



## Leadership versus Management: Between Self-Concept and Actual Practices of Lebanese School Principals

Khalil Al Jammal and Norma Ghamrawi  
Faculty of Education, Lebanese University

### ABSTRACT

*This study attempted to investigate the theory and practice of leadership and management in selected schools in Beirut, Lebanon. The study was quantitative in nature and employed two surveys: one for teachers and another for principals. 110 schools were involved such that 53 were public and 57 were private. In each school the principal along with 4 teachers responded to the research questionnaires. Thus a total of 550 participants were involved: 110 school principals and 440 teachers. Data was analyzed using SPSS 18.0. Descriptive statistics were used to describe and summarize the properties of the mass of data collected from the respondents. Means scores, standard deviations and percentages were calculated per each item of the survey instrument. Cross-tabs and t-tests were also employed. Results indicated that concepts of leadership and management were not clear enough neither to public, nor to private school principals. Moreover, leadership practice was neglected, limited, and marginalized in almost schools involved. The study offers recommendations for research and practice.*

*Key words: leader, leadership, manager, management, school principals, school improvement*

Received 10/07/2013 Accepted 14/08/2013

© 2013 Society of Education, India

### INTRODUCTION

There has been a great interest in school leadership within the early part of the twenty-first century. This is because of the widespread belief that the quality of leadership makes a significant positive influence on schools and student outcomes (Leithwood et al., 2004; Bush, 2008; Day et al., 2009). In many parts of the world, including both developed and developing countries, there is recognition that schools require effective principals if they are to provide the best possible education for their students and learners (Leithwood et al., 2004; Bush, 2008; Day et al., 2009). However, there has also been a strong emphasis on the fact that school principals should not play the role of managers only, but also as leaders (Bush, 2008; Green, 2009). Leadership is often linked to school improvement (Bush, 2008). Outstanding leadership has invariably emerged as a key characteristic of outstanding schools (Bush, 2008; Green, 2009).

In many countries, school leaders begin their professional careers as teachers and progress to headship via a range of leadership tasks and roles (Leithwood et al., 2004). In many cases, principals continue to teach after their appointment, particularly in small primary schools (Bush, 2008). This leads to a widespread view that teaching is their main activity. Throughout Africa, there is no formal requirement for principals to be trained as school managers. They are often appointed on the basis of a successful record as teachers with the implicit assumption that this provides a sufficient starting point for school leadership (Bush, 2008). The picture is similar in many European countries, including Belarus, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, Hungary, Iceland, the Netherlands, and Portugal. This picture is also similar in both, public and private schools in Lebanon (Bush, 2008).

The necessity for specific preparation for school leaders is linked to the evidence that high quality leadership is vital for school improvement and student outcomes (Bush, 2008; Green, 2009). The widespread belief that specific preparation makes a difference to the quality of school leadership has prompted several countries, including Lebanon, to organize training sessions for school principals to provide them with the skills and techniques related to leadership.

The Lebanese Ministry of Education and Higher Education (MEHE) in collaboration with Team International, a local consulting firm; and two Canadian institutions: Collège Boréal and University of Calgary; developed the concept, materials and supervised the Leadership Development Program

(LDP) that aimed at expanding and enhancing the leadership skills of public school principals across Lebanon between 2005-2007. Nearly 35% of school principals were trained. However, since that time, no scientific research has been conducted to evaluate the impact of LDP in terms of supporting trainees in acquiring school leadership skills, nor to examine the degree they were utilizing such skills in their workplace.

In fact, the next tier of public school principals are being now trained by the Faculty of Education (FED) at the Lebanese University under the umbrella of MEHE based on the positive feedback uttered orally by trainees of the previous wave.

Accordingly, the purpose of this study was to examine the understanding and practice of school principals in Lebanon of leadership versus management. By this some robust feedback may be provided to LDP organizers that can guide their decisions and practice.

### **Purpose of the study**

The purpose of this study was to investigate the level of understanding of Lebanese school principals of the concepts of management and leadership. It also aimed at exploring the degree they considered leadership to be connected to school improvement. In other words, the target was to prove whether the respondents recognized that schools, require not only effective management, but also effective leadership which may have a vital role in the overall effectiveness of the school, performance of teachers and student achievement. In addition, this study attempted to explore whether Lebanese school principals were leading or managing their schools through the lens of their teachers.

Thus, the study aimed at answering the following research questions:

1. How do school principals in Lebanon conceptualize management and leadership?
2. Do school principals in Lebanon act out as leaders or managers in their work places?

### **CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

Leadership definitions in the literature are plenty, yet they are centered around inspiring, motivating, enabling and empowering other people to commit to a certain idea, belief, vision or target (Daft, 2007; Academy for Leaders, 2009; Bennis, 2009; Brown, 2009; Gupta, 2009; Grillo, 2010; Prussakov, 2009; McLoughlin, 2010; Clemmer, 2011; Daskal, 2011; Alvesteffer, 2012; Bhojwani, 2012; Padavich, 2012; Sanborn, 2012; Wise, 2012).

On the other hand, the literature frames management with a set of activities such planning, budgeting, controlling, implementing rules, supervising, organizing, and coordinating resources, processes, and systems leading people to deliver consistently according to specified goals and targets way (Daft, 2007; Academy for Leaders, 2009; Bennis, 2009; Brown, 2009; Gupta, 2009; Grillo, 2010; Prussakov, 2009; McLoughlin, 2010; Clemmer, 2011; Daskal, 2011; Alvesteffer, 2012; Bhojwani, 2012; Padavich, 2012; Sanborn, 2012; Wise, 2012).

The literature assures that there is a strong correlation between leadership effectiveness and school improvement (Leithwood et al., 2004; Bush, 2008; Day et al., 2009). Green (2009) enlists 10 questions in the form of self-evaluation questions for school leaders. Such questions (see below) provide a link between leadership effectiveness and school improvement.

1. Are you leading as well as managing your school?
2. Is your leadership focused on school improvement?
3. Do you use evidence to help secure school improvement?
4. Does your leadership challenge others to improve?
5. Is your leadership creating a successful learning community?
6. Do you share your leadership?
7. Are you aiming to be a "good enough" or a "perfect" leader?
8. Are you using both sides of your brain and all three intelligences in leadership?
9. Are you a self-aware leader?
10. Are you a leader with an appetite for change?

The above questions entail that school principals should not consume all their time on management-type activities. They must spend enough time thinking about planning for the changes that may have medium- and long- term implications for education, schools and learning. Thus, some of their current activities could be undertaken by other people to create more space for their strategic work (Day et al., 2009). School principals need to be effective managers as well as effective leaders (Bush, 2008).

But before asking the heads of schools that you need to devote a significant portion of your time

**REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

Characteristics of Leaders and Managers

Leadership and managerial characteristics are ample in the literature. Tables (1) and (2) enlist the ones that appear mostly.

