Distributive Leadership in a Public University in Malaysia

Khalip Musa, Tai Mei Kin, Jamal@NordinYunus, Suriani Abdul Hamid, Daljeet Singh Sedhu

Distributive Leadership in A Public University in Malaysia

Khalip Musa, Tai Mei Kin, Jamal@NordinYunus, Suriani Abdul Hamid, Daljeet Singh Sedhu

Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris, Malaysia

Abstract

This qualitative study aims to understand the practice of distributive leadership among senior university leaders and managers. The researcher utilized a non-experimental qualitative, grounded theory research design. Gordon's (2005) distributive leadership model based on four dimensions of mission, vision and organizational goals, organizational culture, leadership practices, and shared responsibilities has been a guide in developing research questions. A total of 12 respondents involved, which consist of the dean, deputy dean, and head of the department. The data was collected using interview techniques based on semi-structured questions. Interview data were analyzed through a systematic coding process to find categories or themes. Based on the analysis of these four themes, the highest themes that emerged consistently are organizational culture dimension, followed by vision, mission, and organizational goals dimension, followed by a shared responsibility dimension, and the least is the dimension of leadership practices. Therefore, distributive leadership based on sharing among organization members widely practiced. The exercise of academic freedom as a long tradition has been well absorbed by distributive leadership through a freedom opinion. The university's vision, mission, and goals were shared among members in the planning and executing of activities. The organization also provided leadership development and leadership opportunity for members. The existence of a formal structure in university leadership and management helped foster leadership sharing practices among organizational members. However, as a form of leadership based on shared activities, there are still rooms for improvements such as mutual trust, closeness, and sharing of responsibilities.

Keywords: Distributive Leadership, Organizational Goals, Organizational Culture, Leadership Practices, Shared Responsibilities

Introduction

Universities in facing a global competitive challenge are searching for new leadership approaches. Even though all industries face the same problems, the higher education sector is uniquely to take on the role of developing and disseminating knowledge (Jones, Harvey, Lefoe&

Ryland (2012).) The higher education sector has undergone many changes in recent decades. These changes include increasing control in management, market competition, stringent monitoring, and changes in corporate governance and operations (Szekeres, 2004). These changes led to an increase in the anxiety of academic staff as their autonomy decreases with the emergence of new administrative units that can lead to a leadership crisis (Coates et al., 2009; Khalid, Islam & Ahmed, 2019).

The structure and culture of higher learning institutions generally incompatible with authority-based administrative systems. On the contrary, it remains intact to the needs of cooperation, consultation, and academic freedom (Deem, 2001; Alzgool, 2019; Umrani, Ahmed & Memon, 2015; Zin & Ibrahim, 2020).
In this context, where the university moves along with an ambiguous path through competition and conflicts between demands and expectations, the question of how could the university continue to move forward, motivate staff, move the organization together or just become a senior staff? (Bolden, Petrov & Gosling, (2009).

Malaysia's higher education landscape is undergoing rapid change as a result of global economic competition driven by quality human resources. The Government of Malaysia has launched the Malaysian Education Development Plan for Higher Education (MEDPHE) 2015-2025, to transform the country's higher education (Ministry of Malaysia Education, 2015). In realizing the plan, the institutions of higher learning must be able to absorb change, especially leadership and governance, based on autonomy and flexibility (Ministry of Malaysia Education, 2015). However, this goal has its obstacles. As a public university, the process of transformation from a bureaucratic system of management to autonomy is complicated. Bush (2015) concludes that some public education institutions in East and South Europe, Africa, and Asia are still operating on a bureaucratic system where centralization of power and formal leadership are crucial. This problem also acknowledged by the MEDPHE, 2015-2025, which concludes that public universities still tied to the decisions, regulations, and circulars from the center.

In response to the challenges facing by the higher education sector, there is a need for universities to practice distributive leadership that promotes leadership processes that spread throughout the organization through systems, activities, practices, and relationships (HEFCE, 2004). Despite adopting the concept of distributive leadership, there is still unclear in terms of power and responsibility, the processes involved, and whether the concept itself offers excellent benefits to practitioners or policymakers (Bolden, Petrov & Gosling, 2009).

