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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to identify factors that influence leadership and its distribution in the Arab Bureau of Education for the Gulf States (ABEGS) Saudi Arabia. The research was undertaken in the ABEGS as a case study and its two initiatives, the Gulf Arab States Educational Research Centre (GASERC) Kuwait, and the Arab Educational Training Centre for Gulf States (AETCGS) Qatar respectively. The findings of this study reveal that the leadership in this interorganizational environment is distributed within the four levels of organizational structures. The visionary leadership comes from the inner most core political level that has its influence and direction at the strategic, managerial, and operational levels of the organization. Based on extensive research of Leithwood and his colleagues, this study will integrate four leadership functions of setting directions, structuring the organization, developing capacity, and managing the (partnership) program into the analysis of interorganizational partnerships. The study also examined ‘securing accountability’ as another important leadership function in the partnership environment. I learnt that multiple factors influence leadership and enable different individuals and groups to perform these functions at the strategic, managerial and operational levels of the interorganizational structures. However, the major influence on leadership that weaves through the strategic level to the grassroots levels is the consultative process embedded in the organizational structures of the Arab
Bureau. Some other prominent factors that influence leadership found in the study are positional power in the hierarchy, experience and knowledge, and dedication and commitment. Researchers like Benson, Mawhiney, Kickert, Proven, and Rodríguez, explored interorganizational partnerships and view the structures of leadership either vertically centralized or horizontally distributive. I argue that interorganizational leadership works horizontally at each level of the partnership i.e. strategic, managerial, and operational and vertically between these levels in the ABEGS partnership as shown in the ‘Circular Model of Interorganizational Leadership’ of this study. The leaders at various levels in the Arab Bureau from the member states function as equals. However, firm vertical hierarchy exists between various levels in the structures of the ABEGS. It is therefore established that horizontal and vertical leadership work simultaneously in interorganizational partnership environments as found in the case study of the Arab Bureau.
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
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<td>Planning Organizing Staffing Directing Coordinating Reporting Budgeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAC</td>
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<td>SAARC</td>
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<tr>
<td>UAE</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
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<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
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<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization</td>
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<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
</tr>
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CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to explore factors that influence leadership and examine leadership distribution in interorganizational partnership structures established for educational administration and development. The Arab Bureau of Education for the Gulf States (ABEGS) also known as the Arab Bureau is being used as a case study. The Arab Bureau is an interorganizational partnership of seven states\(^1\) in the Gulf region that presents a pragmatic model of educational leadership providing directions at the macro level penetrating its influence to the micro levels of educational administration and development in seven Gulf States. In order to undertake in-depth analysis of this study, two initiatives (1) the Gulf Arab States Educational Research Centre (GASERC) Kuwait, and (2) the Arab Educational Training Centre for Gulf States (AETCGS) Doha Qatar, working under the umbrella of the Arab Bureau were also included. The Arab Bureau was established in October, 1975 with its headquarters in Riyadh Saudi Arabia under the patronage of the governments of member states to promote cooperation and coordination for efficient growth and development of education. The Bureau is governed by two pivotal strategic bodies, the first one is General Conference comprised of the Ministers of Education of the seven member states and the second body is called Executive Board which is represented by the Deputy Ministers or Under Secretaries of the Ministries of Education of the member states. The Director General of the Arab Bureau is the Chief Executive Officer, who is the administrative head of this partnership.

\(^1\) The member states of the ABEGS are Kingdom of Bahrain, State of Kuwait, State of Qatar, Kingdom Saudi Arabia, Sultanate of Oman, Republic of Yemen, and the United Arab Emirates.
This research therefore aims to identify factors that influence “individual & organizational (Anderson et al., 2008)” leadership and patterns of leadership distribution in the ABEGS’ partnership.

I paid special attention to power dynamics and cultural context of this study so as to examine if these factors have some kind of impact on the functioning of the Arab Bureau. The data reveal that all the member countries are oil rich economies of the Gulf region except Yemen. The ABEGS was created in October 1975 with specific focus on education and then six years later on May 25, 1981 another partnership of Gulf States emerged in the region by the name of Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) with multiple objectives covering economy, finance, politics, trade, tourism, industry, agriculture, animal resources, scientific research, technology, military matters, private sector, sports, culture, and higher education. The GCC leaders are also planning to establish common currency in the region. The membership for GCC is not open for all Gulf States. Iraq, Iran, and Yemen have never been the members of GCC. Iraq was a member of ABEGS before the Gulf war in August 1990. Its membership was cancelled when Iraq invaded Kuwait. Yemen entered into the ABEGS partnership after Iraq’s expulsion. Both Yemen and Iraq could not become a member of GCC because of political, cultural, and economic reasons. However, the ABEGS in particular and GCC in general are strengthening educational ties with Yemen. The educational relationships are gradually developing.

Despite its meagre financial contribution (2.5% of the total 81.5%\(^2\) contributed finance by the member states) and minor cultural differences Yemen is an equal and active member of the Arab Bureau partnership. The higher education of the member Gulf States remained

\(^2\) The remaining 18.5% is shared by all the members as per the ratio of their main contribution.
under the jurisdiction of the ABEGS until the GCC came into existence. The Arab Gulf University (AGU) which is the first university of the Kingdom of Bahrain was created by the ABEGS by the fourth General Conference in 1979. However, now this university is governed by the GCC. The Director General of the Arab Bureau works with the Supreme Council of the GCC for the Arab Gulf University Bahrain. He prepares budget and participates in the meetings of the Supreme Council with regard to the administrative matters of the Arab Gulf University. So the relationship of the Arab Bureau and the Arab Gulf University continues that way. The Arab Bureau is financially and administratively an independent body and looks after education of the member states from KG to Grade 12. However the GCC provides political and visionary leadership to the Arab Bureau.

The discussion in this thesis is organized based on my research questions. Therefore the chapters of this study are sequenced in the same order. The first few chapters are allocated to the context of the study, literature review, conceptual framework, research methodology, and structural formation of the Arab Bureau of Education for the Gulf States (ABEGS) partnership. The discussion in chapter six is on the first research question of this study analyzing the factors such as consultative process, positional leadership, experience & knowledge, dedication & commitment that influence leadership decision making in the ABEGS partnership.

The discussion in chapter seven is focused on the second research question of this study that undertakes analysis on the distribution of four core leadership functions such as setting directions, developing people, redesigning the organization, managing the partnership program, researched by Leithwood and his colleagues and securing

\[\text{Please see foot note 12}\]
accountability as fifth leadership function in an interorganizational partnership. This chapter will examine the distribution of leadership functions and 21 specific leadership practices into strategic, managerial, and operational organizational levels in the Arab Bureau as an interorganizational partnership.

Chapter eight talks about the Circular Model of Interorganizational Leadership and examines how vertical and horizontal leadership functions simultaneously in a partnership environment. Chapter nine deals with managerial work processes (cooperation, coordination, and collaboration) of the Arab Bureau and chapter ten concludes the whole thesis and exhibits connections of leadership themes with the existing literature on the subject.

I am confident that the findings of this study will draw the attention of policymakers, senior public administrators, researchers, and educational professionals of the Arabian Gulf region. The scholars interested in understanding interorganizational structures and partnership leadership may also benefit from this study. I anticipate applicability of many findings of this study in multiple ways covering a wide variety of aspects of numerous social disciplines more specifically educational administration.

1.0 Problem Statement

Leadership in a partnership is in some sense separate from but associated with leadership in the participating organizations. They are in a way interdependent to perform their tasks with respect to the partnership functions. In view of the available literature on interorganizational partnerships, we know very little about various leadership functions, its sources, and how it is distributed at various levels and between levels in the interorganizational environment. The past research on interorganizational partnerships
has had more to say about structural arrangements and allocation of management responsibilities, but has not devoted as much attention to "leadership" which according to Leithwood and many leadership theorists is about exercising influence within the core functions and not simply about carrying out given duties and completing day to day tasks. It is therefore very important to study the relationships between the leadership patterns and the partnership structures so as to identify different leadership functions and explore various sources of leadership that influence the governance at the strategic and managerial levels and operations at the operational levels of the interorganizational partnerships. It is also important to understand how leadership for the interorganizational partnership is distributed within the partnership at various levels.

The researchers dealing with the issues of leadership in organizations and in partnerships visualize either a vertically structured leadership or they acknowledge the presence of leadership as a horizontally flat arrangement. The scholars of the field have been examining the issues of leadership using a continuum. They see vertical leadership on one end of the continuum and horizontal leadership on the other. Researchers such as Benson, 1975; Mawhinney, 1993; Kickert et al, 1997; Proven et al., 2007; and Rodríguez et al., 2007 on the interorganizational partnerships view interorganizational leadership either vertically centralized or horizontally distributive. For instance, Kickert at al., 1997) talk about monocentric (vertical) hierarchy and horizontal autonomy, at the same time Benson (1975) pictures leadership as incentive versus authority based. They don’t see a combined picture that may exist in partnerships. In view of my literature review and based on the evidence available in the data collected from Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and Qatar, I argue that the interorganizational governance portrays an integrated structure of
governance into circular leadership that essentially allows the functioning of vertical and horizontal leadership simultaneously.

In view of the available literature there is significant scarcity of research effort in the field of educational partnerships specifically in the developing world. It is therefore imperative to explore leadership issues in the contemporary regional partnerships focused on the educational development mandated by partner states/governments in the developing world.

1.1 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this research is to study leadership in interorganizational partnership structures established for educational administration and development in the developing world. The research will identify factors that influence leadership and patterns of leadership distribution in interorganizational partnerships. The study will also explore how the existing patterns of leadership have emerged to the present shape. The study will address the four main tasks of leadership: setting directions, structuring the organization, developing capacity, managing the (partnership) program as identified by Leithwood and his colleagues. In addition, ‘securing accountability’ is being examined as a fifth leadership function in interorganizational partnerships. The discussion on the existing conceptualization of vertical vs. horizontal leadership by different researchers leads me to hypothesize that vertical and horizontal leadership essentially function together as circular leadership in partnership environments. I have, therefore, developed a “Circular Model of Interorganizational Leadership”, (Figure-8) to apply to the structures of the Arab Bureau so as to examine how leadership patterns emerge from this partnership.
1.2 Research Questions

The Arab Bureau of Education for the Gulf States (ABEGS) is being used as a case study of an interorganizational partnership to answer the research questions of this study. The ABEGS is 35 years old public sector partnership which is focused on KG to Grade 12 education in seven Gulf States. The qualitative research methodology is used to respond to the research questions. Three sites were selected for data collection. (1) The headquarters of the Arab Bureau in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. (2) The Gulf Arab Educational Research Centre (GASERC) also known as Research Centre Kuwait. (3) The Arab Educational Training Centre for the Gulf States (AETCGS) Doha, Qatar also known as Training Centre Doha, Qatar.

The main technique used for data collection was face to face semi structured interviews of the officers working at the strategic, managerial, and operational levels. The second source for the data was the administrative documentation of the ABEGS partnership. Following are the main research questions for this study.

1.3 Main Research Questions

1. What sources of leadership influence direction setting, human capacity building, redesigning the organization, managing the partnership program, and accountability at strategic, managerial, and operational levels of the ABEGS as an interorganizational partnership?

2. How is leadership in this partnership distributed at and between levels in the interorganizational structures?

3. How do vertical and horizontal interorganizational leadership work simultaneously?
1.4 Rationale of the Study

The focus of this research is to study leadership functions in interorganizational partnerships in the field of educational administration. Leadership is generally perceived as a process of influence and providing direction to achieve certain organizational objectives. It is an integral component of an organizational structure that is engaged in planning, initiating, and supervising various organizational processes. Leadership is considered a driving force to perform numerous organizational functions at strategic, managerial, and operational levels of an organizational structure. The main aim of this study is to understand how leadership functions are performed at strategic, managerial and operational levels of interorganizational partnerships. I therefore think that the literature review for this study must help understand various contemporary structural formations and processes to have a better comprehension of leadership functions performed in interorganizational partnerships. The existing literature on the organizational theory and public administration will guide my research and help investigate issues of leadership in the Arab Bureau of Education for Gulf States (ABEGS).
Figure 1: The Arab Bureau of Education for the Gulf States (ABEGS) Map
CHAPTER 2 - CONTEXT OF THE STUDY

2.0 Arab Bureau of Education for the Gulf States (ABEGS) An Overview

In view of limited research with regard to the sources of leadership, its distribution and functions in interorganizational partnerships, I developed a keen interest to undertake this research in one of the contemporary regional partnerships focused on educational development established by partner states in the developing world. I started exploring literature and browsing related available online sources. I came up with a list of partnerships of developed and developing regions that are involved in the work of educational administration and development. I short listed following three regional partnerships from the developing world:

1. South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC)\(^4\).
2. Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS)\(^5\).
3. Arab Bureau of Education for the Gulf States (ABEGS).

The leaders of both SAARC and OECS know that education is an appropriate agent for social and economic development. They also show a certain level of interest and commitment in education. However, since the inception of SAARC and OECS their major focus has been on the economy, defence, heath, trade, industry, tourism, governance, housing, and natural resources with educational matters at a lower priority.

In order to select an appropriate case study for PhD thesis research I examined the Arab Bureau of Education for the Gulf States (ABEGS) in comparison with the SAARC &

---

\(^4\) The member states for the SAARC are Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka.

\(^5\) The OECS is a nine member group comprising Antigua and Barbuda, Commonwealth of Dominica, Grenada, Montserrat, St Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia and St Vincent and the Grenadines. Anguilla and the British Virgin Islands are associate members of the OECS.
OECS. I found the ABEGS a suitable organization for my PhD thesis research. It is completely focused on educational matters. This is a public sector partnership of seven states. The members of this consortium nurtured their relationships using their common interest in education. The ABEGS has successfully completed three and a half decades of work. Its commitment for education, history of more than 35 years of specialized work in education, continued interest of the top political leadership, and perseverance and dedication of educational leadership were some major factors why I decided to use the ABEGS as a case study of interorganizational partnerships for my thesis research. Since 2007 I started collecting literature on the topic of my interest. Faculty at OISE also favoured my decision and encouraged me to explore my interest in this area using the case study of the ABEGS.

I contacted the headquarters of the ABEGS in Riyadh through the Cultural Attaché’s office in the Royal Embassy of Saudi Arabia Ottawa in 2007. I obtained an administrative approval from the Director General of the ABEGS (Appendix – A). I was then in contact with the Arab Bureau and continued my communication with them from Canada until I visited Arab Bureau’s headquarters in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia for data collection in January 2010. The Director Public Relations at the ABEGS headquarters was my contact person at the Arab Bureau. He sent me a lot of documentation for orientation about the ABEGS. This documentation helped me understand the organizational structure, objectives, institutions created by the Arab Bureau, and other overall work performed by this partnership in the Gulf region.
According to Dr. Saeed M. Al-Mullais the former Director General of the ABEGS, this is a consortium of seven Gulf States for “planning the future of education and formulating strategies to stimulate dialogue, encourage cooperation, facilitate the sharing of knowledge, expertise and the exchange of best practices among its member states” (Al-Mullais, 2005). This partnership came into existence in October, 1975 with its headquarters in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. It is governed by two strategic bodies, the first one is known as the General Conference comprised of the Ministers of Education of the member states. The second one is Arab Bureau’s Executive Board consists of either the Deputy Ministers or the Under Secretaries of the Ministries of Education of the member states. The Director General of ABEGS is the Chief Executive Officer, who is the administrative head of this partnership. I came to know during my interviews with the officers of the ABEGS that the following Gulf States were the initial members of the Arab Bureau:

1. Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
2. Kingdom of Bahrain
3. United Arab Emirates
4. Republic of Iraq
5. State of Kuwait
6. Sultanate of Oman
7. State of Qatar

The basic membership was reviewed by the General Conference and the Arab Bureau was restructured when Iraq invaded Kuwait in August 1990. The membership of Iraq was dismissed and the size of the Arab Bureau was reduced to six member countries. Later, the Republic of Yemen joined the partnership and membership of the Arab Bureau went up to seven states again. Some officers were of the view that depending on circumstances the General Conference may allow Iraq to join the ABEGS again.
### Table HDI: Some Indicators of Educational Administration and Development in the ABEGS Member States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of ABEGS Member State</th>
<th>Adult literacy rate (both sexes) (% aged 15 and above)</th>
<th>Combined gross enrolment ratio in education (both sexes) (%)</th>
<th>Expected Years of schooling (of children) (years)</th>
<th>Expenditure on education (% of GDP) (%)</th>
<th>Population with at least secondary education, female/male ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oman</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** http://hdr.undp.org


**Footnotes**

1: Data are from a national census of population.
2: Data refer to 1981.
4: Data refer to 2006.
6: Refers to an earlier year than that specified.
7: Data are from a national household survey.
8: Refers to 2007.
9: Data refer to 1975. CHECK.
10: Data refer to 2005.
2.1 Partnership Mission

The mission of the ABEGS is to operate within the member states to serve education, scientific, and cultural goals specified in ABEGS’ articles of association and other regulations issued by the General Conference. It seeks to achieve coordination, integration, and unification between the member states.

2.2 Partnership Goals

1. Adopting appropriate measures to enable the implementation and follow up of the resolutions passed by the General Conference in the member countries.

2. Coordination of education development operations to reflect the Islamic nature of the region, to promote unity among its citizens and set educational plans based on modern scientific foundation.

3. Undertake educational, cultural, and scientific projects of regional significance

4. To set up joint educational organizations, institutions, and centres within the member states.

5. Promoting scientific and educational research, as well as developing a highly skilled workforce in educational and scientific fields in the member states.

6. Encouraging educational, cultural, and scientific cooperation via:

   a. Scientific, cultural, and educational centres in the member states.
   b. Organizing visits of academic, cultural, and technical experts, and organizing forums, educational, scientific and cultural meetings.
   c. Exchange of experts, information, and educational, cultural and scientific experiences as well as technical service.

---
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d. Facilitating communication with Arab and International educational organizations and institutions, representing ABEGS.
e. Strengthening ties with specialised regional and international organizations in the same area of activity of the Bureau, as well as coordinating different aspects of joint activities.

7. Emphasis placed on Arab and Islamic cultural and contemporary thought through programs and cultural activities throughout various education stages.

8. Coordination and integration in the field of higher education and research institutions in the member states, exchange of expertise and knowledge, and standardisation of accreditation of degree.

The Arab Bureau developed and implemented a number of plans during its 35 years of existence to achieve aforementioned goals for instance:

- Four medium term plans
- The future of the education process
- The joint plan of curricula development
- An integrated mathematics and science development project
- Improvement of Arabic language standards in schools

In addition to the above plans, the Arab Bureau published hundreds of books on a variety of educational and cultural concepts. In order to document its activities the Bureau published a newsletter starting in 1979. It is now being done by an online bi-monthly newsletter called “Jassor” that means “Bridges”. The Bureau also introduced a quarterly academic refereed journal in Arabic “Risalat al-khaleej Al-Arabi” which means “the Message of the Arab Gulf” in 1981. These publications help achieve the following objectives:
➢ Enrich the educational thought

➢ Revive the spirit of Islamic educational heritage

➢ Address educational problems

➢ Review the world educational experiences

➢ Publish topics about the educational thought and teacher training, student behaviour, assessment, and other subjects related to education.
Figure 2: Organogram of the Arab Bureau of Education for the Gulf States (ABEGS).
A brief description of the institutions, departments, and units shown in the above organogram of the ABEGS provides the context of my study. I gathered interview and documentary data from Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and Qatar by visiting many offices.

2.3 ABEGS & Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC)

Arab Bureau of Education for the Gulf States and Gulf Cooperation Council are two distinct intergovernmental partnerships of the Gulf Region. The Arab Bureau was established in 1975 before the GCC was created. The interview data very clearly explains that GCC was created in 1981 with absolutely different aims. The GCC concentrates more on political, military, economic, health, and natural resources. However, GCC also plays an important role in governing the Higher Education in the Gulf region. At the same time ABEGS is mandated to look after schooling of the Gulf States. The top political leadership for both the partnerships is the same. The ministers of education of the member states of GCC (except Yemen) provide this political leadership.

2.4 The General Conference ABEGS

The General Conference is the principal decision making level of the Arab Bureau of Education for the Gulf States. The Ministers of Education of the member states constitute this body. The General Conference is convened biennially to formally approve the major programs and projects, sanction two yearly budget, and secure accountability by undertaking performance appraisal of the entire partnership work. This is an appropriate level for strategic decision making. The General Conference convenes another session after every two years, which is called “Tashawari” that means “consultation meeting”. Consultation is identified as a major factor at all levels in the
Arab Bureau for decision making. Consultation is embedded in Arab culture. More discussion on this aspect will appear in the later part of this thesis. Tashawari (consultation meeting) is an informal session for discussion. However, the ministers may look at matters of emergency nature and take a decision or issue any directive on any important matter depending on the situation. The main purpose of Tashawari is informal discussion and socialization. I shall include detailed discussion on this topic in the following chapters of my thesis. The purpose of this brief description here is to conceptualize the context of my PhD thesis research.

2.5 The Executive Board ABEGS

The Executive Board is considered to be the most important strategic level in the organizational structures of the ABEGS partnership. This body is a bridge between the managerial and operational levels of partnership on one end and the senior strategic level (General Conference) on the other. The Executive Board is comprised of the Deputy Ministers or the Under-Secretaries of the ministries of education of the member countries. The Board meets twice a year between the sessions of the General Conference. The Board is to supervise the execution of the decisions taken by the General Conference. All the plans, programs, and projects have to go through the Executive Board before they are approved by the General Conference. All important matters including biennial budget, administrative, financial, and performance reviews have to be scrutinized by the Board before they are presented to the General Conference. The Executive Board is the most influential body of the ABEGS partnership which is a major agent of coordination with the member states. The members of the Executive Board are always in contact with the Director General ABEGS, “on daily basis” as stated by the
Director General during his interview. The Director of the GASERC Kuwait, and the Director of the AETCGS Doha Qatar maintain their contact with the Executive Board through their Board(s) of Trustees (BOT). The majority of the members of the BOT come from the ministries of education of the member states. So the Executive Board is always closely in touch with Boards of Trustees of each institutions working under the umbrella of the Arab Bureau.

2.6.0 The Director General ABEGS

The Director General ABEGS is the Chief Executive Officer of this intergovernmental partnership. His role in the partnership is that of a boundary spanner. His activities in the Arab Bureau involve strategic thinking. He is a chief consultant to the General Conference and an advisor to the Executive Board. All the institutions, agencies, and departments, permanent and temporary committees work under his supervision and control. He is an administrative head of all the institutions such as the Gulf Arab States Educational Research Centre (GASERC) Kuwait, the Arab Educational Training Centre for Gulf States (AETCGS) Doha Qatar, and the Arab Language Centre Sharja (UAE). He therefore receives reports from and coordinates with the directors of these institutions and the Board(s) of Trustees of these centres. He concludes and signs agreements and treaties with regional and international partners such as United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), Islamic Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (ISESCO), the Arab League Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organization (ALECSO), and the Arab Gulf Programme for United Nations Development Organizations (AGFUND) on behalf of the Arab Bureau.
He is responsible to supervise the implementation of the plans and programs in the seven member states. He also coordinates with the ministries of education of the seven member states. He gives an update to the Executive Board every six months. Then the Executive Board prepares two yearly reports for the General Conference with close consultation and coordination of the Director General. Despite firm hierarchical structures his role is performed as a boundary spanner across the boundaries of strategic and managerial levels of the ABEGS partnership. According to S. Ansett (2005):

Boundary spanners serve strategic roles in organizations by gathering critical information, obtaining feedback and perceptions from the external environment through their stakeholder networks and then interpreting and translating that information back into their organization. Ultimately, if the boundary spanner is effective, the process can lead to innovations in strategy, processes or products. (p.39)

The Director General ABEGS plays a central role by collecting critical information and perceptions from different local, regional and international sources. He maintains connection between different internal departments and organizational structures of the ABEGS, external networks, agencies and organizations. In view of the data analysis a picture of this relation is depicted in Figure 3.

The offices of the following departments and sections of the Arab Bureau are housed in the ABEGS’ headquarters Riyadh that work under the managerial and administrative control of the Director General ABEGS.

2.6.1 Secretariat of the General Conference & the Executive Board – This office arranges the biennial meetings of the General Conference and six monthly meetings of the Executive Board. The data reveals that this department prepares the agenda for each meeting by undertaking consultations from various departments, organizations, institutions, individuals and groups from inside the Arab Bureau and outside this partnership. The record keeping of the decisions taken by the General Conference and the Executive Board and the minutes of meetings is also the responsibility of this secretariat.

2.6.2 Programs Department – This office is responsible to develop, implement, and monitor the implementation of short-term, mid-term, and long-term plans and project of the Arab Bureau. The head of this department is the member of Board
of Trustees of all the institutions such as GASERC Kuwait, AETCGS Doha, and ECAL Sharja UAE, which work under the ABEGS.

2.6.3 Finance & Administration Department - This department prepares the biennial budget for the ABEGS and administers matters related to administration finance and human resources for the partnership.

2.6.4 Planning & Follow up Department – This department is responsible to seek the feedback on every plan that is executed by the partnership and undertakes the follow up activities.

2.6.5 Public Relations, Media & Organizations Department – This department maintains public relations with all the internal and external agencies, institutions, and departments. The media activities and protocol responsibilities are also looked after by this department.

2.6.6 Information Technology Department – This department maintains the ABEGS portal and e-learning in the seven member states. The experts in this department are developing a new Learning Management System (LMS). They have designed thousands online lesson plans to teach math, science, and other subjects to teach different levels of elementary and secondary level students in the member states. The IT department has developed online teacher training programs as well. They are also publishing a two monthly newsletter by the name of “Josoor” which means “Bridges”.

2.6.7 Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) – This committee is presided over by an outside expert from a university. and then The head of the programs department is a member of this committee. The main agenda of this committee is
to test the quality of programs implemented by the ABEGS in the seven countries.
This is an active tool for accountability that make practical and grassroots
assessment of the programs implemented by the ABEGS in the member states.

2.6.8 Information Department – This department retrieves and maintains crucial
data collected from the member states for program planning. This department
supervises a printing facility, a library, and the publication of a quarterly
academic refereed Arabic journal called “Risala-tul- Khaleej” which means “the
Message of the Arab Gulf”.

In addition to the above offices of the ABEGS headquarters in Riyadh, the Arab
Bureau established following institutions under the umbrella of the ABEGS’ partnership.

2.7 The Arabian Gulf University (AGU), Bahrain

The fourth General Conference approved the establishment of the Arabian Gulf
University (AGU) in the Kingdom of Bahrain in 1979. This is the only institution that
was established in the context of higher education. This institution remained under the
control of the ABEGS until the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) was established by the
top political leadership of the Gulf Region in 1981. The Arabian Gulf University (AGU)
was then given under the administrative control of the GCC. However, the Director
General of the ABEGS is still involved in the University affairs. He prepares budget and
participates in designing and development of the University programs.
2.8 The Gulf Arab States Educational Research Centre (GASERC), Kuwait

The GASERC or the Research Centre was created by the Second General Conference in 1977. The Ministers decided to establish GASERC in Kuwait. Since its inception the GASERC has been involved in numerous educational activities. However the main aims of this Research Centre are to conduct educational research for adequate policy formulation, contribute in the development and unification of curricula for the Gulf member states, and undertake evaluation and assessment of educational activities in the member states. The centre has a Board of Trustees (BOT) which meets every six months. The BOT is comprised of the Director GASERC, representatives from all seven member states and one member from the Arab Bureau headquarters. The objectives and functions of this institution as stated in its documentation\(^7\) are:

1. Carrying out comprehensive research into the status of educational system within the member states and measuring their efficiency in the light of their states objectives.

2. Experimenting with new educational techniques within the Gulf institutions with the aim of benefitting from them.

3. Carrying out the prior research and planning studies necessary for the implementation of regional educational projects.

4. Collecting an organizing data about education within the member states and subsequent analysis and publication of such information.

\(^7\) Office documentation, files notes, memos, reports, etc.
5. Encouraging and publishing research of a specifically Arab and Islamic nature in an endeavour to ensure member states base their educational plans on such tenets.

6. Maintaining contact with other educational research centres both within other Muslim states and also with other external Arab, Islamic and international centres in order to exchange expertise and information and to keep abreast of the latest developments so that these may be disseminated to the member states.

7. Providing consultative services over the full range of educational activities whenever requested by the member states.

8. Providing opportunities for a wide range of educationalists (such as teachers, curriculum developers, course book and teaching aid designers, examiners, etc.) to undertake empirical research in the field.

9. Cooperating directly with individual educational institutions within the member states whenever this is beneficial for the centre’s aims and programs.

The GASERC Kuwait is headed by a director who is the executive head of other offices such as educational planning division, curriculum division, adult and continuing education, in the GASERC Kuwait as reflected in the following organizational chart. The Director GASERC Kuwait takes part in the Board of Trustees work as member and
finalizes all the research projects with the consultation of all representatives of the member states. He reports to the Director General of the ABEGS.

2.9 The Arab Educational Training Centre for Gulf States (AETCGS) Doha, Qatar

The Arab Educational Training Centre for the Gulf States (AETCGS) or the Training Centre was established by the fifth General Conference of the Bureau in 1999. The centre is based in Doha Qatar. The major aim of this training center is to provide advanced level training to administrators and leaders of the educational establishments of the member states of the ABEGS. The training programs are designed in a way to enable educational professionals to perform their jobs effectively in their respective member states of the Arab Bureau. The focus of the training programs is to impart and/or improve knowledge and skills of the educational personnel with regard to the curriculum development, instructional techniques, and assessment strategies.

There is a Board of Trustees (BOT) of this centre which convenes meetings every six month to review the performance and discuss new programs and plans of the training centre. The members of the BOT for the training centre are:

1. The Director, AETCGS.
2. Seven representatives from each member states (mostly experienced trainers from the ministries of education).
3. One member from the ABEGS headquarters Riyadh (Head of Programs Department).

The Director of the training centre is the executive head of this institute who is answerable to the Director General of the ABEGS. The Director of the Training Centre works very closely with the Board of Trustees as almost everything is to be discussed in
the BOT before it is moved to the next level in the hierarchy. The organizational structure of the training centre is given in the following organogram:

The AETCGS was established to achieve following objectives for the member states of the Arab Bureau:

1. Utilize scientific methodology and establish the culture of quality and efficiency to organize training programs for the educational leaders of the member states.

2. Prepare educational leaders and enhance their experience and knowledge by organizing training.

3. Diversify services of technical training provided by the Training Center for the Arab Bureau of Education for the Gulf States.

4. Promote the exchange of training experiences between member states and other regional and international organizations.

5. Use of modern technology and information systems in the field of training to acquire desired results.

2.10 The Educational Centre for Arabic Language (ECAL), Sharja -UAE

The Educational Centre for Arabic Language was established by the 19th session of the General Conference in 2007. The Language Centre is being constructed in Sharja UAE. It has not started its work as yet. The main idea to establish this centre is to preserve the status and significance of the Arabic Language.
2.11 Discussion

I have very briefly outlined the institutions, departments, sections, committees, some offices and individuals of the Arab Bureau. The rational of doing so was to clearly describe the context of my study. In view of my research questions I have to identify influencing factors, and distribution of leadership in the partnership environment specifically in the developing world. Prior to my data collection I reviewed related literature and predicted that leadership in a partnership environment is distributed within the organizational structures of the partnerships. I also believe that different sources of leadership emerge from various “individual or organizational phenomenon” (Anderson et al., 2008, page111). In view of my literature review I am using organizational theory and concepts drawn from the public administration for my PhD thesis research. It is therefore imperative to give aforementioned details to explain the context of my study.

I visited all the offices in the headquarters of the ABEGS, the GASERC Kuwait, and AETCGS Doha Qatar and interviewed 20 officers from different organizational levels (strategic, managerial, and operational). The Arabian Gulf University is no longer functioning under the administrative control of ABEGS, so it is excluded from my study. The Educational Centre for Arabic Language Sharja has not started its work as yet. The Language Centre therefore is not the part of my context as well.

In the foregoing discussion I have also explained strategic, managerial, and operational levels of organizational leadership at the ABEGS partnership so as to clearly define the context of my study with regard to my hypothesis that horizontal and vertical leadership work simultaneously in the partnership environments.
Figure 4: Arab Bureau of Education for the Gulf States (ABEGS)

Figure 5: Library ABEGS Headquarters Riyadh Saudi Arabia
Figure 6: Gulf Arab States Educational Research Centre (GASERC) Kuwait

Figure 7: Arab Educational Training Centre for the Gulf States (AETCGS) Doha, Qatar
Chapter 3 - Literature Review

Interorganizational relations is an emerging and developing field of study that covers many disciplines, including, but not limited to organization theory, strategic management, business studies, health care services, public administration, sociology, communication, computer science, and psychology (Proven, Fish, & Sydow, 2007). The literature review for this study will encompass research on structures, leadership functions, and work processes in the interorganizational partnerships.

Interorganizational alliances, coalitions, cooperative arrangements, collaborative agreements, organizational networks and clusters have been defined in many ways. Regardless of their differences, most of the researchers and scholars refer to these themes as cooperation, collaboration, collectivism, and connectedness. The existing literature provides different typologies of interorganizational partnerships based on their combined mission, structural formation, regional location, voluntary or mandated partnership arrangement, and the impact of internal and external organizational environment. Some of these interorganizational partnerships can be labelled as consortiums, joint ventures, mergers (also called acquisitions), corporate management systems, public sector partnerships\(^8\), private sector partnerships, organizational dyads, organizational webs, interorganizational networks (in some cases network of networks), and loosely coupled global partnerships.

In view of structural variations and considering some other features, the list of interorganizational partnership formations can be further extended. However, all the

---

\(^8\) The terminology used for public sector partnerships also includes public sector alliances and/or coalitions. These partnerships could be interstate or intergovernmental in a federation, or bilateral or multilateral partnerships amongst various countries.
The above listed partnership formations can be synthesized under the classification provided by the Strategy, Structure and Performance Model presented by Evan and Klemm (1980). This model talks about four structures of interorganizational arrangements, a consortium, a joint venture, a merger, and a corporate management system. The classification of four types presented by the Strategy, Structure and Performance Model cover all the other types listed in the above discussion. For instance, any of these types can exist in public or private sector. Public sector partnerships could be seen as organizational dyads, organizational webs, bilateral or multilateral arrangements. Joint ventures can be viewed as operating joint ventures or spider web joint ventures (Harrigan & Newman, 1990).

Some interorganizational partnerships are loosely coupled and some are strongly cohesive.

Rodríguez, Langley, Béland, and Denis (2007) argue that interorganizational collaboration has been studied from a wide variety of empirical, theoretical and methodological angles. Theoretical studies mainly explain the initiation, success, and durability of partnerships among organizations by comparing economic opportunism and relational trust (Carson, Madhok, Varman, & John, 2003). The interorganizational collaboration was examined by knowledge based theory (Grant & Baden-Fuller, 2004), agency theory (Milward & Provan, 2000), social embeddedness (Gulati, Nohria, &

---

9 “In a consortium two or more [organizations] join in a legal compact to accomplish one or more objectives while preserving their respective organizational identities. In a joint venture, two or more [organizations] enter into a legal agreement whereby they jointly establish, operate, and control a separate ...facility while maintaining their own individual organizational identities. Unlike a consortium, and a joint venture, a merger entails the legal fusion of two or more [organizations] into a new organizational identity...a corporate management system consists of two or more [organizations] organized and operated for profit, a purpose which distinguishes this mode of organization from the other three [multi-organizational] system (page.317/318).

10 The participants in the operating joint ventures make joint decisions and actively govern their partnerships. The spider web joint ventures link many organizations to one pivotal partner. These joint ventures are highly dependent on resource exchange.
Zaheer, 2000), institutional theory (Phillips, Lawrence, & Hardy, 2000), resource
dependence and power based theories of negotiation and collaboration (Eden & Huxham,
2001). Empirical research analyzed interorganizational relationships at organizational
(Pfeffer & Salancik, 1974), and dyadic (Zollo, Reuer, & Singh, 2002) levels in a wide
variety of organizational contexts. Cross-sectional surveys (Aldrich, 1976) and in-depth
case studies (Hardy, Phillips, & Lawrence, 2003) were some of the methods used to study
interorganizational relations. The collaboration arrangements have also been examined
using combination of multiple methods (Agranoff & McGuire, 2003). The
interorganizational collaborations and cooperation, public policy issues, and the
challenges connected to the partnership leadership have attracted the scholars of public
administration (O’Toole & Meier, 2004). In view of this piece of literature review, I will
apply the principles of public administration and organizational theory using empirical
data to undertake in-depth analysis of my selected case study to explore leadership
functions and work processes in interorganizational partnership environment.

Oliver (1990) as cited by Hudson (2004) proposes reasons such as necessity,
asymmetry, reciprocity, efficiency, stability and legitimacy to establish
interorganizational partnerships. Necessity occurs when organizations are mandated
through law or regulation by higher authorities to establish relationships. Asymmetry is
vital when it is essential to allow one partner organization to exercise power or control
over another. Reciprocity is important when organizations must pursue common or
mutually beneficial goals. Efficiency is required when organizations must achieve higher
input/output ratios by working together. Stability seems essential when through co-
operation organizations can better avert uncertainty affecting their activities. Legitimacy
is important when through co-operation organizations can establish or enhance their reputation, image, prestige or congruence with prevailing norms. Kanter (1994) is of the view that “relationships between companies [organizations] begin, grow, and develop or fail in ways similar to relationships between people. ... Successful ... [partnerships] generally unfold in five overlapping phases. In the first courtship two [organizations] meet and discover their compatibility. During the second engagement they draw up plans and close the deal. In phase three the newly partnered companies like couples setting up housekeeping, discover they have different ideas about how business should operate. In phase four the partners device mechanisms for bridging those differences and develop techniques for getting along. And, in phase five, as old married, each [organization] discovers that it has changed internally as a result of its accommodation to the ongoing collaboration” (p.99). Oliver’s (1990) framework of asymmetry, reciprocity, and stability will help me understand power dynamics, goal achievement, and mitigating the challenges of uncertainty respectively. Kanter’s (1994) analogy of family relationship will guide me to analyze the growth and development of the interorganizational partnerships’ relationships.

3.0 Partnership Structures

Williams (2005) identifies diverse dimensions associated with interorganizational partnership structures. His study examines how internal and external forces formalize and regularize the structure of an interorganizational arrangement. Some of these internal forces are formal control, regulatory bodies, contracts, resource dependence, and transaction cost. The external forces would be environmental change and external control. The importance of external environment is consistent with prior and
contemporary research. Fedorwicz, Gogan, and Williams, (2007) in another study emphasize “economic conditions, legislative mandates, and regulatory requirements” (p. 800) as external influences on interorganizational structures. Williams (2005) also considers complexity as a structural dimension that determines the density (few simple ties means low density and many complex ties means high density) of a partnership. Powell, White, Koput, and Owen-Smith (2005) in their study found that member organizations with higher density in a partnership are very careful when they consider leaving a partnership.

Another structural dimension concerns the importance of partnership members that helps measure the intensity of the relations between members which mainly deals with resource dependence, exchange and social control. “In a highly intense [partnership], member organizations commit considerable proportions of their resources. ... Conversely, in less intense [partnership], member organizations commit relatively fewer of their resources and their reliance on the outcomes from the partnership in question is relatively lower” (Williams, p. 226). Power dependence is that structural dimension which determines the centrality of member organization(s) having greater or lesser influence in the partnership. Stability is another structural dimension. In order to enhance stability, organizations need to reduce uncertainty and increase predictability in relations with other organizations in the partnership.

Provan et al., (2007) in their substantial amount of empirical literature review analysed the structural features in the dyadic or ‘egocentric’ interorganizational relationships and multi-organizational relationships in partnerships. They identified some structural features in the context of egocentric level and discussed the factor of centrality
relatively deeply compared to Williams (2005). In addition to the power element in the partnership they talk about links between partner organizations. For instance they talk about in-degree and out-degree centrality. By degree centrality they mean the number of direct links maintained by an organization with others in the partnership. This idea of centrality overlaps with the concept of intensity presented by Williams (2005).

Calculation of in-degree and out-degree centrality is based on the extent to which assets such as resources, information, and clients are coming into an organization from others in the partnership versus those being sent out to other organizations (p.484). Closeness centrality is recognized as another structural element in partnerships. Some organizations have short and some maintain long paths to connect to all other organizations in the partnerships. Closeness centrality means to measure the short or long path connecting a focal organization to any other organization in the partnership. In view of intermediary links between organizations betweenness centrality is documented as an important dimension of interorganizational structures. A member organization’s betweenness centrality is calculated by considering the extent to which an individual’s position in the partnership lies between the positions of other individuals in the partnership. Multiplex ties are thought to be an indicator of the strength and durability of an organization’s links because they enable the connection between an organization and its linkage partner to be sustained even if one type of link dissolves.

Williams and Proven et al. understand the meaning of `density` in similar way. To them density simply means the level and frequency of connectedness between organizations in a partnership environment. Provan and Milward (1995) found in their
research that the element of centrality facilitates integration and coordination in the partnership. They also found that stability is important for partnership effectiveness.

Evan and Klemm (1980) conceptualize interorganizational structure in terms of centralization, departmental division, standardization, and integration. They define “structure as formal linkages among the [member organizations] comprising a [multi-organizational] system and have identified ... relevant indicators” (p.326) such as degree of centralization of budgetary process, degree of standardization of the management information system, number of decision making centers, and degree of integration of administrative services. These indicators would apply to any interorganizational system. Cultural environments emerge as unintended consequences of routine interactions among member organizations (Abrahamson, Fombrun, 1992). “Institutional theories argue that organizations must adopt strategies and structures that conform to those dictated by cultural environments in order to remain legitimate and survive” (Meyer and Rowan, 1977 – As cited by Abrahamson and Formbrun, 1992, p.720).

The above discussion outlines various ways internal and external influences are exerted on a partnership. These ideas will help me identify instruments and forces of internal and external influence in a partnership. The discussion will further assist me to conceptualize the elements of centrality and stability in the Arab Bureau of Education for Gulf States (ABEGS). The ideas drawn from the foregoing literature provides a framework to look at relations and multiple ties between different partners within partnerships. This framework also helps to devise a way to examine the administrative division of departments, standardization, degree of integration, and linkages, between
different partners in an interorganizational partnership. I will use these ideas to understand partners’ relationships in my study.

Researchers like Chan (2004) suggests that well structured goals, continued partner commitment, rational use of resources, involvement of key players and realization of the partnership discrepancies are some of the elements that can help make a partnership structurally strong. Some member organizations may maintain more exchange ties with some members and less with others which determines the centrality of a particular member organization vis-à-vis other member organizations in the partnership.

It is important to note that some interorganizational partnerships seek control from external environment and some gain strength and cohesiveness from internal forces. The density of the partnership is determined by the level of complexity and simplicity of relations between partner organizations. The intensity of ties amongst members is connected to the mutual resource dependence, exchange, and social control. Conducive cultural environment, stability (reduced uncertainty), integration, and high degree of standardization in management techniques can be termed as positive features of partnership structures.

The above literature review provides a comparative picture of various structural dimensions and features of interorganizational partnerships. Some of these structural dimensions are centrality, stability, density, structural holes, fragmentations, multiplex ties, loose couplings, etc. This discussion will help me understand overall structural formation(s) of the organization(s) of my study.
Leadership or system of governance is identified as an important component of the structure of an interorganizational partnership. The leadership mechanisms range from self governance, lead-organization, to an administrative organization specifically created to steer the partnership. The detailed discussion on leadership and system of governance with respect to interorganizational partnerships is coming in the following section. I am mentioning this aspect here just to highlight that leadership is essentially an important structural dimension of interorganizational partnerships.

3.1 Partnership Leadership and Governance

The interorganizational partnership governance can be defined as a system of exercising control and authority through its leadership. The concept of governance adopted by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) as shown in the World Bank papers “comprises mechanisms, processes, and institutions through which citizens and groups articulate their interests, exercise their legal rights, meet their obligations, and mediate their differences”

The concepts of governance and leadership are so intermingled that sometimes it is hard to make a clear distinction between the two. However, in my understanding leadership is an essential component of the system of governance that deals with the exercising of influence and providing direction to all the organizational systems. The authority of governance is enforced through leadership. Leadership creates the system of governance and then becomes subservient to it. Leadership may also govern, make and unmake the system of governance. The system of governance is implemented and

interpreted through the leadership. The main aim of the proposed study is to deal with leadership and its functions in interorganizational partnerships. It is out of scope of this study to deeply examine the systems of governance in interorganizational partnerships. Therefore the study will only touch upon the system of governance where it is necessary to help set the context for understanding leadership issues.

Leadership has been defined in terms of individual traits, behaviour, influence over other people, interaction patterns, role relationships, occupation of an administrative position, and perceptions by others regarding legitimacy of influence (Yukl, 1994 p.2). Leadership in the interorganizational partnership may be identified by numerous sources, actions, beliefs, individuals and/or groups of individuals with the capacity to influence decision making and implementation processes at strategic, managerial, and operational levels that provide direction to run the affairs of a partnership. According to Leithwood, leaders in the organizational context perform four major functions such as setting directions, developing people, redesigning the organization, and managing the partnership program.\(^{12}\)

Securing accountability is another core leadership function which is considered an essential administrative task performed by the organizational leadership. Ranson (2003) believes that “accountability is no longer merely an important instrument or component within the system, but constitutes the system itself. … Power and purpose … are thus brought together in the institutional arrangements of accountability (p.459).” Leithwood

---

\(^{12}\) “Managing the instructional program” was the model that Leithwood and his colleagues initially added to their leadership research in order to blend earlier model of transformational leadership with models of effective instructional leadership that focused specifically on the instructional program. The study in hand has adapted this model to pay attention to interorganizational partnership programme.
and his colleagues did not find much evidence of securing accountability as a core leadership function in their research. Leithwood et al. (2002) say “although empirical evidence about the effects of some accountability tools has grown in the past few years (e.g., Lee, 1993; Spillane & Zeuli, 1999), in reference to the broad array of such tools currently in use, our knowledge is still quite limited (page.95)”.

I shall explore four leadership functions in the ABEGS partnership identified by Leithwood. I shall also look into the practices of administrative, financial, and program performance appraisal for securing accountability which is the fifth important leadership function performed by organizational leaders.

Considering a partnership environment, Provan et al. (2007) offer three types of governance (leadership) mechanisms that may exist in interorganizational partnerships i.e. shared governance, lead organization governance, and the governance mechanism based on administrative organization. Provan and Kenis (2006) explain that shared governance in the partnerships is seen when the organizations collectively work to make both strategic and operational decisions about how the partnership operates.

There is no formal governance structure other than through the collaborative interactions among members themselves. Control over activities may be formally conducted through meetings of partnership members or more informally conducted through ongoing interactions and collaboration. Lead-organization governance is that in which all organizations may share a common purpose but where there is a more powerful, perhaps larger organization that has sufficient resources and legitimacy to play a lead role. The organizations within the partnership may regularly interact with one
another. The activities and decision making are coordinated through a single organization or by a small group of organizations in the partnership. Other than performing a leadership role, the lead organization functions in the partnership like any other member of the partnership. However, it would be responsible for the maintenance of existing internal relationships and the development of external relationships (Dhanaraj & Parkhe, 2006; Jarillo, 1988; Sydow & Windeler, 1998 as cited by Proven et al. 2007).

Administrative organization governance mechanism is similar to that of lead organization type. In the lead organization mechanism all activities and decisions are coordinated through one organization. The difference is that an organization is specifically created or an individual is designated to perform leadership functions. Unlike the lead organization, the administrative organization governance mechanism is not involved in the day to day functioning of the partnership. (Human & Provan, 2000 as cited in Proven et al. 2007).

Rodríguez, et al. (2007) also identified three governance mechanisms, bureaucratic, market based, and clan based mechanisms. Bureaucratic or hierarchical mechanisms include management fiat, formalized rules and regulations, and formal performance monitoring. Market-based mechanisms of governance rely on incentives that reorient what individuals and groups within a partnership are likely to want (i.e., their interests). Market-based mechanisms work by manipulating interests. Clan based governance means the existence of shared values and beliefs to enhance coordination.

The key mechanisms associated with the development of shared understanding across organizational boundaries involve interactions such as face-to-face communication, information exchange, and socialization in common activities. The aforementioned three mechanisms are conceptualized not as fixed structures of governance but as entities that
are both the medium and the outcomes of mandated processes of collaboration with which they are linked through dynamics of power. The three types of governance mechanisms play different but essential roles in stimulating effective collaboration in a situation of mandated collaboration. For instance, bureaucratic mechanisms are necessary to bring partners to the table and establish rules of engagement, incentives based or market-based mechanisms function by altering participants’ interests in collaboration, and clan-based mechanisms can promote interactions among actors, establish mutual understanding, and create shared meaning and values for smooth coordination.

Rodríguez and colleagues present three scenarios and assume any one of these leadership scenario may prevail. They do not talk about practices or specific functions performed by the leadership of any of these scenarios in interorganizational partnership environment. However clan-based and market based mechanisms can be integrated into philosophy of shared governance, lead organization governance, and the governance mechanism of administrative organization as explained by Proven et al. Whereas Benson’s (1975) control mechanisms of incentive and authority cover both sides i.e. Proven’s shared governance and Rodríguez’s bureaucratic mechanisms. He is of the view that “control mechanisms, incentive versus authoritative, are the means of control ..., control may be formal and authoritative, involving the delegation of authority in bureaucratic fashion to agencies in a [partnership], or exercised through incentive structures in which agencies are drawn into the provision of certain services by the availability of resources. ... Many [partnerships] may display combinations of these control mechanisms and the combinations may be varied in form” (p.240). The control
mechanisms presented by Benson mainly deal with either horizontal or vertical leadership structures in interorganizational partnerships.