**Table 1.** Characteristics of Leaders

Characteristics of Leader	References
The leader innovates.He/She brings a fresh outlook, new ideas.	Alvesteffer(2012), Bennis(2009),Brown(2009), Clemmer(2011), Daskal(2011), Padavich(2012), Prussakov(2009).
The leader is an original.	Bennis(2009),Prussakov(2009).
The leader develops the rules, the system.	Academy for Leaders-AL(2009), Alvesteffer(2012), Bennis(2009),Brown(2009),Daskal(2011),Padavich(2012), Prussakov(2009).
The leader leads people. He/Shefocuses on people.	AL(2009), Alvesteffer(2012), Bennis(2009), Brown(2009), Clemmer(2011), Gupta(2009),McLoughlin(2010), Prussakov(2009), Sanborn(2012).
The leader inspires trust.	AL(2009), Bennis(2009), Bhojwani(2012), Brown(2009), Daskal(2011), Grillo(2010), Gupta(2009), Padavich(2012), Prussakov(2009).
The leader has a long-range perspective. He focuses on long-term results.	Bennis(2009), Bhojwani(2012), Grillo(2010), Gupta(2009), Prussakov(2009).
The leader asks what and why.	Bennis(2009), Bhojwani(2012), Grillo(2010), Padavich(2012), Prussakov(2009).
The leader’s eye is on the horizon.The leader is more comfortable thinking outside of the box instead of in it.	Bennis(2009), Brown(2009), Gupta(2009),McLoughlin(2010), Padavich(2012), Prussakov(2009).
The leader originates.	Bennis(2009), Grillo(2010), Prussakov(2009).
The leader challenges the status quo.	AL(2009), Bennis(2009), Brown(2009),Daskal(2011), McLoughlin(2010), Prussakov(2009).
The leader is his or her own person. He/She is charismatic free-thinkers.He/She follows his own intuition. Leadership is a quality.	Bennis(2009), Bhojwani(2012), Brown(2009), Clemmer(2011), Gupta(2009),McLoughlin(2010),Padavich(2012), Prussakov(2009).
The leader does the right thing.	AL(2009), Alvesteffer(2012), Bennis(2009), Bhojwani(2012), Clemmer(2011), Daskal(2011), Padavich(2012), Prussakov(2009).
The leader creates vision and strategy.He/She sets destinations.	AL(2009), Alvesteffer(2012), Bhojwani(2012), Clemmer(2011), Daft(2007), Daskal(2011), Grillo(2010), Gupta(2009), McLoughlin(2010),Prussakov(2009).
The leader allows room for others to grow, and change him/her in the process.He/She empowers the employees.	Alvesteffer(2012), Brown(2009), Daft(2007), Prussakov(2009),Sanborn(2012).
The leader reduces boundaries. He/She is challenger of rules. He/She breaks rules.	Alvesteffer(2012), Daft(2007), Daskal(2011), Prussakov(2009).
The leader’s relationship and influence is based on personal power. People will naturally and loyally follow him.	Brown(2009), Bhojwani(2012), Clemmer(2011), Daft(2007), Daskal(2011), Gupta(2009), McLoughlin(2010), Padavich(2012), Prussakov(2009), Sanborn(2012).
The leader acts as coach, facilitator, and servant. In order to be successful, leaders will enlist the help and support of the employees in their charge.	Brown(2009), Daft(2007), Grillo(2010), Gupta(2009), McLoughlin(2010), Prussakov(2009).
The leader is proactive. He creates change.	Brown(2009), Clemmer(2011), Daft(2007), Daskal(2011), Gupta(2009), McLoughlin(2010),Prussakov(2009), Sanborn(2012).
The leader creates a culture of integrity.	Daft(2007), Daskal(2011), Gupta(2009), McLoughlin(2010), Prussakov(2009), Sanborn(2012).
The leader exhibits and focuses on: (a) emotional connectedness,	Clemmer(2011), Daft(2007), Daskal(2011), McLoughlin(2010), Prussakov(2009).
(b) open mind,	Brown(2009), Daft(2007), McLoughlin(2010), Prussakov(2009).
(c) listening, persuading, motivating,	Clemmer(2011), Daft(2007), Grillo(2010), McLoughlin(2010),Padavich(2012),Prussakov(2009), Sanborn(2012).
(d) nonconformity,	Alvesteffer(2012), Bhojwani(2012), Brown(2009), Daft(2007), Daskal(2011), Prussakov(2009).
(e) insight into self.	Brown(2009), Daft(2007), Daskal(2011), Prussakov(2009).

**Table 2.Characteristics of Managers**

Characteristics of manager	References
The manager administers, manages day-to-day activities.	Alvesteffer(2012), Bennis(2009), Brown(2009), Grillo(2010), Gupta(2009), McLoughlin(2010), Prussakov(2009), Sanborn(2012).
The manager is a copy.	Bennis(2009), Grillo(2010), Prussakov(2009).
The manager maintains the rules, the system. He goes on the existing roads.	Academy for Leaders - AL(2009),Alvesteffer(2012), Bennis(2009), Bhojwani(2012), Brown(2009), Daskal(2011), Padavich(2012), Prussakov(2009).
The manager focuses on systems and structure. He/She focuses on process and procedure.	AL(2009), Alvesteffer(2012), Bennis(2009), Brown(2009),Clemmer(2011), McLoughlin(2010), Prussakov(2009).
The manager relies on control.He/She directs and supervises subordinate staff.He/She controls the flow of production and performance.	Bennis(2009), Bhojwani(2012), Clemmer(2011), Daft(2007), Grillo(2010), McLoughlin(2010), Sanborn(2012).
The manager has a short-range view.He/She focuses on short-term results.	Bennis(2009), Bhojwani(2012), Grillo(2010), Gupta(2009), Prussakov(2009).
The manager asks how and when.	Bennis(2009),Bhojwani(2012), Prussakov(2009).
The manager has his or her eye always on the bottom line. He/She takes a formal and rational approach to his jobs.	Alvesteffer(2012),Bennis(2009), Bhojwani(2012), Brown(2009), Clemmer(2011) , Daskal(2011), McLoughlin(2010), Padavich(2012), Prussakov(2009).
The manager imitates.	Bennis(2009), Grillo(2010), Prussakov(2009).
The manager accepts the status quo.He/Sheadverses to risk and prefers to preservethe status quo.	AL(2009), Alvesteffer(2012), Bennis(2009), Brown(2009), Daskal(2011), Prussakov(2009).
The manager is the classic good soldier.He/She is implementer of rules. He is reactive.	Alvesteffer(2012), Bennis(2009), Clemmer(2011), Prussakov(2009).
The manager does things right.	AL(2009),Alvesteffer(2012),Bennis(2009), Bhojwani(2012), Brown(2009) ,Clemmer(2011), Daskal(2011), Grillo(2010), Prussakov(2009).
The manager plans, organizes and budgets to maximize production within the current system of an organization.	Brown(2009), Bhojwani(2012), Daft(2007), Daskal(2011), Grillo(2010), Prussakov(2009).
The manager is generally directing and controlling.	Brown(2009), Bhojwani(2012), Daft(2007), Daskal(2011), Grillo(2010), Prussakov(2009).
The manager creates boundaries, makes rules.	Daft(2007), Daskal(2011), Prussakov(2009).
The manager's relationship with people is based on position power. Management is related to titles.	Brown(2009),Bhojwani(2012),Clemmer(2011), Daft(2007), McLoughlin(2010), Prussakov(2009), Sanborn(2012).
The manager acts as boss. He/She has subordinates.	Brown(2009), Bhojwani(2012), Daft(2007), Daskal(2011), Gupta(2009), Prussakov(2009), Sanborn(2012).
The manager tends to seek comfort and stability. He/She reacts to change.	AL(2009), Brown(2009), Daft(2007), Daskal(2011), Prussakov(2009), Sanborn(2012).
The manager concentrates on doing things efficiently.He works on maximizing output.He/She creates a culture of efficiency.	Brown(2009), Daft(2007), Daskal(2011), Grillo(2010), Gupta(2009), McLoughlin(2010), Prussakov(2009), Sanborn(2012).
The manager tends to bring to his positions a lot of technical experience and a solid understanding of how the systems in his institution work.	Brown(2009), Clemmer(2011), McLoughlin(2010).
The manager exhibits and focuses on:	Clemmer(2011), Daft(2007), Daskal(2011), Prussakov(2009).
(a) emotional distance,	
(b) expert mind,	Brown(2009), Clemmer(2011), Daft(2007), Grillo(2010), McLoughlin(2010), Prussakov(2009), Sanborn(2012).
(c) talking, communicating,	AL(2009), Daft(2007), Prussakov(2009), Sanborn(2012).
(d) conformity,	Alvesteffer(2012), Bhojwani(2012), Brown(2009), Clemmer(2011), Daft(2007), Daskal(2011), Padavich(2012), Prussakov(2009).
(e) insight into organization.	Brown(2009),Daft(2007), Daskal(2011), Prussakov(2009), Sanborn(2012).

