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Concerns about Theory

- Concern about theory in educational administration began as early as 1954, emerging from annual meetings of the NCPEA (Knezevich, 1975).
Challenge to Leadership Theory

For two decades theories in leadership and management have been challenged for failure to include the female presence and voice in theory development (Brown & Irby, 1994; Shakeshaft & Nowell, 1984). These same leadership theories did not particularly include other minorities in leadership. Thus, such theories are not socially just.
In the Preface to the Social Justice Issue in the *Advancing Women in Leadership Journal*, Guest Editors, McKerrow and Shockley (2005) stated:

- Social justice is defined not only by what it is but also by what it is not, namely injustice. By seeking justice, we anticipate the ideal. By questioning injustice we approach it. Integrating both, we achieve it. It is one thing to agree that discrimination is wrong. That is the easy part. It is another to make a conscious choice to confront the discrimination that emerges from everyday interactions in organizations and communities. That brings out another element of social justice— the necessity of courage. And so, it seems that social justice requires interactions among a well-developed theoretical /historical viewpoint, a penchant for activism, the choice to meld the two and the courage to do it.
Universities espouse the importance of social justice. Katz and Ryan (2005) emphasized that social justice should be embedded in institutional practices so that all members of the university community demonstrate actions that distribute justice. This requires courage.
Achieving the 21st Century demands for social justice in educational leadership requires that equity in leadership theory be addressed.

Equitable leadership theory acknowledges experiences of both genders and a variety of ethnicities and cultures.
Social Justice for the 21st Century

- promotes (a) democracy in schooling, (b) equitable practices in schools, (c) equal treatment in social, economic, and political arenas, (d) removal of racial, linguistic, gender, and class-based barriers, (e) elimination of hostile environments, (f) equal power relationships, (g) opportunities and resources for career advancement, (h) voice to the marginalized or the oppressed, and (i) changes in attitudes, thoughts, and action (Irby, Brown, & Lara-Alecio, 2004).
Significant to the analysis of the theory taught in leadership programs is the fact that 75% of the pool from which entry level administrators will be drawn over the next decade are female (Hoxby & Leigh, 2005); therefore, it is important to ensure that the theory taught that should be a basis for guiding leadership actions be socially just. Equitable leadership theory acknowledges experiences of both genders.
Historically, theories in leadership and management did not embrace the concept of social justice in that they failed to include the female presence or voice. Additionally, those theories would not have been able to address the current realities of our schools and society.
Problems with Leadership Theories

- Theories run counter to goals of social justice.
- Theories traditionally included samples limited to males in corporate and military environments.
- Theories do not reflect currently advocated leadership practices or organizational paradigms.
- Theories are not relevant for all leaders.
- Theories perpetuate barriers that women and minority leaders encounter.
- Theories promote stereotypical norms for organizations.
- Theories fail to give voice to women and minorities; they do not consider the voice of diversity.
In an early analysis of leadership theories, Shakeshaft (1989) found gender-biased language and the absence of females in related research studies.
Irby, Brown, and Trautman (1999) examined 24 familiar leadership theories and reaffirmed the allegation that the conceptualization of leadership theory was formulated through “a male lens” and was “subsequently applied to both males and females.” These theories were examined for: (a) the inclusion of the female experience or attitudes; (b) gender as a significant variable in development of the theory; (c) females in the sample population; (d) use of non-sexist language, and (e) generalizability.
Iowa Studies (Lewin, Lippitt, & White, 1939) used four groups of ten year old boys and older male group leaders to determine in what type of climate more aggressive behavior occurs. What the researchers failed to ask was what would happen in these same groups if female ten-year-olds were used. Sexist language described the authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire group leaders.
Ohio State Leadership Studies

These studies were concerned with identifying leader behaviors needed to attain group and organizational goals. The researchers observed “head men” (Halpin & Winer, 1957, p.6) in corporate, academic, and military organizations using gender biased language such as the pronoun “he” when referring to a leader. They attempted to examine and measure leadership behavior with the following questions: What does an individual do while he operates as a leader? How does he go about what he does? (p. 6)

