

Krylova Svetlana Gennadyevna,

Candidate of Psychology, Associate Professor of Department of Psychology, Ural State Pedagogical University, Ekaterinburg, Russia.

**EDUCATION MANAGERS VERSUS EDUCATION LEADERS:
SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES**

KEYWORDS: manager; leader; educational management.

ABSTRACT. The article deals with the content of the notions “management” and “leadership” with reference to the sphere of education. It analyzes social factors determining leadership as the necessary element of education institution management under modern conditions. The author carries out a comparative analysis of functions and opportunities of a manager and a leader from the point of view of the Russian social psychology. Alternative points of view on the question of possibility to combine the roles of a manager and a leader by one person are presented: according to one point of view, an education institution manager should also be a leader; in accordance with the other one, a manager without salient leadership properties may compensate for the missing skills by way of creation of a mutually complementary management team. In addition to management of education institution, the article also dwells on another level of pedagogical management connected with management of academic process carried out by the pedagogue. The article describes an empirical investigation focused on testing the hypothesis: whether students take their pedagogues not only as organizers of academic process but also as people possessing leadership characteristics. Student interviews revealed the characteristics typically ascribed to leaders (the content of the implicit leadership theory), as well as characteristics ascribed to the pedagogues who had significantly influenced professional and life experience of the students. The results of our research showed that students ascribe to teachers who had more influence upon them both the characteristics of a manager (can organize group work (academic activity), takes responsibility upon himself, is clever) and the traits of a leader (responsive, supporting, understanding, helping, able to motivate and interest). The article concludes that leadership is the necessary element of efficient management of both education institution and academic process.

Крылова Светлана Геннадьевна,

кандидат психологических наук, доцент, доцент кафедры социальной психологии, конфликтологии и управления, Институт психологии; Уральский государственный педагогический университет; 620017, г. Екатеринбург, пр-т Космонавтов, 26, к. 364; e-mail: s_g_krylova@mail.ru.

**РУКОВОДИТЕЛИ И ЛИДЕРЫ В ОБРАЗОВАНИИ:
СХОДСТВА И РАЗЛИЧИЯ**

КЛЮЧЕВЫЕ СЛОВА: менеджеры; лидерство; педагогический менеджмент.

АННОТАЦИЯ. В статье рассматривается содержание понятий «менеджмент» и «лидерство» применительно к сфере образования. Анализируются социальные факторы, определяющие лидерство как необходимый элемент управления образовательной организацией в современных условиях. Представлен сравнительный анализ функций и возможностей менеджера и лидера с точки зрения отечественной социальной психологии. Рассматриваются альтернативные точки зрения по вопросу о возможности совмещения ролей менеджера и лидера в одном лице: согласно первой точке зрения руководитель образовательного учреждения также должен быть лидером, согласно второй – руководитель, не обладающий выраженными лидерскими качествами, может компенсировать недостающие умения путем создания взаимодополняющей управленческой команды. Помимо управления образовательной организацией в статье рассматривается и другой уровень педагогического менеджмента, связанный с управлением учебным процессом, осуществляемым педагогом. Описывается эмпирическое исследование, направленное на проверку гипотезы: воспринимают ли обучающиеся педагогов не только как организаторов учебного процесса, но и как людей, обладающих лидерскими характеристиками. В результате опроса студентов были получены характеристики, наиболее часто приписываемые лидерам (содержание имплицитной теории лидерства), а также характеристики, приписываемые преподавателям, оказавшим наибольшее влияние на профессиональный и жизненный опыт студентов. Результаты исследования показали, что студенты приписывают педагогам, которые оказали на них наибольшее влияние, как характеристики руководителя (умеет организовать деятельность группы (учебную деятельность), принимает на себя ответственность, умный), так и характеристики лидера (отзывчивый, поддерживающий, понимающий, помогающий, умеет мотивировать, заинтересовать). Делается вывод о лидерстве как необходимом элементе эффективного управления как образовательной организацией, так и учебным процессом.

