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Executive Summary

This report was developed in the frame of the European Policy Network of School Leadership (EPNoSL) project’s second work package (WP) entitled "The State of Affairs on School Leadership in Europe”. The objectives of this WP were a) to review and define critical factors for the implementation of LLL Strategy and Policy under the scope of equity and learning and the perspective of school leaders (SL), b) to reflect on the need for a renewed research agenda on SL, and c) to critically review the knowledge base for the construction of a common European Policy Indicators Framework on/for SL.

WP2 is focused primarily on the meta-analysis of pertinent aspects in the policy discourse on/for SL under the scope of equity and learning, targeting to provide a knowledge-informed framework for further research and reflection in the collective effort towards structuring and culturing SL in Europe. Through an analytical approach, documented in this report, it substantiates the need for 5 studies (on autonomy, accountability, distributed leadership, policy response and educating school leaders) and provides the methodological orientation for their implementation / conduct. It further proposes and indicators framework that policy can use to structure the development and implementation of context relevant SL cultures.

The EPNoSL project considers school leadership as a multi-faceted process of strategically using the unique skills and knowledge of teachers, pupils, and parents, toward achieving common educational goals. It is more about relationships rather than people or processes. Under the EPNoSL's perspective, within the framework of educational goals, leadership is present at all levels of an organization, directed at serving the most important stakeholders, through inspiring others in the organization to take part in the management process.

Chapter one offers a review of the literature on school leadership and equity in order to help provide policy with an evidence base on school leadership from the perspective of equity. This chapter cautions that literature on the efficacy of school leadership and equity may help constitute a “de-stated” account of governance that places onus on school leaders to take responsibility for social processes that may, in reality, lie beyond their control.

In chapter two it is argued that as the issues Europe faces become more testing, so schools are faced with intensifying difficulties in offering an equitable education to all. As it is argued, the causes of inequality are of course multiple and complex and not all under the control of school leaders, but the latter have the opportunity to minimise or exacerbate inequality.

In chapter three, decentralisation is discussed in relation to school autonomy types and the space for manoeuvres to schools and school leaders in related to critical issues such as finances, staff management, curricula etc. It is identified a trend of restructuring following New Public Management patterns of redistribution of power and governance between the State, local authorities and organisations. The couplings to local, municipal and national authorities have been loosened on how to spend public funding, how to manage staff and how to run schools, but the aim and curriculum of education has been tightened at the same time: standards are being detailed more and there are more control and accountability. This autonomy has been established according to bureaucratic and market place logics, using new social technologies like tests and quality reporting or inspection. Following those trends is a trend to empower school leaders more in the style of private sector top down management and leadership.
In chapter four the focus is on the leadership and management of change within organisations. Important questions have to do with how do we ensure that change is led and managed successfully - what do we need to consider when leading and managing the change process?

Chapter five on policy response explores the concept of policy, and considers what is meant by policy response. In this chapter it is provided an analysis that acknowledges that policy is in part extemporized, and in part the attempt to promote a “de-stated” account of governance.

Chapter six offers an analysis of policy briefs from 15 EU countries that were drafted by the EPNoSL partners. The analysis focuses on a) the policy emphasis that is placed on issues of equity and learning achievement at school, and on b) how the role of school leaders is (re)conceptualised in legislative frameworks and policy documents emphasising on the relationships between leadership in schools, equity and learning outcomes, and c) outlines the organisation, the content, and the duration of principals’ and other school leaders’ training that is available, focusing in particular to training on issues related to equity and learning outcomes. What this analysis reveals is that while there is some policy emphasis on equity and learning achievement at school drawing mostly from the PISA results, less emphasis is placed in the training of school leaders on how to deal with issues of equity and learning outcomes.

Chapter seven provides the Swedish Ministry of Education's perspective on policies to support equity and improved learning outcomes and the role of principals in achieving these aims. As it is noted, equity and learning – linked to improved student outcomes - is not an easy task. The variation between high- and low-performing students as well as high and low performing schools and school districts in Sweden has increased over time, and concerns are raised about equity and learning linked to the quality of student outcomes in the context of Sweden’s highly decentralised school system.

Chapter eight offers an in-depth account of the state of affairs on school leadership in Finland. The goal of this chapter is to highlight the academic underpinning on school leadership in Finland and, on such a base, to review the current policy and trends in this country. As it is argued, a major re-orientation to school leadership is taking place in this country. Principals in Finland are called not only to act as educational leaders of their schools but also as managers who are responsible for financing and personnel issues, and also are held accountable for the results of their institutions.

Chapter nine provides a comprehensive overview of the research orientation of studies on school principals across the northern European community - its content, research designs, major findings - and offers conclusions and recommendations for advancing research on school principals. Key research areas identified are the following: 1) important educational challenges in order to inform policy makers, 2) implementation processes in relation to national policy on the local governing structures, 3) effects of national policy on changes processes on the local school level, 4) effects of international testing schemes on student outcomes, 5) effects on change processes in local schools in relation to the local governing structures, 6) principals and their decision making in relation to school governance, 7) principals’ strategic decision making in relation to school improvement, 8) effects of principal training programs, 9) effects of the relation between principals and teachers on improved student outcomes, and 10) effects of school leaders’ behaviour on schools results analyzed with an organizational lens.

Chapter ten deepens into the discussion on policy response by focusing on the implementation of policy on school leadership and equity in Scotland. In particular, in this chapter it is acknowledged that such policy is in part extemporized and in part an attempt to make inevitable a “de-stated” account of governance, as argued in chapter 5. On this basis, it is asked what practices such policy does, and does not permit in the context of Scotland.
Chapter eleven presents a new analysis of the PISA 2009 datasets in relation to school leadership. In this study the hypothesis that the intake of schools related to the socio-economic and cultural background of their students is a critical factor for basing policy on equity and learning was supported by evidence from PISA 2009 showing that students in schools with a high share of students coming from low socio-economic and cultural backgrounds perform on average much lower than their peers in medium or high SES schools. Low SES schools pose therefore much more pressing challenges to school leaders as compared to more privileged schools in terms of their intake. This reality observed in almost all EU countries has or should have implications regarding the training, professional development, retention and replacement of school leaders in low SES schools. Furthermore, the analysis of the relationship between principals' leadership behaviour in low SES schools and student performance showed two dominant patterns between EU countries: the “reactive school management” pattern and the “proactive school management” pattern. As it is argued, these two patterns possibly use different fields of comparison, and is likely to reflect different underlying cultures of school management.

On the basis of the first eleven chapters of this report, as well as the documentation that was produced during the first year of the EPNoSL, in chapter twelve a number of critical factors are identified that may shape the capacity and potential of school leaders to exercise effectively school leadership in order to implement strategies and initiatives that are targeting to combat inequalities in access, opportunities and outcomes and promote learning performance in schools. The critical factors identified are the following: a) policy ownership, b) empowerment of different stakeholders and trust in their professionalism, c) supportive shared dispositions to inclusive schools, d) sound scientific evidence supporting the design, implementation and evaluation of policies, e) human resources: school leaders’ capacity building, f) political commitment and priorities, g) policy coherence and h) financial resources.

Finally, in chapter thirteen a preliminary European Policy Indicators framework is proposed to support policy development that is aimed to promote culturing and structuring of school leadership from the perspective of equity and learning. The framework builds upon the critical factors on policy implementation identified and discussed in the previous chapter.
INTRODUCTION

This report is developed in the frame of the European Policy Network of School Leadership (EPNoSL) project’s second work package (WP) entitled “The State of Affairs on School Leadership in Europe”. The objectives of this WP were a) to review and define critical factors for the implementation of LLL Strategy and Policy under the scope of equity and learning and the perspective of school leaders (SL), b) to reflect on the need for a renewed research agenda on SL, and c) to critically review the knowledge base for the construction of a common European Policy Indicators Framework on/for SL.

WP2 is focused primarily on the meta-analysis of pertinent aspects in the policy discourse on/for SL under the scope of equity and learning, targeting to provide a knowledge-informed framework for further research and reflection in the collective effort towards structuring and culturing SL in Europe. Through an analytical approach, documented in this report, it substantiates the need for 5 studies and provides the methodological orientation for their implementation / conduct. It further proposes (on the basis of critical review of the literature) indicators that policy can use to structure the development and implementation of context relevant SL cultures based on principles of distributed tasking, inclusiveness and enhancement of systemic and organizational / institutional learnability capacity.

A set of 5 concerns / themes for research on major policy areas within EU, identified in the first year of the EPNoSL project, constitute the base to depict critical factors on/for SL, to construct a preliminary Policy Indicators Framework and to guide the implementation of WPs 3 and 4 (focusing on Knowledge Management and Knowledge Construction respectively). In all five themes promoting learning and equity are considered as key educational goals. These research themes, outlined below, are accompanied by a small set of questions aiming to orient further analysis and discussions.

- **Autonomy** – for equity and learning: Financial restraints and public sector restructuring often lead to more autonomous schools. Does financial and operational autonomy help school leaders to develop teacher practice and student outcomes? Are curriculum decisions being centralized or decentralised to schools? How are school leaders educated to lead autonomously and manage finances, operations, staff and curriculum for better learning outcomes and equity?

- **Accountability** – for equity and learning: As educational systems enter into a global competition, they also enter into international comparisons of student outcomes (e.g.: PISA) and are subject to elaborated national accountability systems. Are these systems providing tools for school leaders so they can enhance teacher practice, student outcomes and equity? How are school leaders educated to make use of such tools?

- **Distributed leadership** – for equity and learning: Many schools develop forms of distributed leadership. Which forms of distribution are helpful for furthering teacher practice and collaboration, for student learning and for greater equity? How are school leaders educated to establish and lead structures and cultures in distributed leadership formats?

- **Policy response** – for equity and learning: How do local school authorities (e.g.: municipalities or boards) and school leaders actively respond to policy decisions in systems, schools and classes? How are school leaders educated to include staff in the chain of implementation and to translate external expectations into internal sense?

- **Educating school leaders** – for equity and learning: Are available leadership education programmes inclusive of different kinds of school and school leadership tasks and responsibilities? Are programmes for pre-service, induction, newly-appointed and continuous
professional development in place to support leadership for improved learning and greater equity?