Similarly, Hudson (2004) based on the ideas presented by Rhodes (1997) talks about incentives and sanctions in the matters of partnership leadership. He argues that one of the key features of partnerships “is that they are relatively autonomous and self-organizing; the state can steer them by a variety of incentives and sanctions (Rhodes 1997). Kickert, Klijn, and Koppenjam (1997) view interorganizational partnership leadership in the “approach [that] can be located in the intermediate area between the extremes of monocentric monorational hierarchical steering on the one hand, and horizontal situations of complete autonomy of all actors on the other” (p.182).

This perception of leadership informs that the first-generation classical rational steering approach of regulatory instruments such as executive authority and procedural directives does not apply in partnership situations because they are uniform and one-sided. More appropriate tools in partnership situations are second generation instruments like communicative instruments, covenants, or incentives (Herranz, 2008).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership Governance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monocentric Hierarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(First Generation Instruments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Authority- Procedural Directives etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Second Generation Instruments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenants Incentives, Communication Tools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

13 Monocentric Hierarchy means very strong rather rigid vertical leadership in hierarchical structures. The monocentric leaders would use fist generation tools such as executive authority, procedural directives, and dictation to lead the organizations.
The mechanisms of influence, control, and management define the type of leadership and structure of governance in an individual organization or in an interorganizational partnership. The literature informs that the leadership structure in some situations is vertically centralized and in others it is horizontally distributive. Leadership in the partnership is in a way detached from but connected with leadership in the partner organizations.

The leadership for the partnership and the leadership for participating organizations are in many ways interdependent to perform their own, complementary, and combined functions. It is important to note that some factors such as the size, financial and material share of partner organizations, expertise and knowledge of the participating human resources, given mandate, contractual obligations, goals and objectives of the partnership may have an influence in leadership matters.

Barden and Mitchell (2007) are of the view that prior exchange ties between organizational leaders increase the likelihood of subsequent exchange between the organizations. It is proposed that “the knowledge, trust, and commitments that leaders garner from their personal exchange experiences are influential because leaders bear the ultimate responsibility for organizational decisions, including those related to interorganizational exchange. This responsibility is particularly strong in highly centralized, hierarchical organizations where, by definition, power tends to be concentrated in senior leaders. ... As an organization’s key boundary spanner, a leader must be trusted to negotiate honestly and competently…a leader can be a direct source of value during an exchange because of the leader’s knowledge, skills, legitimacy, and
friendships” (p.1445). These ideas emphasize the importance of leaders in interorganizational environment and indirectly promote centralized leadership style.

Peter Gronn conceptualizes hybrid leadership in organizations as a mix of individual and/or group leadership behaviour. Gronn talks about “Hybrid leadership [that] means mix leadership patterns” (Gronn, P. 2008, page. 19), he further describes this concept saying, “hybridity encompasses ... different kinds and degrees of both individualized-focused and distributed patterns of leadership” (Gronn, P. 2008, page. 19). Gronn does not particularly visualized hybrid leadership in single or interorganizational partnership context. He presents this idea more as a concept of shared leadership.

Leithwood and Duke (1998) are of the view that “the central focus of leadership ought to be the commitments and capacities of organizational members. Higher levels of personal commitment to organizational goals and greater capacities for accomplishing those goals are assumed to result in extra effort and greater productivity. Authority and influence are not necessarily allocated to those occupying formal administrative positions, although much of the literature adopts their perspective. Rather, power is attributed by organization members to whoever is able to inspire their commitments to collective aspirations, and the desire for personal and collective mastery of the capacities needed to accomplish such aspirations (page 35)”. Leithwood and his colleagues provide a set of successful leadership practices evidence through numerous studies from educational and non educational organizational contexts. (Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D., 1999; Leithwood, K., & Duke, D. L., 1998; Leithwood, K., Louis, K. S., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K., 2004; Leithwood & Riehl, 2005; Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., &
McElheron-Hopkins, C., 2006; Leithwood, K., Steinbach, R., & Jantzi, D., 2002; Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D., 2008; Day, C., Leithwood, K., & Sammons, P. 2008). “In organizational sectors as different as schools and the military, and in national cultures as different as The Netherlands, Canada, Hong Kong and the United States, there is compelling evidence of a common core of practices that any successful leader calls on, as needed. Many of these practices are common to different models of leadership, as well” (Leithwood, K., Louis K. S., Anderson S., and Wahlstrom K., 2004 p.8). The core leadership functions have been synthesised into following four main categories and further explained into 15 behavioural practices.

1. Setting Directions
2. Developing People
3. Redesigning the Organization
4. Managing the (partnership) Program
Matrix I: Core Leadership Functions & Specific Leadership Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Leadership Functions</th>
<th>Leadership Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Setting Directions**   | 1. Identifying and articulating a vision  
                          | 2. Fostering the acceptance of group goals  
                          | 3. High performance expectations  
                          | 4. Promoting effective communication |
| **Developing People**     | 5. Intellectual stimulation  
                          | 6. Individualized support  
                          | 7. Modeling appropriate values and practices |
| **Redesigning the**      | 8. Building a collaborative culture  
                          | 9. Structuring the organization to facilitate work  
                          | 10. Creating productive relations  
                          | 11. Connecting the organization to its wider environment |
| **Organization**         |                      |
| **Managing the Program** | 12. Staffing the partnership program  
                          | 13. Monitoring the progress and improvement strategies  
                          | 14. Buffering staff from unproductive external demands for attention  
                          | 15. Allocating resources to foster the partnership improvement efforts |
| **Securing Accountability** | 16. Ensures individual staff accountability  
                          | 17. Develop & present a coherent, understandable, accurate and transparent account of performance  
                          | 18. Reflect on personal contribution to achievements and take feedback from others  
                          | 19. Participate in external evaluation and make adjustments  
                          | 20. Create and redesign organizational structure  
                          | 21. Develop and apply performance management practices |

Leithwood and his colleagues did not find much evidence of securing accountability as a core leadership function in their research. Securing accountability is an important organizational dimension especially in the context of developing world. I am therefore interested to understand what accountability mechanisms and techniques are being used in the interorganizational partnerships in the developing world. The study in hand shall make an effort to examine securing accountability as a core leadership function along with its six specific leadership practices\textsuperscript{14}.

\textsuperscript{14} These six leadership practices were taken from (and adapted for this study) “Putting Ontario’s Leadership Framework into Action – A Guide for School and System Leaders from Purpose to Practice”, printed by the Institute for Education Leadership, August 2008 (page 13).
The proposed research will apply Leithwood’s framework of four core leadership functions in the context of interorganizational partnership environment in the developing world using the case study of ABEGS. Considering its importance in the context of transparent and efficient leadership, adequate use of power so as to achieve desired purpose (Ranson, 2003) and its importance with regard to the organizational context in the developing world, I shall also add in this framework securing accountability as a fifth core leadership function.

Kanter (1994) suggests achieving and maintaining five levels of integration for productive relationships in an interorganizational partnership that provides opportunities to the leadership at various levels of partner organizations to work together and promote working relationships. These five levels are strategic, tactical, operational, interpersonal, and cultural integration. The strategic level of integration ensures close working relations between strategic leadership of partner organizations. Top leaders are encouraged to maintain continued contact to discuss goals and changes in each partner organization. The strategic level of integration means that leaders should not form an alliance and then abandon its nurturing to others. The frequent contact and exchange of information between top leaders will lead the partnership to complementary rather than conflicting directions. Tactical integration brings middle managers and/or professionals together to develop plans for specific projects or joint activities, to indentify organizational and system changes that helps to link the partners establish cohesiveness. Operational integration ensures successful implementation of joint plans and program. The lower level of leadership looks into specific work details in day to day operations. Timely access to the information and other required resources to accomplish joint tasks,
participation in each other’s training, establish common work vocabulary and standards are some of the features of this level of integration. The essential requirement of interpersonal integration is to establish and maintain people to people contact. Leaders do feel the need to bring people together for sharing and exchange. Conferences and other gatherings are organized to provide executive managers and other functionaries of the partner organizations to promote interpersonal integration. “Broad synergies born on paper do not develop in practice until many people in [partner] organizations know one another personally and become willing to make the effort to exchange technology, refer clients, or participate on joint terms” (Kanter, 1995 p.106). Cultural integration is achieved by communication skills and cultural awareness that helps to bridge differences. “When managers accept teaching and learning roles, they demonstrate interest and respect, which helps build the goodwill that’s so useful in smoothing over cultural and organizational differences” (Kanter, 1995 p.107).

Drawing upon Kanter’s ideas, the proposed study shall integrate Leithwood’s leadership functions into a simpler scheme of three level (strategic, managerial, and operational) leadership structure in interorganizational partnership. The strategic level organizational leadership would formulate joint strategies, policies, and legal framework for the ABEGS partnership. The managerial level leadership is to make joint plan, projects, and programs and supervise implementation of the policies made by the strategic leaders with close coordination and collaboration amongst member states. The operational level leadership would be responsible for the day to day implementation of these plans, projects, and programs. The operational leaders need to establish close communication and coordination within the leadership structures of the Arab Bureau and
maintain close contact with all the stakeholders in the member states. For details, please see the conceptual framework of this proposal in Chapter 4.

3.2 Interorganizational Functions and Processes

Most of the functions and processes highlighted in the literature specific to the interorganizational partnership environment can be understood as instances of cooperation, coordination, and collaboration. The literature review for this study explains some features pertaining to coordination and collaboration that have been distinctly conceptualized in the context of interorganizational partnerships.

Coordination can be understood as a situation when two or more parties agree to work together with their own clearly separate agenda. They help each other but not to achieve combined goals. Cooperation is common and often considered an essential trait of circumstances that involves coordination or collaboration between the parties engaged in a partnership arrangement.

Researchers provide various dimensions of coordination as an important function or process performed in organizing interorganizational relationships. Herranz (2008) discussed four managerial approaches to undertake interorganizational coordination. These approaches represent passive to active continuum of managerial behaviour covering reactive facilitation, contingent coordination, active coordination, and hierarchical-based directive administration. The reactive facilitation perspective suggests that partnership coordination primarily relies on managers emphasizing social interactions rather procedural mechanisms or financial incentives. “The contingent approach may be well suited to identifying, supporting, and sustaining special contingent
services that enjoy high levels of reciprocated interest within the partnership” (p.5). Active coordination is demonstrated by the use of vertical authority, jurisdictional management, and direct managerial action. It relates to the typical use of public administration functions such as POSDCORB (planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting). The hierarchical-based directive administration proposes to use authoritative and bureaucratic procedural mechanisms rather than social and incentive based mechanisms.

Litwak and Hylton (1962) presented a theory of interorganizational coordination based on organizational interdependence, level of organizational awareness, and standardization of organizational activities. They think that coordination develops and continues if organizations are interdependent, aware of their interdependence, and work in standardized units to perform tasks of common interest. Coordination should grow both in periods of prosperity and adversity, since greater interdependence can be expected in both these periods. Research shows that resource interdependence, goal congruence, and mutual trust increase interorganizational cooperation. Lundin (2007) found that mutual trust is necessary if goal congruence is to increase cooperation between partner organizations.

Collaboration is a situation where two or more parties work together with combined resources, to achieve common goals. According to Hord (1986) collaboration is possible when mutual gain is sufficiently heightened, the mutual engagement of interorganizational actors in a collaborated effort is efficient in terms of time, and sharing is grounded in continued communication. Collaborating organizations share financial, human, and physical resources to achieve combined goals. Collaborating leaders promote
similar activities in their own organizations. The partnership leaders create a more flexible environment and move closer to collaboration when they are willing to relinquish personal control and assume more risk. Patience, persistence, enthusiasm, and willingness to share are some of the essential personal traits of leaders that help strengthen collaborative environment in an interorganizational partnership. Darlington and Judith (2008) seem to agree with Hord when they suggest having better communication, adequate resources, appropriate services, and knowledgeable professionals for improved collaboration in interorganizational partnership. Similarly, Keast and Hampson (2007) also emphasize resource sharing and improved communication for collaborative advantage. However, they also add that the member organizations are expected to monitor relationships and activities, establish innovative culture, and deal with conflicting situations constructively. Byrne and Hansberry (2007) indentify some common challenges such as incompatible organizational culture, discrepancy in partner expectations, output process and quality of work by participating individuals or parties, equitable mutual contribution of resources, and overstepping the boundaries of authority. These problems may arise in interorganizational collaborations and may be corrected by shared priorities, clarifying differences, building institutional support for collaboration, working on existing strengths, and fostering the development of champions. Mandated collaborations are inherently viewed as a political process. Mandated partnerships are generally found in the public sector or between state governments. They are regulated by contractual, bureaucratic and authoritative mechanisms (Rodríguez et al. 2007).

A collaborative partnership leadership structure should be representative of all major participants and be expanded or reorganized to accommodate changes in
membership and mission. They must be prepared to revisit and renegotiate their terms as conditions change or new challenges arise.

Mawhinney (1993) proposed that interagency interactions can be placed along a continuum of cooperation that ranges from coordination to collaboration. The coordination and collaboration models at polar ends of this continuum are both valued models, but each serves a unique purpose and yields a different return.

Cooperation

Coordination

Collaboration

I have so far discussed cooperation, collaboration, and coordination as major managerial work processes performed in interorganizational partnership environment. These processes are performed either by voluntary means or by mandated arrangements. Different organizations join hands to work together to achieve their common or complementary goals. The interorganizational partnerships are formed by formal or informal methods. Some of the formal methods could be signing contracts with clearly written down mutual expectations or some partnerships come into existence by informal means such as occasional communication or informal social interaction. The processes of cooperation, coordination, and collaboration offer numerous advantages to the members of interorganizational partnerships. However, partnerships may present challenges like reciprocal scarcity of complementary resources drawn from the same sources, similar or competing goals, complete or excessive dependence of some partners, self interest, and negative interpersonal relations. The conceptual framework of this study contains details how the leadership functions such as setting directions, developing
people, re-designing the organization, managing the partnership program, and securing accountability performed by leaders working at strategic, managerial, and operational levels to promote cooperation, collaboration, and coordination amongst partner organizations will be examined.

3.3 Literature Review Conclusion

The aim of this literature review was to acquire knowledge about various structural formations, leadership/governance mechanisms employed, and processes/functions performed in interorganizational partnership environment. I learned that interorganizational relations is an emerging and rapidly growing field of study that covers many disciplines including organizational theory, public administration, healthcare services, communication, and computer science. The structures, leadership/governance mechanisms and processes/functions of interorganizational partnerships vary according to their specific and combined mission, structural formation, regional location, voluntary or mandated partnership arrangements, common challenges, resource sharing, joint planning, shared or complementary interests, and the impact of internal and external organizational environments. The existing literature provides different typologies of interorganizational partnerships. The classification of partnership structures provided by the Strategy, Structure and Performance Model presented by Evan and Klemm (1980) covers most of the partnership formations discussed in the literature. This model talks about four structures of interorganizational arrangements, a consortium, a joint venture, a merger, and a corporate management system.
Leadership in an interorganizational partnership is considered an important component of its structure (Proven et al, 2007). The importance of this component can be appreciated by realizing the fact that leadership mostly plays the role of the creator of partnerships. This argument leads to the proposition that leadership exists prior to the creation of the structure of an interorganizational partnership. Perhaps this is the reason why researchers like Barden and Mitchell (2007) pay attention to the leader to leader relations. They are of the view that relations between leaders prior to the interorganizational exchange increase the likelihood of subsequent exchange between the participating organizations in partnerships. This idea proposes to believe that leadership exists prior to the creation of the structures of interorganizational arrangements. Leaders are the architects of the structures of interorganizational partnerships. They actually make and maintain these partnerships.

Leithwood et al., (2008) indicate that “both leaders and followers engage in practices that need to be understood and the context or situation in which they interact has important influences on what both the leaders and followers do in response to one another. One of the most important missions for leadership research is to uncover those leadership behaviours or practices that have predictable and desirable influences on followers, especially influences that can be predicted across a significant range of contexts or situations” (p.228). Leithwood and his colleagues further maintain that the performance of leadership functions (setting directions, structuring the organization, developing capacity, and managing the program) is consciously aligned across the sources of leadership. The proposed study, therefore, offers a new context of
interorganizational partnership in the developing world to examine various sources of
leadership and patterns of leadership distribution in a partnership environment.

Multiple mechanisms of influence, control and management help define
leadership and the system of governance in interorganizational partnerships. The
financial and material share of member organizations, expertise and knowledge of the
participating human resources, given mandate, contractual obligations, goals, objectives
and overall size of the member organizations play pivotal role in finalizing the system of
governance and leadership in a partnership. This also depends on voluntary or mandated
setup of the partnership.

The scholars in the field discuss several types of leadership in the environment of
interorganizational partnerships. Proven et al, (2007) talk about shared leadership, lead
organization mechanism, and leadership based on an administrative organization. The
leadership approaches found in this classification are purely based on mutually agreed
upon managerial and administrative principles by the member organizations. Some other
leadership types are known as bureaucratic mechanisms, market-based mechanisms, and
clan-based mechanisms, found mainly in the mandated partnerships (Rodríguez, et al,
2007). The bureaucratic mechanisms generally rely on hierarchy, formal regulations, and
administrative control. The market-based leadership mainly depends on incentives and
manipulation of interests of the partner organizations. The clan-based leadership gains
power through shared values, face to face communication, and socialization in common
activities. Kickert et al (1997) talk about monocentric (centralized) hierarchy and
horizontal autonomy, Benson (1975) envisaged leadership as incentive versus authority
based. Some other researchers join the same camp and visualize leadership employing
either autocratic or democratic governance mechanisms. The findings of the studies of this group can easily be placed on a continuum that would show two extreme ends. One end of this continuum would represent centralized hierarchy which is significantly based on the tools such as executive authority, procedural directives, and obligated responsibilities. The other end would represent shared leadership relying on instruments for instance covenants, incentives, socialization, and flexible communication tools.

The above discussion proposes two main categories of leadership approaches in partnership environments, first is authority based which is vertically centralized and second is shared leadership that is flat and distributive. The significant body of existing literature visualizes leadership either vertically centralized or horizontally distributive in interorganizational partnerships.

The proposed conceptual framework for my study reflects an alternative with respect to interorganizational leadership mechanisms. This framework visualizes an integrated picture of vertical and horizontal leadership together and calls it circular leadership (Figure-9). The discussion of the conceptual framework that follows includes more discussion on this argument.

Cooperation, coordination, and collaboration, are some of the processes exist in the environment of interorganizational partnerships for the fulfilment of interdependent needs. The participating organizations contribute or exchange their resources and apply these functions to satisfy their complementary requirements. They engage in multiple mutual services by voluntary or mandated arrangements. Different meanings are associated to each of the above listed processes. For instance, Herranz (2008) examines
interorganizational coordination on a continuum covering passive to active managerial behaviour. Four approaches placed on a continuum from passive to active end are reactive facilitation, contingent coordination, active coordination, and hierarchical-based directive administration. Mawhinney (1993) places the coordination and collaboration models at polar ends of a continuum. She maintains that each serves a unique purpose and yields different results. The analysis of these concepts unfold that collaboration is a joint effort of partners to achieve combined objectives and coordination is a process of mutual cooperation to help partner organizations to achieve their distinct individual organizational aims.

The study in hand aims to look at leadership, structures, and processes of interorganizational partnerships using the Arab Bureau of Education for the Gulf States (ABEGS) also known as Arab Bureau as a case study which is a partnership of seven Arabian Gulf States. The above review of existing literature provides a synthesized picture on the structures of interorganizational partnership, contemporary leadership mechanisms, and processes of interorganizational partnerships in the developed world. The knowledge acquired through this literature review will guide my research to (1) understand the kind of organizational structures established by the Arab Bureau, (2) leadership mechanisms and distribution of various leadership functions within the strategic, managerial, and operational structures in the ABEGS partnership, and (3) processes adopted by the ABEGS partnership in the Arabian Gulf Region.
CHAPTER 4 - CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND METHODOLOGY

The discussion on the leadership mechanisms in partnership environment suggests that interorganizational partnerships may have two main categories of leadership mechanisms: (a) authority-based mechanisms or (b) shared leadership. Authority-based leadership is vertically structured and shared leadership is horizontally distributive. The vertical structures use influence and direction from top to bottom and horizontal structures are based on power sharing across the entire partnership which is considered inclusive, consultative, and collaborative. The conceptual framework for this study specifically with respect to interorganizational leadership mechanisms envisages an integrated picture of vertical and horizontal leadership together and names it as `Circular Leadership`. The Circular Model of Interorganizational Leadership (Figure-9) shows the presence of both vertical and horizontal leadership together in a partnership environment. The vertical hierarchy is structured through the organizational administrative levels (strategic, managerial, and operational) in the matters of individual participating organization (represented by any one triangle in the model) as well as in the affairs of partnership (represented by all triangles together). Leadership is structured horizontally in the context of partnership at the relevant leadership levels. For instance all leaders at the strategic level from partner organizations are shown at the same level. The same is true for the managerial and operational levels. The permeable boundaries reflect mutual interaction and possible mutual impact. The external environments (social, economic, and political) of the partnership are equally important. They have the capacity to influence the partnership. This model helps to interpret and understand relationships between the leadership of participating organizations within the partnership environment.
Drawing upon the studies connected to organizational theory and public administration in the literature review, the main purpose of the study is to examine the relationships between the leadership patterns and the partnership structures. The focus is to explore various sources of leadership and understand how leadership for the interorganizational partnership is distributed within the partnership at different levels and between levels (strategic, managerial, and operational).

The proposed framework of leadership for this study shall be based on Leithwood’s core leadership functions (setting directions, redesigning the organization, developing capacity, and managing the partnership program). Securing accountability is considered another important leadership function within the organizational context. Leithwood and colleagues did not find much evidence for securing accountability as a core leadership function in their research in the context of developed countries. However, theorists on the organizational research combine ‘power with purpose’ (Ranson, 2003) and believe accountability an essential component of an organization. This study therefore will also explore leadership practices with regard to securing accountability in the ABEGS partnership.

The framework will help identify and explore factors that influence leadership, distribution, and interactions across leadership functions in the partnership environment.
Figure 8: Circular Model of Interorganizational Leadership (Proposed)

A = Leadership at Strategic Level
B = Leadership at Managerial Level
C = Leadership at Operational Level
D = External Environments of the Interorganizational Partnership
● = People
The matrix was a useful tool for triangulating the data from all the interviews. The triangulation process increased my confidence in the validity of the findings that emerged in the analysis and that are highlighted in the text are supported by multiple sources.
I used this matrix to integrate and analyze data collected on the core leadership functions with specific leadership practices and their distribution at different levels of the interorganizational partnership. In view of the specific jobs assigned to different organizational levels in the partnerships, strategic level leadership is responsible to formulate policies and programs. Managerial level leadership undertakes the supervision of the implementation of those policies and programs. The operational level leadership does the day to day implementation of all the policies and programs of the partnership.

4.0 Methodology

The main strategy in this research is to investigate a case of a partnership and undertake in-depth analysis of interorganizational leadership within its strategic, managerial, and operational structures. I selected the Arab Bureau of Education for the Gulf States (ABEGS) as a case study. The intention was to investigate the ABEGS’ headquarters for strategic and two of its institutions for in-depth analysis of leadership at the managerial and operational levels in the environment of an interorganizational partnership. I selected the following two institutions:

1. The Gulf Arab States Educational Research Centre (GASERC) Kuwait established in 1977.
2. The Arab Educational Training Centre for Gulf States (AETCGS) Doha Qatar created in 1999.

These two institutions are integral part of the ABEGS’ structure. The reason why I selected these offices is their age, maturity, and their primary focus on education. The research center Kuwait and the training center Doha were explored to provide evidence of managerial and operational work of the Arab Bureau as these offices maintain the earliest and longest history of this partnership.
I collected data from the occupants of key positions at the strategic, managerial, and operational levels in the ABEGS and in two above listed initiatives by using qualitative research methods. This study is based on face to face semi-structured interviews and data collected from administrative documentation of this partnership. The qualitative data helped accommodate diverse perspectives that assisted me to collect and interpret data for appropriate analysis.

4.1 Semi Structured Interviews

According to Merriam (1998) in all forms of qualitative research, some and occasionally all of the data are collected through interviews. The most common form of interview is the person – to – person encounter in which one person elicits information from another. Interviews help find out feelings, thoughts, opinions, and intentions. The researcher may explore things happened in the past. The main purpose of interviewing is to enter into the other person’s perspective. Interview is also the best technique to use when conducting intensive case study of a few selected individuals (pp. 71-72).

I used semi-structured interviews for data collection. The largest part of the interview is guided by a list of thematic questions and issues to be explored in the study. A thematic guide of the interview questions is enclosed as Appendix - B. I planned to interview three categories of participants working at the: (a). strategic; (b). managerial; and (c). operational levels of the ABEGS partnership. The questions, therefore, slightly varied according to levels of the respondents in the partnership. This flexibility allowed me to respond to the organizational context of the subjects and the situation at hand.
I also conducted one pilot interview from an individual belonging to each level. The pilot interviews gave me an opportunity to check appropriateness of the concepts used in the interview guide. I made appropriate modifications in questions after pilot interviews. I also used probe questions asking for more details and clarifications.

The interviews were conducted in two languages English and Arabic\textsuperscript{15}. All the participants of this study were highly qualified people. Most of them had degrees from the North American and European universities. All participants had the ability to understand English language however half of the participants preferred to speak in Arabic. The remaining half gave their responses in English language. The participants of this study were not native English people so some of them were not very good in their English communication. I have mentioned in my thesis exact words that they used in their interviews. These quotes might have some grammatical errors but I did not want to compromise on the meaning conveyed by exact quotations.

I am not a native Arab though I could understand a few words here and there. I therefore needed help of interpreters for interviewees who preferred Arabic language. The interpreters helped in 10 interviews. It was an advantage to find interpreters from within the organizations as they were familiar with organizational work and knew the jargons of the field. There was a remote chance for any misinterpretations because all interviewees knew the English language so they were able to understand the translated responses. It so happened in a few interviews that interviewee started answering in Arabic and then switched to the English language. Some of the interview subjects were not fluent speakers in English and preferred to be interviewed in Arabic. However they

\textsuperscript{15} The Arabic language was used by some of the interviewees. The Arabic responses were translated by interpreters. The researcher used English language during interviews.
all understood English well. As a result, it sometimes happened that the subjects intervened when they did not agree with the interpreter’s translation of their remarks. This increased my confidence in the accuracy of the translations. Despite all the above mentioned advantages, all interviews in English language would have been a better option.

In addition to the language, another limitation that I experienced as a foreign researcher was the Arab culture. It was because of this reason I was unable to collect data on the micro politics of the Arabian organizational culture. My access was limited to the top level leadership engaged at the strategic, managerial, and operational levels of the Arab Bureau partnership. This study therefore does not comment on the micro politics of the Arab Bureau that may have some effect on the leadership behaviour.

4.2 Snowball Sampling

The population for this study is the total number of employees working for this partnership at all levels (strategic, managerial, and operational) in all the offices of this partnership in seven member states. The estimated figure of this is not more than one hundred and fifty individuals. I decided to use snowball sampling which was an appropriate method because I was able start with initially identified participants who referred me to other participants with like or similar characteristics. So having gone through the interview process with me the officers belonging to strategic, managerial, and operational levels were able to recommend suitable participants for this study at their level. I therefore randomly selected six people from the following information rich individuals (initial list) working at the strategic, managerial, and operational levels in this partnership.
I purposively prepared a list of potential interview candidates. The interviewees of the first round were randomly chosen from this list. The snowball sampling process in the second and third rounds of interviews was to ensure that those selected would have the knowledge to act as key informants. I requested to each person in the first batch of interviewees to recommend three individuals working at three different levels in the partnership. The total estimated recommendations were eighteen at each stage. At this stage I randomly selected six people from the recommended employees. I have had three rounds of this kind after the interviews of the first batch. I was able to interview twenty people in total and eight persons from each level (strategic, managerial, and operational). The entire picture of sampling is depicted in the following matrix.
Table – 1 Snowball Sampling Interview Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Recommended Individuals</th>
<th>Randomly Selected</th>
<th>Strategic Level</th>
<th>Managerial Level</th>
<th>Operational Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Batch</td>
<td>15 (Initial list)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Batch</td>
<td>18 (1st Round)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Batch</td>
<td>18 (2nd Round)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Batch</td>
<td>18 (3rd Round)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table – 2 Snowball Sampling Interviews Data Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Recommended Individuals</th>
<th>Randomly Selected</th>
<th>Strategic Level</th>
<th>Managerial Level</th>
<th>Operational Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Batch</td>
<td>15 (Initial list)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Batch</td>
<td>18 (1st Round)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Batch</td>
<td>18 (2nd Round)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Batch</td>
<td>18 (3rd Round)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>20*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Number of interviews completed

The total estimated number of employees at three levels (strategic, managerial, and operational) of this partnership is one hundred and fifty and the number of anticipated interviews was twenty four. I was able to complete twenty interviews from three places Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and Doha Qatar. People were willing to be interviewed but, I could not complete the intended number of interviews due to busy traveling schedule of some of the anticipated participants of the study.
I directly contacted all the randomly selected individuals through telephone at the end of each round of recommendations. I informed the potential interviewees about (a) the purpose of the study; (b) interview process; (c) and estimated time required for the interview. The study includes only those individuals as interviewees who are actively involved in the working of the partnership plans and programmes.

4.3 Document Analysis

In addition to face to face interviews another strategy used for data collection in this study was to examine administrative documentation such as file notes, memos, minutes of meetings, agreements, policy documentation, related legislation, rules and regulations, publications, related videos, pictures, etc. “One of the greatest advantages in using documentary material is its stability. ...The presence of the investigator does not alter what is being studied. Documentary data are “objective” sources of data compared to other forms. ... Documentary data are particularly good sources for qualitative case studies because they can ground an investigation in the context of the problem being investigated” (Merriam, 1998 p.126). In addition to the administrative documentation multiple data sources such as websites, press releases, research reports, pamphlets, were also included to enrich the study.

The research sites of my study i.e. the ABEGS headquarters Riyadh Saudi Arabia and the GASERC (the research centre) Kuwait are in existence for more than thirty years. The AETCGS (training centre) Doha is functioning for more than ten years. The challenge associated to the document analysis was, therefore, the existing volume of documentation that has been saved over the last thirty five years.
I devised a sampling strategy to examine relevant documentation so as to complete this study efficiently. I divided thirty years period into three phases of ten years each. They are called `foundation`, `progression`, and contemporary phase respectively. The anticipated material was to cover these phases as per scheme depicted in the following matrix.

Matrix-III: Documents Analysis Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Retrieved From</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foundation Phase</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1 and 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Progression Phase</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 15 and 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contemporary Phase</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last three years (year 28, 29, &amp; 30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In view of the above mentioned scheme, I analyzed minutes of the meetings, organizational charts, office notes, and communication between the partners that provide crucial information on administrative and financial decision making of the partnership (See Appendix-I). I used some of the following questions (Guba and Lincoln, 1981-citing Clark, 1967) to determine the validity and relevance of documents to be consulted.

What is the history of the document?

How did it come to my hands?

Who was/is the author?

For whom the document was intended? (pp. 238-239).

I prepared a list of major themes emerging from data coded and catalogued data according to these themes for the analysis. As discussed earlier Matrix–I was used to organize interview and document data into core leadership functions, leadership levels,
and key processes/outcome. In addition to this Matrix-I., I used a Document Analysis Guide attached as Appendix - C. This guide helped organize, synthesize, and analyze data retrieved from documents.

In view of the volume of documentary data it is inevitable to make a clarification that the primary source of the data collection and analysis for this study remained face to face interviews.

4.4 Questionnaire for Data Collection

The rationale of using questionnaire for data collection was non availability of high profile participants for long time interview duration. It was difficult in view of time constraint to touch upon all core leadership functions and 21 leadership practices in each interview. I therefore tried to cover as much ground as possible in interviewing the participants and asking the same people to fill in a questionnaire for me that was designed to ensure the collection of data across all categories of practice from all participants in a systematic way. Thus, I was able to collect data by conducting face to face interviews, consulting documents, and by administering questionnaire. When I talk about core leadership functions I mean the four sets of core leadership functions including setting directions, developing people, restructuring the organization, managing the (partnership) programme and 15 specific practices identified by Leithwood and his colleagues as a result of their extensive research in educational and non-educational organizational contexts in the developed world. (Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D., 1999; Leithwood, K., & Duke, D. L., 1998; Leithwood, K., Louis, K. S., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K., 2004; Leithwood & Riehl, 2005; Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & McElheron-Hopkins, C., 2006; Leithwood, K., Steinbach, R., & Jantzi, D., 2002; Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins,
D., 2008; Day, C., Leithwood, K., & Sammons, P. 2008). Considering its importance as an integral managerial and organizational dimension I included ‘securing accountability’ in this study as a fifth set of core leadership function with its six specific leadership practices. The questionnaire was a time effective way to get response on all five core leadership functions with twenty one specific leadership practices.

This thesis research explored aforementioned five sets of core leadership functions and 21 specific practices in an interorganizational partnership context in the developing world using a case study of the Arab Bureau of Education for the Gulf States (ABEGS) which is a partnership of seven countries in the Arabian Gulf region. The data collected through this questionnaire helped analyze how interorganizational leadership is distributed within the core leadership functions and specific practices. The major analysis of leadership distribution has been conducted based on the data collected by qualitative interviews. However, I have also undertaken a comparative analysis how different leadership functions and practices are distributed amongst various organizational levels such as strategic, managerial, and operational within the Arab Bureau as an interorganizational partnership. The questionnaire was designed with a Likert scale. A copy of the questionnaire with its Arabic language version is enclosed as Appendix – D. I asked the participants, ‘how frequently do they perform leadership practices’? The participants responded to the question on the following scale items:

1  =  Never at all
2  =  Seldom
3  =  Sometimes
4  =  Frequently
5  =  Very Frequently
NA= Not Applicable
The questionnaire data were injected in the Matrix – II as an Excel file so as to calculate responses on the performance of different leadership practices from within five core leadership functions. The analysis of data acquired through this questionnaire helped identify what leadership functions and specific practices are being used more than others overall in the Arab Bureau. I have also examined how these leadership functions and specific practices are distributed within the three organizational levels i.e. strategic, managerial, and operational. The data analysis also allowed me to decipher which practices are used more frequently than others at which level. I was able to undertake comparative analysis between different institutions at the Arab Bureau as an interorganizational partnership. The data was collected from a research institute and also from a training institute of the same partnership. I therefore made a comparative analysis of what leadership functions and specific practices are used more than others in a research institute and in a training institute separately and comparatively. The graphical presentation of data analysis using bar charts, pie charts, matrixes, and tables are included in the main body of this thesis and in the form of appendices. The quotes are used from qualitative data that I collected by interviewing officers in the Arab Bureau.

4.5 Data processing, management, and analysis

The audio data taken through all the interviews were initially saved on a digital recorder. The data taken from the documents and field notes were recorded on the Document Analysis Guide and subsequently typed into the computer. A few backup copies of the entire audio data were made on compact disks and stored at a secure location to avoid any data loss. I transcribed\(^\text{16}\), transferred, and indexed the audio data on

\(^{16}\) A sample transcript of an interview is attached as “Appendix – E”.
my computer. While I was transcribing the data, I recorded analytical comments as side notes so as to link the data with my research questions. I was concurrently identifying themes emerging from the data and putting them in my side notes as well. I saved this data on another computer and prepared a backup copy on a compact disk.

I read the data many times to categorize and cluster into themes connected to the main research questions and the conceptual framework of this study for subsequent analysis. Categorization is based on frequency i.e. the number of people who mention an idea, unique insights, emotional responses, and the explicit expression of the respondents. The Matrix- I has the capacity to absorb and organize all the major categories of the collected data. For instance, this matrix has the space for the data connected to core leadership functions with its division into different leadership levels i.e. strategic, managerial, and operational. This matrix is used as a storehouse for most of the collected data through face to face interviews and document consultation. The Document Analysis Guide is also used for data management and analysis for the information retrieved from official documents.

**4.6 Significance of the Study**

Interorganizational partnerships exist in numerous fields including education. Knowledge regarding these partnerships in the areas of health, business, computer, and environmental sciences is increasing enormously at a rapid speed due to regular and extensive research in these areas specifically in the developed world. On the contrary we know very little about the partnerships working for the educational administration and development especially in the developing world. The study in hand is a step forward in
this direction. It is important to note that educational partnerships in the developing world offer enormous potential for research in numerous areas. Experts in the field may initiate research projects to explore issues connected to educational organizations’ administration, and policy in the developing world. The main focus of this study will be on the distribution of leadership functions and practices within an interorganizational partnership. Most of the leadership research has been carried out in Western and Northern regions of the developed world. This will be interesting to study leadership distribution in interorganizational partnerships in the developing world context as well. The need to study and promote interorganizational cooperation in the sector of educational administration in the developing world should be recognized.

This research shall contribute some knowledge with respect to the leadership issues, its sources, and distribution in interorganizational partnership environments. The study shall examine how core leadership functions researched by Leithwood are integrated into interorganizational partnerships. The research shall also investigate how vertical and horizontal dimensions of organizational leadership are integrated into a circular leadership for partnerships. This study will identify potential areas for future research projects and guide this work to understand leadership issues in the context of interorganizational partnership environments. The findings of this study may draw the attention of administrators working in private, public, and corporate sector organizations. The policy makers, researchers, and management professionals may equally benefit from the results of this study. I anticipate applicability of many findings of this study in multiple ways covering a wide variety of aspects of numerous social disciplines.
This study will be potentially used by the policy makers, managers, and public sector educationists to design productive educational policies in the developing world.
CHAPTER 5 – STRUCTURAL FORMATION OF THE ABEGS PARTNERSHIP

This chapter analyzes the structural formation of the Arab Bureau as an interorganizational partnership. The connection between the literature review, conceptual framework, and findings of the study will be uncovered. The first section of this chapter explains how I conceptualized the ABEGS partnership structures before the data collection. The later part of the chapter integrates my learning based on the literature review and data analysis into the conceptual framework of this study. The chapter will reflect the changes brought by the data analysis into my conceptualization of the ABEGS partnership structures.

In order to undertake appropriate data analysis a clear understanding of the structures of the Arab Bureau is necessary. The conceptual framework as depicted in Figure-8 envisages the ABEGS partnership as a three level interorganizational administrative leadership structure. These levels are:

1. Strategic Leadership: Inner most circle.
2. Managerial Leadership: Second circle from inside
3. Operational Leadership: Third circle from inside

The entire organizational structure of this partnership is surrounded by an outer socio economic and political environment. This model acknowledges the possible impact of each level on the other levels which is shown by porous lines between the circles. The outer environment may have social, economic, and political influence on the structures of this partnership.
The evidence found in the data that I collected suggests another level in the administrative and leadership structures of the ABEGS as an interorganizational partnership. This level is found in the inner most core of the entire structure of the ABEGS partnership. I call it “visionary leadership” The visionary leadership at the core of the ABEGS partnership structure is comprised of the heads of the states, members of the royal families, members of the parliaments, cabinet ministers of the member states, and the political leadership at the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC).

Big plans come from big leaders... political leaders, kings & princes.
The directives may come from the top political leaders (Information Officer Riyadh)

The major source of visionary leadership is the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) where the vision is expressed and then this vision provides direction and influence on the working of the strategic, managerial, and operational levels of the ABEGS partnership. As mentioned by a participant of this study, “when decisions come from GCC they have the priority for implementation (Secretary General Conference meetings, Riyadh)” The visionary leadership is not very actively involved in the working of the ABEGS partnership. However, leaders at that level may offer their advice, guidance, and vision if they like. The strategic leadership at the Arab Bureau respects the leadership at the visionary level and follows the given advice. Policies are formulated according to the vision expressed by visionary leaders. The establishment of King Abdullah University of Science & Technology can be quoted as an actual example.

“the vision comes from GCC … for example the idea of the project of the King Abdullah University of Science & Technology came
from GCC… Sometimes the members of the royal families provide vision for education (Administrative & Finance Officer, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia)

The political leadership for the ABEGS and the GCC is the same. Both these partnerships are constituted by the same member states (except Yemen) of the Arabian Gulf region. Yemen is the seventh member state of the ABEGS, the remaining six Arab States are members of both partnerships the GCC and the ABEGS.

A major difference between these two partnerships is the nature of their work. The GCC concentrates on politics, economy, health, natural resources, defence, higher education, etc., whereas, the ABEGS is completely focused on education from KG to grade 12 in the Arab region. The “visionary leadership” is now reflected in the revised ‘Circular Model of the Interorganizational Leadership’. See Figure – 9.

**Figure 9: Circular Model of Interorganizational Leadership (Revised)**
Visionary leadership for the ABEGS partnership is supreme political leadership (Kings and heads of states and governments) of the Arabian Gulf Region mainly six Gulf States\textsuperscript{17}. The visionary leaders empower, energize, and inspire strategic and managerial leaders by articulating macro vision for this partnership.

The difference between visionary and strategic leadership comes when the macro level vision given by the visionary leadership is translated into organizational goals by strategic leaders for setting short and long term direction for the organization. Strategic leaders formulate policies, plans, and programs for the Arab Bureau. They are actively involved in all matters whereas visionary leadership keeps an eye on overall performance of the partnership and provide occasional direction.

In view of its goals and objectives GCC is a visionary platform for many organizations, institutions, and partnerships in the Arab Gulf region. The Arab Bureau works for education under the visionary umbrella of the GCC.

GCC provides the main outline [vision] to the General Conference of the ABEGS. This outline is taken by the Arab Educational groups and then they implement that outline as the education policy in the field. This outline is not obligatory on the member states to follow. However they can take these suggestions as their vision. … The GCC has a deep impact on the overall work of the ABEGS. They are separate partnerships but they cooperate with each other (Education Officer, GASERC Kuwait).

In addition to the inner core the outer circle of the socio economic and political environment remains intact and its capacity to influence the inside atmosphere of the

\textsuperscript{17} United Arab Emirates (UAE), Bahrain, Kuwait, Kingdom Saudi Arabia, Qatar, and Oman
partnership remains unchanged. The interview data also reflects the impact of outside environment on the inside conditions of the organization. I would like to quote an example of the influence of outside environment on the inside structure of the Arab Bureau. Some officers in Riyadh headquarters mentioned that due to financial constraints and because of the advancement in computer technology the size of the workforce was reduced.

when I came here the employees were 120 and now they are 50 … the reason what they say is money, the work now is getting harder and harder the work of 120 people is now being done by 50 so now one person is doing the work of 3 or 4 people … they [say] that we give you the computer, this machine is good to work for ten persons (An officer in Riyadh)

The above statement mentions “money” and the “computers” as the reasons of downsizing in the Arab Bureau. The financial stress was felt because of Iraq and Kuwait war consequently Iraq’s exclusion from the ABEGS partnership. The dismissal of Iraq resulted in substantial loss of money for the Arab Bureau. The bureau had to reduce manpower to save money.

The major factor was Iraq’s exclusion. Iraq was contributing 21% of the total finance to run the Bureau. The Bureau had a financial setback and we had to do it (Finance Officer Riyadh).

The advancement of computer technology was another outside organizational environment factor that influenced inside work of the ABEGS partnership. This example explains how outside political, economic, and technological environment can impact the working of the Arab Bureau.
According to Leithwood and colleagues, “restructuring the organization” and “managing the (partnership) program” are two major functions performed by the organizational leadership. I learnt from the aforementioned discussion that changes in the outside political, social, economic and technological, environmental conditions in the Arabian Gulf Region influence the leadership at the ABEGS to perform these leadership functions. For instance, Iraq’s invasion in Kuwait was a political condition that influenced the leaders of the ABEGS to restructure the organization. The leaders of the Bureau therefore dismissed Iraq’s membership of the Arab Bureau. Another example is of the advanced digital outside organizational environment when the leaders of the Arab Bureau partnership decided to modernize information technology of the Bureau so as to “facilitate work in the partnership” which is a specific leadership practice. Staffing the partnership programme is one of the leadership practices exercised by the leaders of the Arab Bureau when they downsized the work force of the Bureau to mitigate problems posed by the reduced financial resources.

5.0 The Arab Bureau (ABEGS) is a Joint Venture

The Strategy, Structure and Performance Model presented by Evan and Klemm (1980) talks about four structures of interorganizational arrangements, a consortium, a joint venture, a merger, and a corporate management system (Please see footnote #9 for detailed definitions in the literature review). This classification of interorganizational partnerships covers multiple types of interorganizational partnership structures. As explained by the Strategy, Structure and Performance Model “in a joint venture, two or more [organizations] enter into a legal agreement whereby they jointly establish, operate, and control a separate ...facility while maintaining their own individual organizational
identities”. The structural formation of the ABEGS partnership completely fits in the aforementioned criteria of a joint venture.

The ABEGS is an intergovernmental or interstate partnership that works through the Ministries of Education of the member countries. The member states entered into a legal agreement and jointly established a separate facility by the name of the Arab Bureau of Education for the Gulf States (ABEGS) with its headquarters in Riyadh. The member states maintain their sovereignty, the governments work in this partnership with their own identities, and the ministries of education of the member states follow the directives of their own governments while working with the ABEGS. I did not note merger of any kind at any level in this interorganizational partnership. The ABEGS is being controlled and operated by two joint strategic bodies i.e. the General Conference and the Executive Board. These bodies have established a number of institutions such as the GASERC and AETCGS under the umbrella of the ABEGS. The ABEGS is therefore a joint venture established by the Arabian Gulf Sates.
CHAPTER 6 – INFLUENCING FACTORS ON LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOUR IN THE ARAB BUREAU

The part of my first research question for this study is to explore sources of leadership in interorganizational partnership environments using the Arab Bureau as a case study. It is important to note how I understand the meaning of leadership. The simplest definition of leadership to my mind is to “influence and provide direction” to achieve desired objectives. It could be an individual, an organization, an idea, a group of individuals, official position, or a process that leads to exert influence and provide direction. In view of this definition of leadership and the data in hand this chapter is divided into two sections. The first section will explore the factors that influence leadership in the Arab Bureau. The second part will examine how these factors influence leadership functions such as goal setting, managing the partnership program, restructuring the organization, human capacity building, and accountability. The data were collected from the ABEGS headquarters and its two initiatives the GASERC Kuwait and AETCGS Doha Qatar. This data provide rich evidence for multiple factors that influence leadership, including consultative process, position in hierarchy, individual knowledge and experience, and dedication and commitment.

Leadership can be conceptualized and studied as both an individual phenomenon and as an organizational phenomenon. The former orients us toward an analysis of the beliefs, actions, personal traits, and influence of individuals recognized by others as leaders within particular contexts. The organizational perspective suggests that leadership in any particular setting is unlikely to be constituted in the actions and influence of a solitary individual. Consequently, an understanding of leadership requires us to examine the variety of leadership sources, beliefs, actions, interactions, and influences
recognized by participants in those settings (Anderson et al. 2008, Page.111).

The participants of this study identified multiple factors that influence leadership in the Arab Bureau. These factors emerge either from the individual traits or organizational settings of the Arab Bureau as established by Anderson et al. (2008) in their research. Some influencing factors have their roots in the cultural beliefs and some come from the legal organizational structures, some are connected to the individual values and abilities, and some are embedded in the official organizational norms and procedures. I shall now discuss these factors with reference to the data that I collected from the Arab Bureau headquarters Saudi Arabia, its research center in Kuwait, and its training centre in Doha Qatar.

6.0 Consultative process

The participants of this study comprehend consultation in a variety of ways. Therefore, this chapter conceptualizes consultation as formal and informal discussions between individuals, conversations in office meetings, advice taken by experts, researchers, and scholars. It is also understood as exchange of views in national, regional and international conferences, seminars and symposiums, telephone talks, teleconferencing, communication through office memos with the purpose to seek or provide advice. Consultation does not mean the establishment of consensus or agreement. It is also not synonymous with democracy, though democratic systems of governance may employ some consultative processes. The purpose of democracy is to ascertain the majority view and act accordingly. Contrary to that consultation involves participation of different parties in written or spoken discussions that helps explore different aspects of
the matter under consideration. Consequently, this process may influence the opinion of leadership for decision making. However, it does not deprive the leadership of its prerogative to take decisions.

Consultation is found in all formal and informal official processes in the ABEGS and in its subordinate institutions. This process weaves through the strategic organizational levels at the ABEGS headquarters and goes deep into the grassroots levels in the schools and administrative offices of the ministries of education of the member states. This is the most prominent and visible factor that influences leadership for decision making at the strategic levels and provides direction to the managerial and operational levels of the Arab Bureau. The consultation in the ABEGS’ offices and institutions takes place through various means. Consultation is not confined to the inside actors of this partnership. The decision makers and administrators of this partnership hold consultations even outside the organizational boundaries of the Arab Bureau. As stated by the director training center Kuwait, “we consult with many international training institutions ... [and] some foreign universities such as the University of Connecticut, and the Institution of International Training Paris”. The Arab Bureau holds regular consultation with organizations such as the Arab League Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organization (ALECSO), the Islamic Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (ISESCO), and the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

6.0.1 Consultation Meetings (Tashawari) at the Strategic Level

The formal sessions of the General Conference of the ABEGS for the strategic decision making are convened biennially. The General Conference examines and
approves the biennial budget of the Arab Bureau, and discusses and takes decisions on
the programmes and projects of the Bureau. The leaders in this session review the
performance of the Bureau as well. In addition to regular two yearly sessions, the General
Conference meets every second year just for consultation. The consultation meeting is
called “Tashawari” which means “consultation”. Tashawari is an informal but important
meeting in the overall working environment of the Arab Bureau partnership. The
executives at all levels take this session very seriously. During interviews of the
participants of this study for data collection all officers at all administrative levels in three
countries mentioned “Tashawari” as an important context for strategic decision making in
the Arab Bureau. The following decisions taken by the Exectutive Board at the ABEGS as
mentioned in the minutes of the 68th meeting of the Executive Board reflect the
importance given to consultation (Tashawari).

The Executive Board after reviewing the memo of the Director General about what has been done with the coordination with the Ministry of Education in KSA to hold the 5th consulting meeting on Nov. 2009 in Saudi Arabia.

