CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Most of the research on quality management has been geared to manufacturing organisations. The focus on the application of TQM principles and techniques in service organisations has remained limited for many years. However, although TQM has been clearly conceptualised around basic principles such as leadership, customer satisfaction, employee involvement, continuous improvement, supplier partnership and performance measures, the application of TQM principles and techniques in educational institutions is remained a challenging task (Maria, L.S.V. et al., 2007). Adoption of holistic approach in the research of TQM empirical study and differences between countries’ business, socio-political and socio-economic environments prevent straightforward transferability and applicability of TQM concepts, principles and practices universally (Sila and Ebramhimpour, 2002).

In efforts to measure TQM world-wide, several quality awards have been used to guide research into TQM. The most popular of them has been the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award (MBNQA) in USA (Samson and Terziovsky, 1999). This research is based on MBNQA. The literature relating to the leadership, leadership practices and performance were collected from the earlier studies, research papers, journals, books and reports on the domains of school education, higher education, educational research and quality management practices of educational institutions.
2.2 LEADERSHIP

In education, Sergiovanni (1984) in his study on “Leadership and Excellence in Schooling” identified multiple dimensions of leadership he termed “leadership forces”. These were technical, human, educational, symbolic, and cultural. Inclusion of the educational force was significant and typifies early differentiation between the leadership of schools and that of other organisations described the educational force as “expert knowledge about matters of education and schooling”.

Owens (1987) in his book on, “Organizational Behavior in Education” mentioned that the separation of charismatic leadership from position based leadership promoted the belief that leadership was more of a consequence of a set of human actions based on emotional power that engaged the support of others.

Handy and Aitken (1990) in their book on, “Understanding Schools as Organizations” argued that unlike other organizations which have layers of full-time managers, schools had two or three at the top and a few others as part of their job. In the former category were the school head, deputy and assistant head while in the latter were heads of departments and senior teachers grade one who had to contend in most cases with normal teaching duties, thus allowing very little time for management.

Harber (1991) in his research paper on, “International Contexts for Political Education” found that in almost all modern organizations, including schools had the characteristics of the Weberian model of bureaucracy which included a division of labour and specialization, an impersonal orientation, a hierarchy of authority, rules and regulations and a career orientation.
Murphy and Hallinger (1992) in their study on, “The Principalship in an Era of Transformation” noted that in the 1980s, principals needed to become curriculum and instructional leaders if they were to coordinate local school improvement. This dimension of school leadership was termed instructional leadership.

Ukeje (1993) pointed out that the success of a leader depended on the readiness, the willingness commitment and the ability of the followers to follow as well as the ability, the style and skills of the leaders. Consequently the success of educational administrators depended on their effectiveness as well as the effectiveness of the classroom teachers.

According to Republic of Botswana’s (1994) report on, “Revised National Policy on Education“, the head as an instructional leader, together with the deputy and senior teachers should take major responsibility for in-service training for teachers within the schools, through regular observation of teachers and organisation of workshops, to foster communication between teachers on professional matters and to address weaknesses.

Heller and Firestone (1995) in their paper on, “Who’s in Charge Here? Sources of Leadership for Change in Eight Schools” found that teachers were professionals who were creative, who can make a difference in an organisation if they were allowed to be self directed. Leaders should use developmental approaches such as supporting, encouraging, listening, accepting, trusting, respecting and negotiating the differences.

Hall and Lord (1996) in their study on, “Multilevel Information Processing Explanations of Followers and Leadership Perceptions” noted that transformational leader was the leader who inspired people to excel and articulates meaningful vision for the organization. A leader acted in both formal and informal ways to build employee commitment in the organization.
Ibukun (1997) in his book on, “Educational Management Theory and Practice” advocated the transformational approaches to leadership were the effective management of the school system. He also noted that transformational leader was the leader who acted in both formal and informal ways to build employee commitment in the organization.

According to Idowu (1998) in his book on, “Guidance and Counselling in Education”, the job of managing involved among other things, the provision of leadership for men and women, coordinating both human and material resources to ensure the achievement of organizational goals.

In the school system, the principal as an administrator influenced his teachers to achieve the goals and objectives of the school. The fundamental goal of the school was to enhance the teaching and learning process. Hence the school administrators should endeavour to influence the behaviour of the teachers in order to achieve the goals of the school.

