



From Normal Science to Paradigm Change: A Kuhnian Analysis of Educational Management Theory and Practice

Yusuf Fathurrahman

Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung, Indonesia

* yusuffathurrahman@gmail.com

Received: January 2026; Revised: April 2026; Accepted: May 2026

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.33852/jurnalin.v10i1.710>

Abstract:

Educational management is increasingly confronted with complex challenges arising from technological transformation, market-oriented governance, ethical crises, and the growing gap between institutional effectiveness and humanistic educational values. These conditions indicate the emergence of anomalies that question the adequacy of the dominant educational management paradigm. This study aims to analyze contemporary educational management through Thomas Kuhn's concepts of normal science, anomalies, and paradigm change, while exploring the possibility of a more humanistic and prophetic management paradigm. The study employed a qualitative approach with a library research design. Data were collected from primary and secondary scholarly sources and analyzed through data condensation, data display, and conclusion verification. The findings reveal that contemporary educational management functions as a form of normal science characterized by dominant assumptions regarding efficiency, accountability, and performance measurement. However, this paradigm simultaneously generates anomalies, including ethical problems, dehumanization, governance weaknesses, and the marginalization of moral and spiritual dimensions. The accumulation of these anomalies indicates a potential paradigm crisis and the need for transformation toward a humanistic and prophetic educational management model. The implications of this study suggest that educational management should move beyond technocratic and performance-oriented approaches by integrating ethical, humanistic, and prophetic values into institutional governance, leadership, and policy practices.

Key Words: *Educational Management, Paradigm Change, Humanistic and Prophetic Management*

Abstrak:

Manajemen pendidikan semakin dihadapkan pada tantangan kompleks yang timbul dari transformasi teknologi, tata kelola berorientasi pasar, krisis etika, dan meningkatnya kesenjangan antara efektivitas kelembagaan dan nilai-nilai pendidikan humanistik. Kondisi tersebut mengindikasikan munculnya anomali yang mempertanyakan kecukupan paradigma manajemen pendidikan yang dominan. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis manajemen pendidikan kontemporer melalui konsep Thomas Kuhn tentang ilmu normal, anomali, dan perubahan paradigma, sambil mengeksplorasi kemungkinan paradigma manajemen yang lebih

humanistik dan profetik. Studi ini menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif dengan desain penelitian perpustakaan. Data dikumpulkan dari sumber ilmiah primer dan sekunder dan dianalisis melalui kondensasi data, tampilan data, dan verifikasi kesimpulan. Temuan tersebut mengungkapkan bahwa manajemen pendidikan kontemporer berfungsi sebagai bentuk ilmu pengetahuan normal yang ditandai dengan asumsi dominan mengenai efisiensi, akuntabilitas, dan pengukuran kinerja. Namun, paradigma ini secara bersamaan menimbulkan anomali, antara lain masalah etika, dehumanisasi, kelemahan tata kelola, dan marginalisasi dimensi moral dan spiritual. Akumulasi anomali tersebut mengindikasikan potensi krisis paradigma dan perlunya transformasi menuju model manajemen pendidikan humanistik dan profetik. Implikasi dari penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa manajemen pendidikan harus bergerak melampaui pendekatan teknokratis dan berorientasi kinerja dengan mengintegrasikan nilai-nilai etis, humanistik, dan profetik ke dalam tata kelola kelembagaan, kepemimpinan, dan praktik kebijakan.

Kata Kunci: *Manajemen Pendidikan, Ilmu Normalisasi, Manajemen Humanistik dan Kenabian*

INTRODUCTION

The contemporary world is experiencing unprecedented social, technological, and cultural transformations that fundamentally reshape how educational institutions operate and fulfill their responsibilities (Lathifah et al., 2025; Ngubane et al., 2025). Education is no longer viewed merely as a mechanism for transmitting knowledge but as a strategic instrument for developing human capital, social cohesion, ethical citizenship, and sustainable development (Yılmaz, 2026). Consequently, educational management has become a crucial determinant of institutional effectiveness because it influences how educational goals are formulated, resources are allocated, and learning processes are organized (Yokuş, 2022). Effective educational management is therefore essential not only for improving academic outcomes but also for responding to societal expectations regarding equity, accountability, and moral responsibility. Numerous international studies indicate that educational institutions are increasingly required to adapt to digitalization, globalization, and changing labor market demands while maintaining educational quality and inclusiveness (Yılmaz, 2026; Yokuş, 2022). These developments demonstrate that educational management is not a neutral technical activity but a dynamic system shaped by underlying assumptions and values. Therefore, understanding the paradigmatic foundations of educational management becomes increasingly important because the sustainability and relevance of educational institutions depend on their ability to respond to changing societal realities.