Introduction

Management and leadership are scientific notions which denote the object of two extensive research areas with a more than a hundred years' history. The beginning of

scientific research in the field of management is associated with industrial revolution and creation of large enterprises which needed competent management for efficient operation [11, с.64]. As far as leadership is concerned, one of the first works dealing with leaders is

believed to be Plato's "The Republic", in which he described three types of leaders [4, p. 51], though systematic scientific study of leadership began much later – in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. A brief account of the history of research in these two areas allows speaking of at least two tendencies. The first tendency is connected with the absence of a clear cut borderline between these research areas. The use of the notion "leader" and leadership theories in management is one of the consequences of this fact. The second tendency is characterized by the movement from studying general regularities towards investigation of specificity of both management and leadership in certain spheres of activity. It is possible to come across such notions in modern scientific literature as "production management", "political management", "ecological management", management in commerce, information technologies, and sport, which speaks about differentiation of the object of research. Psychology of leadership reveals a similar tendency, which is demonstrated in studying political and organizational leadership and in analyzing the influence of gender and cultural variables on various aspects of leadership [4; 19]. Emergence of interest towards the sphere of education may be regarded to be one more relatively new tendency in management and leadership research. This latter tendency attracts our interest just because management and leadership have been traditionally associated with business and politics. That is why we will begin our study with considering the possibility to use these two notions with reference to the sphere of education.

"Management" and "leadership" in education

Thus, is it correct to use the terms "management" and "leadership" with reference to the sphere of education, and what meanings do these notions get? Let us begin with the notion "management". In a broad sense, we can speak of management as "a process of planning, organization, motivation and control, necessary to formulate and achieve the organization goals" [11, p. 38], including an education institution. In this sense, management of education has been carried out in our country since the time of creation of the Ministry of People's Education of the Russian Empire decreed by Alexander I on September 8, 1802 as an organ of educational management. Nevertheless, if we look not only at provision of functioning of the education system but are also interested in the high quality of the process, we must use the principles of scientific management in the sphere of education. In this case, contemporary literature uses a narrower notion of "pedagogical management" which describes "a complex of principles, methods and organization forms and techniques of pedagogical systems man-

agement aimed at improvement of efficiency of their functioning and development [5, p. 30]. The notion of "pedagogical management" was suggested by Simonov V.P. in 1999 [13]. At approximately the same time, scholarly journals dedicated to the issues of improvement of management of modern education institutions "*Direktor shkoly*" (published since 1993), "*Universitetskoe upravlenie: praktika i analiz*" (published since 1997), "*Upravlenie shkoly*" (published since 1997) and "*Upravlenie sovremennoy shkoly: zavuch*" (published since 1998) began to be published in our country. At present, a whole number of scientific journals on the problems of pedagogical management at education institutions of general and vocational training are being published, which testifies to the interest towards the issue in question. It is worthy of note that the theme of efficient management in education became urgent not only in our country but also abroad in the last quarter of the 20th century. Thus one of the authoritative European journals "*Management in Education*" also began to be published in 1987. It may be attributed to the fact that it was in the last decades of the 20th century that the necessity to make changes in the education system which would correspond to significant changes in the society as a result of globalization and technological progress became evident. These issues were discussed at the *World Conference on Higher Education* in Paris in October, 1998 and the symposium of the Council for Cultural Cooperation in Bern in March, 1996 [21]. Efficient management of education institutions was regarded as a key factor of successful implementation of the necessary changes.

In the case when management is targeted at implementation of changes, our colleagues abroad do not use the notion of "management" but the notion of "leadership". Thus, the pre-view of the last issue of the journal "*Educational Leadership*" (published since 1943) runs as follows: "Change is a constant in education – but it seems particularly prevalent right now" [20]. The articles of this special issue deal with the best practices which would allow pedagogues to find opportunities for implementation of efficient changes. The titles of five out of eleven articles of this issue contain the word "change". In spite of the fact that leadership is in general associated with cardinal changes initiated by the leader, perception of changes in education may come into conflict with understanding education as one of the conservative social institutes. Education conservatism was well grounded in view of the basic function of this institute: preservation of the accumulated knowledge by way of its organized translation from one generation to another [9, p. 117]. Though under modern conditions, when the

amount of knowledge augments very quickly and, correspondingly, knowledge becomes obsolete in a matter of moments, this function of education may not seem to be the basic one. What is more, apart from knowledge translation, education performs one more urgent function: upbringing of people by way of formation in learners of concepts about the system of social requirements and “implanting” in their consciousness of socially accepted evaluations of social phenomena [3, p. 235]. That is why education institutions are controlled by the state organs, which makes educational activity regulatable and, hence, providing limited opportunities for changes. In spite of this fact, the history of Russian education knows quite a number of names of the people who set out with revolutionary ideas which found their supporters and were realized: K. D. Ushinskiy, S. T. Shatskiy, A. S. Makarenko, V. A. Sukhomlinskiy, V. F. Shatalov, Sh. A. Amonashvili, M. P. Shchetinin, I. P. Volkov, and many others.

