pembelajaran bagi pelajar mereka. Kedua, para akademik memerlukan budaya yang menyokong mereka melaksanakan prinsip pengajaran sebagai amalan. Akhirnya, pembentukan budaya pembelajaran tidak hanya bergantung kepada mereka yang berpengetahuan dan juga berprihatin, tetapi juga keseluruhan komuniti akademik yang berkerjasama ke arah membentuk pengajaran dan pembelajaran berpusatkan pelajar. Pembangunan profesional untuk instruktur dan integriti kepercayaan bagi memperoleh visi sesebuah organisasi dan pembangunan profesional yang mantap akan membantu pemimpin instruksional dalam mengimplementasikan amalan kerja supaya lebih efektif. Pemimpin instruksional harus menyediakan peluang untuk membangunkan profesionalisma instruktur dalam sektor pendidikan tinggi. Akhirnya, beberapa cadangan dikemukakan mengenai amalan pengajaran dan pembelajaran oleh pemimpin pengajaran serta cadangan mengenai kajian masa hadapan.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

All praise and thanks are due to Allah, the Almighty who bestowed me with will, strength, and means to finish this thesis successfully after years of hard work.

Gratitude and appreciation are extended to my three-committee members. Indeed, without their help this work would have never been accomplished. First and foremost, I would like to extend deepest thanks to my principal supervisor, professor Dr KHAIRUDDIN BIN IDRIS for his thorough guidance, support, and encouragement.

I am also indebted to my first co-supervisor, Prof. Dr. ISMI ARIF BIN ISMAIL for his providing valuable advice and expert guidance. In addition, I would like to express my utmost gratitude and appreciation to my second co-supervisor, Dr. SOAIB ASMIRAN, for his precious guidance and assessing valuable.

My heartfelt gratitude also goes to my beloved Mother and father for their unconditional love, prayer, and enduring patience. Thank you for everything. May Allah bless all of you.

I certify that a Thesis Examination Committee has met on 18 October 2016 to conduct the final examination of Mehrnaz Fahimirad on her thesis entitled "Instructional Leadership and Development of Instructors at Malaysian Research Universities" in accordance with the Universities and University Colleges Act 1971 and the Constitution of the Universiti Putra Malaysia [P.U.(A) 106] 15 March 1998. The Committee recommends that the student be awarded the Doctor of Philosophy.

Members of the Thesis Examination Committee were as follows:

Bahaman bin Abu Samah, PhD

Professor
Faculty of Educational Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Chairman)

Dato' Norhasni binti Zainal Abidin, PhD

Associate Professor
Faculty of Educational Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Internal Examiner)

Ramli Basri, PhD

Senior Lecturer
Faculty of Educational Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Internal Examiner)

Peter Walter Cunningham, PhD

Professor
Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University
South Africa
(External Examiner)



NOR AINI AB. SHUKOR, PhD
Professor and Deputy Dean
School of Graduate Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date: 26 January 2017

This thesis was submitted to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia and has been accepted as fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The members of the Supervisory Committee were as follows:

Khairuddin Bin Idris, PhD

Associate Professor
Faculty of Educational studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Chairman)

Ismi arif bin ismail, PhD

Professor
Faculty of Educational studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

Soaib bin Asimiran, PhD

Senior Lecturer
Faculty of Educational studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

ROBIAH BINTI YUNUS, PhD

Professor and Dean
School of Graduate Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date:

Declaration by graduate student

I hereby confirm that:

- This thesis is my original work;
- quotations, illustrations and citations have been duly referenced;
- This thesis has not been submitted previously or concurrently for any other degree at any other institutions;
- intellectual property from the thesis and copyright of the thesis are fully-owned by Universiti Putra Malaysia, according to the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012;
- Written permission must be obtained from the supervisor and the office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) before the thesis is published (in the form of written, printed or in electronic form) including books, journals, modules, proceedings, popular writings, seminar papers, manuscripts, posters, reports, lecture notes, learning modules or any other materials as stated in the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012;
- There is no plagiarism or data falsification/fabrication in the thesis, and scholarly integrity is upheld according to the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Graduate Studies) Rules 2003 (Revision 2012-2013) and the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012. The thesis has undergone plagiarism detection software.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

-

Name Matric No.: Mehrnaz Fahimirad, GS33983

Declaration by Members of Supervisory Committee

This is to confirm that:

- The research conducted and the writing of this thesis was under our supervision,
- Supervision responsibilities as stated in Rule 41 in Rules 2003 (Revision 2012-2013) were adhered to.

Signature: _____
Name of
Chairman of
Supervisory
Committee: Associate Professor Dr. Khairuddin Bin Idris

Signature: _____
Name of
Member of
Supervisory
Committee: Professor Dr. Ismi arif bin ismail

Signature: _____
Name of
Member of
Supervisory
Committee: Dr. Soaib bin Asimiran

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	i
ABSTRAK	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
APPROVAL	vi
DECLARATION	viii
LIST OF TABLES	xiii
LIST OF FIGURES	xiv
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background	1
1.1.1 Leaders and Leadership Styles	3
1.2 Characteristics of Participated Organizations	3
1.2.1 Mission of Research Universities	4
1.3 Problem Statement	4
1.4 Research Questions	6
1.5 Significance of The Study	6
1.6 Scope and Limitations of the Study	7
1.7 Definition of Terms	7
1.7.1 Research Universities	7
1.7.2 Teaching and Learning Process	7
1.7.3 Instructional leadership	8
1.7.4 Effective Instructional leadership	8
1.7.5 Development of Instructors	8
1.7.6 Instructional Capacity	8
1.8 Summary	9
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	10
2.1 Introduction	10
2.1.1 Leadership	10
2.2 Malaysian Research Universiti	11
2.3 Role of Research University	12
2.4 Challenges of Research University	14
2.5 Future Direction of Research University	15
2.6 Brief Review of Leadership Role in Higher Education	16
2.7 Leadership Theories	19
2.7.1 Transformational Leadership	20
2.7.2 Instructional Leadership	21
2.7.3 Effective Instructional Leadership	22
2.7.4 Technological Leadership	26
2.8 Theory of Power Relationships	26
2.9 The 3Cs Leadership Framework of Leadership	27
2.10 Competencies	27
2.10.1 Character	28
2.10.2 Commitment	28

2.11	What Is Teacher Leadership?	29
2.12	Models of Learning And Teaching	31
	2.12.1 Transformative models (Harvey & Knight, 1996)	31
	2.12.2 University of Learning (Model Bowden & Marton 1998)	31
	2.12.3 A model for a Responsive University (Tierney 1998)	31
2.13	Teaching	32
2.14	Learning	34
2.15	Teaching and Learning in Malaysian Higher Education	35
2.16	The Instructional Leadership Capability Framework	38
	2.16.1 Personal and Interpersonal Capabilities	39
	2.16.2 Cognitive capability	40
	2.16.3 Key competencies	41
2.17	Summary	42
3	METHODOLOGY	43
3.1	Introduction	43
3.2	The Research Methodology of The Study: Why Qualitative Research?	43
3.3	Qualitative Approach	44
	3.3.1 Location of Study	44
	3.3.2 Population and Sampling	44
3.4	Justification for Choice of Research Method	46
3.5	Research Design	46
3.6	Demographic of Respondents	47
	3.6.1 Characteristics of the Instructional Leaders	47
	3.6.2 Criteria for selecting Instructional leaders	47
3.7	Data Collection	48
	3.7.1 The rationale of choosing interview	49
	3.7.2 Interviews	50
	3.7.3 Saturation Point	52
	3.7.4 Document Analysis	52
3.8	Research participant	53
	3.8.1 Pilot of Study	53
3.9	The interview Protocol	54
	3.9.1 Demographic Profile	54
3.10	Procedure	55
3.11	Informants' demographic data	55
3.12	Data analysis and interpretation	57
	3.12.1 Sketch emerging ideas from the interview transcripts	57
	3.12.2 Display Data by Developing Diagrammatic Summaries	59
3.13	Thematic Analysis	59
3.14	Validity and Reliability	61
3.15	Confirmability and Dependability of Qualitative Study	62
3.16	Limitations	62
3.17	Summary	63