Hallinger and Heck (1999) in their study on, “Exploring the Principal’s Contribution to School Effectiveness:1980-1995” suggested that transformational leadership contributed to a range of organizational outcomes including motivation, commitment and capacity for teachers to develop new approaches to education. School principals were expected to exhibit this leadership quality to enhance teaching and learning in the school.

Elmore (2000) in his book on, “Building a New Structure for School Leadership” emphasised that the distribution of leadership did not mean that those in formal leadership positions, particularly the principal, can abdicate their responsibilities. Distribution of leadership did not imply distributing the leadership functions in terms of delegation either.
Schlechty (2001) in his book on, “Shaking up the School House: How to Support and Sustain Educational Innovation” found that most recent models of educational leadership emphasised the importance of school leaders being heavily involved in the school’s instructional programme.

Hitt and Ireland (2002) in their research on, “The Essence of Strategic Leadership: Managing Human and Social Capital” suggested the essence of strategic leadership was the effectuation of human capital and social capital in and for the firm. In Hitt’s and Ireland’s view, both human capital and social capital were significant contributors to achievement of a competitive advantage. A central issue in strategic leadership was why some firms perform better than others.

Miller (2002) in his study on, Competitive “Strategies of Religious Organizations” argued that the extent to which strategic leadership was exercised in the firm was one possible answer. Strategic leaders must leverage human and social capital to create value for the firm. Included in the leadership category was the need for responsible, informed, and accountable governance or advisory body that protects the interest of key stakeholders.

When Ciulla (2003) in her book on, “The Ethics of Leadership” tracked variations in the definitions of leadership from the 1940s, she noted that in the 1990s the support for the leader was more an inter-dependent relationship between the leader and the led, which was significantly different from the traditional view of leadership.

Copland (2003) noted that effective leadership in schools involved individuals both internal and external to a school. He also pointed that the leadership was a set of functions or qualities shared across a much broader segment of the school community that encompassed administrators, teachers,
and other professionals and community members both internal and external to the school.

Harrington and Williams, (2004) in their study on “Moving the Quality Effort Forward-the Emerging Role of the Middle Manager” concluded that leadership in the context of TQM was not about power, authority and control, it was more about empowerment, recognition, coaching and developing others.

Spillane et al (2005) in their research on, “Towards a Theory of Leadership Practice: A Distributed Perspective” provided evidence that leadership was stretched over people and distributed over the materials and artifacts that were part of the organizational and social structures of schools.

NIST (2006) in its report on, “Criteria for Performance Excellence” found that the MBNQA assessment model addresses how senior leaders guided and sustained an organization, setting organizational vision, values and performance expectations,

Kumar (2007) in his article on, “Comparison between DP and MBNQA: Convergence and Divergence Over Time” quoted that the central role of senior leadership to organizational success must be manifested in a commitment to the development of the organization’s future leaders and to the reward and recognition of employee performance.

Bush (2008) found that there was also increasing recognition that schools required effective leaders and managers if they were to provide the best possible education for their learners. Schools needed trained and committed teachers but they, in turn, needed the leadership of highly effective principals and support from other senior and middle managers. While the need for effective leaders is widely acknowledged, there is much less
certainty about which leadership behaviours are most likely to produce favourable outcomes.

Alister Jones (2009) found that leadership, including a vision for change and planning for action to implement this vision was crucial in any educational change. The notion that this leadership was something that was exercised by one individual was slowly being replaced by a view of leadership that distributed across multiple people and situations.

There was also increasing evidence to support a strong relationship between distributed patterns of leadership and improved outcomes for schools, teachers, students and communities. This led to consideration of extended leadership teams which may include new roles, new practices and new ways of operating.

Mhozya (2010) found that senior management teams in primary schools had the inclination towards a democratic style of leadership. Subordinates were not necessarily people to be lead. They were creative, innovative and can contribute to the betterment of their organizations. However, it was worth mentioning that some people needed to be lead, depending on their maturity levels, ability and willingness to perform tasks.