Despite its strategic importance, educational management faces increasingly complex challenges that question the adequacy of existing management frameworks (Omar et al., 2024; Peddi & Manoharan, 2026). Educational institutions are confronted with growing demands for efficiency, technological integration, innovation, and accountability while simultaneously being expected to preserve ethical values, social justice, and human development (Ngubane et al., 2025; Olaniyan & Uzorka, 2024). In many contexts, managerial

success is measured primarily through quantifiable indicators such as academic performance, institutional rankings, and graduate employability. This orientation often reduces education to a technical and economic enterprise, marginalizing broader humanistic and moral objectives. Scholars have argued that excessive reliance on managerial rationality may create tensions between organizational effectiveness and educational values, resulting in a disconnect between institutional performance and social responsibility (Modise et al., 2025; Musundire, 2025). Such conditions indicate that many educational management practices continue to operate within an established paradigm that prioritizes measurable outcomes while overlooking emerging contradictions. As these contradictions become more visible, questions arise regarding whether the prevailing assumptions of educational management remain capable of addressing contemporary educational realities.

The existence of these contradictions can be observed in various educational contexts, particularly within developing countries and Islamic educational institutions. Rapid technological advancement has encouraged schools and universities to adopt digital management systems and market-oriented governance models; however, these innovations have not always been accompanied by improvements in ethical leadership and institutional integrity (Cooper & Köprülü, 2024; Lathifah et al., 2025). Cases involving the misuse of educational funds, weak transparency mechanisms, and ineffective governance continue to emerge in various educational organizations, including pesantren and other faith-based institutions (Carstensen & Emmenegger, 2023). At the same time, educational policies frequently emphasize competitiveness and workforce preparation while paying insufficient attention to spiritual, moral, and character development. These phenomena suggest the presence of anomalies within contemporary educational management. While the dominant management paradigm promises effectiveness, accountability, and quality improvement, practical realities reveal persistent ethical, social, and humanistic problems that remain unresolved (Bates, 2006). Such inconsistencies indicate that the existing paradigm may no longer provide adequate explanations or solutions for emerging educational challenges.

The concept of paradigm proposed by Thomas Kuhn provides a valuable theoretical framework for understanding such conditions. According to Kuhn, scientific development occurs through periods of normal science in which a scientific community operates within a shared paradigm consisting of theories, methods, values, and exemplary practices. During this phase, researchers focus on solving problems within established assumptions rather than questioning the paradigm itself. However, anomalies inevitably emerge when empirical realities cannot be adequately explained by prevailing theoretical frameworks. Previous studies have extensively employed Kuhn's paradigm theory to analyze developments in science, education, and Islamic thought. Putri and Iskandar (2020) examined paradigm shifts in educational development, while Ulya and

Abid (2024) and Fathurrohman (2015) explored the relevance of Kuhnian concepts for Islamic educational epistemology. These studies successfully demonstrate the applicability of Kuhn's ideas beyond the natural sciences. Nevertheless, their discussions primarily focus on knowledge production, educational philosophy, and scientific transformation rather than the specific dynamics of educational management.

Other studies have further expanded Kuhn's framework by connecting scientific revolutions with curriculum reform, educational innovation, and management information systems. Ulinuha and Sibawaihi (2023) as well as Anwar (2023) emphasized the need for paradigm shifts in Islamic education, particularly concerning curriculum design, teaching methods, and evaluation systems. Meanwhile, Paryanti et al. (2025) applied Kuhn's model to Decision Support Systems literature and identified signs of paradigmatic crisis within Management Information Systems research. Although these contributions enrich the understanding of paradigm change across different disciplines, they leave an important gap. Existing studies have not explicitly conceptualized educational management itself as a form of normal science characterized by dominant assumptions, institutional routines, and problem-solving mechanisms that generate anomalies over time. Consequently, the relationship between educational management, anomaly accumulation, and paradigm transformation remains insufficiently explored. This gap is significant because educational management serves as the operational foundation through which educational philosophies and policies are translated into institutional practice.