Problem Statement
In general, scholars and researchers in the fields of leadership and higher education conclude that university leadership spread throughout the organization (Middlehurst, 1993; Knight and Trowler, 2001; Shattock, 2003). However, the exact processes and practices of distributive leadership and the implications of such leadership practices are unclear (Bolden, Petrov & Gosling, 2009).

Studies in the UK on the effectiveness of leadership in higher education have not been able to formulate a form of effective leadership. However, they have identified the need for leaders to create an environment for members to maximize their potential and interest in performing their duties (Bryman, 2009). They also identified leaders' demand for consultation, respecting existing values, supporting resilience, supporting subordinates, engaging directly in departmental or institutional activities, promoting autonomy, and preventing departments or institutions from losing focus.

The literature proposes alternative leadership to replace traditional leadership and provides new ways of understanding the concept of leadership (Eddy & DerLinden, 2006). According to Davis (2003), leadership identified as an activity that emerges at all levels of the organization and no longer focuses on formal leadership functions. Discussions of leadership across organizations, team leadership, servant leadership, transformational leadership, and role-play have replaced the discourse of superhuman or heroic leadership (Eddy & DerLinden, 2006).

The practice of distributive leadership opposed the bureaucratic structure that emphasizes the centralization of power. Both appear to be incompatible and potentially cause conflict if not carefully managed. The conflict discusses widely in the literature review (Kilinç, Koşar, Er, & Oğdem, 2016). There are studies in the West, showing that there is a conflict between distributive leadership and the bureaucratic structure of the organization. Louis, Mayrowetz, Smiley, and Murphy (2009), in their study, found that distributive leadership cannot adequately implement if the organization maintained a bureaucratic system in its administration. Conflicts arise from decision making when members are confused about their roles (Neuman & Simmons, 2000). Hartley (2010) has argued that distributive leadership in an awkward position in the bureaucratic environment of organizations. Harris (2005), in a gentle tone, argues that distributive leadership is valid only when formal leaders are willing to share power with subordinate leaders.

Distributive leadership based on the interaction of leader, follower, and situation offers a solution to the complex environment (Spillane et al., 2004). However, one question remains whether distributive leadership can be practiced in higher learning institutions or only as a perfect fantasy (Bolden, Petrov & Gosling, 2009). Moreover, the higher learning institutions in nature have been lead and managed through a bureaucratic with the balance of power, authority, resources, and reward system that focuses on individual achievement rather than a collective achievement as the basis of distributive leadership.

Literature Review
Distributive leadership is a leadership that is gaining attention in educational organizations. Gibb first used the term distributive in 1954, which stated that leadership should not be an exclusive monopoly but instead as a sharing of functions and roles among individuals (Menon, 2011). A distributive perspective is one of the alternative methods of leadership that empowers many leaders in an organization (Spillance, 2006). According to Bolden (2007), distributive leadership does not involve increasing leaders but rather the dissemination and distribution of leadership.

According to Harris (2008), distributive leadership models focus on interactions rather than actions among formal and informal leaders within the organization. Distributive leadership is not an individual practice, but it involves teamwork (Williams 2011). Harris (2012) also states that leaders need to work in unpredictable changes. Thus, the distributive perspective appropriately applies to the effectiveness of the organization. It provides an opportunity for all organizational members to make changes. Distribution in leadership can enhance management and success in planning. It can also help organizations meet challenges and increase effectiveness (Pont, 2008).

Distributive leadership is the development of management based on the concept of representation. It is the responsibility of leaders to engage subordinates in performing his or her duties (Dinham, 2006). In distributive leadership, subordinates can lead by giving encouragement, recognition, and support. It can enhance leadership potential, increase knowledge and skills in the organization. Distributive leadership is flexible that allows for change and enhances the role of workers in the organization. It contributes to organizational efficiency and reflects a significant paradigm shift (Williams, 2011).

Distributive leadership facilitates change, where it provides a framework to encourage all employees as partners to bring change (Jones et al., 2012) and provide principles for solving a problem (Ameijde et al., 2009). It also provides a potential for team members to increase their capacity to lead and respond to challenges in the organizational environment (Davidson et al., 2013). The distributive leadership is a phenomenon based on the strength of members as executors.