Also a part of the Ohio State studies, Hemphill and Coons (1957) developed the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire widely used by students of school leadership (Hemphill & Coons, 1957). The researchers took the viewpoint of leadership being a personality test of “great men” who were modeled after successful businessmen of their time. They simply ignored the possibility of a female concept of leadership. As a result, the studies were only generalizable to men in leadership, ignoring gender as a variable and leaving women out of their research sample.
Likert (1967) studied the differences in production-centered and employee-centered leaders in the Michigan Studies (Likert, 1967). He had employees from various companies fill out questionnaires, and the results favored the employee-centered leader. His research samples came from men in life insurance companies, railroad maintenance crews, large manufacturing companies, large utility companies, and a national service organization. Likert (1967) described employee-centered leadership traits as “he pulls for the company; he pulls for himself; he pulls for the men; and he pulls for the company” (Likert, 1967, p. 19). Other descriptors for leader were “boss”, “chief”, (Likert, 1967, p. 46) and one who has a “fine fellow personality” (Likert, 1967, p. 10). The masculine pronouns “he” and “his” were used throughout the book to describe the leader and leadership behavior, and gender was not used as a variable or discussed as a limitation of the study.
We must advance new socially just leadership theory.

Not only would the resulting theory encourage the embedding of social justice in pedagogy (Katz & Ryan, 2005), it would also be relevant for gender-inclusive educational organizations (Brown, Irby, & Smith, 1993) and for administrative training programs. Further, it would address concerns raised by Rost (1994) who asserted that the white male leadership paradigm has no relevance for the post-industrial age.
Over the past 20 years, several leadership concepts or theories which move toward social justice have emerged. Some have consciously included the experiences and perspectives of female leaders while some have not.
Leadership/Organizational Concepts or Styles

- Authentic Leadership (Leadership Style—interactive leadership and the nature of the leader’s impact) (Terry, 1993)
- Caring Leadership (Leadership Style—collectively achieve the organization’s goals through forming connections and enhancing relationships) (Gilligan, 1982; Grogan, 1998; Noddings, 1984)
- Ethical Leadership (Leadership Style—honors personal integrity and responds to the needs of others in promoting justice) (Starrett, 2004)
- Feminist Leadership/Organizations (Leadership Style and Organizational Concept—participatory leadership in shaping rules, goals, and practices) (Tong, 1989; McCall, 1995; Morgan, 1994)
- Interactive Leadership (Leadership Style—effective in flexible, non-hierarchical organizations; preferred by women) (Rosener, 1990)
- Learning-focused Leadership (Leadership Style—focus on teaching and learning) (Beck & Murphy, 1996)
Power to and power with (Leadership Style—democratic and collaborative leaders view power as a property of the group; consider power as a collective action and the ability to get things done with others) (Brunner, 1999; Brunner & Duncan, 1998)

Relational Leadership (Leadership Style—five attributes of leadership are collaboration, caring, courage, intuition, and vision) (Regan, 1990; Regan & Brooks, 1995)
Servant Leadership (Leadership Style—places good of others over self) (Greenleaf, 1977; Sergiovanni, 1992; Schlosberg, 2003)

Value-added Leadership (Leadership Style—substitutes moral authority for bureaucratic leadership) (Covey, 1990; Sergiovanni, 1994)

Visionary Leadership (Leadership Style—visioning for anticipation for change) (Nanus, 1992)
Constructivist Leadership (Leadership Concept—embraces some female leadership behaviors, but not developed specifically to include female leadership perspectives) (Lambert, 1995)
Organizational Framework
(Organizational Model− embraces some feminist organizational characteristics, but was not developed specifically as a feminist organizational theory) (Bolman & Deal, 1991)
Systems Theory (Organizational Theory– no specific mention of females, but schools are viewed as learning community) (Senge, 1990)
The Synergistic Leadership Theory (Leadership Theory– developed purposefully as a systems and postmodern theory to include the female voice and experience) (Irby, Brown, Duffy, & Trautman, 2002)
The Synergistic Leadership Theory

- Addresses the need for a post-modern leadership theory that is socially just.
- Provides an alternative to, and not a replacement for, traditional theories.
The Tetrahedral Model
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Leadership programs have the potential to change. Beginning with theory, programs can promote social justice through the inclusion of a socially just theory such as the SLT.
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