

Distributed leadership in education, contemporary issues in educational leadership

IONIȚĂ (VIȘOIU) Carmen
Valahia University of Târgoviște, Romania
E-mail: ionyta_carmen@yahoo.com

KORAY Sari Yavuz
Valahia University of Târgoviște, Romania
E-mail: koraysari53@gmail.com

GOGLEA Alin Constantin
Valahia University of Târgoviște, Romania
E-mail: alin_goglea@yahoo.com

VASILE Gabriel Ionuț
Valahia University of Târgoviște, Romania
E-mail: ionutvasile2020@yahoo.com

Abstract: In recent decades, the concept of distributed leadership (DL) has become more prevalent in education and has made significant progress in certain theoretical and practical areas. As a result, DL has become a popular concept in educational leadership and is understood as a collective social process that emerges through the interaction of multiple players. In particular, DL is a concept and strategy that is rapidly evolving in school management with the decentralization of the educational system. The purpose of this paper is to review the conceptual and empirical literature on deep learning concepts to identify their origins, main arguments, strengths and weaknesses, and areas for further work. Considers the impact of deep learning on improving the achievement of company goals. The results show that effective principals reconcile the structural, cultural, and agency conditions in which DL is more or less likely to occur. Contemporary evidence from the study supports a positive relationship between deep learning, organizational improvement, and student achievement. The document highlights a number of areas where school leadership can be enhanced, as well as the need to mobilize collective engagement and challenge or strengthen traditional forms of leadership in schools. This article details how to assign leadership in schools to improve learning outcomes.

Keywords: Distributed leadership, education leadership, leadership, learner achievement.

INTRODUCTION

Technological advancements and seemingly ever-changing environmental pressures suggest that educational leaders must review their leadership practices. Changes in educational leadership require school leaders to identify and articulate forms of leadership that meet the needs of the 21st century. In recent years, educational organizations have begun to be guided by more principles of sharing, membership, and democracy. This has led to an accelerated school-based approach to

leadership during the educational decentralization phase, leading to a school-wide spread of leadership.

Changes are taking place in school leadership, and school leaders must reflect on these changes and adapt to improve the achievement of school goals. Leithwood and Jantzi (2000) show that effective school leadership has an indirect but powerful effect on school effectiveness and learner achievement. In other words, the impact of school leadership on school effectiveness and school improvement is significant (Gronn, 2002, 2000; Harris, 2013, 2012; Kruger, 2009; Leithwood et al., 2008; Lumby, 2013; Chava, 2015; Spillane et al., 2004). Harris (2012) reiterates the need for effective leadership in the way school leadership leads the school towards future success. She believes that schools of the future will need multiple, rather than single, leaders if they are to achieve organizational goals. Deep learning is a form of leadership that is prominent in current educational discourse. This means mobilizing expertise at all levels of the school, creating more opportunities for change and building capacity for improvement. Harris (2012:9) argues that “as school organizations become more complex, fragmented and interconnected, different forms of governance and influence are required to cope with the rapidly changing learning environment”. Democratization and decentralization of the education system.

The traditional one-person leadership metaphor of a leader as a hero has been replaced by the concept of DL, which sees leadership as a process that spans the entire organization. A growing body of literature and empirical research shows that no one style or one person can build and maintain an efficient educational institution. Careful (Gronn, 2008) leadership and identification of teacher expertise is required to enable transformation across the system. School leaders today and tomorrow go beyond heroic individual efforts. For example, Woods (2004) argues that it is not possible, or even desirable, for a single person to take on all managerial responsibilities within a school and maximize learner achievement. In an organization (Gronn, 2008), there is rarely only one leader and a few followers.

DL has become a popular representation of postheroic (Badaracco, 2001) leadership in schools, especially in developed and developing countries, which encourages focus on individual leaders found in traditional traits, situational styles attitudes and behavioral shifts, and elevate the theory of change to leadership. School leadership (Northhouse, 2007) is understood as a collective social process that emerges through the interaction of multiple players. In an article titled Distributed Attributes: A New Architecture for Leadership, Gronn (2000) outlines the concept of distributed leadership as a possible solution to the perception of leadership in organizations as a single The trend of people bands. Harris (2014) shows that deep learning focuses primarily on the interactions and dynamics of leadership practices, rather than the formal roles and responsibilities traditionally associated with leaders. Rather, leadership practices in schools are important when the school's goal is to ensure better teaching and achieve better learning outcomes for all learners. More recently, Spillane and Coldren (2011) suggested that the adoption of a distributed framework under the right conditions facilitates organizational development and subsequent high-quality learning outcomes in schools.