4	FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS	64
4.1	Introduction	64
4.2	Themes of The Interview	65
4.2.1	Instructional Leaders' Best Practices	65
4.2.2	Instructional Leaders' Leading Capability	75
4.2.3	Professional Development of Instructors	87
4.3	Summary	93
5	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	94
5.1	Introduction	94
5.2	Summary	94
5.3	Conclusion	97
5.4	Practical Implications	98
5.4.1	Theoretical Implication	99
5.5	Recommendation for Practice	100
5.6	Recommendations for Further Research	101
	REFERENCES	103
	APPENDICES	119
	BIODATA OF STUDENT	124
	LIST OF PUBLICATIONS	125

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
4.1	Research Universities	4
3.1	Different Type of Interviews	51
3.2	The advantages of interview versus observation adapted from Lamnek (1989)	52



LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
2.1	Instructional leadership capability Framework	39
2.2	Theoretical framework Instructional Leadership	41
3.1	Data Analysis Process	58
4.1	MetaMatrix Perspectives in Instructional Leadership	64
4.2	Distributed Leadership Practice	83



CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

It is widely accepted that the pressures for universities to change are immense (Scott, Coates, & Anderson, 2008b). Government funding for higher education is no longer an automatic annual allocated budget but is based on competition and performance, backed by good financial management as well as good academic leadership (Shattock, 2013). As an academic organization, the universities' frameworks are geared towards sustaining the business of teaching through various models in teaching and learning. Relating to university history, Newman through his remarkable discourse on the character of a university put forward his famous The Idea of a University. In it he favored the university as a place for the teaching of universal knowledge. He expounded the virtues of liberal education and opposed the inclusion of research into university activity. To Newman, the cultivation of the intellectual should be the ultimate aim of a university education (L. Evans, 2002). Hence, it can be argued that leadership in teaching and learning is a key variable and clear pointer to a successful university.

According to the previous literature the most critical element in the achievement of the Malaysia National Mission 2020 is the "quality of the human capital." The relevant parts state that, "Human capital development will be holistic; encompassing the acquisition of knowledge and skills or intellectual capital including science and technology (S&T) and entrepreneurial capabilities through education, training and lifelong learning." In support of this, the Education Development Plan (2001-2010) stresses that; "Tertiary education is the major means of meeting human resource needs if Malaysia is to achieve its vision of becoming an industrialized nation..." (Education & Instruction, 2001). Generous funding has been allotted to universities, "The government has allocated and invested more than RM3 billion to public universities to undertake research in various disciplines. The new Ministry of Higher Education (MOHE) is very committed to enhance capacity building towards the development of human capital in research and development (R&D), innovations in enterprises, and to leverage on assets that can be garnered from university research towards strengthening the economic competitiveness of the nation." One of the measures taken by the Ministry of Higher Education to activate and jumpstart research in higher education is to designate and upgrade certain key universities as research universities. There are five in all and they are Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM), Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM), Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM), Universiti Malaya (UM) and University Teknologi Malaysia (UTM). The aims of these research universities are to develop creative and innovative human resource, develop globally competitive new technological products for the industries of tomorrow and to be the engine of growth, particularly for the fields of science and technology.

What are the present expectations of academics in relation to teaching and learning in these universities? It is stated in the 9th Malaysia Plan that “institutions will be required to conform to the standards for quality assurance procedures set out in the Malaysian Qualifications Framework (MQF). The foundation of the MQF is principally expressed as learning outcomes or competency standards, the academic volume expressed as credits in terms of total student effort to achieve the learning outcomes, the purpose and character of the qualifications and consistency of nomenclature.”

From the original idea of the university, changes and developments have deeply affected and shaped universities teaching and learning (Scott et al., 2008b). Universities have also become more like businesses in many aspects (Gonzales & Auerbach, 2010). Universities are affected by external factors such as changing expectations and demands from students and stakeholders, a more globally competitive environment, higher expectations from industry, outcomes based performance, and the role of technology in changing the way teaching and learning takes place. In terms of internal factors, some self-imposed procedures complicate the delivery of teaching and learning depriving students and lecturers of needed creativity, flexibility, and time to optimize meaningful learning. A lack of systematic succession planning in academic leadership detracts from maintaining continuity in teaching and learning related policies and practices. All these factors contribute to the need to reconceptualize university teaching and learning (Scott, Coates, & Anderson, 2008b).

The Malaysian government has seen it as pertinent to steer the direction of the national higher education system to ensure national interest is protected and developed in line with Vision 2020. In doing so, the Government has launched the National Higher Education Strategic Plan 2020 and National Higher Education Action Plan 2001-2010 as the means to transform the Malaysian higher education system consistent with the aim to raise the capacity for knowledge and innovation of the expected first-class human capital. The first phase – Laying the Foundation has passed and we are now entering the second phase. The second thrust of the plan, to improve the quality of teaching and learning is regarded as one of the key determinant factors to contribute to the transformation of higher learning institutions, especially the transformation of teaching and learning in research universities.

Higher education institutions are increasingly faced with pressures to change their practices of learning and teaching to meet the demands of industrial sectors, students, and government for accountability in the age of decreasing public funding (Hamidifar, Vinitwatanakhun, & Roodposhti, 2013). In addition, universities in particular have to fulfill the pressures of meeting professional standards in relevant programmes and to use online learning to facilitate students' learning experiences. The emphasis is now on 'learning and teaching' rather than 'teaching and learning'. Therefore, full commitment to learning and teaching through the application of suitable models based on sound policies and strategies, and guided by strong academic leadership is demanded on universities to add value to students educational experiences.

1.1.1 Leaders and Leadership Styles

Universities are different from other organizations because of their unique activities. One of the most important and current discussions in higher education institutions is the role of instructional leaders. The role of instructional leaders is to encourage and support the instructional process of teaching and learning in a relation to students' learning outcomes and instructors' development. They can motivate and encourage lecturers and other academic staff of the university to do beyond what is expected of them. There is an agreement in the literature that instructional leaders can influence their universities and the larger society significantly in many ways, forms, direct or indirectly. At department level for instance, the key to improvement in teaching and students' learning depends on the departmental leadership (Knight & Trowler, 2000). Researches have shown that the experience of instructional leadership has a significant impact on the quality of student learning (Martin, Trigwell, Prosser & Ramsden, 2003; Robinson & Timperley, 2007). There is a relationship between the conception of leadership in teaching, how educators perceived leadership and how the educators approach their teaching. Transformational leadership is one of the integrative leadership theories, which its main characteristic is direct organizational change effectively. Transformational leadership concentrates on demands and motives, which are more intrinsic, have a higher order and are ethical (Sergiovanni, 2002). Transformational leaders are proactive in that they can develop followers' capabilities, help map new directions, mobilize resources, facilitate and support instructional process in a relation to teaching and learning for faculty and university.