Thus, we can make a conclusion that both the notion “management” and “leadership” may be used for description of organizational processes in the sphere of education with quite good reason. And if we speak about such aspect of management as ensuring education institution functioning in accordance with the existing regulations, the notion of “administration” will be more suitable to denote it. The notion of “pedagogical management” is used to describe the principles of scientific management for improving efficiency of the education institution activity. And, finally, implementation of cardinal changes usually associated with achievement of perspective, proactive goals is denoted with the word “leadership”. Both management and leadership are connected with the actions of people performing the corresponding social roles.

Managers and leaders in education: comparative analysis and modern interpretation

Primarily, the question about people who have special influence upon others was studied by social psychology. Two higher ranks were singled out in the structure of social power: manager and leader. And such division accompanied by clear-cut definition of differences between managers and leaders was accepted in the home social psychology as different from the foreign one where management and leadership are viewed upon as identical or rather similar phenomena [4, p. 7]. In the 70s, B. D. Parygin distinguished some of such differences between a small group manager and a leader (we mean the leader who is spontaneously put forward by the group) [12]. Differences in functions and potential of the manager and the leader of a group are determined by the fact that leadership is a psychological characteristic, and management – a social one [2,

p. 263]. So it follows that the manager of a real social group does not appear spontaneously, but purposively: as a result of appointment or election; his position is more stable; he possesses a broader range of sanctions to influence the members of the group than the leader; he represents the group in a wider social system [12, p. 310–311]. If we regard the group in terms of organization, the manager will be a person who manages the group according to his job description. With reference to the education system, he is a person holding the position of the head of an education institution or a structural subdivision of this institution. As far as the leader is concerned, several questions arise here. On the one hand, what does education institution need the leader for? Can the institution function without the leader? And, on the other hand, are leader and manager different people, or is the manager to have leadership properties, i.e. to combine both roles in one person? Analysis of publications of both Russian and foreign researchers shows that leaders are critical to the development and betterment of organizations and for achievement of outstanding results. According to conclusions of some authors of the trait theory, leaders are distinguished by such personality traits as farsightedness (ability to formulate the tasks and image of organization) and flexibility (ability to respond to new ideas and experience) (A. Lawton, A. Rose) [7, p. 220–221]. In spite of the fact that the trait theory is believed to be outdated, we cannot but agree with the supposition that these traits help the leader predict future circumstances for making a decision about the necessary changes in the present. It has been mentioned that under the modern conditions of global interdependence and development of information technologies, changes in society take place very quickly and cannot but influence the activity of education institutions. The modern education institutions have to solve such problems as taking into account cultural diversity of students and their parents, enhancing application of new information technologies in the education process, raising the quality of education for preparation of students for life in the changing world of today, and improving the level of social responsibility for education outcomes. That is why, if the education institution seeks success, it needs leaders capable of initiating changes and motivating followers to implement new ideas in real life. There may be quite a number of education organizations functioning without a leader but with a good administrator. Such organizations might possess low rating, but may be stable with the government’s support.

The answer to the second question about the correlation of the positions of the manager and the leader is not so evident. For example,

V. A. Sitarov believes that “the manager of an education institution should be the leader of his or her organization” [14, p. 22]. Appealing to the existing experience of education institution management, the author singles out five types of leadership needed by the head of an education institution to make his organization seem successful [14, p. 22]. The description of skills corresponding to all five types of leadership is rather extensive: from compiling the budget and academic timetable to implementation of culture and school traditions. Only few institution heads are able “to cleverly combine various types of leadership in themselves and in their work” [14, p. 23]. There are other authors who believe that the manager should be a leader, but ascribe fewer number of leadership functions to the manager. For example, A. V. Merenov and E.M. Kobozeva think that “the modern manager, as a professional director, should first of all be able to manage socio-psychological processes taking place at the institution. He must learn to motivate people to make up a united team and to perform leadership functions” [10, p. 64], and that “leadership is a most important characteristic of the managers’ level of professionalism” [10, p. 65]. M. V. Kiseleva introduced the notion “managerial leadership” to stress that it is only the manager who is also a leader (manager-leader) that is capable of being an efficient head of innovative processes (by the example of implementation and functioning of the system of quality management at a higher education institution) [8, p. 41]. And the leading role of the top administrative officials of the higher education institution should be manifested: 1) in making decisions about implementation of an innovative project (initiative) based on the analysis of problems which may arise as a result of innovations and might need managerial solutions; 2) in responsibility for realization of innovations; 3) in personal participation in measures for realization of the innovative project [8, p. 42–43].

