THE DEVELOPMENT OF VISIONARY LEADERSHIP MODEL OF ADMINISTRATOR UNDER CHONGQING COLLEGE OF INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS, CHINA[*]

Li Yin[1], Chalong Thapsri[2] and Thanaploysiri Siribunsobh[3]
[1-3]Faculty of Education Pathumthani University, Thailand
Corresponding Author's Email: liyin12@gmail.com

Abstract

This research aimed to develop a visionary leadership model and evaluate its feasibility for administrators under Chongqing College of International Business and Economics, China. The study adopted a research and development methodology divided into four key stages. The first stage involved studying relevant literature and interviewing five experts in the fields of leadership and educational administration. The information collected was analyzed to determine key components of visionary leadership suitable for the educational context. The second stage involved drafting a visionary leadership model based on six components: vision, flexibility, creativity, motivation, networking, and communication, with a total of 68 indicators. After content validation by five experts using the Content Validity Index (CVI), two items were removed, leaving 66 valid indicators. The third stage consisted of refining the model through a focus group discussion with ten educational experts. Suggestions from the group

led to further revisions, including refining language, eliminating redundancy, and ensuring conceptual clarity. The final model contained 62 indicators.

In the fourth stage, the researcher conducted a feasibility study by distributing questionnaires to 30 school administrators under the College. Results indicated that the model was highly feasible, with all six components receiving the highest level of agreement. The components ranked in descending order of feasibility were vision, motivation, communication, flexibility, networking, and creativity. These findings suggest that the model aligns well with the leadership qualities required for 21st-century school administration.

The research contributes to the theoretical development of educational leadership by integrating both classical and contemporary leadership theories. Practically, it provides a validated framework that can be used for leadership training, policy formulation, and organizational development in educational institutions. It is also adaptable for use in other contexts beyond China. The model's focus on visionary thinking, collaboration, and adaptability makes it particularly relevant to current global challenges in education and administration.

Keywords: Visionary Leadership, Educational Administration, Model Development, Leadership Model

Introduction

China's higher education has expanded quickly while undergoing continuous governance and regulatory reform. Private higher education institutions (HEIs)—minban—now play a pivotal role but must balance market responsiveness with strict compliance and ideological guidance under the Party-committee–led governance model (the "president responsibility system under the leadership of the Party Committee"). This governance logic shapes how institutional vision is drafted, communicated, and enacted. For private colleges, additional layers come from corporate-style boards and shareholder oversight,

which complicate alignment between strategic vision and day-to-day administration. Consequently, administrators require a leadership approach that integrates visionary sense-giving with regulatory and governance fit.

Chongqing College of International Business and Economics (CCIBE) operates two campuses in Hechuan and Tongliang Districts and serves a large undergraduate population in western China's Chengdu–Chongqing Twin-City Economic Circle—a national strategy emphasizing coordinated talent development and regional upgrading. CCIBE's positioning—international business, applied programs, and internationalization—implies distinctive expectations for graduate employability, industry linkage, and cross-border collaboration. These strategic pressures heighten the need for a clear, shared institutional vision that translates regional policy priorities into concrete academic programs, student development pathways, and external partnerships.

Regulatory shifts since 2021—the revised *Implementing Regulations for the Law on the Promotion of Private Education* and associated guidance—raise the bar for compliance, transparency, and classification management in private HEIs. At the same time, national policy emphasizes building a "strong education nation" and stabilizing graduate employment, placing measurable outcome pressure on colleges. Vision that is compelling yet compliant is therefore not optional: it is the organizing device that helps administrators align board expectations, Party committee leadership, academic quality assurance, and graduate outcomes.

Leadership scholarship underscores why a dedicated *visionary* model is appropriate here. Bennis and Nanus identified "attention through vision" and "meaning through communication" as core to mobilizing organizations; Kouzes and Posner's *Inspire a Shared Vision* similarly frames vision as a practice—seeing the future and enlisting others. Empirical work on *effective vision* specifies attributes—brevity, clarity, challenge, stability, future orientation, desirability/ability to inspire—that predict satisfaction, commitment, and

performance. In short, content quality and communication intensity jointly drive enactment. A model that helps CCIBE administrators *formulate* visions with these attributes and *communicate* them through stories, symbols, and cascaded KPIs can accelerate strategy execution under China's unique governance constraints.