The tables above show that the two roles are not contradictory, but rather one complements the other. The role of both is essential to school. Obviously, every school needs someone who: manages day-to-day activities, implements rules, focuses on short-term results, and concentrates on doing things efficiently. Yet a school also needs who: focuses on people, challenges the status quo, sets new destinations, makes and delivers the transition from now to a better future. Certainly, a school principal who mismanages daily activities spends most of his time on strategic planning and focuses only on long-term results would be nothing more a dreamer. This will have serious repercussions on profitability and productivity of the school that will see its survival threatened.

However, the literature illustrates that the principal must not simply develop his leadership skills, but he must also help teachers to become leaders (Crowther et al., 2009). In other words, he should

help them to acquire the necessary leadership skills and give them the opportunity to exercise leadership in their classrooms and in the school. Teacher leaders, working with principals, are instructional and organizational change agents who have a critical impact on the school, teachers and student achievement(Crowther et al. 2009).Teacher leaders assume a wide range of roles: Resource Provider, Instructional Specialist, Curriculum Specialist, Classroom Supporter, Learning Facilitator, Mentor, Data Coach, School Leader, Catalyst for Change (Aguilar, 2010;Harrison, 2007). Developing the leadership skills of the school staff and giving it the opportunity to exercise them are two indicators of participative leadership (Bush, 2008).

*Leadership versus Management*

When school principals are involved in the functions of planning, organizing, staffing, supervising and controlling they are said to be managing (Bush, 2008). When they are involved in influencing people through inspirational words and actions for achieving the collective goals they are said to be leading (Aguilar, 2010). Leadership is about thinking and bringing change in the organization, whereas management is about ensuring order and consistency in the organization (Alagse 2009).

The importance of leadership emerges from its role of creating and shaping a culture of integrity and setting a new destination for the school. Without it, there would be no role for management; no cause for it to exist. Leadership creates a context for the management to exist and to persist. Management on the other hand, through well laid out processes and systems, ensures that effective leadership at every level is developed in the school, as a driver for future growth. Leaders create future through strong ideas and leave strong imprint of ideology for the school on which the management system is designed(Alagse 2009).

So, both leadership and management are integral for the success of any school, without one of them; the effectiveness of other is jeopardized. In the absence of leadership, management is a stifling bureaucracy and devoid of clear ends (vision, mission or long term goals) and means (values and behaviours required in the long term). Also leadership, without effective management; may lack the discipline and coordinated effort to accomplish long term goals of the school(Alagse 2009).

Common to both leadership and management are the following:

- Both are involved in the same organization, the same school.
- Both aim at achieving goals
- Both want to achieve goals that belong to the educational and to the administrative domains
- Both mobilize and utilize resource
- Both serve as a link between top management (or board) and subordinates (or followers)
- Both depend upon subordinates (or followers) and hence try to motivate them (Transtutors, 2012; p.12)

So, if we do theoretically speak about management and leadership as discrete entities, we may not do that when it comes to practice. The boundaries are not clearly defined in practice due to the interference between these two concepts. Leadership and management may be considered two inseparable and intertwined aspects of organizational reality (Bush, 2008). In the administrative reality, we cannot say here begins the role of manager and here ends the role of leader and vice versa.

Table (3) attempts to provide a theoretical discretion of the roles played by leaders versus managers. This table summarizes the above (and more) and gives a sense of the differences between being a manager and being a leader. This is, of course, an illustrative characterization, and there is a whole spectrum between either ends of these scales along which each role can range. In fact, many people lead as well as manage, and so may display a combination of behaviors(Changing Minds, 2012).

**Table 3.** Comparison between the Roles of Leader and Manager Based on Different Subjects

Basis/Subject	Leader	Manager
Origin	Personal qualities/Personal Charisma	Formal authority
Status	Free thinker/Inspirational person	Classic good soldier
Focus	Leading people	Managing work
Energy	Passion	Control
Employees	Followers	Subordinates
Style	Transformational	Transactional
Decision	Facilitates	Makes
Persuasion	Sell	Tell
Skills	Leading, listening, persuading, motivating,	Managing, directing, controlling, organizing,

	empowering	supervising
Concern	What is right	Being right
Appeal to	Heart	Head
Exhibits/Focuses on	Emotional connectedness	Emotional distance
Insight into	Self	Organization
Truth	Seeks	Establishes
Destination	New roads	Existing roads
Essence	Change/Innovation	Comfort/Stability
Approach	Sets direction	Plans detail
Rules	Challenger	Implementer
Boundaries	Reduces	Makes
Change	Proactive	Reactive
Results	Long-term	Short-term
Exchange	Excitement for work	Money for work
Eye	On the horizon	On the bottom line
Mind	Open mind	Expert mind
Seeks	Vision	Operational objectives
Asks	What? Why?	How? When?
Wants	Achievement	Results
Likes	Striving	Action
Credit	Gives	Takes
Risk	Takes	Avoids/Minimizes
Blame	Takes	Blames
Culture	Culture of integrity	Culture of efficiency

## METHODOLOGY

### *Research Instrument*

In this quantitative research, we used two questionnaires as a data collection tool. The first was sent to school principals, while the second was sent to their teachers.

The school principal's questionnaire consisted of 2 parts: The first one intended to collect general information about the principals (demographic information). The second was divided into two sub-sections. One included 40 characteristics, 20 of them were specifically related to managers, the others were particularly related to leaders. It is a selected-response-test. The school principals were requested to specify the characteristics of leaders and those of managers. Thus, this sub-section allowed for testing the knowledge of the respondents about the concepts of management and leadership, as well as their ability to distinguish between the characteristics of managers and leaders. The second sub-section, included an open question that enabled the researchers to distinguish if school principals understood the importance of the role of management and leadership in the school.

Teachers' questionnaire consisted of two parts: the first one provided the study with general information about the respondents; while the second included 40 characteristics of school principals: 20 of them were mainly related to managerial work, and the other 20 were specifically related to the tasks attributed to leaders. Out of the 40 characteristics, teachers were requested to choose the top 10 that, in their opinion, marked the administration of their school principals. This part of the questionnaire enabled researchers to distinguish the degree school principals were acting out as school leaders and/or managers through the lens of their teachers.