Alongside authors who believe that combination of the roles of manager and leader in one person, there is another point of view according to which the activities of a manager and a leader in administrative sphere are different. The most significant differences are the following:

1. Character of relations between the manager/leader and other members of the group.

The relations between the manager and other members of the group (organization) are formal and regulated by the normative documentation. And leadership is a process of influencing people generated by the system of non-formal relations [17, p. 241].

2. Character of means of influence on oth-

er members of the group used by the manager/leader to achieve the aims.

The main difference here which is marked by many scholars, is connected with the opportunity for the manager to use more rigorous sanctions and, namely, compulsion. Usually, the manager’s compulsion is not disputed by the inferior, among other things because it is the manager that is finally responsible for achievement of the organization goals. The leader can also use compulsion but it is undesirable as it may change the relations with the followers for the worse. What is more, the leader is a member of the group by definition, and his ideas and actions inspire the people and motivate them to copy and follow him, that is why compulsion is not needed.

3. Time orientation.

N. V. Storchak quotes foreign authors who associate the activity of a manager with facilitating efficiency of the organization, supporting it and ensuring stability. And leadership is considered to be oriented towards change, development of people and improvement [16, p. 74]. Thus, the manager is predominantly oriented towards the present, and the leader – towards the future.

The given differences make the question of whether one and the same person can perform the functions of manager and leader urgent for research. The urgency of the question is determined by conclusions of the experts of the international project “Improving School Leadership” according to which modern school (and, presumably, education institutions of other levels) needs a combination of three elements for successful operation: management, leadership and administration [16, p. 73]. It may be assumed that among managers, including heads of education institutions, there are people who are equally good at performing the functions of a manager, leader and administrator. Although, taking into account the polar character of some functions typical of these roles, we may also assume that the number of such managers will not be great. From this point of view, the model put forward by one of the acknowledged authorities in the sphere of management Ichak Adizes looks more realistic [1]. According to I. Adizes, the final goal of management is to make the organization effective and efficient in the short-term and long-term perspective. For this end, the head of the institution and his team should perform four functions: achievement of results, administration, entrepreneurship and integration [1]. The first two functions are oriented towards short-term perspective, hence, they can be correlated with the above mentioned functions of the manager (achievement of results) and the administrator (administration), and entrepreneurship and integration, as activities oriented

towards long-term perspective are associated with the functions of the leader. As long as not a single person can cope with all functions unaided (cannot become, in I. Adizes's words, "an ideal manager"), successful management can be guaranteed by creation of a mutually complementary management team. For this purpose, I. Adizes worked out a questionnaire that allows the manager to define his both leading and underdeveloped management functions in order to make a well-informed decision for inclusion of people in his management team [18].

The model of I. Adizes correlates with the new model of school management designed in economically developed countries, and the necessity of which is determined by expansion and sophistication of the functions of school headmasters under modern conditions [15, p.154]. As it has been stated above, change does not only concern schools but also education institutions of other levels, that is why the new management model is necessary for them too. It is assumed that the conception of distributed leadership when management duties are distributed between different participants performing various roles both within and outside school may serve as the basis for a new model of management [15, p. 153].

We have considered above the questions of management and leadership having in view people who occupy the corresponding position and organize the activity of the collective of an education institution. Still the notion of "pedagogical management" is not limited to the management of an education institution; it also includes management of the students' activity [14, p. 20], and the pedagogue's functions as a manager of the learning-cognitive process [6, p. 9]. Above, we have looked at the issue of correlation between the functions of manager and leader with reference to the head of an education institution; we can formulate a similar question in relation to the pedagogue.

Should a pedagogue be a leader?

With reference to a group of students, the pedagogue cannot be a leader, because the leader is put forward from among the group, and the pedagogue is not a member of the group of students. But the students can perceive him as a person possessing the traits which are usually associated with the characteristics of a leader. To denote such common beliefs about the characteristic of a leader, the American Professor Robert Lord and his colleagues introduced the conception of "Implicit Leadership Theory" (ILT). In order to answer the question if the students see the pedagogue as a person possessing the properties of a leader, we carried out an empirical research. The study had two stages. At the first stage, we interviewed students in order to reveal

their ideas about a leader. During the second stage, senior students described their university teachers, interaction with whom they believed to be most important for acquiring professional and life experience. After that, we compared the characteristics obtained at the second stage with the ones ascribed to the leader *a priori*.