The executive board decides the following:

1- To send gratitude to the Ministry of Education in Saudi Arabia for the efforts exerted for the preparation of the 5th consulting meeting.

2- The Director General to communicate with the Member States in order to prepare the presentations of the excellent experiences (a presentation should not be more than 15 minutes)

3- The Director General is to put up the book about education development in the Member States in its final version in the light of the observations made by the board. (Minutes of the 68th meeting of the Executive Board)
Consultations at the strategic level seek many advantages for instance the ministers in this informal session have a chance to socialize with officers working at the lower levels. The consultation meetings provide a forum to the member states for sharing their experiences by making presentations to the members of General Conference in Tashawari meeings. The directions given in the decision number 2 in the above mentioned minutes of the 68th meeting of the Executive Board ask the Director General to establish coordination with the member states to prepare for these presentations. While talking about Tashawari the Director General mentioned these presentations.

After the General Conference meeting the ministers also meet the following year just for consultation “Tashawari”. So actually they meet every year. Once just for consultations and to review their unique and good experiences in their member states. There are presenters from each member state usually giving presentations about their best practices that they are doing and information about how they deal with daily problems in the education. This meeting is just for consultation. They also discuss if there is anything of urgent nature. In the General Conference, as I told you they look into the budget and evaluation of the performance of the Bureau. This is the unique opportunity for us to meet the ministers and to have their directions in what to do their needs in their ministries. They also exchange information, and we all find the ministers to be helpful and encouraging (A Senior Officer Riyadh).

Generally, these presentations are made by employees belonging to the operational levels of the ABEGS. Informal and frank communication is established between operational and strategic levels. These presentations of sharing excellent
experiences is a regular feature of consultative meetings (Tashawari). The presentations are followed up by a question and answer session. The discussion generated in these consultations (meetings, seminars, telephone conversations, office communication, etc.) that take place at the managerial and operational levels influence the decision making at the strategic level.

The consultative process guided the leaders of the Arab Bureau to perform many core leadership functions and specific leadership practices. The establishment and maintenance of subordinate institutions such as Research Centre Kuwait, Training Centre Doha, and Language Centre in Sharja\textsuperscript{18} involved setting directions for individual institutions contributing towards the completion of many assigned tasks by the ABEGS partnership. The Board of Trustees, the management of each subordinate institution, and the Arab Bureau headquarters articulate vision and set goals with mutual consultations and strive to achieve these goals and objectives. The director of the training centre mentioned that “the members of the Board of Trustees document the final goals. So there are three organizations Board of Trustees, Executive Board, and the General conference – they are the ones who have meetings and have communication through the correspondence frame the organizational goals”. As explained in the discussion above and by adding relevant quotations from the data the process of creating new institutions under the umbrella of the ABEGS partnership witnessed some specific leadership practices identified by Leithwood in his research. While creating subordinate institutions the leaders of the Arab Bureau at all levels contributed to building a collaborative culture, involved in structuring the organization to facilitate work, helped connecting the

\textsuperscript{18} Detailed discussion on the establishment of the ABEGS’ subordinate institutions will appear in following sections.
organization to its wider environment, and created and redesigned organizational structure. The data also reflect that continued consultative process provides the bases to perform the above listed leadership functions. Setting directions, redesigning (developing) the organizational structures, and performing specific leadership practices such as building a collaborative culture, structuring the organization to facilitate work, connecting the organization to its wider environment, allocating resources to foster the partnership improvement efforts, and creating and redesigning organizational structure, seem essential leadership functions and leadership practices when an interorganizational partnership is expanding and creating new institutions to achieve certain goals.

The item number 3 in the above minutes is making reference to a book that is being considered for publication. The inference can be derived from the language of the minutes that the book was reviewed and observations were made to revise the draft of the book. It also shows that people working at the strategic level are actively involved in the follow up of their intellectual work. This is another example of consultation that takes place amongst strategic, managerial, and operational levels of this partnership. The General Conference and the Executive Board encourage consultative process at all lower levels.

the cycle of meetings, seminars, symposiums, start with a directive to initiate discussions in meetings, conferences, seminars, symposiums at all lower levels and then summary information after extensive consultations is prepared for the ministers to take decisions (Information Officer Riyadh).

Consultations take place in multiple ways at different levels. This consultative process at the operational level has its influence at the managerial levels and consultative
process at the managerial level has its impact on the next higher level which is the strategic level of the ABEGS. An educational consultant in Kuwait research centre mentioned:

The Executive Board seeks consultations from different experts, forums, organizations, researchers, institutions, etc. It is a long series of steps before it [documentation] goes to the General Conference. The General Conference discusses this and approves these plans for the next two years. So we know our part and we start contacting with specialized research centers, universities, according to the nature of the project. According to the nature of the project we look for the agency, body, institution, or a center, to seek help from them (Education Officer Consultant, GASERC, Kuwait).

The above comments reflect that consultation is not only liked but it is required. The upper levels of the ABEGS partnership are completely aware of the advantages of consultation, discussion or dialogue and they encourage to have extensive consultation and dialogue. It has been mentioned before that the General Conference convenes its formal meetings after every two years. The preparation for this meeting also provides evidence of extensive consultative process. The Secretary of the General Conference & Executive Board Meetings’ Secretariat gave me a detailed picture of the information sources with regard to the preparation of agenda for General Conference meetings. These information sources are basically different discussion/consultation forums.

the sources of information are this Bureau, member states, participation of the Bureau in international conferences, and decisions of the GCC meetings …there is a meeting coming up in Bahrain …the Director General will participate in this meeting to prepare the programs [agenda for General Conference] for the next
meeting – people from all the member states and six or seven officers from headquarters will participate in this meeting – people like Mr. Fajeh, [Head of Programmes Department] and Mr. Rabee [Head of Administration & Finance] and few people from IT department – people from Training Center Doha Qatar, Research center Kuwait, from ALECSO, ISESCO, and UNESCO, will also participate – this is the main conference to prepare agenda (A Senior Officer Riyadh).

6.0.2 Consultation at the Grassroots Levels

The consultative process does not stop at the strategic and/or managerial levels. This process goes deep into the grassroots level. When I say grassroots levels that means school teachers, members of the school administrative staff, employees working in the ministries of education in the member states, ABEGS headquarters, research centre Kuwait, and training centre Doha Qatar. I found many examples of grassroots levels consultation during my field research. I shall quote an example that I found in the work of Information Technology Department. During my interviews with the staff and executives of the ABEGS headquarters in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, I came to know that the ABEGS is paying special attention to using information technology to promote education in the Arabian Gulf region. In addition to regular computer tools they decided to develop their own Learning Management System (LMS) in Arabic language. In order to do this job the information technology personnel had to consult the potential end users of this LMS so as to identify their needs. The purpose of this consultation was to collect data to work out design and delivery options for online educational programs in the
ABEGS member states using the ABEGS LMS. This grassroots levels consultation was undertaken in all the member states in the Arab Bureau partnership.

All the projects are done after extensive meetings with people working in the ministries of the member states before and after the General Conference. Any project that we work on; there are series of meetings before, during, and after the execution of the project. We approached administrative staff in the ministries and teachers in the schools to develop our LMS [learning Management System]. We always take a lot of notes when we meet people at that level. …It is team work (Systems Analyst Riyadh).

The process of grassroots levels consultation is not one time deal it is a continuous process of communication. The Information Technology Department use different strategies to get feedback from the people working at the grassroots levels. They organize workshops, establish communication with school teachers through the education ministries of the member states, and use the ABEGS portal. Teachers and educational administrators are encouraged in the member states of the Arab Bureau to register as users of ABEGS portal. The users of this portal can utilize different online services offered by the Arab Bureau. The teachers of member states can teach different courses in Math and Science using the ABEGS LMS. They can establish direct communication with the Arab Bureau. The administrators and other educational professionals may also register on this portal and benefit from various services. The purpose of the feedback received from the end users through ABEGS portal is to ensure the performance of ABEGS’ LMS work according to the designed learning objectives. This also helps to evaluate the working of ABEGS LMS. This is one example how continued consultation and
communication is established at the grassroots levels in the ABEGS partnership. A systems analyst at the Arab Bureau says:

The feedback that we get helps a lot. I give you an example. After we develop learning objectives\(^{19}\), we call the quality assurance\(^{20}\), a workshop is organized. When we organize the workshop we take a lot of notes. Then we make changes according to the feedback. We are now finishing this project this year and sending it to the ministries. The ministries will send this work to schools. The schools will use and prepare their notes. The schools send their feedback to the ministries and then the ministries send this feedback to the ABEGS. Then ABEGS makes corrections (Systems Analyst Riyadh Saudi Arabia).

The presence of the consultative process at different organizational levels in the Arab Bureau shows the importance that is associated with consultations in this partnership. Despite the firm vertical hierarchical structures the consultative process at the lower levels has its influence and impact on the decision making process at the higher levels. The reports, memos, recommendations, suggestions, advisory notes, research papers, feedback, evaluation reports, and presentations at different forums is the product of this consultative process which is duly reviewed by the General Conference in its biennial meetings before the decisions are made. So the product of the consultative process do influence the opinions of the education ministers and provide them some direction for decision making during discussions in the General Conference meetings.

The impact and influence of consultative process at the lower levels including the

---

\(^{19}\) The LMS contains learning objectives for every lesson that they include for e-learning.

\(^{20}\) It means ‘the Quality Assurance Committee’ (QAC), I have given a brief introduction of this committee earlier. There will be more discussion on QAC with different perspective in the following chapters.
grassroots levels on the strategic levels emanates from the following decisions taken by the General Conference. As reported by the systems analyst at the Arab Bureau headquarters the approvals granted to the construction of LMS, its maintenance, establishment of the Arab Bureau internet portal, the curriculum of online-series of math and science from grade 1 to 12, is a solid evidence of the influence of consultative process on the General Conference decisions.

The Director General of the Arab Bureau wishes to strengthen the relationship amongst all administrative levels such as education ministers (strategic leaders), the Arab Bureau (managerial level) and the teachers (personnel at the grassroots levels) in the member states as expressed by him in his vision statement given below.

my vision was to extend the relationship of the Bureau and the ministries of education to the teachers, because they are the real target people, real beneficiaries, and real stakeholders (A Senior Officer, Riyadh Saudi Arabia).

The relationship between different administrative levels can only be strengthened with effective communication and valuable consultation. The Director General unfolded his plan to do so. He mentioned

We took this initiative to … reach out the teachers in our member states approximately a million teachers. We found the best way to reach out is to use technology. We started to build portal for that purpose and we did it … we only have about 60000 teachers registered with us so far … it is a big number but in my opinion it is not. It is up to the teachers to join us or not … we are trying to reach out to them by our electronic [means] (A Senior Officer, Riyadh)
Digital consultation using online organizational portal is a regular and popular means of communication in the developed world. However it is not a very common way of communication in the region of the Gulf States. The leadership of the ABEGS partnership takes pride in using digital consultation in their organizational work. As a representative of the strategic leadership the Director General, Arab Bureau expressed his desire to reach out all the teachers in the member states at the grassroots levels. He is using electronic means in terms of ABEGS portal which is the most efficient way to reach out teachers in the contemporary communication environment. The ABEGS portal has an open invitation to all the teachers to register. This registration enables them to use the online services offered by the Arab Bureau. They are able to contribute to the educational process by using electronic means such as ABEGS portal. The registered teachers have the capacity to share best teaching practices with the community of education professionals in the Arab Gulf States. They can give feedback to the Bureau and provide consultation on any aspect of the teaching process. The summary information retrieved from the portal is communicated to the decision makers at the higher organizational levels.

In addition to the ABEGS LMS and the portal the Information Technology Department of the Arab Bureau maintains the publication of a two monthly online newsletter in Arabic language. The title of this newsletter is “Josoor (Bridges)” www.josoor@abegs.org. This newsletter is a great source of multidirectional communication and consultation. Publication of articles, research reports, and scholarly materials in the newsletter provide a lot of insight to the leaders for suitable decision
making. For instance publication of an article, “Practices of Bullying in Schools”\textsuperscript{21} in Josoor offers good discussion to make appropriate decisions for safe school environment.

In view of the above discussion, I may conclude that the administrative and technical infrastructure and intellectual activities at the Arab Bureau provide opportunities to promote consultative process for organizational decision making at all levels.

6.0.3 Discussion

It is necessary to understand that consultative process is rooted in the Arab culture and Arab culture is embedded in the religion of Islam. Hofstede argues that Islamic traditions and beliefs permeate not only the personal lives but also the life of organizational institutions and work in the region. The data that I collected from ABEGS in the member states confirms this claim.\textsuperscript{22} The cultural study of Hofstede covers Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and United Arab Emirates (UAE) from amongst the ABEGS member states. The data that I collected from Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and Qatar also confirms that the culture of the ABEGS countries is embedded in the religion of Islam. The history, language, and lifestyle of the ABEGS member states reflect homogeneous culture. It is because of this reason that Hofsted combines seven Arab states (Egypt, Iraq, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates) and group them under the title of Arab World. The influence of Islam on the lives of Arabs is very prominent and visible. One of the officers that I interviewed said:

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{21}Josoor, September 1, 2010 by Dr. Tawfiq Al-Rakab, King Saud University KSA
\textsuperscript{22}Hofsted includes Egypt, Iraq, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates in his study. http://www.cyborlink.com/besite/saudi-arabia.htm
\end{flushright}
We have one culture “Arabic Islamic Gulf Culture”. May be small differences but you know the same Islamic culture …one religion for all of us…all of us go to Mekkah …all of us go to Maddinah…no difference (An officer in Riyadh).

I shall include detailed discussion about the culture of the ABEGS member states as it relates to my investigation of leadership in ABEGS in the later part of this thesis. I shall only highlight the work life in the ABEGS partnership with regard to the consultative process in this chapter. The consultative process is a major factor that influences leadership to take certain decision as per my data analysis. I also see that consultation is embedded in the culture of Gulf Arab States and the roots of the Arab culture are in the religion of Islam. This aspect is supported by researchers like Hofstede as well. The Quran which is the holy book of Muslims and Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) emphasizes consultation. I therefore would like to present some quotes from Quran and sayings of the prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) as these two things are the major sources of the religion of Islam. The Quran includes one chapter by the name “Al-Shura” that means “Consultation”. The Quran emphasizes on consultation in a few verses, two references are given below.

Those who avoid the greater crimes and shameful deeds, and, when they are angry even then forgive; Those who harken to their Lord, and establish regular prayer; who (conduct) their affairs by mutual Consultation; who spend out of what We bestow on them for Sustenance; (Al-Quran, Chapter 42 Consultation, verse 37 & 38)
According to the Muslim faith the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him), even though he was the recipient of divine revelation, was required to consult the Muslims in public affairs. The God Almighty while addressing the Prophet Says:

"...and consult with them upon the conduct of affairs. And...when thou art resolved, then put thy trust in Allah" (Al-Quran Chapter 4, Family of Imran, verse 159)

The directives of the Holy Quran with regard to consultation were practiced and confirmed by the sayings of the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him). As narrated by Ali who was one of the closest companions of the Prophet narrated:

“I asked the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) how I should decide upon a matter presented to me when it has neither been discussed in the Qur’an nor is precedent in the Sunnah.” He responded: “Discuss the issue with pious believers and the experts of Islamic law. Do not base your decision on your understanding alone.”

The scholars of Islamic history are of the opinion that consultation was one of the essential practices of early Muslim rulers. Shah Wali Ullah maintains:

According to Shah Wali Ullah ‘Umar (rta) would consult the Companions (rta) and continue discussing the issues with them until the differences were removed and the people were utterly convinced of the validity of a decision. It is only because of this vigorous process that all the [political and administrative] decisions and religious rulings issued by him have been followed by [future rulers] from the east to the west. … this institution of consultation was not

---

23 Tabarani, al-Mu’jam al-Awsat, No: 1618. The compilation of the sayings of the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) as cited by http://www.amin-ahsan-islahi.com/?=136#fn2
operative only during the reign of the first two caliphs; the caliph ‘Uthman (rta) too ran the political and administrative affairs through consultation with the Companions (rta).\textsuperscript{24}

The government of Saudi Arabia is considered a leader of Islam in the contemporary Islamic world. The Islam is a ‘state religion’ and a way of life that is followed in the national and organizational cultures specifically in the Arabian Gulf States. The same is true for the member states of the ABEGS partnership. Therefore the consultative process is a normal cultural feature in the organizational decision making at the Arab Bureau.

The cultural study by Hofstede finds the Arab World culture as a collectivist culture as compared to the individualist culture. The Arab individualism ranking is 38 compared to world’s ranking which is 64 on Hofstede’s scale. The characteristic of collectivist culture as found by Hofstede helps explain the presence of consultative process in the culture of the Arab World. The shades of this consultative process are also visible in the organizational culture of the ABEGS as a partnership in the Arabian Gulf Region.

The foregoing discussion depicts an essential link between consultative process (Tashawari) and Leithwood’s core leadership functions. The consultation at operational managerial and strategic levels necessitates leaders to perform certain leadership functions. The leaders have to set directions for existing and newly established institutions so as to facilitate organizational work. They must create a collaborative

culture to maintain the integration of partnership. Allocation of resources to foster the partnership improvement efforts is a must. Staffing the partnership program is an essential leadership practice for the accomplishment of assigned mission. The data certainly reveal that periodic meetings of leaders at strategic managerial and operational leadership, diverse forms of communication amongst leaders at all levels, involvement of different scholars researchers and educationists, ensure consultative process at ABEGS partnership that influences leaders of the Arab Bureau to perform core leadership functions such as setting directions, developing people, redesigning the organizations, managing the partnership program, and securing the accountability. Chapter seven includes detailed discussion on each of these core leadership functions.

6.1.0 Position in the Hierarchy

Position in the hierarchy is another important influencing factor on leadership behaviour. When it comes to administrative, financial, procedural, and discipline matters, the Arab Bureau maintains firm hierarchical vertical organizational structures. The organogram of the Arab Bureau of Education for the Gulf States and its subordinate institutes is shown in earlier chapters (See Figure-2). The organizational structures of the GASERC and the AETCGS Doha Qatar have been included in this organogram. The place and position in the hierarchy determines the legal authority of the occupant of a particular position. The level of official authority according to the position establishes the capacity to lead in legal terms. The highest level of legal authority and power according to the position in the hierarchy is enjoyed by the General Conference. This is a body of the Ministers of Education of the Member States. This body can make and unmake any law or policy for the Arab Bureau and for its subordinate organizations. All the
governments of the member state give full legal authority to their ministers to contribute in making policies on their behalf. Many events in the history of the ABEGS have given the opportunity to the General Conference to exhibit its unique position.

It is the General Conference that takes final decision. Executive Board follows the projects approved by the General Conference. The Arab Bureau is to supervise the implementation of these projects in coordination (An Officer in Riyadh).

I shall quote some examples from the data when the General Conference used its legal leadership due to its position in the hierarchy. These examples also highlight that the leadership at the strategic, managerial, and operational levels play important role in performing core leadership functions such as setting directions, developing people, redesigning the organization, managing the partnership program, and securing accountability as explained in the conceptual framework of this study.

**6.1.1 Expulsion of Iraq from the ABEGS**

The most appropriate example of the positional authority of the General Conference is the expulsion of Iraq from the Arab Bureau. Iraq was a member state in the ABEGS partnership since its inception in 1975. It was friendly brotherly country for the member states of the Arab Bureau at that time. Kuwait was a close ally of Iraq during its war with Iran. After the Iran Iraq war, relations between Iraq and Kuwait started becoming troublesome due to certain financial and diplomatic reasons. The country road and port infrastructure was badly damaged. Iraq’s economy was struggling. Its loans were more than its national budget. Kuwait’s lucrative economy could solve Iraq’s financial

---

25 Please see Appendix – F for composition and detailed regulations of the General Conference ABEGS.
problems. In view of its small size Kuwait seemed an easy target for Iraq. The invasion started on August 2, 1990, and within two days of intense combat, the state of Kuwait was occupied by Iraq.

The members of the Arab Bureau looked at it as Iraq’s aggression against Kuwait. The Arab Bureau took an immediate action and convened a meeting of the General Conference in 1990 in Saudi Arabia even during the war. The Ministers of six member states unanimously dismissed the membership of Iraq from the ABEGS partnership with immediate effect.

The Iraqi invasion was the reason of Iraqi exclusion from the Bureau. This decision was made by the General Conference. Since the start of the occupation till now all the member countries … are with Kuwait. When this matter was discussed in the General Conference all the member countries agreed to expel Iraq not only from all the activities of the Bureau but from all other activities of the GCC countries as well (An Officer from GASERC Kuwait).

The following comment explains the capacity of the General Conference to give a chance to Iraq to return to the ABEGS. Iraq’s dismissal is a big example to demonstrate that the General Conference is the competent authority to take any decision to redesign the organizational structures of the Arab Bureau at any level.

Iraq was with us when they invaded in 1990. If they correct themselves then they will be with us again. Many people pray in Iraq that they should join again. We hope they change and mend their ways but it is up to the General Conference (An officer in GASERC Kuwait).
The General Conference is sitting at the top of the organizational pyramid in the hierarchy of the Arab Bureau. It is because of the position in the hierarchy that the General Conference had this prerogative to cancel the basic membership of a member state. It was a major restructuring /redesigning the organization which according to Leithwood et al., is a core leadership function performed by organizational leaders.

6.1.2 Voting Rights

The General Conference biennial meetings are attended by the Ministers of Education of the member states. According to “Article-I” of the Regulations of the Composition of the General Conference sometimes non members may also attend these meeting on invitation by the General Conference. They, however, do not have the right to vote. The “Article –X” of the same document states that the Chairman of the Executive Board attend these meetings and make presentations but without a right to vote on decision making. So no one else has the voting rights on decision making at this level except the members of the General Conference. The observers, professionals, and senior executives may attend the meeting. The professionals and senior executives such as the Chairman of the Executive Board may give presentations if so desired by the General Conference but they have no right in the voting process of decision making at this level.

It is therefore concluded that the voting element at the General Conference maintains firm vertical hierarchical structure of the Arab Bureau.

It is not possible to comment on micro political processes how members try to influence the votes of other members due to the paucity of available data. However the data do provide evidence that factors such as prior consultations, the level of experience of the
individual members, the kind and level of commitment of the individual ministers may influence the patterns and process of voting at this level.

6.1.3 The Establishment of Subordinate Institutions

The General Conference is the forum to establish subordinate institutions and organizations that work under the umbrella of the Arab Bureau. It is due to the position in the hierarchy that the General Conference has the power to take final decision to create and/or redesign the organizational institutions to facilitate work by passing resolutions to that effect. Since its inception the General Conference has established following institutions:

- The Gulf Arab States Educational Research Centre (GASERC) Kuwait by a resolution passed in the Second General Conference. This research centre was entrusted the responsibility of ‘developing people’ in the beginning by conducting research and organizing training. One of the officers at the Research Centre mentioned, “we organized training courses for four years from 1981-84”. Since its inception the leaders at the Arab Bureau were therefore vigilant of the core leadership function of developing their people so as to meet an organizational leadership requirement as recognized by the conceptual framework of this research. They continued this job at this Research Centre until they created a specialized training institution in Doha Qatar in 1999 for this purpose.

- The Gulf Arabian University (AGU) Bahrain by a resolution passed in the Fourth General Conference. This was a major step towards the development or redesigning the organizational structures (a core leadership function) of the ABEGS partnership.

- The Arab Educational Training Centre for Gulf States (AETCGS) Doha, Qatar by a resolution passed in the Fifth General Conference. Developing people is a core leadership function identified by Leithwood. The establishment of the AETCGS Doha is major organizational restructuring to facilitate the work of developing
people of all seven member states working under the jurisdiction of the ABEGS partnership.

- The Educational Research Centre for Arabic Language (ERCAL) Sharja, United Arab Emirates (UAE) was established by the resolution passed in the Nineteenth General Conference. This is another major organizational redesigning /restructuring performed by the leaders of the General Conference based on periodical consultation and communication with the leaders working at the lower organizational levels of the Arab Bureau.

The purpose of the creation, objectives, and subsequent performance of the above listed subordinate institutions are clearly linked to Leithwood’s core leadership functions, securing accountability and many specific leadership practices as given in the conceptual framework of this study with the work performed by the leaders at the ABEGS partnership. The core leadership function of ‘setting directions’ for the above institutions was performed by leaders of the Arab Bureau at all levels after rigorous consultations, coordination, and collaboration by delineating and articulating goals and objectives of each institution (See chapter 2 for details).

Some evidence with regard to some leadership functions performed by the leaders of the ABEGS partnership can be given as follows:

a. Staffing of these institutions: “as far as the hiring is concerned, an open announcement is initiated to all the member states. Interested applicants can apply for any job from any of the seven member states (Director AETCGS Doha, Qatar);

b. Allocating resources: “the members pay their shares... then it is the discretion of the Bureau to spend the money as per the budget (Director Finance Arab Bureau Riyadh Headquarters);
c. Securing the accountability: “Every two years an evaluation report is submitted to the Executive Board through the Director General Arab Bureau (Director, AETCGS Doha Qatar);

d. Ensure individual staff accountability: “I write performance reports of the employees working for me and the Director General writes my report (Director Public Relations).

The establishment of subordinate institutions in the Arabian Gulf Region by the Arab Bureau is a prominent evidence of ‘redesigning the organization’ which is one of the core leadership functions. However, performing this particular core leadership function involved many other leadership functions as mentioned in the above discussion. The major influence in establishing of the above listed institutions was exercised by the General Conference due to its positional power in the hierarchy of the ABEGS partnership.

6.1.4 Other Functions of the General Conference

In addition to the above and according to the Article – XI of the regulations of the General Conference of the Arab Bureau, General Conference is the only organizational body that has the power to perform following functions:

- Make decisions on the annual programs of the Executive Board.
- Adopt general plan of the Executive Board.
- Accord approval of the draft budget and expenditure estimates.
- Appointment of the Director General on the recommendation of the Executive Board.
- Any other function specified by the regulations of the General Conference.
The aforementioned examples highlight the position that the General Conference possesses in the hierarchy of the Arab Bureau. The decisions taken at this level are binding for all subordinate groups and/or individual officers. The only upper level administration for the Arab Bureau as stated above is the visionary level that is comprised of the senior political leadership (heads of states or governments) of the member states. The General Conference governs and maintains control of all the affairs of the Arab Bureau in the Gulf region.

The positions are defined and understood. The institutions, groups, and individual officers are very clearly placed in hierarchical structures and their leadership emerges from their organizational level in the Arab Bureau. In terms of hierarchy, the Executive Board comes after the General Conference. The regulations of the composition of the Executive Board stipulate the powers and responsibilities of this body. The Executive Board has to examine everything before it goes to the General Conference.

four or five months’ deliberations Executive Board finalizes the documentation for the General Conference – then General Conference discuss each item approves or disapproves it (An Officer from Riyadh).

The Article - V of regulations of the composition of the Executive Board empowers the Board to approve resolutions and recommendations to be presented to the General Conference for final approval. The members of the Board are either the Deputy Ministers or person(s) equal to this level from the member states. The Article – IX of the regulations of the composition of the Executive Board states that the Director General attends meetings of the Executive Board and participates in the deliberations, gives
presentations or reports, and replies to the questions asked during the meetings of the Board. However, he does not vote for decision making at this level.

A few participants of this study consider the Executive Board as the most powerful body in the entire structure of the Arab Bureau. Firstly because of the nature and volume of its work, secondly, due to its direct and deep rooted access and communication to the headquarters, Board of Trustees of the subordinate institutions (GASERC and AETCGS), and individual ministries of the member states. Most importantly the Board reviews all the data and makes recommendations for decision making to the General Conference on almost every aspect of the Arab Bureau. The Board has meetings every six months and has more practical deep insight of all matters at all levels. The Board members have more and frequent communication with different offices and officials in the Arab Bureau. However, the fact remains that the Board has to seek final approval of almost everything from the General Conference. It is also important to know that the Board members work at the rank of the Deputy Ministers of Education or its equivalent. They are the most trusted people of their Ministers.

The functional responsibilities of communication and synthesis of information for the ministers for decision making show that organizational leaders at the Executive Board level “promote effective communication”, which is a core leadership practice of organizational leaders identified by Leithwood.
The following statements drawn from the interview data show how leadership is exercised in the vertical hierarchy in the organizational structures of the ABEGS partnership.

The top body is Mottamar -e- Aam [General Conference] then Majlis – e- Tanfeedi [Executive Board] – then the Director General, general management and the three centers – Kuwait Research Center, Doha Training Center and third one is Language Center Sharja, which is being constructed – All department heads report to the Director General then the reports go to the Executive Board finally these reports are submitted to the General Conference (An Officer in Riyadh).

The capacity of leadership that emerges from the individual offices is related to the positions different managers of the Arab Bureau like the Director General, the Director Research Centre Kuwait, the Director Training Centre Doha, and other senior
officers in the headquarters possess in the hierarchy of the ABEGS partnership. The
Figure – 10 given above shows how different groups and individuals are positioned in the
Arab Bureau as per their authority and capacity to influence decision making in this
partnership. The pyramid helps to estimate the level of leadership some individuals or
groups of individuals may possess in this organization.

However, position in the hierarchy is just one factor that influences leadership for
decision making in the Arab Bureau. In reality, other factors concurrently influence the
process of decision making as well, such as prior experience and knowledge, and
dedication and commitment as argued in the next section.

6.2.0 Experience & Knowledge

It is normal to see that there are some influential persons. It depends
on their experience, their way of communication, how much they
are familiar with the issue under discussion, so it depends who is
presenting what idea at the meeting. It does not matter which
administrative level that person is occupying it sometimes depends
on the personal qualification, experience and capabilities (A senior
officer in the Arab Bureau Riyadh).

Experience can be defined as the capacity of performing certain functions based
on the skills and knowledge learnt in the past. This learning takes place with the help of
any possible combination of the following undertakings in the past:

- formal and informal education and training.
- opportunities of exposure
- live through critical situations
- unique and/or unusual observations
- research
• reading, writing, talking, listening, watching, and thinking
• varied work opportunities
• professional opportunities to nurture professional insight
• participation in multiple types of activities
• travelling
• meeting with people

More experience is obtained when someone gains the ability to do more tasks in less time. The length of experience is sometimes connected to age or to the time spent in a particular field with measureable achievements. Different people undertake different activities, therefore, their experience is different. Knowledge can be described as quantity of information acquired that helps to enhance the capacity to comprehend new information and situations. Some people undertake more activities and gain more experience and knowledge.

Based on the aforementioned explanation of experience and knowledge, experience was identified as another factor that influences leadership in the ABEGS partnership. The participants of this study mentioned that people with more experience tend to have more knowledge and insight on various matters under consideration. They are the ones who provide direction. When I asked a senior officer of the Arab Bureau: Who has more influence than others in meetings?

He said “it is related to individuals’ best experiences. Some of them are more experienced than others”.

It is experience and knowledge that everyone values and respects in the offices of the Arab Bureau. The people I interviewed for data collection with regard to my research were highly educated and experienced. Half of them have Doctoral degrees from the European or American universities and all of them possess master’s degrees. These
educated and experienced people are the backbone of the Arab Bureau partnership. I explained earlier that formal education enhances the capacity to comprehend and perform various work related functions.

Traveling is another source to increase exposure and experience. So people with higher education availed opportunities of acquiring higher education with exposure to the developed world. Therefore, they definitely have relevant skills, knowledge and experience to influence policy making and day to day decision making at all levels.

Some people studied in Germany, some studied in USA, some in UK, people who remained here don’t know about the world so now this office gave them [foreign qualified people] an opportunity to share their knowledge (An officer in Riyadh).

The foreign qualified and educated people have the orientation of the western educational systems. They are also familiar with the needs of the native educational systems. They are the guides and consultants for the senior executives of the Bureau. Their opinion has strong influence in the decision making at all levels. People with local qualifications and experience do their part. Though they have lesser exposure of the western world but they bring local education and experience. They also influence the decision making mechanisms in the Arab Bureau in their own capacity. The way these experienced and knowledgeable people exert their influence is by investing their energies in preparing plans, programmes, and projects. The knowledge and experience enables them to construct the documentation of various projects to communicate their ideas and consequently to influence the process of decision making and provide direction to achieve certain objectives.
It is very interesting to note that experience and knowledge give confidence and trust to women officers in these male dominated societies. A woman officer that I interviewed said:

I got [more] extensive experience than others. I am the woman officer in the Arab Bureau. I have positive impact on the work of the Bureau

The statement of woman officer is important in its own way. I have no intention to generalize this fact. However, a single but strong voice that has access to the chambers of decision making can make a significant difference. It is also imperative to mention that this one woman is the head of a training institution staffed by male officers in the Arab Bureau. She plans and organizes training programs for all member states of the ABEGS partnership. Educational leaders and professionals, school principals and administrators, officers of the education ministries of the member states and other organizations attend various training programs organized by this woman officer. She therefore has the capacity to influence the decision making process at different levels indirectly through the impact of her training programs. She is an active member of the Board of Trustees for training center in Doha Qatar. She is an educational leader at the managerial level in the ABEGS partnership.

Three interviewees were of the opinion that the most influential group in the Arab Bureau partnership is the people who sit in the Executive Board. This group is comprised of the Under Secretaries or the Deputy Ministers of Education. This is mainly because people in the Executive Board work as a bridge between the ministers and the lower levels. They also closely deal with issues at the managerial and operational levels. They
are familiar with the fundamentals of all educational issues. They have time and capacity
to look into micro details of all educational matters so they influence the decision making
through their experience and knowledge. An officer in ABEGS headquarters says:

    The Deputy Ministers do the real work. The ministers are political
    people so they mostly agree to the recommendations of the
    Executive Board. The Deputy Ministers have extensive experience
    (An officer in Riyadh)

    This view is supported by another officer working for the research centre Kuwait.
He is of the view:

    The ministers sitting in the General Conference approve the
decisions. The Under Secretaries (or Deputy Ministers) are the ones
who decide about the things to be presented to the Ministers. Once it
is approved by the Under Secretaries in the Executive Board you can
say it is 95% approved. So you can say that the members of the
Executive Board play crucial role in decision making in ABEGS
(An officer in Kuwait Research Centre).

    The participants of the study grouped experience with age and tried to develop an
argument that experience comes with age. So they claim that an older person will have
more influence as he/she has more experience and exposure. It is in a way true. Older
people in the Arab society enjoy respect. They sometimes have access to the high profile
executives just because of their age. Their voice therefore can reach to the high echelons
of policy making and decision making levels and influence this process.

    the person who has more experience will speak more…and will
have influence on other people…and when sit with people who are
more than your age say 60 years …they are 30 years older than you
…35 years older than you …they have more experience…they know everything…they have interacted with senior officials ministers and deputy ministers so they have more exposure (An officer in Riyadh).

In view of the above discussion, experience and knowledge is another influencing factor that enables individuals and/or group of individuals influence decision making and provide direction to different levels of the organizational administration of ABEGS partnership.

It is to be noted that besides the decision making process the experience and knowledge of the leaders also influence the distribution of core leadership functions within the strategic, managerial, and operational organizational leadership levels of the Arab Bureau. Leaders of the Arab Bureau contribute in setting direction for the organization at all levels by using their experience and knowledge. Leaders with experience and knowledge may use intellectual stimulation, individual support, and modeling appropriate values and practices for developing people in the ABEGS partnership. These leaders contribute productively in setting direction and managing the partnership programme of the Arab Bureau at all administrative levels of this partnership. Some examples from the data will be presented in the following discussion.

6.3.0 Dedication and Commitment

Dedication and commitment of certain people to perform certain tasks can create special influence to lead the organization in a particular direction. I found a few examples during my research that despite conventional structural formation of the ABEGS partnership some people work with their dedication and commitment and pave new ways for development. I viewed dedication and commitment as another factor of influence on
leadership for decision making in the Arab Bureau. The completion of successful 35 years history with numerous achievements in itself is an evidence of leadership exercised by dedication and commitment in the ABEGS partnership.

I would like to define dedication and commitment as selfless enthusiasm and devotion to a particular task or purpose. The person with dedication and commitment may or may not have experience or knowledge about the task to be performed. I therefore distinguish dedication and commitment from experience and knowledge.

I heard many stories of those committed and dedicated leaders during my research. Due to their commitment and dedication for the growth and development of the Gulf region some leaders are still serving this part of the world at very senior positions in public sector organizations and some leaders laid their lives while working for a cause in the Arab Bureau. Dedicated and committed leaders set standards and leave precedents to be followed. Before I initiate my discussion about dedicated and committed leaders and their contributions, I would like to relate a story.

Dr. Muhammad Al Sane was appointed as the first Director of the GASERC Kuwait. He started his work in this building with nothing except the decision was made to create the center. The GASERC was housed in a school. This is the same building. The man [Dr. Muhammad Al Sane] was dedicated and he had commitment. The work in the GASERC was started by unifying curriculum in the member states. This man contributed significantly in initiating this center and developing the work from the beginning. I think his commitment and dedication laid the practical foundation of this centre. In our work it is very important for the director how he takes the decisions. He was the man of decisions - decision making was one of his qualities and dedication. He died during a meeting with
UNESCO in France working for this centre. He was so dedicated (A Senior Executive GASERC, Kuwait).

The above story was told by a senior executive of the GASERC about a former director of this centre. The officer passionately shared this story with me and appreciated the commitment and dedication of the former director. It is very clearly reflected in the above example that Dr. Al Sane’s dedicated and committed leadership provided positive direction to the GASERC in the early days of its establishment. He died while he was working for this organization. His successors take inspiration from his death as well and regard his death part of this commitment and dedication.

A recent example of the leadership of dedication and commitment in the Arab Bureau is related to commitment shown for the advancement of information technology and e-learning environment in the ABEGS partnership. A senior officer says:

I would like to see the Bureau to be more technology driven and I would like to see the seriousness in utilizing the projects that we are implementing in the ministries of education in the member states. ...there is a big shift that has been made for the last few years towards technology - a lot of people are not familiar with technology here. So we are trying to lead them and to utilize technology more and be technology driven in their work. Our aim is to have in near future a paperless work environment.

The above statement is given by a senior leader who is strongly dedicated and committed to promote information technology. His commitment and dedication to this cause is an influencing factor that is motivating people at the lower levels. The officers who work at the lower levels and have less organizational power have the same dream to
promote information technology. They seek this influence and direction from upper levels and work more enthusiastically. One officer says, “computer technology helps work efficiently. Dr. Ali is already promoting technology in Arab Bureau’s work and I like it (Systems Analyst)”. So dedication and commitment at the senior level has an impact on the lower levels.

I shall give another example. The present Director General is a modern man. He is strongly committed to promote technological means for the administration and development of education in the member countries of the ABEGS partnership. It is because of his commitment and dedication that he exerts his influence for decision making at all levels for the advancement of information technology in the Arab Bureau. The concrete evidence of this influence is demonstrated in the following accomplishments:

- The establishment of modern infrastructure of information technology in the Arab Bureau for member states.
- The development of ABEGS Learning Management System (LMS) to promote e-learning in the member states.
- The development of thousands of model lesson plans contained in the ABEGS LMS to teach different courses in the online teaching environment.
- The establishment of online communication with teachers and educational administrators so as to continuously update educational plans.
- The inclusion of latest technology such as Web 2.0 and blogging so as to help teaching professionals to adapt their lesson plans according to their own subject matter and as per their classroom needs.

The basis of the above listed accomplishments is dedication and commitment of one leader that influenced the strategic leaders to approve these ideas and provide budget
to complete the projects. This dedication and commitment influenced the leaders working at the operational levels to implement these projects on the ground. The Director General passionately shared his dreams with me in the following words:

We are building and accumulating the contents on the systems that we have built. So these contents will be available to the teachers as resources, as model lessons, as a platform where they can exchange ideas and experiences and portal will eventually attract best practices from the teachers and will be distributed to the other teachers. So the use of technology has reengineered our work in the Bureau – We have Web 2.0 technology incorporated in the portal. This technology tool can be used by the teachers to develop their own lessons. They can learn on the best practices and experiences. Teachers can see and imitate. So this is the vision that I have … we are inviting teachers to use the technology and not afraid of it –our technology team chose to build their own and use every new technology in that portal. We are very sincere and committed in providing our latest education to our teachers and this is our mission to help our teachers to overcome the barrier between them and technology (A Senior Officer of the Bureau, Riyadh)

It is true that organizational management in the Arab Bureau is structured on the basis of firm hierarchy, however, leaders with dedication and commitment influence decision making at all levels. The outcomes of dedicated leadership are persuasive and cast deep impact. Dedication and commitment of some people at the macro level (senior management level) in the Arab Bureau is very successful in penetrating its influence into the micro levels.

Another example comes from the operational level leadership of the Arab Bureau. I was interviewing an officer in the GASERC Kuwait. This gentleman had a wide variety
of experience working on many senior managerial positions in different member countries of the Arab Bureau partnership. He had the opportunity to serve as a member of the “Board of Trustees” for the Arabian Gulf University Bahrain as well. He also used to work as a senior officer in the Ministry of Education Kingdom of Bahrain (A member state of the ABEGS partnership). The leaders’ influence on decision making is stronger when more than one influencing factors i.e. hierarchical position, consultation, prior knowledge/experience, and evidence of dedication/commitment coincide in a situation. I will quote two stories from his work as examples of the influence of dedication and commitment on decision making in the Arab Bureau.

From my experience when I was working in Bahrain. I noticed that the work of educational development in general was very poor. I, therefore, fought for this. Now … the Ministry of Education Bahrain is very proud to have a very good documentation center established in mid 70s. It was established in a small room but now it is a big center (Education Officer GASERC, Kuwait).

It is obvious in the light of the above statement that the establishment of documentation centre was partly an outcome of leadership exercised by dedication and commitment. The analysis of the situation reveals that perhaps the leader’s prior experience and knowledge made him more credible and infused commitment. He might have strengthened his work by consultation and used positional authority to gain access to the strategic leaders to present his proposal for consideration. This helps us understand how different influencing factors may interact.

The officer had to “fight” for this to happen. The work environment of the Gulf States is such that a proposal is not pursued if turned down from higher organizational
levels. The officer did not give up despite repeated rejections of his proposal. The influence exerted by the dedication and commitment of a leader resulted in the establishment of documentation centre. Another example comes from the work of the same gentleman. The story is contained in the following conversation that I had with the officer:

Dr. Badri: Let me tell you something. In addition to our normal job as researchers, we try to build relationships with other similar institutions concerned with education research. We worked with International Bureau of Education (IBE) to establish what is called the Global Network of Curriculum Developers. ... Our center is very active as sub regional focal point what they call is community practice – there are 15 focal points in the world we represent the focal point for the Arab region. It has nothing to do with our normal job but we are concerned to support educational innovation in the member countries. We try to fund these activities from outside our ABEGS budget. We seek help from the donors such as Arab Fund for Economic and Social Development.

Researcher: So, you are working with organizations such as IBE and Arab Fund. How do you get approval from the ABEGS authority to seek funding from outside source?

Dr. Badri\textsuperscript{26}: I am not talking about the normal mechanism and this is not a routine matter in the ABEGS. When I needed the approval I talked to the director. (Director GASERC Kuwait) now he is Ambassador in Egypt. I talked to him about this idea. He encouraged me. So I requested him to talk to donors. He asked me to put it on paper. So I prepared the paper work…

\textsuperscript{26} Pseudonym used for this study purpose so as to meet the ethical requirements.
it took me one year in order to present it to the Donor Board. They gave me the approval and talked to my director about this.

Researcher: How come you avoided the Executive Board of the ABEGS?

Dr. Badri: Fortunately we don’t have this kind of dictatorship. The then Director GASERC backed this idea. The system empowers us to do so. There is no such restriction. The approval was also taken from the Executive Board. We believe that we are free to enrich our work but we don’t misuse the money. The money is spent on the projects. Everything is supervised by the administrative authorities. We presented the report to the Executive Board just to inform them and to convince the Under Secretaries to be more involved and make use of our projects, services, and skills. We promised to cover the cost from outside sources. It was well received by the Executive Board. They thanked us. It was kind of opening other doors. They appreciated the work. Later on a letter was sent to the Director General Arab Fund informing him that the project was submitted to the Executive Board. The ABEGS appreciate their generosity. Then the whole project was presented to the General Conference … So all the governing bodies were involved and satisfied.

It was not a routine decision. It was mainly dedication and commitment of this officer that made him step outside the normal decision making process. However, he did not breach the vertical authority of the ABEGS partnership. The consultative channels facilitated his access to the managerial levels. Then the personal endorsement of a higher authority helped his work reach to the strategic level. Dedication and commitment is a factor but it does not operate on its own.
This example shows how an individual officer working at the operational level can influence decisions making at the managerial and strategic levels. In view of the above discussion and actual examples, dedication and commitment appeared to be an influencing factor on leadership for decision making in the Arab Bureau. It is now evident based on the references from interview data of this study that leadership originated from dedication and commitment produce some influence on managerial and strategic leadership for decision making in the Arab Bureau.

6.4.0 Discussion

The discussion in this chapter is based on the data that I collected from the Arab Bureau headquarters Riyadh, the research centre Kuwait, and the training centre Doha, Qatar. I found rich evidence in the data on various factors that influence leadership to take decisions at operational, managerial, and strategic levels of the ABEGS partnership. These influencing factors or sources of leadership are the consultative process, position in the organizational hierarchy, experience and knowledge, and dedication and commitment. The data analysis allows me to conclude that first two factors i.e. consultative process and position in the organizational hierarchy emerge from the organizational processes. The latter two factors first experience and knowledge and second dedication and commitment surface from the personal traits of individual leaders.

The consultative process is a major influencing factor on the decision making process adopted by the leadership at all organizational levels in the ABEGS partnership that is embedded in the religion of Islam which is the basis of Arab culture. The consultative leadership is found at all levels starting from the strategic level known as
“Tashawari”. That means periodical consultation meetings of the education ministers of the member states. Consultation goes deep into the grassroots levels. The school teachers and administrators and employees in the education ministries of the member states of the ABEGS partnership are consulted through various means. The personnel at the grassroots levels are either approached for consultation by the higher levels or communication is established by electronic (IT) means.

The position in hierarchy is another influencing factor for leadership which is entrenched in the firm vertical organizational structures of the ABEGS partnership. Certain levels have legally been authorized to take certain types of decisions to perform various leadership functions. The discussion and data analysis in this chapter reveals two major patterns of distribution of leadership functions. The first pattern of distribution of leadership functions shows the distribution of leadership functions within the strategic, managerial, and operational organizational leadership. A second pattern of distribution of leadership functions is based on the factors (consultation, positional power, experience & knowledge, and dedication/commitment) that influence decision making processes at various organizational levels. The data supports that prior experience and knowledge provides capacity to influence on the decision making. Experience and knowledge may empower women to exert their leadership as well. Lastly, the data are rich with examples of the leadership that germinates from dedication and commitment. Leadership of commitment and dedication is respected and praised at the strategic levels.

None of the influencing factor is likely to function on its own. These influencing factors may work in combinations of two, three or four depending on the situation. It was
learnt that consultative process, and positional power come from the interorganizational structures and systems and the other two influencing factors experience & knowledge and dedication & commitment are the traits of individual leaders belonging to any level (strategic, managerial, or operational) of the organizational structures of the ABEGS partnership.

It was also found that the influencing factors are closely linked with Leithwood’s four core leadership functions (setting directions, redesigning the organization, developing people, managing the partnership programme) and securing accountability. The influencing factors (consultation, positional power, experience/knowledge, and dedication/commitment) encourage performing certain leadership functions. The foregoing discussion clearly depicts that major organizational redesigning and restructuring was performed based on consultative process, using positional power, and benefiting from dedication/commitment and experience & knowledge of the managerial and operational leaders of the Arab Bureau.
CHAPTER 7 – LEADERSHIP DISTRIBUTION IN THE ARAB BUREAU AS AN INTERORGANIZATIONAL PARTNERSHIP

This chapter is to address the second research question of this study and to explore distribution of five core leadership functions i.e. setting directions, developing people, redesigning the organization, managing the partnership program, and securing accountability in an interorganizational partnership. The chapter will also examine the distribution of 21 specific leaders practices (see Matrix–I) into strategic, managerial, and operational organizational levels in the ABEGS partnership. The analytical discussion is based on the data collected through face to face semi structured interviews and by administering a questionnaire.

Leithwood and his colleagues did not identify securing accountability as a distinct core leadership function, subsuming it as a dimension of monitoring under program management. It is now almost impossible to conceptualize an organization without a system of accountability. Accountability is therefore deemed an essential feature of any contemporary administrative and organizational set up. It becomes increasingly important when the discussion is undertaken in the perspective of a public sector interorganizational partnership in the developing world. It does not mean that securing accountability is not important in the developed world. Why it is more important in the developing world is because public sector in the developed world possesses developed and time tested systems embedded in their management to ensure accountability. Whereas the developing countries especially in the public sector organizations are still struggling to make and maintain their public management systems to secure accountability.
Considering its importance as integral managerial and organizational dimension, I included ‘securing accountability’ as a leadership function in this research.

The accountability of schools [organizations] is, to advocates of this approach, what a silicon chip is to a computer or what an engine is to an automobile. Without mechanisms for increasing accountability, a performance based approach to reform is just a hollow shell. Indeed, the same reform efforts are often described in different places as both performance-based approaches (Odden, 1999; Smith & O’Day, 1991 as cited by Leithwood et al. 2002)

although empirical evidence about the effects of some accountability tools has grown in the past few years (e.g., Lee, 1993; Spillane & Zeuli, 1999 as cited by Leithwood et al. 2002), in reference to the broad array of such tools currently in use, our knowledge is still quite limited (Leithwood et al. 2002).

