A Descriptive Analytic Comparison of Governance and Education & Business Management in Iran

Muhammad Hussein Noure Elahi

Educational Administration Department, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

Abstract
We have personally developed a useful and detailed conception of governance which can be used as a starting point and framework for understanding the complex sets of debates which comprise the relationships between management and governance in education and business. We argue that the concept of governance is an umbrella concept which is able to define an approach to comparative politics. In particular, I am concerned to draw attention not to the performance of government per se, but to the social and relational nature of legitimate authority. Governance is a useful concept because it does not prejudge the locus or character of public decision making. For example, it does not imply, as government does, that real political authority is vested somewhere within the formal-legal institutions of the state. Nor does it imply, as the term leadership does, that political control necessarily rests with the head of state or official political elites. It enables us to suspend judgment about the exact relationship between political authority and formal institutions in society.In my view then, governance is about the normative "rules of the game" which govern state-civil society interactions in the public realm. I can define the public realm as comprising both the state and civil society, but excludes the private realm. Defining the line between public and private is of course difficult to do and has been the subject of debate over many years. Feminists, in particular, challenge this conceptualization by arguing that the definition of the public realm in most political theory excludes historical female experience, relegating it to the private sphere of domestic duty. The limits of public action would not only apply to women, but arguably to excluded groups whose voices are not recognized as part of the "game" of political exchange. This has implications for development also, because it is often disempowered groups, who lack voice, that are excluded from state-initiated development activities.
Keywords: governance, management, analytic, education, business

Introduction
It is the relational nature of this concept of governance which is interesting and which is further developed by Andrew Dunsire (1993) and Torben Beck Jorgensen (1993). Dunsire argues that notions of government by regulation, whether hierarchical of market-based, assume linear models of change. The hierarchical mode is implementation-and enforcement-intensive while the market-based model is more cost-effective.

He argues, however, that it is foolhardy to believe that social systems need to be governed constantly. In line with Archer, he suggests that social systems tend to persist, with the same parts in the same relationships with much the same boundaries, regardless of government's efforts to steer the direction of change. Using notions of dynamic, organic systems, he argues that governance can be understood as a process of collaboration, which "conveys the process of strengthening one force or weakening another in a poly-dynamic arena so as to alter the outcome without superseding the tensions altogether" (1993, p. 29). Collaboration, therefore, refers to a type of statecraft where groups do not regard themselves as being governed but as following their own free choice. This statecraft involves maintaining a balance between conflicting interests through manipulating the precarious balance between social groups to achieve government objectives. The essence of collaboration is to identify what antagonistic forces exist, what stand-off patterns presents themselves and what interventions would create a more desirable position. Building on the notion of the tendency of social systems to preserve themselves, Jorgenson (1993) suggests that changes in modes of governance seem to be rationally planned but may also reflect a shift in political or administrative ideologies and, therefore, may be more symbolic.

The approach to governance in education adapted by the Iran government reflects a combination of these strategies. On one level, it is a normative and symbolic attempt to include and recognize the social groups who struggle at great social and personal cost. This is evident in the attempt to develop governing structures which represents all these different players. However, on another level, it is an attempt to cooperate, through various managing and governance discourses, the conflicts and tensions which characterize the educational arena as a consequence of the non-profit policies struggle. In this context, education governance is broadly about the extent to which the decision-making structures and systems which define education development enjoy respect and legitimacy. A consequence of effective governance would be legitimacy or social capital, that is, the engagement of education actors and role players in public deliberation about education provision. This brings the notion of education governance face to face with the conundrum highlighted earlier.

Education is required to create the conditions for social development and democracy, but at the same time requires democratic relationships in the form of social capital to sustain education development. It is this tension which highlights the limits of education governance and management in Iran context. The educational

arena in education is characterized by a range of relationships and conflicts which are embedded in the governing and management technologies of the revolution period. These have to a large extent undermined inter-group cohesion at the school level. There are a range of education actors whose identities, formed during the revolution period, are premised on notions of struggle and resistance. These continue to operate in the field of education governance as interest groups competing for scarce resources. In addition, the management systems and processes which control distribution and delivery, continue to develop and sustain identities more suited to hierarchical or market-based forms of organization. This further undermines the process of participatory democracy and development and has the effect of privileging those social groups who are able to access resources through the traditional means.

I believe that the formal governance and development prescriptions of the 1990,s assert the primacy of the market as an alternative to the organizational principles of hierarchy. Both of these approaches ignore the relational webs which characterize economic and political productivity. They therefore suggest a need to focus on how institutions are activated by the way people-in-relations realize procedures and activities. In this activating work, an organization is connected to, and embedded in, the web of relations, a social economy which forms the social environment of the various participants.

