

Toward Pedagogy Education for Leadership in Nigeria

Felix Okechukwu Ugwuozor

Department of Educational Foundation, Faculty of Education,
University of Nigeria Nsukka, P.M.B, 410001 and Enugu State, Nigeria

Abstract: For decades and Nigeria has applied various strategies and principles to ensure that effective leadership structure is developed and sustained but much still needs to be done. It is expected that proper harnessing of the gains of well-articulated pedagogical education could be the panacea to effective leadership in the near future. The purpose of this study is to create the much-needed awareness particularly at this period when political dispensation is gradually trying to stabilize the polity. Pedagogical education actually requires a conducive environment to thrive and the gains if properly harnessed will lift the nation to a greater height in the committee of nations.

Key words: Education, leadership, Nigeria and pedagogy, education, pedagogy

INTRODUCTION

The effectiveness of schools in educating students is highly dependent on the presence and nature of multi-leveled pedagogy leadership within each individual school. While principals are formally required to lead the school and leadership is not the sole province of the principalship. Indeed most schools are characterized by a combination of formal and informal leadership as evidenced by teachers assuming responsibility for particular tasks and programs. Although, the leadership of schools is a complex phenomenon the outcomes of successful school leadership are nonetheless readily identifiable. These outcomes center upon the quality of the pedagogy provided by teachers and the engagement of students in learning. Pedagogic change is difficult and as Stigler and Hiebert (1999) noted teachers tend to replicate the culture and pedagogy of their personal experiences as students at school. It is proper to state that leadership in early childhood education and care is a holistic process that involves not only the leader and the administration but also personnel and indirectly parents and everyone else who has an influence on the implementation of early education practices (Hujala and Eskelinen, 2013). In contextual leadership model leadership is determined and guided by the mission of early child education and care which defines the core tasks of the practice in childcare. Managerial responsibilities comprise the professional work of center directors.

Researching leadership is challenging because it is difficult to quantify or observe and as Rodd (2013) declares sometimes effective leadership is enacted by standing back saying or doing nothing. Nevertheless

leadership is often identified as a key element in delivering high-quality early childhood programs (Hujala *et al.*, 2013). Waniganayake *et al.* (2012) have suggested that when exploring leadership one must take into account the person (the leader) the position (authority to make decisions) and the place (the organizational setting). Which of these three elements are emphasized or prioritized within the daily practice of early childhood leadership is however highly variable and context specific. Hujala and Heikka (2008) observed that early childhood director's greatest childhood was the lack of time in pedagogical leadership. They identified the contradiction between pedagogical leadership and daily management. Instead of developing pedagogy the director's daily working hours were in maintaining the structures of the program.

While pedagogy is a contested concept it covers a wider range of aspects of the teaching act than instruction. Pedagogy is derived from *paidagogos* (Greek) meaning the teaching of children and the intentional use of the term pedagogy instead of instruction or teaching in modern times can be conceptual geographical or ideological. The term pedagogy was relatively uncommon a decade ago but is currently being used more frequently in publications and teacher's discourse. There appears to be at least five inter-related clusters of meaning of pedagogy in the literature: epistemological (pedagogy as the transmission of knowledge) (Lingard *et al.*, 2003); socio-ideological (pedagogy as a political tool for the enculturation students) (Morton and Zarazadeh, 1991; Smyth, 1988; Manen, 1999) pedagogy ideological practices of constructing subjectivities necessary for reproducing existing social organizations (Morton and Zavarzadeh, 1991); social (Pedagogy as a relationship

that produces knowledge) (Britzman 2003; Manen, 1999); pedagogy as social practice (Daniels 2001) the pedagogy act (the mechanical aspects of how knowledge is transmitted); pedagogy as an inclusive view of all aspects leading but not simply instruction (Mortimore, 1999; Newmann, 1996); any conscious activity designed by one person to bring about learning in another (Ireson *et al.*, 1999) and pedagogy separated from didactics (pedagogy in the European usage related to culture and children's learning while didactics relates to the subjects to be taught) (Alexander, 2004; Hamilton and McWilliam, 2001).