Furthermore, Leithwood and his colleagues conducted their extensive research in developed countries and explored leadership functions in single organizations. I am using Leithwood’s framework in the developing world to find out how the same core leadership functions and specific leadership practices are distributed within the structures of the Arab Bureau of Education for the Gulf States (ABEGS) as an interorganizational partnership. I shall also analyze the patterns of leadership distribution at strategic, managerial, and operational levels of the ABEGS partnership. The analysis of questionnaire data helped me examine which core leadership functions and what specific leadership practices are being used more than others by the leaders at strategic, managerial, and operational levels of the Arab Bureau.
7.0 Arab Bureau and Core Leadership Functions

The data analyses reveal two major patterns of leadership distribution. The first one is the leadership distribution at visionary and strategic level that may be termed as macro level leadership distribution encompassing the entire partnership of the ABEGS in the seven member states. The macro level leadership distribution patterns emerge from the directions that come from the visionary leadership either from the GCC directives for the Arab Bureau or individually from the heads of the states or governments, ministers or members of the royal families of the Arab Gulf States. As pointed out by an officer, “sometimes the vision comes from the GCC”. Another officer said, “the goals are affected by influential personalities, for example the kings, princes or members of the parliament”. The second source of macro level leadership distribution is the policy directions, rules, regulations, administrative and financial systems created by the General Conference.

The roots of the second major leadership distribution patterns which may be called micro level leadership distribution patterns at the Arab Bureau emerge from the practices of individual leaders working at the managerial and operational levels, influencing factors (consultative process, experience & knowledge, position in the hierarchy, and dedication and commitment) on the decision making process discussed earlier (Chapter-6), and the overall environment at lower levels of the interorganizational structures of the ABEGS partnerships.

In addition to the macro and micro level leadership distribution in the ABEGS partnership structures, the aim of this chapter is to find out how leadership is distributed in terms of setting directions, developing people, redesigning the organization, managing
the partnership program, and securing accountability within the strategic, managerial and operational levels of the Arab Bureau partnership.

7.1.0 Setting Directions

The first set of core leadership functions, as defined by Leithwood et al (2006, 2007) includes following four specific leadership practices:

1. Identifying and articulating a vision
2. Fostering the acceptance of group goals
3. High performance expectations
4. Promoting effective communication

The direction setting works differently in an interorganizational partnership environment as compare to a single organization. The direction essentially comes from the top and penetrates vertically down into the lower organizational structures. However, the direction in the partnership environment works horizontally at different organizational levels and vertically from top to bottom between levels as hypothesized in the conceptual framework of this study and as illustrated in the evidence presented in this section. This horizontal and vertical direction setting works the same way in the ABEGS partnership. The leadership at the visionary level provides occasional directions. However, the strategic leadership provides its vision and design goals for the Arab Bureau in its biennial meetings. The General Conference is actively involved in setting directions for the partnership by providing a complete and comprehensive command and control administrative system at all levels. The strategic vision is articulated by formulating policies, defining expectations from different departments and individual executives, designing long-term plans, programs, and projects. The influence of the strategic bodies
on the direction setting is centralized. It was identified by the officers at all levels that the vision for the partnership is given by the strategic leadership as articulated in the policy documents. A senior manager in the Riyadh headquarters said, “I don’t make goals - they are already made and written down by the General Conference”. The strategically placed administrative bodies such as the Executive Board and the Boards of Trustees for the Research Centre Kuwait and the Training Centre Doha Qatar further illustrate the vision, goals, and policies in their six monthly meetings. The executives of the partnership such as the Director General Arab Bureau, the Director Training Centre, and the Director Research Centre express the organizational vision and goals verbally and demonstrate it in their actions.

As you know the Bureau has been in existence since 35 years and it has certain set of objectives laid down by the General Conference of the Bureau. The vision is always to achieve those objectives. Maybe the means and tools will change according to the era we are living in but the same objectives are still valid. It is mainly contributing with the ministries of education towards the development to education practices. This is the main objectives (A Senior Officer, Riyadh).

It is true that policies and programs designed/approved at the strategic levels are binding for all lower levels. However, prior to the final approvals the General Conference promotes extensive communication at every level horizontally and vertically. Policies, programs, long-term, medium term, and short-term are finalized based on in depth and professional discussions and at all levels. The data reveal that organizational goals and objectives are formulated based on pervasive communication in the Arab Bureau. Promoting effective communication is a specific leadership practice that is included in
the setting directions as a core leadership function which was found at all organizational levels in the Arab Bureau. While commenting on goal setting process, an officer in Riyadh said, “goals are framed according to the ideas given by the member states”. A story that was shared by an officer with regard to the goal setting reveals the process how the goals were formulated at the time of the creation of the ABEGS partnership:

Since the beginning of our work here…in my opinion a team of researchers did this job - seven experts from seven states. They looked at the educational goals of each member states and tried to make unified goals for the ABEGS. [Who appointed those seven experts?] The Arab Bureau in Riyadh. [How much time they took to complete this work?] Three years. … The draft goals were submitted to all the ministries of education. The education ministries provided their input and then the updated draft was submitted to the Executive Board. The Executive Board and the Arab Bureau had deliberations on those draft goals. The draft was finalized and submitted to the General Conference. The approval was granted and then we published those goals. [In your opinion who played most effective role?] All of them. They shared this effort (an Officer in Research Centre Kuwait).

The above quote clearly shows that consultation and communication takes place at all levels. However, the final decision is taken by the leaders at the top level which is the strategic level of the partnership. The draft was prepared and discussed by the lower levels and submitted to the strategic leaders for their formal approval. I would also like to add the following comment taken from a published document by the Arab Bureau on the Second Medium-term Plan 1986 – 1991.
In drawing up this plan, the Bureau relied upon many resources and terms of references such as: ABEGS’ vision, mission, tasks and duties, the recommendations of numerous conferences, forums, and meetings, the conclusions of studies and research papers conducted by the Bureau and other related agencies such as the General Secretariat of the Gulf Cooperation Council, and universities, Ministries, and individuals interested in joint Arab Gulf endeavour, and other regional, and other regional as well as international organizations. (Arab Bureau Office Publication, Page, 19)

I found noteworthy evidence of the presence of effective communication as a part of leadership functions at all levels. The Arab Bureau adopts various means to ensure effective communication and consultation at strategic, managerial, and operational levels. They convene yearly consultation meetings (Tashawari), six monthly meetings of the Executive Board, and six monthly meetings of the Board(s) of Trustee for the Research Centre Kuwait, and the Training Centre Doha Qatar, series of staff meetings at different office locations in the entire Arab Gulf region of the ABEGS partnership. The communication\textsuperscript{27} that takes place amongst the strategic levels (the General Conference, Executive Board, and the Board (s) of Trustees), the managerial levels (senior managers at the Arab Bureau headquarter, Research Centre, Training Centre, and the ministries of the member states), and operational levels (all the staff members involved in the day to day implementation of the plans and programs of the ABEGS partnership) construct highways to establish effective communication.

\textsuperscript{27} Letters, office memos, phone talks, meetings, formal and informal visits, presentations, progress reports, feedback on reports, expert opinions of the education consultants, publications, research findings, recommendations offered by experts, , advisories and directives given by the visionary leaders, proceedings and recommendations concluded at the related symposiums, seminars, workshops, training programs, scholarly discussions at the online forums provided by ABEGS portal, feedback collected by the ABEGS portal from the grassroots levels on different online and onsite services offered by the Arab Bureau, etc.
Communication in the Arab Bureau can be categorized into two types i.e. formal and informal. Formal communication is vertically structured. The messages have to move through proper channel in vertical hierarchy from top to bottom and backwards from bottom to top. “An officer mentioned, “we generally do not directly communicate with ministries. It is always through [proper channel]”. There are terminal points for some pieces of information. Information is filtered, updated, and/or certain decisions are made at these terminal points. Sometimes, as required by the procedures the information is moved or disseminated vertically, horizontally, or diagonally to other directions in the Arab Bureau from the above mentioned terminal points. The Arab Bureau has policy directions and procedures to undertake formal communication in the partnership. “There are structured rules and regulations for communication. The centers and headquarter follow the rules to maintain the communication amongst them (An officer in Kuwait)”. The formal way for decision making at the horizontal level is voting and with majority.

**Figure 11: Formal Communication at the ABEGS**

![Diagram of Formal Communication at the ABEGS](image)

Both formal and informal communication is an essential component of the work environment at the ABEGS. The formal communication at the Arab Bureau is carried out
in procedurally designed way. Proper protocol and hierarchical channels are followed for
the flow of formal information. “We establish communication with the institutions of the
Arab Bureau through the Executive Board and secondly, through the meetings that are
held by the Director General Arab Bureau. These meeting are attended by the directors of
GASERC and AETCGS. In addition to our programs and projects, we discuss the
problems and obstacles that come in the way of our work (Director GASERC, Kuwait).

Most of the official decisions are taken on the basis of formal communication.
However, the leaders at the ABEGS promote informal communication as well. Social
visits, celebrations, informal consultation meetings like “Tashawari”, and friendly
behaviour with staff members remove communication barriers and encourage people to
promote communication. “We socialize with ministers as friends (an officer in Qatar)”.
“It [communication] is very frequent and frank … the communication is easy … we even
have their cell phone and we call if we need … we have no problem socializing with
them we have food together …it is like friends (an officer in Riyadh)”.

It is important to look at the communication relationship between strategic,
managerial, and operational levels of the Arab Bureau as an interorganizational
partnership. The officers at the operational level feel no gap of communication with the
higher organizational levels in the Arab Bureau. They are of the view that “there is
always a person of the lower rank in the higher body. This is how there is no gap of
communication” (An officer in Riyadh). The officers feel that they enjoy trust of their
superiors which helps them establish restriction free communication.

They [Senior Executives / Ministries] have trust in us. It shows that
there is meaningful communication…I don’t think there is any
restricted communication. We feel like one family even at the higher levels such as the Executive Board we feel like a family. It is very positive that helps work go smooth (An officer in Doha Qatar).

The Director General of the Arab Bureau is a key officer who plays a role of a bridge to establish and demonstrate multidimensional communication between different stakeholders of the ABEGS partnership. The subordinate organizations of the Arab Bureau, internal departments and committees of the Arab Bureau headquarters, consultant organizations and individual experts, education ministries of the member states, the Board(s) of Trustees, the Executive Board, and the General Conference send and receive messages from the Director General as shown in the following figure.

Figure 12: The Director General A Bridge for Multidimensional Communication at the ABEGS
Position in the hierarchy and job performance expectations empower the Director General to establish direct contact and communication with the education ministers and deputy ministers of the member states of the Arab Bureau.

The Director General has always the path of communication directly with the Ministers and Deputy Ministers. It goes both ways depending on the subject. Sometimes it has a heavier weight that you need to consult the big man and sometimes the deputy minister fulfills your need so it depends on the subject. I write and communicate to both of them (A Senior Officer, Arab Bureau Riyadh).

The Director General connects strategic, managerial, and operational levels of administration with his communication in the ABEGS partnership. He initiates, processes, and/or disseminates all kinds of administrative, financial, and academic information using various means. ABEGS partnership and similar interorganizational partnerships need to establish and maintain consultative processes, communication and structures that ensure that all members have input into direction setting. It is important for some individual or individuals to act as bridges or brokers in the context of partnership environment so as to work on points of coordination and collaboration to help bring desired input together and to ensure communication flow.

The data analyses reveal the pivotal position of the Director General in the overall organizational structure of the ABEGS including his key role in the establishment of effective communication in this partnership. The following statement by an officer in the Riyadh headquarters throws light on this aspect.
The Director General is the one who gets every update, any news, any decision. It is to be communicated by this person to all others. This person is a bridge of communication between the member states, and the Arab Bureau. All the department heads write to the Director General and then he communicates with the deputy ministers and sometimes to the ministers. A deputy minister talk to deputy ministers of the other countries. Sometimes if needed ministers also directly communicate with the Director General (An officer in Riyadh).

7.1.1 Consensus Decisions at the Strategic Level

The procedural requirement for taking decisions in the Arab Bureau is to establish a majority. However, the data unfolds that decisions at the strategic level are taken by consensus. It does not mean that there are no disagreements during discussions at that level. The disagreements are resolved by having exhaustive and effective communication. The decisions are also not taken in haste. The needed information is retrieved from the ministries to help work out differences.

They [ministers] discuss all the details and opinions of each other. If they don’t reach a consensus they postpone it to the next meeting. As I told you if they have any misunderstanding and disagreement they go back to their ministries get more information and discuss those issues again. They don’t make haste to take a decision – so when they have enough and appropriate information then they take decision. If a few members have a different view they at the end of the day join the majority and establish consensus (An officer in Doha).

The above statement is endorsed by another comment.
If there are differences, they [ministries] will discuss until they reach an agreement. They are only seven people. They just nod (showing their acceptance). It is always friendly atmosphere. You know when they agree – you know our decisions have to be unanimous (A Senior Officer, Riyadh).

In order to establish consensus, leaders encourage and promote communication at the strategic level as exhibited by the aforementioned statements that sets an example for the lower levels. The decision makers at the lower levels definitely promote effective communication, utilize multifarious sources of information to analyze issues at greater depth, and explore various possible options to reach appropriate conclusion.

The qualitative data provided more information on identifying vision, articulating goals, and promoting effective communication among the setting directions practices identified by Leithwood et al (2006, 2007). I did not get much qualitative data on ‘high performance expectation’ from my interviews. The responses that I got on the questionnaire that I administered in Riyadh headquarters, research centre Kuwait and training centre Doha highlight the usage of ‘high performance expectations’. The following bar chart presents a picture of integrated data collected from the above mentioned three locations, and from three administrative levels i.e. strategic, managerial, and operational levels of the Arab Bureau partnership. The bar chart shows comparative usage of four specific leadership practices included in the core leadership function i.e. ‘setting direction’.
How frequently do you perform following leadership practices? 
Likert Scale: 1 = never at all 2= Seldom 3 = Sometimes 4 = Frequently 5 = very frequently

The chart very clearly depicts that all four leadership practices are used frequently in the entire partnership, according to self report by the leaders at different levels who were surveyed, as well as interviewed. According to this graph ‘high performance expectations’ and ‘promoting effective communication’ are used more than others leadership practices in setting direction. I would like to make it clear that I have no intention to use the questionnaire data to undertake major analysis of this study. The qualitative data collected through the face to face interviews will remain the basis of main analysis of my research. The questionnaire data will be used to confirm or affirm findings that emerge from the qualitative data.

The analysis of leadership practices included in the set of core leadership functions of ‘setting directions’ reveal that communication and consensus building are more strongly emphasized over articulating vision. This is consistent with the qualitative
data that suggest that in the context of an interorganizational partnership decisions cannot just flow from a top down vision and goals from senior authorities they have to be accompanied by a lot of interorganizational communication and consensus building in order to get agreement on the directions.

The participants of this study talked about achieving high performance standards both at the organizational level in the Arab Bureau and also by the teachers and students at the school level in the member states. “We are trying to develop some standards and some measures so that we can see the effect of our work on our students and on the schools in the field (An officer in Riyadh)”. In view of their ‘high performance expectations’, the leadership at the ABEGS collaborates with numerous organizations in the Arab Gulf region, and at the global level as well. The leaders frequently travel in the Arab region and beyond to enrich their experience and establish ties with educational organizations such as Gulf Research Centre (GRC), Islamic Educational Scientific, and Cultural Organization (ISESCO), Arab Thought Foundation (ATF), Association of Arab Universities (AAU), Arab Institute of Urban Development (AIUD), World Assembly of Muslim Youth (WAMY), United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), Arab League Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organization (ALECSO), and Arab Gulf Fund (AGFUND)\(^\text{28}\). There is a long list of educational programs that the Arab Bureau has developed based on the close interaction and collaboration with such organizations. “This bureau is working at the level of the seven Gulf States and it has relations with other organizations like ALECSO, ISESCO…to develop many educational programs (An officer in Riyadh)”. It is because of the ‘high

\(^{28}\) http://www.abegs.org/Eportal/Organizations
performance expectations’ of the strategic leaders that executives at the managerial and operational levels engage themselves in every possible professional activity to raise the performance level at the Arab Bureau.

Furthermore, the ABEGS’ participation in the Trends in International Mathematics and Sciences Study (TIMSS) and Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS), and the establishment of Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) indicate the Arab Bureau’s interest to maintain high performance standards and expectations for this partnership.

TIMSS is an international study in Mathematics and Science. It is regularly administered every 4 years. It is organized by the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA). TIMSS is aimed at the 4th and 8th grade students where, countries can participate in one or both grades. In view of the importance of this study, many Arab countries decided to participate in TIMSS. All member states of the ABEGS registered in TIMSS 2007. The TIMSS is focused to compare the student achievement in both Mathematics and Science. It is to provide appropriate information to the policy makers so as to help them make and implement adequate plans and policies to improve teaching and learning Mathematics and Science. In order to identify areas of improvement the TIMSS aims to study the effects of the implemented curricula and teaching methods which helps educational managers to prepare for future.

Before and after developing the programs they [ABEGS leaders/officers] do the quality assurance after that they evaluate the final outcomes with the standards of quality. They also evaluate the inputs, processes, outcomes, findings, and results of each program (The Director Quality Assurance in Riyadh).
The leaders at the Bureau connect their work with TIMSS and PIRLS. They view their participation in the large scale tests such as TIMSS and PIRLS help the member states measure student performance and collect data for policy makers to develop appropriate policies to meet high performance expectations of the Arab Bureau leadership. In view of the utility of TIMSS and PIRLS many Arab Gulf States intend to participate in these programs scheduled for the year 2011.

7.1.2 Discussion

Setting directions at the Arab Bureau is vertically structured. It is centralized in nature as far as identifying vision and articulating goals is concerned. The visionary and strategic leadership at the Arab Bureau provides vision at the macro level. This vision is articulated through the policies, plans, and programs formulated by three strategic bodies i.e. the General Conference, the Executive Board, and the Board(s) of Trustees of the ABEGS partnership.

The micro level goal setting is performed at the managerial levels. For instance, leaders in the subordinate institutions such as the Research Centre Kuwait, and the Training Centre Doha Qatar design their own goals but they have to seek approval of these goals from the strategic leadership. “We have a research center in Kuwait – all research projects are undertaken there. They do research about all the curriculum of seven states. So they make their research goals and submit to the Board” (Public Relation Officer). The element of micro level goal setting also prevails at the other offices such as Quality Assurance Committee, Information Technology, Public Relations, Finance and
Administration Departments of the Arab Bureau. The leaders of these departments set goals for their departments but obtain approval of higher levels before they start working to achieve their designed goals.

Our vision is the constant improvement in the educational strategies (Director Training Centre Doha).

Full information about the programs, their goals, budget, and anticipated results is submitted to the General Conference (Direction Information, Riyadh).

A lot of discussion takes place at the lower levels before things go to the General Conference. Lower units make plans, set their goals and objectives, develop proposals programs and projects for two year period and submit through proper channel to the General Conference for final decision (senior officer in Riyadh).

The preceding discussion and data analysis allow me to conclude here that macro level ‘setting direction’ is determined through vertical organizational structures mainly by strategic leaders based on multilevel and multidirectional consultation and communication engaging all stakeholders of interorganizational partnership environment. The ABEGS partnership has rigorous consultative process at all horizontal levels (strategic, managerial, and operational) of the interorganizational structures of this partnership. Synthesized communication at a particular horizontal level is reviewed at the next vertical structural level. The authority works in vertical way. The work completed at the operational level is approved at the managerial level and forwarded to the strategic level for final approval. The picture at ABEGS partnership shows that the decisions taken in the subordinate institutions go to their respective Board of Trustees, passing this stage
decisions are presented to the Executive Board, and final stage for the ratification of decisions is the General Conference. The policy directions come from the strategic level to the operational level through the managerial level for compliance. The leaders at the Arab Bureau promote effective communication by having consultative communication that runs both up and down in the partnership environment more meticulously at the horizontal levels.

7.2.0 Developing People

The second set of core leadership functions, as defined by Leithwood et al (2007) includes following three specific leadership practices:

1. Intellectual stimulation
2. Individualized support
3. Modeling appropriate values and practices

I found that the leaders in the Arab Bureau are using multiple ways to develop people of this partnership. For instance, the establishment of the Arab Educational Training Centre for the Gulf States (AETCGS) Doha Qatar is the most prominent evidence in this regard. The main aim of this training centre is to design and deliver training programs for the “educational leaders” of the ABEGS partnership. The AETCGS offers training in Doha training centre and also in all member states of the Arab Bureau partnership.

In addition to this big training centre in Doha another small but modern training institute has been established in the Arab Bureau headquarters Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. This training centre is more focused on providing training to the operational work force
of the Arab Bureau. In addition to the formal training, there are arrangements such as publication of an educational refereed journal\(^{29}\), scholarly discussions at the ABEGS portal, publication of online articles for intellectual stimulation of the educational leaders in the Gulf States. The officers of the Bureau participate in seminars, symposiums, workshops, conferences, and other educational activities organized by the regional and international organizations for their professional development. Sometimes individual executives are given scholarships and/or financial support to acquire higher education from the regional or international universities. The Arab Bureau offers monetary rewards for high academic achievements in the member states so as to provide intellectual stimulation in the partnership\(^{30}\). The research centre in Kuwait also called the GASERC Kuwait is another source that creates opportunities for developing people by undertaking research projects for development and unification of curriculum in the member states of the Arab Bureau partnership. The GASERC used to organize training programs as well before the establishment of the AETCGS in Doha Qatar in 1999.

It is important to mention the contribution and efforts of individual leaders at the Arab Bureau who served this partnership and became role model for their successors.

When Dr. Rasheed was the Director General of the Arab Bureau, he created the Research Centre in Kuwait and when Dr. Saeed Al-Mullais became the Director General he followed the footsteps of his predecessor and established the training centre in Doha. Dr. Ali

---

\(^{29}\) Risalat al-khaleej Al-Arabi (the Message of the Arab Gulf) started in 1981

\(^{30}\) Dr. Zainab Al-Jaber, of the College of Education of Kuwait University, won the sixth annual award of the Arab Bureau of Education for the Gulf States (ABEGS). The 2010 award-giving ceremony was held here in the presence of Saudi Minister of Education Prince Faisal bin Abdullah bin Mohammad Al-Saud and ABEGS Director-General Dr. Ali Al-Karni...Prince Faisal announced a decision to double the value of ABEGS award from 100,000 to 200,000 Saudi riyals as from the coming seventh session (Arab Times May, 10, 2010.)
is now the Director General of the Arab Bureau and he is working on the Language Centre in Sharja UAE. He has also established a training institute in Riyadh headquarters (An officer in Riyadh).

The above statement explains how leaders at the Arab Bureau followed good practices of their forerunners and gradually developed the structures of the ABEGS partnership for educational administration and development in the Arabian Gulf Region. The impact of the working of institutions such as the GASERC Kuwait, AETCGS Doha, and the Arab Language Centre UAE is manifold specifically for developing people starting from the managerial leadership to the grassroots levels administration in the member states.

The above quote contain rich evidence and information that shows how leaders with their individualized support help redesigned the partnership structures for develop people at all levels. The names of the ABEGS leaders included in the above quote covers the history of the Arab Bureau from early times when Dr. Rasheed was the Director General ABEGS who contributed to establish institutional structure of the research centre so as to promote skills of the people of the Arabian Gulf Region. His individualized support created a research centre in Kuwait which is a significant source of ‘intellectual stimulation’ for the people and professionals working as strategic leaders (for policy making), managerial leaders (to take managerial decisions), and operational leaders (for the implementation of policy in day to day administration) for the ABEGS partnership by undertaking research projects for educational administration and development in the
The leadership exhibited by this executive of the partnership became a ‘model practice’ to be followed by his successors.

The same quote talks about two succeeding generations of the leadership at ABEGS partnership and their contribution for developing people in the Arab Bureau. Dr. Saeed al Mullais (former Director General ABEGS) who contributed in establishing the structures of training centre Doha for professional development of school and educational leaders and Dr. Ali Karni (present Director General ABEGS) who contributed in designing and creating Language Centre Sharja and establishing a training centre for the skill development of teachers and operational leaders in the educational administration of the ABEGS partnership. The Arab Bureau witnessed individualized support of these leaders from early 80s to date which covers more than 30 years history of the Bureau.

The analysis of the quote also shows the leadership values and practices modeled by the leaders for developing people in the Arab Bureau. The human resource development institutions created by the three leaders has already generated hundreds of professional develop activities for internal executives coming from managerial and operational organizational administration of the ABEGS partnership and to thousands educational professionals from managerial and operational levels of the ministries of education of the seven member states. This huge organizational redesigning and restructuring by the strategic leaders of the Arab Bureau is a sizeable long term effort for developing people of the ABEGS partnership.

In promoting the employees at the Arab Bureau, we consider who has higher qualification, who has attended more training courses,

---

31 Please see a list of research projects, publications, and curriculum development projects completed by the research centre Kuwait till 1997 at Appendix - H
who has more experience, so the promotion depends on these factors. We send our employees for training. Mostly when we promote our employees we send the employees for training so that they can handle higher level responsibility (An officer in Training Centre Doha).

As stated by a senior executive of the Arab Bureau, the leaders have created system links of people’s development with their career promotion.

7.2.1 The Role of the AETCGS in Developing People

The main idea was to train the leadership here in Qatar as all the ministries of the member states had their own training centers to provide training to their teachers, inspectors, and other personnel in those training centers. They [education ministers] said that they are going to have specialized place to train the leadership. The state of Qatar was asked to host this center. We have our formal objectives (An officer in Training Centre Doha).

It is inevitable to study the role of the AETCGS in greater depth so as to understand the efforts of the Arab Bureau leadership in developing people at the ABEGS. The main agenda at the AETCGS which is also known as Training Centre at Doha is to provide training to the educational leaders who work at the managerial and operational levels of the education ministries of the member states of the ABEGS partnership.

The process to design and develop the training schedule or calendar of courses for two years period at the AETCGS Doha can be viewed from two perspectives. The first one is the hierarchical and centralized approval procedure and the second one is participative approach to develop calendar of courses for two years. The preparation of the calendar of courses starts at the AETCGS Doha. Based on the training needs
assessment data collected from the member states the director of the research centre prepares a detailed schedule of various training programs to be organized in two years period with the advice of a team of internal experts.

We gather information about their needs every two years because we make budget for every two years. We ask from all seven member states about the needs of their training. Then we collect the relevant data. From that data we see which training program took more points for instance a leadership training program which is coming up next year. This leadership program was nominated by five countries out of seven then we selected it. Then we share this information with our Board of Trustees. In order to get the approval of the Board of Trustees we short list seven or eight training programs from a long list of around fifty. The members of the Board of Trustees are mostly experienced trainers. They understand reasoning of this screening process. The director of the center is also the member of the Board of Trustees, so there is no chance of any gap of communication. These training programs are then sent for the approval of the Executive Board and the General Conference (An officer in Training Centre Doha).

The approval process of the calendar of courses for the AETCGS is centralized. But this process involves extensive participation of different stakeholders at all levels.

The programs are designed based on the data collected from various educational establishments such as the ministries of education, administrative offices at the local levels, and schools. The data is processed at the operational and managerial levels and approved by the leaders at the strategic levels. Though the process of designing and development of training programs is centralized but it also involves participation. The
involvement of leaders at various levels in this process shows their interest in developing people in the ABEGS partnership.

Developing people has been on high priority on the task list of the Arab Bureau. They started training with effect from 1981 much before the establishment of Training Centre in Doha Qatar in 1999. The Research Centre Kuwait popularly known as GASERC Kuwait used to organize training programs. Some of the training programs organized by the GASERC Kuwait are listed below.

1. First Course in Educational Studies, 1981
2. Second Course in Educational Studies, 1983
3. First Course in Educational Research, 1980
4. Second Course in Educational Research, 1982
5. Third Course in Educational Research, 1985
6. First Course in Educational Evaluation, 1983
7. Second Course in Educational Evaluation, 1984
8. Training Course in Documentation and Information, and the Use of Computers in this Field, 1987

In the beginning they had to develop their own capacity to conduct research and evaluation on education activities in the member states. They employed professionals from the member states and prepared their indigenous work force to undertake research, needs assessment surveys, and evaluations of their existing educational activates to handle their first challenge of joint curriculum development for the member states. Later, the strategic leaders created a training institute in Doha to design courses for managerial and operational educational leadership of the ABEGS partnership.

---

32 Source: Research Centre Booklet. Page 25
The core function of developing people was completely moved from the GASERC Kuwait to Doha after the establishment of Training Centre in Doha. In addition to regular activities, the Director and staff at the Training Centre are developing a long-range training project in Doha. They call it, “Strategic Planning for Arab Training Center for the Gulf States”. A senior officer in Doha training centre told me about this project.

Since 2004 we are working on a project called, “Strategic Planning for Arab Training Center for the Gulf States”. This project is currently under final evaluation to be approved. We proposed seven goals to be achieved in this project. For instance, we will try to develop leadership development program, develop standards for training, implementing standards for training, and develop the human resource development people at our center (the master trainer groups). Though we are limited in number but we have to reach higher standards. We have developed standards some of them are written and some are not written. But from our experience we are doing it internally, for instance how to develop training program from A to Z from our own experience. We re-evaluate from time to time our standards like who have to do what and what is the role of whom and why. The Director is interested in developing people here. She is of the view that we must train ourselves and arrange courses to train the trainers (An officer in Doha).

The above statement shows the level of interest, keenness, and the kind of thinking involved in planning strategies for developing people in the Arab Bureau. The training community in the ABEGS partnership is conscious of developing high quality standards for their human resource development which shows their ‘individualized support’ at the operational leadership level. All the officers in the Training Centre Doha possess doctoral degrees in either education or in psychology. They have extensive work
experience in the field of education and training. The Training Centre is located in the centre of Doha city. It has modern class rooms equipped with latest training facilities. The centre has a rich library that contains books, professional journals, regional and international magazines, reports, and other related material to ensure ‘intellectual stimulation’ to the staff and potential participants of the training centre. According to senior management of the AETCGS, they are working with some training professionals in United Kingdom to acquire accreditation for this Training Centre.

We are trying to have accreditation by joining hands with professionals in the United Kingdom. We are working on this accreditation in phases. I have established contact in England to establish this centre as an accredited center. So not everyone with a bag walks in and says I am a trainer. We need to organize this and make it more professional (An officer in Doha).

The training professionals at this centre are not hesitant to establish links with people in the western world. When the officer said ‘I have established contact’ it shows personal involvement and ‘individualized support’ for strategy development and training design for developing people at the managerial leadership level of the ABEGS partnership. The managerial leaders at the Arab Bureau are interested to enhance the credibility and quality of training by getting accreditation from recognized professional sources. The trainers in Doha try to use new and innovative ideas to promote training. They believe that they can reach maximum possible people to help them improve their knowledge and skills. An officer told me that he integrates contents of a given topic and develops his course as a ‘program bag’. He is enthusiastic to use media and information technology to design and impart training to his potential participants. He says:
We are working on another interesting concept, I call it “program bag”. For instance I need to have training on economy of education, so we need to develop contents for that so that people may get knowledge and training even without coming here by e-learning. E-learning is our biggest interest now either through the internet or through the media/video conference. We have this proposal in our next financial period.

The contents and methodology of all the training programs are designed at the training centre and these programs are finalized after seeking series of approvals by the Board of Trustees, the Arab Bureau Headquarters, the Executive Board, and the General Conference. This ensures the essential consultation and positional approval at all levels. The leaders with experience, knowledge, and commitment at all levels have the opportunity to play their role so as to make all training activities purposeful for the partnership. The programs are then advertised in the member states. The Board of Trustees (BOT) and the member of the Executive Board facilitate this communication.

We directly talk to the countries. As we already have had the approval of those programs through the Board of Trustees, the Bureau, the Executive Board, and the General Conference. We therefore directly talk to the countries through their under secretaries. How it works is for example we are organizing a training program we write to the Executive Board copying the same to the members of the Board of Trustees and then the members of the Executive Board issue directions to their respective ministries to arrange nominations. Same thing happens with other kind of communication. They write to their training department that means to the members of the Board of Trustees (seven members) or to any
other department depending on the topic of the communication (An office in Doha).

The marketing of AETCGS training programs through the Board of Trustees and/or the members of the Executive Board appears to be a centralized process. But this is the most efficient and effective strategy to advertise training programs. This is how the Training Centre Doha can arrange nominations of right people for the right training programs. Another advantage of this kind of communication is that senior executives stay informed and involved at every stage of the endeavours for developing people in the ABEGS partnership.

The AETCGS staff intends to maintain close contact with the people in the ministries of the member states at the lower levels of educational administration. They are planning to design needs based program. It was mentioned that “the Director General (a pivotal strategic leadership position) advised to make specific needs focused programs rather than general programs”. They wish to hold yearly meetings with the training directors of seven member states so as to enhance cooperation and identify training needs of the member states.

In order to have cooperation in the field of training we are going to convene yearly meetings of the training directors of the seven countries to have more cooperation to meet our training needs. This will start effect this year for the first time (An officer in Doha).

The officers in Doha training centre mentioned that they organize training on many topics. However, the training designed at the centre fits in one of the following three categories:
1. Accredited programs for the member states.
2. Specific need based programs for a member state
3. Community programs for education professionals

We have three types of programs (1) Accredited programs for all member Gulf States (2) Specific need based programs for any member country. … Either we organize it here or we go in that country and organize it there. All the participants for this program are from that country only (3) Community Programs. We organize these programs for our education community. If we feel that there is need for training for a particular topic then we make announcement through newspapers or by emails and organize that program.

The AETCGS is performing a key role with regard to developing people for the Arab Bureau. The professionals at the training centre design, coordinate, organize, and evaluate the approved training programs. They make decisions pertaining to the contents of training courses, methodology, human and physical resources to be used in different programs. However, the nominations of the participants are in the hands of leaders working at the managerial and operational levels of the ABEGS partnerships. They are the ones who make the assessment of the training needs of people working in their offices. Who needs what kind of training and where to send who for what training is recommended/decided by the immediate boss. The role of managerial and operational leaders is also very crucial as far as the development of people in the Arab Bureau is concerned. This is where close coordination, cooperation, and collaboration of all the stakeholders play its role. The work of the AETCGS is progressing since its inception in 1999. The training professionals of the AETCGS are doing their job by establishing communication at all levels vertically and horizontally throughout the ABEGS
partnership in all the member states. They organize needed training in the training
centre Doha and on demand in a member state as well. The programs designed by the
AETCGS enjoy high value and credibility as they are approved by the higher authorities
of the ABEGS partnership.

7.2.2 Developing People by Various other Means

The AETCGS is the centre of developing people for the ABEGS partnership.
However, the activities with regard to the human resource development at the Arab
Bureau are not limited to the programs designed and conducted by this training centre.
All the member states have their own training facilities and multiple ways to develop
their people.

Though it is not a frequent practice but the Arab Bureau headquarters offers
grants, scholarships, and awards to some employees for higher education. “People go
abroad for training and education but the number is not big. Few people are nominated
for training abroad. Sometimes people go on scholarship or avail grants (An Officer in
Riyadh)”. The major focus is to provide task specific training or training that fills the gap
when someone does not have enough experience. “Once we see a lack of experience on
the part of any staff, we ask them to take training (A senior officer in Riyadh)”. Providing
higher education to the employees of the ABEGS partnerships is not the priority or part
of its mission as stated by a senior executive at the Arab Bureau.

Sometimes we do [help] those who are ambitious to have higher
degrees. It is not part of our mission as we need people to work for
us not those who are interested in higher education. But sometimes
we give part of the tuition fee when we see someone is good and ambitious to get higher education (The Director General).

The contemporary leadership in the Arab Bureau emphasizes developing people in the field of information technology. The Bureau has taken numerous initiatives to promote information technology in the member states. The ministries are advised to encourage teaching professional to use e-learning solution to teach their courses in schools. The ABEGS headquarters is taking many steps to strengthen technology infrastructure in the entire regional jurisdiction of the Arab Bureau partnership. The top leadership believes that people in the member states are not familiar with technology so there is a lot of potential for improvement in the field of information technology in the member states.

We also provide training inside locally especially in the technology. Because there is a big shift that has been made for the last few years towards technology and here a lot of people are not familiar with technology. So we are trying to lead them and force them to utilize technology more and be technology driven in their work (Senior Executive, Arab Bureau Riyadh).

The advanced information technology infrastructure is being developed in the Arab Bureau headquarters and in all the member states to meet the most modern technological needs for human resource development in this partnership. The ABEGS portal offers multiple ways and opportunities to intellectually stimulate the recipients of training on information technology. The Director General of the Arab Bureau is a great advocate of the benefits of information technology. He is making significant efforts to ‘intellectually stimulate’ the people of ABEGS partnership to develop their knowledge
and skills that shows his personal ‘individualized support’ for people development through technological means. He is using technology to impart knowledge to the people associated to the Arab Bureau in all seven member states. The Chief Executive says:

The use of technology has reengineered our work in the Bureau. … The vision is to enrich the environment with the latest in the education. So we also took the initiative to Arabizing the material from other languages to Arabic language, because the thought products in education are not very rich in the Arab countries. So we should utilize the educational theories that are numerous and published daily in the west specifically in the United States and Canada. So we are trying to overcome the copyright issues and take the licenses to translate these materials to our teachers and make this available to them through our portal [ABEGS portal] free.

The Arab Bureau is spending a lot of money, time and effort for the development of its people. The creation of the AETCGS, its running expenditure, the construction of technological infrastructure, the establishment of libraries, acquisition of the services of human resource development (HRD) and other experts, show the seriousness of ABEGS leadership towards developing people of this partnership.

The evidence presented in the qualitative data analysis provides a moderate mix of three specific leadership practices (1) intellectual stimulation, (2) individualized support, and (3) model practices of the partnership leaders. The presence of rich libraries at all three places that I visited (Riyadh headquarters, Research Centre Kuwait, and Training Centre Doha), continued research activities at the GASERC Kuwait, the progressively improved quality of training programs at Doha training centre, and leaders’ encouragement to promote intellectual activities such as regional academic conferences,
seminars, symposiums, publication of educational materials provide rich evidence of intellectual stimulation for people development. The language and contents of the qualitative data clearly show that the establishment of institutions such as GASERC, AETCGS, and Language Centre Sharja development is big source of people development in the ABEGS partnership. The structures of these institutions stand on three main pillars. The first pillar is model practices of the earlier strategic leaders, the second pillar is individualized support of the succeeding strategic and managerial leaders, and the third pillar is consultative process, experience, knowledge, dedication /commitment, hard work of key organizational leaders working at the strategic, managerial, and operational levels of the ABEGS partnership.

The discussion based on the qualitative data above and the graph below shows the mix usage of all three specific leadership practices with regard to the core leadership function of developing people as identified by Leithwood et al (2007).

**Figure 14: Developing People: Comparative Usage of Specific Leadership Practices**

How frequently do you perform following leadership practices?

Likert Scale: 1 = never at all 2 = Seldom 3 = Sometimes 4 = Frequently 5 = very frequently

---

162
7.2.3 Discussion

It is very clearly pictured in the opening discussion of this section that the leadership in the Arab Bureau takes a serious interest in developing its people. Significant resources are allocated to this job. The responsibility of developing people is felt by the leadership at all strategic, managerial, and operational organizational levels. The individual leaders and different strategic, managerial, and operational bodies are involved in the process to design and develop various human resource development activities such as training programs, workshops, educational conferences, symposiums, etc.

The process of sanctioning funds and approving training programs is hierarchical and vertical in nature but it is substantially participative. Most of the training programs are conceived and constructed at the operational levels and gradually developed with the involvement of managerial levels and finally approved or disapproved by the strategic levels. The ideas and vision of human capacity building programs may come from the top as well. In this case the lower levels prepare activities to achieve the given targets of human development and seek approvals from the higher levels. I also learnt through the data analysis that experts are not shy to make use of indigenous and resources from other organizations, regions or countries. The leaders at the ABEGS also made a long standing commitment to developing human resource expertise within the Gulf States from their own experiences so as not to be overly dependent upon external sources of knowledge.

Senior executives emphasize developing people in the field of information technology and use technology as a tool of human resource development. The former
leaders and the leaders of present times have established professional institutions and modern infrastructure for developing people. They are preparing intellectual resources by translating educational and professional material from other languages so as to create convenience and environment of efficient learning for their work force.

I also learnt with the help of data analysis that leaders at the Arab Bureau periodically review the organizational performance and the work quality of employees to plan long and short term human capacity building activities for the ABEGS partnership.

**7.3.0 Redesigning the Organization**

The third set of core leadership functions, as defined by Leithwood et al (2007) includes following four specific leadership practices:

1. Building a collaborative culture
2. Structuring the organization to facilitate work
3. Creating productive relations
4. Connecting the organization to its wider environment

The beginning of the bureau was very simple. We had a first meeting of the General Conference here in Riyadh. It started with a small center in the Arabian Gulf University (AGU) Bahrain. Then we had a research center in Kuwait, then training center in Doha, and now Arabic Language Center in Sharja. If you look at the number from the beginning till today, you will realize how big the Bureau has grown in 35 years (Director Finance & Administration Arab Bureau Riyadh).
The Arab Bureau of Education for the Gulf States (ABEGS) came into being in October 1975 as an interorganizational partnership of seven Gulf States. The leadership of this partnership have introduced many structural changes since its inception. These changes are of two categories. The first type of change is related to the ABEGS’ growth and development when new institutions and departments were established to perform certain tasks for the ABEGS partnership. The second type of change is connected to redesigning of the existing structures of the partnership as explained in the conceptual framework of this study and according to the core leadership functions identified by Leithwood et al (2007) so as to facilitate the partnership work. The purposes of these changes are building a collaborative culture, creating productive relations, facilitating the partnership work, and strengthening the partnership at all levels. Redesigning of this partnership has occurred at all organizational levels.

This section of the chapter will examine the restructuring of the ABEGS partnership at strategic, managerial, and operational levels and study how these changes affect the collaboration, work environment, productivity, and organizational connectivity to its wider environment. It is important to note that suggestions for restructuring may come from any individual or department but final decision or approval of the redesigning is made by the strategic level. The redesigning of the organization is a recurring theme with respect to decision-making within an interorganizational partnership. It is relevant to understand where leadership influence on key decision is located in the organizational structure. Many changes in the Arab Bureau partnership have occurred on the initiative of the strategic level itself. However leaders at the managerial and operational
organizational levels practically implemented the decisions for redesigning the structures of organization in the ABEGS partnership.

Sometimes, our office [Arab Bureau headquarter Riyadh through the Director General] gives suggestions to the Executive Board and then the Executive Board takes this proposal to the General Conference and it is approved – any member state gives a suggestion a particular minister suggests in the meeting and it is done that way - sometimes the ministers discuss most important things in close door meetings and they decide things in those meetings. Restructuring is mostly done at strategic level (An officer in Riyadh).

I shall now analyse some moves of redesigning at the ABEGS and examine their impact in this partnership.

7.3.1 The Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) as Part of Visionary Leadership at the ABEGS

The Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) was created by six Gulf States in May 1981 almost after six years of the ABEGS establishment in October 1975. The GCC was formulated by the heads of the six Gulf States which is the supreme political leadership of the member states of both the GCC and the ABEGS. The role of the GCC in the ABEGS is not very active but the leaders at the GCC may direct the ABEGS to perform any task for the gulf region related to education. The establishment of the GCC affected the core structure of the ABEGS. In view of its leadership status the GCC occupies the core visionary level in the ABEGS interorganizational structure. The GCC leaders sometimes provide visionary direction to the ABEGS. They may also examine any work performed by the ABEGS.

33 Kingdom of Bahrain, State of Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, and United Arab Emirates (UAE).
The direct impact of the GCC on the ABEGS was on its jurisdiction on higher education. The ABEGS was looking after the higher education in the Arabian Gulf region before the GCC came into being. The Arabian Gulf University (AGU) Bahrain was created by the ABEGS. Later AGU was given under the command and control of the GCC through its ‘Supreme Council’.

The ABEGS used to look after all the educational aspects from KG to the University level. But now GCC is in charge of higher education and we [ABEGS] deal with KG to Grade 12 School. GCC is not a leader in the school education. All decisions made by the Executive Board are implemented by the ABEGS and not by the GCC. The only exception is AGU which is now under the umbrella of GCC (An officer in Riyadh).

One of the participants of my study explained the difference between the GCC and the ABEGS. He said:

GCC concentrates more on politics, war and peace issues…also trade and commerce …the leaders meet every year, there informal meetings we call it Tashawari [consultation] are scheduled every six months … every year. They have a formal meeting every year in December. They do not have consultative environment at levels of administration from top to bottom like [we do at] the ABEGS. All their work is done at the top level. Orders are issued at the top and lower levels have to implement those orders (An officer in Riyadh).

The Arab Bureau is an interorganizational body that functions under the visionary leadership34 of the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC). There are many interstate partnerships work under the umbrella of the GCC. The Arab Bureau is one of them and

---

34 See the core layer of the Circular Model of Interorganizational Leadership (Figure -9)
looks after educational administration and development in the region. Some other partnerships in the Arabian Gulf Region that work under the GCC are entrusted with other assignments such as trade, health, supports, natural resources, etc.

The Arabian Gulf University (AGU) Bahrain was initially working under the complete control of the ABEGS. But after the establishment of the GCC it is now being controlled by the Supreme Council of the GCC. However, the Director General of the ABEGS still has a role to play in the administration of the affairs of the AGU. He is the secretary of the Supreme Council GCC meetings with regard to the administrative affairs of the AGU. The Director General is also a member of the Board of Trustees for the AGU. He is the one who prepares budget for this university and closely works with the Council of Higher Education of the GCC. In addition to the AGU administration, the ABEGS also presents progress reports to the Council of Higher Education of the GCC. As mentioned by the Director General of the ABEGS.

There is a meeting of the Supreme Council every year so we make a report to them about certain areas of education. We make a progress report to them intimating progress made in completion of certain projects (The Director General, ABEGS).

The impact of this strategic redesigning of the ABEGS partnership is noteworthy. The involvement of political leadership play significant role in building a collaborative culture in the Arabian Gulf Region. The education ministers who form the strategic leadership for the ABEGS partnership are empowered and motivated by the top political/visionary leadership to perform better by creating productive relations between the partners and other stakeholders. The association of top leadership brings more
credibility to the organization. The relationship of the member states is further strengthened at all levels. The presence of political leadership in the core structure of the ABEGS partnership and its overall influence from the outer environment as shown in the Circular Model of Interorganizational Leadership (Figure – 9) connects the Arab Bureau with its wider environment.

It must also be stated very clearly that involvement of the GCC in the ABEGS affairs is not very active. The GCC and the ABEGS are two separate and independent partnerships. They work with their own separate administrative and financial systems. The organizational decisions in the Arab Bureau are taken by its leadership with full autonomy. The highest level of decision making at the ABEGS is done by its General Conference. The GCC does not interfere in day to day affairs of the ABEGS partnership. It is not a merger of any kind. The ABEGS works independently. But it cannot ignore advice and directives issued by the GCC. The ABEGS always gives due respect to the educational vision offered by the GCC authorities.

7.3.2 Redesigning of Educational Jurisdiction of the Arab Bureau

The Arab Bureau had wider jurisdiction at the time of its establishment in mid 70s and early 80s. The Bureau was responsible to look after higher education and education from the KG to Grade 12 in seven member Gulf States. In the early years of the Bureau some leaders felt the need to establish a university in Bahrain. There was no university in Bahrain at that time. The then education ministers of three countries and the then Director General ABEGS played very active role for the establishment of the Arabian Gulf University (AGU) Bahrain. These leaders were Dr. Ali Fakhroo, Education Minister of Bahrain, Mr. Abdul Aziz Teraki, Education Minister of Qatar, and Dr. Mohamed Rashid,
the Director General of the ABEGS. “They were the pioneers. They believed in joint projects. These people were working day and night in arranging meetings with parliamentarians and political leaders of member states. They eventually succeeded and Bahrain very generously gave a piece of land to establish a university at a very nice location (An officer in Kuwait”).

The credit goes to the then leadership of the Arab Bureau for the establishment of the Arabian Gulf University (AGU) in that region. However, this University did not remain under the jurisdiction of the ABEGS partnership. I asked a question from a very senior officer of the Arab Bureau. “Why this university (AGU) was moved out of the ABEGS jurisdiction?” He gave me a very meaningful reply. He said:

In my view, what happened was quite normal. It [the university] was governed by the Under Secretaries of Education, whereas, we had separate ministries for higher education. We have Ministers of Education (for KG to Grade 12) and then we have Ministers for Higher Education (colleges and Universities). Thirty years ago we did not have Ministers of Higher Education. Even in those countries like Saudi Arabia and Kuwait where they had Universities. Bahrain had no university in 1979. Afterwards they established the Council for Higher Education. So this council started meeting regularly. ... The Council of Higher Education is a separate body that governs the Higher education of the Gulf region. It is functioning very well. The Arabian Gulf University (AGU) Bahrain is practically working under the Council of Higher Education. This change had particular context as the Ministers of Education [from KG to Grade 12] did not have any jurisdiction on the Higher Education it was therefore appropriate to put the AGU under the governance of Council for
Higher Education. Otherwise the university would have been treated as the secondary school. On the other hand Ministers of Education were overwhelmed with their regular work and they would have had extra work responsibility (An officer in Kuwait).

The redesigning of the ABEGS’ jurisdiction was done at the strategic level of the ABEGS partnership to facilitate the bureau’s work. The move was initiated at the strategic level and decided by the ministers in the General Conference. The change reduced the work load of the ministers of education and the staff of the Arab Bureau to keep better focus on the elementary and secondary education. The change in the jurisdiction for the AGU is also meaningful as this university is now being governed by the Council of Higher Education which is the right forum for higher education institutions in the Arabian Gulf region. This redesigning did not completely separate the Arabian Gulf University (AGU) from the administration of the ABEGS, because the Director General of the ABEGS is an important member of the Board of Trustees for the Arabian Gulf University (AGU) Bahrain. He is the one who prepares budget for the university and seeks approval from the Council of Higher Education of the GCC.