1.2 Characteristics of Participated Organizations

What is a Research University? Research Universities are public universities recognized by the Cabinet on 11 October 2006 to become a leading research and educational hub. Recognition of a research university is based on eight selection criteria determined by the Assessment of Research Universities Committee. These criteria have been developed with a focus on aspects of R&D and based on also the criteria adopted by several leading international rating agencies. The marking criteria are as follows:

Table 1.1: Research Universities

No	Criteria	Weightage
1	Quantity and quality of researchers	25
2	Quantity and quality of research	30
3	Post graduate quantity	10
4	Post graduate quality	5
5	innovation	10
6	Professional services and awards	7
7	Network and links	8
8	Support facilities	5
Total		100%

1.2.1 Mission of Research Universities

The mission of research universities is to become the nation's growth engines, offer opportunities for students and academics alike to exchange ideas, and conduct research in a conducive environment which will spur exploration and creativity in the exploration of knowledge and generation of wealth, thus increasing the quality of life.

1.3 Problem Statement

The Malaysian government has seen it as pertinent to steer the directions of the national higher education system to ensure national interest is protected and developed in line with Vision 2020 (Sirat, 2013). In doing so, the Government has launched the National Higher Education Strategic Plan 2020 and National Higher Education Action Plan 2001-2010 as the means to transform the Malaysian higher education consistent with the aim to raise the capacity for knowledge and innovation of the expected first-class human capital (Burke, 2008). In view of this situation, higher education aims to improve the practices of teaching and learning as one of the key determinant initiative to contribute to the transformation toward the research universities and explore the factors contributing to effective instructional leadership in terms of learning and teaching at universities (Jeffrey W. Alstete, 2010), with the emphasis on industry community engagement, character building, entrepreneurship, employability in higher education. Therefore, the purpose was to explain how instructional leader influence instructors' teaching practices. However, other factors influencing instructional leadership and develop the capacity of instructors.

Similarly, there has been a strong impetus towards student focused learning activities at universities. Emphasis has also been given to deep learning (Trigwell & Prosser, 2004). These changes point to the fact that teaching and learning at universities are undergoing changes that will have an effect on the organization and its leadership. The literature review also shows that, the way lecturers experience the leadership of their division is an important precursor to the quality of student learning outcomes and their departments' achievement.

In theory instructional leaders should consider how their leadership skills could transform an organization to have meaningful teaching and learning practices (Burns, 1978). To support the idea of transformational leadership another study on transformational leadership Klar & Brewer, (2013) revealed that educational leaders need to be transformational instructional leaders, empowering others and enacting positive change within the organization. However, there has been little explanation on the actual process of the transformational leadership among leaders.

All above leads to analyzing and determining the instructional gaps between the best practices in the structures and processes for teaching and learning of instructional leadership in the public institutions of higher learning and subsequently working out the objective basis on which to improve the process.

Furthermore, the concept of instructional leadership has considerably been investigated in context of school in relation to the role of principal and instructional leaders in terms of teaching and learning. Therefore, the role of instructional leadership has not been examined in the context of higher education. (Petrov, & Gosling, 2008; Spillane, Halverson, & Diamond, 2000). This research aims to fill this gap in existing literature to examine the roles of instructional leaders at higher education in research universities in Malaysia to identify the best practices in teaching and learning.

However, the majority of higher education research on leadership largely fail to notice the role of the instructional leadership both informal; distributed leaders (Bolden, Petrov, & Gosling, 2008; Spillane, Halverson, & Diamond, 2001) and formal leaders in universities. Taking into account that conducting research is more highly valued and rewarded in context of higher education, this gap generally might reveal the priorities of academic circles. However, the existing literature lacks attention to leading teaching and learning activities runs against to the trend of offering instructional development for academics in the world (Gosling, 2009; Lee, Manathunga, & Kandlbinder, 2008).

The limited literature focused on the role of the instructional leader's provides many research opportunities. As such the experience of instructional leadership has a significant impact on the quality of student learning (Trigwell, Prosser, Martin, & Ramsden, 2005). Moreover, there is a relationship between the conception of leadership in teaching, how instructors perceive leadership and how the instructors approach their teaching. Several dimensions of leadership practices were found to be critical to the improvement of learning and teaching (Catano & Stronge, 2007). Determining these factors to show how leaders successfully balance the needs of their university and continuously to develop and refine their leadership skills. Thus, the above research has important significant to the determination, communication and application of leadership capabilities applied at research universities (Reviews, 2010).

The instructional leadership concept is oriented towards transformational leadership. Any concepts from leadership theory and research are derived within higher

educational research, are related to transformational leadership (Bryman, 1992; Pielstick, 1998). It is also considerable to mention that majority of writers on higher education leadership support the notion that transformational leadership provides the best model for understanding and developing general principles for leaders in the sector (Bensimon, et al. (1989); Birnbaum, R. (1992). According to Burns (1978), transformational leadership entails binding ‘leader and follower together in a mutual and continuing pursuit of a higher purpose’, which in practice may or may not entail an element of organizational transformation.

1.4 Research Questions

Generally, the study aims to conceptualize effective instructional leadership at development of instructors in Malaysian higher education universities. This research was conducted with the following questions:

- 1) What are the current practices of leadership in teaching and learning in Malaysian research universities?
- 2) How do instructional leaders orientate the teaching and learning process in Malaysian research universities ?
- 3) How do universities develop the instructional capacity of Instructors ?

1.5 Significance of The Study

This study has policy implications and impacts on the achievement of the transformation plan particularly on the conceptualization of instructional leadership and the development of instructors on research universities in Malaysia. The outcomes are expected to enhance the strategic direction of instructional leadership in the country. With the consent of the main stakeholder (MOHE) it is also expected that a new practice of effective instructional leadership in learning and teaching will be developed. This study makes a useful contribution to both the basic and applied research. According to Burns (1978) transformational leadership is based on an exchange relationship between leader and follower. Thus, transformational leadership takes place when leaders interact with followers in ways that enhance their productivity, creativity and development in department. Transformational leaders manage to motivate others to achieve more than originally planned or intended; they create a supportive academic culture where individual needs and differences are acknowledged and respected (Burns, 1978).

1.6 Scope and Limitations of the Study

This study focuses on Research Universities in public universities in Malaysia. There are some limitation in this study. This study attempted to address the Malaysian research universities heads of departments' Instructional leadership style in relation to teaching and learning for instructors development. It cant be generalized to other universities in Malaysia.

The study is based on qualitative method . Interviews were conducted with instructional leaders from Malaysian research universities comprising Deputy Vice-Chancellors (Academic Affairs) and Deputy Deans (Academic Affairs) as the population of the study.The data has been mainly collected from face to face interviews with the willingness of the respondents while those not ready to be interviewed were excluded. . Besides the interviews, documentary analysis was utilized to collect data regarding the practices of instructional leaders at higher education.

1.7 Definition of Terms

1.7.1 Research Universities

Research university (RU) or world-class university is concept that is used to call institutions of higher education which are well- known around the globe in terms of highly qualified academic staff, quality teaching and excellent research (Salmi, 2009).

1.7.2 Teaching and Learning Process

Is the heart of education.On it depends the fulfillment of the aims & objectives of education. It is the most powerful instrument of education to bring about desired changes in the students. In teaching - learning process, the teacher, the learner, the curriculum& other variables are organized in a systematic way to attain some pre-determined goal.

University's prime functions has always been circled around research, teaching and extension services (Evans, 2002). Each of the functions complement each other. Teaching, for instance combines the knowledge garnered from research and extension services into the lesson. Teaching disseminates the empirical and practical findings and thus shape the education of both students, educators and researchers.