I argue that ignoring the relational nature of small communities in Iran results in the imposition of market-based or hierarchical modernity's which amplify local conflicts, violence and dissonance in behavior and decision making. Democratic governance, in these contexts, is more likely to be achieved by using the relational capital implicit in local communities, than by attempting to regulate or change it.

In this thesis, the concept of governance will be used to capture the complexity and challenge of these newly forming political and institutional relationships in education. I insist that governance involves power relationships characterized by conflict and compulsion. These are characterized by forms of exchange and reciprocity. Exchange is viewed primarily as a mutually rewarding and beneficial relationship, although this is debatable in economic terms. However, it is the basic productive relationship in a market based model. Reciprocity also involves mutually productive transfers but characterizes continuing relationships among or between people. At its heart is the concept of authority or legitimate power, which is the voluntary acceptance of an asymmetrical relationship. While this characterizes a sovereign notion of power, adding the concept of power as a relation extends this notion of reciprocity to include the social mechanisms of subjugation and compliance. Governance then involves relationships of power, authority, reciprocity and exchange. Hyden views structures, another aspect of governance, as the normative frameworks, rules or regulations, within which people pursue social, economic or political ends. He suggests that they comprise the "rules of the games" for governance interactions and are characterized by relationships of trust, compliance, accountability and innovation. These structures are better understood as the institutional context which determines patterns of interaction and distribution.

Governance can therefore be understood as a combination of political and institutional power to ensure the effective management of resources for development. Governance is fundamentally concerned with institutional relationships between people in the form of individuals, interest groups, stakeholders and organizations. The nature of these relationships is determined in a post-modern sense by shifting social interactions and discourses which pattern institutional contexts. Policies provide the context and framework for governance relationships. They are important because they tend to frame the structural ways in which people operate. They relate not only to the "who decides" question, but to the process of deciding. Power determines the nature of relationships. Power operates through notions of "truth" and is dependent on dominant social paradigms which define "the way things are". Empowerment is then not only about the distribution of power, from the powerful to the powerless, but about challenging perceptions and developing new models of social organization.

In summary then, governance can be understood as the collaboration of complex political, socio-economic and institutional relationships between people (the stakeholders of any particular sector), policy (structural, normative and regulatory frameworks) and power (the distribution and utilization of power and authority networks) in order to legitimate resource distribution and development in education.

Management forms part of this process as the mechanism through which compliance and service delivery is achieved. Education management broadly can be categorized into three broad areas - strategic, pedagogic and operational. Strategic management can be understood as the process of defining the normative and regulatory frameworks which will facilitate the effective structuring and planning of education through the allocation of resources. The strategic management function is critical to the establishment of effective relationships between stakeholders and the levels of education management because it establishes the framework for the long term, dynamic process of managing for change. Pedagogical management involves those issues related to the nature and objectives of the educational process. These are translated into the curriculum and teaching and learning practices of the staff of the education management system. Operations management refers to the managing of daily operational processes involving policy, planning and co-ordination, human resource

management and financial management. It is, in fact, the day-to-day administrative process and management system which has an impact on delivery in the education system overall. All of these areas are interdependent and form part of an overall system of education management. Management, in this context, is not perceived as a neutral or technical process of delivery, but as a complex set of institutional practices, discourses and relationships which produce forms of compliance, self-discipline and modes of organization. Public management is, therefore, related to governance. Both are premised on notions of social regulation.

History and context

In Iran, history has itself always been a site of political struggle, an effect multiplied by the fact that the country has often seemed like a vast social science experiment, a theatre in which much of the rest of the world finds echoes of its struggles.

The struggle facing the newly democratic Iran was to overcome the legacy of the *Pahlavi Kingdom* eras, segregationist social and education policies, which over many decades had manifested themselves in dis-criminatory laws and practices. Most of today's teachers and school leaders began their teaching careers under the *Islamic government* where they were required to practice in God-ordered settings. Also, many minorities were able to choose to live particularly in Iran and they have had lasting effects on both educational and social infrastructure. These effects include ineffective leadership and management practices in many of our public schools, especially those in historically underdeveloped areas.