Distributive leadership defines by Spillane (2005) as a result of interactions between leaders, followers, and situations. Harris, Brown, and Abbot (2006) state that distributive leadership meant to the transition from a hierarchical leadership model to a model that emphasizes togetherness and sharing by organizational members. Wahab et al. (2013) state that in distributive leadership, not everyone can make a decision. However, they can contribute to the decision-making process through the available knowledge and expertise.

Distributive leadership is a practice of leadership that adopts the concept of empowerment and emphasizes the interaction between organizational members as an essential unit (Hulpia, Devos & Keer, 2011). Several models have developed to explain the concept of distributive leadership. Elmore's (2000) distributive leadership model is one of the earliest models that emphasize a change in an education organization setting. He introduces five principles focusing on change and improvement through the importance of goals and creating a conducive climate, continuous learning through dissemination new knowledge, provide exemplary influence over staff rather than using authority, developing expertise instead of formal authority, and accountability based on trust.

Further, Gronn (2000) describes the model of distributive leadership as integration in an action that involves spontaneous collaboration, intuitive working relationships, and institutional practice. Gronn's (2000) distributive leadership model was further developed by Leithwood et al.

(2007), who proposed spontaneously and planned collaboration practices that have great potential for organizational change. These practices are also explained by MacBeath (2005), who states that distributive leadership practices and actions are formal, practical, strategic, and progressive practices. These practices and actions cultivate when organizational leaders collectively mobilize members' energy and intelligence to achieve their shared goals.

Gordon (2005) conducted a quantitative study using the Distributive Leadership Readiness Scale (DLRS) to examine the impact of distributive leadership on organizational achievement. Gordon has presented four dimensions of distributive leadership. The four dimensions are mission, vision, and organizational goals,   organizational culture, leadership practices, and shared responsibilities.

Further, Spillane (2006) introduced distributive leadership theory as a practice of leadership that involves leaders, followers, and situations or contexts through interactive networks. This network created through collaboration, collective, and coordinated action. In similar, Harris (2004) elaborated on the distributive leadership theory by proposing an approach that combines various sources of leadership at any level for improvement. He associates the practice of distributive leadership with organizational structure. The organization with a lateral and flexible structure and supported by strong distributive leadership are capable of generating innovation and change.

Methodology
The purpose of qualitative research is to understand in depth the surrounding events. Comprehensive data is collected by asking open-ended questions. The main goal of qualitative researchers is to understand the views of the participants. (Merriam & Tisdall, 2015). A qualitative research approach for this study was chosen because its use in discovering the meaning that people give to events that they experience (Merriam, 1998). Qualitative research methods, by their very nature to nuance and detail, allow for data gathering in deep and take into consideration opinions and perspectives that may not visible or obvious (Creswell, 2012). It is used to gain an understanding of underlying reasons and opinions. Additionally, it seeks to understand a given research problem or topic from the perspectives of the local population it involves. Taking a qualitative approach that allows a deeper understanding of the complexity of the leadership phenomena (Conger, 1998;).

This qualitative study aims to understand the practice of distributive leadership by asking the following questions:
i) How is distributive leadership practiced through the sharing of the university's mission, vision, and goals?
ii) How are distributive leadership practiced through organizational culture in the context of mutual trust, freedom of opinion, decision-making, and cooperation?
iii) How is distributive leadership practiced through the practice of leadership in the context of professional development, leadership opportunities, and providing future leaders?
iv) How is distributive leadership practiced through the sharing of responsibilities in the context of sharing responsibilities, learning communities, and the existence of formal structures?

To adequately answer the research questions presented in this study, the researcher utilized a non-experimental qualitative grounded theory research design. Campbell (2011) explained that grounded theory research designs initially obtain data and then utilize the findings to discover and produce a theory.

Researchers collected data from the study participants using the Distributed Leadership Readiness Scale (DLRS) (Gordon, 2005). The data coded to assist researchers in developing an understanding of distributive leadership practices. Based on the data collected, the researchers analyzed the data to understand the four dimensions of distributive leadership practice: a) mission, vision, and organizational goals, b) organizational culture, c) leadership practice, and d) shared responsibility (Gordon, 2005).