It should be noted that the selection of the 40 characteristics of management and leadership addressed in the questionnaires were made on the basis of the conceptual framework of this study.

### *The Sample*

The sample of this study consisted of 550 respondents: 110 school principals and 440 teachers. In fact, questionnaires were sent to 110 schools, all located in Beirut and were divided between the public sector (53 schools) and the private sector (57 schools). The 53 principals of public schools were all participants in the training sessions conducted by Team International (Lebanon) in collaboration with Collège Boréal and University of Calgary (Canada). These sessions were held between 2005 and 2007 under the title: "Leadership Development Program" (LDP) for the principals of public schools organized by the Lebanese Ministry of Education and Higher Education (MEHE).

The 440 teachers were selected from 110 schools: 4 teachers from each one on the basis of their readiness to participate. 212 teachers were members of public schools and 228 were private school teachers.

Finally, it should be noted that the empirical work was conducted between January 3<sup>rd</sup> and March 5<sup>th</sup>, 2013.

*Data Analysis*

Data was analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS 18.0) for windows. Descriptive statistics were used to describe and summarize the properties of the mass of data collected from the respondents. Means scores, standard deviations and percentages were calculated per each item of the survey instrument.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

**School Principals Data**

*Demographic Characteristics of Principals*

Table 4, which represents the demographics of principals, indicates that the sample was consisted of an approximate equal number of female principals (51.8%) and male principals (48.2%). The majority of participants (54.4%) were between 36 and 45 years, the other participants (45.6%) had more than 46 years. Almost all principals (98.8%) had more than 10 years of principalship experience. Finally, the majority of the sample (62.3%) were holders of none educational Bachelor degrees.

**Table 4.** Demographic Characteristics of Principals

	%
<i>Gender</i>	
Male	48.2
Female	51.8
<i>Age (Years)</i>	
Less than 25	0.00
26-35	0.00
36-45	54.4
46 and above	45.6
<i>Principalship Experience (Years)</i>	
Less than 4	0.00
5-9	1.20
10- 14	42.1
15- 19	34.2
20 and above	22.5
<i>Highest Degree Held</i>	
Bachelors (Faculty of Education Graduates)	15.3
Bachelors (Graduated from faculties other than Education)	62.3
Masters	19.3
PhD	3.6

The overall frequencies of School Principals are presented in table (5).

**Table5:** Overall Frequencies: School Principals

Item number	Item Manager or Leader...	Wrong Total: 110	Correct Total: 110
1	directs employees and assigns them tasks specified in job description.	70	40
2	prefers to maintain stability and he focuses on rules.	47	63
3	oversees the preparations for the training of personnel.	50	60
4	asks what and why.	57	53
5	ensures that all employees receive training appropriate to their needs.	54	56
6	focuses on far future goals.	58	52
7	has a great ability to persuasion.	47	63
8	ensures that all new teachers receive appropriate support.	70	40
9	does not care about the details.	50	60
10	focuses more on production.	58	52
11	cares so much about rules and regulations.	54	56
12	has the ability to innovative thinking.	47	63
13	derives his authority and legitimacy of his career.	54	56
14	develops ideas and principles.	57	53
15	derives his authority and legitimacy of the official texts.	54	56
16	cares about strategic issues.	50	60
17	focuses on human relationships.	52	58
18	is followed by others voluntarily.	52	58
19	checks in accounts.	54	56
20	delegates tasks and responsibilities to subordinates.	58	52
21	challenges the status quo.	52	58

22	tends to the practice of punishment with employees.	54	56
23	depends a lot on control.	58	52
24	asks how and when.	47	63
25	changes mentalities and ways of thinking.	47	63
26	determines the vision.	52	58
27	controls the employees.	59	51
28	tracks the daily performance of the employees.	47	63
29	always knows every detail.	58	52
30	cares a lot in motivating others.	54	56
31	focuses on the long-term results.	57	53
32	focuses too much on the mechanisms of action.	70	40
33	derives his authority and legitimacy of his personal qualities.	52	58
34	looks to the future.	57	53
35	has the spirit of competition.	70	40
36	proves that he has great confidence in himself.	55	55
37	participates in the selection and appointment of personnel in accordance with the specified conditions.	51	59
38	runs the risk, if necessary.	52	58
39	prepares himself and the institution to implement the vision.	55	55
40	assesses the performance of employees in accordance with the specified criteria.	70	40

As explained earlier, the above table included 40 items: 20 items were mostly related to management actions, while the other 20 were mostly attributed to leadership characteristics. The 110 school principals were requested to identify the items related to management and those related to leadership. Results indicate that 15 items were answered incorrectly by more than half of the school principals (i.e. more than 55 principals). The number of answers distributed evenly on 2 items: 55 respondents answered them correctly and 55 others answered them incorrectly. The same table also shows that 17 items were answered correctly by participants, but their number did not exceed 60 (between 56 and 60 principals). Finally, with respect to the remaining 6 items, they were answered correctly by 63 participants.

To compare responses of private and public school principals, a cross tabulation was conducted. Results are presented in table (6).

**Table 6:** Cross Tabulation: Private School Principals versus Public School Principals

Item number	Item Manager or Leader...	Wrong		Correct	
		Private 57	Public 53	Private 57	Public 53
1	directs employees and assigns them tasks specified in job description.	50	20	07	33
2	prefers to maintain stability and he focuses on rules.	29	18	28	35
3	oversees the preparations for the training of personnel.	28	22	29	31
4	asks what and why.	34	23	23	30
5	ensures that all employees receive training appropriate to their needs.	33	21	24	32
6	focuses on far future goals.	37	21	20	32
7	has a great ability to persuasion.	29	18	28	35
8	ensures that all new teachers receive appropriate support.	50	20	07	33
9	does not care about the details.	28	22	29	31
10	focuses more on production.	37	21	20	32
11	cares so much about rules and regulations.	33	21	24	32
12	has the ability to innovative thinking.	29	18	28	35
13	derives his authority and legitimacy of his career.	33	21	24	32
14	develops ideas and principles.	34	23	23	30
15	derives his authority and legitimacy of the official texts.	33	21	24	32
16	cares about strategic issues.	28	22	29	31
17	focuses on human relationships.	32	20	25	33
18	is followed by others voluntarily.	32	20	25	33
19	checks in accounts.	33	21	24	32
20	delegates tasks and responsibilities to subordinates.	37	21	20	32
21	challenges the status quo.	32	20	25	33
22	tends to the practice of punishment with employees.	33	21	24	32
23	depends a lot on control.	37	21	20	32
24	asks how and when.	29	18	28	35
25	changes mentalities and ways of thinking.	29	18	28	35
26	determines the vision.	32	20	25	33
27	controls the employees.	35	24	22	29
28	tracks the daily performance of the employees.	29	18	28	35
29	always knows every detail.	37	21	20	32
30	cares a lot in motivating others.	33	21	24	32
31	focuses on the long-term results.	33	24	24	29



32	focuses too much on the mechanisms of action.	50	20	07	33
33	derives his authority and legitimacy of his personal qualities.	32	20	25	33
34	looks to the future.	33	24	24	29
35	has the spirit of competition.	50	20	07	33
36	proves that he has great confidence in himself.	31	24	26	29
37	participates in the selection and appointment of personnel in accordance with the specified conditions.	27	24	30	29
38	runs the risk, if necessary.	32	20	25	33
39	prepares himself and the institution to implement the vision.	31	24	26	29
40	assesses the performance of employees in accordance with the specified criteria.	50	20	07	33

Table (6) shows that 36 items out of the 40 were answered incorrectly by more than half the number of private school principals (i.e. more than 28 respondents). The number ranged between 29 and 50 principals. As for the remaining 4 items, the number of participants who answered them correctly did not exceed 30, such that 3 items were answered correctly by 29 principals; one item was answered correctly by 30 principals.