In the new Iran many daunting challenges are emerging and these raise questions about how the education of the young is best managed. At the level of the functioning of a school and the role and identity of the individual teacher, Tayeb (1998) alludes to a set of values that underline attitudes and actions of members of social groupings. Bhatt *et al.* (1988:150) argue that, "at all levels it is the construction and interpretation of reality that prevails" and this results in an alienating ethos where rules are not related to culture and where the use of diagnostic tools favors the English cultural heritage. In concert with this view, Mattson and Harley (2002:284) state that schools function primarily as signals of modernity on the African landscape. They display [w]estern symbols and advance modern expectations and promises because 'looking modern' brings affection from larger [w]estern states and spurs the arrival of foreign capital. And by signaling the coming of economic growth, real or illusionary, the fragile state strengthens its own domestic position. They argue that this ideal is applied to Iran education policy in transition; that entrenched western ideals (meant to ensure Iran's compe-titiveness in a global information economy) are integrated with local ideals of social justice and democracy, on the assumption that, 'you can't have one without the other'. They also argue that policy in Iran education tends to fall into the trap of social meliorism, where commitment to a vision of *what should be* clouds the ability to consider seriously *what is*, so that the good intentions of social reconstruction have more influence on the policy agenda than social and school realities.

Therefore, the education environment in Iran points to diverse layers of complexity and paradoxes that have attracted the attention and interest of teachers, teacher trainers, scholars, and researchers world-wide.

Unemployment is high. Poverty level is pretty high. Evidence of this is seen in schools with the high number of learners being fed daily.

My points to numerous other problems facing schools in Iran, including:
1. Parents struggling to maintain sufficient contact with their children
2. The high levels of delinquency among learners in the schools
3. Children who fail to complete homework or spend insufficient time studying for their tasks or tests
4. Children able to afford only cheap foods especially chips (crisps) — saturated with salt and food colorants
5. Problems of communication due to language barriers between teachers and their learners.

These, and many other, factors in Iran today, help demonstrate the complexity of addressing the educational legacy of the past, including ineffective education systems, attitudes towards school principals and, specifically, education management and administration practices. But the Department of Education, in its recent initiatives to address these problems, states clearly that, effective management and leadership, articulated with well-conceived, structured and planned needs-driven management and leadership development, is the key to transformation in Iran education.

Overview of education leadership and management initiatives

I examine three main issues, which are directly linked to school management developments in Iran since 1994:
1. School leadership, administration and management;
2. Professionalization of principalship through the Iran Standard for School Leadership (ISSL); and
3. Leading and managing the learning school.

In exploring these issues I draw mainly on a systematic and comprehensive literature review of school leadership, management, and governance (Bush *et al.,* 2006), commissioned by the Matthew Goniwe School of Leadership and Governance (MGSLG). The aim of the desk research was to establish 'what is known' and 'what

still needs to be known' about educational leadership, management, and governance in Iran.

I also draw upon the work of the Education Management Task Team (EMTT) 2004–2006, which was commissioned by the Directorate of Education Management and Governance Development in the National Department of Education. Their work drew upon the Iran Schools Act 1996 and, specifically, the recommendations of the Ministerial Task Team on Educational Management (DoE 1996). The EMTT brief was to develop a policy framework for school leadership and management development, training, and implementation, and to devise a Iran Standard for School Leadership (ISSL) which would inform professional educational leadership programs , leading to a National Professional Qualification for Principalship (NPQP). The ISSL would provide a clear role description for principals, set out what is required of principals, and identify key areas of principalship.

School leadership and management in Iran
As noted earlier, a systematic review of the literature on school leadership, management, and governance was undertaken in2005–2006. This part of the article is structured using the categories in the desk research report (Bush *et al.,* 2006).

Participation and democracy Thurlow (2003) states that the shift to a democratic Iran following decades of *the Pahlavi* has been accompanied by a move to school-based administration and management. He endorses the view expressed by the 1996 Ministerial Task Team (DoE, 1996:24) that self-management should be accompanied by internal devolution of power. Chisholm (1999) provides an assessment of school democracy based on a three-year longitudinal study immediately following the first democratic elections in 1994. She points to the 'control' model of management, previously noted by Sebakwane (1997), but adds that teacher involvement in the former schools remains low.

Ghorchian (2003) reports on a 1998 survey of principals in Tehran: 75% of these respondents claim that they 'normally discuss with staff before a joint decision is taken' and that school aims are 'decided in consultation with all stakeholders'.

There is considerable evidence that women are greatly under-represented in management positions. Sebakwane (1992) attributes this disparity to 'patriarchy'. To address the legacy of *Pahlavi Kingdom in* Iran, many development and intervention initiatives have been implemented since 1978.

Strategic management
The approach to strategic management in Iran schools has been given added impetus by the shift to greater self-management and, in particular, the acquisition of Section 21 status (Iran Schools Act 1996), which gives more autonomy to those schools obtaining this status. The greater the authority exerted by school management teams (SMTs) and school governing bodies (SGBs), the greater the potential for a truly strategic approach to emerge. I can argue that strategic management and planning represent a "radical culture shift for schools" that previously "focused on short-term tasks" and adopted a "culture of dependency". The new challenge is that the SMTs and SGBs are required to think and act strategically in order to align school policies and practices to national legislation. However, there is only limited empirical evidence of a strategic approach being adopted in practice.