Addressing this gap, the present study proposes a philosophical analysis of educational management through Thomas Kuhn's concepts of normal science, anomalies, and paradigm change. The novelty of this research lies in its effort to reinterpret contemporary educational management—particularly within Islamic educational contexts as an established paradigm that simultaneously produces unresolved ethical, humanistic, and governance-related anomalies. This study argues that many persistent problems in educational management should not merely be viewed as technical failures but as indicators of deeper paradigmatic limitations. Therefore, the central research question is: How can contemporary educational management be understood as a form of normal science, and to what extent do existing anomalies indicate the need for paradigm transformation? By answering this question, the study contributes to the philosophical discourse on educational management, extends the application of Kuhn's paradigm theory beyond traditional epistemological discussions, and offers a conceptual foundation for developing more ethical, humanistic, and contextually relevant management paradigms in contemporary education.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employed a qualitative approach with a library research design. The qualitative approach was selected because the purpose of the study

was not to measure variables quantitatively but to interpret and critically analyze philosophical concepts related to educational management through Thomas Kuhn's paradigm framework. Library research was considered appropriate because the object of investigation consisted of ideas, theories, and conceptual arguments contained in scholarly literature rather than observable field phenomena (Cernasev & Axon, 2023). Consequently, the setting of this research was situated within academic literature discussing paradigms, scientific revolutions, educational management, and Islamic educational management. The primary data source was Thomas Kuhn's seminal work, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, while secondary sources included peer-reviewed journal articles, books, conference proceedings, and other scholarly publications relevant to educational management and philosophy of science.

Data collection was conducted through documentation techniques involving the systematic identification, selection, review, and classification of relevant literature (Mbanaso et al., 2023; Tischer, 2022). The collected materials were selected based on their academic credibility, relevance to the research objectives, and contribution to discussions on paradigm change and educational management. During the data collection process, important concepts, arguments, and findings related to paradigms, normal science, anomalies, crises, and educational management practices were recorded and categorized. This procedure enabled the researcher to construct a comprehensive understanding of the theoretical foundations of educational management and to identify indications of anomalies within contemporary educational practices, particularly in the context of Islamic educational management.

Data analysis followed the interactive qualitative model consisting of data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing or verification. Data condensation involved selecting, simplifying, and organizing information relevant to the concepts of paradigm, normal science, anomalies, and educational management (Chand, 2025; Lester et al., 2020). Subsequently, the data were displayed through thematic categorization and analytical narratives to facilitate conceptual comparison between the ideal claims of educational management and the practical problems reported in the literature, such as ethical crises, governance weaknesses, and dehumanization. Finally, conclusions were drawn and continuously verified through critical philosophical interpretation based on Kuhn's theoretical framework. To ensure the trustworthiness of the findings, this study employed source triangulation, theoretical triangulation, referential adequacy, and consistency checks by comparing information from multiple authoritative sources and re-examining interpretations throughout the analytical process.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Educational Management as a Form of Normal Science

This finding that contemporary educational management functions as a form of normal science is in line with Thomas Kuhn's argument that scientific communities operate within established paradigms that provide shared assumptions, methods, and standards for problem solving. In the context of educational management, the dominant paradigm is reflected in the widespread emphasis on efficiency, accountability, strategic planning, quality assurance, and measurable performance indicators (Lathifah et al., 2025; Modise et al., 2025). This finding aligns with previous studies that describe educational management as a rational and systematic process designed to achieve institutional effectiveness through planning, organizing, leading, and controlling organizational resources (Ngubane et al., 2025; Olaniyan & Uzorka, 2024). Similar observations have been reported in contemporary educational leadership literature, which emphasizes evidence-based management and performance-oriented governance as dominant approaches in educational institutions. Thus, the present study supports existing scholarship by demonstrating that educational management has developed a stable framework of assumptions that guides managerial decision-making and institutional practices (Arar et al., 2026; Basri & Hasri, 2024).

However, this study differs from previous research in its interpretation of educational management through Kuhn's concept of normal science. Earlier studies primarily examined educational management from organizational, administrative, or leadership perspectives, focusing on the effectiveness of managerial functions and governance mechanisms. In contrast, the present study positions educational management as a paradigmatic system that shapes how educational problems are defined and solved. This perspective extends previous works by Putri and Iskandar (2020), Ulya and Abid (2024), and Fathurrohman (2015), who applied Kuhnian concepts to education and Islamic thought but did not specifically analyze educational management as a paradigm (Polat et al., 2026; Rohmadani & Achadi, 2026; Sathya et al., 2026). Consequently, this study contributes a new philosophical lens through which educational management can be understood not merely as a collection of managerial practices but as an established framework that determines the boundaries of acceptable knowledge and action within educational institutions.