1.7.3 Instructional leadership

Instructional Leadership is defined as leaders who encourage educational achievement by making a instructional quality the top priority of university (Bredeson, 2009). Instructional leadership, as described by Blase and Blase (2004) is leadership that is shared with instructors through coaching, reflection, study teams, and problem solving staff and administrators work together to provide service to students and university.

1.7.4 Effective Instructional leadership

Instructional leadership refers to leadership in the higher education sector. Instructional leaders are needed to inspire, motivate, lead, and direct the other departments' heads and members in the direction of the organizations' vision Gmelch, W. H. (2002). Effective Instructional leadership in higher education refers to the positive impact of leadership functions on the achievement of organizational goals (Ramsden, Prosser, Trigwell, & Martin, 2007).

In theory, instructional leaders in universities would be appointed based on their background and performance in teaching and learning. According to this definition, activities in which instructional leaders would engage include the following:

- 1) Facilitate the development of a shared vision at department levels;
- 2) Use data to identify goals and assess instructional effectiveness;
- 3) Monitor progress in the alignment of curriculum, instruction and student assessment; and
- 4) Promote continuous improvement in teaching and learning at the university and department levels.

1.7.5 Development of Instructors

The professional development of instructors has long been recognized as a priority issue of education reform. Professional development shall be comprised of professional learning opportunities aligned with student learning and improvement of instructors and university leaders' (J Qi, 2012).

1.7.6 Instructional Capacity

Instructional capacity is the collection of resources for teaching needed to provide high quality instruction to groups of students in a specific context (Martha Feldman's, 2004).

1.8 Summary

This dissertation is organized into five chapters. This first chapter describes the focus, context, purpose, conceptual definition, significance of the study and limitations. Chapter Two presents a review of the literature on instructional leadership that informed the questions and the conceptual framework. Chapter Three describes the design of the study and presents the participants in the study. This chapter situates the study within the field of qualitative research. It includes a detailed description of the research procedures including the data gathering process, analyses, and credibility of the work, limitations, and ethical considerations. Chapter four presents the findings from the instructional leaders' interviews, the collected documents in a thematic format and discussion of findings, as they relate to the research questions and the implications for practice, research, and policy. Chapter Five provides the conclusions that I reached and suggests areas for further research.



© COPYRIGHT UPM

REFERENCES

- 2003, I. (2003). *Iso 13485:2003, Medical devices - Quality management systems - Requirements for regulatory purposes. ISO 2003* (Vol. Second Edi).
- Abell, P. (2003). The Role of Rational Choice and Narrative Action Theories in Sociological Theory The Legacy of Coleman's Foundations. *Revue Française de Sociologie*, 44(1), 255–273. <http://doi.org/10.2307/3323135>
- Afshari, M., Bakar, K., & Luan, W. (2008). Academic leadership and information communication technology. *The Turkish Journal of Educational Technology*, 7(4), 82–91. Retrieved from <http://www.tojet.net/articles/v7i4/749.pdf>
- Allee, V. (2009). Value-creating networks: organizational issues and challenges. *The Learning Organization*, 16(6), 427–442. <http://doi.org/10.1108/09696470910993918>
- Allen, S. J. (2007). Adult Learning Theory & Leadership Development. *Leadership Review Claremont McKenna College Kravis Leadership Institute, Leadership Review*, 7(7), 26–37.
- Allio, R. J. (2005). Leadership development: Teaching versus learning. *Management Decision*, 43(7/8), 1071–1077. <http://doi.org/10.1108/00251740510610071>
- Allio, R. J. (2013). (2012). Leaders and leadership – many theories, but what advice is reliable? *Strategy & Leadership*, 41(1), 4–14. <http://doi.org/10.1108/10878571311290016>
- Anderson, D., & Anderson, M. (2005). *Coaching that counts: Harnessing the power of leadership coaching to deliver strategic value. Executive Development*.
- Anderson, L. W., Krathwohl, D. R., Airasian, P., Cruikshank, K., Mayer, R., Pintrich, P., ... Wittrock, M. C. (2001). A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives, (Abridged Edition). *New York Longman*. Retrieved from <http://www.citeulike.org/user/mapto/article/961573>
- Anderson, R., & Dexter, S. (2000). *University technology leadership: Incidence and impact. IT in Education*. Retrieved from <http://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&btnG=Search&q=intitle:Center+for+Research+on+Information+Technology+and+Organizations#0\nhttp://escholarship.org/uc/item/76s142fc.pdf>
- Arsenault, P. M. (2004). Leadership Assessment and Development: Recommendations for a New Assessment Model. In *Improving leadership in nonprofit organizations*. (pp. 252–266).
- Australian Institute for Teaching and University Leadership, Teaching, A., & Leadership, S. (2011). National Professional Standards for Teachers. *Education*

- Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*.
<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.03.001>
- Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 421–449.
<http://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163621>
- Bandura, A., & Erlbaum, L. (2001). Social Cognitive Theory of Mass Communication. *Media Effects: Advances in Theory and Research*, 1–28.
- Barling, J., Christie, A., & Hopton, C. (2010). Leadership. *APA Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 183–240.
<http://doi.org/10.1037/12169-007>
- Barriball, K. L., & While, a. (1994). Collecting data using a semi-structured interview: a discussion paper. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 19(2), 328–335.
<http://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2648.ep8535505>
- Bennett, N., Wise, C., Woods, P., & Harvey, J. (2003). *Distributed Leadership : A Review of Literature Distributed Leadership*. National College for academic Leadership.
- Bennis, W. (2007). The Challenges of Leadership in the Modern World. *American Psychologist*, 62(1), 2–5. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.62.1.2>
- Berger, J. G., Boles, K. C., & Troen, V. (2005). Teacher research and change: paradoxes, problems, and possibilities. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21(1), 93–105. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2004.11.008>
- Biernacki, P., & Waldorf, D. (1981). Snowball Sampling: Problems and Techniques of Chain Referral Sampling. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 10(2), 141–163.
<http://doi.org/10.1177/004912418101000205>
- Binard, K., & Brungardt, C. (1997). Learning leadership: Assessing students at the Community College of Denver. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 4(4), 128–140. <http://doi.org/10.1177/107179199700400410>
- Blanchard, J. (2008). Learning awareness: constructing formative assessment in the classroom, in the academic institutions. *Curriculum Journal*, 19(911796916), 137–150. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09585170802357454>
- Blase, J., & Blase, J. (2000). Effective instructional leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38(2), 130–141.
<http://doi.org/10.1108/09578230010320082>
- Blom, M., & Alvesson, M. (2014). Leadership On Demand: Followers as initiators and inhibitors of managerial leadership. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 30(3), 344–357. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.scaman.2013.10.006>

- Bobb, S. C., & Mani, N. (2013). Categorizing with gender: Does implicit grammatical gender affect semantic processing in 24-month-old toddlers? *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, *115*(2), 297–308. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2013.02.006>
- Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. (2003). Qualitative research in education. *An Introduction to Theory and Methods*, 110–120. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/recordDetail?accno=ED419813>
- Bowden, J., & Marton, F. (1998). *The university of learning: beyond quality and competence in higher education. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*. <http://doi.org/10.4324/9780203416457>
- Boyd, B. (2011). Journal of Leadership Education. *Education*, *10*(1), 165.
- Brass, M., & Haggard, P. (2008). The what, when, whether model of intentional action. *The Neuroscientist: A Review Journal Bringing Neurobiology, Neurology and Psychiatry*, *14*(4), 319–325. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1073858408317417>
- Bredeson, P. (2000a). The school principal's role in teacher professional development. *Journal of Inservice Education*, *26*(2), 385–401. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13674580000200114>
- Bredeson, P. V. (2000b). Teacher learning as work and at work: exploring the content and contexts of teacher professional development. *Journal of In-Service Education*, *26*(1), 63–72. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13674580000200104>
- Brown, M. E., & Treviño, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *17*(6), 595–616. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.004>
- Bryman, A. (2007). Effective leadership in higher education: a literature review. *Studies in Higher Education*. <http://doi.org/10.1080/03075070701685114>
- Burke, L. (2008). Models of reference services in Australian academic libraries. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, *40*(4), 269–286. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0961000608096716>
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. Oxford.
- Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2012). Distributed leadership in action: leading high-performing leadership teams in English schools. *School Leadership & Management*, *32*(1), 21–36. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2011.642354>
- Cameron, K. (1978). Measuring Organizational Effectiveness in Institutions of Higher Education. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *23*(December), 604–632. <http://doi.org/10.2307/2392582>
- Carlisle, J. F., Kelcey, B., & Berebitsky, D. (2013). Teachers' Support of Students' Vocabulary Learning During Literacy Instruction in High Poverty Elementary Schools. *American Educational Research Journal*, *50*(6), 1360–1391.

