

LEADING HIGHER EDUCATION CURRICULUM REFORM IN BOTSWANA: ISSUES AND DIFFICULTIES FOR SCHOLASTIC CENTER CHIEFS**Shreya Awasthi**

Abstract- This exploratory review analyzed issues and difficulties for scholastic center supervisors (AMMs) in the main of educational program change in advanced education organizations HEIs. The reason of this study was that administration errands that include persuading and motivating subordinates as opposed to forcing them are the best approach to come by the best outcomes from subordinates during the course of educational program change. Therefore, the study sought to answer the following question: In Botswana's higher education institutions, how do AMMs lead curriculum change? The stratified random sampling method was used to select 162 AMMs from a total of 280 AMMs from the five HEIs. A concurrent triangulation design and a mixed methods approach were used. The concentrate likewise utilized an organized poll and a semi-structure interview for information assortment. Means and standard deviations were used to analyze quantitative data. The weights for responses with the words "Strongly Agree," "Agree," "Neutral," "DA," and "Strongly Disagree" were 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1. A criterion mean of 3 was calculated by dividing the weights by 5, so that responses with mean scores below 3 were rejected and those with mean scores of 3 or higher were accepted as representing marginal to very good performance in leading curriculum change. The qualitative data were analyzed using thematic analysis. Aftereffects of this study showed that the utilization of more participative authority styles, for example, appropriated administration is critical to fruitful preparation and execution of educational plan change in HEIs by scholastic center supervisors.

Keywords: Curriculum leaders, leadership models, distributed leadership, leadership dimensions.

1 INTRODUCTION

Initiative is an indistinct and troublesome idea to characterize and its importance has been a subject of much elevated banter for quite a while on the grounds that it is neither exact nor brought together (McCaffery, 2004; 2007 Bryman; Hallinger and Hell (2010a). There has been a proliferation of definitions that attempt to clarify the concept because there is still no universal definition of leadership (Bryman, 2007, Hallinger & Heck, 2010b). A number of leadership approaches have ranged along a continuum, from administration to management to leadership, due to the multiplicity and multidimensionality of leadership definitions. The last two leadership approaches represent more visionary, creative, inspiring, and energizing approaches than the first two (Bush, 2008; 2011 Gilbert According to

Northouse (2010), one of the definitions of leadership offered by authorities based on

their various conceptions and perceptions of the term includes the notion that leadership is a process intended to influence a group of individuals to work together to achieve a common objective. According to Hohepa and Lloyd (2009), leadership is also a process of influence that causes people to think or act differently depending on a task or circumstance. Without the collective support of institutional members, the higher education (HE) sector has become complex and difficult to manage, according to Joyce and Boyle (2013). Jones, Lefoe, Harvey, and Ryland (2012) argue that the complexity of higher education management necessitates collective or distributed leadership rather than hierarchical leadership.

2.1 The Managerial Leadership Model

According to the managerial leadership model (Leithwood, Mascall, Strauss, Sacks, Memon, & Yashkina, 2006), curriculum leaders should focus on their functions, tasks, and behavior because if these are done well, the work of others in the organization and department will be made easier and better. A cyclical process model with seven managerial responsibilities—goal setting, need identification, priority setting, planning, budgeting, implementing, and evaluating—must be developed and implemented by managers as leaders in order to effectively perform the aforementioned tasks. As it focuses on successfully managing existing activities rather than envisioning a better future for the institution or department, the model does not include the vision that is central to most leadership models (Bush, 2007). Since curriculum change is an ongoing, timeless process, it is not considered an effective model for higher education institutions' planning and implementation.

Nonetheless, the above model is likewise a model that is reasonable for a unified arrangement of the board, for example, the one that gets in many PHEIs in Botswana as it focuses on the effective execution of outer objectives, that is to say, those goals endorsed to the center supervisor by higher specialists inside a regulatory order in the organization. According to Daniel (2009), this model is a bureaucratic system or model in which making decisions is seen as a rational process in which good or efficient choices are made. This rationality is viewed in the light of the fact that, according to Daniel (2009), in a bureaucracy, there are distinct and unified sets of goals and objectives that must be accomplished within a predetermined amount of time. Written rules and regulations, a knowledge base, and clear and formal communication and reporting systems are

hallmarks of the preceding leadership model. Scientific management, as Tyler proposed it, is a good illustration of how the managerial leadership model is put into practice. According to Bush (2007), Tyler's model is associated with authoritarian, hierarchical, and inaccessible leadership styles and the belief that the middle manager has God-given, judicial, and final authority. It is praised for its effectiveness in ensuring operational efficiency, despite its opponents' claims that it is antidemocratic and archaic (Bush, 2007).

2.2 Transformative Leadership Model

The transformative leadership model makes the assumption that the commitment and capabilities of departmental members should be the primary focus of leadership. Building the department's vision, establishing the department's goals, providing intellectual stimulation, individual support, modeling best practices and important departmental values, creating a productive departmental culture, and developing structures to encourage member participation in departmental decisions are the major dimensions of the middle manager's role (Thrash, 2012). The process by which middle managers as leaders attempt to influence departmental outcomes, rather than the nature or direction of those outcomes, is the primary focus of the model (Bush, 2007; 2012). Thrash According to Allix (2000), one major criticism of the model is that the strong, heroic, and charismatic qualities of the middle manager as leader could lead to despotism.