The respondents of this study were 12 senior leaders and managers comprising deans, deputy deans, and heads of departments of a public university in Malaysia. Their involvement as respondents is voluntary. The researcher has interviewed with all respondents where each session took approximately 40-50 minutes. The researcher has conducted a total of 12 interview sessions within three months.

Data analysis for grounded theory involves a systematic coding process to help find categories or themes. Themes are abstract stages beyond categories (Ary et al., 2014). The grounded theory requires a large number of interpretations and data transformations (Cho & Lee, 2014). In qualitative research, where data trends are important, data encoding is essential. In short, the process of analysis in grounded theory involves conceptualizing, categorizing, identifying core categories, finding relationships between categories, and generating theories of those relationships (Cho & Lee, 2014).

From the results obtained from DLRS, the researchers analyzed the data and sought to understand how distributive leadership practiced. In particular, there are four dimensions of distributive leadership practices and 13 themes explored. The first dimension is mission, vision, and organizational goals (i.e., supporting vision, shared goals). Followed by the second dimension is organizational culture (i.e., mutual trust, freedom of opinion, collective decision-making, cooperation). The third dimension is leadership practices (i.e., professional development, leadership opportunities, providing future leaders). The last dimension is shared responsibilities (i.e., sharing responsibilities, learning communities, formal structures). Researchers are trying to determine if there are any similarities or themes between the responses in the four dimensions. In particular, the process is seeking an understanding of these four-dimensional distributive leadership practices.

Research Findings and Discussion
Based on the data analysis seeking for the themes that appeared consistently, the table below presented.

Table 1: Frequency of Themes of Distributive Leadership Dimensions

Respondent	Dimension 1 (vision, mission, and organizational goals)	Dimension 2 (organizational culture)	Dimension 3 (leadership practices)	Dimension 4 (shared responsibility)
1	3	3	2	2
2	3	4	2	3
3	3	2	3	2
4	2	3	2	2
5	3	3	1	3
6	2	2	2	2
7	3	3	3	2
8	3	3	3	2
9	2	2	1	3
10	3	3	2	2
11	2	4	2	3
12	3	3	3	3
Total	32	35	26	29

Based on Table 1 above, the highest number of themes according to the dimensions that appeared consistently were organizational culture dimensions (35 themes), followed by mission, vision and organizational goals dimensions (32 themes), shared responsibility dimensions (29 themes), and finally the dimensions of leadership practices (26 themes).

The analysis of the findings of the study further explores the themes that emerge based on the research questions.

Study Question 1: How is distributive leadership practiced through a shared mission, vision, and university goals?

As a result of the interview, two primary practices of distributive leadership implemented: (1) sharing mission and vision, (2) university goals. These result can be seen from the interview in the following example:

> Faculty members are generally aware of the mission and vision of the university to achieve excellence as an educational university. Accordingly, all the planning and implementation of our programs and activities lead to that goal.
>
> The vision and mission of the university is a compass and guide us in all planning and execution activities.

> *...when we evaluate the effectiveness of programs implemented at the department level, we often see how far we have contributed to the achievement of the university's vision and mission.*

> *...the university's goal of becoming the # 1 educational university has motivated our work. It was like a magical force that led us to work hard. This goal excited us.*

The findings of this study are in line with the views of some scholars who emphasize the importance of sharing goals to achieve the success and sustainability of distributive leadership. For example, Peace (2004) has emphasized that clear goals are essential to the development and sustainability of distributive leadership. Carson, Tesluk, and Marrone (2007) found that a clear goal is practical when it shared among group members. Goal sharing only occurs when team members have a common understanding of the main goals and take action to focus on common goals.

Study Question 2: How is distributive leadership practiced through organizational culture in the context of mutual trust, freedom of opinion, decision making, and cooperation?