Theoretically, this finding broadens the application of Kuhn's paradigm theory beyond the domains of science and epistemology into the field of educational management. It demonstrates that management theories, policies, and institutional routines can function similarly to scientific paradigms by providing shared assumptions that guide organizational behavior. This interpretation enriches the discourse on educational management by highlighting its philosophical foundations rather than treating it solely as a technical or administrative discipline (Ngubane et al., 2025; Olaniyan & Uzorka, 2024; Omar et al., 2024). Furthermore, the study suggests that educational management should be analyzed not only in terms of effectiveness and efficiency

but also in terms of the paradigmatic assumptions that influence managerial practices. Such a perspective opens new opportunities for future research to investigate how dominant management paradigms shape educational outcomes, organizational culture, and institutional change.

From a practical perspective, the findings encourage educational leaders, policymakers, and administrators to critically reflect on the assumptions underlying current management practices. The dominance of efficiency-oriented and performance-based approaches may contribute to organizational stability and accountability; however, it may also limit the capacity of educational institutions to respond to emerging social, ethical, and cultural challenges. Therefore, educational managers should not only focus on improving existing managerial techniques but also periodically evaluate whether the prevailing paradigm remains relevant to contemporary educational needs. Such critical reflection can foster more adaptive, inclusive, and context-sensitive management practices that balance organizational effectiveness with broader educational purposes, including human development, ethical responsibility, and social transformation.

According to Kuhn (2012), a paradigm is the comprehensive framework that guides scientific communities in conducting research, encompassing shared theories, methods, values, assumptions, and exemplary problem-solving models that determine what constitutes legitimate questions, appropriate methods, and acceptable standards of explanation (Sargeant & Trask-Kerr, 2026; Tariq, 2025; Yokus, 2022). Within this framework, scientific activity enters a phase known as normal science, in which researchers focus on solving specific problems or “puzzles” defined by the prevailing paradigm rather than questioning its fundamental assumptions. The primary objective of normal science is therefore not to generate radical innovations but to refine, extend, and strengthen the existing paradigm through cumulative research. However, the process of normal science inevitably produces anomalies, namely empirical findings, observations, or phenomena that cannot be adequately explained by the dominant paradigm. Initially, such anomalies are often ignored or accommodated through minor adjustments, but when they accumulate and challenge core assumptions, they generate tensions between theory and reality, leading to a crisis of confidence within the scientific community. According to Kuhn, this crisis may ultimately trigger a scientific revolution, a fundamental transformation in which the old paradigm is replaced by a new and incompatible one that offers more satisfactory explanations (Rohmadani & Achadi, 2026; Saiti et al., 2026; Salendab et al., 2026). Scientific revolutions therefore involve not merely the addition of new knowledge but a profound reconstruction of perspectives, changing the questions scientists ask, the methods they employ, and the criteria by which truth and validity are evaluated.



Figure 1. The Kuhn Cycle, Source: Simply Psychology

Figure 1 illustrates Thomas Kuhn’s model of scientific development as a cyclical process consisting of four interconnected phases: pre-science, normal science, model crisis, and revolution. The pre-science phase represents a pre-paradigmatic condition in which no dominant framework has yet been established and scientific ideas remain fragmented. This stage is followed by normal science, where a paradigm becomes widely accepted and guides scientific activity through routine problem-solving or “puzzle solving.” During this phase, anomalies may emerge, but they are generally tolerated and addressed through minor theoretical adjustments because confidence in the prevailing paradigm remains strong. Over time, however, the accumulation of unresolved anomalies may lead to a model crisis, a stage in which the explanatory power of the paradigm is increasingly questioned and alternative theories begin to compete for acceptance. According to Kuhn, this crisis marks the beginning of extraordinary science and creates the conditions for scientific revolution. The revolution phase occurs when the old paradigm is replaced by a new paradigm that offers a more convincing explanation of observed phenomena. This transformation is not merely an incremental improvement but a fundamental shift in perspective, where standards, methods, and assumptions are redefined. Consequently, the new paradigm becomes the foundation for a new period of normal science, initiating another cycle of scientific development.