2.3 LEADERSHIP PRACTICES

The research conducted by Heck (1992) revealed that once the environmental factors are controlled, the principals in elementary and high schools that were extraordinary high achieving as measured by constant academic achievement in a variety of curricular areas, may be substantially different from their counterparts in constantly low achieving schools in terms of the type and effectiveness of leadership they provide.
Numkanisorn (1993) in his research on, “An Exploration of the Impact of the Principal Leadership Behavior on School Culture” concluded that the capabilities of principals to perform roles influenced student learning process aligned to school goals, school organizational structure and culture. He identified three types of roles played by school principals namely the roles of an instructional leader, a transformational leader and a transactional.

Leithwood et al (1996) in his report on “Leadership Practices for Effectiveness of the Organization” supported the view that transactional practices were necessary and associated with routine management whereas transformational practices were associated with their change of efforts.

Owlia and Aspinwall (1997) in their study on, “A Framework for the Dimensions of Quality in Higher Education” interpreted the quality for higher education in terms of the quality dimension by using Garvin’s quality framework, Parasuraman’s service quality dimension and Watt’s software quality dimension. However, the dimension identification frameworks focused mainly on defining the quality aspect of the product features and service features.

The core set of basic school leadership practices support Hallinger and Heck (1998) in their study on, Exploring the Principal's Contribution to School Effectiveness: 1980-1995” found that the school conditions through which leadership may exercise their quality practices. These conditions included purposes and goals, school structure and social networks, people and organizational culture.

Leithwood and Duke (1999) in their study on,” A Century’s Quest to Understand School Leadership” proposed a core set of basic leadership practices that are valuable in almost all school contexts. This core set included:
• Setting directions includes building a shared vision, developing consensus about goals and priorities, and creating high performance expectations.

• Developing people includes providing individualized support, offering intellectual stimulation, and modeling important values and practices.

• Redesigning the organization includes building a collaborative culture, creating and maintaining shared decision-making structures and processes, and building relationship with parents and the wider community.

Laszlo (1999) in his study on, “Implementing a Quality Management Program - Three C’s of Success: Commitment, Culture, Cost” suggested that the critical success factors, or Quality Management (QM) drivers, can been grouped together into three groups, termed “the 3C’s of success“.

The three C’s included; commitment (micro and macro, involvement at all levels within the organization), culture (responsibility at the social level, doing it the way that this particular company did it, which invariably differs according to individual company philosophy, vision and culture) and cost (the costs, financial and other, of implementing the quality management programme, not forgetting the costs of non-implementation).

This classification of quality attributes was in accordance with the organization’s operation system of converting the inputs into outputs via the process. In this way, it can be associated the quality improvements with the operating system of any organization, including those from the education sector.

Day et al’s (2000) in their work on, “Leading Schools in Times of Change” developed a model of ‘values-led contingency leadership’, which included dimensions of values and vision, integrity, context, continuing professional development, and reflection. They found that good leaders were informed by and communicate, clear sets of personal and educational values, which represented their moral purposes for the school.

Cuban et al (2001) in their study on, “High Access and Low Use of Technologies in High School Classrooms: Explaining an Apparent Paradox” pointed out that leadership for ICT required an overview of the technology itself, along with skills to manage the changes in school structures and systems and the teaching and learning processes that can arise from the use of ICT.

Zhao et al (2002) noted in their study on, “Conditions for Classroom Technology Innovations” that aspects of the school context including administrator support, school technological infrastructure and the extent to which peers supported and encouraged the innovator impacted on the success of the innovative administrative and learning practices.

Gurr et al (2003) in their research on, “Successful School Leadership in Victoria” formulated the model revealed that successful school leaders intervene in a variety of school aspects. These included interventions that either directly or indirectly influence the students’ outcomes.
They also explained that ‘teaching and learning’ was believed to have a direct influence on ‘students’ outcomes’, and ‘teaching and learning’ were directly influenced by ‘school capacity’. ‘School capacity’ was affected by some ‘other influences’ including policies and programme of external organizations, organizational characteristics, community resources, stakeholders and social and economic landscape.

Mulford and Johns (2004) in their study on, “Successful School Principalship” found that the principals’ personal set of beliefs and values were the basis for their leadership practices. These beliefs and values led the principals in their decisions and actions regarding supports and capacity building provided both for individual people in the school and for the schools as organizations that include school culture and structure.