First stage research results

The aim of the first stage of research was to study the content of the Implicit Leadership Theory (common concepts about a leader). 46 respondents took part in the experiment; 14 male persons and 32 female ones, all aged 18–22 (USPU students). The instruction ran as follows: Give a free answer to the question: *What kind of person is the leader?*

We received a total of 252 answers including: leader's personality traits, his actions, opportunities, and actions of followers and other people in relation to the leader. The number of characteristics given by a single respondent ranged from 2 to 11. After collecting the answer sheets, characteristics close in meaning were united into groups, and the groups were ordered in accordance with the frequency of characteristics named in them. Below, we are going to enumerate the groups of characteristics most often found in the answers and reflecting simple everyday images of the leader. A number of respondents wrote in their answer sheets that the leader was a person "who could lead others" (17 answers). Though this characteristic denotes the essence of the word "leader", it is more metaphoric than semantic: *to lead* is the result of manifestation of characteristics which the leader possesses.

Leader characteristics

1. Can organize group work including building the group and helping in problem solution – 26 answers (56,5% of respondents).
2. Responsibility for taking important decisions, for his own actions and the actions of his followers – 24 answers (52,2% of respondents).
3. Orientation towards result, persistence in goal achievement – 23 answers (50% of respondents).
4. Communicativeness, skill to establish relations – 16 answers (34,8% of respondents).
5. Can use different methods of influence (to interest, motivate, inspire, convince) – 14 answers (30,4% of respondents).
6. Cleverness – 13 answers (28,3% of respondents).
7. Assurance, ability to keep his head in a crisis – 11 answers (23,9% of respondents).
8. Charisma, ability to arouse admiration – 10 answers (21,7% of respondents).

The list does not include characteristic which were found in fewer than 15% of respondents' answers.

Second stage research results

The aim of the second stage of investigation was to reveal the perceived characteristics of the pedagogues who had the most influence on the students in terms of their getting both professional and life experience.

Final year students of the USPU having maximum experience of interaction with the university teachers took part in the experiment – 43 respondents on the whole, 5 male persons and 38 female ones, all aged 21–25.

Instruction 1. Recall one of your teachers, communication with whom was, according to your opinion, most important for your getting professional experience. Describe him or her by answering the question “What kind of person is he/she?” (Try to give at least five answers in any form).

Instruction 2 is similar to the first one; the only difference consists in replacing the words “professional experience” by the words “life experience”.

At the second stage of research experiment, we collected 42 answer sheets following Instruction 1 (about professional experience), and 43 answer sheets following Instruction 2 (about life experience).

Characteristics of the pedagogue, communication with whom was, according to the student's opinion, most important for his getting professional experience.

1. Responsive, supporting, understanding – 33 answers (78,6% of respondents).
2. Competent, professional – 31 answers (73,8% of respondents).
3. Good at organizing learning activity – 27 answers (64,3% of respondents).
4. Strict, exacting – 16 answers (38,1% of respondents).
5. Responsible (including responsibility for his words, promises and activity outcomes) – 13 answers (31% of respondents).
6. Just, tolerant – 12 answers (28,6% of respondents).
7. Clever, highly-educated – 12 answers (28,6% of respondents).
8. Uses methods of influence: interests, “makes” students think on their own, leads them on, supports – 12 answers (28,6% of respondents).

Characteristics of the pedagogue, communication with whom was, according to the student's opinion, most important for his getting life experience.

1. Supporting, helping – 34 answers (79,1% of respondents).
2. Cheerful, with a good sense of humor – 20 answers (46,5% of respondents).
3. Competent, experienced – 18 answers (41,9% of respondents).
4. Shares his life experience – 18 answers (41,9% of respondents).
5. Clever – 12 answers (27,9% of respondents).

Discussion of results

Let us first consider the list of leader's characteristics most commonly met in the respondents' answers (results of the first stage of research). On the basis of the differences between the leader and the manager described above we may come to the conclusion that in the eyes of the students the leader is rather a manager, i.e. a person with good organization skills, sense of purpose, ready to take responsibility upon himself, clever and communicable. The characteristics that could be called leadership ones are closer to the less frequent ones in the list: these are the means of “soft power” (to interest, motivate, inspire and convince), found in 30,4% of respondents, and also special characteristics that single out the leader from among other people and bring about their admiration (charisma), found in 21,7% of respondents. The list of most frequent characteristics does not contain those which are connected with non-formal interpersonal relations between the leader and his followers, though the scholars studying leadership phenomenon define it as belonging to the system of non-formal relations in the group.

Comparing the lists of characteristics of the pedagogues obtained at the second stage of experiment with general leader's characteristics, we may see more coincidences with the characteristics of the pedagogues who had more influence on acquisition of professional rather than life experience (see *Table 1*).