The problem is that, in many Chinese HEIs, top leaders are pulled toward managerial transaction (procedures, inspections, and risk control) at the expense of meaning-making and stakeholder mobilization. In private HEIs specifically, quality assurance, legitimacy, and trust remain salient challenges. Without a robust visionary-leadership model tailored to China's governance and regulatory context, institutional visions risk becoming slogans disconnected from faculty behavior, resource allocation, and external partnerships—jeopardizing educational quality and graduate outcomes in a region targeted for talent development. Developing and validating such a model for CCIBE is thus both practically urgent and theoretically valuable.

Objectives

1. To develop a visionary leadership model for educational administrators under Chongqing College of International Business and Economics, China, that is grounded in leadership theories and aligned with contemporary educational needs.

2. To evaluate the feasibility of the developed visionary leadership model in real-world educational settings, focusing on its applicability, clarity, and practical implementation among school administrators.

Literature Review

This study draws upon an extensive body of both international and Thai literature that examines visionary leadership in educational administration. Visionary leadership is widely recognized as a transformational leadership style

that empowers school leaders to develop a clear future direction, promote change, and align personnel and stakeholders toward common educational goals. The review covers four key areas: theoretical concepts, leadership components, empirical studies, and contextual relevance in Thailand.

1. Visionary Leadership Concepts and Theories Visionary leadership has its roots in transformational leadership theory, which emphasizes change, future-oriented thinking, and shared vision. Nanus (1992) defined visionary leaders as individuals who articulate desirable future states, anticipate trends, and inspire their organizations toward meaningful outcomes. According to Bennis and Nanus (1997), such leaders act as role models, displaying strong values, creativity, and the ability to translate vision into strategy. Kirkpatrick et al. (2002) further emphasized communication clarity and organizational alignment, noting that successful leaders consistently reinforce the vision through symbolic actions and practical policies. Kapur (2009) added components such as motivation, ethical conduct, and building networks as essential to visionary leadership. Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory also contributed significantly by showing how leaders must adapt their approach depending on the readiness and maturity of followers. Similarly, Yukl & Lepsinger (2004) highlighted the importance of behavioral flexibility, emotional regulation, and social intelligence in promoting visionary leadership in complex organizations. Thompson (2011) pointed out that visionary leadership depends not only on the articulation of goals but also on building trust through transparent decision-making and consistent communication. These views establish a strong theoretical foundation for identifying the core elements of visionary leadership in the educational context.

2. Components of Visionary Leadership in Educational Settings From the synthesis of major theories and models, visionary leadership in schools commonly includes six core dimensions: Vision: The leader's capacity to foresee institutional development paths and create a clear roadmap aligned with future

educational trends. Flexibility: The ability to respond to contextual shifts and adjust strategies in response to feedback or unforeseen challenges (Yukl & Lepsinger, 2004). Creativity: The encouragement of innovative ideas, particularly in curriculum design, learning technologies, and instructional methodologies (Simonton, 1999; Carmeli et al., 2013). Motivation: Leaders foster a positive work environment by recognizing staff contributions, facilitating professional growth, and encouraging intrinsic motivation (Kwanjira Thongnam, 2004). Networking: Establishing strong collaborative relationships with parents, local agencies, and external stakeholders to broaden support for the school's mission (Stone, 2000). Communication: Employing various channels to ensure clarity, timeliness, and inclusivity in the dissemination of information (Barnlund, 2008; Norton, 2010). These dimensions are reflected across both Western and Eastern educational literature and form the operational backbone of visionary leadership in schools.

3. Empirical Studies Related to Visionary Leadership Numerous international studies have demonstrated the impact of visionary leadership on educational outcomes. For instance: Rina (2009) examined how visionary leadership behaviors affected elementary student performance, especially in reading. Results indicated a direct positive correlation. Kathleen & Vincent (2010) reported that open communication and shared decision-making were key to effective visionary leadership in secondary schools. Heck et al. (2011) confirmed that leadership vision, when communicated well, positively influenced school climate and academic achievement. Taylor et al. (2013) linked visionary leadership to enhanced perceived organizational effectiveness within non-profit education sectors. Dhammika (2014) explored how cultural and religious values moderate the relationship between visionary leadership and employee citizenship behavior. Andacao (2014) showed that integrating team-building and visionary planning led to better conflict management and school success. These

studies underline the tangible and intangible benefits of visionary leadership in various educational contexts.