The Emergence of Anomalies within Contemporary Educational Management

These findings explain that contemporary educational management produces various anomalies supporting Thomas Kuhn's argument that every dominant paradigm will eventually encounter phenomena that cannot be fully explained within the existing framework. In educational management, these anomalies are manifested in ethical crises, weak governance, managerial burnout, dehumanization of educational processes, and the marginalization of moral and spiritual values (Peddi & Manoharan, 2026; Yılmaz, 2026). This finding is consistent with a growing body of literature that criticizes the dominance of managerialism and performance-based accountability in education. Previous studies have shown that the increasing emphasis on efficiency, standardization, institutional rankings, and measurable outcomes often leads educational

institutions to prioritize technical performance over human development and ethical responsibility (Modise et al., 2025; Musundire, 2025; Olaniyan & Uzorka, 2024). Consequently, although contemporary management paradigms have contributed to organizational effectiveness and accountability, they have also generated unintended consequences that challenge their own foundational assumptions.

The present finding also aligns with studies on Islamic educational management that highlight the growing gap between managerial effectiveness and value-based educational goals. Scholars have argued that many educational institutions, including Islamic schools and pesantren, continue to experience problems related to transparency, accountability, and ethical leadership despite adopting modern management principles. However, this study differs from previous research in the way these problems are interpreted. Existing studies generally regard governance failures, ethical misconduct, and organizational inefficiencies as isolated managerial issues that can be resolved through better policies, stronger supervision, or improved leadership (Saiti et al., 2026; Sargeant & Trask-Kerr, 2026; Savilov & Savilov, 2025). In contrast, this study interprets these recurring problems as anomalies in the Kuhnian sense, meaning that they are symptoms of deeper tensions within the dominant paradigm itself. Thus, the contribution of this research lies in shifting the focus from technical problem-solving toward a paradigmatic analysis of educational management.

From a theoretical perspective, this finding extends Kuhn's concept of anomaly into the field of educational management and demonstrates that management paradigms are not immune to internal contradictions. While educational management literature often assumes that greater efficiency, accountability, and performance measurement will automatically improve educational quality, the existence of persistent ethical and humanistic problems suggests otherwise (Musundire, 2025; Ngubane et al., 2025; Olaniyan & Uzorka, 2024). Theoretically, this indicates that educational management should not be viewed solely as a technical discipline but also as a value-laden system shaped by particular assumptions regarding organizational success and educational purposes. The finding therefore enriches the philosophical discourse on educational management by revealing how dominant paradigms may simultaneously produce solutions and generate new problems that remain unresolved within the same framework.

Paradigm Transformation Toward Humanistic and Prophetic Educational Management

These findings suggest that contemporary educational management is moving towards a humanistic and prophetic paradigm in line with Thomas Kuhn's theory of scientific revolutions, which argues that the accumulation of unresolved anomalies ultimately undermines confidence in existing paradigms and creates opportunities for the emergence of alternative frameworks. In recent

educational literature, scholars have increasingly criticized the dominance of managerial rationalism, market-oriented governance, and performance-based accountability, arguing that these approaches often fail to address broader educational purposes such as character formation, ethical development, social justice, and human flourishing (Grant & McGhee, 2025; Jantarak et al., 2025). The present finding aligns with these critiques by demonstrating that the limitations of efficiency-centered management have encouraged the search for more holistic approaches that integrate organizational effectiveness with moral and humanistic values. Therefore, the emergence of a humanistic and prophetic management paradigm can be understood as a response to the growing inadequacy of conventional educational management in addressing contemporary educational challenges.

This finding also resonates with previous studies in Islamic educational management that advocate the integration of managerial functions with Qur'anic values, prophetic leadership, and ethical responsibility. Researchers have emphasized that educational institutions should not merely function as organizations that produce academic achievement but also as environments that cultivate spirituality, morality, and social responsibility (Arvind, 2024; Carstensen & Emmenegger, 2023). However, the present study differs from earlier works in its theoretical interpretation of this transformation. Most previous studies present prophetic or Islamic educational management as a normative model that should be adopted because it reflects religious principles and educational ideals. In contrast, this study interprets the emergence of humanistic and prophetic educational management through Kuhn's paradigm framework, viewing it as a potential paradigmatic response to the crisis generated by the dominant management paradigm. Consequently, the study not only supports the importance of value-based management but also explains why such an alternative paradigm becomes increasingly relevant in periods of institutional and conceptual tension.