Pedagogy specifically recognizes the cultural moral and societal aspects of what is learned why it is learned. Pedagogy acknowledges the aspects of learning that were previously described as the hidden curriculum. Pedagogy peels back the veneer of teaching methodology to expose the conscious and unconscious decisions made by school leaders as the communities' agents of enculturation. Pedagogy leadership is therefore an act that motivates others thus facilitating culturally and morally aware learning in a second party. Fullan (2005) stated "my main point is that effective (school) cultures establish more and more progressive interactions in which demanding processes produce both good ideas and social cohesion. A sense of moral purpose is fueled by a focus on value-added high expectation for all raising capability pulling together an ongoing hunger for improvement. The advantage of using the term pedagogy rather than instruction is that it represents a fresh broader way of thinking about the learning-teaching act because in the English-speaking world the term has not received widespread acknowledgment or usage. Pedagogical education actually requires a conducive environment to thrive and the gains if properly harnessed will lift the nation to a greater height in the committee of nations. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to create the much-needed awareness particularly at this period when political dispensation is gradually trying to stabilize the polity.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Literature search: I conducted a systematic literature search from several databases until December 2015. The Scopus and Google databases were specifically explored for papers relating to education and leadership in Nigeria and pedagogy education.

Selection criteria: I incorporated review papers and research articles relating to education and leadership in Nigeria and pedagogy education.

Data collection: To gather the required data for the qualitative analysis two review researchers were asked to autonomously appraise and get hold of data from the major reports.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Harnessing the potential of pedagogy of education: Quite recently precisely November 2015 Nigerians were thrown into hilarious grandeur as her under-17 national football team (Golden eaglets) emerged world champions by defeating their Malian counterpart in the final football competition in Chile. It is undoubtedly on record that this promising lad of Nigeria had won this coveted trophy the fifth time as Table 1.

It is equally found that Nigeria met runners-up positions three times in the past in 1987 at Canada in 2001 at Norway and in 2009 when Nigeria hosted the competition (www.naji.com; <https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/>; www.rssf.com/players/wcu17.winners.htm). Facts that can be deduced from the above analysis are as follows: all the coaches were Nigerian and each coached once and won the competition. These feat have never been met by any other football age category in the country that is above this under-17 golden eaglets. The question now is why can't the other categories be able to meet these feats? Effective and holistic application of the appropriate pedagogy education is what is required to achieve things consistently and even turn out human beings of the right leadership quality that can compete not only in football but also in various spheres of human endeavor.

Again it is a generally acceptable rule that in the process of appointing secondary school functionaries for any incoming academic year the academic nonacademic staff and the entire students play vital roles in College of the Immaculate Conception (CIC) Enugu Enugu State Nigeria. This secondary school is owned by the Catholic Diocese of Enugu.

In one such occasion in 2010 to be precise a senior prefect who was screened by the academic and nonacademic staff was however rejected unanimously by the entire students on the ground that the student did not merit such highly exalted post from the assessment of the students. The principal of the school Rev. Fr. Dr. Nnamdi Nwankwo who was visibly present at the assembly where the presentation was going on had no other option than to let the student step down and another student earlier screened given the position of the senior prefect. The principal who was believed to have been quite familiar and well-grounded with pedagogy education for several years

Table 1: Promising lad of Nigeria

Years	Hosting country	Coach	Winner	Remark
1985	China	Sabastine imasuen Brodrick	Nigeria	-
1993	Japan	Fanny ikhayere amun	Nigeria	-
2007	South Korea	Late yerni tella	Nigeria	-
2013	United Arab Emirate (UAE)	Manu garba	Nigeria	-
2015	Chile	Emmanuel amunike	Nigeria	-

in the United States of America simply maintained that the students equally have a say in critical issues that concern them such as this one. Based on the above scenario it is not quite easy to find this in several schools in Nigeria and no one cares about it. If students are aware that their conducts are effectively evaluated by all concerned including his or her fellow students such a student will more likely devote the required virtues for it. That of course would not be possible if the needed pedagogy education is not given the right attention it deserves nationally. Buckminster Fuller once said and “you never change things by fighting the existing reality. To change something build on a new model that makes the existing model obsolete.”

Nigeria obviously is one of the English-speaking countries that have not appropriately harnessed the enormous potential of the term pedagogy of education that can improve realization of quality and well-equipped future leaders. This forms the main thrust of the issue towards pedagogy education for leadership in Nigeria. The aim of this study is to create the needed awareness to the relevant stakeholders in the country. It will also showcase the connection pedagogy education has with leadership and other forms of education and why it stands out distinct in recent times.