It should be mentioned here that the EPNoSL project considers school leadership as a multi-faceted process of strategically using the unique skills and knowledge of teachers, pupils, and parents, toward achieving common educational goals. It is more about relationships rather than people or processes. Under EPNoSL’s perspective, within the framework of educational goals, leadership is present at all levels of an organization, directed at serving the most important stakeholders, through inspiring others in the organization to take part in the management process. Likewise, management in leadership involves making the best use of human, material and financial resources available. School leadership therefore conveys dynamism and pro-activity and is not restricted to principals or school heads but also includes other leaders in education, such as members of a formal leadership team and other persons who contribute towards the aims of the school, even including student leadership.

This volume is organised in four parts. In the first part, comprised of 5 chapters, emphasis is placed on the conceptualisation of equity and equality, school autonomy, change, and policy response in relation to school leadership, from a highly critical and reflective perspective, with the aim to outline a conceptual framework that will guide the work of EPNoSL partners in WPs 3, 4 and 5. In the second part, comprised of 3 chapters, school leadership is examined from the perspective of policy and practice in 16 EU countries, with the aim to provide an informed view on the realities and needs in relation to school leaders' role and capacities to promote equity and learning in schools. Part three, comprised of 3 chapters, focuses on current and future research trends in school leadership with a view to direct the orientation and methodologies of exploratory, comparative and country-specific, empirical research that is to be undertaken by the EPNoSL partners in the context of WP 4 on the research themes of autonomy, accountability, distributed leadership, policy response and educating school leaders. Finally, in the concluding part four, that is comprised of 2 chapters, the ideas and findings presented in the previous parts are being utilised and meta-analysed to identify and further discuss factors that are critical for the implementation of LLL strategies and policies under the scope of equity and learning and the perspective of school leaders. On this basis, a preliminary common European Policy Indicators framework is proposed to support policy development that is aimed to promote culturing and structuring of school leadership from the perspective of equity and learning.

In more detail, chapter one offers a review of the literature on school leadership and equity in order to help provide policy with an evidence base on school leadership from the perspective of equity. It does so by: (i) considering how discourses constitute objects; (ii) exploring the rationale of policy on school leadership and equity; (iii) considering the various models of school leadership and equity; and (iv) examining literature on the practical application of ideas about school leadership and equity. In so doing, this chapter draws attention to the positive claims made internationally about the utility of school leadership strategies to promote social justice in modern multicultural societies. In particular it considers the alleged value of the dual concepts of ‘equality of opportunity’ and ‘equity of results’. Drawing upon Foucault’s account of discourse formation, this chapter cautions that literature on the efficacy of school leadership and equity may help constitute a “de-stated” account of governance that places onus on school leaders to take responsibility for social processes that may, in reality, lie beyond their control.

In chapter two it is argued that as the issues Europe faces become more testing, so schools are faced with intensifying difficulties in offering an equitable education to all. System level choices, for example about school types and the distribution of funds, are all critical in shaping equality. This chapter, however, does not focus on these system-level factors but on school-level issues; that is, how school leaders can embed equality within their school. This issue has received less attention in the educational leadership and management literature because typically it is policy makers or family/society factors that are cited as maintaining inequality, and staff in schools depicted as constrained by the context
within which they work. As it is argued, this is a misleading assumption. Schools and school staff also play a part in creating, maintaining or increasing inequality. Failing to achieve equality in schools relates not so much to a lack of technical know-how, but to issues of ethics and priorities. Leaders who attempt to shift school priorities and practices in fundamental ways usually encounter a modicum of support and a good deal of resistance from teachers, from parents and even from learners. Leaders themselves and those who design programmes to educate them, although share a discourse with parents and teachers which shows a commitment to equality, are also often resistant to making such an aim central in practice. The causes of inequality are of course multiple and complex and not all under the control of school leaders, but the latter have the opportunity to minimise or exacerbate inequality. It is their determination to do so, that is to minimize inequality, and the degree to which they prioritise this aim that is the foundation of action. Should leaders, those who prepare them and teachers genuinely wish to change things, there is much research and practice guidance available to help.

In chapter three it is argued that over the past two to three decades most public sectors in the European area have been restructured. Most of them are following New Public Management patterns of redistribution of power and governance between the State, local authorities and organisations. In many cases the phrase ‘autonomy’ has been used to characterise the new relations. At first glance one thinks that this signifies one way of distributing governance irrespectively of the country or system it is being use on. This is not so. Autonomous organisations are different in type of autonomy, in governance and power relations; in issues included and in the room for manoeuvre they give to educational actors. As it is pointed out, there are diverse types of autonomy: Decentralisation of governance from state to local authorities and further on to individual schools. This leaves school with more self-determination on how to spend funding (provided totally by the state), how to manage staff and their terms of work and wages and the day-to-day operations. The couplings to local, municipal and national authorities have been loosened on these parameters, but the aim and curriculum of education has been tightened at the same time: standards are being detailed more and there are more control and accountability. This autonomy has been established according to bureaucratic and market place logics, using new social technologies like tests and quality reporting or inspection. Following those trends is a trend to empower school leaders more in the style of private sector top down management and leadership. It is up to the power-relations in each individual school to find appropriate ways of planning and making decisions: more is left to the leader, but she/he can choose to negotiate and give professionals room for deliberation in several stages of decision making. When it comes to the room for manoeuvre, it is difficult to give a clear picture: on one hand more room is left to schools (e.g.: school leaders) to plan and act on finances (within tight frames), staff management and operations. At the same time it seems that there is less room when it comes to teaching and learning because more issues in curriculum are described and tested in more detail. The national governance is also tighter and aligned to international trends (comparisons and competitions through international tests).

The focus of chapter four is on the leadership and management of change within organisations. How do we ensure change is led and managed successfully - what do we need to consider when leading and managing the change process? Stoll et al’s assertion of a decade ago - that to succeed in a world characterised by rapid change and increased complexity, it is vital that schools grow, develop, adapt creatively to, and take charge of change so that they can create their own preferable future - is still applicable today. The chapter aims to give a better understanding of why leading and managing organisational change well is so hard to do but, perhaps more importantly, it also suggests how it might be made easier! There are no easy answers or ‘magic bullets’ but understanding the nature of change and how we react to it can help us manage and lead it more effectively. It begins by asking the simple question – what is change?

Chapter five on policy response aims to explore the concept of policy, and to consider what is meant by policy response. It is adopted a critical postmodern perspective on the implementation of policy, viewing policy as both an attempt to solve problems and an attempt to persuade social actors to
subscribe to particular beliefs that delineate action. As it is argued, few policies arrive fully formed and the processes of policy enactment involve ad-hoc, borrowing, re-ordering, displacing, making do and re-invention. However, policies create circumstances in which the range of options available in deciding what to do are narrowed or changed. Consequently, in this chapter it is provided an analysis that acknowledges that policy is in part extemporized, and in part the attempt to promote a “de-stated” account of governance.

Chapter six offers an analysis of policy briefs from 15 EU countries that were drafted by the EPNoSL partners, namely from Austria, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Latvia, Lithuania, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, and the United Kingdom. The analysis focuses on the policy emphasis that is placed on issues of equity and learning achievement at school in different EU countries and on the perspectives under which such issues are discussed or addressed by policy measures during the past few years. The analysis further focuses on how the role of school leaders is (re)conceptualised in legislative frameworks and policy documents, emphasising on the relationships between leadership in schools, equity and learning outcomes. Next, this chapter offers an outline of the organisation, the content, and the duration of principals’ and other school leaders’ training that is available (and in what cases such training is compulsory) by different providers in various EU countries, from pre-service formative education, to induction and in-service professional development, focusing in particular to training on issues related to equity and learning outcomes.

Chapter seven provides the Swedish Ministry of Education’s perspective on policies to support equity and improved learning outcomes and the role of principals in achieving these aims. As it is noted, equity and learning – linked to improved student outcomes - is not an easy task. The variation between high- and low-performing students as well as high and low performing schools and school districts in Sweden has increased over time, and concerns are raised about equity and learning linked to the quality of student outcomes in the context of Sweden’s highly decentralised school system. Decentralisation implies that principals (and school leaders in general) are very crucial factors at school level in promoting equity and learning for better outcomes. This perspective is clearly reflected in the Education Act which came into force in 2011, where the term “principal” is mentioned 111 times in different paragraphs. The principals’ responsibility for students’ right to education, their responsibility for students’ opportunities to acquire social and civic skills, their responsibility to help and arrange support for students with special needs, and their responsibility to lead and coordinate the pedagogic work in schools are particularly highlighted. In order to ensure accountable and responsible school leadership for equity and improved learning outcomes for all students the Ministry of Education established the National School Leadership Training Program. All newly appointed principals are required to participate in this program, offered by six universities at masters level. Finally, the Ministry stresses that within the context of decentralisation, the wide variation in learning structures and cultures on the local level must be adjusted on a higher level than it is today in order to achieve improved learning outcomes for all students.

Finland attracts considerable interest around its education system and hence its school leadership approaches and practices not only because it has consistently achieved top ranking in all PISA rounds but also because it has among the lowest variations in student performance between schools, something that indicates a school system that sustains a high level of equity in learning outcomes. Finland also presents an interesting national case because, as it is argued, it follows a path in dealing with public affairs which includes steering from the top, but the system is built from the bottom, and both sported and motivated from the sides. On this basis its model includes several characteristics of the organic meta-governance model, a novel approach as compared to the welfare state governance model and the marketing meta-governance model, or even a synthesis of these two approaches. Chapter eight offers an in-depth account of the state of affairs on school leadership in Finland. The goal of this chapter is to highlight the academic underpinning on school leadership in Finland and, on such a base, to review the current policy and trends in this country. The chapter is organised around six
thematic areas: trends and tendencies in external expectations: policies, culture and governance, translation of external expectations into internal meaning and direction, understanding and empowering teachers and other staff, structuring and culturing schools, working with partners and the external environment- systems leadership, and school leaders’ recruitment, preparation and development. As it is argued, a major re-orientation to school leadership is taking place in Finland. Principals are called not only to act as educational leaders of their schools but also as managers who are responsible for financing and personnel issues, and also are held accountable for the results of their institutions. This re-orientation stresses the importance of understanding four developmental processes at the core of principals’ pedagogical leadership work: curriculum work, creating and leading a school culture which supports learning, defining the school vision in collaboration with the whole school community, and redefining the school mission. Overall, principals’ work in Finland becomes more and more demanding due to internal as well as external pressures. As it is pointed out, despite the strong role of equality in Finland, two risks are emerging. First, more and more emphasis is given to measurable learning outcomes. The demand comes both from parents and from administration. This is also closely linked to the Finnish media’s strong interest to rank the schools according to the matricular examination results. In general, educators in Finland are opposed to ranking, because most often internal and external evaluation activities in schools do not measure what the media try to emphasize, which school is ‘the best, the second’ etc. As it is argued, the pressure to emphasize on better learning outcomes as those are signalled by exams scores necessarily means lowering the emphasis so far to equity and equal learning outcomes, which in turn is likely to challenge the egalitarian values of the Finish society. The second risk in Finland can be seen in the latest PISA results. Although in Finland the variance in performance between schools is one of the lowest in the world, the gap started (slightly) to increase. This must be seen as a warning signal, and might hint to possible changes in the PISA results in the future.