Deep learning in educational administration is one of the most influential ideas in educational leadership. The idea of DL as "shared leadership within and across schools" (Harris, 2008: 16) resonates with researchers, policymakers, practitioners, and educational reformers around the world (Harris, 2008; Leithwood et al. , 2009; Spillane, 2006). According to Heck and Hallinger (2009), deep learning in educational organizations is a participatory or collaborative decision-making process involving teachers, administrators, students, and parents. It increases the opportunities for school organizations to benefit from the skills of several of its members, enables school staff to leverage the breadth of their individual strengths, and develops among members a more comprehensive understanding of interdependence and how individual behavior affects organizations entire. This creates comparative advantage when individuals and groups in different positions within an organization take leadership roles in their most influential areas of organizational activity. Using the holistic form of DL (Gronn, 2002), solutions within the school structure are possible that would rather come from individual sources.

DL initially evolved into a utility that allowed leaders to share their ever-increasing workload (Tiana et al., 2016). In recent decades, the concept of DL in education has gained unprecedented independence and popularity (Bolden, 2011). In this article, the authors explore and examine the concept of deep learning, its origins, strengths, and weaknesses, especially in teaching leadership. This paper draws on the extensive research literature to examine the available empirical evidence on deep learning and organizational outcomes. It also explores the lineage of the concept and its recent rise in schools. The authors review major theoretical developments in the field and the ways in which these ideas have been adopted and applied in educational contexts.

Learn about distributed leadership in schools

The concept of DL overlaps with several other terms, such as shared leadership (SL), collaborative leadership (CL), democratic and participatory leadership concepts. Any attempt to provide a well-defined definition for deep learning fails to capture the complexity and inherent paradox of the concept, which may prevent some of the ongoing debates and discussions that are unavoidable and feasible. DL is a rather vague term. It is recognized that the term DL is increasingly used in educational leadership discourse and is currently receiving a lot of attention and growing support (Gronn, 2000; Spillane et al., 2001). However, as Bennett et al. (2003:2) claim that there seems to be little agreement on what these terms mean, and that interpretations and understandings vary. Bennett (2003) argues that deep learning is best viewed as "a way of thinking about leadership" rather than another technique or practice (p. 2). Harris and Lambert (2003, p. 4) argue that DL focuses on "embedding expertise wherever it exists" within an organization, rather than seeking it only through formal positions or roles. I also think it goes against the traditional school concept

Leadership Assumes that school leaders manage hierarchies and structures as individuals, DL is characterized by a collective, shared form of leadership practice in which everyone in the school participates according to his or her expertise. As Elmore (2000:14) acknowledges, in "knowledge-intensive enterprises, such as teaching and learning, these complex tasks cannot be accomplished without a broad distribution of leadership responsibilities among organizational roles. A core

element of deep learning is to revolve around individuals. The use of skills and abilities creates a culture of shared expectations. According to Leithwood et al. (2009:1) For most authors, deep learning can be viewed as shared, democratic, distributed, and other forms of leadership.

For these authors, the primary concern is how leadership should be distributed for the most beneficial results, usually measured by student learning outcomes. Elmore (2000) adds that deep learning implies multiple sources of guidance and direction following the contours of expertise among members of an organization, aligned through a shared culture. DL means mobilizing leadership at all levels of the school to create more opportunities for change and build capacity for improvement. High-performing schools allocate leadership broadly and wisely (Leithwood et al., 2009). It is "the glue for improvement of a common task or instructional goal, and a common set of values to accomplish that task" (Elmore, 2000: 15). However, this does not mean that no one is ultimately responsible for the overall performance and leadership of the school, or that those in formal leadership positions are fired. Instead, the role of those in formal leadership positions is primarily to keep the various parts of the organization in productive relationships.

DL corresponds to maximizing the capabilities of people within an organization. Woods (2004:441) affirms that DL is about "additional dynamism as a product of collaborative activity - people working together in a way that combines initiative and expertise", with the result that a product or energy is greater than the sum of their individual actions. Also, as Leithwood et al. (2007) point out that DL emergencies do not necessarily flatten the hierarchical structure of fragmented and differentiated leadership across different roles. Instead, deep learning will acknowledge the cooperative existence of hierarchical and fluid structures in organizations. These holistic forms assume that the whole of management is greater than the sum of its parts and that there is a high degree of interdependence among those responsible for management. The holistic form of DL produces leadership activities that stem from dynamic, multidirectional, social processes that at best result in learning for the people involved and their organizations. Interdependence between two or more organizational members may be based on overlapping roles or complementarity of skills and knowledge (Gronn, 2002).