Challenges of conceptualizing pedagogy and pedagogical leadership

Challenges of conceptualizing pedagogy: Discussions about the concept of pedagogy are often driven by its Grecian origins. However and tracing the conceptual origin of pedagogy through its Hellenistic roots or Greek mythology is problematic. In this history, the relationship between children and adults are highly gendered along male line. That is pedagogy is perceived as being concerned with men bringing up boys. Scholars have not contested the validity or significance of this approach and the existence of a caring ethos in Ancient Greece is assumed simply because of the involvement of children and adults. Overall the Hellenistic origins of pedagogy is difficult to penetrate because this writing has not been well translated across discipline boundaries nor is it sufficiently sensitive to taking into account the subtleties of cultural and linguistic nuances in writing and analyzing

complex concept derived from ancient times reflecting on these against contemporary contexts (Heikka and Waniganayake, 2011).

Pedagogical leadership has also been weakened by inadequate translations made by English language writers that have added confusion or diluted the meaning and significance of certain literature. For example, the limitations of translations are eloquently illustrated by Hamilton and McWilliam (2001) who referred to the English translations of the original publication of Immanuel Kant’s *Uber Pedagogik* (originally written in German in 1803 and Freire (1993)’s *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (first written in Portuguese in 1968). While the US publishers revised the title of Kant’s book to *Education* in 1899 Freire’s title referring to pedagogy was retained as is in the English transition. There is also a strong focus on Kant’s research in Hamilton’s historical analysis of the use of pedagogy in public education. However, this discussion may be faulty given that as Hamilton and McWilliam (2001) declared and “throughout both pedagogy and education have been blurred in translation! Heikka and Waniganayake (2011) state that the example reflects that the analysis of complex concepts may be limited by a variety of factors including the epoch and context of writing; selective interpretation driven by commercial publishing decisions and personal and professional considerations such as disciplinary status cultural heritage and the political orientation of translators publishers and researchers.

When adopting particular theoretical frameworks Heikka and Waniganayake (2011) believe that it is important to examine the contextual space and time within which ideas emerge and are applied to early childhood practice and policy. For example, Freire’s philosophy was developed in an effort to democratize education in Brazil and pedagogy was perceived as a means for political liberation and revolution (Senge, 1995). In Freire’s writing pedagogy has specific or emancipatory purposes not necessarily directly concerned with child development and education in early childhood.

Pedagogy and social pedagogy: Hamalainen (2003) stated that social pedagogy started with efforts to confront social distress pedagogically in theory and practice. It was enhanced and took up the concept of social help. The relationship between social pedagogy and pedagogy can be examined across countries in relation to social policy concerning children and youth. For example, Cameron (2004) described the differences between the UK and Germany as follows: “while in England pedagogy refers to how subjects are taught within formal education systems in Germany the definition of pedagogy and its close relation social pedagogy has evolved and widened over time.”

Petrie *et al.* (2009) advocate the use of social pedagogues in day care and in residential care and foster care for young children. In an era of significant global national curriculum reform in early childhood education it is difficult to know what impact broadening the role of early childhood practitioners will have on implementing educationally sound early years learning and teaching programs. Moss (2006) states that pedagogy is a relational and holistic approach to working with people and within pedagogy learning care and upbringing are interwoven and connected. The notion of considering the whole child is often used as a justification for the emphasis on social pedagogy. Kyriacou for instance emphasized the importance of going beyond subject learning found in traditional school curriculum to ensure that the professional is meeting the needs of the whole child within the context of a family and society. Petrice claimed a need for a wider definition of pedagogy closer to continental European than English usage and the notion of pedagogues as practitioners.

The whole child approach is not new to early childhood education this approach also cannot be used to justify this emphasis on social pedagogy as the guiding framework in early childhood education (Heikka and Waniganayake, 2011). According to Yates (2009) pedagogy suggest (s) that there is something bigger and more complex to be considered than terms like teaching and learning is being used extensively within the education academy. Pedagogy is a relative academy pedagogy is a relatively new concept for many early childhood education. The increasing interest in implementing pedagogical leadership in everyday practice demanded more clarity and analysis by all concerned (Heikka and Waniganayake, 2011).