Over the past decade 2000-2013 there has been a significant increase in research studies on school principals across the northern European community. Chapter nine provides a comprehensive overview of this research orientation–its content, research designs, major findings, and offers conclusions and recommendations for advancing research on school principals. More specifically, this chapter overviews current research studies by describing a broad national framework for research on school principals in Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, England, Germany, Poland, and Latvia. It is pointed out that research in each country is at a different stage of development, some areas of study are just emerging while others have a longer and richer history of inquiry on principals. Furthermore, some research topics are missing in the descriptions of research, others have clearly been described as areas with very few research publications. This chapter concludes with the identification of key areas to advance research on school leadership in EU.

Chapter ten deepens into the discussion on policy response by focusing on the implementation of policy on school leadership and equity in Scotland. In particular, in this chapter it is acknowledged that such policy is in part extemporized and in part an attempt to make inevitable a “de-stated” account of governance, as argued in chapter 5. On this basis, it is asked what practices such policy does, and does not permit in the context of Scotland. Finally, there are identified Scotland’s policy implementers in order to contextualise further empirical enquiry into the Leadership Standards for Social Justice in Scotland.

Chapter eleven presents a new analysis of the PISA 2009 datasets in relation to school leadership. In this study the hypothesis that the intake of schools related to the socio-economic and cultural background of their students is a critical factor for basing policy on equity and learning was supported by evidence from PISA 2009 showing that students in schools with a high share of students coming from low socio-economic and cultural backgrounds perform on average much lower than their peers in medium or high SES schools. Low SES schools pose therefore much more pressing challenges to school leaders as compared to other schools. This reality in almost all EU countries has or should have
implications regarding the training, professional development, retention and replacement of school leaders in low SES schools. Yet the current discussion on school leadership seldom addresses this issue. The analysis of the relationship between principals’ leadership behaviour and student performance showed that this should not be discussed in terms of causality. More frequent leadership behaviours and activities in low SES schools are not associated with better performance in many EU countries and this does not imply that the principals in these countries are not doing their job well. Similarly in those countries were “stronger” leadership is positively associated with student performance in low SES schools it would be rather naïve to believe that principals are doing their job well. According to the interpretation of the findings that is offered in this chapter, in the many EU countries there is a dominant “reactive school management” pattern among principals in low SES schools which uses as field of comparison other low SES schools in order to specify the level of engagement in various school management activities. In schools where principals believe that their students are doing less well than students in other low SES schools they also tend to exhibit more active engagement in school matters. This pattern is likely to reflect an underlying culture of school management, a kind of leadership tradition. The same could be true for the EU countries where, in the opposite direction, principals follow predominantly a “proactive school management” pattern, using perhaps a wider field of comparison which includes not only low SES schools but also more privileged schools and where more principals’ engagement is associated with better student results.

On the basis of the first eleven chapters of this report, as well as the documentation that was produced during the first year of the EPNoSL, in chapter twelve a number of critical factors are identified and discussed that may shape the capacity and potential of school leaders to exercise effectively school leadership in order to implement strategies and initiatives that are targeting to combat inequalities in access, opportunities and outcomes and promote learning performance in schools. In the context of EPNoSL critical factors in policy implementation are the building blocks of a specific LLL strategy or policy initiative on equity and learning that policy implementers, with school leaders being at the forefront of our analysis, can and even cannot control and manage in order to increase the chances of achieving its intended educational goals. The critical factors identified are the following: a) policy ownership, b) empowerment of different stakeholders and trust in their professionalism, c) supportive shared dispositions to inclusive schools, d) sound scientific evidence supporting the design, implementation and evaluation of policies, e) human resources: school leaders’ capacity building, f) political commitment and priorities, g) policy coherence and h) financial resources. As it is stressed, given the high diversity in the political, social, cultural and economic realities and traditions between and even within EU countries, some of the factors identified in this chapter may be less important than others in different countries or school education systems; it is also to be expected that the relative importance of different factors even in the context of a single country or education system may change with time or circumstances. However, all these factors appear to be related directly or indirectly to all five research themes for research on major policy areas within EU identified by EPNoSL, namely autonomy, accountability, distributed leadership, policy response and educating school leaders, and therefore will be utilised to orient further research, networking and policy discourse to be undertaken by the EPNoSL partners in the context of WP 3, 4 & 5.

Finally, in chapter thirteen a preliminary European Policy Indicators framework is proposed to support policy development that is aimed to promote culturing and structuring of school leadership from the perspective of equity and learning.
PART I: (RE)CONCEPTUALISING SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TOWARDS IMPROVED EQUITY AND LEARNING OUTCOMES
1. SCHOOL LEADERSHIP AND EQUITY: A CRITICAL REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The aim of this chapter is to provide policy with an evidence base on school leadership from the perspective of equity. We do so by: (i) considering how discourses constitute objects; (ii) exploring the rationale of policy on school leadership and equity; (iii) considering the various models of school leadership and equity; and (iv) examining literature on the practical application of ideas about school leadership and equity. In so doing, we draw attention to the positive claims made internationally about the utility of school leadership strategies to promote social justice through critical reflection and 'transforming dialogue' (Woods, 2011, p. 134). Although cognisant of the benefits of creating a shared vision of equity in schools, we draw upon Foucault’s (2009) account of discourse formation, and caution that literature on school leadership and equity may help constitute a “de-stated” account of governance that places onus on school leaders to take responsibility for social processes that may, in reality, lie beyond their control.

1.1 Discourse formation on school leadership and equity

When commencing a literature review of school leadership and equity, it is helpful to consider Foucault’s account of discourse formation. According to Foucault (2009, p. 49), 'Discourses are not about objects; they do not identify objects, they constitute them and in the practice of doing so conceal their own intervention'. Thus, the discourse on school leadership and equity constructs the phenomenon that researchers seek to identify, and researchers contribute to discourse formation through their publications. Although inequalities and injustices are not merely “constructs” in various researchers’ discourses, critical postmodernism serves to remind us that policy (as the political enactment of discourse) is both an attempt to solve real world problems and an attempt to persuade social actors to subscribe to particular beliefs that delineate action (Nudzor, 2009). Researchers’ empirical enquiries thus play a significant role in constructing the social landscape. Because researchers utilise various perspectives in their accounts of school leadership and equity, the emergent discourse is diverse and complex. For example, in their paper on school leadership practice and preparation across seven nations, Ylimaki and Jacobson (2013, p. 6) discuss organisational learning (OL), instructional leadership (IL), and culturally responsive practices (CRP). Meanwhile, in their paper on how leadership influences student learning, Leithwood et al. (2010, p. 673) talk about four leadership ‘paths’: ‘Rational, Emotions, Organizational, and Family’.

In spite of the enormous variety of papers about school leadership and equity, researchers are able to produce literature reviews that identify overarching narratives by categorising disparate accounts under discrete headings. For example, in their review of the literature, Ross and Berger (2009, p. 464) organise discussion using headings based on what they describe as the ‘three main conceptions’ of leadership: (i) transformational leadership; (ii) distributed leadership; and (iii) instructional leadership. Similar conceptions are identified by Earley et al. (2012, p. 21) in their review of the literature on school leadership, where they discuss (i) transformational leadership; (ii) instructional leadership; and (iii) pedagogic or learning-centred leadership. Consistency of categorisation implies consensus, yet Foucault’s (2009) assertion that writers help create what they aspire to discover alerts us to the danger of producing a literature review that implies homogeneity in accounts of school leadership and equity, and conceals our intervention in the construction of consensus. The authors of the present literature review therefore attempt to highlight the salient features of the literature on...
school leadership and equity, whilst acknowledging that the identification of broad themes does not render interchangeable disparate ideas about leadership and social justice. Because the reading process is disrupted by parenthetic lists of multiple authors, we do not provide extensive lists of authors who have written upon a particular topic in this chapter, but instead reference texts by authors who do provide such lists.

### 1.2 The rationale of policy on school leadership and equity

Goddard (2007, p. 5) identifies an ‘increasingly ethnoculturally diverse global community’ and suggests that the discourse of leadership and equity has developed in response to the ‘great movements of people taking place around the world’ (ibid, p. 1). While it appears that there is agreement that the discourse of school leadership and social justice is bound up with the concept of ‘equity for all’ in modern multicultural societies, it is less clear how this ‘new mantra’ (Brown, 2004, p. 80) came into being. Most papers on school leadership and equity focus on why it is necessary (for example, to enhance race relations) and how it might be implemented (for example, through prejudice reduction workshops), without interrogating the foundation of these ideas about social justice. Instead, much of the literature contains assertions that are presented as self-evident truths, for example that school leaders are acting in an ‘increasingly complex environment’ (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003, p. 2) and that we need to ‘trust schools more and see them as the levers of reform’ (Collarbone & West-Burnham, 2008, p. 6). The tendency to ignore the ideological basis of policy on equity means that the promotion of school leadership strategies is presented in much of the literature as a “natural” and non-contestable offshoot of policies, rather than a political action performed on the individual.