In contrast, the table shows that the 40 items were answered correctly by more than half the number of public school principals (i.e. more than 26 respondents). The number ranged between 29 and 35 respondents. More precisely, the majority of items (34 items) were answered correctly by more than half of the principals, but that number did not exceed 33, while the other 6 items were answered correctly by 35 participants. These numbers are surprising, knowing that the 53 principals of public schools had all participated in LDP.

Mean scores of items per each category of school principals are listed in table (7).

**Table 7.** Mean Scores for Public and Private School Principals

Item number	Item Manager or Leader...	Mean Score	
		Private School Principals	Public School Principals
1	directs employees and assigns them tasks specified in job description.	.12	.62
2	prefers to maintain stability and he focuses on rules.	.49	.66
2	oversees the preparations for the training of personnel.	.51	.58
4	asks what and why.	.40	.57
5	ensures that all employees receive training appropriate to their needs.	.42	.60
6	focuses on far future goals.	.35	.60
7	has a great ability to persuasion.	.49	.66
8	ensures that all new teachers receive appropriate support.	.12	.62
9	does not care about the details.	.51	.58
10	focuses more on production.	.35	.60
11	cares so much about rules and regulations.	.42	.60
12	has the ability to innovative thinking.	.49	.66
13	derives his authority and legitimacy of his career.	.42	.60
14	develops ideas and principles.	.40	.57
15	derives his authority and legitimacy of the official texts.	.42	.60
16	cares about strategic issues.	.51	.58
17	focuses on human relationships.	.44	.62
18	is followed by others voluntarily.	.44	.62
19	checks in accounts.	.42	.60
20	delegates tasks and responsibilities to subordinates.	.35	.60
21	challenges the status quo.	.44	.62
22	tends to the practice of punishment with employees.	.42	.60
23	depends a lot on control.	.35	.60
24	asks how and when.	.49	.66
25	changes mentalities and ways of thinking.	.49	.66
26	determines the vision.	.44	.62
27	controls the employees.	.39	.55
28	tracks the daily performance of the employees.	.49	.66
29	always knows every detail.	.35	.60
30	cares a lot in motivating others.	.42	.60
31	focuses on the long-term results.	.42	.55
32	focuses too much on the mechanisms of action.	.12	.62
33	derives his authority and legitimacy of his personal qualities.	.44	.62
34	looks to the future.	.42	.55

35	has the spirit of competition.	.12	.62
36	proves that he has great confidence in himself.	.46	.55
37	participates in the selection and appointment of personnel in accordance with the specified conditions.	.53	.55
38	runs the risk, if necessary.	.44	.62
39	prepares himself and the institution to implement the vision.	.46	.55
40	assesses the performance of employees in accordance with the specified criteria.	.12	.62

Table (7) shows that the mean scores of public school principals are higher than those of the private school principals on all items. The table shows that the mean scores are significantly larger between the two groups for the items 1, 8, 32, 35 and 40; where the mean score of public school principals is 0.62 as opposed to 0.12 for private school principals.

However, these data do not allow for rejecting or accepting the null hypothesis which entails that there is no statistical significance between the means of public and private school principals in attributing the right role to leaders/managers.

In other words, it is necessary to calculate the t-test to support the rejection ( $p < .05$ ) or the acceptance ( $p > .05$ ) of the null hypothesis.

**Table: 8 T-Test for Public and Private School Principals**

Item number	Item Manager or Leader...	Sig.	Sig. (2-tailed)
1	directs employees and assigns them tasks specified in job description.	.000	.000
2	prefers to maintain stability and he focuses on rules.	.013	.074
3	oversees the preparations for the training of personnel.	.208	.427
4	asks what and why.	.532	.090
5	ensures that all employees receive training appropriate to their needs.	.602	.056
6	focuses on far future goals.	.340	.008
7	has a great ability to persuasion.	.013	.074
8	ensures that all new teachers receive appropriate support.	.000	.000
9	does not care about the details.	.208	.427
10	focuses more on production.	.340	.008
11	cares so much about rules and regulations.	.602	.056
12	has the ability to innovative thinking.	.013	.074
13	derives his authority and legitimacy of his career.	.602	.056
14	develops ideas and principles.	.532	.090
15	derives his authority and legitimacy of the official texts.	.602	.056
16	cares about strategic issues.	.208	.427
17	focuses on human relationships.	.213	.054
18	is followed by others voluntarily.	.213	.054
19	checks in accounts.	.602	.056
20	delegates tasks and responsibilities to subordinates.	.340	.008
21	challenges the status quo.	.213	.054
22	tends to the practice of punishment with employees.	.602	.056
23	depends a lot on control.	.340	.008
24	asks how and when.	.013	.074
25	changes mentalities and ways of thinking.	.013	.074
26	determines the vision.	.213	.054
27	controls the employees.	.197	.092
28	tracks the daily performance of the employees.	.013	.074
29	always knows every detail.	.340	.008
30	cares a lot in motivating others.	.602	.056
31	focuses on the long-term results.	.523	.189
32	focuses too much on the mechanisms of action.	.000	.000
33	derives his authority and legitimacy of his personal qualities.	.213	.054
34	looks to the future.	.523	.189
35	has the spirit of competition.	.000	.000
36	proves that he has great confidence in himself.	.945	.345
37	participates in the selection and appointment of personnel in accordance with the specified conditions.	.674	.828
38	runs the risk, if necessary.	.213	.054
39	prepares himself and the institution to implement the vision.	.945	.345
40	assesses the performance of employees in accordance with the specified criteria.	.000	.000

The results for items 1, 8, 32, 35 and 40, table 9 support the rejection of the null hypothesis: there is no difference between the two groups. The acceptance of the alternative hypothesis entails that there is a statistical significant difference between the two groups ( $p < .05$ ). In other words,

concerning these 5 items, there is a statistical significance between the means of public and private school principals in attributing the right role to leaders/managers.

In regards to the majority of the items (35 of 40 items), table 8 supports the acceptance of the null hypothesis ( $p > .05$ ) entailing that there is no statistical significance between the means of public and private school principals in assigning the right role to leaders/managers.

**Teachers Data**

As stated earlier, a questionnaire was distributed to teachers that included the 40 items enclosed in principals', and they had to choose the top 10 items (characteristics) they considered to closely describe their principals' administrations. These 40 items contained 20 items that describe managerial administrative work, and another 20 that describe leadership characteristics.