From a theoretical perspective, this finding contributes to the expansion of Kuhn's theory beyond its traditional application in the philosophy of science. It demonstrates that paradigm shifts can also occur in educational management when existing assumptions are no longer capable of adequately addressing organizational realities and societal expectations (Olaniyan & Uzorka, 2024; Omar et al., 2024; Polat et al., 2026). Furthermore, the study enriches educational management theory by proposing that management paradigms should be evaluated not only in terms of efficiency and effectiveness but also in terms of their capacity to foster ethical leadership, human dignity, social justice, and holistic development (Musundire, 2025; Ngubane et al., 2025; Sargeant & Trask-Kerr, 2026). The concept of prophetic and humanistic educational management therefore offers a new theoretical lens that bridges managerial effectiveness with moral and spiritual dimensions, thereby broadening the conceptual foundations of educational management scholarship.

DISCUSSION

These findings explain that contemporary educational management is moving towards a humanistic and prophetic paradigm in line with Thomas Kuhn's theory of scientific revolutions, which states that the accumulation of unresolved anomalies gradually weakens confidence in existing paradigms and creates opportunities for the emergence of alternative frameworks (Arvind, 2024; Basri & Hasri, 2024). This finding is supported by contemporary educational literature that increasingly critiques the dominance of managerial rationalism, market-oriented governance, and performance-based accountability (Andoniou, 2024). Many scholars argue that educational institutions have become excessively focused on efficiency, competitiveness, and measurable outcomes, often at the expense of character formation, ethical development, and social responsibility (Rohmadani & Achadi, 2026; Salendab et al., 2026). Therefore, the emergence of a humanistic and prophetic paradigm can be understood as a response to the limitations of the existing educational management paradigm in addressing complex moral, social, and cultural challenges.

This finding also aligns with studies in Islamic educational management that emphasize the integration of managerial functions with Islamic values, prophetic leadership, and ethical governance (Lee, 2024). Previous studies have highlighted the importance of incorporating spiritual responsibility, justice, trustworthiness, and compassion into educational leadership practices. However, the present study differs from earlier research in its analytical perspective. While most previous studies propose prophetic educational management as a normative ideal grounded in religious teachings, this study interprets its emergence through Kuhn's paradigm framework (Wang & Nguyen, 2025). In other words, prophetic and humanistic educational management is not merely viewed as an alternative model based on religious values but as a paradigmatic response to the crisis generated by the dominant managerial paradigm. This perspective provides a deeper explanation of why calls for value-based educational management have become increasingly significant in recent years.

Theoretically, this finding contributes to the development of educational management scholarship by extending Kuhn's concepts of anomaly, crisis, and paradigm shift into the field of educational management. It demonstrates that management paradigms are dynamic intellectual frameworks that may become inadequate when confronted with changing social realities and educational expectations (Khasawneh et al., 2026; Ngubane et al., 2025). Furthermore, the study enriches the discourse on educational management by proposing that institutional success should not be assessed solely through efficiency, accountability, and performance indicators, but also through ethical leadership, human dignity, social justice, and holistic human development (Grant & McGhee, 2025). The concept of humanistic and prophetic educational management therefore broadens the theoretical foundations of educational management by integrating organizational effectiveness with moral and spiritual dimensions.

From a practical perspective, the findings suggest that educational leaders, policymakers, and administrators should reconsider the assumptions underlying current management practices. Educational institutions need to move beyond a narrow emphasis on performance measurement and organizational productivity by incorporating ethical accountability, character education, spiritual development, and community engagement into management strategies (Harrison & Laco, 2022; Lee, 2024). In Islamic educational institutions, this transformation may be reflected in the strengthening of prophetic leadership values such as integrity, justice, responsibility, and compassion in decision-making processes. More broadly, adopting a humanistic and prophetic management paradigm can help educational institutions balance institutional effectiveness with the cultivation of ethical, socially responsible, and spiritually grounded individuals. Such a transformation has the potential to create educational systems that are not only efficient and accountable but also meaningful, inclusive, and responsive to the challenges of contemporary society.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that contemporary educational management can be understood through Thomas Kuhn's paradigm framework as a form of normal science that has successfully established dominant assumptions regarding efficiency, accountability, and performance-based governance, yet simultaneously generates various anomalies in the form of ethical crises, dehumanization, governance weaknesses, and the marginalization of moral and spiritual values. The most important lesson derived from this research is that educational management should not be viewed merely as a technical and administrative activity but as a value-laden paradigm whose limitations may trigger the need for transformative change. The findings further suggest that the accumulation of unresolved anomalies creates conditions for a paradigm shift toward a more humanistic and prophetic model of educational management that integrates organizational effectiveness with ethical leadership, social justice, spiritual responsibility, and holistic human development. The principal contribution of this study lies in extending Thomas Kuhn's theory beyond the philosophy of science into the field of educational management, thereby providing a novel conceptual lens for understanding management practices as paradigmatic systems that evolve through crisis and transformation. Nevertheless, this research is limited by its reliance on a philosophical library research approach, which does not provide empirical evidence from educational institutions. Therefore, future studies are encouraged to employ qualitative field research, case studies, or mixed-method approaches to examine how anomalies emerge in educational management practices and to investigate the practical implementation of humanistic and prophetic management paradigms across diverse educational contexts.