When authors do attempt to locate policy on school leadership and equity within a wider socio-political narrative, they tend to position it as a global expression of neoliberal marketisation. For example, Serpieri (2009, p. 123) is highly critical of the introduction of ‘homogenous head teacher training models’ in Italy which, he claims, are designed to reposition head teachers as managers/entrepreneurs as part of the ‘marketisation of the public service’ (ibid, p. 130). In her study of school leadership and equity in Slovenia, Trnavcevic (2007, p. 79) states that Slovenia has undergone ‘a radical adjustment from a socialist, planned economy to a market-driven economy’, and argues that school leaders are employing inclusion strategies to ‘strengthen the ‘market position’ of the school’ (ibid, p. 88) rather than promote social justice. Fitzgerald (2009, p. 155) condemns the marketisation of education in New Zealand, claiming that ‘access to schools has been rationalised’ so that ‘a particular group, the middle classes, can exercise their choice with regard to the school, and ultimately the university, to which they send their child’. Fitzgerald claims that teachers have been repositioned as ‘producers of commodities’ (i.e. students’ skills and knowledge) that can ‘contribute to the national and global economy’ (ibid, p. 157), and suggests that the identification and measurement of “standards” in education is ‘a compensatory attempt to create an imagined community of sameness’ that obscures the advantage that marketisation confers upon the elite (ibid, p. 158). Fitzgerald calls upon school leaders to resist the abuses of marketisation by promoting a ‘social justice agenda’ in schools (ibid, p. 159), but this possibility rests upon the assumption that the discourse of school leadership and equity stands outside, rather than within, the metadiscourse of neoliberal marketisation; a theory refuted by Serpieri (2009) and Trnavcevic (2007). Foskett and Lumby (2003, p. 181) claim that ‘macro changes sweeping the world’ translate into ‘micro changes within the work of leaders in schools and colleges’, and it seems that these changes entail the adoption of micro policy on leadership and equity informed by macro neoliberal economic principles. Evidence for this is found in the OECD (2010) report on the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), in which it claims that ‘educational outcomes are a strong predictor of economic growth’ (ibid, p. 3), and argues that educational outcomes (and thus economic growth) may be enhanced through effective school leadership strategies.
In spite of the apparent international consensus over the function of school leadership as a means to foster equality of opportunity in local and global contexts, Foskett and Lumby (2003, p. 183) argue that ‘ubiquitous western concepts such as transactional, transformational and instructional leadership’ are not universally applicable, as ideas about such things as gender equality vary widely between cultures. In the absence of a universal definition of “leadership”, Foskett and Lumby (2003, p. 195) suggest that we might conceive of leadership as 'the individual's moral agency'; an idea that features widely in the literature. For example, Sergiovanni (1992) talks about sources of moral authority in school leadership; Fullan (2003) considers the moral imperative of school leadership; Bosu et al. (2011) discuss the moral use of power, and Bottery et al. (2012) explore how school leadership is guided by a sense of moral purpose. Whether or not the concept of leadership is held to have a moral foundation, much of the literature suggests that the overriding aim of policy on school leadership and equity is to promote equality of opportunity for pupils in the global free market economy, irrespective of race, gender or class. The extent to which this aim is realistic is, of course, challenged by those writers on school leadership and equity who subscribe to Sandel's (2012) view that the act of commodification corrupts education and undermines social justice. For example, in his study of leadership, personalization and high performance schooling, Fielding (2006, p.353) argues that market values render the personal 'subservient to the functional', and Hatcher (2005) critiques the tension between democratic principles and managerialism in his study of the distribution of leadership and power in schools in the market society.

Having briefly considered the socio-political basis of policy on school leadership and equity, the following section of this chapter looks at the models of leadership and equity that might be said to emerge from the literature.

### 1.3 Models of school leadership and equity

As stated previously, the literature on school leadership is replete with terminology, and for the sake of simplicity most authors subsume accounts of leadership under various typologies. Of these, the most prevalent are:

- **Transactional leadership**, which posits a ‘leader-follower dichotomy’ (Harris et al., 2003, p. 16) and is associated with a central command model of governance.

- **Transformational leadership**, which is associated with inspiring others, building a shared vision, providing support and developing a collaborative culture (Yu et al., 2002, pp. 372-373).

- **Distributive leadership**, which is associated with the distribution of the performance of tasks across the ‘three constitutive elements of leader, follower and task or situation’ (Robinson, 2008, p. 243). A more radical reframing of how leadership is understood sees leadership as an emergent phenomenon that arises through complex, interactive processes across organisations and groups (Gronn, 2002; Woods & Woods, forthcoming).

- **Instructional leadership**, which is associated with ‘setting and communicating clear instructional goals and expectations’ and ‘promoting and participating in teacher learning and development’ (Brown & Chai, 2012, p. 753).

Writing in the 1990s, Clegg and Palmer (1996, p. 212) identified a ‘popular trend’ for leadership to be considered in terms of ideas like ‘empowerment’, ‘vision’, and ‘culture’. This trend shows no sign of abating, and the leader-follower transactional model does not feature strongly in the literature on school leadership and equity. Instead, the other more "negotiated" styles of leadership identified above are described, and these models are contextualised through reference to social justice. For example, Capper et al. (2006, p. 218) discuss how leadership preparation programmes aimed toward social justice tend to focus on developing educators’ ‘critical consciousness’ and sense of shared responsibility.
Perhaps surprisingly, given the amount of literature on school leadership and equity, Furman (2012, p. 192), flags up the paucity of literature about the actual practice of social justice leadership in K-12 schools and the capacities needed by school leaders to engage in social justice. Furman (ibid, p. 192) also notes that the ‘literature on leadership preparation is thin in regard to explicit methods for developing these capacities’. Furman suggests that a preoccupation with the raising of consciousness, rather than action-oriented behaviour, may account for this deficiency in the literature, which she attempts to address through her account of praxis. However, a second explanation offered by Furman is perhaps more likely, in light of our earlier discussion of the socio-political basis of the discourse of school leadership and equity. Citing North (2006), Furman (2012, p. 193) describes social justice as an ‘under-theorised concept in education’ and calls it an ‘umbrella term’ with ‘multiple meanings’. A possible explanation for why social justice is presented as a nebulous construct in the literature is found in Harris et al. (2003) account of school leadership policy. According to Harris et al. (ibid, p. 164) policy serves the demands of governments ‘for raising standards of school performance in terms of the economic “market-led” agendas’. Equity, or social justice, is positioned under the market model as “equality of opportunity” in terms of access to education and the global standardisation of education (measured through such things as PISA). This policy has, Harris et al. (ibid, p. 164) claim, in fact disadvantaged ‘many inner-city, migrant and socially deprived communities’, where ‘an increasing number of children’ are, for whatever reason, ‘unable to cope with a national curriculum’. The pervasiveness of the market model may have stifled the development of competing theories of social justice. Evidence of this is provided by Goddard and Hart (2007) in their study of school leadership and equity in Canada. Goddard and Hart (2007, p. 15) found that Canadian principals ‘actively resisted any attempts to recognize diversity and difference’, as they were wedded to the notion that all students should be ‘treated the same’. Goddard and Hart (ibid, p. 16) are uncomfortable with this finding arguing that ‘such an assimilationist approach limits the experiences of the minority -culture child’, yet the principals’ attitude is obviously consistent with the concept of social justice as “equality of opportunity”.

In a report commissioned by the OECD, Levin (2003) identifies the respective positions on equity held by the Canadian principals and Goddard and Hart:

Historically there have been two main approaches to addressing equity in education. One focuses on what is called ‘equality of opportunity’. In this view, it is access to education that is critical. The responsibility of the state is to provide opportunities to participate; whether people choose to take advantage of that access or are successful in doing so should not be a primary focus of public policy. The second view is more concerned with equity in the results of education, such as graduation and access to employment. From this perspective, providing the same opportunity is not enough because different people will need different kinds of opportunities and some people will need more support in order to be successful (Levin, 2003, p. 8).

The desire to enhance ‘graduation and access to employment’ through equity of results (Levin, ibid) is symptomatic of the re-conceptualisation of education as a means to serve the needs of industry by cultivating individuals’ employability (Ward, 2012), a project that has been promoted internationally by US backed multilateral agencies (such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) and the European Union (Connolly, 2013). In spite of the unease over performativity evident amongst authors identified in this chapter (e.g. Fielding, 2006; Hatcher, 2005), a ‘paradigm convergence’ (Ball, 2001, p. 48) over the efficacy of the market model of education has created political consensus around the idea that marketisation automatically creates a meritocracy based on the pursuit of self-interest (Ward, 2010). Under this model, we are all ‘free to make the most of our talents’ (Ward, 2010, p. 203), and actions and outcomes are the result of the exercise of free choice, rather than compulsion. Thus, the role of government is to ensure that standards of education are consistently high (hence the standards agenda); parents must
choose their children's schools wisely (hence the league tables), and pupils must work hard to maximise the utility of their education by gaining credentials for employment (ibid). In theory, the market model of education supports and sustains economic development by ensuring that every member of society is educated to be a productive component of the knowledge economy (Ball, 2001; Ball, 2010), and it is possible that the equity of results approach to education may prove more conducive to this aim than equality of opportunity. Indeed, Levin (2003) claims that the equity of results model of social justice is gaining in popularity, and the OECD (2010) report mentioned earlier appears to confirm that governments around the world are increasingly interested in implementing leadership strategies to enhance educational outcomes. However, in spite of international attempts to promote equity of results, Brown (2006, p. 394) argues that we have entered a ‘zero-sum game’, where the winners take most, if not all, of the opportunities available in the free market; a supposition which may lead us to question the idea that social justice is guaranteed in a neoliberal meritocracy. Furthermore, given that the concepts of equality of opportunity and equity of results have become embedded in policy stances that aim to promote markets, competition and neoliberal ideas about education, we might argue that Levin’s (ibid) identification of ‘two main approaches’ is something of a false binary, and that policy makers are in fact mired in a monodiscourse of neoliberal free market fundamentalism.