*Demographic Characteristics of Teachers*

Table (9), which represents the demographics of teachers, indicates that the majority (71.6%) of the sample was comprised of female teachers. In fact, teachers were randomly selected, regardless of the sex factor. However, this percentage shows that education has become a "feminized profession". According to Educational Center for Research and Development (ECRD), in the 2009-2010 school year, the proportion of females in all sectors of education in Lebanon is 74.5% versus 25.5% for males. The "feminization of the teaching profession" is not just in Lebanon, but it is a remarkable phenomenon around the world, particularly in the pre-school and at the primary level of education (Bagnoud et al., 2002; Pech, 2011; Polony, 2011; Tran, 2011).

The age of most respondents (68.5%) were between 26 and 45 years. The majority of respondents (68.7%) had more than 10 years of teaching experience. Finally, the majority of the sample (54.3%) were holders of none educational Bachelor degrees.

**Table 9: Demographic Characteristics of Teachers**

	%
<i>Gender</i>	
Male	21.8
Female	71.6
<i>Age (Years)</i>	
Less than 25	16.9
26-35	39.6
36-45	28.9
46 and above	14.6
<i>Teaching Experience (Years)</i>	
Less than 4	10.4
5-9	20.9
10- 14	23.1
15- 19	22.9
20 and above	22.7
<i>Highest Degree Held</i>	
Bachelors (Faculty of Education Graduates)	25.2
Bachelors (Graduated from faculties other than Education)	54.3
Masters	19.4
PhD	1.1

Table (10) represents the overall frequencies of items on teachers' questionnaire.

**Table 10: Overall Frequencies: Teachers**

Item number	Item Manager or Leader...	No Answer Total: 440	Answer Total: 440
1	directs employees and assigns them tasks specified in job description.	53	387
2	prefers to maintain stability and he focuses on rules.	110	330
3	oversees the preparations for the training of personnel.	325	115
4	asks what and why.	380	60
5	ensures that all employees receive training appropriate to their needs.	330	110
6	focuses on far future goals.	440	0
7	has a great ability to persuasion.	440	0
8	ensures that all new teachers receive appropriate support.	387	53
9	does not care about the details.	440	0
10	focuses more on production.	387	53
11	cares so much about rules and regulations.	335	105

12	has the ability to innovative thinking.	440	0
13	derives his authority and legitimacy of his career.	165	275
14	develops ideas and principles.	382	58
15	derives his authority and legitimacy of the official texts.	163	277
16	cares about strategic issues.	440	0
17	focuses on human relationships.	440	0
18	is followed by others voluntarily.	440	0
19	checks in accounts.	60	380
20	delegates tasks and responsibilities to subordinates.	380	60
21	challenges the status quo.	440	0
22	tends to the practice of punishment with employees.	167	273
23	depends a lot on control.	118	322
24	asks how and when.	383	57
25	changes mentalities and ways of thinking.	440	0
26	determines the vision.	440	0
27	controls the employees.	110	330
28	tracks the daily performance of the employees.	110	330
29	always knows every detail.	110	330
30	cares a lot in motivating others.	380	60
31	focuses on the long-term results.	440	0
32	focuses too much on the mechanisms of action.	222	218
33	derives his authority and legitimacy of his personal qualities.	440	0
34	looks to the future.	440	0
35	has the spirit of competition.	440	0
36	proves that he has great confidence in himself.	440	0
37	participates in the selection and appointment of personnel in accordance with the specified conditions.	387	53
38	runs the risk, if necessary.	440	0
39	prepares himself and the institution to implement the vision.	440	0
40	assesses the performance of employees in accordance with the specified criteria.	275	165

The previous table shows that 17 items were not selected by any of the 440 teachers. Only 1 of these 17 items is related to management, while the other 16 items are related to leadership. In other words, 16 of the 20 items related to leadership were not selected by any of the 440 teachers. These items are: 6, 7, 9, 12, 16, 17, 18, 21, 25, 26, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36 and 38.

In regards to the 4 other items related to leadership (4, 14, 20 and 30), they have been selected by a very small number of teachers: Item 14 was chosen by 58 respondents, while items 4, 20 and 30 were chosen by 60 respondents.

Based on the answers of teachers, it can be concluded that, generally speaking, school principals are not inclined to get engaged in tasks related to leadership. In general, the principals do not play the role of leader. This role seems to be limited and marginalized in schools.

On the other hand, the table shows that the 10 items that were the most chosen by teachers were: 1, 2, 13, 15, 19, 22, 23, 27, 28 and 29. All of them are related to management. These items were selected by the majority of teachers: item 1 was chosen by 387 participants; item 19 was chosen by 380 participants; items 2, 27, 28 and 29 were chosen by 330 teachers; item 23 was chosen by 322 respondents; items 13, 15 and 22 were chosen by teachers whose number varies between 273 and 277.

In regards to the other 10 items relating to management (3, 5, 8, 10, 11, 24, 32, 37, 39 and 40), they were selected as follows: item 32 was chosen by 218 teachers; items 3, 5, 11 and 40 were chosen by participants whose number varies between 105 and 165; items 8, 10, 24 and 37 were chosen by respondents whose number varies between 53 and 57; item 39 is the only one that was not selected by any one of the teachers.

As shown, there is a clear difference in number between the two groups: the last item in the first group (item 22) was chosen by 273 participants, while the first item in the second group (item 32) was chosen by 218 participants. In other words, the big difference in number between the first and the second group confirms that the first ten items are predominant.

Further to this, a cross-tabulation was carried out to compare data pertaining to private and public school principals obtained through their teachers. Such data is presented in table (11).

**Table 11:** Cross Tabulation: Private School Teachers versus Public School Teachers

Item number	Item Manager or Leader...	No Answer		Answer	
		Private Total: 228	Public Total: 212	Private Total: 228	Public Total: 212
1	directs employees and assigns them tasks specified in job description.	53	0	175	212
2	prefers to maintain stability and he focuses on rules.	110	0	118	212
3	oversees the preparations for the training of personnel.	111	0	117	212
4	asks what and why.	168	212	60	0
5	ensures that all employees receive training appropriate to their needs.	118	212	110	0
6	focuses on far future goals.	228	212	0	0
7	has a great ability to persuasion.	228	212	0	0
8	ensures that all new teachers receive appropriate support.	175	212	53	0
9	does not care about the details.	228	212	0	0
10	focuses more on production.	175	212	53	0
11	cares so much about rules and regulations.	228	107	0	105
12	has the ability to innovative thinking.	228	212	0	0
13	derives his authority and legitimacy of his career.	58	107	170	105
14	develops ideas and principles.	170	212	58	0
15	derives his authority and legitimacy of the official texts.	58	105	170	107
16	cares about strategic issues.	228	212	0	0
17	focuses on human relationships.	228	212	0	0
18	is followed by others voluntarily.	228	212	0	0
19	checks in accounts.	60	0	168	212
20	delegates tasks and responsibilities to subordinates.	168	212	60	0
21	challenges the status quo.	228	212	0	0
22	tends to the practice of punishment with employees.	60	107	168	105
23	depends a lot on control.	118	0	110	212
24	asks how and when.	171	212	57	0
25	changes mentalities and ways of thinking.	228	212	0	0
26	determines the vision.	228	212	0	0
27	controls the employees.	110	0	118	212
28	tracks the daily performance of the employees.	110	0	118	212
29	always knows every detail.	110	0	118	212
30	cares a lot in motivating others.	168	212	60	0
31	focuses on the long-term results.	228	212	0	0
32	focuses too much on the mechanisms of action.	117	105	111	107
33	derives his authority and legitimacy of his personal qualities.	228	212	0	0
34	looks to the future.	228	212	0	0
35	has the spirit of competition.	228	212	0	0
36	proves that he has great confidence in himself.	228	212	0	0
37	participates in the selection and appointment of personnel in accordance with the specified conditions.	175	212	53	0
38	runs the risk, if necessary.	228	212	0	0
39	prepares himself and the institution to implement the vision.	228	212	0	0
40	assesses the performance of employees in accordance with the specified criteria.	170	105	58	107

Table 11 shows that none of the 20 items related to leadership (4, 6, 7, 9, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 25, 26, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36 and 38) were chosen by public school teachers. None of these 20 items were selected by any of the 212 teachers. This could be used to claim that public school principals do not seem to play a leadership role, despite the fact that all of them participated in LDP.