According to Heck and Hallinger (2009), deep learning in educational organizations is a participatory or collaborative decision-making process involving administrators, teachers, students, and parents. On the other hand, Spillane et al. (2001) viewed DL as a process that first involves distributing work among leaders and followers, and then integrating the work done by team members. Spiran et al. (2001:25) defined deep learning as "the collective characteristic of a group of leaders working together to accomplish a specific task, resulting in the development of leadership practices that may be greater than the sum of each individual's practice".

The term DL has multiple meanings and is associated with various practices. According to Harris (2014), the main characteristics of deep learning are:

- All actions focus primarily on improving the educational experience of students.
- Interdependence between learners, followers and their situations.

- Each member is valued and supported in their professional practice.
- Leadership occurs through interaction, influencing practices and organizational routines.
- Recognize that leadership does not depend only on the principal and vice-principal.
- There is a sense of community.
- Continuous learning is considered the norm for teachers and learners.
- It is recognized that everyone contributes to the overall good of the organization.
- Relevant expertise is recognised and rewarded.
- Create and redesign appropriate structures to provide opportunities for collaborative and participatory decision-making.
- There is an atmosphere of trust among teachers.
- Leadership can be exercised through formal positions and informal roles and actions.
- Collaborative and participatory leadership across the school organization, enabling people to work together to improve teaching and learning.
- A leader's job is a whole greater than the sum of its parts, providing a high degree of interdependence among leaders.

Strengthening Distributed Leadership Approaches

The concepts of deep learning overlap greatly with the concepts of shared leadership, collaboration, democracy, and participatory leadership. Deep learning starts with a set of practices implemented by people at all levels, rather than a set of individual characteristics and attributes at the top, which gives this approach a lot of power. Deep learning has many personal and organizational benefits. Compared to purely hierarchical forms of leadership, DL more accurately reflects the division of labor experienced in an organization on a daily basis, and reduces the potential for error in decisions based on the limited information available to a single leader. DL improves an organization's ability to leverage the skills of several of its members, enabling members to leverage the breadth of their individual strengths and gain a more complete understanding of how interdependence among members of the organization and how their own actions affect the organization as a whole. When DL operates When good, individuals are accountable for their leadership behavior, new leadership, roles created, collaborative teamwork is the way of work, and interdependent work is a cultural norm. Elmore (2000) describes it as comparative advantage, where individuals and groups at different positions within an organization play a leadership role in their most influential areas of organizational activity. In the context of teamwork, DL provides more opportunities for members to learn from each other.

Greater involvement in decision-making improves commitment to organizational goals and strategies. DL has the potential to add to the leadership development experience in the workplace, and the enhanced empowerment that DL brings can enhance members' work experience. This leadership enables members to better anticipate and respond to the demands of the organizational environment. Under the assumptions of DL (Gronn, 2000), solutions that are unlikely to emerge from a single source are possible, and the overlapping actions that take place in a DL setting further reinforce the management impact.

Tian et al. (2016) hypothesized that deep learning may have a positive impact on student learning, teacher morale, and student transition, with some critics suggesting that this enhancement may be rhetorical. On the other hand, Lumby (2013:582) warns that DL "balances staff with increased workload and responsibility," but teacher autonomy is instructive when it comes to exercising power. When leadership teams are cohesive, deep learning can significantly improve organizational engagement and teacher job satisfaction. In some cases, however, teacher engagement appeared to decline when multiple leaders oversaw.

Reviewing the literature on deep learning has significant implications for future research. It is important to address and minimize conceptual and methodological challenges related to deep learning. While it may be difficult to arrive at a universal use and definition of DL (Mayrowetz, 2008), research into the outcomes and impacts of such governance in schools should be guided by a shared understanding of what leadership assignments involve. the meaning of. This is critical to ensure that research findings are comparable and can be used to build a solid evidence base, which in turn can inform policy and practice.