Although literature on social justice and school improvement constitutes a significant research field in the area of school leadership and equity, Heck and Hallinger (2010, p. 678) identify a paucity of large-scale, longitudinal empirical studies of the relationship between school leadership and academic performance. To explain this phenomenon, Heck and Hallinger (2010, p. 880) cite research that indicates that the ‘inherent complexity’ of organisations makes it ‘difficult to establish empirically a causal linkage between changes in leadership or organizational processes and changes in performance over time’. However, another possible explanation (which is not considered by Heck and Hallinger) is researchers’ incredulity towards the idea that school leadership produces equity of results, and this scepticism is evident in some of the literature. For example, in her study of social justice and school improvement in the poorest neighbourhoods, Lupton (2005, p. 591) criticises the English initiative, ‘Schools in Challenging Circumstances’, on the grounds that its discussion of inequity of results is ‘dominated by references to the poor practice of heads and teachers’. Lupton argues that, in reality, inequity of results is the product of ‘widespread material poverty’ outside the school (ibid, p. 594) that obliges teachers to divert teaching time into pastoral activities (ibid, p. 598) and forces principals to divert strategic planning time into policing pupil behaviour and liaising with external agencies (ibid, p. 599). Lupton (ibid, p. 602) argues that equity of results will not be achieved through improvement measures that concentrate on ‘upskilling and motivating staff’, and that fail to address systemic constraints on social justice. Interestingly, this theory is endorsed in Levin’s (2003, p. 8) report for the OECD, where he states: ‘efforts to promote equity in education cannot rely solely on schools but must also include policy options around issues that are largely outside the educational system’, and there is evidence for the existence of these policy options within the literature. For example, Harris et al. (2006) report on a UK government sponsored project that specifically aimed to address the effects of local contexts, and in particular deprivation, on school performance.

In the next section of this chapter, attention is turned from theory to practice, and a review is presented of literature about the implementation of ideas about school leadership and equity.

1.4 Implementation of ideas about school leadership and equity

As stated previously, the literature on school leadership puts forward three dominant models of leadership: transformational; distributive and instructional. These models are readily adapted within the literature on school leadership and equity to serve the interests of social justice, and writers typically focus on: (i) distributive justice, or the fair distribution of social and material goods (Yavuz, 2010); (ii) a cultural approach, where marginalised groups are more strongly acknowledged and
supported (Gewirtz & Cribb, 2002); and (iii) relational or participatory justice, where individuals are empowered to take a full part in relationships and in society (Lumby, 2013a). These categories of social justice are not discrete, nor are they aligned to particular models of leadership. In much of the literature all three approaches are described simultaneously, to produce what might be described as two main “paradigms of action”: (i) the cultivation of critical reflection, where educators look inwards to discover and challenge personal beliefs about equity, and/or teach for critical engagement (ii) the cultivation of a common vision, where educators look outwards to negotiate a shared policy on social justice (in some instances this common vision is co-created with pupils and the wider community).

In order to consider the value that authors attach to these paradigms of school leadership and equity, accounts of how various strategies have been successfully implemented in schools are detailed below. While this appraisal of practical ideas for policy implementation is by no means exhaustive, it should be noted that, within the literature on school leadership and equity, there is a paucity of guidance for practitioners on how they might enact leadership strategies for social justice (Furman, 2012).

### 1.5 Critical reflection

Brown (2004, p. 77) seeks to develop a ‘process-oriented model’ to prepare educational leaders who are ‘committed to social justice and equity’, and she argues that critical reflection is the first step towards transformational practice. Brown (ibid, p. 89) defines critical reflection as ‘the examination of personal and professional belief systems, as well as the deliberate consideration of the ethical implications and effect of practices’. Brown recommends a number of activities to stimulate the development of critical reflection:

- **cultural autobiographies**, where participants identify their ethnic/cultural group;
- **life histories**, where participants ‘identify and interview a person who is older than 65 years of age and attended school in the United States’ (ibid, p. 100);
- **prejudice reduction workshops**, where participants take part in ‘a series of incremental, participatory activities that empower individuals of all ages and backgrounds to take leadership in building inclusive communities in their workplaces, schools, and neighbourhoods’ (ibid, p. 100);
- **reflective analysis journals**, where participants record their thoughts throughout the semester ‘as a means of identifying and clarifying thoughts, feelings, beliefs, perspectives, worldviews, challenges, hopes, and aspirations’ (ibid, p. 100);
- **cross-cultural interviews**, where participants engage in a ‘one-on-one encounter with an individual’ who is different from them in ‘ethnicity/race/religion/sexual orientation’ (ibid, p. 101);
- **educational plunges**, where participants are encouraged to ‘select an activity that will challenge them to move beyond their present level of comfort, knowledge, and awareness and yet not be so uncomfortable or threatening that they are unable to be open to the “minority experience”’ (ibid, p. 101);
- **diversity panels**, where participants ‘engage in a sharing of their educational experiences, and participate in an informal question and answer session’ (ibid, p. 102);
- **activist action plans**, where participants ‘identify issues that can trigger conflicts (i.e., unequal distribution of material/social resources or differing values, beliefs, and cultural expressions)’, and ‘then develop practical, doable strategies for avoiding them and/or resolving them’ (ibid, pp. 102-103).

Brown does not provide empirical evidence to support the claims for the efficacy of the activities listed above, but she does identify numerous studies that highlight the utility of such strategies as a means to stimulate inward reflection on social justice.
1.6 Teaching for critical engagement

In their study of plural conceptions of social justice, Gewirtz and Cribb (2002, p. 506) identify an approach to teaching that involves ‘a redistribution of the cultural tools needed to decode and critically engage with dominant cultural forms’, and they support their discussion through reference to the Citizen School in southern Brazil:

The starting point for the construction of curricular knowledge is the culture(s) of the communities themselves, not only in terms of content but in perspective as well. The students are not studying history or social or cultural studies through books that never address the real problems and interests they have. The students learn history by beginning with the historical experience of their families. They study important social and cultural content by focusing on and valorizing their own cultural manifestations. A real shift is occurring because the focus is not on the ‘core/official’ knowledge organized around dominant class and race visions of the world, but on the real problems and interests of the students and the community (Gandin & Apple, in Gewirtz & Cribb, 2002, p. 508).

Teaching for critical engagement is similar to Brown’s (2004) process-oriented model of critical reflection, as both seek to cultivate the individual’s understanding of his/her subject position. However, there is a significant difference between the two approaches. Brown’s methodology aims to eradicate feelings of cultural superiority/otherness by engaging school leaders with the experiences of marginalised groups. The methodology identified by Gewirtz and Cribb (2002) aims to eradicate feelings of inferiority held by marginalised pupils by valorising their cultural manifestations.

1.7 The cultivation of a ‘common vision’ of equity

In their study of leadership practices within a secondary school in Australia, Niesche and Keddie (2011, p.66) describe how ‘a common vision about the significance of equity’ has been developed and sustained through the work of the school’s Equity and Action Group (EAG). This group was established in 1996 ‘in conjunction with a state government initiative encouraging schools to address issues of social justice’ (ibid, p. 69). The weekly EAG meetings are open to all staff members and attendance is voluntary. The meetings enable guidance officers, administrative staff, teachers and therapists to meet and share their ideas and concerns about social justice, and Niesche and Keddie praise the collaborative and flexible approach to responding to issues of equity that is fostered by the EAG. Members of the EAG describe it as:

...the school’s ‘guardian of equity’; as a ‘powerful’ mechanism to ensure that ‘equity is never off the agenda’ (senior school head of curriculum); as ‘taking the pulse of the school’ in terms of equity (creative arts teacher 2); and as a way to ensure that the school ‘walks the talk’ in relation to equity (principal) (Niesche and Keddie, 2011, p. 70).

The interventions that are developed by the EAG are ‘geared towards reducing the negative effects of the students’ specific material and cultural disadvantages’ (ibid, p. 69). They include the successful development of support groups for refugees and immigrants; extra language and mathematics support; music and art therapy; family services, and ‘acknowledgement of Indigenous heritage and issues through the National Aborigines and Islanders Day Observance Committee week’ (ibid, p. 69). The variety and scope of the initiatives developed by the EAG appear to confirm that the EAG has enabled the school to develop ‘a “collective wisdom” on addressing the barriers to student learning’ (ibid, p. 72).
1.8 ‘Transforming dialogue’

Within the literature on the cultivation of a common vision of equity, the development of collective wisdom is often linked to transformational language practices. For example, in his study of how we might shape a democratic future by transforming education policy, Woods (2011, p. 134, italics in original) identifies a ‘democratic approach’ to leadership that ‘reflects a valuing of student voice and professional participation’ and in particular aspects of ‘transforming dialogue which aims to enhance understanding’. Woods describes a UK secondary school that has a Leadership Forum similar to the EAG reported by Niesche and Keddie (2011), but which supplements this forum with a School Council. The School Council meets once a month to discuss problems and develop action points in response to issues that pupils put forward via ‘student representatives’ (ibid, p. 137). These issues include such things as the school dress code and access to the library at lunchtime, and the pupils believe that the School Council system ‘works well’ and is democratic (ibid, p. 137). In the words of the Head Boy: “The smallest person with the quietest voice can make a difference” through the School Council’ (ibid, p. 137). According to Woods, the model of distributive leadership adopted by this school enables the school principal and ‘students in key positions’ to both play roles ‘as critical democratic actors’ (ibid, p. 135). Similarly, in their study of school leadership and equity in New Zealand primary schools, Robertson and Miller (2007, p. 100) identify ‘Team Talk’ as ‘a very inclusive way of actively including every child in the school in discussion and play’. Before lunch and playtimes, ‘the class, as a community’, sits together in a circle, and the children ‘plan among themselves what would happen when they went out to play, as ‘an inclusive way of dealing with any potential problems’ (ibid, p. 100).

In some of the literature on leadership and equity, the development of transforming dialogue is supplemented by the gathering of background data. For example, in her study of the utility of transformative leadership theory in practice, Shields (2010, p. 560) explores the practice of two US school principals ‘who have successfully “turned their schools around,” making them more inclusive, socially just, and academically successful’. The first principal identified small groups of ‘willing teachers’, and asked them to collect data about the background and progress of every child in the school (ibid, p. 575). The principal then convened a series of staff meetings to develop teaching methods informed by the pupils’ disclosed needs:

[The] teachers, beginning with the data they generated, spent long hours in dialogue, in newly created team meetings, trying to develop new approaches to achieving success with all students...The constant questioning about what they would do if there were no constraints led to creative new approaches and to a shared rejection of after-school tutoring, noon-hour instruction, or Saturday school - in favour of strategies that placed the onus on teachers and did not "punish students." In fact, they recognized that too many of these common practices arise from deficit thinking—a belief that children need to be cured rather than a belief that teachers using multiple pedagogical strategies can help all children to attain high standards. (Shields, 2010, p. 576)

The second principal that Shields writes about made use of frequent staff meetings, similar to those reported by Niesche and Keddie (2011) and Woods (2011). These meetings focused on ‘trying to understand the needs’ of students from disadvantaged families (Shields, 2010, p. 576) and led to pedagogic and pastoral interventions. For example, a ‘community partnership’ was developed with retirees from the community to benefit those pupils who lack ‘the consistent presence of a caring adult in their lives’ (ibid, p. 576). Although the approaches of both principals led to school improvement, Shields (ibid, p. 578) expresses the belief that the principal who collected data about the background and progress of every child ‘was more explicit and more intentional in her use of power to transform’.