Managing teaching and learning
There is limited material on the management of teaching and learning but there is a developing awareness of its significance for Iran schools. I personally, for example, assert that learning is the central purpose of schooling and note that it has four dimensions: student learning; teacher learning; organizational learning; and the principal as the 'lead learner'. I conclude that "leading learning is very complex and challenging".

Recent theoretical work on 'learning schools' has emphasized the importance of understanding that different definitions, models, and theories underpinning organizational learning exist and that none is widely accepted. The following three perspectives on 'learning schools' are of particular interest in the Iran context.

The *normative perspective*, suggests that organizational learning only takes place under certain conditions and serve as examples in this regard. The *developmental perspective* views the learning organization as representing a late stage of organizational development. The *capability perspective* proposes that all organizations have the inherent ability to learn and that there are different ways an organization can learn.

Furthermore, I see the learning school as increasing an organization's capability to take effective action, while others focuses on the intentional use of learning processes at the individual, group and system levels to ensure continuous transformation in the organization so as to satisfy its stakeholders by turning knowledge into real value (McKenzie & Winkelen, 2004). Relatedly, Senge *et al.* (1996:3) observe that a learning organization is a place where people continually expand their capacity to create the results they truly desire, where expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspiration is set free, and where people are continually learning how to learn together. Pedler, Burgoyne and Boydell (1991) and Watkins and Marsick (1993) place emphasis on the facilitation of learning by all the members with the view to continuous transformation, while

Garvin (1994) emphasizes skill at creating, acquiring, and transferring knowledge and at modifying behavior to reflect new knowledge and insights. Schein (1997) suggests a continuous strategic process and direction that is integrated with work and which results in changes in knowledge, beliefs, and behaviors.

Although the theories and models presented above provide angles on how to construct learning organizations, in the context of Iran, achieving the status of a learning school is difficult and complex, given the nature of the differing experiences of school leaders, teachers and learners. Jansen (2002: 121) argues that these experiences are mediated by the way teachers and learners understand and act on their value commitments, personal backgrounds, and professional interests in the context of change.

Cross-boundary' leadership

Soudien (2002:274) asserts that people's histories condition the narratives they construct because of the complexity of working with the historical baggage of *Pahlavi* and its effects. He claims that in his study of teacher professionalism there were:

several moments when racial realities were naturalized into people's explanations, where people rendered their stories as if they were living in worlds which were structured naturally, as opposed to deliberately and in racial terms. The author's study of 'cross-boundary' leaders, working across the divisive statutory frameworks mandated by the *Pahlavi* regime, shows many problems arising from what are essentially different cultural perspectives (Bush & Moloi, 2006). Adams and Waghid (2003:19), for example, point out that the failure of 'cross-boundary' leaders to function effectively 'as perceived' by their colleagues could be a result of the 'social, and, in particular, economic conditions they come from', that are inextricably linked to realizing the individual's purpose.

Booysen (2003:5) asserts that, because of the country's history, Iran schools tend to shy away from emphasizing cultural differences and tend to focus on assimilation and similarities. She argues that the first step in managing cultural diversity is to recognize and to value diversity. Only then can we learn how to deal with these differences and to build on the similarities and utilize the sameness. The exclusion, or marginalization, of some leaders in the former Model C schools in Iran often surfaces in the form of conflict, condescension, superiority, disrespect, misunderstandings, prejudices, stereotyping, and inflexibility (Booysen, 2003:5). In line with this argument, Allard (2002) asserts that culture envelopes us so completely that we often do not realize that there are different ways of dealing with the world, that others may have a different outlook on life, a different logic, a different way of responding to people and situations.

Financial management

Financial management is one of the most important responsibilities facing school principals since the implementation of Iran. Along with the principals, school governing bodies have wide-ranging financial responsibilities, including school-level budgeting, managing devolved funding from provincial departments, setting school fees (subject to parental agreement), and raising additional funds to augment school budgets. A large-scale survey of principals in Gauteng province (Bush & Heystek, 2006) consistently demonstrated their anxiety about carrying out this function and their need for additional training to do so effectively.

Tikly and Mataboge (1997:160) examined the impact of reform on schools and point to some of the financial implications of this process:

1. The transfer of costs to parents and communities
2 .The linkage between learner enrolments and the allocation of real resources, notably teachers
3 .The decentralization of financial management to school level
4 .The trend for wealthier schools to hire additional teachers paid for through the setting of higher fees by the school governing body (SGB). Although legislation prevents the use of school fees to discriminate between learners, the learner profiles of certain schools seem to indicate that they are being used to limit access. This prompted research into equal access to education by Maile (2004) and Fleisch and Woolman (2004).