<http://doi.org/10.3102/0002831213492844>

- Carrier, S. J. (2011). Implementing and integrating effective teaching strategies including features of lesson study in an elementary science methods course. *The Teacher Educator*, 46(November), 145–160. <http://doi.org/10.1080/08878730.2011.552666>
- Catano, N., & Stronge, J. (2007). What do we expect of school principals? Congruence between principal evaluation and performance standards. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 10(4), 379–399. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13603120701381782>
- Coffey, A., & Atkinson, P. (1996). *Making sense of qualitative data: Complementary research strategies*. *The Lancet* (Vol. 42). [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(03\)12668-2](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(03)12668-2)
- Cohall, K. G., & Cooper, B. S. (2010). Educating American Baptist pastors: A national survey of church leaders. *Journal of Research on Christian Education*, 19(1), 27–55. <http://doi.org/10.1080/10656211003630174>
- Collins, D. B. (2003). The effectiveness of managerial leadership development programs: A meta-analysis of studies from 1982--2001. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences*, 63(8-A), 2929. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=psyh&AN=2003-95003-013&site=ehost-live>
- Collinson, D. (2006). Rethinking followership: A post-structuralist analysis of follower identities. *Leadership Quarterly*. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.12.005>
- Conger, S. (2014). Knowledge Management for Information and Communications Technologies for Development Programs in South Africa. *Information Technology for Development*, 21, 113–134. <http://doi.org/10.1080/02681102.2014.899960>
- Creswell, J. W. (1998). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions. *Qualitative Health Research*. <http://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9299.00177>
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). Understanding mixed methods research. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches*, 11(2), 1–19. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.aenj.2008.02.005>
- Creswell, J. W., & Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining Validity in Qualitative Inquiry. *Theory into Practice*, 39(3), 124–130. <http://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip3903>
- Crossan, M., Gandz, J., & Seijts, G. (2012). Developing Leadership Character. *Ivey Business Journal Online*, (February), 1. Retrieved from <http://libra.naz.edu/docview/926976649?accountid=28167> <http://linksource.ebsco.com/linking.aspx?sid=ProQ:abiglobal&fmt=journal&genre=article&issn=&volume=&issue=&date=2012-01->

01&spage=N_A&title=Ivey+Business+Journal+Online&atitle=DEVELOPING
+LEADERSHIP+CH

- Culnan, M. J. (1986). The Intellectual Development of Management Information Systems, 1972-1982: A Co-Citation Analysis. *Management Science*, 32(2), 156–172. <http://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.32.2.156>
- Day, D. V. (The P. S. U. (2001). Leadership development:A review in context. *The Leadership Quarterly*. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(00\)00061-8](http://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(00)00061-8)
- Deng, L., & Togneri, R. (2015). *Deep dynamic models for learning hidden representations of speech features. Speech and Audio Processing for Coding, Enhancement and Recognition*. http://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-1456-2_6
- Denzin, N. K. (2010). Moments, Mixed Methods, and Paradigm Dialogs. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16, 419–427. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1077800410364608>
- Development, L. (2006). Introduction : Leadership Development : Micro , Macro , or Both ? *Management Learning*, 5(4), 524–525. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=vfh&AN=23473213&site=ehost-live>
- Donohue, R. (2007). Examining career persistence and career change intent using the career attitudes and strategies inventory. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 70(2), 259–276. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2006.12.002>
- DuFour, R., & Marzano, R. J. (2009). Strategies for Principal Leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 66(5), 62–68.
- Echevarria, J., Short, D., & Powers, K. (2006). School Reform and Standards-Based Education: A Model for English-Language Learners. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 99(4), 195–211. <http://doi.org/10.3200/JOER.99.4.195-211>
- Education, U., & Instruction, A. (1993). Instructional Best Practices. *Education*.
- Elgström, O. (2007). The European Union as a Leader in International Multilateral Negotiations - a Problematic Aspiration? *International Relations*, 21(4), 445–458. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0047117807083071>
- Evans, C., Cools, E., & Charlesworth, Z. M. (2010). Learning in higher education – how cognitive and learning styles matter. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 15(4), 467–478. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2010.493353>
- Evans, L. (2002). What is teacher development? *Oxford Review of Education*, 28(1), 123 – 137. <http://doi.org/10.1080/03054980120113670>
- Ferguson, M., Hassin, R., & Bargh, J. (2008). Implicit motivation: Past, present, and future. *Handbook of Motivation Science*, 150–166. Retrieved from <http://psycnet.apa.org/psycinfo/2008-00543-010>
- Fink, D., & Stoll, L. (2005). Educational Change: Easier Said than Done. In

Extending Educational Change SE - 2 (pp. 17–41). http://doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-4453-4_2

- Forester, J. (2012). Learning to Improve Practice: Lessons from Practice Stories and Practitioners' Own Discourse Analyses (or Why Only the Loons Show Up). *Planning Theory & Practice*, 13(1), 11–26. <http://doi.org/10.1080/14649357.2012.649905>
- Fry, H., Ketteridge, S., & Marshall, S. (2009). *A Handbook for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education. A Handbook for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*. <http://doi.org/10.1080/03075079312331382498>
- Fullan, M. (2006). The future of educational change: system thinkers in action. *Journal of Educational Change*, 7(3), 113–122. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-006-9003-9>
- Ganser, T. (2000). An Ambitious Vision of Professional Development for Teachers. *NASSP Bulletin*, 84(618), 6–12. <http://doi.org/10.1177/019263650008461802>
- Ganz, M. (2012). *Why David Sometimes Wins: Leadership, Strategy and the Organization in the California Farm Worker Movement. Why David Sometimes Wins: Leadership, Strategy and the Organization in the California Farm Worker Movement*. <http://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195162011.001.0001>
- Gaziel, H. (2009). The Impact of globalization upon education: universal or contextual? *World Studies in Education*, 10, p.63–78.
- Girmen, P. (2009). A sample implementation on teacher candidates' pre-service learning. *International Journal of Learning*, 16(8), 1–10.
- Glaser, B. (2013). Grounded theory methodology. *Introducing Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 69–82.
- Glesne, C., & Peshkin, A. (1992). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction. Becoming Qualitative Researchers An Introduction* (Vol. 2nd).
- Goldring, E., Porter, A., Murphy, J., Elliott, S. N., & Cravens, X. (2009). Assessing Learning-Centered Leadership: Connections to Research, Professional Standards, and Current Practices. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 8(1), 1–36. <http://doi.org/10.1080/15700760802014951>
- Goleman, D. (2002). Leaders with impact. *Strategic HR Review*, 1(6), 3. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=7307240&site=ehost-live>
- Goleman, D. (2004). On Leadership. *Harvard Business Review*, 82(1), 82–91.
- Goleman, D. (2013). The focused leader. *Harvard Business Review*, (DEC).
- Gonzales, R., & Auerbach, A. (2007). Trainees, teams, and timely performance feedback. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 22(8), 1218–1219.