As a result of the interview, three primary practices of distributive leadership exercised; freedom of opinion, mutual decision, cooperation. While trusting practices rarely reviewed. These can detect from the interview, as in the following example:

> *As a dean, I am open-minded and allow every faculty member to express himself. I think the views and ideas of faculty members will add value to any discussion and decision. I feel comfortable in this situation.*

> *In every meeting that I chair, I will make sure that every decision is a joint decision. Each host is encouraged to give their opinion. I do not like to make my own decisions.*

> *…many activities are carried out based on cooperation. We do research and article writing together. We also work together to improve the quality of learning and teaching in our department.*

> *…to trust each other is essential. Only by trusting each other, we can work as a team. It is difficult and challenging. We are working on that.*

The findings of this study have been in line with the views of several previous scholars. Theoretically, the practice of distributive leadership recognizes that the focus of formal leadership has shifted to the number of individuals involved in managing and leading the organization (Spillane and Diamond, 2007). Leadership involving groups of leaders is a crucial component of distributive leadership (Spillane et al., 2004). It is a lateral leadership style where leadership practices are shared by organizational members (Harris, 2008) and built on interactions that involve leaders, members, and situations in the context of influencing work

practices (Spillane, 2004). Kennedy et al. (2011) emphasize that there are three critical elements in determining the success of distributive leadership - leader confidence in others, shared decision making, and collaborative culture among organizational members.

Distributive leadership is, at one point, seen as the practice of leadership that scattered throughout the organization and beyond organizational boundaries (Spillane, Halverson, and Diamond 2001; Denis, Langley, and Sergi 2012). Individuals from different levels of an organization involved in an activity. Distributive leadership scholars often focus on integrated leadership in relationships and situations rather than individual leadership (Huxham and Vangen 2000). Distributive leadership is also often associated with team leadership, where there is a shared function of leadership among members of a team. Pearce and Conger (2003), defines team leadership as a dynamic and interdependent process within individuals in a group whose goal is to lead group members toward achieving group and organizational goals. It involves vertical and horizontal leadership in which members' influence is shared rather than in the hands of individuals acting as leaders.

Distributive leadership also refers to team members' reliance on each other to complete tasks and achieve goals. A team with high interdependence is said to have a distributive leadership trait (Fausing et al., 2015).

Study Question 3: How is distributive leadership practiced through the practice of leadership in the context of professional development, leadership opportunities, and future leadership?

As a result of the interview, there are two leading practices of distributive leadership implemented, namely professional development and leadership opportunities. Whereas preparing future leaders is a little concerning. These pieces of evidence can be seen in the following example:

> *Professional development is a priority for our faculty to ensure faculty members have the latest knowledge and skills in their respective fields. We regularly run internal courses, whether planned at the university or faculty level. TLAS courses is a clear example of how important the development of professionalism. Every lecturer must attend it.*

> *Each faculty member has the opportunity to become a leader at various levels. Many activities are carried out, such as research, teaching, and consulting involve teamwork where everybody has the potential to be a leader.*

> *…developing capacity as a future leader is more individualistic. So any faculty member who aspires to be a future leader needs to prepare himself. Many platforms are available.*

The findings of this study also support the opinion of previous scholars. The concept of distributive leadership defines the function of leadership distributed within the leadership team (Hulpia et al., 2010). Distributive leadership is that all employees in an organization have the right to participate in decisions that affect their job (Williams, 2011).

Study Question 4: How is distributive leadership practiced through the sharing of responsibilities in the context of sharing responsibilities, learning communities, and the existence of formal structures?

As a result of the interview, three leading practices of distributive leadership,i.e., shared responsibilities, learning communities, and the existence of formal structures.

> *…as I explained earlier, our working way is group-based, so sharing responsibility should be a fundamental principle. Each member takes responsibility collectively as a group.*

> *The existence of formal structures such as faculty and departments is a sound management system. It helps the management smoothly as there are individuals or groups of people responsible for performing a task. After all, their appointments based on knowledge and skills.*

> *…the learning community occurs when department members share new knowledge, skills, and experiences. My department encourages lecturers to attend seminars or conferences to share knowledge and gain new experience.*

The findings of this study are in line with the views of some scholars. Distributive leadership sees the role of leadership beyond formal leadership. Individuals are encouraged to contribute their expertise in helping an organization meet a goal (Torrance, 2011). Distributive leadership is a form of leadership that emerges as a result of individual interactions within a group by emphasizing the actions of experts in the organization (Gronn, 2002). Bennet et al. (2003) conclude that distributive leadership is group expertise rather than individual actions.