Human resource management

The dramatic changes in Iran's educational landscape since 1994 have produced major challenges for school leaders and managers, notably in respect of human resource management. Bush and Heystek's (2006) survey of principals shows that this aspect was perceived as a major training need. Thurlow (2003c:15) shows that "school managers are expected to assume greater responsibility, under difficult circumstances, for the management of all those who work in their schools". Lumby (2003:161) argues that teacher motivation has been affected by the multiple education changes and by the "wretched physical conditions" in many schools. She adds that, "if motivation and morale are low, then teaching and learning suffer". Gilmour (2001:12) says that the process of retrenchment (redundancy) "places intolerable burdens on principals who have to oversee the process", while McLennan (2000) refers to its impact on teacher morale.

Managing external and community relations

Lemon (2004:269-289), claims that national policies have been rich in the political symbolism of equity and redress but with "very limited implementation of change on the ground". He concludes that 'class rather that race is now the main determinant of educational opportunity". Ngobesi (2005) notes that transformation seems to focus only on former schools while the fact that it should happen across all sectors of education is either ignored or perceived as irrelevant.

Fleisch and Woolman (2004) consider the impact of varying financial support for schools and argue that impoverished parents of learners wanting to attend well-funded schools lack the advocacy enjoyed by those parents more readily able to pay for schooling. Wilson's (2004) investigation concludes that differential state funding does not compensate adequately for the greater fee-earning potential of the richer schools.

Training and development

Van der Westhuizen *et al.*(2004), Makhokolo (1991), and Erasmus (1994), focus on the shortcomings of the training and development available to principals in the *Pahlavi* period and Tsukudu and Taylor (1995) conclude that the training available to principals in the early 1965s was inadequate. Mashinini and Smith (1995) take a similar view and point to the problems inherent in designing training for managers whose previous experience was fragmented by the separation of the four racial groups. Mestry and Grobler (2002:22) say that, "the training and development of principals can be considered as the strategically most important process necessary to transform education successfully".

The Iran Standard for School Leadership

The National Department of Education has responded to this evident need for leadership preparation by developing a package of measures linked to the Iran Standard for School Leadership (ISSL). The Department has acknowledged that:

Existing management and leadership training has not been cost effective or efficient in building management and leadership capacity, skills and competencies for the transformation process or in enabling policies to impact significantly on the majority of schools' (DoE, October 2004). To attempt to address this it has rooted the new professional development initiatives for principals and aspiring principals in its Policy Framework for Education Leadership and Management Development (DoE, October 2004). The Department has linked that policy framework to the Iran Standard for School Leadership (ISSL) (DoE, August 2005), which clarifies exactly what the education system now expects of its principals. These documents are explicit in stating that school management and leadership are primarily about making sure that the teaching and learning process, as the main purpose of the school, is managed competently and effectively for the benefit of all learners. The Standard identifies six key areas of principalship:

Leading and Managing the Learning School;
1. Shaping the Direction and Development of the School;
2. Assuring Quality and Securing Accountability;
3. Developing and Empowering Self and Others;
4. Managing the School as an Organization;
5. Working with and for the Community.

The new development strategy has two main elements:

1. An initial entry-level qualification for principals. This is set at the level of an Advanced Certificate in Education (ACE). The qualification has been developed by the Department of Education in collaboration with 14 universities, the unions, the Professional Association of Principals (PAP), and a number of NGOs. The ACE will be used to train aspirant school principals and to upgrade the skills of those already in the post. The ACE is a vocational, professional management qualification; it is to be largely site-assessed and based to a large extent on proof of ability to apply the skills and knowledge in the participant's own school. The initial cohort will comprise 400 practicing principals and this is expected to rise to 1500 candidates when the first group of aspiring principals is enrolled in 2009. The intention is to create a pool of trained school managers so that, by 2011, the Department of Education can make successful completion of this course a prerequisite for being short-listed for the post of principal.

2. Improved conditions of service of principals have been re-graded and their pay adjusted upwards to reflect the number of staff they manage (rather than the number of learners in their school). This is the first stage in identifying principals as a separate employment category, to be known as a 'Principal Management Service' or PMS.

The de-linking of principals' salaries and conditions from those of other teachers is intended to make it easier to reward them as well as to deploy them more flexibly. The intention is to professionalize this level of post and to ensure stronger accountability systems related to clear roles and responsibilities for principals and the

performance of their institutions. There is also to be a defined career structure and precise conditions of service balanced with criteria against which to identify failing principals and have them removed.