In regards to the 20 items related to management, the table shows that 6 of them (5, 8, 10, 24, 37 and 39) were not selected by any teacher. In contrast, 8 items (1, 2, 3, 19, 23, 27, 28 and 29) were chosen by all teachers, while 3 items (15, 32 and 40) were chosen by 107 participants (i.e. more than half of the total number of teachers) and 3 other (11, 13 and 22) were selected by 105 participants.

Accordingly, the first 10 items are all management-related characteristics. In fact, the items are 11 (not 10), considering that in addition to the 8 items that have been selected by all participants, there are 3 other that were chosen by the same number of teachers (107).

Based on these data, it can be concluded that the majority of items related to management (14 out of 20) were chosen by all teachers (8 items), or on the contrary, they were not selected by any of them (6 items).

This shows that some tasks (6 tasks) seem to be totally neglected by principals of public schools. Conversely, it can be concluded that a large part of their work is clearly limited to certain tasks (8 tasks). It seems that some tasks are given extra care on the expense of other ones. This could constitute an obstacle to them, thus prevent them from strengthening their role as managers; or exhibiting leadership roles in their schools.

Regarding private schools, table (11) shows that 16 of the 20 items related to leadership (6, 7, 9, 12, 16, 17, 18, 21, 25, 26, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36 and 38) were not chosen by any of the 228 teachers which constituted the sample. The 4 others (4, 14, 20 and 30) were chosen by a small number that varied between 58 and 60 participants. Thus it can be argued that, the leadership role of the principals of private schools is neglected, limited, and marginalized.

The 20 management-related items were as follows: 2 of them (11 and 39) were not selected by any one of the teachers; no item was selected by all participants all together; 5 items (8, 10, 24, 37 and 40) were chosen by a number of participants that varied between 53 and 58; 3 items (5, 23 and 32) were chosen by a number of participants that varied between 110 and 111 respondents, while 10 items (1, 2, 3, 13, 15, 19, 22, 27, 28, and 29) were selected by a number of participants that varied between 117 and 175 participants (i.e. more than half the number of teachers of private schools).

Based on the above, it can be concluded that there are only 2 management-tasks that were completely neglected by the principals of private schools. Conversely, the role of the principals as a manager is not only limited to certain tasks: there are no items that have been chosen by all participants, though the first 10 items were chosen by more than half of the sample.

**Is Management or Leadership More Important?**

**Table 12:** Evaluation of Leadership versus Management by School Principals

Principal	Private	Public
Leadership	71.24%	78.12%
Management	20.0%	5.8%
Both	8.76%	16.08%

Although teachers' data show that all principals of public schools did not play the role of leaders in their schools, table (12) indicates that the majority of them (78.12%) asserted that leadership is more important than management. In contrast, some of them (5.8%) consider management to be more important than leadership, while others (16.08%) considered both to be equally important.

Similarly, although the survey data indicated that the role of principals as leaders is marginalized and limited in private schools, the majority of principals of these schools (71.24%) argued that leadership is more important than management as a school principal practice. Contrary to that, some respondents (20%) considered management to be more important than leadership, while others (8.76%) believed that both were equally important.

This paradox shows that both the concept of management and leadership is vague and ambiguous for school principals both in theory and practice. Moreover, it can be argued, based on the data derived from this study that school principals tend to act as managers much more than their tendency to display leadership skills within their work places.

**CONCLUSION**

Data relating to principals of public and private schools indicated that a large number of them do not distinguish between the concept of management and that of leadership. A large number of managers of both public schools and private schools answered incorrectly on the majority of the survey items. In fact, more than half of school principals of private schools responded incorrectly regarding 36 out of 40 items. As for the remaining 4 items, the number of those who answered them correctly was no more than 50% of the sample. Conversely, more than half of the principals of public schools were able to answer all items correctly. However, the number of respondents did not have much exceeded the half of the sample.

Results indicate that there is no statistically significant difference between responses of public school principals as opposed to those of private schools relating to the distinction between leadership and management concepts. In fact, this study accepted the null hypothesis ( $p > .05$ ) entailing that there is no statistical significance between the means of public and private school principals in assigning the right role to leaders/managers in the majority of items. There is a significant difference between the two groups in only 5 items (5 out of 40 items).

It should be recalled that all public school principals were previously involved in Leadership Development Program (LDP) organized by the Lebanese Ministry of Education and Higher Education (MEHE) and carried out by Team International (Lebanon) in collaboration with Collège Boréal and University of Calgary (Canada). So the data derived, though not sufficient for full judgment on the output of the LDP, could be employed to gain preliminary ideas regarding the degree participant principals were able to distinguish between the basic concepts addressed in LDP. Moreover, it also provides primary information as to what administrative approach (leadership or management) such principals endorsed. In fact, based on this study, it may be argued that such principals did not reflect a deep grasp of leadership and management; nor they seemed to be modeling an effective balance of leadership and management in their administrative practice. Likewise, in the case of private school principals, it can be concluded that the concepts of leadership and management are not clear enough and their practice seems to be neglected, limited, and marginalized.

A resonating relationship between management and leadership in schools is recommended for effective school improvement (Bovay, 2009; Gandhi, 2010; Geisler, 2011; Warner, 2009). This is unfortunately seems to be missing within the investigated research sample of public and private school principals.

#### **LIMITATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH**

The sample of this study is one of the limitations confronting the validity of the study. In fact, the sample constituted of school principals from the Governorate of Beirut only. The other six Governorates were not represented in the sample. According to the statistical bulletin issued by the Center for Educational Research and Development for the 2009-2010 school year, the Northern Lebanon Governorate comprises one-third of public schools in this country. Future research should attempt to involve a larger and more representative sample of school principals and teachers across Lebanon.

Moreover, the methodology can be improved by conducting semi-structured interviews with selected school principals and teachers. Future research should take this point into consideration.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The principal must lead as well as manage his/her school. The school principal should not consume all his time on management. He must spend enough time thinking about planning for the changes that may have medium- and long- term implications for education, schools and learning. In other words, principals are called to make a proper balance of time usage so that they cater equally well to management tasks as well as leadership tasks. Thus, some of his/her current activities could be undertaken by other staff thus allowing for more space for strategic work (Green 2009). Therefore, the school principal should learn about the power of collaboration, delegation and prioritization (Bush, 2008). School principals are encouraged to participate in training sessions so as to improve their management and leadership skills (ATA, 2010; Millbower, 2010; Wong, 2011)

On the other hand, training providers and universities are encouraged to make use of the findings of this study in designing their school leadership preparatory courses. The Faculty of Education at the Lebanese University, which currently organizes training sessions for principals of public schools, can also take advantages of the results of this research.