Also, the successful school principalship was summarized as an interactive, reciprocal and evolving process involving many players, which was influenced by, and in turn influenced, the context in which it occurred.

Tearle (2004) in his report on, “Implementation of ICT in UK Secondary Schools” who analyzed ICT integration in three schools in the United Kingdom, came to conclusion that the need for a whole-school vision for ICT use, along with a role for school characteristics, culture and ethos that support change, all coupled with the practical support and the visible involvement of the principal.

Waters and Grubb (2004) in their study on, “The Leadership We Need: Using Research to Strengthen the Use of Standards for Administrator Preparation and Licensure Programs” outlined three sets of core leadership practices:
• Developing people-Enabling teachers and other staff member to do their jobs effectively, offering intellectual support and stimulation to improve the work, and providing models of practice and support.

• Setting directions for the organization-Developing shared goals, monitoring organizational performance, and promoting effective communication.

• Redesigning the organization-Creating a productive school culture, modifying organizational structures that undermine the work, and building collaborative processes.

Fullan (2005) in his study on, “Leadership and Sustainability: System Thinkers in Action” proposed that when the goal was sustainable systemic change individuals at the level of the state, the region and the school needed to provide leadership for change and, more than this, they needed to work together across the levels to promote and support change.

Leaders at each of these three levels thus needed to be adept at working with policies and practices within and across the levels. Distributed leadership was primarily concerned with mobilizing leadership at all levels in the organisation not just relying on leadership from the top. It was about engaging many rather than the few in leadership activity within the school and actively distributing leadership practice.

The emphasis was about leadership practice and a distributed model of leadership was one premised upon the interactions between many leaders rather than the actions of an individual leader.
Research by Anderson and Dexter (2005) in their research on, “School Technology Leadership: An Empirical Investigation of Prevalence and Effect” endorsed the importance of the principal in establishing a technology committee and budget, personally using technology, spending time on and budgeting for technology integration, however, they concluded that leadership and planning for ICT integration was more a school than an individual characteristic.

Fishman et al (2006) in their study on, “Creating a Framework for Research on Systemic Technology Innovations” found that when systemic sustainable change was the goal there was a need to consider systemic issues. That was, there was a need to look beyond the individual leader and even what was happening in an individual school, to consider the ways that the wider educational and political context including policy, professional development planning and the provision of resources, both shapes and constrains what happened.

Specifically, leadership was distributed over people involved in school governance, over senior school managers including the principal, over those with formal responsibilities for ICT within a school and over departmental leaders and teachers as leaders in the classroom.

Oluremi (2007) in their study on, “Principals’ Leadership Behaviour and School Learning Culture in Ekiti State Secondary Schools” suggested that the selection of principals to schools should include a process to identify those who have history of exhibiting the interpersonal skills, consistent with individual concern as identified in this research.

A selection based on mass promotion or year of certification would not urge well for effective leadership and school learning culture. Periodic
seminars for school principals should be organized to assist them in the management of their schools.

Robinson et al (2008) in their analysis on, “The Impact of Leadership on Student Outcomes: An Analysis of the Differential Effects of Leadership Type” of 22 studies showed that the impact of those types of leadership that were characterized as instructional were three to four times greater than those characterized as transformational. The reason was that measures of instructional leadership were more likely to capture variation in the particular knowledge and skills required to drive improvement in teaching and learning.

Raihani (2009) in his research report on, “The Principal Perspective of Successful School Leadership in Yogyakarta” found that besides demonstrating their ability in visioning and setting appropriate strategies, the principals successfully worked on the provision of school conditions including professional development, building collaborative culture and redesigning school structure to support the school improvement.

This intervention in such school conditions indicated support for contemporary model of educational leadership. Although mostly indirectly, the principals also intervened in the aspect of teaching learning by fostering professional development programs oriented to build instructional competences of teachers.

Brooks and Normore (2010) in their study on, “Educational Leadership and Globalization: Literacy for A Global Perspective” suggested nine educational leadership literacies that leaders must be conversant with to effectively led from a global perspective. This had significant implications for the field of educational leadership, but it did allow for the interrogation of
leadership practice in a school without the limitations of job titles or distinctions such as teacher leadership versus principal leadership.