4. Visionary Leadership in the Thai Educational Context Thailand's move toward educational reform, particularly under the Thailand 4.0 policy, has highlighted the importance of innovative and adaptable leadership. Visionary leadership is seen as a mechanism to modernize teaching practices, digitalize learning environments, and encourage holistic development in schools. Sureephan Senanuch (2010) conducted a case study at Songkhlanagarind Hospital and found that hospital leaders exhibited characteristics of visionary leadership through ethical modeling, vision articulation, and collaborative execution. Thanathorn Suphaklet (2016) studied school administrators under the Secondary Educational Service Area Office 6 and identified high levels of visionary leadership, particularly in fostering teamwork, networking, and long-term strategic planning. Suriya Chiamprachanarak (2006) emphasized motivation as a crucial factor in school leadership. The study found that effective leaders used motivational techniques to create workplace satisfaction and commitment. National Education Commission (2001) proposed a framework that encourages decentralization, community involvement, and flexible leadership at the school level. The policy supports school-based management (SBM), where principals act as visionary agents of change. Wimon Chankaew (2014) developed a leadership model incorporating vision, ethics, participation, and evaluation mechanisms. The findings supported the use of focus groups and Delphi methods in refining visionary frameworks. Banchob Bunchan (2011) also contributed a structural model of leadership development with emphasis on cultural appropriateness and responsiveness to Thailand's socio-political context. These Thai studies validate global leadership models while adapting them to local culture, values, and educational reform goals. Visionary leadership is not a static set of traits but a dynamic, multi-dimensional approach to leading schools through change. The literature consistently points to six integrated components—vision, flexibility,

creativity, motivation, networking, and communication—as foundational to educational leadership success. Empirical studies, both global and Thai, reinforce that visionary leadership improves school climate, innovation, teacher engagement, and ultimately student outcomes. This review establishes a strong academic foundation for developing and validating a visionary leadership model tailored to school administrators in contemporary educational settings, particularly in the Thai and Asian contexts.

Related research

Numerous In order to establish a foundation for the development of a visionary leadership model in educational settings, this study reviewed several key research works—both domestic and international—that have examined visionary leadership and its impact on educational administration, organizational performance, and leadership behavior. These related studies highlight the significance, relevance, and dimensions of visionary leadership and help validate the framework used in this research.

1. International Research

Nanus (1992) emphasized that visionary leaders are defined by their ability to create compelling images of the future and align their organizations toward those goals. His study laid the conceptual groundwork for understanding the behavioral characteristics of future-oriented leaders. Kirkpatrick et al. (2002) conducted empirical research on visionary leadership in private organizations and found that leaders who effectively communicated their vision significantly influenced organizational commitment and job satisfaction among employees. Kathleen & Vincent (2010) explored the characteristics of visionary leadership among school principals in the United States. Their research concluded that the most successful visionary leaders emphasized participatory decision-making, effective communication, and strategic planning. Carmeli, Gelbard & Reiter-Palmon (2013) focused on creativity as a core component of leadership. Their

study highlighted that leaders who encouraged innovation and took calculated risks were more likely to drive institutional success. Heck et al. (2011) analyzed school improvement initiatives and reported that visionary leadership positively influenced teacher collaboration, school culture, and student learning outcomes. Loughead (2009) studied transformational leadership among educational administrators in Pennsylvania and found that visionary leaders scored highest in aspects of motivation, communication, and adaptability. Thanathorn Suphaklet (2016) conducted a study on visionary leadership among administrators in secondary schools under the Office of Secondary Educational Service Area 6. The findings indicated high levels of visionary leadership, particularly in the areas of ethics, teamwork, and innovation. Sureephan Senanuch (2010) studied leadership behaviors in a hospital administration context and found that ethical vision formulation and role modeling were key features of successful leaders. Suriya Chiamprachanarak (2006) explored the link between motivation and leadership in Thai schools. His study revealed that motivated teachers responded better to visionary leaders who recognized their contributions and promoted professional development. Banchob Bunchan (2011) developed a model for educational leadership suitable for Thai cultural and organizational settings. The model emphasized flexibility, moral leadership, and stakeholder collaboration. Wimon Chankaew (2014) utilized the Delphi technique to construct a visionary leadership model for school principals, finding that vision clarity, shared values, and collaborative communication were critical. National Education Commission (2001) promoted school-based management and decentralization. Their recommendations emphasized visionary leadership as a necessary component of educational reform, particularly for school principals who act as agents of change.

Methodology

1. Research Design

This study employs a Research and Development (R&D) design, integrating both qualitative and quantitative methods to ensure comprehensive findings. The research process is divided into four main steps:

1.1 Study of relevant literature and expert interviews – A review of academic works and policy documents related to visionary and transformational leadership, as well as interviews with experts, is conducted to gather essential concepts and frameworks.