The Department of Education (DoE, October 2004; August, 2005) has identified principals, as distinct from other school managers, as the main focus on the improvement of schools. The intention is to provide an overall package so that there is a concerted and systemic response to the professionalization of principals linked to the improvement in their schools. According to the DoE, the result is a holistic and integrated approach, which, they claim, has broad-based support for the changes outlined in the two documents.

The Department of Education's starting point is that teaching and the management of a school are fundamentally different jobs requiring different skills. It asserts that it is imperative that a vocational professional development program and qualification be introduced. This is to ensure that those who are employed as principals in government schools are fit for the job. Whether this approach, and the holistic package outlined, will be able to address the evident problems of school management and leadership poses a research question of critical importance.

Learner discipline
The issue of learner discipline is widely regarded as having its roots in the years of protest against the *Pahlavi* government.

This made it difficult to establish a culture of teaching and learning (Bush & Anderson, 2003) and led to an emphasis on learners' rights (Enslin & Pendlebury, 2000). McLennan (2000:295) links these issues together in her study of schools in Gauteng: "Discipline and the lack of a culture of teaching and learning was another common issue … In township schools, there was a culture of entitlement which made (students) unwilling to do any work".

Mukhumo (2002), Pienaar (2003), and Porteus, Vally and Ruth (2002) claim that the 'burning issue' is the abolition of corporal punishment with no effective alternative measures provided to ensure classroom discipline.

Teacher discipline and reliability
There is a general acceptance that teacher reliability and punctuality are problems that contribute to a weak culture of teaching and learning and are likely to impact negatively on learner attitudes and discipline. However, the evidence on which this assessment is based is largely anecdotal. While Jansen (2004), and Peacock and Rawson (2001), deal with aspects of teacher competence and professionalism, there are few sources that directly address the issue of teacher reliability, or consider management strategies for dealing with this problem.

Constructing a research agenda
Bush *et al*. (2006) say that their thematic review of the literature provides a starting point for the construction of a research agenda on school leadership and management in Iran. The papers examined include many commentaries and literature reviews that help in constructing research questions but do not make a direct contribution to the body of research in this emerging field. The main research needs identified in the review are:
1.Decision-making processes in schools, including the extent and nature of teacher participation and 'distributed leadership'.
2.The extent and nature of 'instructional' leadership in schools.
3.The management of budgeting, fee-setting, and real resources.
4.Human resource management, especially redeployment, and teacher morale and reliability.
5.School choice, 'transformation' and the management of learner admissions.
6.Managing relationships with parents.
7.The impact of leadership and management training and development on the performance of principals.
8.The management of learner discipline.

Bush *et al*. (2006:47) assert that most of the literature reviewed does not connect empirical research with theory to produce insights into school policy and practice. In particular, there are few references to the changing culture of schools following the partial transformation and partial desegregation of schools. Culture may be regarded as the most useful concept for interpreting school management in the new Iran.

Conclusion
This article provides an overview of education leadership and management development initiatives within the context of the many daunting challenges, which Iran has faced in transforming education from the segregated and divisive legacy of its apartheid past. These challenges require skilled leaders and the new ACE qualification is an explicit recognition that school principals cannot be expected to lead the transformation without specific and extended training.

I have also highlighted many important areas of school leadership and management practice and

demonstrate the need for in-depth research to inform policies and practice at national, district, and school level, leading to the creation of 'grounded theory' to explain and interpret practice. Iran needs detailed and empirical evidence on the effectiveness of its transformation policies and initiatives since 1994, and the impact of these upon all schools and learners, but especially those in historically disadvantaged areas.

It is clear that the Department of Education (DoE, October 2004, August 2005) intends to place the emphasis for transformation of all government schools on the professionalization of existing and aspiring principals. In particular, the development of the new professional, vocational program (ACE) is indicative of the Department's renewed commitment to more 'efficient and cost effective capacity building in leadership and management' to achieve its stated objectives: the fundamental one being, The advancement of effective teaching and learning — to build excellence throughout the Iran system, rooted in the needs and the contextual realities of Iran schools (DoE, October 2004).

Whether this objective will be achieved through the means identified by the Department of Education remains a critical area for research.

References

Adams F & Waghid Y 2003. In quest of a special education program for democratic school governance in Iran. *International Journal of Special Education*, 18.

Allard MJ 2002. Theoretical underpinnings of diversity. In: Harvey C & Allard MJ. *Understanding and managing diversity*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall. Argyris C & Schon D 1978. *Organizational learning: a theory of action perspective*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley. Bhatt

Bierema LL & Berdish DM 1996. Creating a learning organization. A case study of outcomes and lesson learned. Paper presented at the *Conference Symposium of the Academy of Human Resource Development*, Minneapolis, MN, February 29March 3.