The viability of DL in schools depends on several variables. These are the level of control and autonomy allowed by school leaders, the school's organizational structure and institutions, the social and cultural context of the school system, and the dynamics of DL development (Bennett et al., 2003). . All of these variables need to be considered to determine whether deep learning is feasible in schools. In some cases, other forms of leadership, or a combination thereof, may be preferable and beneficial for the continued development of the school. One direction for future research might be to explore the connection between deep learning and other forms of leadership. Regardless of the conditions at the time, it would be unwise or suicidal for the school system to implement DL. The literature on DL shows a tendency to focus only on the theoretical underpinnings of DL and separate it from practice. For example, the relationship between DL and democratic leadership is of interest to scholars (Gronn, 2008). While perfecting the conceptual underpinnings of deep learning requires exploring its connections to other conceptual domains, a key question for any leadership model remains whether it can significantly contribute to student learning outcomes.

The literature suggests that DL, like other school governance strategies, has some drawbacks. The literature review clearly shows the need for further research on the impact of deep learning on student learning outcomes. Because there is no further evidence of the impact of deep learning on learning outcomes, this model risks retaining the notion of intuitive leadership with limited or no

impact on educational policy or practice. On a theoretical level, deep learning is an analytical framework for understanding leadership practices. A distributed perspective can serve as a tool for school leaders, providing a set of structures that can be used to develop diagnostics and inform the design process (Spillane et al., 2004). Deep learning can be used both as a diagnostic tool and as a design tool to gain insight into leadership practices within and across schools. It gives schools an opportunity to take a step back and think carefully about how leadership is distributed and what impact that distribution may or may not have had. Leadership strategy provides another potentially insightful way to track, analyze and describe complex patterns of interaction, influence and action.

The point is that DL is not necessarily good or bad practice in school; it depends on the context in which leadership is assigned and the primary goal of the assignment. Deep learning offers a real opportunity to look at leadership through a new and alternative lens, challenging the tacit understanding of the relationship between leader and follower. In fact, followers can be a key factor in defining leadership through their interactions with leaders. It raises the possibility that leadership can have a significant impact on organizational change when leadership practices are purposefully assigned or orchestrated. Deep learning is not a panacea, blueprint, or recipe, but a way to gain insight into leadership practices or to look at them differently and illuminate the possibilities of organizational transformation. The main questions raised in this paper show that successful leaders are those who can assign leadership, understand relationships, and recognize the importance of mutual learning processes leading to common goals; they assign leadership to facilitate organizational development and change.

Conclusion

This post attempts to provide an overview of the field of deep learning, how it has developed, its strengths and limitations. The concept of DL has been shown to involve expanding a school's leadership role beyond formal leadership or administrative positions and represents the most influential ideas to emerge in the field of educational leadership over the past decade. The idea of DL as shared leadership within and between schools resonates with researchers, policymakers, practitioners, and educational reformers around the world. While the idea of shared, collaborative or participatory leadership is far from new, deep learning theory offers new perspectives on familiar leadership styles. The paper emphasizes that DL is unlikely to flourish or sustain without customer support. Effective school leaders orchestrate the structural, cultural, and agency conditions in which DL is more or less likely to occur. They play a key role in distributing leadership and are a key component in building leadership across the school. High, school leadership occupies a key position in the teacher leadership equation and is at the center of the work transformation needed to bring distributed leadership into school life. A distributed view of leadership suggests a changing role for principals. The shift is quite dramatic and can be summed up as a shift from decision makers at the top of an organization to thinking about its core role, namely developing the leadership and skills of others, and practicing from a distributed perspective, interaction and key parts of leadership. The implication for school leaders is that they are an important part of the school leadership practice, but there are other sources of influence and

direction. Contemporary evidence from the paper tends to support a positive relationship between deep learning, organizational improvement, and student achievement. The research conducted also outlines and highlights the importance of deep learning as a potential contributor to positive organizational change and improvement. It is seen as an important part of raising standards and improving school performance. Despite the warnings from many in the research community, DL is clearly advocated and supported in education policy around the world. On the other hand, there is evidence that some forms of collective leadership or distributed influence have modest but significant indirect effects on student learning. Meeting the educational demands of the 21st century requires greater leadership and skills than ever before, within schools, across schools, and between schools. Deep learning research shows that, under the right conditions, multiple or collective influences can positively impact organizational outcomes. Many would argue that the primary goal of leadership in the 21st century is innovation. Use DL-Frame to generate innovation through sharing and collaboration. This article summarizes the evidence base on the impact of DL and its impact. There is growing evidence that there is a positive relationship between deep learning, organizational improvement, and student achievement. Therefore, in the future, it is very likely that ongoing discussions and debates about distributed leadership will take place at the intersection of practice, research, and theory. Delegating the idea of distributed leadership to people who implement and practice it in schools seems not only timely, but an important step in its next phase of development. While DL's ideas are not their critics, contemporary literature continues to demonstrate a positive relationship between shared leadership and improved organizational performance, making this strategy a powerful strategy for use in education.