This jurisdictional change is linked with the restructuring explained in the earlier discussion when GCC came into being and Arab Bureau through the visionary leadership was connected with its wider environment. This change affected the long-term mandate and scope of operations of the partnership. New ministries of higher education (for colleges & Universities) came into being which influenced the jurisdictional scope of the Arab Bureau. The AGU was given under the strategic leadership of the Council of Higher Education with a strategic link (Director General) with the Arab Bureau. The managerial
and operational control was completely shifted from the Bureau to the Council of Higher Education under the GCC.

7.3.3 Iraq’s Dismissal from the ABEGS

The Iraqi invasion was the reason of Iraqi exclusion from the Arab Bureau. This decision was made by the General Conference. Since the start of the occupation till now all the member countries in the Bureau were with Kuwait. When this matter was discussed in the General Conference all the member countries agreed to expel Iraq ... from the Arab Bureau (Director GASERC, Kuwait).

The decision to expel Iraq was taken by the General Conference unanimously. The proposal was initiated at the strategic leadership and approved by the same. The decision of Iraqi expulsion was taken to express Arab Bureau’s solidarity with Kuwait. It was a major redesigning of the organization that was undertaken with the consultation of all member states against the aggressor and to support the victim. The impact of this restructuring was manifold. The first and foremost impact of this decision was to build up friendly relations and enrich collaborative culture with the peaceful partners. It was an expensive decision for the Arab Bureau but all the members were steadfast in collaborating with Kuwait who suffered by an unfriendly act of a brotherly member state of this partnership. Since the Iraqi invasion in Kuwait with effect from August 1990 till today Iraq is out of ABEGS partnership. It is also important to note that the Arab Bureau remained connected with the wider environment of this partnership. The relations of the ABEGS with other regional and international organizations remained intact. The growth and development of this partnership as far as its activities and physical infrastructure is
concerned progressed well. The top leadership introduced many new educational programs, published hundreds of books, and conducted numerous research projects.

The dismissal of Iraq from the Arab Bureau caused a huge financial loss to the partnership. Iraq was contributing 21% of the total budget of the Bureau. The following pie chat show the percentages of the financial contribution of the member states before 1990.

**Figure 15: Financial Contribution of Member States (ABEGS) Before 1990**

Despite the financial loss the leaders of the Arab Bureau stood with Kuwait and offered sincere collaboration to Kuwait. Normally structural change takes a long time. The proposed changes are discussed and analyzed at all organizational levels and move through proper channel until they reach the General Conference for consideration. The leaders examine consequences of proposed redesigning and then it is approved by the competent authority. “It takes years to do restructuring (An officer in Riyadh).” However, the expulsion of Iraq from the ABEGS happened very quickly. I was told that the ministers traveled by road during the war and assembled in Riyadh and dismissed Iraq with immediate effect.
Iraq’s aggression created a critical situation for the leaders of ABEGS partnership. This example highlights that the leaders of the Arab Bureau used core leadership function to resolve this situation. Building a collaborative culture with peaceful brotherly member state by redesigning the organizational structures of the ABEGS partnership was the action taken by the strategic leaders of the Arab Bureau to resolve the problem. It is true that the partnership lost substantial revenues but then leadership has to take such tough decisions to maintain discipline and fairness amongst different stakeholders of the partnership. The dismissal of Iraq also reflects the power of majority in an interorganizational partnership situation.

**7.3.4 Yemen Joins ABEGS**

After Iraq’s expulsion Yemen was given the membership in the Arab Bureau. Yemen joined the ABEGS under the decision of the Supreme Council of the Gulf Cooperation Council in its 22\(^{nd}\) session which was held in Masqat the capital of Sultanate of Oman on December 31, 2001. Yemen’s inclusion in the Arab Bureau shows wider coverage of educational services in the Arabian Gulf region. In addition to the education Yemen was given the membership of a few other organizations of the GCC such as health, sports, labour and social services. The change is brought by the visionary and strategic leadership of the Arab Bureau. The closing statement of the GCC Supreme Council mentioned that the participation of Yemen will enhance cooperation and coordination in the region.

The Supreme Council, while appreciating the role of being played by the brotherly Republic of Yemen in the Arabian Peninsula and the tasks that it is dealing within the framework of security, stability
as well as growth in the Peninsula, declares the participation of the brotherly Republic of Yemen in enhancing the process of cooperation and coordination as part of the joint action of the GCC through its membership of the following:

- The Council of Health Ministers of the GCC States
- The Education and Training Bureau of the GCC States [ABEGS]
- The Council of Labor & and Social Affairs Ministers of the GCC
- Gulf Cup Football Tournament

Other steps will follow this step in relation to the Republic of Yemen, including participation in the field of economy and other fields of cooperation. The Supreme Council looks forward to the fact that this step will contribute in consolidating cooperation, progress, development and social prosperity, and strengthen the links between the peoples of states of the Arabian Peninsula (Closing Statement of 22nd Session of the GCC Supreme Council).

Since 2001 Yemen is actively participating in the ABEGS’ activities. The recent 67th meeting of the Executive Board of the ABEGS partnership was organized and hosted by Yemen on My 12- 13, 2009. This meeting of the Executive Board discussed and approved the Arab Bureau of Education for the Gulf States charter of teaching profession ethics, stressing on circulating the charter to all member states to be a guideline document. The two day meeting discussed the educational programs, budgets and the Educational Research Center's programs.

Yemen was welcomed to the ABEGS partnership without any financial consideration. Yemen is contributing only 2.5% of the total budget in the ABEGS
partnership. The purpose of this inclusion is to extend cooperation, coordination and collaboration in the states of Arabian Peninsula. This action helped leaders of the Bureau to connect this interorganizational partnership to the wider environment of the Arabian Gulf.

7.3.5 The Establishment of Subordinate Institutions and Departments

The Arab Bureau has redesigned the structures of its partnership since its inception and introduced many new subordinate institutions to build collaborative culture, facilitate the bureau’s work, nurture productive relations, and establish links with its wider environment. Some of the subordinate institutes and departments are listed below:

1. The Gulf Arab States Educational Research Centre (GASERC) Kuwait
2. The Arab Educational Training Centre for the Gulf States (AETCGS) Doha, Qatar
3. The Educational Centre for Arabic Language (ECAL) Sharja UAE. Established by the General Conference in its 19th meeting in January 2007.
4. Quality Assurance Committee (QAC). The Director General of Arab Bureau proposed the creation of this committee and the Executive Board approved it.
5. Information Technology Department.

I have discussed the GASERC Kuwait, the AETCG Doha, and the ECAL Sharja in earlier chapters in different contexts. I am mentioning these establishments in this section to highlight the significance of the creation (restructuring of the Arab Bureau) of these institutions. The leaders of the ABEGS partnership made these institutions at
different locations, assigned different work to them, and designed diverse goals for them to achieve.

The rationale of selecting different locations for different institutions is to integrate and build a collaborative culture in the member states in many ways. This helped the Arab Bureau create its physical presence, its network, and infrastructure in different parts of the partnership jurisdiction. The people of different member states were provided job opportunities, chance to contribute in the work of the Arab Bureau, and to directly benefit from the specialized task that particular institution is performing. For instance, the main job of the AETCGS Doha Qatar is to design and provide training to the education professionals of the member states. It is obvious that people from Qatar likely to have more jobs in the AETCGS. The people of Qatar would be able to contribute more in the activities of this institution and they may seek more benefit from the AETCGS compared to other member states.

The leaders of the ABEGS partnership assigned different type of work to different institutions. The GASERC Kuwait is asked to do educational research for the Bureau, the AETCGS is doing training, and the Arabic Language Centre is to organize language programs. The Quality Assurance committee is to ensure the quality of Bureau’s work.

When the programs are completely designed, they are sent to the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC). The Assurance Committee reviews the programs.... The work of the quality assurance committee involves outside experts as well. The QAC sends the programs to the outside experts and seek their opinion. After the
external reviews QAC [gives] approval (Head of the Arab Bureau’s Program Unit).

The information technology unit of the Bureau also facilitates the work of the partnership. The managers in this unit are involved in performing all the technology related work. For instance they provide technical support with regard to the ABEGS Learning Management System (LMS) to all the member states in the entire Arabian Gulf region. They organize the ABEGS portal, administer the online newsletter, and provide technical assistance to the registered 60,000 thousand teachers (may be more now) of the ABEGS partnership. They maintain a huge database of the intellectual materials such as lesson plans, translated books, professional journals, and other online resources to be used by educational professional of the Arab Bureau. They also offer E-training to the teachers and other education administrators to promote information technology usage in the region. They organize feedback received from the users of the educational programs of the Arab Bureau. Based on this data they prepare and submit reports to their superiors. It is also worth mentioning that they are always busy in upgrading and running the technical environment of the Bureau to maintain connectivity amongst all internal and external stakeholders and or users of the educational programs of the Arab Bureau.

The decisions pertaining to organizational restructuring such as the establishment of subordinate institutions were taken by the strategic leadership of the ABEGS partnership. However, the creation of Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) and the Information Technology Department were initiated at the managerial levels and approved by the strategic levels of the Arab Bureau. It is important to mention that impact of these changes is pervasive on the entire partnership. This is how the leaders tried to connect the
organization with its wider environment, facilitated the partnership work, established collaboration between stakeholders, and created productive relations amongst various units, individuals, and the members of the ABEGS partnership.

The establishment of different subunits in different geographic locations within the partnership is an attempt to ensure that different members have particular jurisdictions and perform different leadership functions in the partnership exerting significant influence on the partnership through those sub-unit organizations. This is how leadership distribution ensures that each of the partners has an important and distinctive responsibility on behalf of the partnership for all members. For instance the AETCGS Doha performs the responsibility of developing people and the GASERC Kuwait conducts research and develops joint curriculum for the entire partnership. These institutions exert influence through their work performed by their operational and managerial leaders. These leaders also influence decision making at the strategic level via their consultation, experience, and commitment.

7.3.6 Downsizing Human Resource

The redesigning of the organization was done at the human resource level as well. An officer mentioned. “When I came here the employees were 120 and now they are fifty. I do not know what happened but the reason they say is money”. He further mentioned, “they gave us computers, [now] one person is doing the work of three or four”. It was in 1990 when Iraq was expelled from the ABEGS partnership. The Bureau suffered a loss of 21% of its financial resources. In order to facilitate its work some restructuring had to be done. The leaders of the organization decided to down size the
work force of the Arab Bureau. When I was exploring the reasons of this downsizing the
director finance of the Bureau told me that:

The major factor was Iraq’s exclusion. Iraq was contributing 21% of
the total finance to run the Bureau. The Bureau had a financial
setback and we had to do it. ... When Iraq invaded Kuwait, the
structural changes started at that time. The first change was to make
adjustment for over staffing. Mainly the service positions were
eliminated like secretaries, reception staff, and drivers, etc. The
strategy was now changed. Instead of using permanent staff for
everything we started using need based temporary or part time staff
for certain jobs. It happened gradually. It took years after the
exclusion of Iraq (An officer in Riyadh).

The summary of the above scenario is that the financial constraint results in
dowsizing of the human resource which consequently increases the workload for the
remaining employees. The leaders of the Bureau provide computers to deal with
increased responsibility. The leadership was trying to overcome the financial stress and
facilitate work firstly by restructuring human resource and secondly providing technical
support in shape of computers to maintain productivity.

Structuring the organization to facilitate work is a specific leadership practice
included in Leithwood’s core leadership functions that was applied here. The situation
caused by reduced funds and subsequent reduced human resource posed administrative
and managerial challenge to the leaders of the Bureau at all organizational levels. The
macro level change penetrated its influence to the micro levels at the managerial and
operational leadership of the Arab Bureau organizational administration. This particular
change did not alter the patterns of leadership distribution in the Arab Bureau as an interorganizational partnership. However, it definitely shows that change at the strategic level may have trickledown effect at lower organizational levels.

**Figure 16: Redesigning the Organization Comparative Usage of Specific Leadership Practices**

How frequently do you perform this leadership practice?

**Likert Scale:**

1 = never at all
2 = Seldom
3 = Sometimes
4 = Frequently
5 = very frequently
6 = NA

The comparative picture of the usage of specific leadership practices with regard to redesigning the organization is constructed based on the data collected through a questionnaire. The bar chart shows higher use of “building a collaborative culture” as a leadership practice in the ABEGS partnership that matches with the qualitative data analysis in the earlier discussion of this section.

**7.3.7 Discussion**

It is normal and perhaps necessary to restructure an organization in its 35 years of existence. The redesigning events in the Arab Bureau show its growth and development
as an interorganizational partnership. It seems easy to bring change in a single organization due to its size and simple managerial structures. But restructuring in an interorganizational partnership with the involvement of sovereign partners appears to be a complex phenomenon. The above discussion unfolds many dimensions of the leadership decisions with regard to redesigning the organization. Sometimes external factors such as war, financial conditions, and technological environment demand redesigning. Sometimes the internal organizational atmosphere, for instance the urge to achieve organizational objectives, the performance potential of the organizational leadership, and the kind of work environment require restructuring.

The most important feature that emerged from the data is the focus of the ABEGS leaders on building a collaborative culture in the entire partnership. The leadership of the ABEGS partnership witnessed crucial times like wars in the region and had to take difficult decisions such as dismissal of a member state but they were able to maintain the cohesion of the partnership. The leaders continued their struggle to facilitate their work even during the financial stress. The smart use of technology enhanced their organizational efficiency and productivity. The leaders used technology to maintain connectivity with its wider environment. Furthermore, strategically located subordinate units of the partnership in different member states ensure developing and sustaining collaborative structure and joint commitment of members to the work of the ABEGS partnership.

The above discussion and analysis allow me to say that there is a moderate mix of the usage of specific leadership practices such as facilitating the organizational work, creating productive relations amongst different stakeholders, and connecting the Arab
Bureau with its wider environment. However, the evidence shows higher use of building collaborative culture within the ABEGS partnership by redesigning its structures.

7.4.0 Managing the Partnership Program

This study is to look at managing the partnership program as another core leadership function in the Arab Bureau of education for the Gulf States (ABEGS). The data will be analysed in this section to find out how the leaders of the ABEGS partnership use the following specific leadership practices:

1. Staffing the partnership program
2. Monitoring the progress and improvement strategies
3. Allocating resources to foster the partnership improvement efforts
4. Buffering staff from unproductive external demands for attention

Some of these leadership practices are regular functions in the field of public administration, for example staffing, monitoring, and allocating resources. Normally these functions are carried out bureaucratically as routine administrative tasks but they are used as leadership functions when they are leveraged strategically by individuals and/or groups to influence decision making and to provide for the achievement of certain organizational goals. I shall briefly touch upon topics related to accountability in this section. However, detailed discussion will be undertaken on securing accountability in the last section of this chapter.

7.4.1 Staffing the Partnership Program

The programs of the partnership are staffed with people in different capacities. The leaders of the Bureau use different strategies to staff these programs. Some staff
members work in the ABEGS offices as permanent employees and some work as temporary employees. The consultants are hired as per the needs of projects. Professional experts are temporarily engaged in different projects. Sometimes professors from the local universities, personnel from private organizations, and employees from international or regional organizations are also requested to take part in certain programs designed by the Arab Bureau.

It is also important to mention that the Arab Bureau is actively involved in the educational administration and development of the Arabian Gulf region. The Bureau therefore has designed a variety of short, medium and long-term educational plans and programs for the Gulf region. The following table pictures some of these programs designed by the Arab Bureau.

Table 4: Educational Programs of the (ABEGS) Partnership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum &amp; Education</th>
<th>Education &amp; Technology</th>
<th>Education Systems</th>
<th>Collaborative Partnerships</th>
<th>Make Education Your Profession</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Protection Culture</td>
<td>• Information Technology</td>
<td>• Information Systems</td>
<td>• School &amp; Community</td>
<td>• Training Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Writing Dictation</td>
<td>• Utilizing Technology in Education</td>
<td>• Quality Assurance</td>
<td>• Private Sector</td>
<td>• Teachers Standard of Qualification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Making the Curriculum</td>
<td>• Information Technology in Education</td>
<td>• Assessment</td>
<td>• Participation of the Private Sector</td>
<td>• Teachers Standard of Qualification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• National Resources</td>
<td>• Information Technology in Education</td>
<td>• School of Future</td>
<td>• The Guide of Experiences</td>
<td>• Education Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Professional Values</td>
<td>• Teaching Technology in Intermediate Schools</td>
<td>• Managing Educational Programs</td>
<td>• Integration Between Public and Higher Education</td>
<td>• Strategies of Training Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Developing Thinking</td>
<td>• Information Technology in Education</td>
<td>• Developing Educational Management</td>
<td>• Role of Universities in Public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Measuremen t of Mental Abilities</td>
<td>• Information Technology in Education</td>
<td>• Information Technology in Education</td>
<td>• Information Technology in Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Curricula of Private</td>
<td>• Information Technology in Education</td>
<td>• Information Technology in Education</td>
<td>• Information Technology in Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Developing Programs of Private Education</td>
<td>• Learning Outside School Boarders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assessment of Math &amp; Sciences Curricula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Developing Math and Science Curricula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Health and Environmental Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joint Plan to Improve Curricula</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• English Language</td>
<td>• Education Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Basic Skills</td>
<td>• Information Technology in Public Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Setting Goals</td>
<td>• Full Quality in Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Designing Objectives Courses</td>
<td>• Tests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pre-school Education</td>
<td>• The Required Time to Complete the Curricula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student Activities</td>
<td>• Length of the School Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Educational Planning</td>
<td>• Assessing School Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Curricula Guide</td>
<td>• Educated Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teaching Methods</td>
<td>• Coordination Between Education and Private Sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School Books</td>
<td>• Other Sources to Fund Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reflection Skills</td>
<td>• Private Sector and Education Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teachers Qualifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Educational Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Professional Formation of Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strategic Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Leadership for a New Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Crisis Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Educated Organizational Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Organizational Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Management of Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Development Projects in the Member States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Dialogue Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Daily Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In addition to Leithwood’s core leadership functions and specific leadership practices the conceptual framework of this study explains that the strategic leaders make policies, plans, and programs according to the goals of the organization. The managerial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Teachers E-House &amp; E-Learning Portal</th>
<th>Self Reliance</th>
<th>Professional Guidance for Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concepts Atlas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Centre for Arabic Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies of Teaching Arabic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing Teachers of Arabic Languages and Enhance Their Qualifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported Programs to Improve Teaching of Arabic Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Test for Primary and Intermediate Stages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Difficulties in the Primary School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitution Programs for the Basic Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Learning Portal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Reliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Guidance for Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
leaders supervise and coordinate implementation of policies, plans, and programs made by the strategic leaders. The operational leaders work on the day to day implementation of policies, plans, and programs of the organization.

It is learnt from data analysis that strategic leadership of the ABEGS partnership comes from the royal families, political dignitaries, and the parliaments (Majalis-e-Shura – the Consultative Assemblies) of the member states. The Education Ministers formulate the General Conference and the Deputy Ministers of Education or the Under Secretaries of the Education ministries of the member states constitute the Executive Board of the Arab Bureaus. These two bodies form the strategic leadership of the ABEGS partnership. The strategic leadership formulates policies, plans, and programs for the partnership.

The managerial staff members are entrusted with the job to supervise different projects and programs of the ABEGS partnership. The operational level staff members include line managers and all other employees who practically implement the partnership programs.

The appointment of the Director General is recommended by the Executive Board and approved by the General Conference. The names of the Directors of the Centers are recommended by the Director General and approved by the Executive Board. The rest of the staffing process at the ABEGS partnership is considerably decentralized. The Directors of the subordinate institutes enjoy full autonomy to hire their staff at the location of their offices. The staff members of the Riyadh headquarters are hired by the Director General, Arab Bureaus.

When we have higher position, we make an announcement in all the countries. … So we announce the position, state the requirements,
receive the applicants and choose as usual. The announcement is made in all seven countries for higher positions only. For service positions …we do it here (The Director General, Riyadh).

During my study in the ABEGS, I visited three locations i.e. Arab Bureau Headquarters Riyadh in Saudi Arabia, Research Centre, Kuwait city in Kuwait, and Training Centre Doha in Qatar. I found that majority of the staff members at all these places are the citizens of the host country but at the same time I met some employees who were the citizens of other member states of the partnership. In the headquarters Riyadh, I met many people from Oman, Bahrain, and Yemen. I was told that there is no bar for the citizens of the member states to work in any of the office of the ABEGS partnership at any place in the territorial jurisdiction of the Arab Bureau. However, “there is no quota for the countries that have to be followed (the Director General)”. When I asked: Are the employees hired from all seven countries? “Yes the rules say that - but in reality – it does not happen [that way] as people don’t want to move. They like to stay in their own countries (An Officer in Riyadh)”. The Director General commented on the issue as follows.

From our own experience people from the member states are not attracted to work [other than their own country]. Kuwaiti will be attracted to Kuwait office and Qatri will be attracted to Doha and Saudies will be attracted to the headquarters here. But when we know that somebody is interested from the member state we like to help him provided the required qualifications are met (The Director General).

According to the hiring procedures of the ABEGS partnership, the information about the vacant positions is circulated in all member states. The qualified citizens of all
the member states are authorized to apply for any position. Some participants of this study explained that the economy of the member states is a major factor in staffing a program in the Arab Bureau. People from rich countries may not like to work in the ABEGS office other than their own country. However, employment from a member state that is economically weak is quite competitive.

The office writes to the countries. We have to inform the member states. They may or may not send the applicants. Looking at the applicants we choose the suitable. In our countries, sometimes it is very difficult to bring people from countries like Kuwait or UAE because the pay here would be comparatively lower. But if you need from Yemen you may have more than you need. … In this headquarter we have people from Oman, Yemen, Bahrain but not from UAE, Kuwait, or Qatar. It is difficult (The Finance & Administration Officer Riyadh)

The data of this study also reveal that the leaders at the ABEGS partnership feel scarcity of professional and experienced people in the Arab Bureau. “We are short of professional and experienced people... We have more than fifty employees most of them are service employees (The Director Programs)” The educational programs and projects mentioned in the above table demonstrate the ambition of the leaders of the ABEGS partnership. The major five areas that they are working on are curriculum development, education & technology, education systems, collaborative partnerships, and promoting education profession in the member states. Then they have numerous programs under each of these five broad areas.
In addition to the programs listed in the above table it is important to discuss the medium term and long-term plans that the strategic leaders of the Bureau have introduced since the inception of the ABEGS partnership. It is also important to highlight why the leaders of the Arab Bureau feel the scarcity of professional experts in the ABEGS partnership. The aims are very high as revealed by the medium term and long-term plans but the required human resource is not available. The leaders need professional experts to fulfill the dreams of the partnership.

The deeper analyses of staffing of the ABEGS partnership program reveal that strategic leaders are royal dignitaries and/or political personalities. The managerial leaders of this partnership are professional educationists, researchers, trainers, or educational administrators. The majority of operational position holders are general administrators and/or service employees. The professional needs at the operational level are mainly fulfilled by using the services of consultants, experts, and scholars from outside ABEGS partnership sources. The situation reveals that in terms of professional human resource the Bureau is not self-sufficient and overly dependent on external sources such as university professors, professional consultants, and foreign experts. Also the recruitment, management, and performance assessment of the external operational work force is completely under firm control of the strategic and managerial leadership of the Bureau. There is no third party arrangement for recruitment, management, and performance appraisal of external staff members.

I shall discuss very briefly the medium term and long term plans of the ABEGS partnership so as to emphasize the need of professional staff to achieve the desired objectives of the educational programs of the Bureau.
7.4.2 The First Medium-term Plan 1980 – 1985\textsuperscript{35}

This five year plan was the Arab Bureau’s first effort in formulating its future plans and programs. The GASERC Kuwait was assigned this job to conduct a study so as to identify the educational needs in the member states. The first five year plan provided a general framework for forthcoming partnership programs for the Arab Bureau. This plan included 68 projects and each project comprises a number of programs designed according to the nature and objectives of the plan. In addition to the projects the first medium term plan decided to organize 242 joint educational activities so as to promote collaborative educational environment in the member states.

7.4.3 The Second Medium-term Plan 1986 – 1991

The second medium term plan was also designed based on the research conducted by the GASERC Kuwait. The leaders also took into consideration a number of other factors like recommendations of the member states, the advice of the General Secretariat of the GCC, suggestions offered by the local universities. Besides the educational and scientific needs of the member states at that time, the second plan intended to conduct the performance appraisal of the first medium term plan as well. This plan included 237 educational programs for the member states.

7.4.4 The Third Medium-term Plan 1992 – 1997

The third medium term plan was focused on the Islamic values. It was decided to learn from the experiences of other nations of the world, adopt innovative approach, and

\textsuperscript{35} Information on the medium term and long-term plans was taken from the Arab Bureau documentation
work according to the modern educational trends to enrich and unify the curricula of the member states. The plan includes 225 programs covering various key educational areas.

### 7.4.5 The Joint Plan for Curriculum Development

The forth medium term plan was introduced later in the year 2001. Meanwhile the gap was filled with the ‘Joint Plan for Curriculum Development’. This plan was discussed and developed by the fifth General Conference in 1999. The same program was later on approved by the visionary leadership of the ABEGS partnership in the 21st session of the Supreme Council of the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) in the year 2000 in Manama Bahrain.

“The Supreme Council approved the Common Curricula Development Program of the GCC, its procedures and mechanisms, which were submitted before it by the Ministers of Education and Training”.

The focus of this plan is curriculum development, teaching plans, achievement level in tests, teaching facilities, and general plans in education. The joint plan included 20 programs addressing key educational issues in the member states.

### 7.4.6 The Fourth Medium-term Plan 2001 – 2006

This plan was designed by a large number of educational experts from the Arab world and beyond. This plan witnessed the launch of the training centre Doha Qatar which aims to improve the performance of educational leaders of the member states of the ABEGS partnership.

---

7.4.7 The GCC Long-term Comprehensive Strategy 2000 – 2025

The long-term comprehensive plan was approved by the visionary leadership of the ABEGS in the Supreme Council of the GCC in its 19th session in 1999. This plan aims to achieve a sustainable development process in various fields in the member states. The leadership of the Arab Bureau recognizes the importance of education in sustainable development. Education is a basis for human development and therefore part of the comprehensive economic and social process. The plan decided to put in vigorous efforts to develop the educational systems and its institutions with an emphasis on rectifying any discrepancies and weaknesses in areas such as curricula, teaching strategies, teacher training, and the use of technology in education.

In view of the aforementioned plans and programs the leaders of the ABEGS partnership feel lack of capacity in terms of professional experience and skills to achieve the optimum results from these programs. They are willing to staff these programs from all possible sources. The Director General expressed his desire to have expert staff as full time employees for all specialized jobs. He said:

We do not have so many experts working here as full time employees so we rely on outside experts. So we are outsourcing and ask them to perform those jobs for us. Most of our staff members are of administrative nature. They have simple tasks in their hands. My wish is to have more experts doing here full time jobs. ... Whenever we have an opportunity we’ll try to recruit full time employees here. You know when you talk about education you need so many specialized experts doing full time jobs and when you don’t have
them you rely on other people from the universities and schools locally and internationally (The Director General).

Leaders in organizations perform their functions based on available financial, human, and physical resources. The challenges for organizational leaders could be many, including but not limited to the lack of resources. In view of data analysis the major challenge for the Arab Bureau has been scarcity of professional human resources. It is imperative for an organization to maintain related professional and skilled work force to achieve organizational objectives. The respondents of this study felt shortage of local experts to complete certain projects and programs. The ABEGS partnership has to outsource many jobs due to lack of expertise. The deficiency in human resource results in increased dependence on outside human resources, slower pace of work to complete different projects and programs, underutilization of physical and financial resources, and work related stress due to excessive workload for the existing skilled human resource.

7.4.8 Expert Houses

The educational programs are staffed by internal as well as external people. Another way of staffing the partnership program in the Arab Bureau is ‘expert houses’. Many of the participants of this study mentioned the contribution of “expert houses” or “experience houses”. These expert houses are either private companies, foreign universities, or any other outside agency in the field of research, technology, consultancy, quality control, educational administration and development. In addition to the local and regional expert houses, the professionals from international expert houses also help different offices of the ABEGS partnership. “We also benefit from international experience houses such as the University of Connecticut and expert house in Geneva
(Director GASERC Kuwait)”. I was also told that in the beginning research studies were being conducted by the expert houses. However, now these expert houses are used for educational consultancy to conduct research projects.

In the beginning the expert houses were carrying out the studies and programs. But now there are experts and researchers discuss the educational matters with the expert houses. They evaluate the studies regularly. They contribute in developing the level and quality of the studies. It is a big development in the way GASERC works here (The Director GASERC Kuwait).

In view of significantly huge magnitude of technological projects, some professional assistance is required from the expert houses. The expert houses maintain teams of professional experts on various technical fields. These experience houses provide technical services and also help in implementation and supervision of different projects. The head of the information technology in the Arab Bureau headquarter Riyadh mentioned:

It is the General Conference that takes final decision. Executive Board follows the projects approved by the General Conference. The Arab Bureau is to supervise the implementation of these projects in coordination with expert houses. ... We are responsible to implement the projects as internal people and then the experience houses are the outside agencies.

In addition to research activities the expert houses are also involved in quality assurance process of the Arab Bureau. There is a rigorous process to hire professionals from the expert houses especially for the quality assurance. The head of the Quality Assurance Committee said:
When we receive programs from the institutions ... then we advertise the tender [to staff these programs]... the short listed experience houses are asked to send us curriculum vitae (documentation / papers) and the qualification of the people working in the experience houses.

The Arab Bureau is looking after single portfolio i.e. ‘education’. In order to provide full coverage to this portfolio the Bureau has to look into many dimensions of education such as research, training, teaching, administration, technology, curriculum development, literacy, physical infrastructure, elementary education, and secondary education. Managing a partnership program such as the Arab Bureau is a complex task that involves the territorial jurisdiction of seven sovereign states. Therefore the staffing of this partnership program is also very complex. Multiple strategies are being used to perform this task for the Bureau.

The strategic levels of the ABEGS partnership are staffed by the people who occupy certain positions in the hierarchy of the governments of the member countries. The managerial level positions are filled with people who have high level educational qualification, relevant skills and experience. The managers are hired by the strategic leadership of the Arab Bureau. The rest of the positions are mostly of the operational level. Some of the ways of staffing ABEGS partnership program positions are hiring people as full time permanent employees, temporary workers, contract staff, job specific consultants, and taking professionals from the expert or experience houses.

There are different ways to look at the staffing model of the Arab Bureau. The data reveals that Arab Bureau is not self sufficient to staff its partnership programs with
full time permanent staff to accomplish its medium term and long-term plans and projects. Its reliance on outside expertise is one of its professional limitations. One should also realize that it is hardly possible to find a big partnership that is self sufficient or self reliant on internal resources in all respects. Dependence of one type or another cannot be completely avoided. In view of the size of the partnership and considering the volume of plans and projects of the Bureau, the acquisition of desired human resource in short term duration is difficult. However it is good if the leaders of the Bureau are aware of this limitation. The power dynamics of the ABEGS partnership leadership remain entrenched in vertical positional hierarchy. The strategic and managerial leaders of the Bureau enjoy complete control on hiring and firing mechanisms of internal and external human resource of the ABEGS partnership. At the same time leaders of the Arab Bureau do not ignore the value and importance of consultation, experience, knowledge and commitment.

7.4.9 Monitoring the progress and improvement strategies

Monitoring the progress and improvement strategies is another leadership practice included in the set of Leithwood’s core leadership function of Managing the (partnership) program.

The organizational structure of the Arab Bureau partnership is designed horizontally at strategic, managerial and operational levels. The vertical structure is constructed by maintaining hierarchy through these levels. Monitoring the progress and improvement strategies at the horizontal levels include face to face periodical meetings, review of the plans and programs, evaluation of reports submitted by the lower levels,
peer to peer written or verbal communication, and informal exchange of views during consultative meetings (Tashawari).

Some of the strategies adopted for monitoring through vertical levels are holding meetings with upper or lower level management, regular reporting to the higher levels, periodical performance reviews, site visits and inspections, maintain stress to meet scheduled deadlines, financial scrutiny, and constant vertical communication at every organizational level.

The ABEGS maintains an organized system of meetings at all levels to monitor progress and improvement strategies of the Bureau. The General Conference meets every year, once for a regular meeting and next year for consultation. The Executive Board meets after every six months. The Board(s) of Trustees meet every six months. The managers at the managerial levels and operational levels convene numerous meetings to monitor progress and improvement strategies. These meetings are scheduled at different places in the member states. The ministries hold meetings at various levels and prepare paper work for the Bureau. The subordinate institutes also organize meetings with different stakeholders in their premises or in one of the member states. The Directors attend the Board(s) of Trustees’ meetings wherever and whenever they are organized.

The participation of senior leaders in the meetings is an important way to monitor but this is not the only way to do this job. The time between meetings is full of activities focused on monitoring progress and investigating improvement strategies in every office of the Arab Bureau. The main role in this context is performed by the office of the Director General Arab Bureau. This office maintains and monitors multilevel, multidirectional, and multidimensional communication amongst different stakeholders of
the ABEGS partnership. The reports on the educational programs, financial and budgetary matters, organizational and administrative issues are received by the Director General from the regional offices, ministries of the member states, departments, individuals, outside agencies, foreign organizations are scrutinized at this level. “These reports after due assessment in this office are approved for consideration at the next organizational level or disapproved or returned to the origin with comments for rework. “All heads of the department report to the Director General then the reports go to the Executive Board then the reports go to the General Conference (An officer in Riyadh)”. Information technology is also being used for effective monitoring. The Director General is monitoring the partnership program by using on line tools. He can keep an eye on everything in ABEGS’ work.

Technology is helpful for example the Director General has his own page on the portal. So he has his online office. Where ever he is in the world, he can communicate with anybody in his office and signs his documents if he likes. This also helps to have efficient communication between member states (Systems Analyst in Riyadh).

In order to monitor progress and review improvement strategies the ABEGS member states or a senior leader may form a committee and assign the committee specific tasks. These reports are discussed with the leadership of the Bureau as well.

Sometimes the member countries appoint a committee and come here [Saudi Arabia] go to Qatar and visit all concerned offices in the member states of the Gulf region. They prepare a report and discuss it in a very frank way senior officers from management like Dr. Ali [the present Director General] sit through those discussions. I
remember this type of committee was made ... by the Director General ABEGS the committee that I mentioned was ... made ... to examine the Bureau’s work – the members of this committee visited some countries and contacted the members of the executive board to complete the assessment of this partnership (An officer in Riyadh).

In addition to the occasional committee formulation to monitor or assess the partnership program a permanent committee called the ‘Quality Assurance Committee’ plays an important role in monitoring, evaluating, and reporting on the quality of programs designed by different individuals or groups in the ABEGS partnership. The Quality Assurance Committee is actively involved in securing the accountability of partnership programs which will be discussed in the next section of this chapter. However, the role played by this committee in monitoring the progress and improvement strategies is very prominent.

The data collected through the questionnaire indicates that ‘monitoring the progress and improvement strategies’ is a frequently used specific leadership practice at all organizational levels in the Arab Bureau amongst the set of core leadership function of ‘managing the partnership program’ (Figure-17).

The conceptual framework of this study pleads that leadership is horizontally distributed at strategic, managerial, and operational levels and it is vertically distributed between levels in organizational hierarchy. This is how horizontal and vertical leadership in an interorganizational partnership function simultaneously. The monitoring strategies used in the Arab Bureau function the same way. Horizontal monitoring is undertaken
indirectly through discussion amongst equals (consultation – tashawari), peer progress reviews, exchange of feedback, by making and attending professional/official presentations, etc. Vertical monitoring is conducted by performance report writing, identifying areas of improvement, formal ability assessment, evaluative comments, direction (s) for improvement, regular or surprise visits, measuring gap between desired and actual performance through inspections, performance interviews, etc. The leaders in the Arab Bureau utilize both horizontal and vertical monitoring techniques. It is customary for the Bureau leaders to monitor the improvement strategies for programs, plans, and projects using their positional/hierarchical power. They also monitor progress of various plans and projects through institutional regulatory authorities such as Quality Assurance Committee (QAC). The QAC looks at the performance of different programs by coordinating between internal ABEGS’ partnership leadership and external agencies, consultants, contractors, and experts.

7.4.10 Allocating Resources to Foster the Partnership Improvement Efforts

The unique feature with regard to the financial cycle at the Arab Bureau is that budget for the Bureau is made for two years instead of one year. The resource allocations are also done for two years period.

They [Education Ministers of the member states] meet every two years in the General Conference to look into the projects that will be implemented in the fiscal year [period] and also to approve the budgets and to look into the evaluation I mean the work of the Bureau in the past fiscal period. (Director General).
The General Conference is the competent authority in the ABEGS for final budgetary approvals. The lower levels are involved in this process when they prepare budgetary estimates, submit financial reports, and communicate with leaders at the higher levels.

The General Conference is the right forum for approval of the budget. Sometimes the documents are sent to a country for particular question for example how to pay? When to pay? Etc. for the finance department …lots of meetings are held. We have a complete schedule for the budget meetings. These meetings are held sometimes here and sometimes in other states (The Finance Officer).

The process of allocating resources to various institutions, departments, offices, and activities organized under the banner of the Arab Bureau is hierarchically centralized and participative at the same time. Before the budgetary proposals are submitted to the Bureau’s headquarters by all the subordinate offices they are extensively discussed by the people who prepare budget at the origin of these proposals. The budgets are examined by the director finance in Riyadh office. The Director Finance submits these budgetary proposals with comments to the Director General of the Arab Bureau. The Director General scrutinizes budget estimates and accords approvals to some of them that fall under his financial jurisdiction. He sends the rest of the budgetary proposals with his recommendations or comments to the Executive Board ABEGS partnership. The final budgetary approval is given by the General Conference. “The complete process of the budget making is that Bureau makes the budget and it is submitted to the Executive Board, after going through the Executive Board the budget goes to the General Conference (The Finance Officer)”.
The allocation of resources is performed by making budgets and their approvals. The budgets are discussed and prepared at the operational levels. The proposed budgets are scrutinized at the managerial levels and finally approved or disapproved by the strategic levels.

The involvement of leadership at all organizational levels works in vertical hierarchical fashion. However, the involvement of leaders from all organizational levels demonstrates participation of all concerned in the process of allocation and distribution of financial resources in the Arab Bureau partnership. It is also important to mention that sometimes General Conference forms committees to review budget proposals. This is a consultative element in the process of allocation of resources. The experts from the member states are asked to form budget committees.

Sometime General conference approves the budget and sometimes it forms committees to review the budget and resubmit it to the General Conference. Then the budget is approved after the General Conference looks at the reports submitted by the committees. When the General Conference forms these committees, these committees already have background about the subject matter [financial situation] so they hold their discussion accordingly and prepare their report. The members of the committee are the nominees of the ministries of the member states (The Finance Officer).

The resource allocation systems include procedures, rules and regulations for distribution and spending the approved money. “The Director General is the one who makes final decisions. The money is distributed by his orders (Director Finance)”. The allocated money is spent in the headquarters, and subordinate institutions such as
research centre and training centre under the supervision and approval of the head of the institution. After the approval of the budget ... the money is distributed to all the centers ... the director(s) take most of the financial decisions (An officer in Doha, Qatar). The budgetary approvals are given in view of the requirements of medium term plans, long term plans, and educational programs designed for the Arab Bureau.

We have to follow the financial procedures to spend the money. For example we can’t spend money beyond the approved budget of a particular program. We cannot exceed unless otherwise we take the permission of the Bureau. If we need to transfer money from one project to the other we can do it to a certain limit, if we are exceeding then we have to seek Bureau’s approval. We have to follow the procedures set by the Bureau (Director Finance).

The financial resources of the partnership are contributed by all the member states. The share of the contribution is based on “financial capacity”. The process of allocation of resources is not limited to budget preparation, its approval by the competent authority, distribution of funds, and spending. This process continues and undergoes audit and other stages of financial accountability. The next section of this chapter will have detailed discussion on securing accountability. In view of the above discussion we learnt that leaders of the Arab Bureau at all organizational levels are involved in one way or the other in the process of allocation of resources. The operational leaders prepare the budgets, managerial leaders examine them and approve some components of the budget to a certain limit, and strategic leaders give final approval of two yearly budget of the entire partnership. The overall distribution of funds is performed through the office of the Director General of the Arab Bureau. The allocated budget is spent under the supervision
of the heads of the subordinate institutions and according to the financial procedures, rules and regulations of the partnership. If required the General Conference forms committee(s) of the representatives of the member states to resolve any issues with regard to the Bureau’s budget. The financial accountability is undertaken by the internal and external means to ensure transparency and integrity.

7.4.11 Buffering Staff from Unproductive External Demands for Attention

The qualitative data that I collected did not give me any clue on buffering staff of the partnership from unproductive external demands. The study of the inside structures of the ABEGS partnership presents a very cohesive and integrated picture of the entire structure of the Arab Bureau. The history of three and a half decades of the existence of this partnership tells the tale of its gradual growth and development of its physical structures and intellectual capacity in the Arabian Gulf region. The study also reveals the fact that the Arab Bureau is not shy in making and strengthening its relations with other regional and international organizations and partnerships. The evidence in the data gives an impression that leaders encourage the people of this partnership to maintain productive relations with its external environment. However I did not find any mechanism of buffering staff from unproductive external demands for attention.
Figure 17: Managing the Partnership Program Comparative Usage of Specific Leadership Practices

How frequently do you perform this leadership practice?

**Likert Scale:** 1 = never at all 2 = Seldom 3 = Sometimes 4 = Frequently 5 = very frequently 6 = Not Applicable

The above bar chart is constructed based on the data collected from strategic, managerial, and operational leadership of the Arab Bureau with the help of a questionnaire. This chart gives an integrated picture of four specific leadership practices such as staffing the partnership program, monitoring the progress and improvement strategies, allocating resources to foster the improvement efforts, and buffering staff from unproductive external demands for attention. These specific leadership practices are the part of managing the partnership program as a core leadership function. The above chart clearly displays that monitoring the progress and improvement strategies is very

---

37 The Appendix – G includes graphs and tables to show overall leadership distribution amongst organizational levels (strategic, managerial, & operational) in the entire partnership, then the graphs are included for each subordinate unit - tables and graphs show various comparative distribution of core leadership functions and specific practices. I am not presenting all tables and graphs in my main thesis document because of two reasons. The first reason is that the survey size is very small. The reason for the small survey size is very simple. This is a case study of one interorganizational partnership. The human resource in one partnership and then the number of strategic, managerial, and operational level leaders would not be very big. The second reason is the method of this research. I am using qualitative data for the main analysis of my study. The survey data is very briefly referenced here and there as a little support to my qualitative data.
frequently used leadership practice and second most used leadership practice is allocating resources to foster the partnership improvement effort, the third one is staffing the program. I did not find much evidence of the use of buffering the staff from unproductive external demands for attention in qualitative data as well. The questionnaire data also shows it as the lowest used leadership practice in the Arab Bureau.

7.4.12 Discussion

Managing the partnership program is a core leadership function that covers staffing the program, allocation of resources, and monitoring the progress. These leadership practices play pivotal role to achieve the desired objectives of ABEGS partnership. The leadership of Arab Bureau use various techniques to appoint the right people for the right jobs. The process of allocation and approval of financial resources involves organizational leaders from all levels. Adequate monitoring techniques ensure appropriate utilization of human, financial, and physical resources. The monitoring strategies are used considering the horizontal or vertical organizational level.

7.5.0 Securing Accountability

The discussion in this section will analyze following six specific leadership practices\textsuperscript{38} with regard to ‘securing accountability’ in the ABEGS as an interorganizational partnership.

1- Ensure individual staff accountability
2- Develop & present a coherent, understandable, accurate and transparent account of performance

\textsuperscript{38} These six leadership practices were taken from (and adapted for this study) “Putting Ontario’s Leadership Framework into Action – A Guide for School and System Leaders from Purpose to Practice”, printed by the Institute for Education Leadership, August 2008.
3- Reflect on personal contribution to achievements and take feedback from others
4- Participate in external evaluation and make adjustments
5- Create and redesign organizational structure
6- Develop and apply performance management practices

The leadership at the Arab Bureau use multiple techniques to ensure different types of accountability in the partnership. The task of securing accountability is carried out as a core and essential leadership function starting from administrative performance appraisal of individual staff members to the program accountability of the entire partnership.

Securing accountability of individuals, groups, mechanisms, projects, and programs is considered an essential attribute of an organization in contemporary work environment. Securing accountability is a vital organizational feature in the Arab Bureau. “Accountability is taken very seriously at the ABEGS” says an officer in the Riyadh office. Performance appraisal, evaluation, and assessment are some other terms that will be used interchangeably for accountability in this section. Evaluation process of an organization helps measure the level of achievement of designed objectives that guides the organization to make future objectives to reduce gap between actual and desired performance. The Arab Bureau is making use of various techniques to secure accountability. The related data can be synthesized into following four major categories.

1. Administrative Accountability
2. Financial Accountability
3. Legal Accountability
4. Program Accountability

The ABEGS’ leadership at strategic, managerial and operational levels of the Arab Bureau is involved in the process of accountability in different ways. The officers in the
Bureau use some leadership practices to accomplish the task of accountability in aforementioned four areas. Educational researchers and scholars have explored these practices in different organizational contexts. I am applying the same set of leadership practices in the ABEGS as an interorganizational partnership of the developing world. Some leadership practices are used more than others as highlighted in different sections of the following discussion. A bar chart is also included at the end of this section showing the comparative usage of leadership practices in the ABEGS partnership.

7.5.1 Administrative Accountability

The administrative accountability of the individual employees or groups, and other people working for the Arab Bureau helps to maintain discipline and productivity. Some of the techniques used by the managers in the Arab Bureau to ensure individual staff accountability are “observation, daily attendance, assignments and follow up, annual performance reviews written by the supervisors”, etc. The performance appraisal is a regular task that every manager performs at the end of every year.

Punctuality is ensured by attendance record, productivity is ensured by giving tasks and targets to be achieved within given time limit. There is accountability for experience houses as well (Head of the Quality Assurance Committee).

The junior officers are answerable to their senior officers in their respective sections in terms of their office attendance, doing the job according to the given job description and as per instructions of the supervisors. The supervisors make an assessment about the quality of output of their staff. “Annual evaluation of the employees is done by all the heads of the departments (An officer in Doha)”. According to the
system in place in the Arab Bureau headquarters securing accountability of the operational staff is the responsibility of the Director Finance and Administration.

According to the regulations of the Bureau [Director Finance & Administration] is the person responsible to implement accountability in this office for example we have electronic system of employee attendance – any person who is lacking attendance, he [Direction Finance & Administration] does the accountability (An officer in Riyadh).

**Figure 18: Electronic Attendance**

There are more than fifty employees working at different positions in various departments in the Arab Bureau headquarters Riyadh. The performance reports of all the full time permanent employees in the headquarters are written by the immediate supervisors. These reports are submitted to the Director Finance and Administration for further review. The performance reports are also analyzed by a committee and a summary report is prepared for the Director General Arab Bureau.

There is annual performance report written about every employee. This report goes to the committee. This committee looks at this report. The members make their observation and send it to the
Director General. The daily attendance is another one. If the attendance is poor or any discrepancy is noticed then disciplinary action is taken against the employee (Director Finance & Administration).

The annual evaluation reports are written in vertical hierarchy. The officers working at the operational level report to the executives at the managerial levels, the managerial personnel is responsible to the strategic officers. The supervisors write evaluation reports of their staff based on their observation and assessment of the kind and quality of work performed by the staff member(s) throughout the year. These reports are confidential. The supervisor does not share his/her observation, comments, or assessment with the recipient of this report. The Director of the research centre Kuwait writes annual performance reports of all the officers working under him. Similarly the director of the training centre writes reviews of the officers working under her supervision. The officers working in the research and training centre write performance reports of the service employees working under their supervision and submit these reports to their respective directors.

The individual performance is reviewed by the head of the department. The centers do this at their places. It is a confidential report. The employee does not know what is written in that report (An officer in Riyadh).

The same principle works at the higher levels of the ABEGS partnership. The Director General of the Arab Bureau writes annual performance reports of the Directors of the research centre and training centre. He also writes annual reviews of all the heads of the departments such as Director Finance & Administration, Director Media, Public
Relations and Organizations, Director Programs in the headquarters, head of the Information Technology Department, and the head of the Quality Assurance Committee. The annual performance of the Director General is reviewed by the Executive Board of the Arab Bureau. The annual performance reports of the Directors and heads of the departments can be reviewed by the Executive Board if so desired by the Board. While explaining the accountability process an officer in the Riyadh office says, “The centers are answerable to the Director General and Director General is responsible to the Executive Board and Executive Board is answerable to the General Conference”.

The system is designed in such a way that it automatically ensures individual staff accountability as revealed by the following comment. Sometimes the performance of an individual staff member reflects upon the work of the entire department or a particular group. Securing accountability is embedded in the official procedures and processes of the Arab Bureau. For instance the electronic attendance system that takes photo with time and date (See Figure 18), the advanced schedule for meetings, target dates to accomplish certain tasks, and reporting schedules are features of a user friendly accountability system.

Every office has an agenda for example…the Secretary of the General Conference has agenda of holding four meeting of the Executive Board and two meetings of the General Conference every two years. This agenda keeps him busy all the time. … If these meetings or one of these meetings is not held on schedule… the performance of this office becomes obvious… with a little more effort deep reasons for any deficiency can be explored. For example look into the work of the Secretary of the General Conference…who prepares papers, sends letters, assembles reports from all the departments here, from Doha and Kuwait, and other states. He
combines all the documents in one report and discusses them with the Director General and finalizes this documentation for General Conference meeting. For me as a Media and Public Relations officer I have to make arrangements for transport, do the protocol duties, hotel and lodging arrangement … (Director Public Relations Riyadh).

The system of securing accountability in administrative matters is extended from the individual staff members to ensure group accountability. The formal performance review of the entire ABEGS partnership as a group is executed by the General Conference after every two years. Similarly the performance of the Bureau and the Board(s) of Trustees is examined periodically by the Executive Board every six months. The Directors of the research centre Kuwait and training centre Doha submit periodical performance reports to the Director General of the Arab Bureau. The department heads housed in the headquarters are also answerable to the Director General. They submit the performance reports of their respective departments to the Director General. Sometimes a committee is formulated (a) to look into the performance of a particular group or (b) to evaluate the work of a group on a particular aspect.