This section of the chapter has considered various strategies for the implementation of school leadership and equity. Some of these strategies are directed inwards, to raise educators’ consciousness
of racial, sexual and cultural discrimination and to valorise pupils' own cultural manifestations, while others are directed outwards, to create spaces for democratic discussion about how we might enhance the social and educational inclusion of all pupils. Common to these diverse accounts of school leadership and equity is the desire for positive change. For Brown (2004), change is achieved through the individual's clarification of thought, while for Niesche and Keddie (2011) change comes about through dialogue that cultivates a common vision of equity. Woods (2011, p. 134) uses the term 'transforming dialogue' to capture how democratic communication enables the development of this negotiated understanding of equity. What is clear from the studies cited above is that the educators who encountered the real world application of these particular ideas about school leadership and equity are convinced that critical reflection and the cultivation of a common vision through transforming dialogue are beneficial to pupils, teachers and (in many instances) the wider community.

1.9 Conclusion

The literature on school leadership and equity is both complex and simple. This apparent contradiction stems from the contrast between the straightforward aim of school leadership and equity to make education fair, and the abundance of complicated terminology that is used to describe styles of leadership and the structure of organisations. Of course, the issue of 'fairness' is far from simple, and this literature review has demonstrated that the dominant concepts of equality of opportunity and equity of results are both underpinned by neoliberal economic theory, which is condemned by some as inherently un-egalitarian (see for example, Harvey, 2009). Ramonet (2008) describes how 'the market penetrates all society's interstices, like a liquid, that leaves nothing and spares nothing'. Although numerous researchers identified in this chapter, such as Fielding (2006) and Hatcher (2005), have spoken out against marketisation, our review of the literature suggests that the discourse of school leadership and social justice is largely saturated with market principles. In support of this diagnosis, Ball (2012, p. 34) argues that the construct of school leadership is bound up with performativity and 'governing by numbers', rather than equity. Ball claims that 'leadership is a means of reworking and narrowing the responsibilities of the practitioner by excluding 'extraneous' issues that are not directly related to performance outcomes' (ibid, p. 34), and we might consider here the use of "metrics" and so called “big data” in the USA. The implication of Ball's theory is disturbing: this paper has highlighted a number of school leadership and equity strategies, such as educational plunges (Brown, 2004); Equity and Action Groups (Niesche & Keddie, 2011), School Councils (Woods, 2011), Team Talk (Robertson & Miller, 2007) and pupil data collection (Shields, 2010), that have been implemented around the world in good faith by educators who are interested in establishing equity in education. However, if Ball (2012) is correct, then policy on school leadership and equity has, in fact, been implemented by governments as a means to identify and exclude factors that inhibit national education performance, which is measured through PISA to produce performance league tables for international comparison (OECD, 2010). The standards agenda is, arguably, incompatible with the account of equity as the reduction of social injustices that affect people's lives: as noted previously in our discussion of Fitzgerald's (2009) critique of education policy in New Zealand, the standards agenda creates a spurious meritocracy that favours the interests of middle class pupils.

Lupton (2005) argues that government policy on school leadership and equity lays responsibility for both equality of opportunity and equity of results firmly at the door of principals and teachers. Ball (2012, p. 35) is highly critical of what he terms the 'new professionalism', whereby social actors are required to take 'responsibility' and have “appropriate” reflexive moral capacities', often in relation to issues that reside beyond their understanding or control. A prime example of this is the structural constraints on equity identified by Lupton (2005): it is simply unreasonable to expect educators to ‘take responsibility’ for issues of material poverty that undermine pupils’ educational performance. Various researchers identified in this literature review describe earnest attempts by educators to develop their critical consciousness and foster democratic governance, yet if Ball is correct, these educators are in fact
engaged in a process of destatization – which involves ‘re-drawing the public-private divide, reallocating tasks, and rearticulating the relationships between organisations and tasks across this divide on whatever territorial scale(s) the state in question asks’ (Jessop, 2002, in Ball, 2012, p. 36). It is not surprising then, that the attempt to make school leaders, rather than the State, responsible for the integration of immigrants and/or minority groups into the dominant culture is found to falter in some of the literature reported in this chapter (see for example, Goddard and Hart, 2007).

While we agree with Ball that educators should not be held responsible for the effects of an unequal society, we also recognise that the idea that individuals’ social and economic prospects are bound up with their education is longstanding, and pre-dates the instigation of the market society by many decades. Indeed, going back to Waller in 1932, it is clear that schools and school professionals embody a ‘grammar’ of schooling, which advantages some and disadvantages others (Lumby, 2013b, p. 3). This ‘grammar’ has, it seems, proved difficult to modify: in their account of schooling in Western Europe, Jones et al. (2008, p. 10) claim that despite the ‘verve and energy of alternative or critical educational projects’ during the 1960s, ‘the curricula and pedagogies developed in earlier periods remained dominant’. Jones et al. (2008, p. 18) show how the ‘grammar’ of advantage was vehemently reasserted in England in the wake of the 1970s economic crisis by neoliberal politicians who linked the ‘populist energies of regressive campaigners’ against progressivism with the ‘modernising’ claim that ‘the school was out of step with economic needs’. Although teachers should not be considered helpless victims in this scenario, Jones et al. (ibid) point out that resistance to neoliberalism has been destabilized by the weakening of trade unions, media campaigns against child-centred and radical classroom practice, and market-friendly legislation that has undermined local comprehensive systems. Lamentably, neoliberalism has resulted in a ‘social polarisation’ that has further undermined the post war project of educational equality (ibid, p. 94). The literature reviewed in this chapter demonstrates that strategies to enhance equity through individual action, systemic change, and complex processes of interaction and initiative at different levels are available to educators for use in schools today (see Woods, 2011), but these practices take place within a neoliberal culture that is as intractable as anything encountered by would-be reformers in the 1960s. For example, the UK Coalition’s Education Secretary, Michael Gove (2013), recently gave a speech entitled ‘The Progressive Betrayal’, in which he condemnation progressive education and praised ‘the leadership of brilliant head teachers’ who had helped inspire his ‘uncompromisingly radical’ educational philosophy.

In spite of the questionable socio-political rationale of discourses of school leadership and equity, this literature review has demonstrated that policy on school leadership and equity produces results in real world settings that are often found to be positive and, indeed, life enhancing. Summing up the findings of their research into primary school leadership and equity in New Zealand, Robertson and Miller (2007) state:

> Schools such as Fern, Rainbow and Daffodil represented more than a child receiving an education. These schools that have an inclusive philosophy of community contribute, in their unique ways, to a more culturally inclusive society. These schools became a vital community connection for the families as they attended functions and made friends, helping to dispel any sense of isolation and trauma that immigrant families would have experienced in coming to a new country. Parents had the opportunity for input in the classroom curriculum concerning their land and culture. (Robertson & Miller, 2007, p. 101)

Notwithstanding such enthusiasm, Foucault's (2009) theory of discourse formation reminds us that literature on leadership and equity helps create the discourse that constructs social phenomena. With this in mind, we should perhaps exercise caution when making claims about the utility of policy on school leadership and equity. As demonstrated by Jones et al. (2008), politicians and the media in England and elsewhere have undermined attempts to promote educational equity by simultaneously ignoring pupils’ material poverty and ridiculing progressive pedagogy, advocated by researchers such
as Gewirtz and Cribb (2002), that might help raise marginalised pupils' critical consciousness. Without due caution, literature on school leadership and equity that fails to acknowledge structural constraints on social justice in neoliberal societies may help constitute a "de-stated" account of governance that places onus on school leaders to take responsibility for social processes that may, in reality, lie beyond their control.
2. LEADING FOR EQUALITY IN A CHANGING EUROPE

2.1 Europe is changing

In many parts of Europe the context in which school leaders must work is changing dramatically: change is both large scale and speedy. Financial insecurity is rising as global economic trends favour Asian and South American nations while much of Europe faces increasing austerity and uncertainty. Resulting youth unemployment is at disquieting levels, particularly in Eastern Europe, and around 50 per cent in Spain and Greece (Eurostat 2012). Migration is increasing rapidly. The proportion of children in school 'who are foreign-born or have foreign-born parents now exceeds 10% in Germany, Belgium, Austria, France, the Netherlands and Sweden, and is above 20% in Switzerland and Luxembourg' (Nusche, 2009, p. 5). These changes are overlaid on the perennial challenges schools face in meeting the needs of children from very diverse socioeconomic and ethnic backgrounds. As Brown (2004, p. 79) states 'the evidence is clear and alarming that various segments of our public school population experience negative and inequitable treatment on a daily basis'. Schools have grappled with achieving equality for along time, but as the issues Europe faces become more testing, so schools are faced with intensifying difficulties in offering an equitable education to all. System level choices, for example about different categories of school, the method of distributing funding and the terms and conditions of teachers' recruitment and employment, are all critical in shaping equality (Nusche, 2009). This chapter, however, does not focus on these system-level factors but on school-level issues; that is, how school leaders can embed equality within their school.

2.2 Defining equality

Deciding what equality means and what it would look like in practice is one of the challenges. Equality is one of the most contested concepts in education, repeatedly debated along with related terms such as equity, social justice, fairness, equal opportunities (Morrison, 2009). Many people link achieving equality with offering the same treatment to all. However, over time it has become clear that equality is not about providing the same educational experiences for all, or even about achieving the same outcomes for all groups irrespective of their characteristics (Lumby with Coleman, 2007). Individuals and families do not necessarily value similar life trajectories, and in particular, not all valorise the kind of academic pathway into a professional job sought by many from a socio-economically advantaged background. Counter-intuitively, rather than equality meaning same treatment, equality may be better understood as 'giving all children an equal chance to be equipped to live a life they value' (Lumby, 2013, p. 19), which implies giving each child what is needed from their perspective, and this will not be the same in all cases. What each family and individual values is culturally nuanced and, although children and young people should not be bounded by the family and community culture in which they grow up, neither should the aspirations and values of their community be disdained or rejected as deviant from or lesser than those of other groups. As Fitzgerald (2009, p. 157) asserts, 'social justice is an impossibility if it rests on notions of deficit'.