Education and pedagogy: Highlighting differences between the concepts of instructions and pedagogy Biesta and Miedema (2002) suggested that no distinction between these two concepts should be made. According to these authors instructions mean transforming skills and knowledge while pedagogy incorporated moral and value-related perspectives. They added that the pedagogical tasks of education take into account the whole person by not separating pedagogy and instruction. However in early childhood education these aspects are interwoven.

Webster (2009) noticed that pedagogy has been connected with the means or process of instructing and is totally neglectful of the end purposes which are intrinsic to education. Within the contest of schools it can be seen that teachers are responsible for pedagogical

aspects of schoolwork. However, typically it is those who hold managerial position at the upper levels of the schools system and do not work as classroom teachers who have the responsibility for setting targets and visions for school education. This understanding of leadership responsibilities based on a hierarchical system is often connected with the command-and-follow approach to leadership. When explaining pedagogical functions within schools separating pedagogy from education reinforces conventional leadership thinking of the roles of leaders as creators of a vision and of teachers as being the followers responsible for implementing it. In early childhood education national and local policies teaching practice and curriculum theory form the three points of the pedagogy triangle. Leadership is necessary to make functional connections between the triangle point of interaction in the triangle (Heikka and Waniganayake, 2011). In providing early childhood services for children and families a variety of pedagogical approaches including educational pedagogy and social pedagogy can be used (Karila, 2001).

Exclusion and otherness in critical pedagogy: Critical teaching is at its most basic an examination of the intersections of person and their surrounding historically exigencies; Freires educational theories fundamentally changed the impetus behind teaching from a passive pouring into a questioning investigation of knowledge and information. The goal of education became not transfer of knowledge but rather the transformation of social structure of inequality and hegemony students and teachers might probe the existing knowledge bases and cultural power structures in an effort to promote social justice and come to a more meaningful understanding of the world. Their transformation could only be brought about through the effort of the oppressed; therefore the subject position becomes the focal point of Freire's the orization of education for critical consciousness and the subject positions of the majority student are lost. This lack of concern for majority subject positions represents a measure of incompleteness and exclusion in the critical teaching project. For while the battle lines between oppressed and oppressor were perhaps more clearly drawn for the audience Freire was initially writing for the postmodern understanding of the fragmented and multiple subject positions and that all students and minority and majority alike requires that no student identity be delegitimized or marginalized if critical pedagogy is sincere in its effort to bring about terms-transformative consciousness. Critical pedagogy requires that students and teachers learn how to perceive themselves differently

to investigate how their actions languages and places in the world might counter or contribute to hegemonic discourses.

Based on the foregoing, it is suggested that pedagogical education should be effectively integrated into the education curriculum of the government in Nigeria. Experts from Nigeria that are experienced in pedagogy education should be invited to brainstorm on the way forward with a view to bringing up workable and authentic format and design that can meet the socio-cultural and other related dimensions that would be of importance.

Challenges of conceptualizing pedagogical leadership:

Pedagogical leadership is connected with not only children's learning but also the capacity building of early childhood profession as well as values and beliefs about education held by the wider society or community (Heikka, 2014). In early childhood setting pedagogical leadership means taking responsibility for the shared understanding of the aims and methods of learning and teaching of young children. Pedagogy leadership itself constitutes these elements when addressing it through the key concept of pedagogy and leadership. It focuses on responsibilities for pedagogy emphasizing future-directed leading of staff. Andrews (2009) stated that interest in pedagogical leadership has arisen through the need to develop skills in leading organizational change in early childhood settings. Pedagogical leadership also consists of strategic elements which involves a wider set of stakeholders in pedagogical improvement; Sergiovanni (1998) states that the inclusion of visionary leadership among bureaucratic functions and entrepreneurial leadership views are unsuccessful as strategies to gain change and better results in schools involving both teachers and learners. He presents pedagogical leadership as an alternative concept of leadership that aims to develop the human capital of schools involving both teachers and learners.

Pedagogical leadership is equally a relatively young concept in the context of early child education (Heikka, 2014). Kagan and Bowman (1997) presented a broad leadership framework consisting of five dimensions: administration pedagogy advocacy community and conceptual leadership. This framework marks a turning point in early childhood education leadership discourse as it expands conventional notions of leadership as management or administration suggesting that leadership in early care and education actually has many functions or parts (Kagan and Bowman, 1997). The inclusion of pedagogical leadership within this framework is significant as it signals engagement of focused scholarly publications on this topic within this sector of education.