References

1. Badaracco, J. L. (2001). We do not need another hero. *Harvard Business Review*, 97(8): 120-126.
2. Bennett, N., Harvey, J. A., Wise, C., and Wood, P. A. (2003). Distributed leadership: A desk study. [www.ncsl.org.uk/literature reviews](http://www.ncsl.org.uk/literature%20reviews).
3. Bolden, R. (2011). Distributed leadership in organizations: A review of theory and research. *International Journal of Management Review*, 13: 251–269.
4. Chapman, C., Lindsay, G., Muijs, D., Harris, A., Arweck, E., and Goodall, J. (2010). Governance, leadership and management in Federations of schools. *School effectiveness and school improvement*, 22(1): 53-75.
5. Day, C., Sammons, P., Hopkins, D., Harris, A., Leithwood, K, Gu., Q., Penlington, C., Methton, P., and Kingston, A. (2007). The impact of school leadership on pupils' outcome: Interim Report. National college of school leadership. Nottingham UK.
6. Elmore, R. (2000). Building a new structure for school leadership. Washington, DC: Albert Shanker Institute.
7. Gibb, C. A. (1954). Leadership. In Lindzey, G. (ed), *Hand book of social psychology*, Reading, MA: Addison- Wesley, (2): 877-917.
8. Giddens, A. (1979). *Central Problems in Social Theory*. London: Macmillans.

9. Gronn, P. (2000). Distributed properties: a new architecture for leadership. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 28(3): 317-338.
10. Gronn, P. (2002). Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis. *Leadership Quarterly*, 13: 423-451.
11. Gronn, P. (2008). The future of distributed leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 46: 141-158.
12. Harris, A. (2008) *Distributed leadership: b Developing tomorrow's leaders*. London: Routledge Publishers.
13. Harris, A. (2009). *Distributed school leadership*. Netherlands: Springer Press.
14. Harris, A. (2012) *Leadership system transformation*. *School Leadership and Management*, 3: 179-209.
15. Harris, A. (2013). Distribute leadership: Friend or foe? *Educational Management and Administration*, 41(5): 545-554.
16. Harris, A. (2014). *Distributed Leadership Matters: Perspectives, Practices, and Potentials*. Corwin: Sage Publication.
17. Harris, A., and Lambert, L. (2003). *Building leadership capacity for school improvement*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press
18. Harris, A., and Muijs, D. (2004). *Improving schools through teacher leadership*. London: Open University Press.
19. Harris, A., and Spillane, J. (2008). *Distributed leadership through the looking glass: Management in Education*. Sage Publication.
20. Harris, A., Leithwood, K., Day, C., Sammon, P., and Hopkins, D. (2007). *Distributed leadership and organizational change: Reviewing the*

(1) All the following items should be listed in both Romanian and English: title, author (please mark the corresponding author with *), affiliation (department, faculty, and university), address, zip code, country, email address.

(2) The articles should be published in English. The translation into English should be faithful to the Romanian variant, including summary (or abstract), key words, titles of figures and tables as well as bibliography. The English variant should comply with the well-known equivalence of the scientific terms. The author or the authors are required to have articles in Romanian and also in English, all the content: abstract, key words, body and bibliography. The Editorial board is entitled to translate the title, the abstract and the key words and the editorial assistants will check the English translation faithfulness.

(3) The title should be no more than 20 words, refined and distinct. Abbreviations should be avoided in the title. Subtitle can be added as needed.

(4) The English abstract is an accurate and short summarization without explanation or comments of the paper. It should reflect the main information of the paper briefly and clearly. The abstract

of the articles will have no more than 100 words (between seven and ten lines), being followed by five key words (key expressions) arranged in the decreasing order of their importance

(5) The keywords should reflect the feature of the paper, and be in favor of literature retrieval. The keywords should be at least 3 and no more than 5, separated by semicolon.

(6) After the abstract, JEL classification will be inserted in the system available on <http://www.aeaweb.org>

(7) The texts will be edited in Word under Windows, as it follows ([article template - download here](#)):

Paper size A4;

At single line;

Letter size 12;

Font Time New Roman;

Top, Bottom, Right, Left 1,27.