Also, MEHE could make use of the results of this study in planning other research studies to evaluate LDP programs they aim at developing. Private schools governing agencies (whether associations or individuals) could benefit from the results of this research to help school principals achieve a balance between management tasks and leadership tasks.

#### **REFERENCES**

1. Academy for Leaders-AL. (2009). *Leader Versus Manager*, Retrieved from: <http://www.academy-for-leaders.com>

2. Alberta Teachers' Association-ATA. (2010). *PD Activities for Professional Growth*, Retrieved from: <http://www.teachers.ab.ca>
3. Aguilar, E. (2010). *Becoming a teacher leader*, Retrieved from: <http://www.edutopia.org>
4. Alagse. (2009). *Leadership and Management: Differences and Overlap*, Retrieved from: <http://www.alagse.com>
5. Alvesteffer, R. (2012). *The difference between a leader and a manager*, Retrieved from: <http://ronalvesteffer.com>
6. Bagnoud, D. P. et al. (2002). *L'enseignement, métier féminin, métier féminisé?*, Retrieved from: <http://www.ordp.vsnet.ch>
7. Bennis, W. (2009). *On Becoming a Leader*. Fourth Edition. Basic Books: New York.
8. Bhojwani, L. (2012). Difference between a Leader and a Manager, Retrieved from: <http://business.wikinut.com>
9. Bovay, K. (2009). *Leadership Versus Management - Which is More Important to the Operation of Your Business?*, Retrieved from: <http://ezinearticles.com>
10. Brown, S. (2009). *The Difference between Management & Leadership*, Retrieved from: <http://suite101.com>
11. Bush, T. (2008). *Leadership and Management Development in Education*. SAGE Publications Ltd: London.
12. Bush, T. (2009). *Leadership Development and School Improvement: Contemporary Issues in Leadership Development, Educational Review*, Vol. 61, No. 4, November 2009, Routledge, Retrieved from: <http://myfirstwikipage.wiki.westga.edu>
13. Changing Minds. (2012). *Leadership Versus Management*, Retrieved from: <http://changingminds.org>
14. Clemmer, J. (2011). *Management Versus Leadership*, Retrieved from: <http://changingminds.org>
15. Crowther, F. et al. (2009). *Developing Teacher Leaders: How Teacher Leadership Enhances School Success*. Australia: Hawker Brownlow Education Pty Ltd.
16. Daft, R. (2007). *The Leadership Experience*. Fourth Edition. Cengage Learning: Stamford, Connecticut.
17. Daskal, L. (2011). *What is the biggest difference between managers and leaders?*, Retrieved from: <http://www.lollydaskal.com>
18. Day, C. et al. (2009). *The Impact of School Leadership on Pupil Outcomes*. London: National College for School Leadership (NCSL).
19. Educational Center for Research and Development-ECRD. (2011). *Bulletin of Educational Statistics for the 2009-2010 School Year*. Beirut: ECRD.
20. Gandhi, B. (2010). *Is Management More Important Than Leadership?*, Retrieved from: <http://bhavingandhi.com>
21. Garoia, V. (2012). *Synergies Between eTwinning and National Schemes for Professional Development*, Retrieved from: <http://insight.eun.org>
22. Geisler, J. (2011). *Are You a Manager, a Leader, or Both?*, Retrieved from: <http://www.poynter.org>
23. Green, H. (2009). *Ten questions for school leaders*, Retrieved from: <http://single-session-schools.blogspot.com>
24. Grillo, J. (2010). *The difference between leadership and management*, Retrieved from: <http://www.leadershippost.com>
25. Gupta, A. (2009). *Leadership versus management*, Retrieved from: <http://www.practical-management.com>
26. Harrison, C. (2007). *Ten roles for teacher leaders*, Retrieved from: <http://www.ascd.org>
27. Hendrick, K. (2013). *Professional Development People*, Retrieved from: <http://twitter4teachers.pbworks.com>
28. iWise2. (2012). *What Is Leadership?*, Retrieved from: <http://www.iwise2.com>
29. Jensen, B., Sandoval-Hernandez, A., Knoll, S. & Gonzalez, E.J. (2012). *The Experience of New Teachers*. OECD.
30. Johnson, J. (2009). *Ways to Continuing Professional Development*, Retrieved from: <http://www.teachingenglish.org.uk>
31. Leithwood, K. et al. (2004). *How Leadership Influences Student Learning*. Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement: University of Minnesota, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education: University of Toronto.
32. Liu, W., Carr, R., & Strobel, J. (2009). *Extending Teacher Professional Development through an Online Learning Community: A Case Study*. *Journal of Educational Technology Development and Exchange*, 2(1), 99-112, Retrieved from: <http://www.sicet.org>
33. McLoughlin, P. (2010). *16 differences between leadership and management*, Retrieved from: <http://www.iired.com.au>
34. Millbower, L. (2010). *Which Professional Association for Trainers, Teachers, or Speakers Should I join*, Retrieved from: <http://www.examiner.com>
35. Murray, A. (2010). *What is the difference between management and leadership?*, adapted from: *The Wall Street Journal Guide to Management*, Harper Business: New York, Retrieved from: <http://guides.wsj.com>
36. Padavich, R. (2012). *Difference between managers versus leaders*, Retrieved from: <http://info.execdev.uni.edu>
37. Pech, M. E. (2011). *Le débat sur la féminisation de l'enseignement est lancé*, Retrieved from: <http://www.lefigaro.fr>
38. Polony, N. (2011). *Il faut plus de professeurs hommes, pour que les petits garçons aient un modèle masculin*, Retrieved from: <http://www.atlantico.fr>
39. Prussakov, G. (2009). *20 Differences between Management and Leadership*. Retrieved from: <http://www.amnavigator.com>
40. Sanborn, M. (2012). *9 Differences between Managers and Leaders*, Retrieved from: <http://www.marksanborn.com>
41. Schreefel, E. (2012). *101 Websites That Every Elementary Teacher Should Know About*, Retrieved from: <http://www.goedonline.com>
- Terrell, S. (2013). *20+ Free Professional Development Opportunities for 2013*, Retrieved from: <http://shellyterrell.com>



43. Tran, C. (2011). *Pourquoi le métier d'enseignant, qui se féminise, se dévalorise-t-il?*, Retrieved from: <http://www.educavox.fr>
44. Transtutors. (2012). *Similarities between Leadership and Management*, Retrieved from: <http://www.transtutors.com>
45. Warner, J. (2009). *Leadership and Management: Do We Need One More Than the Other?*, Retrieved from: <http://searchwarp.com>
46. Wong, M. S. (2011). *Fifty Ways to Develop Professionally: What Language Educators Need to Succeed*, Retrieved from: <http://www.camtesol.org>
47. Zvi, G. (2013). *Visiting Other Classrooms: One of the Best Forms of Professional Development*, Retrieved from: <http://www.gallitzvi.com>

#### **Citation of This Article**

Khalil Al Jammal and Norma Ghamrawi. Leadership versus Management: Between Self-Concept and Actual Practices of Lebanese School Principals. Int. J. Educat. Res. Technol. Vol 4 [3] September 2013 : 56-72