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Ideal Leader and Personal Leadership Philosophy   
Barbuto & Gifford (2002) noted that the notion of servant leadership has inspired many. Education in leadership can be found in a variety of venues (Huber, 2002). At the same time, leadership has a purpose and Townsend identified six possible purposes of leadership (2002). According to Culp & Cox (2002), the context of leadership in the 21st century will revolve on the administrative, catalytic or collaborative, collegial, humanitarian or activist, innovation, religiosity, and visionary. Culp & Cox (2002) also pointed out that partnerships will be important in leading in the 21st century. In building leadership, Curtin (2002) pointed out that there can be two modes, teaching as opposed to facilitating, but building leadership through facilitating is the more common. Cartwright emphasized, “ Everyone has his or her own definition of leadership, most often at the tacit level” (2002, p. 70).   
My ideal leader is one that knows how to follow in order to lead better and serve excellently. Of course, this should not be taken to mean that my ideal leader does not innovate. On the contrary, a leader must be one who is able to see farther than the rest. He or she is a person who lives in the present but is also able to chart the future. This essentially means that he or she effectively leads and is one who does not simply follow the tide. However, no person has a monopoly over good ideas. Many heads can be a lot better than the brightest and most clever head. A leader must recognize this fact and must use participatory methods to unlock the potentials of his or her collective. In other words, a leader must lead to make participatory processes work and exploit the diversity of ideas and use dialogue and discussions to bring out the best ideas.   
Educators live in society and are accountable to society. The business of education is society’s business and not simply of the educator. There are authorities above an educator. Even the President of the United States has an authority to follow---the people of the United States---even as every person of the United States is expected to follow the laws created by Congress and implemented through the Chief Executive or the US President. As educators, we owe it to the American people or to society that we live in that education be conducted according to the vision that authorities before us have charted for our society and for the educational system. Educators live in a structure where there are educational authorities to follow. However, society also allows innovation and within the parameters of norms that our authorities have set, educators can innovate. Educators have ample autonomy but, at the same time, they have basic rules to follow. The maintenance of social order requires that educators must also follow the basic rules even as we innovate, improve, and even change or reform our rules.   
Meanwhile, the philosophy of personal leadership that I try to follow can be described in the following terms: VISION, PARTICIPATION, and DATA/EVIDENCE. Educators must have a vision but in constructing that vision, he or she must enlist the participation of his or her colleagues. No one has a monopoly over knowledge and participation allows us to define a more accurate perception of reality on which we can construct a vision that is most acceptable to many of us. It is only through a vision shaped by participation that we can unleash the energies latent in many of us to realize a vision. Further, promoting participation is the best way to promote the notion of servant leadership. On the other hand, Moore et al. (2010) had proposed that the achievement motivation theory can best explain why participatory leadership works. In constructing a vision that is realistic and appropriate to our times, our bases must be on data. We must also continuously monitor data to find out whether we are realizing our vision or whether we have going astray from our vision. We must also use data as evidence to find out whether our methods work or whether our vision are no longer appropriate to our times and must therefore be changed.   
In summary, my ideal leader is similar to the notion of servant leadership in the literature and I consider my leadership philosophy as an improved version of a concern for data in education that others also call as a data-driven education.   
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