In a specific context, vertical leadership needed to support distributive leadership. Fletcher and Kaufer (2003) refer to this as a paradox of distributive leadership in which appointed leaders act together to reduce organizational hierarchy. Sveiby (2011) refers to this type of leadership as benevolent leadership, where leaders support to extend leadership across teams or organizations. Barnes et al. (2013) also acknowledge that distributive leaders must work with formal leaders to ensure that organizational conflicts and power competition managed effectively.

Conclusion
Distributive leadership, as a form of leadership based on shared leadership among organizational members, has been widely practiced. As a public university, academic freedom that has been at

the forefront of time has been well absorbed by distributive leadership by giving each member the freedom to express themselves. There is a shared vision of the university's mission, mission, and goals among members in the planning and execution of activities. Organization members also provided with leadership development and leadership opportunities. The existence of a formal structure as a core of university leadership and management has well used to help foster leadership sharing practices among organizational members. However, as a form of leadership based on shared activities, there is still room for improvement, such as mutual trust, accountability, and sharing of responsibilities.

Corresponding Author

Khalip Musa

Faculty of Management and Economics, Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris

Email: khalip@fpe.upsi.edu.my

References

Alzgool, M. (2019). Nexus between green HRM and green management towards fostering green values. *Management Science Letters*, *9*(12), 2073-2082.

Ary, D., Jacobs, L., Sorensen, C., & Walker, D. (2014). *Introduction to research in education* (9th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Barnes, B., John, H. H., Jennifer, D. O., Stephanie, S. P. H., & Milorad, N. (2013). Transcending the power of hierarchy to facilitate shared leadership. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal,* 34(8), 741–762. http://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-01-2012-0015.

Bennett, N., Harvey, J. A., Wise, C., & Woods, P. A. (2003). Distributed leadership: desk study review of distributed leadership, available at www.ncsl.org.uk/.

Bolden, R. (2007). Distributed leadership. *Discussion Paper in Management,* 7(2).

Bolden, R., Petrov, G., & Gosling, J. (2009). Distributed leadership in higher education: Rhetoric and reality, *Educational Management, Administration and Leadership*.

Bryman, A. (2009). *Effective leadership in higher education. Final Report*. UK: Leadership

Bush, T. (2015). Organisation theory in education: How does it inform school leadership? *Journal of Organizational Theory in Education,*1(1). Retrieved from

Carson, J. B., Paul, E. T., & Jennifer, A. M. (2007). Shared leadership in teams: An investigation of antecedent conditions and performance. *Academy of Management Journal,* 50(5), 1217–1234.

Cho, J., & Lee, E. (2014). Reducing confusion about grounded theory and qualitative

Coates, H., Dobson, I., Edwards, D., Friedman, T., Goedegebuure, L., & Meek, V. (2009). *The attractiveness of the Australian academic profession: A comparative analysis*. Research Briefing, L.H.Martin Institute, Education Policy Unit, ACER.

Conger, J. A. (1998). Qualitative research as the cornerstone methodology for understanding leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 9(1), 107-121
content analysis: similarities and differences. *The Qualitative Report,* 19(32), 1- 20. Retrieved from http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol19/iss32/2

Creswell, J. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Davis, J. (2003). *Learning to Lead*. Westport, CT: American Council on Education, Praeger

Davison, A., Brown, P., Pharo, E., Warr, K., McGregor, H., Terkes, S., &Abuodha, P. (2013). Distributed leadership: Building capacity for interdisciplinary climate change teaching at four universities. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 15(1), 98–110. doi:10.1108/IJSHE-10-2012-0091

Deem, R. (2001). Managing contemporary UK Universities - manager-academicsand new managerialism, *Academic Leadership Online*, 1(3), www.academicleadership.org

Denis, J. L., Ann, L., & Viviane, S. (2012). "Leadership in the plural." *The Academy of Management Annals,*6(1), 211–283. http://doi.org/10.1080/19416520.2012.667612.