As seen from *Table 1*, the pedagogue who has exercised most influence upon the student's professional experience possesses four characteristics which are also included in the list of leadership properties: can organize group work (academic activity), takes responsibility upon himself, is clever, and uses various methods of influence. We have already noted that these characteristics are not exclusively leader's properties, and may be also considered to be characteristic of a manager. As long as training is organized first and foremost to translate professional experience, the pedagogue acts in this case as a manager of education process. Nevertheless, in spite of presumably formal character of academic activity, the students found the pedagogues' characteristics related to non-formal relations and, hence, closer to the characteristics of the leader rather than the manager, to be most important. While describing pedagogues who had influenced both professional and life experience, about 79% of students singled out such a group of characteristics as responsive, supporting, understanding, helping.

Table 1

Comparison of characteristics ascribed to the leader with characteristics of the pedagogues who had the most influence on the student's getting professional and life experience

<i>Group characteristics rank</i>	<i>Leader's characteristics</i>	<i>Characteristics of the pedagogue who has influenced the student's professional experience</i>	<i>Characteristics of the pedagogue who has influenced the student's life experience</i>
1	Can organize group work	Responsive, supporting, understanding	Supporting, helping
2	Responsibility for taking important decisions	Competent, professional	Cheerful, with a good sense of humor
3	Orientation towards result	Good at organizing learning activity	Competent, experienced
4	Communicativeness	Strict, exacting	Shares his life experience
5	Uses different methods of influence	Responsible	Clever
6	Cleverness	Just, tolerant	
7	Assurance	Clever, highly educated	
8	Charisma	Uses the methods of influence: interests, "makes" students think on their own, leads them on, supports.	

One of the most important distinctions of the leader from the manager is the use by the former of the means of "soft power". Ta-

ble 2 contains the above mentioned means of influence ascribed to leaders and pedagogues.

Table 2

Means of influence ascribed to leaders and pedagogues

<i>Leader</i>	<i>Pedagogue who had influence on the student's professional experience</i>	<i>Pedagogue who had influence on the student's life experience</i>
can interest, inspire to action, motivates himself and others, shows, edifies, manages, can lead people on	interests, "makes" students think on their own, leads them on, supports	can motivate, interest, and support
14 (30,4% of respondents)	12 (28,6% of respondents)	7 (16,3 % of respondents)

The answers given in Table 2 testify to the fact that the pedagogues who have influenced the students in a more significant way use the means of influence ascribed to the leader.

Comparison of characteristics of the pedagogues who had the most influence on the student's professional experience with the pedagogues who had the most influence on the student's life experience shows that the differences are connected with the skills of the pedagogues of the first group to organize academic process, as well as such characteristics as strictness, exactingness, and responsibility. These characteristics are more typical of a manager rather than a leader. The pedagogues

of the second group are distinguished, according to the students, by such characteristic as sense of humor, which is necessary for maintaining a positive emotional atmosphere in the group.

Summing up, it may be noted that the student distinguish in their teachers who have had most influence on them both characteristics of the manager which are urgent for efficient organization of the academic process, and the characteristics of the leader. Leadership characteristics determine the nature of interpersonal relations between pedagogues and students and form a favorable emotional atmosphere in the academic group.

Conclusion

Management and leadership in education can be considered both in the context of management of education institution and its structural divisions, and in terms of management of education process. In the former case, it concerns people occupying administrative positions at education institutions; in latter case it deals with pedagogues. According to the point of view of modern researchers, efficient management of education institutions presupposes combination of management, administration and leadership. Management is aimed at facilitating efficient activity of an institution and ensuring stability; administration is called upon to promote functioning of an education institution in accordance with the existing regulations; and leadership is oriented towards change and achievement of perspective proactive goals. Notwithstanding conservatism traditionally ascribed to the education system, social changes brought about by the processes of globalization and technological progress demand changes in education, which determines the urgency of the problem of leadership in this sphere.

The functions of management, administration and leadership differ from each other, that is why the solution of the problem whether one person can combine all these functions with equal success is ambivalent. The point of view of I. Adizes that formation of a mutually com-

plementary management team is a precondition of effective management seems to be realistic enough; this idea is in agreement with the new model of management of an education institution on the basis of the distributed leadership conception.

While studying the issues of management and leadership in the context of education process management, we carried out an empirical research using the method of questionnaire. The results of our study showed that the students ascribe to the pedagogues who have had most influence upon them both the characteristics of the manager (can organize group work (academic activity), takes responsibility upon himself, is clever) and the characteristics of the leader (responsive, supporting, understanding, helping, can motivate and interest).