2.3 Participative Leadership Model

According to Leithwood et al. (2006), this model assumes that the group's decision-making processes should be the group's primary focus. In the context of the role of middle managers during curriculum change, its three main assumptions are that: i) participation by all members

increases department effectiveness; ii) participation by all members is justified by democratic principles; and iii) leadership may be available to any legitimate stakeholder in the context of site-based management. According to Daniel (2009), this model is also known as the collegial model, and it places an emphasis on the development of a community of members who share interests in the decision-making processes that take place within the department or organization. Individuals in this group connect and impact each other through an organization of ceaseless individual trades in view of social cooperation, esteem agreement and correspondence (Daniel 2009). Members respect each other's professional autonomy and authority while exchanging ideas with their leader on both a formal and informal level. Because leadership functions and roles are shared, this leadership model is highly regarded for its ability to unite employees and alleviate middle manager pressures (Thrash, 2012).

3 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The theoretical framework of this study is the distributed leadership theory. Literature demonstrates that distributed leadership and effective leadership in general are necessary for effective change in higher education, particularly in curriculum change (Thrash, 2012; Wood, 2004; Northouse, 2007; 2006 Spillane; Bolden, 2007). As an alternative to leadership models like traits, style, situational, and transformational theories, which focus primarily on the characteristics and behaviors of individuals, the idea of distributed leadership has gained popularity in recent years (Bolden, 2007). Research has also demonstrated that distributed leadership is one of the most preferred leadership styles by AMMs in higher education, confirming its popularity (Lustik, 2008; Rhodes, Brundrett, & Nevill, 2008) is a

style that aims to explain and demonstrate how leaders can effectively, efficiently, and sufficiently lead change in their organizations and departments by sharing formalized power and authority (Lo, Ramayah, & de Run, 2010) (Thrash, 2012).

The reason of dispersed administration is that initiative ought to be more foundational to guarantee that authority obligations are separated from formal authoritative or departmental jobs and that the activity and impact of individuals at all levels are the ones perceived as vital to the general course and working of associations or divisions (Bolden, 2007). According to Spillane (2006), distributed leadership is a shift away from the traditional leader-follower dualism, which places all responsibility for leadership on the leader and portrays followers as somewhat passive and subservient, toward a more collective-oriented definition of leadership. As a result, distributed leadership is viewed as defining leadership in a way that shifts focus from the traits and characteristics of leaders to the shared activities and functions of leadership.

Pearce & Conge (2003), who postulate that leadership has historically been conceptualized in terms of an individual and his or her subordinates, concur. As a result, the field of leadership has focused more on the behaviors, mindsets, and actions of the individual leader in a team or organization than on the behaviors, mindsets, and actions of a team. Scholars, however, argued that leadership was not a role but rather a shared or distributed activity among members of a group or organization, challenging this conventional conception of leadership (Northouse, 2010, Holt, 2011, Leithwood et al., 2009; 2009, Harris; 2007 and 2006 Spillane). This new way of thinking about leadership saw it as a group quality or a set of tasks that must be done by the group, not just one person (Gronn, 2008a, 2008b). As a result, there

would be more leaders in organizations and departments—the numerical or additive function of distributed leadership—and this would make it easier for people to work together and engage with others (Gronn, 2010).

Earlier theories conceived of distributed leadership in a number of different ways. For instance, Melinck (1982) and Shelley (1960) viewed distributed leadership as describing tolerance for team members' differences of opinion. In the mid 1990s likewise, the term circulated initiative became seen as being equivalent to an unmerited group or independent group (Barry, 1991), a portrayal which reverberates well with current conceptualisations of disseminated authority particularly in its acknowledgment of initiative as a new common property (Leithwood et al, 2006). A more modern conception of distributed leadership did not emerge until the late 1990s and early 2000s. This conception portrayed distributed leadership as a web of leadership activities and interactions that spread across individuals and situations (Copland, 2003; Diamond, Halverson, and Spillane, 2004). According to Spillane et al. (2004), distributed leadership was viewed in this context as a social process of distributing leadership in which the leadership role is spread across a number of people's work and accomplished through the collaboration of multiple leaders.

4 CONCLUSION

The conclusion reached on the basis of the aforementioned findings was that AMMs are only marginally successful at leading curriculum change in PHEIs. A further conclusion was reached: AMMs performed their leadership roles more effectively and successfully when they were given control over curriculum change leadership tasks like establishing a vision and making the reason for the change clear. However, it was determined that AMMs performed their leadership

roles in PHEIs ineffectively when it came to tasks outside of their control, such as issues related to having authority over curriculum change issues and decision-making issues. It was also determined that the lack of authority to take initiative and be innovative in curriculum change in some PHEIs was the primary obstacle that AMMs faced, and that this obstacle had a significant impact on their leadership role in curriculum change.