2.4 PERFORMANCE

Bamburg and Andrews (1991) in their study on, “School Goals, Principals and Achievement” suggested that the teachers should have the clarity of the criteria and leaders used to evaluate their classroom performance, and the frequency and usefulness of leaders’ feedback. Similarly, they assessed the regularity of classroom visits and the degree to which monitoring of student progress was systematic.

Malloy and Janowski (1992) in their study on, “Perceptions and Meta Perceptions of Leadership: Components, Accuracy, and Dispositional Correlates” found that social relations model to perceptions of leadership (e.g., amount of talking, friendliness, leadership), self and other perceptions appeared to be highly similar and in general quite accurate. It was apparent that good leadership practices would improve the student’s academic performance and teacher’s teaching abilities.

Lowe et al (1993) in their review on, “Effectiveness Correlates of Transformational and Transactional leadership: A Meta-Analytic Review of the MLQ Literature” found that sex differences in transformational and transactional leadership had implications for female advantage arguments because researchers defined these styles in an effort to identify effective leadership.

Substantiating these claims, a meta-analysis of 39 studies showed positive correlations between effectiveness and all components of transformational leadership as well as the contingent reward and performance
component of transactional leadership, the one aspect of transactional leadership on which women exceeded men.

Gastil (1994) This meta-analysis included some possible interpretations of the autocratic–democratic sex difference—specifically, (a) the greater social skills of women (vs. men) may have facilitated collaborative, democratic leadership behavior and (b) such behavior may have been especially advantageous for women because it placated subordinates and peers who might other-wise have been resistant to female leadership.

He also viewed that the demonstrated difference in autocratic–democratic tendencies was unimportant that this style’s effectiveness depended on context who were “unwilling to argue that women’s relatively democratic and participative style was either an advantage or disadvantage.”

Heilman et al (1995) found that although stereotypes were not necessarily activated or applied to bias judgments of individuals, many circumstances do favor both activation and application. Because such circumstances were common, it was assumed that, in general, perceptions of individual leaders reflected both beliefs about leaders and beliefs about gender. The typical similarity of the male gender role and leader roles required no such amalgamation and these stereotypes role of leadership negatively affected the performance of the organizations.

Hallinger et al (1996) in their study on, “School Context, Principal Leadership, and Student Reading Achievement” found that a school leader played an integral role in influencing the school learning environment. In light of the intense need for reform facing schools nationwide, it was important to identify leader behaviours that can help guide schools through the change process.
They also found seven distinct leader behaviors and responsibilities that were highly correlated with deep levels of change and reform for student achievement (intellectual stimulation of faculty member and staff member, change agent, monitor and evaluate practice, operate with ideas and beliefs, knowledgeable of curriculum, instruction, and assessment, flexibility, and optimizer). Therefore, to meet the goal of high levels of achievement for all students, the role of school leaders must shift with everything else that was influencing schools (i.e., the economy, demographics).

Dijkstra (1997) in his research on, “An Empirical Interpretation of the EFQM Framework” claimed that in enablers’ criteria, "Leadership" and "Processes", and in Results criteria, "Key Performance Results" and "Customer Results" have the highest impact on creating a meaningful relationship. There was no debate that the success of any organization was greatly dependent upon the competence of its leaders and similarly, the leaders’ capabilities defined the success of the organization.

Evans (1997) in his study on, “Critical Linkages in the Baldrige Award Criteria: Research Models and Educational Challenges” discussed MBNQA and institutions of higher education by relating it to learning and curriculum issues and identifying what higher education should be teaching based upon a survey of Baldrige Award winners.

Weinstein et al (1998) in their research on, “What Higher Education Should be Teaching about Quality – But is Not” identified an apparent gap between the Baldrige Award winners’ perceptions and the current practice in higher education institutions. While developing a curriculum based upon Baldrige principles has received noteworthy attention, what is not readily evident within the literature was the actual application of the MBNQA concepts as part of the educational delivery process.
Winn and Cameron (1998) in their study on, “Organizational Quality: An Examination of the Malcolm Baldrige Quality Framework” examined the validity of the proposed relationships among the MBNQA dimensions using data from higher education. They developed a survey instrument of the processes, practices, and outcomes of quality at a large Midwestern university in the USA.