Thus, performing leadership functions is urgent both for the head of an education institution and for the pedagogues. For heads of education institutions, to be a leader means to initiate innovations ensuring effective functioning of the institution under changing conditions, and to motivate the staff to implement them. For the pedagogues, performing leadership functions is largely connected with providing support for the students, giving just evaluation of their activity, and showing ability to interest and create a favorable emotional atmosphere in the academic group.

ЛИТЕРАТУРА

1. Адизес И. Развитие лидеров. Как понять свой стиль управления и эффективно общаться с носителями иных стилей. – Альпина Паблишерз, 2008. – 264 с.
2. Андреева Г. М. Социальная психология. – М.: Изд-во Моск. ун-та, 1980. – 414 с.
3. Андреева Г. М. Психология социального познания : учеб. пособие для студ. выс. учеб. заведений. – Изд. 2 перераб. и доп. – М.: Аспект-Пресс, 2000. – 288 с.
4. Бендас Т. В. Психология лидерства : учеб. пособие. – СПб.: Питер, 2009. – 448 с.
5. Борозинец Н. М., Коблева А. Л. Педагогический менеджмент в специальном образовании : учеб. пособие. – Ставрополь : СКФУ, 2014. – 167 с.
6. Гончаров М. А. Основы менеджмента в образовании : учеб. пособие. – 3-е изд., стер. – М.: КНО-РУС, 2016. – 476 с.
7. Занковский А. Н. Организационная психология : учеб. пособие для вузов по специальности «Организационная психология». – М.: Флинта : МПСИ, 2000. – 648 с.
8. Киселева М. В. Лидерство руководства как существенный фактор управления качеством образования в вузе // Вестник Костромского государственного технологического университета. Серия : Экономические науки. – 2013. – № 1 (3). – С. 41–47.
9. Костикова И. О консерватизме образования // Высшее образование в России. – 2004. – № 7. – С. 116–121.
10. Меренов А. В., Кобозева Е. М. Проблемы лидерства в образовании // Новая наука: Теоретический и практический взгляд. – 2016. – № 2–1 (63). – С. 64–65.
11. Мескон М., Альберт М., Хедоури Ф. Основы менеджмента : пер. с англ. – М.: Дело, 2005. – 720 с.
12. Парыгин Б. Д. Основы социально-психологической теории. – М.: Мысль, 1971. – 351 с.
13. Симонов В. П. Педагогический менеджмент: 50 НОУ ХАУ в управлении педагогическими системами : учеб. пособие. – 3-е изд., испр. и доп. – М.: Педагогическое общество России, 1999. – 428 с.
14. Ситаров В. А. Педагогический менеджмент как теория и практика управления образовательным процессом // Знание. Понимание. Умение. – 2014. – № 3. – С. 18–24.
15. Сторчак Н. В. Современные международные исследования лидерства в школьном образовании // Человек и образование. – 2012. – № 3 (32). – С. 153–156.
16. Сторчак Н. В. Трактовка лидерства в образовании в международной практике // Наука и Мир. – 2016. – Т. 3. – № 6 (34). – С. 73–75.
17. Шелкоплясова И. Ф., Сунайкина Т. В. Проблема соотношения понятий лидерства и руководства в отечественной системе образования // Психолого-педагогические исследования качества образования в условиях инновационной деятельности образовательной организации : мат-лы IX Всерос. (с междунар. участием) науч.-практ. конф. / Филиал Кубанского государственного университета в г. Славянске-на-Кубани. – 2016. – С. 240–243.

18. Adizes. Institute Worldwide [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access: https://adizes.me/paei_test/.
19. Ayman R. & Korabik K. Leadership: why gender and culture matter // *American Psychologist*. – 2010. – № 65 (3). – P. 157–170.
20. Educational leadership [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access: <http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership.aspx>.
21. Hutmacher Walo. Key competencies for Europe // Report of the Symposium Berne, Switzerland 27–30 March, 1996. Council for Cultural Co-operation (CDCC) // Secondary Education for Europe Strasburg, 1997.
22. Management in Education (MIE) [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access: <http://journals.sagepub.com/home/mie>.
23. World Conference on Higher Education [Electronic resource] // World declaration of higher education for the twenty-first century: Vision and action (Paris, 9 October 1998). – Mode of access: http://www.unesco.org/education/educprog/wche/declaration_eng.htm.