5 RECOMMENDATIONS

AMMs must operate in an environment where they have sufficient authority to make decisions and take initiative in the performance of their curriculum change roles and responsibilities in order to effectively fulfill their leadership role. Most importantly, AMMs need to be more involved in making decisions about when and how to change the curriculum so that they feel like they own and are in charge. During the process of changing the curriculum, this will motivate them and assist them in motivating their subordinates.

REFERENCES

1. Allix, N. (2000). Transformational leadership: Democratic or Despotic. Retrieved from monash.edu/education/research.html [Accessed: 27th March 2014].
2. Barry, D. (1991). Managing the boss less team: Lessons in distributed leadership. *Organizational Dynamics* 20.1, 31-47.
3. Bolden, R. (2007). Distributed Leadership. Discussion Paper in Management Presented at the University of Exeter, United Kingdom. Retrieved from. Bolden, R. (2008). Distributed leadership. In Marurano & J. Gosling (Eds.), *Leadership: The key concepts*. New York: Routledge.
4. Brown, M., Rutherford, D., & Boyle, B. (2000). Leadership for School Improvement: The Role of the Head of Department in UK Secondary Schools. *School Effectiveness & School Improvement* 11.2, 237-258.
5. Bush, T. (2007). Educational leadership and management: theory, policy, and practice. *South African Journal of Education* 27.3, 391-406.
6. Bush, T. (2008). From management to leadership: Semantic or meaningful change? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership* 36.2, 271-288.

7. Bush, T & Glover, D. (2003). *Leadership Development: A literature Review*. Nottingham: National College for Leadership.
8. Bush, T. & Middlewood, D. (2005). *Leading and managing people in education*. London: Sage Publications.
9. Busher, H. (2005). 'Being a Middle Leader: Exploring Professional Identities', *School Leadership and Management* 25.2), 137-153.
10. [10] Brundrett, M. (2007). Evaluating the Individual and Combined Impact of National Leadership Programmes in England: perceptions and practices, Evaluation of the Impact of Leadership Programmes Project (ILP Project), The Centre for Educational Leadership (CEL), University of Manchester/National College for School Leadership (NCSL).
11. Bryman, A. (2007). Effective leadership in higher education: A literature review. *Studies in Higher Education* 32.6, 693-710.
12. Copland, M. A. (2003). Leadership of inquiry: Building and sustaining capacity for school improvement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 24.4, 375-395.
13. Corey, M. S., & Corey, G. (2006). *Groups: Process and practice*. Pacific Grove, CA: Thompson Wadsworth.
14. Daniel, T.E. (2009). Factors influencing performance of academic middle managers in the technical college System of Georgia. Doctoral Thesis submitted to the University of Georgia.
15. Del Favero, M. (2005). The social dimension of academic discipline as a discriminator of academic deans' administrative behaviors. *Review of Higher Education* 29.1, 69-96.
16. Del Favero, M. (2006a). Disciplinary variation in preparation for the academic dean role. *Higher Education Research & Development* 25.3, 277-292.
17. Del Favero, M. (2006b). An examination of the relationship between academic deans' administrative behavior. *Research in Higher Education* 47.3, 281-315.
18. French, R.P & Raven, B. (2005). The basics of social power. In Griffin, R.W, *Management*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
19. Gilbert, R. (2011). Professional Learning flagship Program: Leading curriculum change, Literature Review. Retrieved from www.aitsl.edu.au. [Accessed: 27th March 2014].
20. Gmelch, W. H. (2004). The department chair's balancing acts. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 126, 69-84.
21. Goodman, M.B. (2001). Current trends in corporate communication. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal* 6.3, 117 - 123.
22. Gosling, J, Bolden R., & Petrov, G. (2009). Distributed leadership: what does it accomplish? *Leadership* 5.3, 299-310.
23. Grint, K. & Holt, C. 2011 Followership in the NHS. Report from the King's Fund to inform the leadership commission. London: The King's Fund.
24. Gronn, P. (2010). Hybrid configurations of leadership. In: A. Bryman, D. Collinson (ed.), *International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
25. Gronn, P. (2008a). The future of distributed leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 46.2, 141- 158.
26. Gronn, P. (2008b) Hybrid leadership. In: K. Leithwood, B. Mascall and T. Strauss (eds.), *Distributed Leadership According to the Evidence*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.
27. Hallinger, P., and Heck, R. 2010a. Collaborative leadership and school improvement: understanding the impact on school capacity and student learning. *School Leadership and Management: Formerly School Organisation* 30.2, 95 - 110.
28. Hallinger, P., and Heck, R. H. (2010b). Leadership for Learning: Does Collaborative Leadership Make a Difference in School Improvement? *Educational Management Administration and Leadership* 38.6, 654-678.
29. Harris, A. (2008). *Distributed school leadership: Developing tomorrow's leaders*. Abingdon: Routledge.
30. Harris, A. (Ed.). *Distributed leadership: Different perspectives*. London: Springer.