They concluded that the assumed relationship between an organization’s leadership and each of the quality process was definitely supported. Using structural equations modeling, the same authors proceeded to perform statistical analysis of MBNQA framework as a whole. They presented an alternative framework of relationships that took into account the lack of direct effects on quality and operational results from leadership, information and analysis, and strategic planning and the lack of direct effects on customer focus and satisfaction from leadership, information and analysis and human resource development and management.

Astin (1999) in his article on, “Involvement in Learning Revisited: Lessons We have Learned” found that the challenge of narrowing the college education gap and achieving equitable educational outcomes for historically underrepresented students as a problem of institutional responsibility and performance rather than as a problem that was exclusively related to student accountability, motivation, and academic preparation.

He further focused on characteristics such as students’ social and academic integration, student involvement, intensity of their high school curriculum, lack of cultural capital and other risk factors associated with poor performance. The students must accept responsibility for their own success or failure, it was also believed that institutional actors, particularly faculty member members, also bear individual and collective responsibility for student outcomes.
Prabhu et al (2000) in their study on, “The Impact of ISO 9000 and Total Quality Management (TQM) on Best Practice/Performance” demonstrated there were strong relationships between: (1) people and people results; (2) emphasis on leadership and customers, through the assurance of good training for people; and (3) issues on key performance results related to people.

Eskildsen and Dahlgaard (2000) in their research on, “A Causal Model for Employee Satisfaction” indicated that leadership significantly derived people, policy and strategy, partnership and resources, which affected processes. Moreover, there was a direct influence of policy and strategy on people and partnerships and resources. Also people and processes influenced people results. But customer results have only effect on key performance results and society results have merely effect on customer results.

Meyer and Collier (2001) in their study on, “An Empirical Test of the Causal Relationships in the Baldrige Health Care Pilot Criteria” found that the performance relationships among the seven categories, uncertain of the true direction of causation, they defaulted to the premise that all categories were related and used two-headed arrows among all Baldrige categories.

Flynn and Saladin (2001) in their study on, “Further Evidence on the Validity of the Theoretical Models Underlying the Baldrige Criteria” found that the MBNQA has evolved from a means of recognizing and promoting exemplary quality management practices to a comprehensive framework for world-class performance, widely used as a model for improvement.

As such, its underlying theoretical framework was of critical importance, since the relationships it portrayed convey a message about the route to competitiveness. It became imperative that the relationship between
constructs be tested and validated. It was important because organizations allocated substantial resources toward improvement of their processes based on the relationships in the Baldrige framework.

Blazley et al (2003) in their study on, “Insights to Performance Excellence in Education 2003 an inside look at the 2003 Baldrige Award Criteria for Education” highlighted that Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award Criteria for Performance Excellence in Education (MB) and related scoring guidelines were powerful assessment instruments that would help leaders of educational organization identify strengths and key areas for improvement. Leaders then needed to use the information to achieve higher levels of performance”.

The core values and concepts of the MB criteria were embodied in seven categories of leadership, strategic planning, student, stakeholder, and market focus, measurement analysis and knowledge management, faculty member and staff member focus, process management and organizational performance results.

Wangrassamee et al (2003) in their study on, “Performance Measurement Tools: The Balanced Scorecard and the EFQM Excellence Model” had identified performance measurement by traditional method was in consistent with accept thinking constantly improve, it was difficult to use in practice, its flexibility was low, it was neglect to meet the needs of customers and can not be combined with organizational strategies.

A study on, “Validating Key Results Linkages in the Baldrige Performance Excellence Model” by Evans and Jack (2003) provided evidence of the validity of the Baldrige model and its examination/self assessment process. The study validated strong business results as an outcome of high-performance management practices. Essentially, the results documented the
relationship between what organizations did in terms of quality management practices and the results they achieved in several types of outcomes.

Douglas and Fredendall (2004), in their research on, “Evaluating the Deming Management Model of Total Quality Services” “had provided the strongest evidence that the Baldrige criteria, as a framework of TQM”, were linked with improved organizational outcomes and performance at all the levels of organization.