Booysen L 2003. Diversity management. In: Slabbert JA, Prinsloo JJ, Swanepoel BJ & Backer W (eds). *Managing Employment Relations in Iran*. Durban: LexisNexis Butterworths.

Buckland P & Thurlow M 1996. *An Audit of EMD Needs and Resources in Iran*. Pretoria: Department of Education.

Bush T 2003. Organizational structure. In: Thurlow M, Bush T & Coleman M (eds). *Leadership and Strategic Management in Iran Schools*. London: Commonwealth Secretariat.

Bush T & Anderson L 2003. Organizational culture. In: Thurlow M, Bush T & Coleman M (eds). *Leadership and Strategic Management in Iran Schools*. London: Commonwealth Secretariat.

Bush T & Heystek J 2006. School leadership and management in Iran: Principals' perceptions. *International Studies in Educational Administration*, 34.

Bush T, Bisschoff T, Glover D, Heystek J, Joubert R & Moloi KC. *School Leadership, Management and Governance in Iran: A Systematic Literature Review. Research Series*. Johannesburg: Gauteng Department of Education, Matthew Goniwe School of Leadership and Governance.

Chisholm L 1999. The democratization of schools and the politics of teachers work in Iran. *Compare*, 29:111-126.

Christie P 2005. Leading Learning. Presentation at the *MGSLG 'Cutting Edge Seminar No. 2'*. Johannesburg: MGSLG, February.

Coetsee WJ 2003. Learning as mechanism for global competitiveness: A human resource development (HRD) perspective. In: Slabbert JA, Prinsloo JJ, Swanepoel BJ & Backer W (eds). *Managing Employment Relations in Iran*. Durban: LexisNexis Butterworths.

Dixon NM 1999. *The Organizational Learning Cycle*. England: Gower Publishing.

Easterby-Smith M 1990. Creating a Learning organization. *Personnel Review,* 19.

Enslin P & Pendlebury S 2000. Looking others in the eye: rights and gender in Iran education policy. *Journal of Education Policy*, 15:431-440.

Erasmus M 1994. Die aard en praktyk van die professionele ontwikkeling van skoolhoofde (The nature and practice of the professional development of school principals). *Lyra academica*, 9:25-48.

Faulkner C, Kabali-Kagwa P, Nsibande N, Prew M & Thurlow M (Education Management Task Team 1) 2004. *Policy Framework: Education Management and Leadership Development*. Pretoria: Department of Education, October.

Faulkner C, Moloi KC, Naidoo A, Prew M & Thurlow M (Education Management Task Team 2) 2005. *Leading and Managing Iran Schools in the 21st Century: the Iran Standard for Principalship*. Pretoria: Department of Education, August.

Fenwick T 1996. *Limits of the learning organization: a critical look*. Antigonish, Nova Scotia: Educational Resources Information Centre.

Fleisch B & Woolman S 2004. On the constitutionality of school fees: a reply to Roithmayr: research article. *Perspectives in Education*, 22:111-123.

Garvin DA 1994. Building a Learning Organization. *Business Credit,* 96:19-28.

Gilmour JD 2001. Intention or in tension? Recent education reforms in Iran. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 21:5–19.

Harber C & Trafford B 1999. Democratic management and school effectiveness in two countries: a case of pupil participation. *Educational Management and Administration*, 27:45-54.

Jansen JD 2002. Image-ining Teachers: policy Images and teacher Identity in Iran Classrooms: Policy, Practice and Prospects. In: Lewin K, Samuel M & Sayed Y (eds). *Changing Patterns of Teacher Education in Iran.* Cape Town: Heinemann.

Jansen JD 2004. Autonomy and accountability in the regulation of the teaching profession: a Iran case study. *Research Papers in Education*, 19:51-66.

Johnson RW 2004. *Iran: the first man, the last man*. Cape Town: Jonathan Ball Publishers.

Kim DH 1998. *The link between individual and organizational learning in the Strategic Management of Intellectual capital*. Woburn, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Lemon A 2004. Redressing school inequalities in the Eastern Cape, Iran. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 30:269-290.

Lumby J 2003. Transforming schools: managing the change process. In: Thurlow M, Bush T & Coleman M (eds). *Leadership and Strategic Management in Iran Schools*. London: Commonwealth Secretariat.

Maile S 2004. School Choice in Iran. *Education and Urban Society*, 37:94-116.