Dinham, S., Aubusson, P., & Brady, L. (2006). Distributive leadership through action learning. *Australian Centre for Educational Leadership 5thInternational Educational Leadership Conference.*

Eddy, P. L., & DerLinden, V. K. E. (2006). Emerging definitions of leadership in higher education, 60. http://publish.wm.edu/articles/60

Elmore, R.F. (2000). *Building a new structure for school leadership*. The Albert Shanker Institute, Winter, 1-42.

Fausing, M. S., Thomas S. J., Joshua, L., & Michelle, B. (2015). Antecedents of shared leadership: empowering leadership and interdependence. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal,* 36(3), 271–291. http://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-06-2013-0075.

Fletcher, J. K., & Katrin, K. (2003). Shared leadership: paradox and possibility. In *Shared Leadership: Reframing the Hows and Whys of Leadership*, edited by Craig L. Pearce and Jay A. Conger, 21–47. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Foundation for Higher Education.
framework for academics, executives and professionals in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 34(1), 67–78. doi:10.1080/1360080x.2012.642334

Gordon, Z. V. (2005). The Effect of distributed leadership on student achievement. Ph.D. Dissertation. New Britain. Central Connecticut State University.

Gronn, P. (2000). Distributed properties: A new architecture for leadership. *Educational Management and Administration, 28*(3), 317 - 338.

Gronn, P. (2002), Distributed leadership, in Leithwood, K., Hallinger, P., Seashore-Louis, K.,Furman-Brown, Gronn, P., Mulford, W., & Riley, K. (Eds), *Second International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 557-560, available at ttp://newfirstsearch.oclc.org/.

Harris, A. (2005). Distributed leadership. In B. Davies (Ed.), *The Essentials of School Leadership,* 160-172. London, England: Paul Chapman.

Harris, A. (2008). Distributed leadership: According to the evidence. *Journal of Educational Administration,* 46(2), 172-188.

Harris, A. (2012). Distributed leadership: Implications for the role of principal. *Journal of Management Development,* 31(1), 7-17.

Harris, A. (2014). *Distributed Leadership Matters: Perspective, Practicalities, and Potential*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Harris, A., Brown, D., & Abbott, I. (2006). Executive leadership: Another lever in the system? *School Leadership & Management*, 26(4), 397-409.

Hartley, D. (2010). Paradigms: How far does research in distributed leadership stretch. *Educational Management, Administration, and Leadership,* 38(3), 271-285.

HEFCE. (2004). *HEFCE Strategic Plan 2003-08* (Revised April 2004), London: HEFCE.

Hulpia, H., Devos, G., & Van Keer, H. (2011). The relation between school leadership from a distributed perspective and teachers' organizational commitment: examining the source of the leadership function. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47(5). 728-771.

Hulpia, H., Devos, G., &Keer, H. V. (2010). The influence of distributed leadership on teacher's organizational commitment: A multilevel approach. *The Journal of Educational Research,* 103(1), 40-52.

Huxham, Chris, & Vangen, S. (2000). Leadership in the Shaping and Implementation of Collaboration Agendas: How Things Happen in a (Not Quite) Joined-Up World. *Academy of Management Journal,* 43(6), 1159–1175.

Jones, S., Lefoe, G., Harvey, M., & Ryland, K. (2012). Distributed leadership: A collaborative

Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia. (2015). *Pelan Pembangunan Pendidikan Malaysia 2015-2025 (Pengajian Tinggi)*. Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia.

Kennedy, A., Deuel, A., Nelson, T., &Slavit, D. (2011), Requiring collaboration or distributed leadership?,*Phi Delta Kappan*, 92(8), 20-24.

Khalid, N., Islam, D. M. Z., & Ahmed, M. R. M. (2019). SENTREPRENEURIAL TRAINING AND ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE: IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, 7(2), 590-593.

Kilinç, A. C., Koşar, S., Er, E., & Oğdem, Z. (2016). The relationship between bureaucratic school structures and teacher self-efficacy. *Mcgill Journal of Education,* 51(1).

Knight, P. T., & Trowler, P. R. (2001). *Departmental Leadership in Higher Education*, Buckingham: SRHE and OU Press.