Leading for equality matters fundamentally to us all. There is considerable evidence that giving some children fewer chances than others to live a life they value rebounds on the whole of society, including those who are apparent recipients of a relatively privileged education (Connell, 1995; Wilkinson & Pickett, 2009). Equality is a necessary foundation for the social and physical health of the entire
community and not an add-on relevant only to those born into a stigmatised group or an economically poor family.

2.3 Approaches to leading for equality

Synthesising the literature of leading for equality, there are three major approaches that leaders may adopt. The approaches were first highlighted by Fraser (1995) and have since been developed by others (Cribb & Gewirtz, 2003; Gewirtz, 1998):

- **Redistribution**: ensuring that available resources are reshaped to enable those who have less physical or social capital, or have greater need, receive sufficient additional help to enable them to make choices and be enabled to take part in society in ways that they value.

- **Recognition**: recognising difference, insisting on respect for different values and cultures, ensuring that those likely to encounter negative responses or discrimination are particularly supported.

- **Participation**: ensuring that children are equipped to take their place as citizens, to have a voice, to challenge societal assumptions and practice, the better to shape the future.

The three approaches outlined above are not mutually exclusive. Together they translate to an agenda for action. There are many examples from throughout the world of school leaders taking action related to redistribution, recognition and participation. For example, in England, the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (2012) documents a range of redistribution actions in schools, including using additional funding provided by the government to give one-to-one tuition and small group teaching to learners who need extra help. Shah (2006) describes a range of recognition actions for leaders in UK schools to achieve greater recognition of the lives and needs of Muslim students in the UK. Flecha (2011: 8) writes of participation work with migrants and Romani children in Spain which provided 'the tools both to transform injustice and to gain access to socio-economic benefits'.

2.4 Maintaining inequality

Despite many examples of school leaders acting to achieve greater equality for learners, there are also examples of indifference and active maintenance of existing inequalities. In Spain a different interpretation of redistribution is apparent when a local administration decided immigrant students must be 'redistributed' to other schools 'when the percentage of immigrant students in a given centre passed 15%, based on the belief that a larger percentage of immigrants in schools would impede adequate learning for the others and thus lead to school failure and violence' (Flecha, 2011, p. 10). Belief that a particular percentage of immigrants in a school is disadvantageous is not supported by empirical evidence (Song, 2011). Concern such as the example in Spain seems to relate more to fears of harming the education of advantaged learners rather than prioritising the needs of those who may be in poverty and using a second language for instruction: not concern for greater equality, but for protecting advantage from erosion.

A second example is the use of tracking, that is, organising children into classes according to perceptions of their ability. Leaders persist in using tracking despite considerable international evidence that it exacerbates disadvantage and does not particularly help the advantaged (Ammermüller, 2005; Gamoran, 2001; Flecha, 2011; Schneeweis, 2006). Additionally, individual or group classes for those with perceived lesser attainment or ability are often staffed by the least qualified and experienced teachers. Consequently children may experience a double disadvantage, placed in classes which engage with a less challenging curriculum and taught by less expert teachers.
Learners whose first language is not the language of instruction in their school are sometimes seen as a problem. Their language education is often viewed as the responsibility of specialist staff rather than an integral part of the remit of all teachers (Karsten, 2006; Nusche, 2009). Under such circumstances, the provision of specialist language staff may disadvantage rather than help children (Nusche, 2009). In the examples given, whether explicitly stated or not, the primary concern is maintenance of the standards of education for the advantaged. The choices made reflect teacher and parent preferences, where some children are perceived as different to a norm and so in deficit, rather than potentially advantaged by being bilingual.

### 2.5 Attitudes to equality

This chapter opened by describing structural changes in Europe. Many would argue that there are cultural changes also, austerity driving a focus on protecting self-interest. If this is the case, the rhetorical commitment to equality in education which threads through most European policy documents, school missions and educators’ discourse cannot be assumed to reflect a determination to enact such assertions. On the contrary, Kohl (2001, no p.n.) writes:

> One problem is that many people – children as well as adults – do not believe that justice is worth fighting for. One cannot assume an idea or cause will be embraced merely because it is just, fair, or compassionate. Contemporary society values self-interest and personal gain over compassion and the communal good.

Evidence supports Kohl, in that children themselves may resist attention being given, as they see it, to the less able or less well behaved (Lumby & Morrison, 2009). There is also overwhelming evidence that leaders and teachers, though often sincerely convinced of their commitment to equality, prioritise other aims, such as maintaining their subject, the school’s prestige, their own daily professional survival. Since Waller (1932), research has repeatedly recognised the ‘grammar and deep structure’ (Pajak, 2012, p. 1187) of schools that, rather than move towards greater equality, supports a continuation of what is (Delpit, 2006; Gamoran, 2001; Reay, 2001; Shields & Mohan, 2008). Consequently, leaders require considerable preparatory and ongoing development in order to attempt to dismantle inequalities in education.

### 2.6 Embedding equality in schools

The impression is sometimes given that we know too little about how to embed equality in schools. This is not the case. There is considerable guidance about how to lead to be more inclusive (Henze et al., 2002; Rusch & Douglass Horsford, 2008; Shields & Mohan, 2008). Failing to achieve equality in schools relates not so much to a lack of technical know-how, but to issues of ethics and priorities. Leaders who attempt to shift school priorities and practices in fundamental ways usually encounter a modicum of support and a good deal of resistance from teachers and from parents. Teachers may argue, for example, that dismantling tracking jeopardises teaching their subject well, or any subject well (Oakes et al., 2000). Leaders who recruit learners seen by others as problematic risk parents’ response to avoid their school. Flight from schools with a high percentage of immigrant learners has been noted in Denmark (Bloem & Diaz, 2007), and Sweden (Rangvid, 2007), amongst other countries. Above all, leaders face a belief that some children are not educable or only educable with great difficulty. The children of immigrant families or of minority ethnic groups are more likely to be seen as having special needs than are other groups (Field et al., 2007; Nusche, 2009) reflecting deeply embedded prejudices that link being perceived as different with being less able (Lumby with Coleman, 2007). In short, leaders face unjust discriminatory convictions that underpin many teachers’ and parents’ judgements about what is right and possible in education.
Leaders themselves are not immune from such beliefs. Those who, for example, give entry preference to learners with higher attainment (Björklund et al., 2004), or who allocate the most inexperienced teachers to classes of those perceived as lower ability, are enacting inequality. In the light of overwhelming evidence that leaders, teachers and school communities do not act in the best interests of all learners, that they may embody inequality, the preparation and development of leaders has the aim of heightening awareness of how inequality is maintained and how it might be countered.

### 2.7 Preparation and development programmes

Leaders themselves and those who design programmes to educate them are often resistant to making such an aim central. Henze et al. (2002, p. 4) found that only lip service is paid to preparation for leading diverse schools and that 'leaders had not been prepared with tools to analyse racial or ethnic conflict, or with specific strategies for building positive interethnic communities'. Similarly, Marshall (2004, p. 5) suggests that:

> In the push toward credentialing, many faculties and curricula trip lightly on the ways in which education policies are framed without a critical, contextual, or historical understanding of social inequities, equity concerns, or desires for social justice.

Many others reviewing their national system to prepare leaders have made the same point (Brundrett & Anderson de Cuevas, 2007; Shields & Mohan, 2008). Repeatedly, research has found that those who lead programmes feel that they do not have the time or skills or sometimes the necessity to address equality issues explicitly as a priority in leader preparation programmes and that leaders themselves see the issues as taken-for-granted, and not demanding specific attention (Lopez, 2003; Rusch, 2004). Strategies and practice related to poverty, gender, ethnicity, immigrant language or sexuality are often aggregated within a general rhetorical commitment to equality. Programme leaders and school leaders collude to accept token gestures towards equipping senior and middle leaders. This is only possible because, though they may protest to the contrary, the majority do not wish it to be otherwise. The premise for progress is therefore that leaders and those who prepare them should genuinely wish to equip themselves with the knowledge and skills that would allow them to tackle inequalities head on and to withstand the resistance they are likely to encounter in their school community. Policy makers also need to enable freedoms so that organisational level choices about resource distribution, curricula and pedagogy can be fitted to the needs of the whole school community.

### 2.8 Looking for guidance

Leaders might look to learn about meeting the social, curricular and pedagogic challenges from a number of perspectives.

**Understanding oneself**

An initial focus might be to look more objectively and critically at oneself, scrutinising those characteristics as taken-for-granted and used as an unconscious norm; for example, whiteness and its implications are rarely the subject of interest in the way that black principals expect their colour to be; whiteness is pertinent in all schools, but particularly in the many with black and Asian heritage learners (Lumby & Heystek, 2012). Additionally, leaders are acculturated into particular assumptions that they may view as being universal truths, although they are not (Hopkins, 2013). For example, beliefs about capacity to learn and how far it relates to innate ability or to effort and beliefs about the impact of families on early learning are culturally shaped. Very different assumptions about such issues are held in different cultures and correspondingly promote or inhibit learning. Unpacking one's own culture and
its assumptions about people and about learning may move leaders out of their unconscious habitual
thinking and behaviours, raising awareness of how they are shaped by gender, ethnicity, class and
societal culture. If the leader is more aware of how his or her thoughts and actions reflect a specific
location in a particular society, a deeper understanding of learners and particularly of those deemed 'other' in the school, may be possible.

Understanding the experience of disadvantaged groups
Leaders might also be supported to better understand the experience of minority groups within their
school, whether characterised by ethnicity, gender, religion, language or a range of other factors. They
might also focus on groups disadvantaged by poverty, and plan to act upon what is learned. There is no
shortage of materials. Norte (1999) offers five key categories to frame an action agenda to organise a
school for positive interethnic equality. Shah (2006) provides an explicit agenda for leaders who have
Muslim children in their school. Cook-Sather et al. (2010), and Nagda and Gurin (2007) offer techniques
to facilitate dialogue to confront perceptions of difference within school. These are merely examples of
the rich literature offering frameworks, processes and materials to address particular needs and to
properly equip leaders. Rather than some learners being seen as in deficit, preparation and
development programmes might characterise the leader and school as lacking, in that leaders do not
adequately understand their own limitations and the experience of all their learners and need to equip
themselves with better knowledge and ideas for action.