Overall however there has been limited theoretical advancement in writing about pedagogical leadership in early childhood education. For instance, Karila (2001) noted that in Finland the concept of pedagogical leadership is used as a general way to refer to responsibilities that are not considered management tasks.

Studies on pedagogical leadership in early childhood education suggest a firm connection between distributed and pedagogical leadership. Fonsen (2013) found that the structures of organization can either inhibit or promote the enactment of pedagogical leadership. She also emphasized the meaning of support provided from the national level of government. Also, the culture of distributed leadership in early childhood education centers was shown to be important for success in pedagogical leadership. Lunn and Bishop (2002) found that shared understandings among teachers about pedagogical ideas significantly contributed in realizing the functioning of pedagogical leadership. Similarly, Blatchford and Manni (2007) discuss how leadership for learning is connected with effective communication collaboration and development of children's learning in early childhood settings.

The problematic nature of instructional leadership:

Daresh and Playkoas cited in Macneill Eavanagh and Sileox defined instructional leadership as "direct or indirect behaviour that significantly affect teacher instruction and as a result and student learning." A shortcoming of this definition is that a distant politician's direction to spend more money investigating indigenous students learning styles for example would be seen as instructional leadership even if the act were driven solely for political gain.

It is being observed that pedagogic leadership is overshadowed by the concept of instructional leadership. The term instructional leadership has an almost oxymoronic quality where the instruction is problematic and the leadership aspect is often ignored or misunderstood. While many use instruction as synonyms for teaching or pedagogy instruction is a clinical term that relates to one part of the teaching and learning cycle. Instruction does not encompass the formative or summative assessment that effective teachers do as a matter of course.

Instruction does not consider the effect of the teacher's body language or discourse that helps create a learning environment that promotes academic risk-taking. Instruction does not describe the influence of the class culture on student's understanding of democratic decision-making. In addition the word instruction is contaminated with pejorative connotation of power. The command and "I instruct you to do X," leaves a second

party in no doubt about the power relationship between the speaker and the person being spoken to. As a result instructional leadership too can be perceived as a power-based transaction.

Instructional leadership research and literature is characterized by the promotion of principal behaviors as distinct from the behaviors of other members of the school organization or community. Instructional leadership is often seen as the sole domain of school principals. For example, the National Association of Elementary School Principals defined instructional leadership of setting out six standards of what principals should know and be able to do. Scheerens and Bosker (Hill, 2002) identified five dimensions of instructional leadership.

- Time devoted to educational versus administrative tasks
- The head teacher as a meta-controller of classroom processes
- The head teacher as a quality controller of classroom teacher
- The head teacher as a facilitator of work-oriented team
- The head teacher as an initiator and facilitator of staff professionalization

A more realistic model of the instructional leadership needs to acknowledge that within schools there are multiple layers of instructional leadership and not just that ascribed to principals (Crawther *et al.*, 2002; Spillane *et al.*, 2001). Fullan (2005) stated that leadership must understand the change process. At the school level change is complex and nonlinear. Fullan advised that leaders who combine a commitment to moral purpose with healthy respect for the complexities of the change process not only will be more successful but also will unearth deeper moral purpose. To embed the change there is a need to re-culture the school and change prevailing beliefs values and attitudes of teachers students and parents.

While the principal may have a key role in the development of the shared vision the shared vision advise all stakeholders of the agreed direction and content of change in relation to instruction the shared vision purpose and agreed values guide teachers choices of approximate instruction. In the translation of the vision purpose and values into action through school planning there is agreement and understanding of how the change will evolve.

There has been a surface of change and innovation in schools that Fullan (2005) described as problematic. The leader's task is to listen to this school community through the potential problems by creating an agreed sense of direction through a vision. However while there may be agreement about a sense of direction what leaders do often is not scripted as Heifets and Linsky observed leadership is an improvisational art. Amidst the uncertainty of change Fullan (2005) identified three coherence-making features:

- Lateral accountability that engages peers at all levels of the organization
- Sorting which is applied against the tests of utility and fitting the organizational vision
- Shared commitment in which people inspire and stimulate each other

The school must establish implement and achieve agreed academic standard for students (McEwan, 2007) and confirm expectation and standard for staff (Fink and Resnick, 2001; McEwan, 2007; Miller, 2001).