1.2 Creation of a visionary leadership model – Based on the literature and qualitative findings, a preliminary model is designed.

1.3 Development and refinement of the model through expert validation – The draft model is presented to experts for feedback and adjustments.

1.4 Evaluation of the model's feasibility – The validated model is tested with administrators to determine its practical applicability and feasibility.

2. Population and Sample

2.1 Qualitative Phase

The qualitative sample consists of five experts in educational leadership, purposively selected using the following criteria:

-Holding a doctoral degree in educational administration or a related field,

-Having experience in school leadership or leadership research,

-Being recognized for expertise in visionary or transformational leadership through publications or professional contributions.

2.2 Quantitative Phase

The quantitative sample includes 30 school administrators under the Provincial Administrative Organization, selected through purposive sampling. These administrators are directly involved in decision-making and leadership,

making them suitable respondents for assessing the feasibility of the developed model.

3. Research Instrument

3.1 Qualitative instruments:

-Semi-structured interview guides for expert interviews.

3.2 Quantitative instruments:

-A questionnaire designed to evaluate the feasibility and practicality of the visionary leadership model. The questionnaire is divided into sections on relevance, clarity, applicability, and effectiveness.

The instruments are validated by experts in educational leadership and measurement to ensure content validity, and reliability testing is conducted using Cronbach's Alpha for the quantitative instrument.

4. Data Collection Procedures

-Qualitative phase: Conduct in-depth interviews with experts and collect additional data from academic sources, policy documents, and institutional reports.

- Quantitative phase: Distribute and collect questionnaires from the selected administrators, ensuring anonymity and voluntary participation

5. Data Analysis

5.1 Qualitative Data Analysis

-Data from expert interviews are analyzed through content analysis, involving coding, categorization, and theme extraction.

-The analysis focuses on identifying core elements and dimensions of visionary leadership relevant to educational administrators.

5.2 Quantitative Data Analysis

-Descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, frequency, percentage) are used to summarize the feasibility results.

-The criteria for interpretation:

4.51–5.00 = Very High

3.51–4.50 = High

2.51–3.50 = Moderate

1.51–2.50 = Low

1.00–1.50 = Very Low

Result

1. Development of the Visionary Leadership Model: The researcher followed a systematic four-step research process to construct the visionary leadership model. The outcomes are as follows: Component Identification: From literature review and expert interviews, six core components of visionary leadership were identified: Vision, Flexibility, Creativity, Motivation, Networking and Communication.

Item Construction and Validation: Initially, 68 behavioral indicators were developed.

Through expert validation using the Content Validity Index (CVI), items with a CVI below 0.80 were removed. The final model included 62 indicators deemed relevant and valid.

Focus Group Discussion: Conducted with 10 experts to refine the model. Suggestions included: merging overlapping items, removing redundant content, and improving clarity of definitions. Finalized model confirmed to be clear, comprehensive, and theoretically grounded.

2. Feasibility Evaluation of the Model: Participants: 30 school administrators under the Provincial Administrative Organization evaluated the feasibility of the model using a 5-point Likert scale. The visionary leadership model showed an overall mean score of 4.83 (SD = 0.17), indicating the highest level of feasibility.

Component-wise Feasibility:

Component	Mean ($\bar{x}$)	SD	Interpretation
Vision	4.87	0.21	Highest
Motivation	4.85	0.21	Highest
Communication	4.85	0.23	Highest
Flexibility	4.83	0.27	Highest
Networking	4.80	0.29	Highest
Creativity	4.79	0.37	Highest

Top-Rated Sub-Indicators:

School administrators setting vision-aligned goals and missions ($\bar{x}$ = 4.97)

Using SWOT analysis for vision planning ($\bar{x}$ = 4.93)

Using motivational strategies to enhance work performance ($\bar{x}$ = 4.95)

Inspiring communication for staff engagement ($\bar{x}$ = 4.91)

These findings confirm that the model is not only theoretically sound but also practically applicable and well-received by professionals in the field.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to develop a visionary leadership model tailored for school administrators under the Provincial Administrative Organization, and to evaluate its feasibility for application in real-world educational contexts. The findings of the study reveal that the developed model, consisting of six core components—Vision, Flexibility, Creativity, Motivation, Networking, and Communication—was deemed highly appropriate and feasible by both expert panels and practicing administrators. This section discusses the implications of these findings considering prior research and prevailing theoretical frameworks.