<http://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-007-0263-8>

Goodman, L. (1961). Snowball sampling. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 32(1), 148–170. <http://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177705148>

Gooty, J., Connelly, S., Griffith, J., & Gupta, A. (2010). Leadership, affect and emotions: A state of the science review. *Leadership Quarterly*. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.10.005>

Greenleaf, R. (1998). *The power of servant-leadership*. *Leadership* (Vol. 23). <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jada.2010.04.021>

Gronn, P. (2002). Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13(May), 423–451. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(02\)00120-0](http://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(02)00120-0)

Hallinger, P. (2005). Instructional leadership and principal: A passing fancy that refuses to fade away. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 4, 221–239. <http://doi.org/10.1080/15700760500244793>

Hallinger, P. (2005). Instructional Leadership: How has the Model Evolved and What have We Learned? In *American Educational Research Association Conference*.

Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning: lessons from 40 years of empirical research. *Journal of Educational Administration*. <http://doi.org/10.1108/09578231111116699>

Hamidifar, F., Vinitwatanakhun, W., & Roodposhti, F. R. (2013). Developing an Effective Academic Leadership Model at Islamic Azad University. *International Journal of Management and Business Research*, 3(2), 161–174.

Harris, a, Leithwood, K., Day, C., Sammons, P., & Hopkins, D. (2007). Distributed leadership and organizational change: Reviewing the evidence. *Journal of Educational Change*, 8, 337–347. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-007-9048-4>

Harvey, M. G. (1996). Developing leaders rather than managers for the global marketplace. *Human Resource Management Review*. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822\(96\)90020-0](http://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(96)90020-0)

HBSP, H. B. S. P. (2009). Harvard Business Review on Developing High-Potential Leaders. *Harvard Business School Press Books*, 1. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=33461721&site=ehost-live&scope=site\http://harvardbusinessonline.hbsp.harvard.edu/relay.jhtml?name=itemdetail&id=2870>

Honan, E. (2014). Disrupting the habit of interviewing 1 Disrupting the habit of interviewing. *Reconceptualizing Educational Research Methodology*, 5(1), 1–17. Retrieved from <http://journals.hioa.no/index.php/term>

House of Commons. (2004). Scientific Publications: Free for all? <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0954102004002172>

- House, R. J., & Aditya, R. N. (1997). The Social Scientific Study of Leadership : Quo Vadis ? *Journal of Management*, 23(3), 409–473. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063\(97\)90037-4](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063(97)90037-4)
- Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J., & Hoy, a. W. (2006). Academic Optimism of Schools: A Force for Student Achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 43(3), 425–446. <http://doi.org/10.3102/00028312043003425>
- Hughes, J. (2005). The role of teacher knowledge and learning experiences in forming technology-integrated pedagogy. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 13(2), 277 – 302. <http://doi.org/http://www.editlib.org/p/26105>
- Idris, F., & Mohd Ali, K. A. (2008). The impacts of leadership style and best practices on company performances: Empirical evidence from business firms in Malaysia. *Total Quality Management*, 19(1-2), 165–171. <http://doi.org/10.1080/14783360701602130>
- Jago, a. G. (1982). Leadership: Perspectives in Theory and Research. *Management Science*, 28(3), 315–336. <http://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.28.3.315>
- Jeffrey W. Alstete. (2010). *Policy and Performance in American Higher Education: An Examination of Cases across State Systems* (review). *The Review of Higher Education*. <http://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2010.0014>
- Jepsen, C. (2005). Teacher characteristics and student achievement: Evidence from teacher surveys. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 57(2), 302–319. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jue.2004.11.001>
- Jo Blase dan Joseph Blase. (2004). *Handbook of Instructional Leadership: How Successful Principals Promote Teaching and Learning: Second Edition*. SAGE. Retrieved from <http://www.sagepub.com/books/Book226257>
- Kalra, S., Pathak, V., & Jena, B. (2013). Qualitative research. *Perspectives in Clinical Research*, 4(3), 192. <http://doi.org/10.4103/2229-3485.115389>
- Katzenmeyer, C., & Lawrenz, F. (2006). National Science Foundation Perspectives on the Nature of STEM Program Evaluation. *New Directions for Evaluation*, (109), 7–18. <http://doi.org/10.1002/ev.175>
- Kesebir, S., Graham, J., & Oishi, S. (2010). A Theory of Human Needs Should Be Human-Centered, Not Animal-Centered: Commentary on Kenrick et al. (2010). *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 5(2010), 315–319. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1745691610369470>
- Klar, H. W., & Brewer, C. a. (2013). Successful leadership in high-needs schools: An examination of core leadership practices enacted in challenging contexts. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 49(5), 768–808. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X13482577>
- Knight, P. T., & Trowler, P. R. (2000). Department-level cultures and the improvement of learning and teaching. *Studies in Higher Education*, 25(1), 69–83. <http://doi.org/10.1080/030750700116028>

- Kumcagiz, H., Celik, S. B., Yilmaz, M., & Eren, Z. (2011). The effects of emotional intelligence on optimism of university students. In *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* (Vol. 30, pp. 973–977). <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.10.189>
- Lamnek, S. (2014). Qualitative Interview. *Qualitative Sozialforschung*, 301–371. <http://doi.org/10.4135/9780857020116>
- Law, J. (2000). On the Subject of the Object: Narrative, Technology, and Interpellation. *Configurations*, 8(1), 1–29. <http://doi.org/10.1353/con.2000.0003>
- Leaders, I., & Digest, E. (2002). Developing Instructional Leaders. *Instructional Leaders.ERIC Digest*, 1–7.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2000). The effects of transformational leadership on organizational conditions and student engagement with school. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38(2), 112–129. <http://doi.org/10.1108/09578230010320064>
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2008). Linking Leadership to Student Learning: The Contributions of Leader Efficacy. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(4), 496–528. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X08321501>
- Leithwood, K., & Wahlstrom, K. L. (2008). Linking Leadership to Student Learning: Introduction. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(4), 455–457. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X08321495>
- Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1986). Research, evaluation, and policy analysis: Heuristics for disciplined inquiry. *Policy Studies Review*, 5(3), 546–565. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-1338.1986.tb00429.x>
- Luthans, F., & Avolio, B. (2003). Authentic leadership development. In *Positive Organizational Scholarship* (pp. 241–258).
- Marginson, S. (2013). The impossibility of capitalist markets in higher education. *Journal of Education Policy*, 28(3), 353–370. <http://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2012.747109>
- Markwell, J. (2004). The human side of science education: Using McGregor's theory Y as a framework for improving student motivation*. *Biochemistry and Molecular Biology Education*, 32(5), 323–325. Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/bmb.2004.494032050393/full\paper33://publication/uuid/8DE07D07-1D98-495C-BDB7-3E11E9CB66CE>
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. (1999). Building the conceptual framework. *Designing Qualitative Research (3rd Edition)*.
- Marshall, S. (1989). Review of shape coding techniques. *Image and Vision Computing*, 7(4), 281–294. [http://doi.org/10.1016/0262-8856\(89\)90032-2](http://doi.org/10.1016/0262-8856(89)90032-2)
- Massy, W. (1997). Teaching and Learning Quality-process Review: the Hong Kong programme. *Quality in Higher Education*, 3(3), 249–262.