It is in the hands of the Director General and the Executive Board to constitute a body [committee] that takes over the evaluation process every time they meet. The work of the Bureau is always checked by the ministries, by the Executive Board and the General Conference (The Director General).

The above discussion focused on administrative accountability of an individual functionary and a group of employees working in the ABEGS partnership. The evaluative procedures are vertically structured both in terms of individual and group accountability.
This system presents a coherent and understandable account of performance of individual staff members, departments, and institutions working for the Arab Bureau in the Arabian Gulf region.

The first part of this section deals with the administrative accountability that mostly covers administrative performance appraisal of individuals and groups. The method of administrative performance appraisal both for individuals and groups is strictly vertically bureaucratic. The control mechanism and influence of leadership is centralized and exercised from top to bottom. Performance reporting is communicated from lower levels to the supervisory levels of leadership. The work completed in the units though geographically located at different places is reported by the heads of the units and appraised by the authorities in the headquarters. The accountability (performance appraisal or evaluation) system works in a vertical way that runs between the organizational leadership levels as given in the circular model (Figure -9). The visionary level is located in the core of the partnership structure that means at the top of the organizational structure followed by the strategic, managerial, and operational level leadership.

The work of the partnership (programs & projects) is performed in all seven countries sometimes through the staff of the member state ministries or by the representative(s) of the Arab Bureau. It does not matter where or who is doing the partnership work, it remains under the influence of the ABEGS partnership. This work is duly appraised by the authorities of the Arab Bureau.

Technological means are also used in the process of accountability, digital attendance is one way. The Bureau covers administrative, financial, legal, and program
accountability by using internal sources and/or external agencies. These areas will be addressed in the following sub sections of this chapter.

### 7.5.2 Financial Accountability

The financial accountability seems imperative when different partners are contributing financial resources for the functioning of an interorganizational partnership such as Arab Bureau. It will not be out of place to mention here the financial shares contributed by seven member states. The ABEGS partnership had seven members when Iraq was a member. The partnership worked with six members for some time during Iraq’s invasion in Kuwait when the General Conference dismissed Iraq’s membership from the Arab Bureau. This dismissal had adverse financial impact on the ABEGS partnership. Iraq was paying 21% of the total budget and Yemen has joined the Arab Bureau with 2.5% financial contribution. Since then the Arab Bureau is experiencing short fall of 18.5% in its financial resources. The members make up the shortfall jointly according to the ratio of their respective share.

**Table 5: Financial Contributions by the Member States after 1990**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Contribution When Iraq was a member</th>
<th>Financial Contribution with Yemen as a new member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iraq 21%</td>
<td>UAE 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSA 25%</td>
<td>Bahrain 2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait 25%</td>
<td>Kuwait 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oman 2.5%</td>
<td>KSA 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatar 9%</td>
<td>Oman 2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAE 15%</td>
<td>Qatar 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahrain 2.5%</td>
<td>Yemen 2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total= 100%</td>
<td>Total = 81.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shared financial resources demand adequate financial management with proper financial accountability. The financial contribution is not equal but it does not affect
power dynamics in the ABEGS partnership in terms of members’ influence on decision making. There is no disparity on the status of members. They are treated equally in the partnership. According to the evidence presented by the data, all member states have equal representation at all organizational leadership levels. For instance each member state sends one member to the interorganizational bodies of the ABEGS partnership such as the General Conference, the Executive Board, and Board of Trustees for each subordinate unit. The decision making in above listed interorganizational bodies is carried out on the principle of one member one vote. There is no veto power given to any member state. The members can only influence decision making through the means of consultation at strategic, managerial, and operational level leadership. The experience, knowledge, and/or commitment of the representative of member state(s) may influence the decision making process at any level as discussed in previous chapters. Chapter 8 contains detailed discussion supported by data on the power dynamics and parity or disparity status of the members in the ABEGS as an interorganizational partnership. It is suffice to say here that in the Arab Bureau unequal financial contribution does not have any influence on decision making.

The process of financial accountability in the ABEGS partnership starts with the preparation of budget by following rules and regulations in the Arab Bureau as a whole and in the research and training centre as well. The budget is prepared for two years. The Arab Bureau “financial cycle comprise of two years instead of one (An officer in Riyadh)”. The budget making process is rigorous and evaluative in nature. The estimates and spending proposals are examined at all the steps till it is scrutinized and approved by the General Conference. The recent budget proposal of the Arab Bureau is sixty million
Saudi Riyal (approximately sixteen million US dollars). The budget proposals are appraised by the Director General and the Executive Board before they are submitted to the General Conference for approval. The approved money is spent according to rules in a very careful manner. “We have to follow the financial procedures to spend the money. For example we can’t spend money beyond the approved budget of a particular program. We cannot exceed unless we take the permission of the Bureau. If we need to transfer money from one project to the other we can do it to a certain limit, if we are exceeding then we have to seek Bureau’s approval (An officer in Doha)”.

The organizational leaders in the Arab Bureau are equally involved in the matters of securing accountability at all levels. The financial accountability is ensured by using different techniques. The most popular technique is internal and external audit. Majority of the participants of this study mentioned internal and external audit as a regular practice and an essential part of coherent system of accountability. The internal and external audit is conducted in all establishments of the ABEGS partnership.

We have accountants and auditors. This is an internal process with accountants and auditors we have monthly meetings. The accounts are reviewed in those monthly meetings. … After two years they send an auditor to us to examine our accounts. This happens at the end of every financial cycle which consists of two years. The auditors come from Riyadh to examine the accounts. The auditors submit their report to the Executive Board. The auditors make their points and free to seek clarifications from the concerned people (The Director Training Doha).

The Director GASERC Kuwait mentioned similar comment:
We do have accountability here. The employees know that they have to do their work effectively according to the rules. An external agency is appointed to do the financial audit at the end of every financial period (The Director GASERC Kuwait).

The internal audit is performed periodically by the accounts and finance experts of the Bureau. The financial experts are actively involved in making the budget and they watch the transactions while the money is spent. It is their job to advise the management to handle money matters according to the rules and regulations. However, the Executive Board appoints external auditors when the financial cycle of the Arab Bureau comes to an end.

The second level is financial accountability. There is an organization that comes from outside (external auditors) to examine our accounts … these auditors come after every two years according to our budget cycle. … It is the discretion of the Executive Board to appoint external auditors. The present auditors have conducted the audit for our three budgetary cycles (The Director Finance).

The external agency conducts the audit in the Arab Bureau headquarters as well as in the research centre Kuwait and training centre Doha Qatar. All the participants of this study mentioned about this external audit. Some of the quotes from the research centre and the training centre are given here: “An external agency is appointed to conduct the audit (An officer in Kuwait), “the financial cycle of the bureau is two years. After every two years there is an audit (An officer in Doha)”, “regarding financial accountability, an external agent comes every financial period (An officer in Kuwait)”. 
It is obvious in view of the above discussion that financial accountability is a regular process in the ABEGS partnership. The money is collected from the member states and then accounts are maintained in a professional way. The accounts and finance experts help the management of the Arab Bureau to run the money matters according to the rules and regulations. The leaders at all the organizational levels handle financial matters very meticulously. Securing financial accountability is hierarchical in nature. Senior levels always keep an eye on the junior levels. Internal audit works in continuity throughout the financial cycle and external auditors examine the accounts every two years at the end of financial cycle. The external audit is conducted throughout the jurisdiction of the ABEGS partnership.

External auditors are hired to ensure fair, professional, and neutral financial accountability. When external auditors are involved the influence of the internal operational leaders is reduced in the process of securing accountability. However, the influence exerted by the senior leaders (strategic, and/or in some cases managerial) of the Bureau remains intact as they are the ones who control hiring, firing, and management of the services of external auditors. The same principle of horizontal equality and vertical hierarchy of leadership works here as well.

7.5.3 Legal Accountability - Muhasiba E Qanooni

I learnt from some of the participants of this study that sometimes measures are taken to conduct legal accountability. An outside agency or an expert is appointed to examine various aspects of the partnership. The expert is called “Muhasib” (the person who conducts the process of accountability). I was told that “Muhasibe Kanooni (Legal
Accountability Officer)” looks into every paper (An officer in Riyadh)” and works independently.

The head of this agency is like deputy finance minister …he has to be a very competent person with very good character. The Muhasib looks into financial, administrative, and legal matters. He prepares his report and submits to the Director General. … the Director General may ask him to present his report to the Executive Board or the General Conference (An officer in Riyadh).

The focus of the “Muhasibe Kanooni” is to examine documents with legal perspective. The Muhasib can examine any managerial, financial, or program papers. The geographical jurisdiction of his job is defined either by the Executive Board or by the Director General. The Muhasib performs his job at the designated place(s). The legal accountability appears to be occasional event of the Bureau. It is performed as and when the senior leadership feels the need to do it.

Sometimes the same Muhasib covers Riyadh, Doha, and Kuwait…and sometimes Doha and Kuwait have their own Muhasib … (An officer in Riyadh)

The influence of the senior leadership (strategic and/or managerial) is revealed in the process of legal accountability as well. This influence is consistent in all accountability measures that are initiated in the Arab Bureau as an interorganizational partnership. One of the reasons for this consistency of influence in securing accountability is that strategic and managerial leaders assume the overall responsibility of conducting securing accountability. It is
therefore established that “power and purpose” (Ranson, 2003) go hand in hand.

7.5.4 Program Accountability

The prime goal of the ABEGS partnership is to design educational programs and projects and implement them in the member states. I have described earlier some of the medium term and long-term plans that include number of educational programs. Individual functionaries, groups, and departments are involved in their official capacity in planning, organizing, designing, implementing, monitoring, coordinating, and evaluating various programs for the Arab Bureau. Some people or sections are providing technical support. Some individuals and institutions are doing research for needs assessment purposes. Some are conducting training courses.

There are five major categories of the partnership programs. They are curriculum & education, education & technology, education systems, collaborative partnerships, and make education your profession. The method to design different programs involves a very rigorous process. The Bureau’s programs are finalized based on the feedback acquired by various stakeholders from the highest to the grassroots organizational levels of the ABEGS partnership. The design process ensures the participation of internal and outside educational professionals and experts.

The process of securing program accountability begins at the very outset of program designing stage and it runs all the way through during design and its implementation stage. Thereafter, the post program evaluation is conducted by using

39 The educational programs under each category are listed in ‘Table -4’.
different tools and techniques. The program design is cyclical in nature. The feedback is acquired from the education ministries of the member states, members of the Board(s) of Trustees, implementation site of the program, and other stakeholders of the concerned program. The managers involved in designing different programs visit member states and collect feedback from the people who work at the grassroots levels and participate in day to day implementation of these programs. The internal and external experts examine the feedback with various stakeholders in different meetings and in a workshop organized by the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC). The Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) is considered an instrument of securing accountability that helps maintain quality in Arab Bureau’s work (detailed discussion on the role of QAC shall be included in the later part of this section). The synthesized analysis, recommendations of the experts, and report of the QAC guide the leaders of the Arab Bureau to redesign educational programs. The above described process of educational program design is evaluative that runs through many cycles from start to the end until it is finalized and approved by the strategic leaders sitting in the Executive Board and the General Conference. The accountability and educational program design go hand in hand during the entire planning process as explained in the aforementioned discussion. All programs are designed under the supervision of the Director Programs who is a member of all Board(s) of Trustees for all the subordinate institutions of the ABEGS partnership. He is an expert educational professional and doing this job for more than thirty years since the inception of the Arab Bureau.

There is plan for every project from start to end. We are responsible to implement the projects as internal people and then the experience
houses are the outside agencies. The Bureau follows the plan and supervises the work. Every outcome of every project is submitted to the quality assurance committee. The quality assurance team evaluates our work and gives us feedback. The feedback goes to the concerned department. The concerned department makes corrections. This is how each and every aspect of our projects is evaluated. They follow up all the stages of the projects till the end. These are our accountability and follow up processes. The quality assurance approves the successful implementation of each project. Then they hold a workshop. This workshop is attended by the representatives of all the member states according to the nature of the project. In this workshop all the participants discuss all the aspects of the project in depth. Then the Bureau sends the project to the concerned state(s) for implementation. People who join the workshop are responsible personnel for the implementation of that particular project (An officer in Riyadh).

In view of the involvement of so many stakeholders and putting in place numerous procedures to examine the quality and securing the process of program design, implementation, and securing accountability in the Arab Bureau takes years to complete one cycle. During this time organizational leaders at the strategic, managerial, and operational levels of the Arab Bureau find many opportunities to apply following leadership practices for securing accountability in all the educational programs of the partnership as demonstrated in the foregoing discussion.

1. Ensure individual staff accountability
2. Develop & present a coherent, understandable, accurate account of performance
3. Take feedback from others
4. Participate in external evaluation and make adjustments

5. Create and redesign program structure

7.5.5 Securing Accountability at Grassroots Levels

Starting from the General Conference and going through the Executive Board, the Board(s) of Trustees, Programs Department in the headquarters and through the Quality Assurance Committee, there is an arrangement to get the feedback from the highest to the lowest organizational levels of the Arab Bureau partnership. School teachers, administrators, and operational staff working in the education ministries of the member states are the grassroots levels of the administration of the ABEGS partnership. The people working at this level are asked to give their feedback on the projects and programs that they are involved under the umbrella of the Arab Bureau. This is how the accountability process of the educational programs goes deep into the grassroots levels of the ABEGS partnership. The example of developing learning objectives of different training programs given in the following quote demonstrates how the feedback from the grassroots levels is collected and communicated to the planners in the Arab Bureau to make corrections and redesign the program/project.

The feedback that we get helps a lot. I give you an example. After we developed learning objectives, we called the quality assurance, a workshop was organized. When we organize the workshop we take a lot of notes. Then we make changes according to the feedback. We are now finishing this project and sending it to ministries. The ministries will send this work to schools. The schools will use and prepare their notes. The schools send their feedback to the ministries and then the ministries send this feedback to the ABEGS. Then ABEGS makes corrections (An officer in Riyadh).
The current example of the involvement of grassroots levels administration in securing accountability helps understand that leaders of the Bureau use the specific leadership practices of seeking feedback from various organizational levels and restructuring educational projects and programs in the ABEGS partnership.

7.5.6 External Evaluation by UNESCO⁴⁰

Some programs are long term, some are medium term, and some programs are short term. We requested UNESCO to evaluate these programs. We have done two UNESCO evaluations covering all programs implemented by the Arab Bureau. In addition to that we schedule workshops and invite experts to examine and evaluate our programs (Director Programs).

The leaders of the Arab Bureau participated in several evaluation activities conducted by external agencies. Based on the findings and recommendations of external evaluators the ABEGS’ authorities redesigned the partnership program. The data collected from the Arab Bureau present many examples of external accountability in the Arab Bureau. However, two evaluation studies conducted by the United Nations Educational Scientific & Cultural Organization (UNESCO) were cited very consistently. All the participants of my study mentioned these two research projects undertaken by the UNESCO. The first study was concluded in 1985 and the second was completed in 1998.

Our Bureau in Riyadh used to carry out the evaluation of all its work. These evaluations were conducted by UNESCO – first was completed in the year 1985 and the second one in 1998. It is good

⁴⁰ Most of the information for this section is retrieved from the UNESCO report 1998 in Arabic language and the translations provided by the Arab Bureau.
that an external agency is evaluating the work of your organization and provides report with findings. These reports cover everything such as administration, financial matters, projects, and programs (An officer in Kuwait).

It is also important to note that in both its evaluative studies UNESCO covered Arab Bureau’s offices in Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and all the member states at that time.

Subsequent to his exploratory visit to the Arab Bureau Dr. Victor Balla the Director of the regional office of UNESCO in Beirut was requested by the Bureau to conduct the second formal evaluation study of the Arab Bureau. A team of experts was deputed to make an assessment of ten years work of the ABEGS partnership. The UNESCO team arrived in Riyadh in April, 1989. The team began its work in the first week of June 1998. The team came to Riyadh (ABEGS), then Arab Center of Educational Research in Kuwait, Ministries of Education in the member states, The team interviewed many persons in different departments of the ABEGS covering the mission, structures, programs, work technique, and challenges of this partnership. The team also interviewed 83 persons in the ministries of education in the member countries. The UNESCO team also collected documents to be analyzed later.

The UNESCO team analyzed interview data and the documents of the Bureau. Based on their analysis they prepared and presented a report to the Arab Bureau. The UNESCO study included the analysis of ABEGS programs and activities, from a quality and quantity point of view. The UNESCO evaluation report 1998 highlighted some of the Arab Bureau’s achievements during the past ten years of its work:
a. The Bureau accomplished 330 programs in education, culture, sciences, and higher education (symposiums, workshops, books, etc).

b. The publication of numerous important documents by the ABEGS in the field of curricula, tests, higher education, and scientific education is another achievement. Some researches and reference books were translated. Some of these works were published more than once.

c. The Bureau also developed educational materials for the member states (schoolbooks in mathematics and sciences).

d. The Arab Bureau created communication channels of higher levels for thousands of employees in the educational sector and developing technical means to connect the Bureau with the member states.

The UNESCO report on achievements of ABEGS enhanced the confidence level of the leaders of this partnership. The people at the Arab Bureau felt motivated and responded to the negative feedback of the report in very constructive way. The leaders redesigned some pivotal aspects of the partnership program where they thought improvement was needed. The UNESCO report also identified some areas of improvement. The Arab Bureau took the recommendations of this report very seriously and brought some useful changes. Some of the areas of Bureau’s improvement and changes introduced for the improvement are briefly discussed as under

a. The UNESCO report identified that there was very little follow up of the Bureau’s accomplishments. The leaders have to pay attention to this aspect for long term effectiveness and quality of the partnership program. The Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) was created to ensure follow up and maintain quality in educational programs of the ABEGS partnership. The QAC establishes coordination amongst various institutions of the Bureau and the member states to perform this task.
b. The UNESCO report emphasized the need of infrastructure growth and development to upgrade Bureau’s efficiency. The report highlighted the need for the professional development of the human resource of the ABEGS partnership. Some major tangible changes introduced by the leadership of the Arab Bureau could be observed subsequent to this UNESCO report. These changes are (1) tremendous growth and development in technical and physical infrastructure (2) many employees were hired with better qualification (3) a modern training centre called the Arab Educational Training Centre for the Gulf States (AETCGS) was established in Doha Qatar with the intention for the professional development of the human resource of the ABEGS partnership across the whole region of the Arabian Gulf. It is also important to mention here that the jurisdiction of the partnership is huge and sometimes it is very difficult to find people with adequate professional qualifications. The leaders of the Bureau feel the scarcity of professional experts. They intend to continue their work with the existing human resources and hope to hire more experts when they find any suitable opportunity.

c. The UNESCO report says that the reference documents developed by the Bureau were not revised or updated in order to be a reference for employees in the educational field. In view of this feedback of the UNESCO report, the Bureau paid special attention to this aspect. The three major locations of the Arab Bureau i.e. Riyadh headquarters, research centre Kuwait, and the training centre Doha maintain huge libraries with modern facilities for the use of the citizens of the ABEGS partnership. Furthermore, the indigenous reference material is generated by the research centre Kuwait to be disseminated to the member states. The Director of the research centre mentioned:

   In the beginning the output of the institution was some copies of the studies that were sent to the member states. But now every study is converted into a book. We print many copies of this book and we send these copies to each member state so that
they can distribute the copies of our research in their countries and benefit from our work (The Director GASERC).

In addition to the modern libraries, printing and distribution of the Bureau’s research work, the Bureau has made significant progress in its information technology infrastructure. This technical advancement is offering several professional services to the employees of the Bureau and to the education professionals of the member states. For instance, teachers of the member states can use ABEGS LMS to teach on line courses in their schools, teachers can become a member of the ABEHGS’ online community to benefit from the free of charge ABEGS online resources, education professionals can also share their ideas with the help of ABEGS blogging, etc.

d. The UNESCO report recommended reducing high cost of publishing books in the printing facility housed in the Riyadh headquarters. The ABEGS authorities accepted this feedback and eliminated the publishing facility from the Riyadh headquarters. The Bureau saved substantial money by redesigning the partnership program this way.

The first UNESCO survey was done in 1985 and second was completed in 1998. The above discussion of the UNESCO evaluation is based on the UNESCO report submitted to the ABEGS leadership in 1998. The UNESCO study is considered one of the measures taken by the Bureau to secure accountability of the partnership program. I have quoted some examples of the feedback acquired by the UNESCO report and actions taken by the Arab Bureau to introduce improvements in the ABEGS partnership program.
7.5.7 The Role of Quality Assurance Committee (QAC)\textsuperscript{41}

Before and after developing the programs we do the quality assurance after that we evaluate the final outcomes with the standards of quality. We also evaluate the inputs, processes, outcomes, findings, and results of each program. … We have established standards. The members of the quality assurance committee also come from the Riyadh University and experts from outside. So there are internal members and external members. … We use some standards to evaluate and control the programs of the Arab Bureau. … It is the process of accountability. … The projects are evaluated by the experience houses. They give their notes and recommendations for amendments in the projects and programs (Head of the Quality Assurance Committee).

The Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) is considered an ongoing instrument of accountability for all programs and projects designed and implemented by the Arab Bureau. This committee was established about eight years ago. “The creation of this committee was proposed by the Director General and formal approval was given by the Executive Board (Director Programs)”. The distinguished feature of this institution is that it is staffed by internal and external educational experts. The committee is comprised of five members. The Director of Programs unit and head of the QAC are two internal members from the Arab Bureau. The Chairman of this committee and two members are taken from outside the Arab Bureau. The chairman of QAC is appointed by the Director General.

\textsuperscript{41} This section is based on ideas shared by the director programs, head of the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC), head of the Information Technology department, and many others.
The committee was created by the Executive Board on the recommendation of the Director General. Dr. Ahmad, the under secretary of the Ministry of Education of Kuwait, the then Director General of the Arab Bureau here and Dr. Mona Jardaniya from the Ministry of Education of Oman were the three people who were very active in creating this committee (Head of QAC).

The committee maintains connection with upper leadership, external experts, grassroots levels educational administration and the students of the member states. The working of the committee is essentially evaluative which leads to securing program accountability. This committee examines various educational programs designed by the program design unit and other units of the Bureau and submits periodical report to the Bureau. Before the report about the programs is submitted to the Bureau, the programs are sent to the experience houses. “The quality assurance companies are called experience houses here (Manager QAC)”.

When the programs are completely designed, they are sent to the Quality Assurance Committee. … The work of the quality assurance committee involves outside experts... The committee sends the programs to outside experts for their opinion. After the external reviews programs are resubmitted to the programs department with recommendations by the committee. Programs and projects are then seen and approved by the Director General, Executive Board, and General Conference. The Committee reviews the programs and gives approval if the committee is satisfied. The work of the quality assurance committee involves outside experts... The committee sends the programs to outside experts for their opinion. After the external reviews programs are resubmitted to the programs unit with recommendations by the QAC. Programs and projects are then seen
and approved by the Director General, Executive Board, and General Conference (Programs Officer Riyadh).

The essence of the quality of work of the QAC is found in its reach to the top program designers, external experts, ultimate users and beneficiaries of the Bureau’s projects and programs. The internal and external experts representing QAC examine the design of the programs and the impact of their implementation in the field.

We call monthly meetings attended by internal and external members. They review the programs before they give them to the experience houses. Then we receive their [experience houses] reports. Based on these reports and our reviews we evaluate the programs. After that we evaluate the final product. Thereafter we look forward to evaluate the impact of the programs in the outside field i.e. ministry, schools, or offices of the member states and examine what are the benefits of these programs at the grassroots level. The final recipients of these programs are the students of the member states (QAC Officer).

In addition to the appraisal of educational projects and programs of the Arab Bureau the QAC maintains the record of the student assessments in the “Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS)” and “Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS)” tests of the participating member states. The QAC also organizes large scale tests in every member state in math and science in elementary and secondary schools. This is Arab Bureau’s indigenous initiative. The QAC makes arrangements to hold these tests by coordinating with ten member teams in each country. The QAC keeps record of the student scores of indigenous tests and the tests organized
under TIMSS & PIRLS studies. The committee is assigned to develop standards and measures of quality for the Arab Bureau partnership. Therefore, the test results earned by students of the Gulf countries are used to set standards and measures for student performance in the member states of the ABEGS partnership.

We organize programs for joint tests – they are national tests – member countries organize them at the end of grade 3 and grade 6, grade 9 and then grade 12 in math and science … In every member country we have a committee of ten persons who help us conduct these tests. And these ten persons are the employees of the ministries of education … hundred percent quality assurance is very difficult however we want to see the effect of our work on our students. We are trying to develop some standards and some measures so that we can see the effect of our work on students and on schools in the field (Head of the QAC).

The accountability work performed by the QAC covers the assessment of the experience houses as well. The hiring of external agencies (quality assurance organizations / companies) known as experience houses is a competitive process. The profiles of the quality assurance companies are appraised before they are given the task of the program evaluation. The tenders are advertised in the news papers. The qualifications and experiences of individual experts are also examined. The punitive measures are also taken if the job is not performed properly. The Arab Bureau has the arrangement to review the performance of the experience houses and external experts. The individual accountability of the external professionals and organizational assessment is also ensured.

We receive the programs from the institutions and then we advertise the tender to hire the experience houses we ask them to send us
documentation and the qualification of the people working in the experience houses. …If we feel that the job is not done properly – we send the programs back to experience houses. Sometimes we fine them as well. We evaluate the final product. We seek the help of three experts if two of them say the work is not good then we withdraw work or the project from the experience house or cancel the contract (Head of QAC).

The work of the Quality Assurance Committee is considered a strong mechanism of securing accountability of the partnership program. The participants of this study highlighted in their comments that QAC is constituted by internal and external experts. The staff members of the committee have access to various stakeholders of the educational projects and programs. The analytical process adopted by the QAC is considerably comprehensive that involves people of various administrative levels from various locations of the ABEGS partnership. The QAC seeks feedback by organizing workshops, meetings with internal and external experts, external evaluations from experience houses, large scale math and science tests of elementary and secondary school students, and by visiting member states and taking notes based on discussions and observations. The QAC officers develop and present a coherent, understandable account of performance.
How frequently do you perform this leadership practice?

**Likert Scale:** 1 = never at all 2 = Seldom 3 = Sometimes 4 = Frequently 5 = Very Frequently 6 = Not Applicable

The bar chart presents a comparative picture of the usage of six following specific leadership practices pertaining to securing accountability.

1. Ensures individual staff accountability.
2. Develop & present a coherent, understandable, accurate and transparent account of performance.
3. Reflect on personal contribution to achievements and take feedback from others.
4. Participate in external evaluation and make adjustments.
5. Create and redesign organizational structure.
6. Develop and apply performance management practices.
It is obvious from the chart that reflection on personal contribution to achievements and take feedback from others is very frequently used leadership practice and the developing and applying performance management practices is frequently used leadership practice.

The above discussion based on qualitative data analyses reveals that ABEGS partnership at all levels ensured following leadership functions for securing accountability. The leaders ensure individual staff accountability, develop & present a coherent, understandable, accurate and transparent account of performance, reflect on personal contribution to achievements and take feedback even from the grassroots levels, participate in external evaluation, create and redesign organizational structure, develop and apply performance management practices.

**7.5.8 Discussion**

Securing accountability is a leadership function that involves performance appraisal of human resource (individuals & groups), assessment of efficient use of financial resources, and performance measurement & evaluation of the effectiveness of organizational plans and programmes. The data analyses reveal that the role of leadership with respect to securing accountability in an interorganizational partnership would not be radically different compared to a single organization. However, it would be interesting to study in a leadership research that which individuals or bodies (groups) of individuals used what kind of influence to provide direction so as to achieve desired objectives of securing accountability.
The qualitative data analysis provided details on how various leadership practices are used to ensure administrative, financial, legal, and partnership program accountability. Multiple tools, techniques, and mechanisms are employed for securing accountability in the ABEGS partnership. The services of internal and external agencies and experts are utilized to ensure neutrality, reduce bias and cover optimum geographical and functional jurisdiction in seven member states. The most convincing evidence in this regard that I came across was two UNESCO evaluations in 1985 and 1998. Third party assessment helps to give real performance picture of various organizational aspects not the picture that leaders may like to see at the end of performance appraisal process.

In view of certain constraints the UNESCO type large scale accountability event may not be possible so regularly. An internal agency like Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) may help maintain regularity to secure ongoing accountability during the whole year. I learnt from the QAC style accountability that combination of internal and external experts / agencies arrangement can be used for regular performance appraisal. Periodical audit by internal and external professionals ensures financial accountability and the services of Muhasib (legal accountability expert) to undertake legal accountability show the use of the combination of internal and external accountability tools. However, regular annual performance report writing of individual employees is purely internal arrangement for securing accountability in the Arab Bureau.

The principle of horizontal equality and vertical hierarchy remained consistent throughout the accountability process going through administrative, financial, legal, and program accountability as hypothesized by the conceptual framework of this study. The deep analysis of this principle helps conclude that it does not allow national or partner
bias to intervene in the process of accountability. I also learnt that the influence of joint leadership thinking and action by strategic and/or managerial leaders (General Conference, Executive Board, Board(s) of Trustees) does not allow partner specific agenda to play a role that is not liked by other partners.

This study suggests that leadership and its distribution associated with interorganizational partnership should be conceptualized differently compared to a single organizational environment. Sometimes researchers take interdepartmental relations of a mega organization same as how different organizations form partnerships and maintain their relations. The leadership behaviour in partnerships and in single organizations with respect to interdepartmental coordination is not synonymous. The rationale of drawing a distinction between interorganizational partnerships and single organizations and how leadership works in them can be explained in the following analysis.

Firstly, leaders working in different departments in a single organization pursue the same goals and objectives for the success of that organization. The leaders in a partnership join hands with specified area of combined interest. The loyalty of partner organizations stays with their own organizations in case of competing and/or conflicting interests. This does not happen in coordination of interdepartmental relations. Everyone is loyal to and works for the best interest of the organization. Secondly, the participating organizations in partnership environments come from varied organizational structures, diverse leadership styles, and different cultural environments (organizational and/or national culture). However, single organizations maintain homogeneity in all of these areas within the organizational boundaries. Thirdly, the resource potential of partner organizations would not be the same. Some partners may own significantly more
resources compared to others. The contributions are negotiated and potential benefits are estimated to examine the viability of participation. The main aim of each partner is to guard its own benefits. Partners put in part of their resources because the area of combined work in a partnership is limited whereas leadership in single organization use full resources to achieve their objectives looking at the whole picture. Leadership in single organization maintains interdepartmental relations for optimum productivity for the whole organization.

Leaders in organizations perform their functions based on available financial, human, and physical resources. The challenges for organizational leaders could be many, including but not limited to the lack of resources. In view of data analysis the major challenge for the Arab Bureau has been scarcity of professional human resources. It is imperative for an organization to maintain related professional and skilled work force to achieve organizational objectives. The respondents of this study felt shortage of local experts to complete certain projects and programs. The ABEGS partnership has to outsource many jobs due to lack of expertise. The deficiency in human resource results in increased dependence on outside human resources, slower pace of work to complete different projects and programs, underutilization of physical and financial resources, and work related stress due to excessive workload for the existing skilled human resource.
CHAPTER 8: CIRCULAR MODEL OF INTERORGANIZATIONAL LEADERSHIP

The discussion in the previous chapter explains how the interorganizational leadership of the Arab Bureau of Education for the Gulf States is distributed in visionary, strategic, managerial and operational levels by performing five major leadership functions such as setting directions, developing people, managing the partnership program, redesigning the partnership program, and securing accountability. This chapter will cover the last research question of this study i.e. how vertical and horizontal interorganizational leadership function simultaneously in the Arab Bureau. The discussion in the literature review on the existing conceptualization of vertical vs. horizontal leadership by different researchers lead me to hypothesize that vertical and horizontal leadership essentially function together as circular leadership in partnership environments. I have, therefore, developed a “Circular Model of Interorganizational Leadership” (Figure -9), to apply it into the structures of the Arab Bureau of Education for the Gulf States so as to examine how vertical and horizontal leadership function simultaneously in an interorganizational partnership environment. It would be useful to repeat how leadership is defined for the purposes of this study. Leadership in the interorganizational partnership may be identified by numerous sources, actions, beliefs, individuals and/or groups of individuals with the capacity to influence decision making and implementation processes at strategic, managerial, and operational levels that provide direction to run the affairs of a partnership. I am also using Leithwood and his colleagues’ framework which pleads that leaders in the organizational context perform four major functions such as setting directions, developing people, redesigning the
organization, and managing the (partnership) programme. This research includes ‘securing accountability’ as a fifth core leadership function.

It is important to conceptualize the meanings of horizontal and vertical leadership for the purposes of this study. Horizontal leadership can be defined as a group of individual leaders who work on the same organizational level in an interorganizational partnership environment and, at least formally in terms of the organizational design, possess the equal powers and privileges to make decisions. For instance, individuals at the policy making level of an organization work as peers. They have the same capacity with equal powers to participate in decision making. None of them enjoys any kind of preferential status, no one is reporting to anyone else, no one is answerable to others, and none of them gives directives to others in the same group. Individuals working in a group at this level will be considered part of horizontal leadership. The horizontal organizational arrangements may also be called flat organizational structures. Contrary to that vertical leadership works in a hierarchical fashion. The higher level administrators keep an eye on the performance of the lower level employees. They delegate work, monitor and motivate lower administrative levels. The individuals working at the lower levels receive directions from the upper levels and are expected to obey the orders. They are answerable to the upper levels. The lower level administration submits performance reports to the higher levels. The vertical leadership looks like an organizational pyramid. The subsequent discussion will demonstrate how Circular Model of Interorganizational Leadership presents an integrated picture of horizontal and vertical leadership of the ABEGS partnership.
8.0 Horizontal Leadership at the ABEGS Partnership

It has been discussed in the earlier chapters that the structures of ABEGS partnership possess five organizational leadership levels. The ‘Circular Model of Interorganizational Leadership’ is designed to present the overall structure of the ABEGS partnership. This model has the capacity to demonstrate horizontal and vertical leadership structures of the Arab Bureau at the same time. The individuals at the same organizational leadership levels work as peers. Disparity in territorial size, diverse demographic features, varied natural resources, variation in economic development, and uneven financial contribution to the Arab Bureau does not make any difference to maintain equal status of the member states at all organizational levels of the ABEGS partnership. Therefore, the ‘Circular Model of Interorganizational Leadership’ displays the parity of partners in the ABEGS’ organizational structures at all levels. The consultative (tashawari) processes at strategic (General Conference & Executive Board) and managerial (Board(s) of Trustees of Subordinate units) levels, and equal voting rights of member states at all levels could be presented as evidence of horizontal equality and parity of partners at all levels. Detailed discussion on this topic is included in the later part of this chapter.

The heads of the states and governments of the Gulf States constitute the visionary leadership of the ABEGS partnership. The visionary leadership of the Arab Bureau is depicted as the inner most circle of the Circular Model. The heads of the states represent their countries in the Supreme Council of the GCC as equal participants in the meetings. The visionary level is not actively involved in the practical operations of the Arab Bureau. It is therefore not the focus of my discussion in this study. However, the
member states may provide vision to the rest of the ABEGS partnership from the GCC forum.

Strategic leadership is the next horizontal organizational leadership level in the Arab Bureau. The General Conference and the Executive Board of the ABEGS are two bodies that provide strategic direction to the Arab Bureau. The General Conference is comprised of the education ministers of the seven member states. The final decisions are taken by the General Conference on behalf of the AGEBS as a top institution of this partnership. According to the participants of this study the members of the General Conference have the same vision, goals, and achievements. They are equals. The decisions are made based on the principle of one seat one vote. Each minister of the member states is entitled to have the same powers and privileges while working as a member of the General Conference.

I have observed in the meetings they [the ministers] are the same. They have the common goals, same vision, yes few countries pay more but it does not have any bearing on decision making. There is no difference as they have common goals and same achievements they respect each other. Every country in the General Conference has one seat one vote (Director Training Centre).

The financial contribution of the member states is not equal. Some states pay more money than others.\footnote{Please see Table 3 for details on contribution.} For instance, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the state of Kuwait together pay 50% of the total budget of the Arab Bureau but it does not give them special powers or privileges. The rules and regulations in the Bureau do not talk about any special powers or preferences to the ones who pay more money. The equality does
not mean that everyone has to agree on everything with everyone. It does not happen that way. I was told that disagreements are resolved by continued discussion. The members do not haste to make decisions. They take time and bring relevant material/argument to convince others and remove difference of opinion so as to reach consensus. According to the conceptual framework of this study the strategic leadership in the interorganizational partnership is the policy making level. It is therefore possible that members at this organizational leadership level work in policy governance model, where decisions are debated and argued amongst members, but once the decision is made the whole group supports and endorses the decisions rather than continue their disagreements. All the participants of this study were of the view that all member states enjoy equal status in the General Conference.

Let me start with financial aspect. As far as I know it does not have impact on the decision making because these are educational matters not political matters. When they [ministers] meet they talk as professionals. There is no veto. None of the country is given a veto power. Any idea comes forward from any member is considered and discussed seriously. As far as I know the financial matters do not have any negative impact on decision making (An officer in Kuwait).

The right to use ‘veto’ does not exist in the ABEGS partnership. This is a noteworthy point mentioned in the above quote. The members are treated equally in the General Conference. However leadership may be expressed by individual members based on their experience, knowledge, and/or commitment. A senior officer in Riyadh says, “it is normal to see that there are some influential persons. It depends on their experience, their way of communication, how much they are familiar with the issue under
discussion”. This is how sometimes leadership is informally manifested by experienced and knowledgeable individuals. All members in the General Conference, in the Executive Board, and for that matter in the Board(s) of Trustees in the Arab Bureau are equal and they claim to respect each other’s ideas. This is exactly what horizontal leadership means. The participants also mentioned that decisions are taken by establishing consensus. The director general of the Arab Bureau said, “Our decisions have to be unanimous … if there are differences, they [ministers] will discuss until they reach an agreement (Director General)”.

In view of analyses and discussions undertaken in various sections of this thesis, I argue that influence of leadership is expressed through main organizational bodies such as the General Conference, the Executive Board, and the Board(s) of Trustees (strategic, managerial, and operational leadership). Leadership is not attributed to particular individuals rather it emanates from groups. The representatives of member states enjoy equal status in above listed shared leadership groups with an agreement to consensus decision making processes at all levels. Main decisions in the ABEGS partnership are taken at all levels in meetings based on extensive consultative and communication process.

Preference based on money is probably against the Arab Islamic brotherhood culture, according to the Arab Bureau officials interviewed. The homogeneous Arab culture of the member states has its roots in the same religion, same language, and same way of life. It is because of the same culture that the Arab Gulf States feel themselves so close to each other. They therefore feel the need to plan the educational administration and development matters jointly so as to make progress together. It is because of this
reason that many of the participants of this study responded on money question in the following words:

“We have one culture Arabic Islamic Gulf Culture. May be small differences but you know the same Islamic way of life… money is no big deal (An office in Riyadh)”.

“They are brothers – they work like equals (An officer in Kuwait)”
“they don’t brag about that [money]. They are like family members (An officer in Riyadh)”

They [ministers] are equal…equal influence…they are like family members. …you have more money you have more say in decision making no it does not work here at the Arab Bureau. Their say is equal. Budget is different but say in decision making is equal. It might happen in other partnerships that the one who pays more has more say in the decision making but at ABEGS all are equal irrespective of the size of their financial contribution (An officer in Riyadh).

The horizontal leadership in the Arab Bureau also means that people working at the same organizational level do not exercise undue influence on their colleagues / co-workers due to their superior economic and /or political position in the region. The participants of the study did not like to use the word ‘influence’. They were not comfortable with this word. They were somehow interpreting (in gestures/body language) this word negatively. They perceived the word ‘influence’ as the word ‘force’. As one of the participants mentioned, “no one can force others to take certain decisions” (An officer in Riyadh). Some of the interviewees clearly used the word respect in place of the word influence. It seems that the strategy to influence others opinion in the Arab Bureau is to
‘give them respect’. However, it does not sound binding for the peers to agree with the person who is offering more respect at the horizontal levels of the ABEGS partnership.

The consultative process, experience, and commitment are three prominent factors of influence in decision making in the Arab Bureau as discussed in earlier chapters. The influence exerted by these factors is possible and can be productive due to the presence of element of ‘respect’ of someone’s opinion, experience, knowledge, and commitment. The interplay of consultation, experience, and commitment with respect influence decision making processes at all horizontal levels i.e. strategic, managerial, and operational leadership in the ABEGS partnership.

Sometimes it appears to be a matter of semantics and culture. Some words are perceived differently in different cultures. However, I would like to make a clarification here that I am not interpreting the word respect as ‘agreement’. I just want to say that I could be respectful to someone without agreeing with that person. So the participants stressed that members of the General Conference are respectful to each other. They also believe that there is no influence of one on the other at the same level. The participants expressed their opinions in the following words:

    No influence …it is respect we call it …you respect my idea and I respect yours. If I pay more respect I deem to get more respect…
    (An officer in Riyadh).

    There is an environment of mutual respect (An officer in Doha).

The atmosphere of ‘mutual respect’ prevails during discussions in the meetings at all organizational leadership levels. Mutual respect is the part of Arab Bureau’s organizational culture that influence discussions and consultations at all levels including
General Conference, Executive Board, Board(s) of Trustees, and other meetings at the operational level leadership. An idea that comes from a member of a meeting is respected and appreciated by other members. The participants of this study define influence as ‘respect’ as depicted in the above quote.

It was out of scope of the conceptual framework of my study to collect data on micro politics of key decisions taken by the leadership of the Arab Bureau. I was therefore not able to collect enough data on aspects such as ‘respect’ to argue that element of ‘respect’ is certainly used informally to influence decision making processes at horizontal levels of ABEGS partnership leadership.

The participants of this study in Kuwait presented the logo of the GASERC Kuwait as evidence of equality. The GASERC Kuwait logo contains the national flags of the member states in a circle. The flags are shown in the logo in alphabetical order (Arabic alphabets) so as to avoid any preferential treatment. It was also mentioned that the meetings of the General Conference, the Executive Board, and the Board(s) of Trustees are also organized in all member states following the names of the member states in alphabetical order.

they are equal even in the logo as well. The flags are sequenced in alphabetical order UAE [Amaaraat] comes first, and then comes Bahrain, and so on. There is no other order of importance (An officer in Kuwait).
Sovereignty is an essential feature of an independent state. The same is true of the member states of the ABEGS partnership. They would not compromise their sovereignty to become a member of regional partnership. Besides, the Arab Bureau does not demand loyalty of the member states beyond their sovereignty. The leaders of the Bureau are very sensitive on the issue of equality amongst members of the partnership. The design of the office furniture for the meetings is also designed to maintain equal status and ensure equal treatment between all the members during the meetings. The picture of the following round conference table can be presented as evidence. I took this picture in the ABEGS headquarters Riyadh.
The Executive Board of the Arab Bureau is one of the strategic bodies of this partnership. Some participants of this study are of the view that actual powers of the Arab Bureau are practically exercised by the Executive Board of the Bureau. It is because of the central role that the Board plays in the partnership. Many of the managerial and operational approvals are accorded by the Executive Board. The members of the Executive Board maintain frequent communication by organizing six monthly meetings. They are the major source of connecting education ministries of the member states with the Bureau. This is the level where all partnership educational programs and projects are thoroughly examined. The members of the board work as peers which demonstrate horizontal organizational leadership at this level as well.

The Circular Model of Interorganizational Leadership of the ABEGS partnership maintains horizontal leadership at all organizational levels including the managerial and
operational levels as depicted by the relevant circles in the model. The functionaries of
the Bureau from different member states at the managerial level are considered equal
participants in decision making. Same is true for the operational level leadership. The
employees at the operational level enjoy the same powers and privileges irrespective of
their nationalities. It has been established by the Circular Model that leadership at the
strategic, managerial and operational levels works horizontally in the interorganizational
environment of the ABEGS partnership.

8.1 Vertical Leadership at the ABEGS Partnership

In addition to the horizontal leadership, the Circular Model of Interorganizational
Leadership also demonstrates the existence of vertical leadership in the partnership
environment at the same time. The vertical leadership is conceptualized as an influence
and direction exerted by the upper on the lower organizational levels in hierarchical way.
The Circular Model shows how strategic, managerial and operational leadership work
between organizational levels in vertical direction and at the levels in their respective
administrative jurisdiction. Each organizational level is shown as a separate circle. These
circles have porous lines on both sides which demonstrate possible impact of one
organizational level on the other. The porous lines in the model also display the ability of
the organizational structure to maintain official communication between levels and
amongst member organizations of the partnership. The following picture is representation
of the ABEGS partnership.
The triangles in the figure represent seven member Gulf States of the Arab Bureau. The leadership is vertically distributed in four organizational leadership levels. These organizational levels are visionary leadership, strategic leadership, managerial leadership, and operational leadership. The integrated view of all member states together reveals the vertical and horizontal view simultaneously. The Circular Model of Interorganizational Leadership has the capacity to absorb the features of vertical and horizontal leadership of the ABEGS partnership in its design.

The ABEGS partnership observes firm hierarchy in its organizational structures. The power of major decision making for the Arab Bureau partnership is concentrated in the higher levels of organizational leadership. But due to extensive consultation and communication the voice from the lower levels reaches the higher organizational levels in shape of recommendations, suggestions, requests, reports, presentations by subordinate staff, etc. This possibility of consultation and communication from lower to higher levels is shown in the model by porous lines.
The personnel at the operational level leadership may function horizontally within the partnership at its level as well. The type of decisions taken at the operational level would not be of huge impact for the partnership. The operational decisions are mostly of administrative nature with limited significance. The officers belonging to the same level organize meetings and establish communication amongst them to complete the assigned tasks.

Yes they [leaders at operational level] can have meetings by invitation – any office intends to have meeting sends a letter to the ministry – then invite the concerned persons for the operational level meetings – people from the same level from all member states join these kinds of meetings (An officer in Riyadh).

The tasks completed at the operational levels are submitted for approval to the leadership at the managerial level. For instance the training programs conceived and designed by training professional in the training centre Doha Qatar are submitted to the Director of the training centre for approval. Similarly, all the research proposals prepared by research officers in the GASERC Kuwait are submitted to the Director GASERC Kuwait for approval. The Directors of the training centre and research centre take the approved projects for further review to their respective Board(s) of Trustees. The projects approved at the Trustee Board level are reviewed and approved by the Director General of the Arab Bureau. The next stage to review and approve these projects is the Executive Board. The highest legal authority to approve all kinds of projects and programs in the ABEGS partnership is the General Conference.

It deems appropriate to mention here that everything initiated at the operational level does not have to reach the top level which is the General Conference. Some projects
of not very high magnitude are approved at lower levels of the ABEGS hierarchy. However, all important matters are submitted to the General Conference for final approval.

The Circular Model of Interorganizational Leadership fits in the organizational structures of the ABEGS partnership. The model explains how horizontal and vertical leadership can function simultaneously. The horizontal equality is an essential feature when parity of relationship between partners is desired. The collaborators of an interorganizational partnership work with same powers and privileges at certain organizational levels as shown in the case of ABEGS partnership. The organizational leadership at the strategic, managerial, and operational levels in the Arab Bureau works in horizontal style. According to the officials interviewed, The Arab Bureau disregards all the economic, political, geographical, and demographical inequalities amongst seven member states. Despite uneven financial contributions, all member states are considered equal partners of the ABEGS partnership.

Another view of horizontal and vertical dimensions of circular model in is that leadership is horizontal at each level in terms of member state authority and its influence on key decision making processes in the ABEGS partnership. Major decisions taken at the higher horizontal levels (the General Conference and Executive Board represent strategic levels and Board(s) of Trustees represent the managerial level) are implemented through vertical organizational levels. The vertical dimension of leadership therefore relates to the implementation of decisions through the partnership apparatus. Institutions such as Research Centre Kuwait, Training Centre Doha, and Language Centre Sharja are some prominent initiatives that represent vertical implementation of the partnership.
decisions, policies, plans, and programs. The picture of this view is depicted in Figure 23. A separate piece of the following pie shows vertical implementation of decisions taken at the horizontal levels of the partnership.

**Figure 23: Vertical Implementation of Horizontal Decisions**

The vertical leadership functions through the strategic, managerial, and operational levels of the interorganizational environment of the Arab Bureau as a whole and in the specific initiatives as well. The vertical functioning of the ABEGS partnership ensures the accomplishment of intended tasks by exercising authority through hierarchical organizational structures. The horizontal leadership helps achieve peer participation in decision making and vertical leadership allows rational and meaningful coordinating, reporting, monitoring, and evaluation of the work performed by the people in the partnership.

It is worth mentioning in the concluding discussion of this chapter that the data analyses recognize four factors that influence decision making in the Arab Bureau at all levels. These factors as discussed in earlier chapters are (1) consultative process, (2) positional power, (3) experience & knowledge, and (4) dedication and commitment. The
first two factors consultative process and positional power emerge from the organizational processes in the Arab Bureau. The latter two factors experience & knowledge and dedication & commitment relate to the traits /abilities of individuals in the Arab Bureau. The discussion on Circular Model of Interorganizational Leadership establishes the patterns of horizontal equality of leadership at organizational levels and vertical leadership authority between the organizational hierarchical levels. Deeper analyses of the influence of above listed four factors inform that consultation (Tashawari) is an essential element of organizational leadership at strategic (General Conference & Executive Board) and managerial (Board(s) of Trustees) levels in the Arab Bureau. Consultation exert its influence directly through Tashawari (consultation meetings) and indirectly by other means such as research projects, workshops, seminars, conferences, feedback, evaluation reports, etc. The leaders at all levels take consultation very seriously. The second influencing factor is positional power which is an essential part of vertical leadership in the entire partnership.