1. Vision

The component of vision received the highest feasibility score, reaffirming its centrality to effective school leadership. School administrators who articulate

a clear vision and align institutional goals accordingly are better positioned to steer their schools toward innovation and progress. This finding resonates with Nanus (1992) and Bennis and Nanus (1997), who emphasized that visionary leaders must possess the ability to forecast, imagine, and inspire change. Moreover, the finding supports the work of Thompson (2011), who identified visionary clarity as a critical factor in building trust among educational stakeholders. In the Thai context, Sinlarat (2010) argued that visionary administrators earn credibility and promote stakeholder engagement, both of which are reflected in the high scores observed in this study.

2. Motivation

Motivation emerged as the second-highest scoring dimension. This suggests that effective school administrators must inspire personnel by fostering a sense of purpose, satisfaction, and achievement. The result aligns with Thomas (2004), who underscored the importance of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in enhancing employee engagement. Furthermore, Kwanjira Thongnam (2004) and Suriya Chiamprachanarak (2006) stressed that motivation not only improves work performance but also encourages loyalty and commitment. This is particularly relevant in the Thai educational context where morale and retention of qualified teachers remain persistent challenges.

3. Communication

Communication was found to be an equally critical element in visionary leadership. Effective administrators engage in multidirectional communication, including listening, informing, persuading, and providing feedback. This finding corroborates the conclusions of Barnlund (2008) and Norton (2010), who emphasized that clear, persuasive communication enhances team cohesion and organizational efficiency. In the age of digital transformation and borderless information, as emphasized by Pugh (1990), communication becomes not only a managerial function but also a strategic leadership competency.

4. Flexibility

Flexibility, the fourth-ranked component, indicates that adaptive leadership is vital in managing change and uncertainty in school environments. This aligns with the conceptual contributions of Yukl & Lepsinger (2004), who highlighted that visionary leaders must be behaviorally flexible and emotionally intelligent. Moreover, Kaiser et al. (2007) emphasized that flexible leaders can reallocate resources, revising policies, and modifying structures to meet emerging demands. This is further supported by the National Education Commission (2001), which advocated for decentralization and context-sensitive school-based management in Thailand.

5. Networking

Networking reflects the ability of school administrators to mobilize both internal and external resources, and to collaborate with stakeholders such as parents, communities, and educational agencies. The results echo the findings of Jarirat Prakaew et al. (1998) and Ned (2015), who recognized that a strong network promotes shared ownership, interdependence, and collective responsibility. In Thai schools, the emphasis on collaborative governance and community partnerships has been reinforced by policies encouraging MOUs with local entities and private sectors.

6. Creativity

Although creativity ranked lowest among the six components, it remains a vital attribute for visionary school leaders. Creativity enables the formulation of innovative strategies and solutions, particularly in response to pedagogical challenges. This dimension is in line with Simonton (1999) and Carmela et al. (2013), who noted that creative thinking fosters continuous improvement and problem-solving. Batey and Furnham (2006) further highlighted that creative leaders are more open to risk, novelty, and experimentation. The relatively lower rating in this study may be attributed to contextual factors, such as traditional

administrative cultures and limited institutional support for experimentation in Thai schools.

7. Integration with Prior Research

The present study aligns with numerous empirical findings, including those of Kathleen & Vincent (2010), Heck et al. (2011), and Taylor et al. (2013), who demonstrated that visionary leadership is positively associated with school effectiveness, student achievement, and organizational resilience. In the Thai context, the study extends the findings of Thanathorn Suphaklet (2016) and Sureephan Senanuch (2010) by operationalizing visionary leadership into measurable behavioral indicators and confirming their relevance through content validity and feasibility testing.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this research, the following recommendations are proposed for practical implementation and further academic inquiry:

1. Recommendations for Practical Application

1.1 Educational administrators should adopt the developed visionary leadership model as a framework for institutional management, particularly emphasizing vision formulation, strategic flexibility, and innovation.

1.2 Visionary leadership training programs should be implemented to enhance leadership capacity among school administrators, with a focus on communication skills, motivational strategies, and collaborative networking.

1.3 Provincial Administrative Organizations should integrate the visionary leadership model into leadership evaluation and promotion criteria to align with national education reform strategies.

1.4 Schools should promote participatory vision planning by involving stakeholders—teachers, students, parents, and the community—to foster shared ownership of institutional goals.1.5 The application of the visionary leadership

model should be monitored and periodically assessed for effectiveness in improving institutional performance and learner outcomes.