Larsen, C., &Rieckhoff, B. S. (2014). Distributed leadership: principals describe shared roles in a PDS, *International Journal of Leadership in Education: Theory and Practice*, 17(3), 304-326.

Leithwood, M. B., Strauss, T., Sacks., R. N. M., & Yakashina, A. (2007). Distributing leadership to make school smarter. Taking the ego out of the system. *Leadership and Policy in Schools,* 6(1), 37 - 67.

Louis, K. S., Mayrowetz, D., Smiley, M., & Murphy, J. (2009). The role of sensemaking and trust in developing distributed leadership. In Harris, A. (ed.), *Distributed Leadership*. Dordrecht: Springer, 157–180.

MacBeath, J. (2005). Leadership as distributed: A matter of practice. *School leadership and management,* 25(45), 349 - 362.

Menon, M. E. (2011). Leadership theory and educational outcomes: The case of distributed and transformational leadership. *IESEI Conference*

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Merriam, S., &Tisdell, E. (2015). *Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley &Sons.Campbell, J. (2011). *Introduction to methods of qualitative research grounded theory.* [Video file]. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fZYlXMStdlo

Middlehurst, R. (1993). *Leading Academics*, Buckingham: SRHE and OU Press.

Neuman, M., & Simmons, W. (2000). *Leadership for student learning*. Phi Delta Kappan, 82(1), 9 - 12.

Pearce, C. L. (2004). "The Future of Leadership: Combining Vertical and Shared Leadership to Transform Knowledge Work." *The Academy of Management Executive,* 18(1), 47–57.

Pearce, C. L., &Conger, J. A. (2003). *Shared Leadership: Reframing the Hows and Whys of Leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pont, B., Nusche, D., & Moorman, H. (2008). *Improving School Leadership.* Policy and Practice, Paris: OECD.
Publishers.

Shattock, M. (2003). *Managing Successful Universities*, Buckingham: SRHE and OU Press.

Spillance, J. P. (2006). *Distributed leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Spillane, J. P. (2004). Distributed Leadership: What's all the Hoopla? *Working paper, Northwestern University*, Institute for Policy Research.

Spillane, J. P. (2004). Educational leadership, *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 26(2), 169-172.

Spillane, J. P. (2005). Distributed leadership. *The Educational Forum*, 69, 143-150. doi:10.1080/00131720508984678.

Spillane, J. P., & Diamond, J. B. (2007). *Distributed leadership in practice*, Teachers College Press, New York, NY.

Spillane, J. P., Richard, H., & John, B. D. (2001). Investigating school leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Educational Researcher* 30(3): 23–28.

Sveiby, K. E. (2011). Collective leadership with power symmetry: Lessons from Aboriginal Prehistory. *Leadership,* 7(4): 385–414.

Szekeres, J. (2004). The invisible workers. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *26*, 7–22.

Torrance, D. (2011), Preparing to lead, in Forde, C. and O'Brien, J. (Eds), *Coaching and Mentoring: Developing Teachers and Leaders*, Dunedin, Edinburgh, 45-62.

Umrani, W., Ahmed, U., & Memon, P. (2015). Examining the absorptive capacity construct: A validation study in the Pakistani banking context. *Management Science Letters*, *5*(12), 1053-1058.

Van Ameijde, J. D. J., Patrick C. N., Jon B., & Nathalie M. (2009). Improving leadership in higher education institutions: A distributed perspective." *Higher Education,* 58(6): 763–779. http://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-009-9224-y.

Wahab, J. A., Hanim, A., Hamid, Zainal, S., & Rafik, M. F. M. (2013). The relationship between headteachers' distributed leadership and teachers' motivation in national primary schools. *Asian Social Science*, 9(16), 161-167.

Williams, C. G. (2011). Distributed leadership in South African schools: Possibilities and constraints. *South African Journal of Education,* 31, 190-200.

www.organizationaltheoryineducation.com.

Zin, M. L. M., & Ibrahim, H. (2020). The Influence of Entrepreneurial Supports on Business Performance among Rural Entrepreneurs. *Annals of Contemporary Developments in Management & HR (ACDMHR)*, *2*(1), 31-41.