Fullan (2005) points out that in people-based organizations (such as schools) is the key relationship to successful change. It is ironic that while schools exist to educate children the principles and process of learning are rarely applied to organizational learning and the professional learning of teachers. Fullan (2005) observed that schools are in the business of teaching and learning yet they are terrible at learning from each other. The research on instructional leadership emphasizes the role of the principal in knowledge creation and sharing at the dyadic (collaborative pairs) and whole staff level what the literature on instructional leadership emphasizes. As a result such leadership could descend into dictatorship. The problems to be envisaged could be as a result of the following reasons the relationship between both parties loses its voluntary nature and the change process does not bring the promised rewards for those who follow.

CONCLUSION

Having gained wide range of acceptability effective leadership can only be realized by any nation when she imbibes fully the pedagogical education in her educational curriculum; since it holds the key to not only advancing towards effective leadership but will also turn around positively other sectors of the system. Having gained wide range of acceptability effective leadership can only be realized by any nation when she imbibes fully the pedagogical education in her educational curriculum; since it holds the key to not only advancing towards

effective leadership but will also turn around positively other sectors of the system. It can synergize some social political and environmental consciousness right from the cradle. As a result of the multi-faceted need teachers and educators who should handle pedagogical education have to possess the habits and minds of transformative practice. The excessive hostilities as a result of unprovoked attack on radical or splitter group and the increasing violent attitude associated with such and related groups will be adequately contained early if this is allowed to take a central stage in the educational curriculum.

REFERENCES

- Alexander., R., 2004. Still no pedagogy? Principle pragmatism and compliance in primary education. *Cambridge J. Educ.*, 34: 7-33.
- Andrews, M., 2009. Managing Change and Pedagogical Leadership. In: *Managing Early Years Settings Supporting and Leading Teams*. Robins, A. and S. Callan (Eds.). Sage, New York, USA., pp: 45-64.
- Biesta, G.J. and S. Miedema, 2002. Instruction or pedagogy? The need for a transformative conception of education. *Teach. Teach. Educ.*, 18: 173-181.
- Blatchford, I.S. and L. Manni, 2007. *Effective Leadership in the Early Years Sector: The ELEYS Study*. Institute of Education Press, London, England, ISBN: 0-85473-X.,
- Britzman, D.P., 2003. *Practice Makes Practice: A Critical Study of Learning to Teach*. State University Press, New York.
- Cameron, C., 2004. Social pedagogy and care Danish and German practice in young people's residential care. *J. Soc. Work*, 4: 133-151.
- Crawther, F., S.S. Kaagan, M.L. Ferguson and L. Hamm, 2002. *Developing Teacher Leaders: How Teacher Leadership Enhances School Success*. Kirwan Publisher, Thousand Oaks, California.,
- Daniels, H., 2001. *Vygotsky and Pedagogy*. Routledge Company, Abingdon, England.
- Fink, E. and L.B. Resnick, 2001. Developing principals as instructional leaders. *Phi. Delta Kappan*, 82: 598-610.
- Fonsen, E., 2013. Dimensions of Pedagogical Leadership in Early Childhood Education and Care. In: *Researching Leadership in Early Childhood Education*. Hujala, E., M. Waniganayake and J. Rodd (Eds.). Tampere University Press, Tampere, Finland, pp: 181-191.
- Freire, P., 1993. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Continuum Publishing Company, New York, ISBN-13: 9780826406118, Pages: 164.
- Fullan, M., 2005. *Leadership and Sustainability: System Thinkers in Action*. Kirwan Publisher, Thousand Oaks, California.,
- Hamalainen, J., 2003. The concept of social pedagogy in the field of social work. *J. Soc. Work*, 3: 69-80.
- Hamilton, D.G. and E.L. McWilliam, 2001. Ex-Centric Voices that Frame Research on Teaching. In: *Handbook of Research on Teaching*. Reardon, V. (Ed.). American Educational Research Association, Washington, USA., pp: 17-43.
- Heikka, J. and M. Waniganayake, 2011. Pedagogical leadership from a distributed perspective within the context of early childhood education. *Int. J. Leadersh. Educ.*, 14: 499-512.
- Heikka, J., 2014. *Distributed Pedagogical Leadership in Early Childhood Education*. Tampere University Press, Tampere, Finland, ISBN: 978-951-44-9380-5.,
- Hill, P.W., 2002. What Principals Need to Know about Teaching and Learning. In: *The Principal Challenge: Leading and Managing Schools in an Era of Accountability*. Twcker, M.S. and J.B. Coddling (Eds.). Jossey-Bass A Wiley Imprint, San Francisco, California, ISBN: 0-7879-6447-6, pp: 43-75.
- Hujala, E. and J. Heikka, 2008. Shared leadership in day care. *Nursery*, 1: 32-35.
- Hujala, E. and M. Eskelinen, 2013. *Leadership Tasks in Early Childhood Education*. Tampere University Press, Tampere, Finland.,
- Hujala, E., M. Waniganayake and J. Rodd, 2013. *Researching Leadership in Early Childhood Education*. Tampere University Press, Tampere, Finland.,
- Ireson, J., P. Mortimore and S. Hallam, 1999. The Common Trends of Pedagogy and their Implications. In: *Understanding Pedagogy and its Impact on Learning*. Mortimore, P. (Ed.). Paul Chapman Publishing, London, England, pp: 212-232.
- Kagan, S.L. and B.T. Bowman, 1997. *Leadership in Early Care and Education*. NAEYC, Washington, USA.,
- Karila., 2001. The day care center's variable work. *Kindergarten*, 64: 30-35.
- Lingard, B., D. Hayes, M. Mills and P. Christie, 2003. *Leading Learning*. Open University Press, Maidenhead, UK.,
- Lunn, P. and A. Bishop, 2002. Nursery teachers as leaders and managers: A pedagogical and subsidiarity model of leadership. *Res. Educ.*, 67: 13-22.
- Manen, M.V., 1999. The Language of Pedagogy and the Primacy of Student Experience. In: *Researching teaching: Methodologies and Practices for Understanding Pedagogy*. Loughan, J. (Ed.). Falmer Press, London, England, pp: 13-27.