The experience and knowledge has a very delicate interplay with respect. The data analysis establishes that ‘respect’ for experience, knowledge, and commitment is part of organizational culture in the ABEGS partnership. The evidence in the data displays the influence of experience, knowledge, and commitment on decision making by presenting various examples. The effectiveness of this type of influence paves its way through the vertical authority. At the same time this influence succeeds to convince peers at the horizontal levels as well. So leadership both at vertical levels and horizontal levels respect experience, knowledge, and commitment by giving due consideration in decision making.
CHAPTER 9: INTERORGANIZATIONAL PARTNERSHIP PROCESSES

In this chapter I highlighted key findings with regard to interorganizational partnership processes adopted by the Arab Bureau. The main processes identified in the Arab Bureau are coordination and collaboration that emerge from the administrative performance and communication between the ABEGS headquarters, subordinate institutions (such as the GASERC Kuwait and the AETCGS Doha Qatar), and Education Ministries of the member states.

Coordination and collaboration are two underlying themes of the creation of the ABEGS partnership. The founders of the Arab Bureau in the first meeting of the General Conference on October 23, 1975 at the time of the creation of the Bureau very clearly stated and emphasized coordination and collaboration in the mission statement of the ABEGS partnership in the following words.

ABEGS mission is to serve educational, scientific, and cultural goals specified in ABEGS’ statutes, bylaws, and regulations issued by the General Conference. It seeks to achieve coordination and collaboration among member states to accomplish common goals (Arab Bureau Documentation).

Coordination is defined as a situation where two or more organizations agree to work together to pursue their own distinct aims. The collaboration is conceptualized when two or more parties contribute resources to achieve their common aims. The cooperation is considered an essential element both in coordination and collaboration (Mawhinney, 1993).
The participants of this study are of the view that Arab Bureau is involved both in coordination and collaboration. They offered many examples related to coordination process and collaboration process. They also highlighted that offering coordination and collaboration within the member states are the fundamental aims of the ABEGS partnerships.

We are in contact with the ministries on daily basis. We have one of our programs to hold meetings of identical departments in all the ministries. ... The nature of work is cooperative, but sometimes we have combined objectives then we need to collaborate ... like we have a project on math and science for Bahrain and Saudi Arabia so there is collaboration between two countries. So our role is to coordinate this cooperation and collaboration (The Director General).

The member states have their own priorities. At the same time they have many combined goals. People stated different reasons to necessitate both coordination and collaboration process. Some of these reasons are homogeneous cultural environment, contiguous territory, common language, similar customs, values and traditions, identical way of life, and most importantly and predominantly the same religion.

One of the goals of the Bureau is to establish coordination between member states. This is to offer mutual help. I am sure there is a lot of collaboration as well. They have combined projects to achieve common goals. From our side we are trying to do something for all seven member states to have more cooperation among the seven countries. In order to have cooperation in the field of training we are going to yearly meetings of the training directors of the seven
countries to have more cooperation to meet our training needs (An officer in Training Centre Doha).

The data analysis provided many examples that distinctly draw attention to either the process of coordination or the process of collaboration. Following part of this section will discuss them separately.

9.0 Coordination

The member states of the Arab Bureau have their own national educational strategies to pursue their educational goals. They design their own path to achieve their targets with regard to the elementary, secondary and postsecondary education. The budgetary allocations for the educational sector vary according to the available resources and as per economic and education development priorities of each member state. The emphasis on literacy, technical education, secondary and postsecondary education also differs. It is the matter of national priorities and discretion of each member state to plan, establish, and maintain schools, colleges, universities, and institutions for technical and professional education. Each country has to decide and allocate resources for teacher training facilities. All the countries make their own educational laws, policies, procedures, and set direction to achieve their own aims. Each member state of the Arab Bureau is free to follow its own national priorities.

However, the presence of the Arab Bureau in the region is making a difference. The Arab Bureau helps all the member states to achieve their respective educational targets efficiently and with better quality. The coordination of member states in the Arab Bureau is witnessed in many areas such as publication of books for the member states,
leadership training through AETCGS training centre Doha, online teacher training and online educational courses through the ABEGS Learning Management System (LMS) is to help sustain reciprocated interest of the member states in this partnership.

The process of coordination in the ABEGS partnership is performed in many ways to promote educational administration in the member states. For instance, “after the implementation of different programs the studies are carried out. The findings of those studies tell us the effectiveness of our programs (An officer in the Research Centre Kuwait)”. The member states participate in these studies by their own choice. The responsibility of the ABEGS’ administration is to coordinate such studies if so desired by any member state. Similarly, the Arab Bureau coordinates curriculum development process by following the distinct aims of the national policies of each member state. Sometimes separate educational literature is prepared for separate member states. It is not necessary that one book is prepared to be used in all seven stated. It is the job of the ABEGS’ authorities to coordinate this process with professional care and responsibility.

The process of coordination is undertaken by using different tools and techniques at different organizational levels. The leaders at the horizontal levels of the interorganizational structures of the ABEGS partnership use social interaction (Tashawari – consultative meetings), information sharing, and active communication. The techniques used by the leaders for coordination in the vertical organizational structures are bureaucratic procedures, directive administration, and jurisdictional management (Herranz, 2008).
Sharing experiences by organizing seminars, workshops, and conferences is another technique to promote coordination and cooperation amongst member states. Some participants are of the view that cooperation extended to other existing organizations in the region may also help enrich knowledge and experience of the educational professionals of the member states.

The central goal of this partnership is to establish cooperation and coordination between the member states. It also helps other organizations and other institutes in the region. … The common goal is to share experiences. How we acquire this experience is through conferences, meetings, seminars that are held periodically – this gives us a big learning experience (The Director Training Centre Doha).

9.1 Collaboration

The process of collaboration involves more commitment in terms of contributing resources and working together for the achievement of combined aims. The discussion in previous chapters clearly explains that all the member states of the Arab Bureau contribute financial and other resources for the functioning of the ABEGS partnership. Collaboration can be visualized as a closer relationship between partner organizations that demonstrate mutual trust and obligation.

The substantial evidence of collaboration process in the ABEGS partnership is the creation and existence of professional institutions such as the GASERC Kuwait and the AETCGS Doha, Qatar. These institutions are working to fulfill combined aims of the member states, for instance regional educational research is undertaken by the GASERC and combined educational leadership training is being organized by the AETCGS. The
officers of the ABEGS partnership from all places shared examples that explain the process of collaboration between the member states through the Arab Bureau.

The first example is that the members of the partnership developed eight goals after rigorous collaboration. They are developing curricula the considerable part of the curricula will be combined and the other part will be from the member country so this is another example of collaboration and coordination that goes hand in hand. For example for history every country will work on 25 books for different levels. However, 75 books are of common and general history of the region. They will cover the combined history ... when you are coordinating ... you don’t ignore their history, you don’t ignore their achievements in life so you give them a chance to write their own history for their children or for their people (Director Public Relations).

Shared priorities, working on existing strengths, and building institutional support for collaboration (Byrne and Hansberry, 2007) are some prominent techniques used to enhance collaboration in the ABEGS partnership. Resource sharing, consistent communication and securing accountability help the leaders of the Arab Bureau to achieve common desired targets and to ensure success.

9.2 Discussion

The cooperation, coordination, and collaboration are essential processes of interorganizational partnerships. People may use different semantics for these processes but they will remain the major reason for organizations having common, complimentary, or similar objectives to come closer and work together for mutual benefits. The same is true for the ABEGS partnership. “Promoting collaboration and coordination” was the
vision of the founders of this partnership. The leadership of the ABEGS at different times during 35 years of its existence has been pursuing the same goals designed by their ancestors. The existing leadership of the Arab Bureau has the same vision and the future leaders of this partnership will have to do the same.
CHAPTER 10: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This chapter contains key findings of my PhD thesis research with regard to the leadership sources and core leadership functions, structures, and processes in the Arab Bureau of Education for the Gulf States (ABEGS) as an interorganizational partnership.

The main research questions that I addressed in this study helped identify factors that have the capacity to influence leadership practices in the Arab Bureau as an interorganizational partnership. Leithwood and his colleagues based on extensive research in the context of educational and non-educational organizational contexts in the developed world concluded four leadership functions i.e. direction setting, developing people, redesigning the organization, and managing the (partnership) program. I examined in my study the distribution of leadership within these core leadership functions in strategic, managerial and operational levels of the Arab Bureau as an interorganizational partnership in the developing world. Ranson (2003) argues that ‘power and purpose’ go hand in hand in the context of accountability as a system. Therefore, in addition to Leithwood’s four core leadership functions I also looked at securing accountability as a fifth core leadership function in the partnership environment.

10.0 Leadership Distribution within Core Leadership Functions

The data analyses reveal that all five core leadership functions and many specific leadership practices are unevenly distributed at strategic, managerial, and operational levels in the ABEGS as an interorganizational partnership. The presence of all five core leadership functions in the Arab Bureau confirmed that the research conducted by Leithwood and his colleagues with regard to four core leadership functions is also
relevant to the environment of interorganizational partnerships of the developing world. The evidence of leadership influence in securing accountability towards the achievement of organizational goals for the Arab Bureau establishes the significance of this task as an important leadership function as well.

The qualitative data analyses displayed many consistent patterns of leadership distribution in the Arab Bureau. The first set of core leadership functions i.e. ‘setting directions’ is being used consistently at the strategic leadership (General Conference & Executive Board), managerial leadership level (Board(s) of Trustees), and operational leadership (subordinate units). The data pin pointed the consistent use of three specific leadership practices. The strategic leaders of the Arab Bureau provide macro direction to the partnership by articulating overall organizational vision and by developing the partnership goals in the resolutions passed by the General Conference. The influence of these directions penetrates into the micro levels of the ABEGS partnership. The subordinate institutions, departmental units in the headquarters, educational ministries, and schools at the grassroots levels are identified as micro level establishments of the ABEGS partnership. The operational leadership of the partnership works at the micro level organizational structures of the partnership. The evidence confirms that the leaders of the ABEGS partnership promote effective communication at all levels. It is because of this reason that factors such as consultative process, prior experience and knowledge of various individual leaders gain the capacity to influence decision making process particularly at the horizontal organizational levels and possibly through vertical leadership levels as well.
The leadership of the Bureau used multiple means for ‘developing people’ for the accomplishment of overall organizational goals of the ABEGS partnership. The strategic leaders influenced the process of human resource development by establishment of training institutes (AETCGS in Doha and Training Institute in Riyadh headquarters). Construction of rich libraries, holding conferences, organizing workshops/seminars/symposiums, publication of scholarly material, digital communication, and offering scholarships are some strategies to provide intellectual stimulation to human resource in the partnership. The individualized support of contemporary leaders and role modeling of former leaders influenced the entire process of developing people in the Arab Bureau. Many of these human resource development initiatives and/or activities positively influence various long and medium term plans and programmes. It was the influence of commitment and dedication of some individual leaders at horizontal organizational levels that helped develop reasonably strong infrastructure for people development in the ABEGS partnership.

The availability of rich evidence in the data and tangible outcomes plead the influence of leadership at different organizational levels that introduced many redesigning /restructuring events during 35 years of existence of the ABEGS partnership in the Arabian Gulf Region. It is comparatively easy to undertake redesigning in a single organization but it involves complex process to initiate restructuring in an interorganizational partnership. It requires strong commitment of dedicated leadership to plan and complete many organizational redesigning projects. This complicated job of redesigning the organization involves significant collaboration that consequently creates opportunities for building further collaboration. The qualitative data analyses provide
substantial evidence where leaders of the Arab Bureau restructured the organization to facilitate organizational work with respect to information technology by organizing online program development, digital communication, learning management system, etc. The experienced leadership created productive relations by establishing the research and training institutions which are contributing towards the accomplishment of partnership goals such as the development of joint curriculum for the member states based on research conducted at the research centre and by creating opportunities of preparing adequate educational leadership by organizing leadership training for the partnership. The visionary leadership influenced the territory of six member states under the jurisdiction of the ABEGS partnership by giving permission to passport free travelling in the six GCC states. This decision helped connecting the organization to its wider environment.

The redesigning events helped the ABEGS partnership to move successfully on the path of development, strengthened the existing structures, modernized technological infrastructure of the partnership, and gave long-term direction to build future. The analysis informed the possibility of the influence of external factors such as war situation, financial conditions, and technological environment that may demand partnership redesigning. Sometimes internal organizational atmosphere for instance urge to achieve organizational objectives, the performance potential of the organizational leadership, and the kind of work environment influence restructuring.

Based on their strong commitment some leaders use technology to maintain connectivity with its wider environment. I also learnt that strategically located subordinate units of the partnership in different member states ensure developing and
sustaining collaborative structure and joint commitment of members to the work of the ABEGS partnership.

Managing the partnership program is fourth core leadership function examined in this study. Staffing the partnership program, monitoring the progress and improvement strategies, allocating resources to foster the partnership improvement efforts, and buffering staff from unproductive external demands for attention are specific leadership practices. These leadership practices play pivotal role to achieve the desired objectives of ABEGS partnership.

The leadership of Arab Bureau use various techniques for staffing the Bureau’s short, medium, and long-term programmes. The influence in staffing the program is mostly vertically centralized for internal as well as external human resources. The authority of hiring and firing staff remains with the internal leaders at strategic and managerial organizational levels. I learnt that the Arab Bureau is not self sufficient in maintaining full time permanent professional staff to fulfil its requirements. The leaders feel scarcity of professional experts in the partnership. The magnitude of work in terms of desired goals to be achieved is larger compared to available professional human resource. The Bureau therefore has to rely on external sources. The reliance on external professional human resources is a challenge for the ABEGS leaders. They are aware of this problem and working to resolve it.

Managing the partnership program has been at the higher priority for the leadership of the Arab Bureau at all levels. The data reveal that leaders are consistently formulating their educational plans since its inception. The General Conference, the
Executive Board, the Board(s) of Trustees\textsuperscript{43} never missed their two yearly, yearly or six monthly meetings since 1975 whether they were consultative (Tashawari) or regular meetings. The consistency of such meetings at these levels show the commitment offered by the leadership. Allocation of resources is concluded in these meetings. There has been no gap in this regard. The commitment to work has been very high in terms of meetings. The leaders at all levels convene emergency meetings if so required. The involvement of visionary leadership (GCC) in managing the partnership program adds seriousness to the partnership program. The visionary leadership articulated the partnership vision by giving a comprehensive long range strategy (2000 – 2025). This is how visionary leaders provide macro level direction and empower the lower level leadership to stay energetic for the achievement of organizational goals.

Monitoring the progress and improvement strategies is another area to manage the partnership program in the ABEGS partnership. Monitoring involves horizontal and vertical techniques used by individual and group leadership in the Bureau. The leaders at the horizontal levels make use of face to face periodical meetings, review of the plans and programs, evaluation of reports submitted by the lower levels, peer to peer written or verbal communication, and informal exchange of views during consultative meetings (Tashawari) to monitor the progress. Some of the vertical strategies for monitoring are holding meetings with upper or lower level management, regular reporting to the higher levels, performance reviews, inspections, maintain stress to meet scheduled deadlines, financial scrutiny, and constant vertical communication at every organizational level. The

\textsuperscript{43} The General Conference & the Executive Board represent strategic leadership. The Board(s) of Trustees is the managerial leadership level. The General conference meets every year once for consultation (Tashawari) and then for Budget and Executive Decisions. The Executive Board and the Board(s) of Trustees meet every six monthly for consultation, executive and budgetary decisions.
most frequent tool is consultative /communication meetings at all leadership levels to monitor progress and improvement strategies of the Bureau.

The participation of senior leaders in the meetings at lower levels is an important way to monitor by close interaction of multilevel leadership. The main role in this context is performed by the office of the Director General Arab Bureau. This office maintains and monitors multilevel, multidirectional, and multidimensional communication amongst different stakeholders of the ABEGS partnership. The reports on the educational programs, financial and budgetary matters, organizational and administrative issues are received by the Director General from the regional offices, ministries of the member states, departments, individuals, outside agencies, foreign organizations are scrutinized at this level. The information technology is also being used for effective monitoring.

Institutional monitoring for instance through Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) is another tool to monitor & investigate improvement. This technique required active involvement of operational leadership.

The presence of resource allocation to foster the partnership improvement efforts was also noted as a leadership practice. The process of formal allocation of resources is again a hierarchically centralized process but requires participation at all levels. Budgetary proposals are submitted to the Bureau’s headquarters by all the subordinate offices after extensive discussions by the proposal originators (groups & individuals) at the operational levels. These discussions demonstrate power to participate/discuss. The budgets are examined by the finance authorities in leaner hierarchy. The budgets/resource
allocation proposals are discussed and prepared at the operational levels scrutinized at the managerial levels and finally approved or disapproved by the strategic levels.

Leithwood’s core leadership functions include buffering staff from unproductive external demands as a leadership task. The study of the inside leadership structures of the ABEGS partnership offers a very cohesive and integrated picture. I learnt from the data that the leaders at the Arab Bureau maintain and nurture relations with regional and international organizations, partnerships, and individual scholars/leaders. The evidence in the data shows that ABEGS’ leaders encourage the people of this partnership to make and maintain productive relations with external world. However I did not find any mechanism of buffering staff from unproductive external demands.

I examined in this study the distribution of leadership within Leithwood’s four core leadership functions in strategic, managerial and operational levels of the Arab Bureau as an interorganizational partnership in the developing world. In addition that I also looked at securing accountability as a fifth core leadership function in the partnership environment. Leithwood and his colleagues did not find much evidence of securing accountability as a leadership function in their research in the developed world. Leithwood et al. (2002) say “although empirical evidence about the effects of some accountability tools has grown in the past few years (e.g., Lee, 1993; Spillane & Zeuli, 1999), in reference to the broad array of such tools currently in use, our knowledge is still quite limited (page.95)”.

Ranson (2003) argues that ‘power and purpose’ go hand in hand in the context of accountability as a system. So it was imperative to study securing accountability in the context of organizational leadership.
The data of this study guided me to realize that securing accountability is a leadership function that involves human performance appraisal (individuals & groups), audit of the efficient utilization of financial resources, and evaluation of the organizational plans and programmes. The data analyses reveal that securing accountability becomes an essential function for leadership because of many reasons especially in the context of interorganizational partnership environment where joint resources are used in shared leadership environment. Transparent accountability reinforces the trust of the partners to maintain their interest in the partnership. The positive results of performance appraisal provide motivation and negative assessment help the leaders identify their areas of improvement. Accountability in an interorganizational partnership would not be radically different compared to a single organization. However, it helps to identify that which individual leaders or leadership groups used what kind of influence to provide productive direction to achieve desired organizational goals.

The analysis provided details on how various leadership practices in partnership are used to ensure administrative, financial, legal, and partnership program accountability. I learnt in the ABEGS case study that multiple tools, techniques, and mechanisms can be employed for securing accountability in an interorganizational partnership. The leaders in the Arab Bureau used the services of internal and external agencies and experts to ensure neutrality, reduce bias and to cover huge geographical and functional jurisdiction in seven member states. The most convincing evidence in this regard that was seen was using UNESCO two times first in 1985 and secondly in 1989. This neutrality and fairness is essential for partner satisfaction and trust in an
interorganizational partnership environment. Third party evaluation helps give realistic performance picture.

The use of internal agencies like Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) helps maintain regularity to secure ongoing accountability. I also learnt from this experience that combination of internal and external experts/agencies could give comparative performance appraisal. However, regular annual performance report writing of individual employees is purely internal arrangement for securing accountability of individual employees in the Arab Bureau.

The principle of horizontal equality and vertical hierarchy remained consistent throughout the accountability process going through administrative, financial, legal, and program accountability as hypothesized by the conceptual framework of this study. The deep analysis of this principle helps conclude that it does not allow national or partner bias to intervene in the process of accountability. I also learnt that the influence of joint leadership thinking and action by strategic and/or managerial leaders (General Conference, Executive Board, Board(s) of Trustees) does not allow partner specific agenda to play undesirable role in the partnership that helps nurture trust.

10.1 ABEGS Partnership Structures

The literature review presented a long list of different types of interorganizational partnership structures. Partnerships are made based on diverse reasons such as common mission, territorial location, social embeddedness (Gulati, Nohira, & Zaheer, 2000) resource dependence (Eden & Huxham, 2001), necessity, asymmetry, reciprocity, efficiency, stability, and legitimacy (Oliver, 1990). Partnerships may also come into
being based on one, two, or many of these reasons. The emergence of Arab Bureau falls into many of the aforementioned reasons. The data analyses suggest that homogenous culture, territorial contiguity of the member states, social embeddedness, and geographical location are some of the factors contributing to the creation of the ABEGS partnership.

The top political leadership of the Arabian Gulf region felt the need to establish a partnership. Therefore the ministers of education of seven states assembled in Riyadh on October 23, 1975 and created a mandate for the educational ministries of the member states to join hands for educational development in the region. So the emergence of ABEGS was necessitated by law of the regional powers. Efficiency and reciprocity are two other reasons for the creation of the ABEGS partnership in the Arabian Gulf region. The rational of the establishment of the ABEGS partnership is therefore rooted in multiple reasons.

In view of multiple structural variations the existing literature provides different typologies of the interorganizational partnership structures. The Strategy and Performance Model presented by Evan and Klem (1980) allowed me to synthesis numerous types of structural formations into four major categories of partnership structures i.e. a consortium, a joint venture, a merger, and a corporate management system (For details see footnote 9). The data analysis and review of literature indicate that the Arab Bureau was created as an independent separate establishment. The member states and the participating educational ministries maintain their distinct organizational identities in the Arab Bureau. The attributes maintained by the ABEGS partnership are consistent with the defining criteria of a joint venture. I would consider Arab Bureau a
joint venture. This joint venture is being controlled and operated by the General Conference which is the governing body comprised of the education ministers of the member states.

I found many structural features in the ABEGS partnership which were explained in the literature. According to Williams (2005), internal and external forces affect the nature of partnership structures. He takes formal control, regulatory bodies, and contracts as forces of internal control. The external forces would be environmental change. The data provide substantial evidence of internal and external forces that influence the working of the ABEGS partnership. The existence and involvement of the General Conference, the Executive Board, the Board(s) of Trustees, the office of the Director General, and the Quality Assurance committee are some arrangements for internal control. The variation in political and economic conditions of the Arabian Gulf region has an impact on the ABEGS partnership as external force. The internal forces are deeply involved in the planning, organizing, budgeting, and coordinating processes to design and implement educational plans and programs for the member states. Securing accountability is also ensured by the internal agencies of this partnership. The Iraq and Kuwait war had an impact on the ABEGS. The political and economic circumstances of the GCC states changed the structure of the ABEGS partnership. So Williams (2005) theory fits in the Arab Bureau functioning as a partnership.

Williams and colleagues offer many theoretical perspectives with regard to the structural features of the partnerships. Some of these theories talk about density, intensity, and centrality in interorganizational partnerships. Density is explained as ties
established between partners. Low density means simple ties between partners and many complex ties amongst partners is known as high density.

In view of analytical discussions in the previous chapters based on the data collected from the Arab Bureau all seven member states of the ABEGS maintain high density within the partnership. Hundreds jointly designed educational programs and projects (See Chapter 7 and Table 4) run concurrently in different parts of the Arabian Gulf region. The duration of each program vary. These programs could be part of ABEGS’ short term, medium-term or long-term strategy. The data reveal that all the member states actively participate in most of the educational programs and projects. I found very limited instances in the data where some member states do not participate in some programs designed by the Arab Bureau. It is only because of certain priorities that individual member states may have and decide not to participate in a program. It is also noticed that some member states decide bilaterally or multilaterally to pursue certain programs so as to achieve their common or complimentary objectives. For instance the Director General of the Bureau mentioned that “we have a project on math and science for Bahrain and Saudi Arabia so there is collaboration between two countries”. The bilateral or multilateral arrangement may happen within the ABEGS partnership but it is not a frequent practice. High density is directly connected to the core leadership function that involves specific practices such as staffing, monitoring, and allocating resources to foster the partnership improvement program. High density amongst all member states is also established by looking at their active participation in creating and maintaining huge research and training centre in Kuwait and Doha respectively. Maintaining close contact and communication in terms of regular periodical meetings at all levels is another
evidence of high density of relations amongst the member states in the ABEGS partnership.

Intensity is identified as another structural dimension. High intensity in a partnership means when partner organizations commit more resources. The commitment of meagre resources is interpreted as low intensity of a particular member in the partnership. The simplest way to measure the intensity of member states in the ABEGS partnership is to look at each member’s biennial financial contribution. It seems that Saudi Arabia and Kuwait maintain high intensity as each one of them is contributing 25% of the total budgetary requirements of the Arab Bureau. The United Arab Emirates maintains the next high level of intensity by contributing 15% of total finance, and then comes Qatar by paying 9% of total money. The rest of the member states Bahrain, Oman and Yemen pay 2.5% each. They maintain same level of intensity in the partnership (See Figure -15 and Table - 5).

It is important to note that low or high intensity of a member state does not increase or decrease the ability of a member state to influence decision making process in the partnership. All member states enjoy equal status in the ABEGS irrespective of their intensity level in the partnership. The previous chapter had detailed discussion on horizontal equality irrespective of varied intensity of the member states. The culture of cooperation and mutual respect in the organizational environment in the ABEGS partnership ignores financial inequalities. The high or low intensity therefore does not play any role in the exercise of leadership influence in the Arab Bureau. Other factors such as consultation, experience, and commitment seem more relevant when compared to intensity factor.
Centrality for a partner organization is explained as short and long path to connect other partner organizations in a partnership environment. Centrality facilitates integration and coordination amongst member organizations. Williams and colleagues have explored many dimensions of centrality in partnerships. Some of these dimensions are called between centrality, closeness centrality, in-degree centrality, and out-degree centrality. Between centrality means an individual’s position in the partnership as compared to other individuals in the partnership. Closeness centrality is understood as short or long path connecting a focal organization to any other organization in the partnership. In-degree centrality is recognized by the extent of resources, assets, and clients coming in the partnership. The out-degree centrality on the contrary measures the assets, resources, and clients going out of the partnership.

The structures of the ABEGS partnership provide equal opportunities to all the member states to maintain their centrality in the partnership. The fundamental nature of the Arab Bureau is circular at visionary, strategic, managerial, and operational levels of its interorganizational structures as represented in the Circular Model of Interorganizational Leadership (See Figure – 9). The representation of all member states in the top organizational structures is the same. Each member has one seat in the General Conference and one seat in the Executive Board. The representation of each member in the Board(s) of Trustees is the same. There is no preferential quota for employment for any member state. The legal and administrative procedures do not give any discretionary powers to any member of the partnership. There is no veto power given to anyone in the partnership. I therefore conclude that overall centrality for all the member states in the
ABEGS partnership is the same. There are no longer or shorter paths for anyone to connect with others within the partnership.

Gronn’s hybrid leadership conceptualizes another dimension of shared leadership. He argues that mix of individuals, dyad, or groups of people have the capacity to reflect hybrid leadership. “In my view... the mix of the combined work of solo, dyad and team leadership formations is a more accurately described as hybrid than distributed” (Gronn, P., 2009, Page. 209). The leadership in the Arab Bureau is shared at all levels. Joint decision making with equal opportunity of participation and leading the partnership provides same level of centrality. The meetings of the General Conference, Executive Board, and Board(s) of Trustees are convened in all member states in alphabetical order providing equal opportunity for leadership influence to all member states.

10.2 Circular Model of Interorganizational Partnership

In addition to the distribution of leadership patterns in the ABEGS as an interorganizational partnership, I developed a Circular Model of Interorganizational Leadership to examine simultaneous functioning of horizontal and vertical leadership in a partnership environment (See Chapter 8). The existing literature visualizes interorganizational leadership either vertically directive building on authority based leadership mechanisms or horizontally distributive due to shared leadership models. Researchers such as Benson, 1975; Mawhiney, 1993; Kickert et al, 1997; Proven et al, 2007; and Rodríguez et al, 2007 on the interorganizational partnerships view interorganizational leadership vertically centralized or horizontally flat. For instance, Kickert et al., (1997) talk about monocentric (vertical) hierarchy on one end of the continuum and horizontal autonomy on the other, Benson (1995) envisages leadership as
incentive versus authority based. They do not see a combined picture that may exist in partnerships. I found in the case study of ABEGS partnership that leadership in this partnership works horizontally at strategic, managerial, and operational levels. So leadership is structured horizontally in the context of interorganizational partnerships at the relevant levels. In the Circular Model all leaders at the strategic level from all partner organizations are shown at the same level, exactly like the General Conference in the ABEGS partnership. All the education ministers from member states work at horizontal leadership level. The vertical leadership on the other hand functions between these organizational levels. The Circular Model of Interorganizational Leadership demonstrates the vertical structures in terms of single partner organizational triangles and hierarchical circles for the whole partnership. The hierarchy is established through the circles. One complete horizontal circle represents one interorganizational leadership level. The integration of all circles and triangles in one model demonstrate simultaneous functioning of horizontal and vertical interorganizational leadership. I therefore argue that the interorganizational leadership portrays an integrated structure of governance that essentially allows the functioning of vertical and horizontal leadership simultaneously.

10.3 Partnership Processes at the ABEGS

The main processes that emerge from the data analysis are coordination and collaboration (Chapter-9). The cooperation is the essential condition for both coordination and collaboration. The coordination is defined as cooperation between two or more partners to help achieve distinct objectives of the participating partners. The collaboration means where partners join hands to achieve joint objectives with combined resources. According to Mawhinney (1993) interorganizational interaction can be placed
along a continuum of cooperation that ranges from coordination to collaboration. Both coordination and collaboration serve unique purpose and yield different outcomes.

In addition to regular administrative duties, the leaders at different organizational levels of the ABEGS partnership perform a variety of academic and professional tasks to complete wide ranging jobs assigned to them. Some of these jobs are curriculum development for seven member states, publication of books, designing and conducting training programs, develop and conduct a variety of research projects, develop short-term midterm and long-term educational programs, training and advisory services to the teachers of the member states, organize seminars conferences and workshops, etc. It is not required from all the member states to participate in each and every activity. However, all of them are welcome to take part in any of the activities initiated and organized by the Bureau. It is up to the member states if they wish to become the part of the coordination process to work out their own priorities or they want to join hands in the collaboration process to achieve common aims.

10.4 Interorganizational Partnership Leadership at the ABEGS

The conceptual framework and research questions guided my PhD thesis research to investigate factors that influence decision making process at different leadership levels in the Arab Bureau, leadership distribution within the core leadership functions at the strategic, managerial, and operational levels in the ABEGS partnership, and examine how vertical and horizontal leadership function simultaneously in the Arab Bureau as an interorganizational partnership.
Before I start my concluding discussion on the aforementioned points, I would like to very briefly analyse the overall existing leadership mechanism in the ABEGS partnership. Considering partnership environments, the literature review of this study offers two sets of leadership mechanisms. The first set enlists shared governance, lead organization governance, and governance based on administration organization (Proven et al., 2007). The second set identifies bureaucratic, market based, and clan based governance (Rodriguez et al., 2007).

Shared governance in the partnerships is conceptualized as collective leadership to make both strategic and operational decisions for the partnership. This system of governance works with collaborative interactions among member organizations. Control over activities is exercised formally through meetings of partnership members informally through ongoing interactions and collaboration. Lead-organization governance means complete control of the most powerful, perhaps larger organization that has sufficient resources within the partnership. The activities and decision making are coordinated through a single organization. Administrative organization governance mechanism is similar to that of lead organization. An organization is specifically created or an individual is designated to perform leadership functions.

Bureaucratic leadership works in a hierarchical environment. It means leadership that controls the partnership through formalized rules and regulations. Market-based mechanisms of governance rely on incentives and work by manipulating interests. This type of leadership is more suitable for business environment. Clan based governance means the existence of shared values and beliefs to enhance coordination. The key
techniques in this type of leadership are development of shared understanding, face-to-face communication, information exchange, and socialization in common activities.

The existing governance mechanism in the Arab Bureau demonstrates a mix of the attributes of shared governance (Proven et al., 2007) especially at all horizontal levels, bureaucratic leadership which is reflected through vertical levels, and clan based governance (Rodriguez et al., 2007) that comes from the Arab Gulf Islamic values.

Shared governance (Proven et al., 2007) at the horizontal levels is probably an essential feature for an interorganizational partnership. The sovereign partners cannot afford to sacrifice their sovereign authority to become a member of multinational partnership. Shared leadership is therefore the most suitable model for equal partners to sit together in a partnership arrangement. The Arab Bureau provides this equality at all horizontal organizational leadership levels.

The bureaucratic model is necessary to exert authority for implementation of decisions made at higher leadership levels. The Arab Bureau maintains a firm vertical hierarchy to establish bureaucratic authority. This bureaucratic leadership is mainly used in the ABEGS partnership when different plans and programmes are executed through the subordinate units (research, training, and language unit) of the partnership.

The organizational culture in the Arabian Gulf Countries is embedded in the Islamic values. All seven member states are brotherly Islamic countries. The same or similar values of the member states are grounded in common religious, cultural, political and historical background that necessitates clan based governance (Rodriguez et al., 2007).
In addition to the overall governance mechanisms, I was concentrating on various organizational leadership levels in the ABEGS partnership. I learnt from Kanter (1994) the construction of leadership structure for five levels interorganizational integration. The five levels proposed by Kanter are strategic, tactical, operational, interpersonal, and cultural. The strategic level ensures close working relationship between strategic leaders. Tactical leaders (middle managers, professionals) develop joint plans, programs and activities for the partnership. Operational leaders participate in successful implementation of joint plans and programs. I applied this scheme with slight modification in my PhD research. Instead of five, I worked with leadership distributed into three organizational levels i.e. strategic, managerial, and operational levels. The strategic level for policy making, managerial level for supervision and monitoring the implementation of policies, and operational level involves in the day to day implementation of policies, plans, and programs of the ABEGS partnership.

The actual data collected from the ABEGS partnership offices proposed fourth level. The new level emerged from the data as ‘visionary leadership level’. This level of leadership is not very actively involved in the Arab Bureau’s work but provides an overall strategic vision through Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) which is another regional partnership of the Arab Gulf states. These four organizational leadership levels are shown in the ‘Circular Model of Interorganizational Leadership (Chapter 8 Figure 9)’ especially designed to demonstrate simultaneous functioning of horizontal and vertical leadership in the ABEGS partnership.

Leadership certainly emerge from various “individual or organizational phenomenon (Anderson et al., 2008)”.

I therefore discovered listed below four major
influencing factors that either surface from individual personal traits or come out from organizational processes. These four factors influence decision making at all organizational levels in the ABEGS partnership (See Chapter 6).

(1) Consultative processes in the ABEGS partnership.
(2) Experience & knowledge of an individual
(3) Position of an individual and or of a group of individuals in the hierarchy
(4) Dedication & commitment.

Consultative process is embedded in the organizational and regional culture of the Arab society. Consultation has its roots in Islam which is a dominating religion of this region. It is part of formal and informal work environment of the Arab Bureau. The second influential factor is experience and knowledge. According to the data people with prior experience have the capacity to influence decision making. These people gain respect from the audience in the meetings and influence the opinion of decision makers with their strong argument based on their experience and knowledge. The word ‘influence’ was perceived as ‘force’ that was understood by the interviewees as a negative word as shown by their gestures/body language. The participants associated themselves more with the word ‘respect’. The influence through mutual respect they think is more relevant. Position in the hierarchy is formal source of influence. Individuals and/or group(s) of individuals occupying higher level positions in the hierarchy likely to have relatively more influence compared to the people at the lower levels. For instance, the General Conference has more power and influence than the Executive Board of the Arab Bureau. People with dedication and commitment make difference everywhere in the Bureau. Those who work with dedication have the capacity to influence decision making at all levels of the ABEGS partnership. The influencing
factors such as consultation, experience, and commitment influence relatively more effectively at the horizontal leadership levels in the Arab Bureau as the element of mutual respect works with high profile peers with greater intensity. These factors may play a desired role through vertical authority with a harder push and with an endorsement of some positional power.

10.5 Challenges for the ABEGS

I realize that the account of the Arab Bureau given in this study is largely positive. I do not claim that ABEGS is a problem free partnership. There are some areas of improvement that emerge from the data. However, I must comment on certain limitations beyond my control as a research. I collected data as a non-native foreign researcher who had limited understanding of the Arab culture. I understand that some deeper realities which can only be approached if the researcher has access to the micro politics of the host organization. I would have presented extensive analysis to highlight various areas of improvement if I had data on micro politics on the ABEGS partnership in particular and the member states of the Arabian Gulf region in general. Another limitation was time constraint to follow up so as to undertake more intensive investigation with more interviews and observations of leadership at different levels in different units of the partnership. Possibility of positive bias among the participants cannot be completely ignored because they were all working in leadership roles within the partnership organization, and thus, might have been unwilling to make negative comments about the partnership. As I mentioned before the design of the study did not include the investigation of micro politics within the partnership that might have some influence on leadership decisions despite the formal cultural norms of consultation and respect.
Some of the weak areas that I found in the data are as follows. First, the participants mentioned shortage of indigenous expert professionals as the most important problem. The interviewees working in the Arab Bureau headquarters Riyadh, research center Kuwait, and training centre Doha mentioned the scarcity of professional human resources. Leaders at these places use expert houses, contractors, and outside consultants to do the required work for them. It was also mentioned that many of their existing staff members can only perform administrative work and lack of skill to do technical work such as design training programs, conduct field research projects independently, develop curriculum for different school levels, etc. A senior officer expressed his desire to have more professional people to perform technical jobs for the partnership.

Underutilization of physical resources is second important problem that was mentioned by the respondents of this study. For instance, a complete training centre equipped with modern training facilities has been established in the ABEGS headquarters, Riyadh. The Director General wishes to use this centre for the training of educational administrators and teachers. He also wants to use the headquarters building which is a huge complex in a very important area of Riyadh in the evening when the morning shift completes its work. But both of these facilities are underutilized because of the shortage of professional human resource. The training centre Doha is also established in a big building with modern training facilities. This training centre is also underutilized because of the non availability of enough training professionals.

Third important challenge that surfaced from the data is slow pace of work. The Arab Bureau has a long list of their short, medium and long term projects and programs (See Table 4) for the partnership. Many of the listed programs delayed completion
because of the slow pace of work at the ABEGS partnership. One of the reasons of this slow pace of work is again shortage of local professional staff.

The above discussion indicates that ‘scarcity of professional human resource’ is the major source of other problems. The Arab Bureau may address deficient areas by solving one main problem of the shortage of professional staff. A key recommendation for the authorities at the ABEGS partnership is to take steps to strengthen human capacity building initiatives so as to prepare indigenous work force by organizing training to develop professional skills and expertise. They may use outside the ABEGS partnership local or foreign experts to design training to prepare a team of master trainers from within the partnership to attain self-sufficiency in capacity building to prepare future indigenous expert professionals for the ABEGS partnership.

In addition to the above mentioned areas of improvement another challenge for the ABEGS partnership is to enhance awareness of the usage of information technology tools at all levels. The managerial leaders and expert staff at the Riyadh headquarters demonstrate the desired technical capacity to manage advanced hard and software with regard to information technology. They have developed their own Learning Management System (LMS) in Arabic language to facilitate online teaching and learning. The staff in the information technology at the Bureau is using highly advance technical tools such as Web.2 technology and Blackboard. However, workforce at the operational levels needs extensive awareness and motivation to use technology at broader scale.

10.6 Summary Findings

Leithwood and his colleagues established four core leadership functions i.e. setting directions, developing people, restructuring the organization, and managing the
(partnership) programme in single educational and non-educational organizational context. The study in hand recognizes the presence of these four leadership functions in the Arab Bureau as an interorganizational partnership as well. I also explored and found securing accountability in the ABEGS partnership as a fifth leadership function. These five leadership functions and related leadership practices are distributed within the strategic, managerial, and operational levels of the Arab Bureau. The study found varied usage of leadership functions and specific practices at various leadership levels in the Bureau.

This study identified following factors that influence organizational leadership behaviour at strategic, managerial, and operational levels of an interorganizational partnership.

1. Consultation.
2. Positional power.
3. Experience and knowledge (Skill & Information).
4. Dedication /commitment.

The influence on leadership is exerted by one factor or by joint interaction of different combinations of two, three, or all four of these factors. The first two factors emerge from the organizational processes and structures and later two originate from individual abilities and traits. The consultative process in the Arab Bureau has its roots in the Arabian culture. However, the evidence of its presence and influence on leadership behaviour and its distribution at strategic, managerial, and operational levels in the Arab Bureau is very prominent. I also learnt that consultation is an essential feature in a partnership environment especially where the partnership is comprised of sovereign
states. Consultation amongst leaders in a partnership is also essential because leadership works horizontally at levels in a partnership where leaders enjoy equal status. Autocracy or dictation amongst peers is not observed as an organizational norm at the horizontal levels, on the contrary leadership in a single organization may avoid consultation and have dictatorial vertical work environment.

Positional power is identified as another influencing factor on the leadership behaviour and its distribution in interorganizational partnership environment. It works vertically through the organizational levels. The decisions taken at higher levels are followed by the leadership at lower levels. However, leaders at the operational levels consult each other to implement policy decisions. They may also seek advice from the leadership at the higher levels.

The experience and knowledge of an individual is an ability that can be acquired by human effort whereas dedication and commitment is developed as personality trait. The study suggests that conceptually leadership in interorganizational partnerships manifests two dimensions i.e. vertical and horizontal. It is a methodological challenge for researchers who take only one dimension of leadership into account. A researcher should study both dimensions and examine how they interact with each other to influence organizational leadership behaviour. The data analysis supports the hypothesis of this study that vertical and horizontal leadership function simultaneously in a partnership environment as circular leadership (see Figure -9). It is further suggested that horizontal leadership works at and vertical leadership functions through the organizational levels of a partnership.
10.7 Recommendations for future research

The discussion in this study introduces a number of interstate/interorganizational partnerships such as Arab League Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organization (ALECSO), Islamic Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (ISESCO), Arab Gulf Programme for United Nations Development Organizations (AGFUND), Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC), and the Arab Bureau of Education for the Gulf States (ABEGS) that are busy in various areas of socio economic development including educational administration and development. These partnerships maintain formal and information connections amongst themselves that portray a picture of region wide network of interorganizational partnerships which can be titled as Arabian Gulf network of networks. Based on the findings of this study some recommendations for future research with regard to the interorganizational partnerships of the developing and developed regions of the world are listed as follows.

The indigenous perspective of the local culture is embedded in religious norms in the Arabian Gulf region that emerged in the findings about the importance of consultation and the idea of respect rather than influence in the enactment of leadership. This study was not specifically designed to investigate cross-cultural concepts and leadership practices. However, this is an interesting area for future research.

Researchers may investigate interorganizational partnerships that involve unequal partners in terms of natural resources, regional politics, territorial size, strategic importance, economic development, etc., these inequalities at the starting point into consideration in the design of the partnership and in its structures and decision making processes. Some other areas such as the importance of consultation and other influencing
factors on leadership behaviour in the structures of interorganizational partnerships, patterns and relationship of vertical and horizontal leadership in interorganizational partnerships, women empowerment and leadership in partnership environments can be considered for future exploration.
REFERENCES


Distributing leadership to make schools smarter. In Leithwood, K., Mascall, B., Strauss, T (eds) Distributed leadership according to the evidence.


www.ontario.ca/eduleadership

http://www.geert-hofstede.com

الموضوع: الموافقة على زيارة الطالب
محمد سردار مقر المكتب بالرياض

المحترم
سعادة الأستاذ الدكتور أحمد بن حسن التولي
اللحق الثقافي بسفارة خادم الحرمين الشريفين
أوتاروا / أونتاريو - كندا
فأكس : 21313569010

السلام عليكم ورحمة الله وبركاته وبعد...
 فأهديكم أطيب التحية، وإشراء لخطاب سعادتك رقم 235 وتاريخ 28/11/2016،
والواد إليها عن طريق إميل السيد محمد سردار بتاريخ 23/8/2008، المتضمن رغبته
بزيارة مكتب التربية العربي لدول الخليج لجمع بيانات ميدانية عن دور المكتب في التنسيق
والتعاون في المجال التعليمي بين دول مجلس التعاون الخليجي.

يرجى إفادتنا بعدم مكتملنا من قيام السيد محمد سردار بهذا الزيارة للمكتب على
أن يتم التنسيق في ذلك مع رئيس قسم العلاقات العامة والإعلام والمنظمات بالكتب هايت.

وتفضلا بقبول خالص تحياتنا.
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Appendix B: Thematic Guide of Interview Questions

1. **Partnership goals:** How are the overall vision and goals for the partnership set? Which individuals or groups have more influence than others on the establishment of goals for the partnership work? How is that influence exercised?

2. **Organizational structures:** What are the key organizational structures through which the partnership is governed at a policy level, and managed at an operational level? How and in what contexts are decisions about organizational structures and processes within the partnership made? Examples of any recent/pending changes in organization? Reasons and sources of influence concerning these changes?

3. **Human resource development:** What kinds of human capacity development activities does the partnership provide or make available to its members (member organization)? Which individuals or groups influence decisions related to developing the capacity of partnership members, and in what ways?

4. **Partner relationships and communication:** How do you communicate between partner organizations? What is the official protocol for correspondence? What are the main practices? How do the officers (leaders) socialize and maintain official relationships with their superiors, peers, and subordinates?

5. **Partnership accountability processes:** What kinds of accountability expectations and processes exist in the work of the partnership? How do those processes affect the work of the partnership and its members? Who are the key players and sources of influence in the development and implementation of accountability processes related to partnership activity?

6. **Decision making:** How are the administrative and financial decisions made? (POSDCORB – planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting and budgeting).

7. **Partnership Processes:** How do you share the work load? Which individuals and/or groups play main role and how do they plan and perform these processes? (for cooperation, coordination, collaboration, etc.)

8. **Organizational Culture at ABEGS and National Culture of the Member States:** How would you comment on the organizational culture of the ABEGS and National Culture of the Member States? How do these cultures help or resist achieving ABEGS’ goals and objectives?

9. **GCC & ABEGS:** How do these two partnerships can be viewed differently in your opinion?
ملخص للأسئلة المحتملة:

1 - أهداف التعاون بين المنظمات التعليمية: ما هي الأهداف المحددة والرؤية العامة لهذا التعاون؟ ومن هم الأفراد أو المجموعات التي تؤثر أكثر من غيرها في وضع الأهداف؟ وكيف يمارس هذا التأثير؟

2 - الهياكل التنظيمية: ما هي الهياكل التنظيمية الأساسية التي من خلالها تنظم المشاركة على مستوى المكتب وتدار على مستوى العمليات؟ كيف وفي أي سياق تتخذ القرارات حول الهياكل التنظيمية والعمليات ضمن إطار التعاون، مع إعطاء أمثلة لأية تغيرات حديثة أو قديمة أو متوقعة في المكتب؟ ما هي أسباب ومصادر التأثير فيما يخص هذه التغيرات؟

3 - تنمية الموارد البشرية: ما هي أنواع أنشطة تنمية القدرات البشرية التي توفرها هذه المنظمات لأعضائها؟ ومن هم الأفراد أو المجموعات ذات التأثير في القرارات المتعلقة بتنمية هذه القرارات، وكيف يتم ذلك؟

4 - العلاقات والاتصالات: كيف يتم التواصل بين هذه المنظمات وما هو البروتوكول الرسمي للمواصلات وما هي الممارسات الرئيسية في هذا الشأن؟ كيف يحافظ المسئولون (والمراد) على العلاقات الرسمية مع روؤسهم ونظامهم ومروئهم؟

5 - الإجراءات المحاسبة: ما نوع عمليات المساءلة والمحاسبة الموجودة في العمل بالمنظمات؟ وكيف تؤثر هذه العمليات في عمل المنظمات وأعضائها؟ ومن هم اللاعبيات الرئيسيون المؤثرين في وضع وتنفيذ عمليات المساءلة والمحاسبة المتعلقة بنشاط هذه المنظمات؟

6 - اتخاذ القرارات: كيف تتخذ القرارات الإدارية والمالية (التخطيط، التنظيم، التوقيت، التوائم، إعداد التقارير والميزانيات)، عمليات التعاون: كيف يتم تقاسم أعباء العمل من هم الأفراد أو المجموعات الذين يلعبون الدور الرئيسي في ذلك؟ وكيف يخططون وينجزون تلك العمليات؟ (التعاون والتنسيق، الخ).