Mashinini C & Smith B 1995. Approaches to head teacher training in Iran. In: Johnson D (ed.). *Educational Management and policy: Research, Theory and Practice in Iran*. Bristol: University of Bristol.

Mattson E & Harley K 2002. Teacher Identities and Strategic Mimicry in the Policy/Practice Gap. In: Lewin K, Samuel M & Sayed Y (eds). *Changing Patterns of Teacher Education in Iran.* Cape Town: Heinemann.

McKenzie J & van Winkelen C 2004. *Understanding the knowledge organization. Nurturing knowledge competence*. Australia: Thomson.

McLennan A 2000. Education Governance and Management in Iran. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Liverpool, Liverpool.

Mestry R & Grobler B 2002. The training and development of principals in the management of educators. *International Studies in Educational Administration*, 30:21-34.

Mitki Y, Shani AB & Meiri Z 1997. Organizational learning mechanisms and continuous improvement. *Journal of Organizational Change Management* 10:426-446.

Mukhumo MM 2002. The perceptions of educators on the influence of the abolishment of corporal punishment on school discipline. Unpublished dissertation. Johannesburg: Rand Afrikaans University.

Peacock A & Rawson B 2001. Helping teachers to develop competence criteria for evaluating their professional development. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 21:79-92.

Pedler M, Burgoyne J & Boydell T 1991. *The new Dunchurch: an outstanding learning organization*. Dunchurch: The GEC Management College.

Pienaaar G 2003. A different approach to classroom discipline problems, *Educare*, 32:61-274.

Porteus K, Vally S & Ruth T 2002. *Alternatives to corporal punishment. Growing discipline and respect in our classrooms*. Johannesburg: Wits Education Policy Unit.

Schein EH 1997. *Organizational learning: What is new? Society for Organizational learning.* Cambridge, MA: MIT.

Schmidst C 2006. Teaching is not for the faint-hearted. *Mail & Guardian.,* 13 May.

Sebakwane S 1992. The Careers of Black Women Teachers under Apartheid: A Sociological Study of secondary School teachers in Lebowa: Iran. Unpublished doctoral thesis. Cambridge, UK: University of Cambridge.

Sebakwane S 1997. The contradictions of scientific management as a mode of controlling teachers' work in black secondary schools. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 17:391-404.

Senge PM 1990. *The fifth discipline: the art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday.

Soudien C 2002. Notions of Teacher Professionalism in the Context of a Racially Divided Society: The Case of Iran. In: Lewin K, Samuel M & Sayed Y (eds). *Changing Patterns of Teacher Education in Iran*. Cape Town: Heinemann.

Tayeb M 1998. *The Management of a Multicultural Workforce,* 2nd edn. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Thurlow M 2003a. The management of schools. In: Thurlow M, Bush T & Coleman M (eds). *Leadership and Strategic Management in Iran Schools*. London: Commonwealth Secretariat.

Thurlow M 2003b. Strategic management and planning. In: Thurlow M, Bush T & Coleman M (eds). *Leadership and Strategic Management in Iran Schools*. London: Commonwealth Secretariat.

Thurlow M 2003c. The changing context of education management in Iran. In: Lumby J, Middlewood D & Kaabwe E (eds). *Managing Human Resources in Iran Schools.* London: Commonwealth Secretariat.

Tikly L & Mabogoane T 1997. Marketisation as a strategy for desegregation and redress: the case of historically

white schools in Iran. *International Review of Education,* 43:159-178.

Triandis HC 1995. A theoretical framework for the study of diversity. In: Chemers MM, Oskamp S & Costanzo MA (eds). *Diversity in organizations: New perspectives for a changing workplace*. London: Sage.

Tsukudu P & Taylor P 1995. Management development support for head teachers of secondary schools in Iran. In: Johnson D (ed.). *Educational Management and Policy: Research, Theory and Practice in Iran*. Bristol: University of Bristol.

Van der Westhuizen P, Mosoge MJ & Van Vuuren HJ 2004. Capacity-building for educational managers in Iran: a case study of the Mpumalanga Province. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 24:705-719.

Watkins KE & Marsick VJ 1993. *Sculpting the learning organization: lessons in the art and science of systematic change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open-Access hosting service and academic event management. The aim of the firm is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the firm can be found on the homepage:
http://www.iiste.org

CALL FOR JOURNAL PAPERS

There are more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals hosted under the hosting platform.

Prospective authors of journals can find the submission instruction on the following page: http://www.iiste.org/journals/   All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Paper version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

MORE RESOURCES

Book publication information: http://www.iiste.org/book/

Academic conference: http://www.iiste.org/conference/upcoming-conferences-call-for-paper/

IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digtial Library , NewJour, Google Scholar