<http://doi.org/10.1080/1353832970030305>

- Maxwell. (2004). Conceptual Framework. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 30(4), 33–64. <http://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-11-23>
- May, D. R., Chan, A. Y. L., Hodges, T. D., & Avolio, B. J. (2003). Developing the moral component of authentic leadership. *Organizational Dynamics*. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0090-2616\(03\)00032-9](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0090-2616(03)00032-9)
- Mazutis, D., & Slawinski, N. (2008). Leading Organizational Learning Through Authentic Dialogue. *Management Learning*, 39(4), 437–456. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1350507608093713>
- Mazutis, D., & Zintel, C. (2015). Leadership and Corporate Responsibility: A Review of the Empirical Evidence. *Annals in Social Responsibility*, 1(1), 76–107. <http://doi.org/10.1108/ASR-12-2014-0001>
- McFadden, C., Eakin, R., Beck-Frazier, S., & McGlone, J. (2005). Major approaches to the study of leadership. *Academic Exchange Quarterly*, 9(2), 71.
- McGregor, A. (2007). *Fifty Key Thinkers on Development*. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography* (Vol. 28). <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9493.2007.00298.x>
- Mello, J. (2003). Profiles in Leadership: Enhancing Learning Through Model and Theory Building --. *Journal of Management Education*, 27(3), 344. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1052562903251351>
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. *Dados* (Vol. 2nd).
- Merriam, S. B. (2004). The Role of Cognitive Development in Mezirow's Transformational Learning Theory. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 55(1), 60–68. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0741713604268891>
- Meyer, M. (2003). Academic entrepreneurs or entrepreneurial academics? research-based ventures and public support mechanisms. *R&D Management*, 33, 107–115. <http://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9310.00286>
- Miles, M. (2014). Qualitative data analysis : a methods sourcebook. *Sage Publ Inc P O Box 5024 Beverly Hills Ca 90210Usa 1984 264*. Retrieved from <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/enhancements/fy0654/84002140-d.html>
- Miles, M. A. (1994). Miles and Huberman (1994)- Chapter 4.pdf. In *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook* (pp. 50–72).
- Militello, L., Dominguez, C.O., Lintern, G. Klein, G. (2009). The Role of Cognitive Systems Engineering in the Systems Engineering Design Process. *Systems Engineering*, 14(3), 305–326. <http://doi.org/10.1002/sys>
- Miller, T. L., & Wesley, C. L. (2010). Assessing mission and resources for social change: An organizational identity perspective on social venture capitalists'

decision criteria. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 34(4), 705–733.
<http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2010.00388.x>

Miner, J. B. (2003). The Rated Importance, Scientific Validity, and Practical Usefulness of Organizational Behavior Theories: A Quantitative Review. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 2(3), 250–268.
<http://doi.org/10.5465/AMLE.2003.10932132>

Montez, J. M., Wolverton, M., & Gmelch, W. H. (2002). The Roles and Challenges of Deans. *The Review of Higher Education*, 26(2), 241–266.
<http://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2002.0034>

Morrow, S. L. (2005). Quality and Trustworthiness in Qualitative Research in Counseling Psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52(2), 250–260.
<http://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.52.2.250>

Murphy, J. (2011). Leading from the future: Leadership makes a difference during electronic health record implementation. *Frontiers of Health Services Management*, 28(1), 25–30. Retrieved from <http://web.a.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.apollolibrary.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=c3104062-db8f-4722-b4c9-061d2e4255b6@sessionmgr4001&vid=1&hid=4209>

Nanus, B. (1992). Visionary Leadership: How to Re-Vision the Future. *The Futurist*, 26(5), 20. Retrieved from http://sfx.scholarsportal.info.subzero.lib.uoguelph.ca/guelph?url_ver=Z39.88-2004&rft_val_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:journal&genre=article&sid=ProQ:ProQ%253Aabiglobal&atitle=Visionary+Leadership%253A+How+to+Re-Vision+the+Future&title=The+Futurist&issn=00163

Neuman, S. B., & Cunningham, L. (2009). The Impact of Professional Development and Coaching on Early Language and Literacy Instructional Practices. *American Educational Research Journal*, 46(2), 532–566.
<http://doi.org/10.3102/0002831208328088>

Neumerski, C. M. (2013). Rethinking Instructional Leadership, a Review : What Do We Know About Principal, Teacher, and Coach Instructional Leadership, and Where Should We Go From Here? *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 49(2), 310–347. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X12456700>

Northouse. (2006). Introduction to Leadership. *Leadership Defined*, (1989), 1–14.

Osborn, R. N., Hunt, J. G., & Jauch, L. R. (2002). Toward a contextual theory of leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 13(6), 797–837.
[http://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(02\)00154-6](http://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(02)00154-6)

Ovando, M. N., & Ramirez, A. (2007). Principals' instructional leadership within a teacher performance appraisal system: Enhancing students' academic success. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 20(1-2), 85–110.
<http://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-007-9048-1>

Oxford. (2010). Oxford Dictionaries. *Oxford University Press*.

<http://doi.org/10.5860/CHOICE.48-1195>

Patton, M. (1990). Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods. In *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods* (pp. 169–186). <http://doi.org/10.1002/nur.4770140111>

Patton, M. Q. (2002). Qualitative research and evaluation methods. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 3rd, 598. <http://doi.org/10.2307/330063>

Ramakrishnan, R., & Gehrke, J. (2003). *Database Management Systems. Computing* (Vol. 8). http://doi.org/10.1300/J115v06n04_07

Ramsden, P. (1991). A performance indicator of teaching quality in higher education: The Course Experience Questionnaire. *Studies in Higher Education*, 16(2), 129–150. <http://doi.org/10.1080/03075079112331382944>

Ramsden, P., Prosser, M., Trigwell, K., & Martin, E. (2007). Learning and Instruction : University teachers' experiences of academic leadership and their approaches to teaching. *Learning and Instruction*, 17(2), 140–155. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2007.01.004>

Ramsden, P., Prosser, M., Trigwell, K., & Martin, E. (2007). University teachers' experiences of academic leadership and their approaches to teaching. *Learning and Instruction*, 17(2), 140–155. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2007.01.004>

Rankin, B. (2004). The Importance of Intentional Socialization Among Children in Small Groups: A Conversation with Loris Malaguzzi. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 32(2), 81–85. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-004-1073-9>

Reinhartz-Berger, I., Soffer, P., & Sturm, A. (2010). Extending the adaptability of reference models. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics Part A: Systems and Humans*, 40(5), 1045–1056. <http://doi.org/10.1109/TSMCA.2010.2044408>

Reviews, B. (2010). The Journal. *Statistics*, 2(June), 1–86.