REFERENCES

- Andoniou, C. (2024). Technology Integration and Digital Transformation in Post-COVID-19 Hybrid Education. In *Technical and Vocational Education and Training* (Vol. 38, pp. 303–315). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-99-6909-8_27
- Arar, K., Cansoy, R., Türkoğlu, M. E., & Utku, R. (2026). Islamic Educational Leadership: A Systematic Review of Empirical Evidence and A Conceptual Framework. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220620.2026.2671907>
- Arvind, T. (2024). Leveraging Technology for Enhanced Connectedness and Student Engagement. In *Sustainable Development, Humanities, and Social Sciences for Society 5.0* (pp. 233–258). <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-7989-9.ch013>
- Basri, H., & Hasri, S. (2024). Modern Education Management: Challenges, Strategies Towards A Future of Continuing Education. *Munaddhomah*, 5(3), 260–269. <https://doi.org/10.31538/munaddhomah.v5i3.875>
- Bates, R. (2006). Educational Administration and Social Justice. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 1(2), 141–156. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1746197906064676>
- Carstensen, M. B., & Emmenegger, P. (2023). Education as Social Policy: New Tensions in Maturing Knowledge Economies. *Social Policy and Administration*, 57(2), 109–121. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spol.12888>
- Cernasev, A., & Axon, D. R. (2023). Research and Scholarly Methods: Thematic Analysis. *Journal of the American College of Clinical Pharmacy*, 6(7), 751–755. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jac5.1817>
- Chand, S. P. (2025). Methods of Data Collection in Qualitative Research: Interviews, Focus Groups, Observations, and Document Analysis. *Advances in Educational Research and Evaluation*, 6(1), 303–317. <https://doi.org/10.25082/AERE.2025.01.001>
- Cooper, J. J., & Köprülü, F. (2024). The Implications of Technology Integration in the Classroom. In *Artificial Intelligence of Things (AIoT): Current and Future Trends* (pp. 203–210). <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-443-26482-5.00019-5>
- Grant, P., & McGhee, P. (2025). I Am Responsible for Who I Become: Reframing Students' Sense of Responsibility for Their Ethics and Academic Integrity. *Journal of Business Ethics Education*, 22, 109–113. <https://doi.org/10.5840/jbee2025226>
- Harrison, T., & Laco, D. (2022). Where's the Character Education in Online Higher Education? Constructivism, Virtue Ethics and Roles of Online Educators. *E-Learning and Digital Media*, 19(6), 555–573. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20427530221104885>
- Jantarak, S., Chiratiwatawat, K., & Nilkote, R. (2025). Guidelines for Empowering Educational Leaders Based on the Five Vesarajakarana-Dhamma Principles to Develop Educational Institutions as Learning Organizations in the Digital Era. *Journal of Buddhist Anthropology*, 10(2), 314–326.