2. Recommendations for Future Research

2.1 Future studies should explore the application of this visionary leadership model in diverse educational contexts, such as private schools, international schools, or urban-rural comparative studies.

2.2 Experimental research should be conducted to assess the causal impact of implementing the model on school effectiveness, student achievement, and teacher engagement.

2.3 Quantitative structural equation modeling (SEM) could be used to test the interrelationships among the six components of visionary leadership in predictive frameworks.

2.4 A longitudinal study could be conducted to evaluate the sustainability and long-term effects of visionary leadership practices on school transformation.

2.5 Cross-cultural comparative research may be undertaken to assess the universality and contextual adaptation of visionary leadership models in different educational systems globally.

Reference

Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985/1997). Leaders: Strategies for taking charge. HarperBusiness. (Summary of core themes).

Carmeli, A., Gelbard, R., & Reiter-Palmon, R. (2013). Leadership, creative problem-China Justice Observer. (2021, Sep 10). Implementing Regulations on the Private Education Promotion Law of China (2021) (explainer).

China Ministry of Education (MOE). (2021, May 17). Implementing Regulations for the Law on the Promotion of Private Education (overview/EN note). Chongqing College of International Business and Economics (CCIBE). About/Why us (institutional overview: campuses, size, programs).

Dhammika, K. A. S. (2014). Visionary leadership and organizational citizenship behavior: The mediating effect of trust and religious influence. Journal of Management Development, 33(4), 356–370. education administrators in Thailand. Journal of Education Administration, 27(3), 109–111.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1993). Management of organizational behavior:

HKTDC Research. (2022, May 24). Chengdu–Chongqing Economic Circle: Objectives and planning rationale.

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (1991). Educational administration: Theory, research,and iChongqing. (2021, Jan 25). The big events of the ChengduChongqing Economic Circle in 2020 (talent cooperation framework). inside out. Jossey-Bass. Journal, 23(1), 77–79.

Kahan, S. (2008). Getting change right: How leaders transform organizations from the Kamol Andacao, J. A. (2014). Visionary leadership and school effectiveness: The role

Kantabutra, S. (2008). What do we know about vision? Journal of Applied Business Research, 24(2), 127–138. (Vision attributes and outcomes).

Kapur, R. (2009). Leadership styles in education: Visionary leadership. Educational

Kathleen, M. R., & Vincent, C. D. (2010). Strategic vision and school planning: A case

Kim, J. H. (2005). Leadership and creativity in education: The Korean perspective. Asia Pacific Education Review, 6(1), 57–66.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (n.d.). The five practices of exemplary leadership (official overview page). Leadership Journal, 17(1), 18–27. multiple challenges and choices. Jossey-Bass.

Nanus, B. (1992). Visionary leadership: Creating a compelling sense of direction for National Education Commission. (2001). National education reform: School-based management policy and guidelines. Office of the Prime Minister, Thailand. of successful leadership. Leadership and Policy in

Schools, 9(2), 99–111. of team building and conflict resolution. Journal of Educational Administration, 52(3), 305–321. organizational effectiveness. Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 34(2), 123–139.

Ozturgut, O. (2011). Quality assurance in private higher education in China. Current Issues in Education, 14(1), 1–10. (Challenges and QA context). practice (4th ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Reuters. (2025, Jan 19). China unveils 2024–2035 plan to build a "strong education nation." Reuters. (2025, Mar 9). China pledges more resources to support employment.

SHS Web of Conferences (Yu, X.). (2023). Internal governance structure and characteristics of private colleges and universities in China (Party-committee-led system).

Simonton, D. K. (1999). Origins of genius: Darwinian perspectives on creativity. Oxford solving capacity, and creative performance: The importance of knowledge sharing. Human Resource Management, 52(1), 95–121.

Suphaklet, T. (2016). Visionary leadership and school safety: A study of secondary

Sureephan, S. (2010). The characteristics of visionary leadership in hospital administration: A case study of Songkhlanagarind Hospital. Journal of Health Systems Research, 4(2).

Taylor, M. J., Cornelius, C. J., & Colvin, K. (2013). Visionary leadership and nonprofit

Thompson, J. R. (2011). Visionary leadership: The power of trust andengagement. University Press.Utilizing human resources (6th ed.). Prentice Hall.

Wu, M., et al. (2023/2025). Research on the corporate governance structure of private universities in Sichuan Province, China (board–president–party committee roles).your organization. Jossey-Bass.

Yukl, G., & Lepsinger, R. (2004). Flexible leadership: Creating value by balancing.