Normal style for the text formatting.

The texts should not exceed more than 15 pages A4, inclusively notes and bibliography. Do not use in excess highlighting techniques (bold, italic, underline, quotations etc.).

The articles will consist of chapters of the 1st degree, subchapters and paragraphs. The title will be written in capitals, using a size twice bigger than that for the rest of the text. The titles and the subtitles should be relevant for the content and well thought-up. The chapters and the subchapters should be numbered in decimal system, and the subchapters should be at least of two degrees of subordination for each chapter.

The titles of inferior degree should be numbered and placed at the head of each line structured (in decreasing order) as follows: bold, bold italic; italic. (e.g.: Value Added Tax /Law/Specificity). The paragraphs (first line) should start at 0.5 cm from the text margin. The enumerations are made with bullets or dash, at a considerable distance from the margin where the paragraphs start.

(8) Tables, graphs, accounting formula should not be scanned or used separately in other contexts and then copied in the paper. The table and the figures should have short and precise titles. All their notes should be written under them, not in the foot page. The tables should have well built up heads, with names from the columns and the rows as well as the units of measure between squared parentheses

The formulas should be numbered and the number should be written between round parentheses and will be placed in the right side of the page. The formula should also be centered. The units of measure should be those of International System, respecting the correct symbolization (e.g.: bar instead of “bari”; kW not “KW”; “s”, not “sec”; m3 instead of “mc” etc.). The tables should have their titles above them, and the figures (graphs or images), a legend under them, at a distance of 0.5 cm from the table or the figure. Between figures, (tables, formulas) and text should be left (up and bottom) at distance of 0.5 cm. The formulas, figures and tables as long as the legends to

the figures and table titles shall be written in the same font as the text, but in a lower mark (e.g.: within the text with Arial Narrow 11 and within the table Arial Narrow 9).

The formulas, figures and tables shall be numbered separately within the article (example: Formula no. 1, Figure no. 1, Table no. 1, Figure no. 2, Table no. 2). All figures and all tables shall be mentioned within the text (e.g.: „As shown in Table no.1, ...”) or shall be marked between round brackets, such as (Figure no. 1).

The graphics shall be processed in Excel or Word (excluding scanning), the explanations from the graphics shall be written in text boxes in Time New Roman 9, and shall be no more than 8 cm high (small graphics) or 16 cm (large graphics).

The equations shall be written with the equation editor in Time New Roman 9, and the multiplication mark shall be represented as „×” and not „•” (dot).

The tables’ are drawn in Word, with the 9 Time New Roman font, the last rubrics for the sums are aligned to the right. The sign % is written in front of the equal sign, over the accounts symbols (to the left or to the right there can be several accounts) written in ”justified”.

(9) The references to the ideas and quotations from the text must follow these criteria: (Green, D. 1998: pp. 66-69). The author and the book quoted must be detailed in the bibliography from the end of the article. The expression “et altera” must be used when the paper has more than two authors (Green, D., Black, M. et altera, 1998: pp. 70-71). When an author with several publications in the same year is quoted, the small letters a, b, c must be used. E.g.: (Kaplan, R. 1999a: pp. 91-92).

(10) The notes, marked within the text with „[1]”, shall be placed in the order of their apparition at the end of the article (not as a foot note), before the bibliography, with the title “Notes”.

(11) The bibliography shall be written in a regular manner (not in a table), in alphabetical order at the end of the article at 10 Time New Roman. The name of the author shall be written in a regular manner while the title of the work and the name of the publication shall be written in italics with quotation marks. The translation of the bibliography into the English language shall be done as follows: the title of the paper shall be translated into English, in italics and with quotation marks, and then there is the publishing house.

(12) Other necessary materials (latest ISI requirements)

The papers must have the following annexes:

- The pictures of the authors (original or scanned with a 300 dpi resolution);
- A few bibliographical data (regarding profession) in no more than 3-4 lines;
- Abstracts of the published papers in Romanian and in English;
- Home address, e-mail address, telephone number and mobile phone number.

(13) Other specifications: - The paper is published on the author’s own responsibility observing the laws on privacy and patent.

- According to the editing rules, the manuscripts, the figures published will not be returned to the author.

- The author must guarantee the technical and scientific content of the article and the article must be the final version as during editing no other changes to the article can be brought.

(14) The author is responsible for obtaining the copyright approval for all the quotations and reproductions from the article including the images, tables, graphics, figures or excerpts included in the paper.