REFERENCES

1. Adizes I. Razvitie liderov. Kak ponyat' svoy stil' upravleniya i effektivno obshchat'sya s nositelyami inykh stiley. – Al'pina Pablishez, 2008. – 264 s.
2. Andreeva G. M. Sotsial'naya psikhologiya. – M.: Izd-vo Mosk. un-ta, 1980. – 414 s.
3. Andreeva G. M. Psikhologiya sotsial'nogo poznaniya : ucheb. posobie dlya stud. vys. ucheb. Zavedeniy. – Izd. 2 pererab. i dop. – M.: Aspekt-Press, 2000. – 288 s.
4. Bendas T. V. Psikhologiya liderstva : ucheb. posobie. – SPb.: Piter, 2009. – 448 s.
5. Borozinets N. M., Kobleva A. L. Pedagogicheskiy menedzhment v spetsial'nom obrazovanii : ucheb. posobie. – Stavropol': SKFU, 2014. – 167 s.
6. Goncharov M. A. Osnovy menedzhmenta v obrazovanii : ucheb. Posobie. – 3-e izd., ster. – M.: KNORUS, 2016. – 476 s.
7. Zankovskiy A. N. Organizatsionnaya psikhologiya : ucheb. posobie dlya vuzov po spetsial'nosti «Organizatsionnaya psikhologiya». – M.: Flinta : MPSI, 2000. – 648 s.
8. Kiseleva M. V. Liderstvo rukovodstva kak sushchestvennyy faktor upravleniya kachestvom obrazovaniya v vuze // Vestnik Kostromskogo gosudarstvennogo tekhnologicheskogo universiteta. Seriya : Ekonomicheskie nauki. – 2013. – № 1 (3). – S. 41–47.
9. Kostikova I. O konservatizme obrazovaniya // Vyshee obrazovanie v Rossii. – 2004. – № 7. – S. 116–121.
10. Merenov A. V., Kobozeva E. M. Problemy liderstva v obrazovanii // Novaya nauka: Teoreticheskiy i prakticheskiy vzglyad. – 2016. – № 2–1 (63). – S. 64–65.
11. Meskon M., Al'bert M., Khedouri F. Osnovy menedzhmenta : per. s angl. – M.: Delo, 2005. – 720 s.
12. Parygin B. D. Osnovy sotsial'no-psikhologicheskoy teorii. – M.: Mysl', 1971. – 351 s.
13. Simonov V. P. Pedagogicheskiy menedzhment: 50 NOU KhAU v upravlenii pedagogicheskimi sistemami : ucheb. Posobie. – 3-e izd., ispr. i dop. – M.: Pedagogicheskoe obshchestvo Rossii, 1999. – 428 s.
14. Sitarov V. A. Pedagogicheskiy menedzhment kak teoriya i praktika upravleniya obrazovatel'nym protsesom // Znanie. Ponimanie. Umenie. – 2014. – № 3. – S. 18–24.
15. Storchak N. V. Sovremennye mezhdunarodnye issledovaniya liderstva v shkol'nom obrazovanii // Che-lovek i obrazovanie. – 2012. – № 3 (32). – S. 153–156.
16. Storchak N. V. Traktovka liderstva v obrazovanii v mezhdunarodnoy praktike // Nauka i Mir. – 2016. – T. 3. – № 6 (34). – S. 73–75.
17. Shelkopyasova I. F., Sunyaykina T. V. Problema sootnosheniya ponyatiy liderstva i rukovodstva v otechestvennoy sisteme obrazovaniya // Psikhologo-pedagogicheskie issledovaniya kachestva obrazovaniya v usloviyakh innovatsionnoy deyatel'nosti obrazovatel'noy organizatsii : mat-ly IX Vseros. (s mezhdunar. uchastiem) nauch.-prakt. konf. / Filial Kubanskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta v g. Slavvanske-na-Kubani. – 2016. – S. 240–243.
18. Adizes. Institute Worldwide [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access: https://adizes.me/paei_test/.
19. Ayman R. & Korabik K. Leadership: why gender and culture matter // *American Psychologist*. – 2010. – № 65 (3). – P. 157–170.
20. Educational leadership [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access: <http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership.aspx>.
21. Hutmacher Walo. Key competencies for Europe // Report of the Symposium Berne, Switzerland 27–30 March, 1996. Council for Cultural Cooperation (CDCC) // Secondary Education for Europe Strasburg, 1997.
22. Management in Education (MIE) [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access: <http://journals.sagepub.com/home/mie>.
23. World Conference on Higher Education [Electronic resource] // World declaration of higher education for the twenty-first century: Vision and action (Paris, 9 October 1998). – Mode of access: http://www.unesco.org/education/educprog/wche/declaration_eng.htm.