Richards, D. (2011). Leadership for Learning in Higher Education: The Student Perspective. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 40(1), 84–108. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1741143211420617>

Rigby, J. G. (2013). Three Logics of Instructional Leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 50(4), 610–644. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X13509379>

Robinson, V. M. J. (2009). *Distributed Leadership. Distributed Leadership* (Vol. 7). <http://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-9737-9>

Robinson, V. M. J., Lloyd, C. a., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The Impact of Leadership on Student Outcomes: An Analysis of the Differential Effects of Leadership Types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5), 635–674. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X08321509>

- Robson, C. (2002). *Real World Research: a Resource for Social Scientists and Practitioner-Researchers*. books.google.com (Vol. 2nd).
<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2010.08.001>
- Rogers, B. (2003). Educational research for professional practice: More than providing evidence for doing “x rather than y” or finding the “size of the effect of A on B.” *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 30(2), 65–87.
<http://doi.org/10.1007/BF03216791>
- Rost, J. C. (1993). Leadership Development in the New Millennium. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 1, 91–110.
<http://doi.org/10.1177/107179199300100109>
- Sathye, M. (2004). Leadership in higher education: A qualitative study. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung*, 5(3).
- Schön, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions*. San Francisco.
<http://doi.org/10.1182/blood-2010-02-266338>
- Scott, G., Bell, S., Coates, H., & Grebennikov, L. (2010). Australian higher education leaders in times of change: the role of Pro Vice-Chancellor and Deputy Vice-Chancellor. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 32(4), 401–418. <http://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2010.491113>
- Scott, G., Coates, H., & Anderson, M. (2008a). Learning Leaders. *Acer*, (May).
- Scott, G., Coates, H., & Anderson, M. (2008b). *Learning leadership in times of change: Academic Leadership Capabilities for Australian Higher Education*. *Higher Education Research*. Retrieved from http://research.acer.edu.au/higher_education/3
http://research.acer.edu.au/higher_education/3/
- Seidman, I. (2006). Interviewing as Qualitative Research. *PsycCRITIQUES*.
<http://doi.org/10.1037/032390>
- Sergiovanni, T. (2006). The Stages of Leadership - a Developmental View. In *The Principalship* (pp. 131–144).
- Shattock, M. (2013). University governance, leadership and management in a decade of diversification and uncertainty. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 67(3), 217–233.
<http://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12017>
- Siddique, S. (2011). Being in-between: The relevance of ethnography and auto-ethnography for psychotherapy research. *Counselling and Psychotherapy Research*, 11(December), 310–316.
<http://doi.org/10.1080/14733145.2010.533779>
- Sikes, P. (2006). Working in a “new” university: in the shadow of the Research Assessment Exercise? *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(5), 555–568.
<http://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600922758>

- Sirat, M. Bin. (2010). Strategic planning directions of Malaysia's higher education: University autonomy in the midst of political uncertainties. *Higher Education*, 59(4), 461–473. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-009-9259-0>
- Sirat, M. (2013). Internationalizing Higher Education in Malaysia - Understanding, Practices and Challenges. *Kajian Malaysia*, 31(2), 105–106. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.msu.edu/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/1507589928?accountid=12598&http://za2uf4ps7f.search.serialssolutions.com/?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2004&ctx_enc=info:ofi/enc:UTF-8&rft_id=info:sid/ProQ%3Asociology&rft_val_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx
- Smith, Z. a., & Wolverson, M. (2010). Higher Education Leadership Competencies: Quantitatively Refining a Qualitative Model. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 17(1), 61–70. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1548051809348018>
- Spillane, J., & Healey, K. (2010). Conceptualizing school leadership and management from a distributed perspective: An exploration of some study operations and measures. *The Elementary School Journal*, 111(2), 253–281. <http://doi.org/10.1086/656300>
- Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. B. (2001). Investigating School Leadership Practice: A Distributed Perspective. *Source: Educational Researcher*, 30(3), 23–28. <http://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X030003023>
- Stake, R. (1994). Handbook of Qualitative Research. In *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (Vol. 42, p. 643). <http://doi.org/10.2307/3121684>
- Stewart, J. (2006a). Instructional and transformational leadership: Burns, Bass and Leithwood. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, 54, 1–29.
- Stewart, J. (2006b). Transformational Leadership: An Evolving Concept Examined through the Works of Burns, Bass, Avolia, and Leithwood. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, (54), 1–29.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1950). Leadership, Membership and Organization. *Psychological Bulletin*, 47(1), 1–14. <http://doi.org/10.1037/h0053857>
- Submission, H. E. (1997). Chapter Five. *Journal of Library Administration*, 23(3), 71–99. http://doi.org/10.1300/J111v23n03_05
- Supovitz, J. A., & Tognatta, N. (2013). The Impact of Distributed Leadership on Collaborative Team Decision Making. *Leadership and Policy in Universities*, 12, 101–121. <http://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2013.810274>
- Swaffield, S. (2011). International Handbook of Leadership for Learning, 1047–1065. <http://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-1350-5>
- Tierney, W. G. (1988). Organizational Culture in Higher Education: Defining the Essentials. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 59(1), 2–21. <http://doi.org/10.2307/1981868>

- Timperley, H. S. (2005). Distributed leadership: developing theory from practice. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 00(0), 1–26. <http://doi.org/10.1080/00220270500038545>
- Tracy, S. J. (2010). Qualitative quality: Eight “big-tent” criteria for excellent qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16(10), 837–851. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1077800410383121>
- Trigwell, K., & Prosser, M. (2004). Development and use of the approaches to teaching inventory. *Educational Psychology Review*, 16(4), 409–424. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-004-0007-9>
- Trigwell, K., Prosser, M., Martin, E., & Ramsden, P. (2005). University teachers’ experiences of change in their understanding of the subject matter they have taught. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 10(2), 251–264. <http://doi.org/10.1080/1356251042000337981>
- Trowler, P., & Knight, P. T. (2000). Coming to Know in Higher Education: Theorising faculty entry to new work contexts. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 19(1), 27–42. <http://doi.org/10.1080/07294360050020453>
- Vescio, V., Ross, D., & Adams, A. (2008). A review of research on the impact of professional learning communities on teaching practice and student learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24(1), 80–91. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2007.01.004>
- Vilkinas, T., & Ladyshevsky, R. K. (2012). Leadership Behaviour and Effectiveness of Academic Program Directors in Australian Universities. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 40(1), 109–126. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1741143211420613>
- Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A. G. (2007). The role of the situation in leadership. *The American Psychologist*, 62(1), 17–24; discussion 43–7. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.62.1.17>
- Walker, J. L. (2012). The use of saturation in qualitative research. *Canadian Journal of Cardiovascular Nursing = Journal Canadien En Soins Infirmiers Cardio-Vasculaires*, 22(2), 37–46. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-007-0077-6>
- Walkowiak, T., & Mazurkiewicz, J. (2011). Human resource influence on dependability of discrete transportation systems. *Advances in Intelligent and Soft Computing*, 97, 271–283. http://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-21393-9_21
- Wallis, A., & Kennedy, K. I. (2013). Leadership training to improve nurse retention. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 21(4), 624–632. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2834.2012.01443.x>
- Watkins, K., Fu, H., Fuentes, R., & Ghosh, a. (2005). *Human Development Report 2005. Nations Development*. Retrieved from http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/HDR05_complete.pdf
- Wilson. (2005). Evaluation of Human Work. In *Evaluation of Human Work* (pp.

706–754).

Wilson, A., & Cervero, R. (2010). Democracy and program planning. *New Directions for Adult and ...*, Winter(128), 81–90. <http://doi.org/10.1002/ace>

Wirt, F., & Krug, S. E. (1998). From leadership behavior to cognitions: a constructivist theory of US principals. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 36(3), 229–248. <http://doi.org/10.1108/09578239810214696>

Yin, H., & Liu, H. (2002). Performance of Space-division Multiple-access (SDMA) with scheduling. *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, 1(4), 611–618. <http://doi.org/10.1109/TWC.2002.804188>

Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in Organizations*. *Leadership in Organizations* (Vol. 25). [http://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843\(95\)90027-6](http://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(95)90027-6)

Yusnita, Y., Amin, A., & Muda, S. (2012). The Influences of Transformational Leadership in Homestay Programme. *The International Journal of Social Sciences*, 1(1), 1–7.