7 - الثقافة التنظيمية لمكتب التربية العربي والثقافة الوطنية للدول الأعضاء: ما هو رأيك وتفهمك حول الثقافة التنظيمية لمكتب المكتبة العربية والمكتبة الوطنية في الدول الأعضاء؟ وكيف تساعد هذه الثقافات في - أو تحول من - تحقيق أهداف مكتب التربية العربي لدول الخليج وغاباتها؟

8 - دول مجلس التعاون الخليجي ومكتب التربية العربي لدول الخليج: كيف يمكن أن ننظر لบทاين المنظمتين بشكل مختلف، في رأيك؟
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Data Source / Document Type</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Connection to Question/Theme</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research Question No. 1</td>
<td>sources of leadership influencing decision making about direction setting, human capacity building, managing the partnership program, accountability at strategic, managerial, and operational levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Themes derived from data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research Question No. 2</td>
<td>How leadership is distributed at various levels and between levels in the partnership structures?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Themes derived from data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research Question No. 3</td>
<td>How vertical and horizontal interorganizational leadership work simultaneously?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Themes derived from data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research Question No. 4</td>
<td>How the key interorganizational functions/processes (cooperation, coordination, and collaboration) are performed in a partnership environment?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Themes derived from data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Appendix D: Specific Leadership Practices Questionnaire

How frequently do you perform following leadership practices? Please indicate on the following scale: **Number 1 is the lowest (never at all) and number 5 is the highest (very frequently)** NA=not applicable. Please circle the appropriate number.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Identify and articulate a vision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Foster the acceptance of group goals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Encourage high performance expectations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Promote effective communication</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Intellectual stimulation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Individualized support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Modeling appropriate values and practices</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Building a collaborative culture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Structure the organization to facilitate work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Create productive relations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Connect the organization to its wider environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Staffing the partnership program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Monitor the progress and improvement strategies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Buffering staff from unproductive external demands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Allocate resources to foster the partnership improvement efforts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Ensure individual staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Develop &amp; present a coherent, understandable, accurate and transparent account of performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Reflect on personal contribution to achievements and take feedback from others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Participate in external evaluation and make adjustments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Create and redesign organizational structure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Develop and apply performance management practices</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Any other (Please specify)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** 1 = never at all 2= Seldom 3 = Sometimes 4 = Frequently 5 = very frequently 6= NA
في الجدول التالي: ما هو معدل أداءكم للممارسات القيادية المذكورة؟ يرجى وضع دائرة حول الرقم الذي يشير إلى الإجابة المناسبة: (الرقم 1 يمثل الرمادي الأدنى - أي نادراً - بينما يمثل الرمادي الأعلى - أي غالباً).

| تعديل وصيانة الرؤى | -1 | تحليل وتتبع مشاريع أهداف المجموعة | -2 | تشجيع التوقعات العالية في الأداء | -3 | تشجيع التواصل الفعال | -4 | التحفيز الفكري | -5 | الدعم الفردي | -6 | صياغة الفهم والممارسات المناسبة | -7 | بناء الثقافة التعاونية | -8 | هيئة المنظمة لتبسيط وتسهيل العمل | -9 | ربط منظمة بمحليها الخارجي الواسع | -10 | توسيع برامج المشاركة | -11 |
|------------------|----|-----------------------------------|----|---------------------------------|----|-------------------|----|----------------|----|------------|----|-----------------------------|----|-------------------------------|----|------------------------|----|--------------------------|----|
| لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد |
| لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد |
| لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد |
| لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد |
| لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد |
| لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد |
| لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد |
| لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد |
| لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد |
| لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد |
| لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد | 5 | لا يوجد |
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Appendix E: Sample Interview Transcript

Transcript # 7

Senior Executive 44
The Arab Bureau of Education for the Gulf States
Riyadh, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Researcher: What is your vision to take this org. to the future and what did you get from your predecessors when you joined this office?

Dr. Faisal: As you know the Bureau has been in existence since 35 years and it has certain set of objectives laid down by the General Conference of the Bureau. The vision is always to achieve those objectives. May be the means and tools will change according to the era we are living in but the same objectives are still valid. It is mainly contributing with the ministries of education towards the development to education practices. This is the main objectives. We are here to implement large projects that would be of common interest of all ministries and will at the end of value to them to develop their education systems. This has been done professionally our Director Generals before me and numerous projects have been implemented and achieved. Since I took over, I am trying to lead the Bureau to the new era by using the tools and the means that are specific to this era. First of all my vision was to extend the relationship of the Bureau and the ministries of education to the teachers. Because they are the real target people, real beneficiaries, and real stakeholders. So the relationships with the ministries were very good excellent but we realized that sometimes the material that we send them do not penetrate to the establishment or base of education namely the teachers. So the bureaucracy in the ministries sometimes they are very busy in their daily operational work so we took this initiative to help them to reach out the teachers in our member states approximately a million teachers. We found the best way to reach out is to use technology. We started to build portal for that purpose and we did and now we are in the phase of building and accumulating the contents on the systems that we have built. So these contents will be available to the teachers as resources as model lessons as a platform where they can exchange ideas and experiences and portal will eventually attract best practices from the teachers and will be distributed to the other teachers. So the use of technology has reengineered our work in the Bureau. The other thing is it is causing the same line the vision is to enrich the environment with the latest in the education. So we also took the initiative to Arabizing the material from other languages to Arabic language. Because the thought products in education is not very rich in the Arab countries. So we should utilize the educational theories that are numerous and published daily in the West specifically in the United States and Canada also. So we are trying to overcome the copyright issues and

44 Pseudonym used for this study purpose so as to meet the ethical requirements.
take the licenses to translate these materials to our teachers and make this available to them through our portal free. As you can see here the main objective and the vision and you asked me about the vision …so the vision is to enrich the environment surrounded teachers with the system of education and with numerous resources so that this will help them because you cannot rely only on the formal training of the teacher because this something of the past. This thing is to instigate the desire inside the teachers to learn by themselves. They cannot do so unless they find resources around themselves. We are trying to fill a small gap in this aspect also. We know that this will not be enough but at least from our part of the Bureau we do our share.

Researcher: I wish you best of luck to achieve these objectives and vision. Sir, you are here more than five years now and you have organized at least two sessions of General Conference and as I understand that you have two sessions (meetings) of the executive board every years. So roughly you might have organized 10 meetings of Executive Board. I would like to have your comments on like you have seven countries and ministers and deputy ministers when they sit to gather, in your opinion what do they contribute and what are different strengths of different partners in this partnership?

Dr. Faisal: Well…as you know the General Conference is the highest umbrella to the Bureau and it consists of ministries of education of our member states. Our member states as you are seven UAE, Kuwait, Yemen, Saudi Arabia, Qatar, Oman, and Bahrain. So they meet every two years in the General Conference to look into the projects that will be implemented in the fiscal year and also to approve the budgets and to look into the evaluation I mean the work of the Bureau in the past fiscal period. That is provided to them by the Executive Council. After the General Conference meeting the ministers also meet the following year just for consultation (Tashawari). So actually they meet every year. Once just for consultations and to review their unique and good experiences in their member states. There are presenters from each member state usually giving presentations about their best practices that they are doing and information about how they deal with daily problems in the education. This meeting is just for consultation. They also discuss if there is anything of urgent nature (emergency matters). In the General Conference, the official one as told you they look into the budget and evaluation of the performance of the Bureau. This is the unique opportunity for us to meet the ministers and to have their directions in what to do their needs in their ministries. They also exchange information, and we all find the ministers to be helpful and encouraging. Without that our will be based on our individual initiatives. But they don’t meet until the Executive Council has collected information and prepare report about our work. So there is a close tie between General Conference and the Executive Board. The
members of these two bodies are highest officials in the education ministries. The Executive Council meets more frequently twice a year and when there is formal meeting of the General Conference, this is the last year of our fiscal period they’ll meet three times a this year. They are meeting in March, September, and may be in October. The last one will be just to prepare for General Conference. The Executive Council usually the meetings consists of a report by the Director General. It is a progress report. How we wen about the implementation of our programs (14:01) . There is chance to talk about the obstacles in our way. We will have their views about our progress, so that we know if they want us to do something different. We also put in front of the Exe. Council some issues of urgent nature. The decisions of the Exe. Council are not bound to be executed unless they are approved by the General Conference. Unless something that has already been agreed to by the Gen. Conference. The core decisions have to be approved by the General Conference.

Researcher: My question is that when the General Conference meets, the Ministers sit to gather what strengths do they bring from their countries or how do they influence the decision making in the conference?

Dr. Faisal: Actually, the needs of the education development are common everywhere. Not in our region but in all over the world. There is an urgent need in each and every country to develop education. The need inside all the ministries are almost the same. How about seven countries who have a lot of things in common. Really they are all the time in agreement in what to do in the common work because this is small portion of their task. This is common collaborated work in the member States. So usually we don’t put something in front of them until we had their consultation about it. In terms of programs for example, we write to the each ministries if they have any urgent problem that they wish the Bureau to discuss or research (17:05) usually they are in total agreement …of course the way each ministry go about the development of education …of course effect the view of each minister. From my experience it is almost the same.

Researcher: What I was trying to understand was that people bring different experiences and perspectives?

Dr. Faisal: Oh yes this is very important objective of getting together. This is an important objective to have this Bureau. One the objective to establish this office was to coordinate the efforts between the ministries of education. So the meeting will reveal some practices of each country. So it is a chance for all ministers to listen to his colleagues how they went about to solve certain problems. So they exchange information and experiences they make different agreement between each other sometimes they agree to visit each other and conclude bilateral agreements or understandings. May
this is one of the objectives to have this common body which gives them a chance to get together.

Researcher: Again this was my question, different people have different strengths. Some people are may be good in education, some are good in Islamic Ideology, some are good in science and math, and some may interested in technology advancement?

Dr. Faisal: That’s natural for any meeting. If the views are not different then there is no food for thought. They may have different views but at the end they agree on something. Our countries are not so different, they are so common and similar. The areas of differences are negligible.

Researcher: Do you have the same environment in the Exe. Board discussion? They seem to have more exhaustive discussions.

Dr. Faisal: Yes these discussions are longer and more meticulous, sometimes the differences are there, this is required of course to get the better solution

Researcher: What do think who has more influence than others in these meetings?

Dr. Faisal: It related to individual best experiences, some of them are more experienced than the others. They change …the minister of education is considered to have a hot seat all the time in the government so sometimes they change. Sometimes the forthcoming person is full of ideas and sometimes you will get those calm people they talk when it required. It is individual differences.

Researcher: Do you think that budgetary contributions affect the decision making process in the board?

Dr. Faisal: The portions are distributed differently for example we have two countries who contribute more than 50% and the rest of the countries have 50%

Researcher: Do they have more say?

Dr. Faisal: No they don’t brag about that – we just don’t give one country have a say over the other no …

Researcher: How the decisions are made – show of hands, do they vote

Dr. Faisal: They are only seven people, they just nod (showing their acceptance). It is always friendly atmosphere. You know when they agree – you know our decisions have to be unanimous

Researcher: Do they must always be unanimous?
Dr. Faisal: If there are differences, they will discuss until they reach an agreement.

Researcher: What other structural elements are there in this partnership? I can see there is General Conference, Executive Board, and then you have Arab Bureau and under the Arab Bureau as we discussed the other day you have different institutions except AGU has different conference and Executive Board and you are the DG for all these institutions. I would like to know that how the communication takes place between you and deputy ministers, and ministers?

Dr. Faisal: The DG has always the path of communication directly with the Ministers and Deputy Ministers. It goes both ways depends on the subject. Sometimes it has a heavier weight that you need to consult the big man and sometimes the deputy minister fulfills your need so it depends on the subject. I write and communicate both of them.

Researcher: Another angle that I like to understand is that the deputy ministers of member states, do they communicate with other deputy ministers and with the ministers as well?

Dr. Faisal: Yes they do communicate like friends …they have common mission … sometime they are lobbying certain issues in the Bureau that’s natural

Researcher: How different institutions working under the umbrella of the Arab Bureau report their work to the Arab Bureau or they directly go to the Exe. Board or to the General Conference?

Dr. Faisal: Our centers around the gulf…the each one like Research center in Kuwait, Training Center in Doha and would be Language Center in UAE, each has a Board of Trustees from each member state. They meet with the director of the center on a regular basis, they review their reports, the progress reports and they inject ideas. They have a report this report is one of the elements that will be in front of the Executive Board every time they meet. They first have to submit their report to me first before it goes to the Executive Board.

Researcher: As I understand the Director of the institute is the member of Board of Trustees. They submit the report to you and then it is presented to the Executive Board.

Dr. Faisal: It is generally put in front of the Executive Board.

Researcher: What are main human capacity building activities or HRD activities in this partnership?
Dr. Faisal: Yes it is very important, sometimes we ask them to apply for certain training programs – it is task specific. Once we see a lack of experience on the part of any staff, we ask them to take training. Sometimes we also do training inside locally especially in the technology. Because there is a big shift that has been made for the last few years towards technology and here a lot of people are not familiar with technology. So we are trying to lead them and force them to utilize technology more and be technology driven in their work. Our aim is to have in near future a paperless work environment here. But what prevented us so far is lack of experience of some of our staff. We are trying to raise their level. There is something that I want to say about our task force here in the Bureau and the centers. We don’t have so many experts working here as full time employees so we rely on outside experts. So we are out sourcing and ask them to perform those jobs for us. Most of our staff are of administrative nature. They have simple task in their hands. My wish is to have more experts doing here full time jobs. But there are some budgetary obstacles. We are trying to overcome that also. Whenever we have an opportunity we’ll try to recruit full time employee here. You know when you talk about education you need so many specialized experts doing full job and when you don’t have them you rely on other people from the universities and schools locally and internationally.

Researcher: Do you have any other initiative like providing grants for higher studies etc.?

Dr. Faisal: Sometimes we do for those who are ambitious to have higher degrees. It is not part of our mission as we need people to work for us not those who are interested in higher education. But sometimes we give part of the tuition fee when we see someone is good and ambitious to get higher education.

Researcher: You have a training center in Doha. What kind of training programmes do you offer there?

Dr. Faisal: The training is for educators, teachers and supervisors of teachers and school principals. It is not for our staff. Training for the ministries of the member states.

Researcher: Different people come there from the member countries?

Dr. Faisal: Yes … the trainers …those people who have the job to train teachers …yes.

Researcher: What processes do you have for the accountability in this partnership?

Dr. Faisal: Well if you mean that if we conduct time to time formal check or evaluation to check the quality of our work. We have not. Long time ago
there was some evaluation of the Bureau done by UNESCO but after that it is in the hands of the Director General and the Executive Council constitute a body that takes over the evaluation process every time they meet. The work of the Bureau is always checked by the ministries, by the Exe. Board and the General Conference and I think there is a need at some point in time for a formal independent evaluation of the Bureau and its centers but it has to be channelled by a higher authority in order to have real independent. People should be able to take decisions whether to keep those bodies or cancel them and this very sensitive result to reach but I think we need it at some point in time. I myself convinced that cooperation, collaboration should continue between countries but I am also a believer in evaluation that will lead to improving the performance

Researcher: Sir, in your opinion what are the main processes of this partnership like cooperation, coordination, or collaboration?

Dr. Faisal: We are in a contact with the ministries on daily basis also we meet with officials, we have one of our program to hold meetings of identical departments in all the ministries. We do all three. The nature of work is cooperative, but sometimes we combined objectives then we need to collaborate …like we have a project on math and science for Bahrain and Saudi Arabia so there is collaboration between two countries. So our role is to coordinate this cooperation and collaboration

Researcher: You mentioned in your previous comment that you have so many things in common in the member states, I like to have your comment on the national culture of the member states and what is the organizational culture of Arab Bureau an how do they impact each other?

Dr. Faisal: We have so much in common that you rarely think of difference in these countries. When it comes to social values, religion, geographical and historical aspects …this area in the world used to be families and tribes going to each other there were no boundaries separating them. Now they are different states but they still have common ties between them. When it come to the problems that they are facing in their educational development mostly it is the same but if you consider Yemen has just joined. Yemen has different set of problems because it is a very large country the population is very large comparatively speaking. When you compare Yemen and Saudi Arabia with other countries in the region, Saudi Arabia and Yemen are the larger countries than the others. Yemen is still in the developing phase. It is striving to reach out all the students and trying to make education available to every child in the country. This problem is not faced in any other member state as they have already passed that stage. Literacy is a big problem in Yemen. So these are the differences that we are facing. The situation of Yemen is different than the rest of the member
states but in terms of the vision to develop education of course we are the same.

Researcher: Do you think that certain things should be discontinued and there are certain things that should be introduced to get the job done?

Dr. Faisal: Of course you know we are always striving to do better. I have so many wishes but sometimes you are strained by the circumstances. I have no limit to my wishes and vision but you are bound to the limit which has been drawn for you and the budget that is available to you. But I would like to see the Bureau to be more technology driven and I would like to see the seriousness in utilizing the projects that we are implementing in the ministries of education in the member states. I would like to see a think tank being established in each ministry so that they can examine what is being received from the Arab Bureau and from other organizations like UNESCO to utilize their products. Current situations implies that each ministry is very busy in their educational systems and very busy in their daily operational procedures and they don’t have time to utilize some of our programs and we think that they can contribute towards the development of education those are the things that we are working on …and there is good understanding between the departments of the ministries they want to benefit from the Bureau’s work because they pay money for that. The thing that I would like to introduce to the Bureau is have more utilization of the programs and the bureau and its centers more technology driven.

Researcher: Sir, I learnt from my visit here and I was taken around in this office. I visited different places here…I learnt that you have introduced a new training center, you want run this office 24 hours?

Dr. Faisal: The driving force behind it is my eagerness is to utilize this building. It is located at the nice place in Riyadh and we work from 7.30 to 2.30 and that’s it …I am dreaming to have people coming and going all day long so I am planning to have this small training center so that we can affect people around us the schools around us by offering them some quality training programs. We are slow in reaching that objective because we have not found he people to run the training programs exactly in the manner that we want them to do …because I am becoming less and less believer of the formal training method I think self training (42:40) is now becoming more valuable to teachers it is more valid but still we here that we can test our training packages we can evaluate these training packages and we can see what can be done more in this area. I think we have to concentrate on the training of the teachers if we want to achieve educational objectives. This my passion about the training.
Researcher: I visited your tech facility here, I am also glad to note that you are developing your own LMS – this is a great job?

Dr. Faisal: We have already done that and we making this available free to the ministries of education and that’s why I told you when you asked about things I would like to introduce…I think better utilization of programs is one…we have developed our own portal and we have our own LMS … sometimes people think it clever to got the open source and adopt it …our technology team chose to build their own and use every new technology in that portal. We are very sincere and we are providing our latest education to our teachers and we this mission to help our teachers to overcome the barrier between them and technology. We are making available to them so many model lessons to them using international standards. Now we are leading the region in the e-learning so we are also planning to establish a virtual school in the area. Of course each ministry has its huge projects in the ……in education we complement these efforts as we have very relaxed base of working maybe we can provide them a better solution. We draw their attention to use it but we don’t compel them to use it

Researcher: In fact I had a chance to work with the WLU as a Manager educational development and I was dealing with online programs I was developing courses for the university degree programs. So when I saw your LMS, I was impressed .

Dr. Faisal: It is a dream …for us technology is not the big problem. It is easy, you can do things in no time…to make the skeleton is easy. The problem is the content. My dream is the accumulation of contents. It has to be done on daily bases. We have now thousands of research papers, we have numerous materials available to teachers. We have not reached all the teachers in the region. Teachers are busy. We hope it serves as an eye opener for them and they join us. We only have about 60000 teachers registered with us so far … it is a big number but in my opinion it is not. It is up to the teachers to join us or not … we are trying to reach out to them by our electronic news letter that we publish every two month … it is a news letter and it hardly contain any news but some ideas, suggestions, invitation to join …in future it will be edited by the teachers by themselves. We have web2 technology incorporated in the portal. This technology tool can be used by the teachers to develop their own lessons. They can learn on the best practices and experiences. Teachers can see and imitate. So this the vision that I have … we are inviting teachers to use the technology and not afraid of it. E-learning is a slogan in the ministries but every ministry goes about it in a different way depending on the establishment they contracted to give them the solution. Here we are trying to use the best solution the latest the state of the art hoping to give the correct example about e-learning of course e-learning has (50:43) we
are trying to give the best solution to the ministries. We are confident that the best solution will prevail.

Researcher: I learnt that there were two restructuring periods starting from 1975 till today when 150 people were working here and now 50 people are working here and second one when there was a war in the Gulf, when Iraq invaded Kuwait and then a major restructuring was done?

Dr. Faisal: I was not here during those two times. But any organization that is in existence for that long for more than 30 years would face certain circumstances that will dictate some new vision, to rethink the establishment and you are right at one time there were so many people were working in the Bureau. You know the budget is limited so in order to face those financial situation we had to get rid of some employees. The second one when Iraq invaded Kuwait. Iraq was a member at that time and the Kuwait and the decision was taken to expel Iraq from the Bureau

Researcher: Who took this decision?

Dr. Faisal: The General Conference

Researcher: How do you employ people here? There are seven member states. There should be some representation from the member states?

Dr. Faisal: There is no quota for countries that has to be followed, no. When we have higher position, we make an announcement in all the countries. From our own experience people from the member states are not attracted to work in the Bureau. Kuwaiti will be attracted to Kuwait office and Qatri will be attracted to Doha and Saudies will attracted to the headquarters here. But one we know that somebody is interested from the member state we like to help him provided the required qualifications are met. There are a few people from member states in this headquarters not many. The majority is from Saudi Arabia. So we announce the position, state the requirements, receive the applicants and choose as usual. The announcement is done in all seven country for higher positions only. For service positions …we do it here.

Researcher: How do you see these two organizations differently GCC and ABEGS?

Dr. Faisal: Well ABEGS was established well before GCC. The secretariat of the GCC was hosted here at the Bureau. The Arab Bureau is financially and administratively independent partnership. But sometimes there is a decree from the higher council through the general secretariat of the GCC and from the GCC it comes to us because of the specialty of education. The relationship is of cooperative nature coordination also. There is a meeting of the Higher Council every year so we make a report to them about
certain areas of education what happens. We make a progress report to them intimating progress made in completion of certain projects and so on.

Researcher: Thank you
Appendix F: Rules and Regulations of the Arab Bureau

Rules and Regulations of the Arab Bureau
With Regard to the Composition of the
General Conference and the Executive Board

The composition of the General Conference

Article I:
The General Conference of Education Ministers in the Member States or the Office of Inebounam, and participates in meetings and delegations of Member States, as well as observers member who issued invitations decision of the General Conference and not the right to vote.

Dates of meetings

Article II:
1) General Conference meets in regular session every two years, and members of the General Conference held a consultative meeting in the year in which a regular session.
2) may hold sessions of the General Conference unusual, if so decided by himself, or at the request addressed to the President of the General Conference from four Member States, or at the invitation of the Executive Board.
3) Executive Board shall determine the date of the Special General Conference if he had not been determined by the Conference, and the general manager office to inform Member States that two months before the date in the least.
4) The General Conference to postpone one of its meetings to resume at a later date determined. Venue

Article III:
General Conference holds its regular session in a Member State by alternating arrangement alphabet of the names of the Member States, and if not possible, then meeting in the State which followed, and hold extraordinary meeting of the State Headquarters, failing which the Executive Board meeting venue.

The preparation of the agenda

Article IV:
1) The Executive Board the draft agenda, before the advance of the meeting, to reach the table to members of the General Conference a month before the date of the meeting.
2) The draft agenda as follows:
A. Report of the Chairman of the Executive Board on the Council's work between sessions of the General Conference.
B. The report of the Director General on the work of the Bureau between sessions reconvene.
C. Topics included the General Conference decided.
D. Topics included the Executive Board.
E. The topics proposed by any Member State.
F. Topics budgetary accounts.

Approval of the agenda

Article V:

1) The President of the General Conference or on behalf of the agenda at the conference after the opening of the first meeting for approval by a majority of the members.
2) may modify some of the agenda items or deletions from or additions to a majority vote of members present and voting.

The agenda for the sessions unusual

Article VI:

1) The executive board of this draft table taking into account the points of the system.
2) a table to the Member States one month before the meeting date.

The presidency of the General Conference

Article VII: Headed by the General Conference at its regular heads of delegations rotation in alphabetical order of names of the Member States and chaired by the extraordinary session of the presidency have in the same year.

Delegations

Article VIII:

1) The delegation of each State of the number of delegates from professionals.
2) The head of delegation to appoint a representative to act as a representative of his own, and shall notify the Chairman of the Conference so.

Commissions

Article IX:

1) The General Conference at each regular session or unusual commissions believed that composition of the work of the Conference.
2) Each committee formed by the General Conference to appoint subcommittees for specific purposes required work.
3) constitute each of the representative of each delegation session of the need assisted by the members of his delegation.
4) of the General Conference that the committees of a number of members without adherence to the requirement of each State.

Assembly Committee

Article X:
1) The General Conference of the general form of the President, heads of delegations, to be chaired by the President of the Conference, may be involved in the Bureau Director and Chairman of the Executive Board at meetings of the Assembly without the right to vote for whichever.

2) The committee will consider all public matters, which are private.

3) in the absence of President of the General Conference is proceeding Vice President then chooses Conference.

The terms of reference of the General Conference

Article XI :
General Conference regard to the following :
1) outlining the work of the Office of the President and the general thrust.
2) making decisions on the annual programs of the Executive Board.
3) Report conferencing unusual when necessary.
4) Adoption of the general plan of the Executive Board.
5) approval of the draft budget and expenditure estimates.
6) Appointment of the Director General of the Office on the nomination of the Executive Board.
7) Any other functions prescribed by regulations office or specialized devices.

Functioning

Article XII :
1. Quorum :
A. Quorum of the absolute majority of Member States.
B. Quorum each committee formed by the absolute majority of its members.
2. The debate :
A. The President of the General Conference to invite the President of the Executive Council to submit a report on behalf of the Council, in meetings that discuss issues relating to the terms of reference of the Executive Council.
B. Observer States or non-participating Member words oral or written with the consent of the President of the Conference.
C. President calls asylum floor by ordering them to request.
D. May be given precedence in the speech of the President or the Commission's decision if necessary.
E. The President may determine the time allowed to each speaker.
F. President recite the list of applicants and declares the floor after taking approval of the closure of the list.
G. The President to give the right answer after the closure of the list if necessary.
H. Any Member State may make in the course of the debate you to a point system and the
president should immediately decide that.

I. Can reconsider the decision of the President, put to a vote.

3. Meeting stop or postpone the discussion:

A. Any Member State the right to propose a meeting or postponed, if seconded the proposal put to a vote immediately.

B. Any Member State the right to request the postponement of the discussion of the topic under discussion, and give precedence to this proposal, which would allow the proposal to make a point.

C. Any Member State may propose the closure of the debate, the President may declare the closure of the debate if Congress approved it.

D. The following proposals for the order of priority above all else:

1) the postponement of the debate.

2) closure of the debate.

3) to postpone the meeting.

4) stop the meeting.

Vote

Article XIII:

1) only vote on the Member States, and each member State has one vote in the General Conference and of any committee.

2) take decisions by an absolute majority.

3) is a member Abstainer voting non-voting delegate.

4) is a vote by show of hands.

5) the President to restore the voting roll call if in doubt the result.

6) can vote on separate parts of the proposal, if a member requests it.

7) If an amendment to the proposal to be voted on the amendment first.

8) proposals containing an amendment to a proposal submitted to the General Conference or any committee of its committees have priority in the supply of the vote, and start voting on amendments those most distant from the original proposal, so that the President in accordance with the amendments, and is intended to amend the proposal includes everything from or add or change in the wording.

Article XIV:

May not modify or suspend any of these rules only on the decision of the General Conference.

The Arab Center for Educational Training in the Gulf is one of the fruits of cooperation between the GCC countries in the educational field, in addition to the march of distinguished Arab Bureau of Education spanning twenty-five years I spent in the service of Education and the players step on the road to achieving the aspirations of educators from the countries of the region.
The Composition of the Executive Board

Introduction:

The Executive Board is composed of one member from each State and the level of deputy minister or equivalent level, the nomination of the State of expertise and competence in educational matters, in the case of free seat one member of the Executive Council had their replacement, Board members representing their governments and exercise the authority granted to them by the General Conference on behalf of the entire conference. The Council takes the Arab Bureau of Education for the Gulf States in the Riyadh-based, and may hold meetings anywhere in the Member States. The Executive Board will hold regular meetings twice a session every year, that precedes one of the regular sessions of the General Conference convened to approve the draft agenda and documents before it. The Council may hold a special meetings at the request of four of the Member States, or upon the decision of the Executive Board, or at the invitation of the Director-General.

Materials provided in the Council

Article I: The semantics of the terminology contained in this system on each specified in the statute of the Arab Bureau of Education for the Gulf States.

Article II: Without prejudice to the provisions contained in this system be organizing meetings of the Executive Board in accordance with the rules set forth in the following articles.

Article III: Chairman of the Executive Board is responsible for managing its business during meetings, which opens the meeting and announces closing or lifted or suspended, and direct the discussions, all in accordance with the provisions of the Statute of the Office of the system. Article IV: The Vice-President powers of the president in his absence.

Article V: Board approves at the end of its meetings, resolutions and recommendations adopted by the President of the Council.

Article VI: The Director-General in consultation with the Chairman of the Executive Board the draft agenda for each session, and communicated to the Member States with documents and invited to the meeting convened before the month in the least.

Article VII: Topics raised by the Council arranged on the agenda unless the Council decides during its otherwise, the Council shall consider the claims of members of topics at each meeting in the paragraph concerning further work.

Article VIII: When asked to hold a special session must be specified in the demand issues required consideration of this session, when the session may not discuss any matter not included in the request only if the Council approved it by an absolute majority of its members.
Article IX: Director-General attends meetings of the Executive Board, and participates in the deliberations, and submit to the Council finds the submission of statements and clarifications, and answered questions from Council members and the questions nor the right to vote when making decisions.

Article X: No assistant Director-General hired in the meetings of the Council the right to participate in deliberations or discussions by the Board only if requested by the Director-General and President agreed.

Article XI: The President shall call arranged their floor, and the Chairman may limit the time allowed for each speaker.

Article XII: A division of the consent of the Council proposal or paragraphs to the subject before the vote on each paragraph.

Article XIII: Proposals containing an amendment to the proposal submitted to the Council have priority in the supply of the vote, and start voting on amendments those most distant from the original proposal, so that the President in accordance with the amendments, and is intended to amend the proposal includes everything from or add or change in the wording.

Article XIV: If one member raised a point of order must be decided by the President immediately raised, and the President's ruling shall not reverse the Council on the proposal of a member.

Article XV: May not offer any proposal for discussion or a vote only if he had discourage it.

Article XVI: A motion to withdraw its proposal at any time before the commencement of voting, and any other member to introduce a motion thus once again.

Article XVII: A member may halt or adjournment of the meeting, or postpone consideration of the topic before or closure of the debate around it, if seconded the motion introduced by President immediately put to a vote without debate.

Article XVIII: The proposals are arranged according to the following precedence over everything else: 1) stop the meeting for a certain period. 2) to postpone debate on the issue before the Council. 3) closure of the debate on the subject before the Council. 4) postponement of the meeting to a later date.

Article XIX: It may not be reconsidered in a resolution adopted at the Council's session, which was issued only with the consent of an absolute majority of Council members.

Article XX: Voting by show of hands, and make decisions by an absolute majority of
members present and voting, unless otherwise provided.

Article XXI: Any member has reservations on the decision taken by the Council and must prove this reservation in the record of the meeting with the reasons, if the member reservation withdrawn before the end of the paragraph was deleted from the record of that meeting.

Article XXII: A member may abstain from voting is not a member Forgoer object to the resolution issued in accordance with the provisions of this system.

Article XXIII: With the exception of articles based on the texts of the statute, this system may be amended by an absolute majority of members of the Executive Board, and must introduce the proposed amendment to Member States at least two months before the date of the proposed consideration.

Article XXIV: This system works from the date of approval by the General Conference.
## Leadership Distribution within Leadership Functions & Specific Practices (Overall)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Leadership Function</th>
<th>Sr. #</th>
<th>Sr. #</th>
<th>Leadership Practice</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setting Direction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Identifying and articulating a vision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fostering the acceptance of group goals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>High performance expectations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Promoting effective communication</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Developing People</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Intellectual stimulation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Individualized support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Modeling appropriate values and practices</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Redesigning the Organization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Building a collaborative culture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Structuring the organization to facilitate work</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Creating productive relations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Connecting the organization to its wider environment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managing the (Partnership) Programme</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Staffing the partnership program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Monitoring the progress and improvement strategies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Buffering staff from unproductive external demands for attention</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Allocating resources to foster the partnership improvement efforts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Securing Accountability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ensures individual staff accountability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Develop &amp; present a coherent, understandable, accurate and transparent account of performance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reflect on personal contribution to achievements and take feedback from others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Participate in external evaluation and make adjustments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Create and redesign organizational structure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Develop and apply performance management practices</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix G: Leadership Distribution Tables, Graphs and Matrixes Based on Questionnaire Data
## Leadership Practices

### Setting Direction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. #</th>
<th>Sr. #</th>
<th>Leadership Practice</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Identifying and articulating a vision</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fostering the acceptance of group goals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>High performance expectations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Promoting effective communication</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Developing People

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. #</th>
<th>Sr. #</th>
<th>Leadership Practice</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Intellectual stimulation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Individualized support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Modeling appropriate values and practices</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Redesigning the Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. #</th>
<th>Sr. #</th>
<th>Leadership Practice</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Building a collaborative culture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Structuring the organization to facilitate work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Creating productive relations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Connecting the organization to its wider environment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Managing the (Partnership) Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. #</th>
<th>Sr. #</th>
<th>Leadership Practice</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Staffing the partnership program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Monitoring the progress and improvement strategies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Buffering staff from unproductive external demands for attention</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Allocating resources to foster the partnership improvement efforts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Securing Accountability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. #</th>
<th>Sr. #</th>
<th>Leadership Practice</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ensures individual staff accountability</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Develop &amp; present a coherent, understandable, accurate and transparent account of performance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reflect on personal contribution to achievements and take feedback from others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Participate in external evaluation and make adjustments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Create and redesign organizational structure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Develop and apply performance management practices</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Leadership Function</td>
<td>Sr. Function</td>
<td>Sr. #</td>
<td>Leadership Practice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting Direction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Identifying and articulating a vision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fostering the acceptance of group goals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>High performance expectations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Promoting effective communication</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Intellectual stimulation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Individualized support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Modeling appropriate values and practices</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redesigning the Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Building a collaborative culture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Structuring the organization to facilitate work</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Creating productive relations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Connecting the organization to its wider environment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing the (Partnership) Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Staffing the partnership program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Monitoring the progress and improvement strategies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Buffering staff from unproductive external demands for attention</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Allocating resources to foster the partnership improvement efforts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securing Accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ensures individual staff accountability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Develop &amp; present a coherent, understandable, accurate and transparent account of performance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reflect on personal contribution to achievements and take feedback from others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Participate in external evaluation and make adjustments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Create and redesign organizational structure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Develop and apply performance management practices</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Leadership Distribution Within Leadership Functions & Specific Practices
At the AETCGS (Training Centre) Doha Qatar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Leadership Function</th>
<th>Sr. #</th>
<th>Sr. #</th>
<th>Leadership Practice</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setting Direction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Identifying and articulating a vision</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fostering the acceptance of group goals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>High performance expectations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Promoting effective communication</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Developing People</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Intellectual stimulation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Individualized support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Modeling appropriate values and practices</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Redesigning the Organization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Building a collaborative culture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Structuring the organization to facilitate work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Creating productive relations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Connecting the organization to its wider environment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managing the (Partnership) Programme</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Staffing the partnership program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring the progress and improvement strategies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Buffering staff from unproductive external demands for attention</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Allocating resources to foster the partnership improvement efforts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Securing Accountability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ensures individual staff accountability</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop &amp; present a coherent, understandable, accurate and transparent account of performance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reflect on personal contribution to achievements and take feedback from others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Participate in external evaluation and make adjustments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Create and redesign organizational structure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop and apply performance management practices</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Comparative Picture of the Distribution of Core Leadership Functions in the Organization Levels at Arab Bureau

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Leadership Function</th>
<th>Organizational Level</th>
<th>Tabulated Responses on Likert Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting Direction</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing People</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redesigning the Organization</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing the (Partnership) Programme</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securing Accountability</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Core Leadership Functions' Usage - In order from Most to Least Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABEGS Partnership</th>
<th>Strategic Level</th>
<th>Managerial Level</th>
<th>Operational Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting Directions</td>
<td>Setting Directions</td>
<td>Setting Directions</td>
<td>Setting Directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securing Accountability</td>
<td>Securing Accountability</td>
<td>Restructuring the Organization</td>
<td>Securing Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restructuring the Organization</td>
<td>Restructuring the Organization</td>
<td>Developing People</td>
<td>Restructuring the Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing People</td>
<td>Developing People</td>
<td>Securing Accountability</td>
<td>Developing People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing the Partnership Programme</td>
<td>Managing the Partnership Programme</td>
<td>Managing the Partnership Programme</td>
<td>Managing the Partnership Programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Leadership Practices' Usage - (Setting Directions) In order from Most to Least Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABEGS Partnership</th>
<th>Strategic Level</th>
<th>Managerial Level</th>
<th>Operational Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Performance Expectations</td>
<td>High Performance Expectations</td>
<td>High Performance Expectations</td>
<td>High Performance Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting Effective Communication</td>
<td>Promoting Effective Communication</td>
<td>Promoting Effective Communication</td>
<td>Promoting Effective Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering the Acceptance of Group Goals</td>
<td>Fostering the Acceptance of Group Goals</td>
<td>Fostering the Acceptance of Group Goals</td>
<td>Fostering the Acceptance of Group Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying and Articulating a vision</td>
<td>Identifying and Articulating a vision</td>
<td>Identifying and Articulating a vision</td>
<td>Identifying and Articulating a vision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Leadership Practices' Usage - (Developing People) In order from Most to Least Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABEGS Partnership</th>
<th>Strategic Level</th>
<th>Managerial Level</th>
<th>Operational Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>Individualized support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling appropriate values and practices</td>
<td>Individualized support</td>
<td>Modeling appropriate values and practices</td>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized support</td>
<td>Modeling appropriate values and practices</td>
<td>Individualized support</td>
<td>Modeling appropriate values and practices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Leadership Practices' Usage - (Redesigning the Organization)

In order from Most to Least Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABEGS Partnership</th>
<th>Strategic Level</th>
<th>Managerial Level</th>
<th>Operational Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building a collaborative culture</td>
<td>Building a collaborative culture</td>
<td>Creating productive relations</td>
<td>Creating productive relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating productive relations</td>
<td>Connecting the organization to its Wider Environment</td>
<td>Building a collaborative culture</td>
<td>Building a collaborative culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecting the organization to its Wider Environment</td>
<td>Creating productive relations</td>
<td>Connecting the organization to its Wider Environment</td>
<td>Connecting the organization to its Wider Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structuring the organization to facilitate work</td>
<td>Structuring the organization to facilitate work</td>
<td>Structuring the organization to facilitate work</td>
<td>Structuring the organization to facilitate work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABEGS Partnership</td>
<td>Strategic Level</td>
<td>Managerial Level</td>
<td>Operational Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring the Progress &amp; Improvement Strategies</td>
<td>Allocating Resources to Foster the Partnership Improvement efforts</td>
<td>Allocating Resources to Foster the Partnership Improvement efforts</td>
<td>Monitoring the Progress &amp; Improvement Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocating Resources to Foster the Partnership</td>
<td>Monitoring the Progress &amp; Improvement Strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td>Allocations Resources to Foster Partnership Improvement efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>staffing the Partnership Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing the Partnership Programme</td>
<td>Staffing the Partnership Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td>Staffing the Partnership Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffering Staff from Unproductive External</td>
<td>Buffering Staff from Unproductive External Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Buffering Staff from Unproductive External Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABEGS Partnership</td>
<td>Strategic Level</td>
<td>Managerial Level</td>
<td>Operational Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflect on Personal Contribution to Achievements and Take Feedback from Others</td>
<td>Reflect on Personal Contribution to Achievements and Take Feedback from Others</td>
<td>Reflect on Personal Contribution to Achievements and Take Feedback from Others</td>
<td>Reflect on Personal Contribution to Achievements and Take Feedback from Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop &amp; Apply Performance Management Practices</td>
<td>Ensure Individual Staff Accountability</td>
<td>Ensure Individual Staff Accountability</td>
<td>Participater in External Evaluation and Make Adjustments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop &amp; Present a Coherent, Understandable accurate and Transparent Account of Performance</td>
<td>Participate in External Evaluation and Make Adjustments</td>
<td>Participate in External Evaluation and Make Adjustments</td>
<td>Develop &amp; Present a Coherent, Understandable accurate and Transparent Account of Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create &amp; Redesign Organizational Culture</td>
<td>Create &amp; Redesign Organizational Culture</td>
<td>Create &amp; Redesign Organizational Culture</td>
<td>Create &amp; Redesign Organizational Culture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Core Leadership Functions' Usage - In order from Most to Least Used (Country & Work Type Comparison)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admin. Management (KSA)</th>
<th>Research (Kuwait)</th>
<th>Training (Qatar)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting Directions</td>
<td>Setting Directions</td>
<td>Setting Directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restructuring the Organization</td>
<td>Restructuring the Organization</td>
<td>Securing Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securing Accountability</td>
<td>Securing Accountability</td>
<td>Restructuring the Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing People</td>
<td>Developing People</td>
<td>Developing People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing the Partnership Programme</td>
<td>Managing the Partnership Programme</td>
<td>Managing the Partnership Programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Core Leadership Functions' Usage - In order from Most to Least Used (Country Comparison)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saudi Arabia</th>
<th>Kuwait</th>
<th>Qatar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting Directions</td>
<td>Setting Directions</td>
<td>Setting Directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restructuring the Organization</td>
<td>Restructuring the Organization</td>
<td>Securing Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securing Accountability</td>
<td>Securing Accountability</td>
<td>Restructuring the Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing People</td>
<td>Developing People</td>
<td>Developing People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing the Partnership Programme</td>
<td>Managing the Partnership Programme</td>
<td>Managing the Partnership Programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Core Leadership Functions' Usage - In order from Most to Least Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABEGS Partnership</th>
<th>Strategic Level</th>
<th>Managerial Level</th>
<th>Operational Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting Directions</td>
<td>Setting Directions</td>
<td>Setting Directions</td>
<td>Setting Directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securing Accountability</td>
<td>Securing Accountability</td>
<td>Restructuring the Organization</td>
<td>Securing Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restructuring the Organization</td>
<td>Restructuring the Organization</td>
<td>Developing People</td>
<td>Restructuring the Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing People</td>
<td>Developing People</td>
<td>Securing Accountability</td>
<td>Developing People</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Integrated Picture of Core Leadership Functions at ABEGS at All Levels**

![Graph showing usage of core leadership functions at different levels for ABEGS partnership.]
Redesigning the Organization at ABEGS

Managing the Partnership at the ABEGS
Securing Accountability at the ABEGS

- Ensures individual staff accountability
- Develop & present a coherent, understandable, accurate and transparent account of performance
- Reflect on personal contribution to achievements and take feedback from others
- Participate in external evaluation and make adjustments
- Create and redesign organizational structure
- Develop and apply performance management practices

Leadership Functions & Practices at Strategic Level
Core Leadership Functions at Strategic Level

- Setting Direction
- Developing People
- Restructuring the Org.
- Managing the Partnership Programme
- Securing Accountability
Setting Directions at Strategic Level

Developing People at Strategic Level
Redesigning the Organization at Strategic Level

Managing the Partnership Programme at Strategic Level
Securing Accountability at Strategic Level

- Ensures individual staff accountability
- Develop & present a coherent, understandable, accurate and transparent account of performance
- Reflect on personal contribution to achievements and take feedback from others
- Participate in external evaluation and make adjustments
- Create and redesign organizational structure
- Develop and apply performance management practices
Developing People at Managerial Level

Redesigning the Organization at Managerial Level
Managing the Partnership Program at Managerial Level

Securing Accountability at Managerial Level

- Ensures individual staff accountability

- Develop & present a coherent, understandable, accurate and transparent account of performance

- Reflect on personal contribution to achievements and take feedback from others

- Participate in external evaluation and make adjustments

- Create and redesign organizational structure

- Develop and apply performance management practices
Managing the Partnership Programme at Operational Level

Securing Accountability at Operational Level

Since it began working in 1979, GASERC has embraced a wide range of activities as will be seen. There are four main areas:

1) Studies and research publications.

2) Unification and development publications.

3) Educational meetings.

4) Training courses.

STUDIES AND RESEARCH PUBLICATIONS:

Evaluation of the current status of curricula in the Arab Gulf States in the light of the stated objectives.

Islamic Education, Physical Education, Art Education, Home Economics, Mathematics, Science, Foreign Languages, Arabic Language,

Unification of Educational Goals and General Foundations of Curricula, 1400 AH.

A Comparative Study of Science Curricula in General Stages in A.G.S. 1400AH, 2 Vols.

A Comparative Study of the Status of Laboratories in Secondary Education in A.G.S: Language Labs, 1400 AH.


Evaluation of Educational Programs in the Arab World, 1401 AH / 1981.


Educational and Vocational Orientation for Intermediate Stage Students towards General and Vocational Education in A.G.S. (Field Study), 1403 AH, 3 Vols.


A Comparative Study of the Status of the Content material of Math and Science Curricula in A.G.S. The Unified Content Material in the first four grades, 1404 AH / 1984.


A Comparative Study into Updating the level of Basic Skills in Arabic Language Learners at the End of the Secondary Stage 1405 AH / 1985.


A Study into Setting Criteria for the Content of Arabic Grammar in the Basic Education Stage up to the End of 9th Grade 1411 AH / 1991.

A Study into the establishment of a Spelling Program for the First Four Grades in the Elementary Stage in the Member States (Skills, Techniques and Methodology) 1411 AH / 1991.

A Study into the Level of Basic Skills in the Learner's Performance in Arabic at the End of Basic Education 1411 AH / 1991.


A Study of the Projects Concerned with Developing ELT in the Member States and the Possibility of Benefiting from them or Adopting one of them, 1413 AH / 1992.

A Study into Introducing Military Education within the Programs of General Education Stages in the Member States, 1413 AH / 1993.


A Study on the Linguistic Vocabularies of the Child in the Member States (First Link), For Grades 1 & 2 in the Elementary Stage, 1414 AH / 1994.

A Study on the Linguistic Level Expected to be attained by the Learner at the End of the First Link (Grades 1 & 2) of the Elementary Stage in the Linguistic Arts (Reading, Writing, Speaking, and Listening) 1415 AH / 1995.
An Evaluative Study of the Unified Curricula of Science in the Elementary Stage in the Member States (1st - 6th Grades), 1415 AH / 1995.

A Study on the Arabic Language Vocabulary of the Primary Stage Child in the Member States (4, 5, and 6th Grades), 1417 AH / 1996.

A Study on the Linguistic Level Expected to be attained by the Learner at the end of the 6th Grade in Linguistic Arts (Reading, Writing, Speaking and Listening) 1417 AH / 1996.

A Study on the Comprehensive Curriculum of the Arabic Language in the Light of the Evaluative Efforts Added to it, and following up how Member States Benefited from it in Building up their Arabic Language Curricula, 1417 AH / 1996.

A Study on the Criteria and the Controls of Selecting the Linguistic Content for the Elementary Stage Curricula (4, 5 and 6th Grades) 1417 AH / 1996.


A Study on the Comprehensive Evaluation of the Unified Math and Science Curricula for the Intermediate Stage in the Member States, (7, 8, and 9th Grades) 1417 AH / 1996.


A Study on Teaching Slow Learners in the General Education Stages in Member States in the Light of the Current Status and the Contemporary Trends, 1417 AH / 1997.

**THE FIELD OF UNIFICATION AND DEVELOPMENT:**


THE DEVELOP AND UNIFIED BOOK SERIES IN MATH'S:

BOOK I ( Pupil's Book - Workbook - Teacher's Guide)
BOOK II ( Pupil's Book - Workbook - Teacher's Guide)
BOOK III ( Pupil's Book - Workbook - Teacher's Guide)
BOOK IV ( Pupil's Book - Workbook - Teacher's Guide)
BOOK V ( Pupil's Book - Workbook - Teacher's Guide)
BOOK VI ( Pupil's Book - Workbook - Teacher's Guide)
BOOK VII ( Pupil's Book - Workbook - Teacher's Guide)
BOOK VIII ( Pupil's Book - Workbook - Teacher's Guide)
BOOK IX ( Pupil's Book - Workbook - Teacher's Guide)
BOOK X  ( Pupil's Book - Workbook - Teacher's Guide )
BOOK XI  ( Pupil's Book - Workbook - Teacher's Guide )
BOOK XII ( Pupil's Book - Workbook - Teacher's Guide )

THE DEVELOPED AND UNIFIED SERIES IN SCIENCE :
BOOK I  ( Pupil's Book - Workbook - Teacher's Guide )
BOOK II  ( Pupil's Book - Workbook - Teacher's Guide )
BOOK III ( Pupil's Book - Workbook - Teacher's Guide )
BOOK IV  ( Pupil's Book - Workbook - Teacher's Guide )
BOOK V   ( Pupil's Book - Workbook - Teacher's Guide )
BOOK VI  ( Pupil's Book - Workbook - Teacher's Guide )
BOOK VII ( Pupil's Book - Workbook - Teacher's Guide )
BOOK VIII ( Pupil's Book - Workbook - Teacher's Guide )
BOOK IX  ( Pupil's Book - Workbook - Teacher's Guide )

Tenth Grade Chemistry ( Pupil's Book - Lab Book - Teacher's Guide )
Tenth Grade Physics  ( Pupil's Book - Lab Book - Teacher's Guide )
Tenth Grade Biology  ( Pupil's Book - Lab Book - Teacher's Guide )
Tenth Grade Geology  ( Pupil's Book - Lab Book - Teacher's Guide )
Eleventh Grade Chemistry ( Pupil's Book - Lab Book - Teacher's Guide )
Eleventh Grade Physics  ( Pupil's Book - Lab Book - Teacher's Guide )
Eleventh Grade Biology  ( Pupil's Book - Lab Book - Teacher's Guide )
Twelfth Grade Chemistry ( Pupil's Book - Lab Book - Teacher's Guide )
Twelfth Grade Physics  ( Pupil's Book - Lab Book - Teacher's Guide )
Twelfth Grade Biology  ( Pupil's Book - Lab Book - Teacher's Guide )
Appendix I : List of Documents

List of Documents

1. An online journal that is called Josoor a bimonthly newsletter
2. Boards of Trustees (Research Centre Kuwait) minutes of the six monthly meetings 1980, 1981
5. General Conference, minutes of the meetings of the year 1975, 1976 (Consultation session - Tashawari).
7. Graphical data with pictures, retrieved media department.
8. Progress in international ready Literacy Studies (Pirls)2011
9. The Arab Bureau of education for the Gulf States (ABEGS) an Introduction, 2001 Published by ABEGS headquarters.
10. The Arab Bureau of education for the Gulf States (ABEGS) Two years of Aspiration and Accomplishments 2005.
11. The Education development project in ABEGS Members States 2004
13. Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMMSS) 2009
16. Interorganizational and interdepartmental communication.