Belohlav et al (2004) described how several faculty members in the Department of Management at DePaul University designed, developed, and delivered course material using the MNBQA framework both as part of the structure and as point in their individual classes. They concluded that end-of-term student evaluations indicated that the approach led to a higher level of student engagement in the learning process, as evidenced by more abundant and higher-quality feedback to the instructors. Badri et. al., (2005) found that leadership was identified as a driver for all components in the Baldrige System, including measurement, analysis and knowledge management, strategic planning, faculty member and staff member focus and process management.

All Baldrige components (categories) were significantly linked with organizational outcomes as represented by the two categories of organizational performance results and student, stakeholder and market focus.

Bell and Elkins (2005) in their research on, “A Balanced Scorecard for Leaders: Implications of the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award Criteria” said that leadership practices can make a considerable difference to the learning and achievement of students. However, the performance of the students depended on the particular leadership practices they employ, because
different types of leadership have, on average, very different impacts on student outcomes.

Jelodar (2006) in his report on, “Organizational Excellence EFQM” suggested that one of the best ways for organizational assessment was self-assessment that the EFQM model has special attention to it. There were nine criteria in this model that the five criteria of it was related to empowerments and the four other criteria were considered the results.

Chinda and Mohamed (2007) in their conference paper on, “Causal Relationships between Enablers of Construction Safety Culture” demonstrated leadership has positive effects on people, partnership and resources, policy and strategy. Also people influenced partnership and resources and processes. Further partnership and resources impacted on policy and strategy. Besides it was showed that policy and strategy had impact on processes. Finally results revealed the effect of processes on goals.

Pouyan and Karimanpoor (2007) in their study on, Establishment of Organizational Excellence Model EFQM in Services Companies” found that the European EFQM model has been admitted popularity in the world and it was model of many countries for making and designing the national prizes. EFQM model was specially tools the using by organizations for performance assessment and it was the basis to make common language and thinking and building a structure to management system that for removing re-workings and detect deviations.

Homayonfar (2008) in his book on, “Excellence Pioneers” found that the business excellent models offered method of an organization that it was excelled in the idea and practice than other organizations and it showed in the competitive environment how must apply for growth, survive and superiority.
Saravanan and Rao (2008) in their study on, “The Impact of Total Quality Service Age on Quality and Operational Performance” found that the MBNQA business results category groups performance measures into five segments: customer; financial and market; human resource; supplier and partner performance; and organizational effectiveness. Within the context of MBNQA, measuring business results was a balanced scorecard approach where both financial and non-financial measures assumed equal importance and were part of the assessment/information system for all organizational levels.

Mohebi (2009) in their book on, “Organizational Excellence Model EFQM, Tactics and Executive Approach” suggested that the comparative approach should be systematic and comprehensive vision to all of performance area of organization and also it should consider all inputs, implementation process, output and results of activities of each organization and their impact on others.

Martinez-Lorente et al (2009) in their conference paper on, “An Evaluation of the EFQM Excellence Model” used the regression technique to test the direct and indirect interrelationships in 71 organizations by apply a questionnaire. The results revealed the direct and indirect relationships among the criteria which are forgotten by original EFQM excellence model.

Bou-Llusar et al (2010) in their study on, “An Empirical Assessment of the EFQM Excellence Model: Evaluation as a TQM framework Relative to the MBNQA Model” suggested if the organizations wanted to compete in the dynamic and complex environment, it was needed to implement EFQM in the organization, because it was inevitable.

Sadeh and Arumugan (2010) in their study on, “Interrelationships among EFQM Excellence Criteria in Iranian Industrial SMEs” found that
leadership was the most effective criteria having the largest influence on other excellence concepts.

Also the finding revealed people was an important impressive criterion having a large effect value on other concepts. Further results showed key performance results criterion was significantly affected by other excellence criteria.

2.5 CONCLUSION

Through this extensive literature survey, it is concluded that the most of the earlier research studies were carried out on different leadership styles, leadership practices, performance outcomes and several quality awards such as MBNQA and EFQM.

Though the body of research on leadership quality practices and their impact on outcomes has grown in the last three decades, the majority of studies lack empirical support and theoretical background. Many earlier studies describe the structural, content and delivery practices of leadership quality practices, yet fail to link these variables to outcomes such as leadership behavior, the college learning environment and student achievements and performances. Meanwhile, there is no in depth and strong empirical investigations about the leadership quality practices and its impact on performance of students in technical educational institutions especially in polytechnic education.