- McEwan, E.K., 2007. *The 7 Steps to Effective Instructional Leadership*. Corwin Book Publisher, Thousand Oaks, California.
- Miller, A.W., 2001. Finding time and support for instructional leadership. *Principal Leadersh.*, 2: 29-33.
- Mortimore, P., 1999. *Understanding Pedagogy: And its Impact on Learning*. SAGE Publications, London, England.
- Morton, D. and M. Zavarzadel, 1991. *Theory-Pedagogy Politics: Texts for Change*. University of Illinois Press, Urbana, Illinois.
- Moss, P., 2006. Structures understandings and discourses: Possibilities for re-envisioning the early childhood worker. *Contemp. Issues Early Childhood*, 7: 30-41.
- Newmann, F.M., 1996. *Authentic Achievement: Restructuring Schools for Intellectual Quality*. 1st Edn., Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Fransisco, CA., ISBN-13: 978-0787903206, Pages: 384.
- Petrie, P., J. Boddy, C. Cameron, E. Heptinstall and S. McQuail *et al.*, 2009. *Pedagogy: A Holistic Personal Approach to Work with Children and Young People Across Services, European Models for Practice Training Education and Qualification*. UCL Institute of Education, London, England.
- Senge, P., 1995. On schools as learning organizations: A conversation with Peter Senge. *Educ. Leadership*, 52: 20-23.
- Sergiovanni, T.J., 1998. Leadership as pedagogy capital development and school effectiveness. *Int. J. Leadership Educ. Theory Pract.*, 1P: 37-46.
- Smyth, W.J., 1988. *A Critical Pedagogy of Teacher Evaluation*. Deakin University, Geelony, Australia.
- Spillane, J.P., R. Halverson and J.B. Diamond, 2001. Investigating school leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Educ. Res.*, 30: 23-28.
- Stigler, J.W. and J. Hiebert, 1999. *The Teaching Gap: Best Ideas from the World's Teachers for Improving Education in the Classroom*. Free Press, New York.
- Waniganayake, M., S. Cheeseman, M. Fenech, F. Hadley and W. Shepherd, 2012. *Leadership: Contexts and Complexities in Early Childhood Education*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, Massachusetts.
- Webster, R., 2009. Why educators should bring an end to pedagogy. *Aust. J. Teach. Educ.*, 34: 42-53.
- Yates, L., 2009. From curriculum to pedagogy and back again: Knowledge the person and the changing world. *Pedagogy Culture So c.*, 17: 17-28.