- Khasawneh, N. A. S., Khasawneh, Y. J. A., & Khasawneh, M. A. S. (2026). Development and Validation of the AI-Driven Pedagogical Leadership Agility Scale (AIDPLA): Exploring Ethical and Spiritual Dimensions of Educational Leadership in Jordan. *Journal of Religion and Health*, 65(1), 922–963. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10943-025-02478-1>
- Lathifah, Z. K., Febrianisya, M., Rusli, R. K., Adri, H. T., & Islamia, T. N. (2025). Educational Management Perspective on Project-Based Learning in Collaborative Subjects: Case Study of Student-Centered Learning (SCL) Paradigm in Indonesia. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences*, 46(2). <https://doi.org/10.34044/j.kjss.2025.46.2.13>
- Lee, J. (2024). Moral and Character Education in Korea. In *Handbook of Moral and Character Education* (3rd ed., pp. 268–284). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003374077-18>
- Lester, J. N., Cho, Y., & Lochmiller, C. R. (2020). Learning to Do Qualitative Data Analysis: A Starting Point. *Human Resource Development Review*, 19(1), 94–106. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484320903890>
- Mbanaso, U. M., Abrahams, L., & Okafor, K. C. (2023). Data Collection, Presentation and Analysis. In *Research Techniques for Computer Science, Information Systems and Cybersecurity* (pp. 115–138). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-30031-8_7
- Modise, M.-E. P., Majola, X. M., & Kotoka, J. K. (2025). The Crucial Role of High School Management in Facilitating E-Portfolio Implementation in Classrooms. *Journal of Education and E-Learning Research*, 12(4), 573–580. <https://doi.org/10.20448/jeelr.v12i4.7563>
- Musundire, A. (2025). Understanding the Research Process and Its Application in Educational Leadership and Management: Making Use of Ngulube's Research Model. In *Research Methods for Educational Leadership and Management* (pp. 385–414). <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-9425-0.ch016>
- Ngubane, S. A., (2025). Resilience, Determination, and Innovation in Women's Educational Leadership. In *Women's Leadership in African Education* (pp. 369–395). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-90038-9_18
- Olaniyan, A. O., & Uzorka, A. (2024). Leadership's Role in Facilitating Faculty Professional Development for Technology Integration. *International Journal of Technology in Education and Science*, 8(3), 470–480. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijtes.563>
- Omar, F., Ashour, L., Khattab, A. R., & Abu Hamdan, T. (2024). Implementing Corporate Social Responsibility for Sustainable Education: A Comprehensive Case Study Analysis. In *2nd International Conference on Cyber Resilience (ICCR 2024)*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCR61006.2024.10532972>
- Peddi, S., & Manoharan, G. (2026). Technological Integration for the Education Process. In *Global Perspectives on Social Empowerment Using Current Technology* (pp. 119–147). <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3373-0629-2.ch005>

- Polat, G., Özen, H., & Arar, K. H. (2026). Micropolitics of Social Justice in Schools: A Qualitative Case Study From Türkiye. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432261446825>
- Rohmadani, Z. V., & Achadi, M. W. (2026). Integrating Religious Dimensions and Humanistic Education to Enhance Student Personality: A Case Study in Indonesian Madrasas. *Multidisciplinary Science Journal*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.31893/multiscience.2026208>
- Saiti, A., Arar, K., & Prokopiadou, G. (2026). Digital Ecology and Educational Leadership: Why Technology Needs Leadership More Than Ever to Build Vision, Capacity, and Citizenship. *Management in Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08920206261440712>
- Salendab, F. A., Asis, R. A., Elevado, L. C., & Millendez, G. J. T. (2026). Faculty Leadership and Shared Governance: Navigating Power and Participation in University Structures. In *Management, Governance, and the Evolving Role of Faculty in Higher Education* (pp. 1–24). <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3373-5806-2.ch001>
- Sargeant, J., & Trask-Kerr, K. (2026). Character Education as Curriculum-Making in the Humanities: A Scoping Review. *Curriculum Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/curj.70064>
- Sathya, M., Alamelu, R., Purushothaman, R., & Christina, J. L. (2026). Educational Technology, Innovation, and Sustainability in ASEAN Higher Education: The Role of Institutional Control and Leadership. In *Digital Leadership and Innovation in ASEAN Education* (pp. 1–30). <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-2600-1142-3.ch001>
- Savilov, E. D. (2025). Paradigms and Scientific Revolutions in Epidemiology. *Acta Biomedica Scientifica*, 10(4), 255–266. <https://doi.org/10.29413/ABS.2025-10.4.25>
- Tariq, M. U. (2025). Equity-Driven Leadership in Technology Integration for Higher Education. In *Transformative Leadership and Enhancing Equity in Technological Advancements in Higher Education* (pp. 171–198). <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3373-2322-0.ch007>
- Tischer, D. (2022). Collecting Network Data From Documents to Reach Non-Participatory Populations. *Social Networks*, 69, 113–122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socnet.2020.09.004>
- Wang, Y., & Nguyen, C. (2025). Social Justice School Leadership Through the Century (1904–2020): From Foundations to Anomalies. *Journal of Educational Administration*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-01-2025-0029>
- Yılmaz, O. I. S. (2026). Transpersonal Educational Leadership: An Integrative Model of Spiritual Alignment, Energy Coherence, and Mystical Awareness. *Frontiers in Education*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2026.1734179>
- Yokuş, G. (2022). Developing a Guiding Model of Educational Leadership in Higher Education During the Covid-19 Pandemic: A Grounded Theory Study. *Participatory Educational Research*, 9(1), 362–387. <https://doi.org/10.17275/per.22.20.9.1>