Challenging curricula and pedagogy
A third focus might be, to use Flecha's (2011, p. 8) phrase 'both a curriculum of access and a curriculum
dissent'. Again there is help for understanding how methods might be used to challenge the
embedded grammar of teaching and move to a more inclusive approach. Hayes et al. (2009) studied
high poverty schools and devised a programme of working with researchers and teachers to change
habitual teaching practices unsuccessful with many students. Furman (2012) highlights the developing
toolbox for pedagogic development in relation to equality, pointing the way to researchers who offer
equality audit tools, cultural competency assessments, community outreach ideas and a range of other
methods to develop leaders and teachers to achieve more inclusive schools. Given the will to learn how
to create greater equality, there is much material to use in support. The issue is not technical knowledge
of how to act, but the will to do so.

2.9 Leading for equality

This chapter suggests that Europe faces something of a crisis. The economic and societal pressures are
likely to intensify negative attitudes towards those deemed different, for example immigrants (Collett,
2013), or the poor (Jones, 2012). In this context, schools will come under pressure to ensure those
currently advantaged suffer no detriment, and that provision of those seen as in some way in deficit is
tackled in discrete ways, for example, ability sorted classes for those deemed of lower attainment, or
specialist language teachers to deal with language issues, exclusion of those children who behave in
ways that are deemed unacceptable, or careful quotas maintained for the entry of the proportion of
those learners perceived as problematic. Typically, in educational leadership and management it is
policy makers or family/society factors that are cited as maintaining inequality, and staff in schools
depicted as constrained by the context within which they work. This is a misleading assumption.
Schools and school staff also play a part in creating, maintaining or increasing inequality.

It has become a cliché that leadership is above all a moral task (Begley, 2003). A changing Europe has
made this more so than ever. Policy makers, leaders and teachers share a discourse with a commitment
to equality, and yet educational inequality persists. The causes are of course multiple and complex and
not all under the control of school leaders, but the latter have the opportunity to minimise or
exacerbate inequality. It is their determination to do so and the degree to which they prioritise this aim
that is the foundation of action. Should leaders, those who prepare them and teachers genuinely wish to
change things, there is much research and practice guidance available to help.
3. DIVERSE PERSPECTIVES AND HOPES ON AUTONOMY IN SCHOOL LEADERSHIP

Over the past two to three decades most public sectors in the European area have been restructured. Most of them are following New Public Management patterns of redistribution of power and governance between state, local authorities and organisations. In many cases the phrase ‘autonomy’ has been used to characterise the new relations.

At first glance one thinks that this signifies one way of distributing governance irrespectively of the country or system it is being use on. This is not so. Autonomous organisations are different in type of autonomy, in governance and power relations; in issues included and in the room for manoeuvre they give to educational actors.

3.1 Autonomy

Autonomy is defined as 'the capacity to informed, un-coerced decisions', or: self-determination, one's own self-governance.

We see autonomy being used at several levels:
- On at state level it means: self-government, or the right of self-government.
- On a community or organizational level it means: self-governance.
- On an individual level it means: independence or freedom of the will or one's actions.

The descriptions used seem to indicate full and unrestricted self-governance as if the actors, the organisations or the states are free floating entities with no strings to the context, surrounding and other people. This is of course not so in contemporary societies: we are extremely interdependent. Autonomy then is only interesting as a term if it indicates that an organisation or professional actors are given some room for manoeuvre, and that constrains from the outside - and inside - are reduced to the necessary and legitimate frames, values and norms.

3.2 Educational Governance

In order to illustrate, that autonomy is an international trend in public governance, we need to describe a greater picture of globalisation, transnational agencies and national tendencies.
Transnational agencies\(^1\) are driving forces behind the opening of national economies towards a Global competition from the 1970s and with more power from mid-1990s. The economic aims shifted from growth through full employment through increasing productivity (of labour force and technology) towards growth through international trade and investment. National governments increasingly work through their membership of international organizations on the regional markets.

In line with neo-liberal economical politics is the emergence of new forms of managing public sectors: New Public Management (NPM). Fundamental to this very broad and diverse tendency are the notions of market place and management: The idea that public sectors are best governed in the same way as the private sectors through competition and consumer choice and also by being transparent in a managerial way. One sign is the free school choice: Both across school and day care institution's catchment areas and municipalities and the augmentation of autonomous schools and day care institutions.

### 3.2.1 An example: Decentralization of educational governance systems

From the beginning of the 1990s there was in many countries a strong and general move to decentralize finances, personnel management and other areas from state level to local (municipal) level and in many cases from there further on to school level. Parallel to the decentralisation many educational systems have re-centralises the governance of curriculum and subject matters by prescribing more detailed standards and aims and at the same time introduce national test and international comparisons, based on test.

Whenever the educational system is decentralized, the balance between professional and political power on all levels in the system is changed. The responsibility and professional ability for principals and teachers are enhanced at the same time as evaluation becomes an important instrument for governance.

Systemic evaluation regimes have been established throughout many countries, which means that local government, schools, teachers and pupils are subjected to external evaluation and self-evaluation. Moreover, the state uses actively financial resource allocation in combination with reporting procedures as an indirect control instrument, where municipalities have to report their use of financial costs and human resources to state agencies on a yearly basis. Finally, accountability is strengthened through making results from national tests and evaluations available on special websites.

Taken together, a general picture of present governance model appears to be a joint regulatory enterprise between the state, through a range of ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ steering instruments and quality control, and the municipality sector through direct ownership and decentralized decision-making power. There is a ‘mix mode’ of regulation that is important for understanding the current context of superintendent leadership in different municipalities in Denmark.

---

\(^1\) E.g. WTO-World trade Organization, OECD-Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, GATT-General Agreement on Tariff and Trade, IMF-International Monetary Fund, EU-European Union (especially ‘the Inner Market’ and the ‘Europe 2020’ statement) and the World Bank.
3.3 Private sector inspiration

Yet another trend is very visible too: the trend towards privatisation or towards private-like forms of governance. Instead of being part of a municipal educational system, schools can be autonomous by having a governing board of its own that is accountable directly to the Ministry.

This is the case with free standing, private schools and it is the case with all secondary schools (Gymnasium) and universities: Most of the finances are provided by the state according to number of students. The general aims and curriculum, the standards and testing are still national, but the free standing school is free to manage staff and operations. This means they can hire and fire and set the wages and working conditions on their own.

3.4 Analytical categories

The example has touched on a number of autonomy-categories. The bullet points illustrate the categories of diverse aspects of autonomy in education. In some cases one can find all aspects represented, in other systems only a few. The categories are necessary to reflect upon, when determining what kind of autonomy of leadership is present and what opportunities for equity and learning you see in each case:

1. Autonomy:
   - Decentralisation of decisions within the educational system from state to school, preferably with bureaucratic and management arguments.
   - Self-governance/privatisation, with public-private and market place arguments, establishing single school executive boards, accountable to state.

2. Governance:
   - Market mechanisms: choice, competition, top down leadership.
   - Bureaucratic need for control and transparency.

3. Power:
   - Structural power like budget and legislation.
   - Social technologies (e.g.: test, benchmarks, protocols).
   - Discursive power through recommendations, comparisons, soft governance.

4. Issues:
   - School frames: Budget, staff management, operations are distributed.
   - School content: Aims and curriculum are centralised, national.

5. Room for manoeuvre:
   - Actors participating directly in decision making.
   - Actors deliberating, negotiating and thus participating in construction of premises for decision making.

6. Responsibility for equity and learning:
   - National level, responsible for societal frames and aims, like social justice in access and effects of education.
   - Local level, responsible for community frames and social justice.
   - School level, responsible for treating everybody fairly, equitable and for education and teaching.

We see in diverse types of autonomy: Decentralisation of governance from state to local authorities and further on to individual schools. This leaves school with more self-determination on how to spend funding (provided totally by the state), how to manage staff and their terms of work and wages and the day-to-day operations. The couplings to local, municipal and national authorities have been loosened on these parameters, but the aim and curriculum of education has been tightened at the same time:
standards are being detailed more and there are more control and accountability. This autonomy has been established according to bureaucratic and market place logics, using new social technologies like tests and quality reporting or inspection. Following those trends is a trend to empower school leaders more in the style of private sector top down management and leadership. It is up to the power-relations in each individual school to find appropriate ways of planning and making decisions: more is left to the leader, but she/he can choose to negotiate and give professionals room for deliberation in several stages of decision making.

The self-governed type of autonomous schools was described above: they have a governing board of it’s own that is accountable to the state for finances and quality of education. These schools are even more than the decentralised schools subject to competition and less regulations on finances – even if 70-80 per cent of their incomes stem from the state.

When it comes to the room for manoeuvre, it is difficult to give a clear picture: on one hand more room is left to schools (e.g.: school leaders) to plan and act on finances (within tight frames), staff management and operations. At the same time it seems that there is less room when it comes to teaching and learning because more issues in curriculum are described and tested in great detail. The national governance is tight and aligned to international trends (comparisons and competitions through international tests).

3.5 Questions for reflection
In the case of leadership for learning:

- Are schools able to plan and act more autonomously on teaching and learning matters than before?
- How come?

When it comes to equity the picture is even more muddled, because equity is not only a matter for the individual school, but as much for the social and educational system:

- Are schools given better tools for furthering equity now?
- How come?
4. LEADING AND MANAGING CHANGE: WHY IS IT SO HARD TO DO?

The focus of this chapter is the leadership and management of change within organisations. How do we ensure change is led and managed successfully - what do we need to consider when leading and managing the change process? Stoll et al's (2003) assertion of a decade ago - that to succeed in a world characterised by rapid change and increased complexity, it is vital that schools grow, develop, adapt creatively to, and take charge of change so that they can create their own preferable future - is still applicable today.

It is hoped that this chapter will provide food for thought and establish a good basis for reflection and further discussion about what makes for successful change and why things may not always work out as planned. Questions (in boxes) are raised throughout the chapter and may form the starting points for structuring discussions and research on leading and managing change in the context of EPNoSL. The chapter aims to offer a better understanding of why leading and managing organisational change well is so hard to do but, perhaps more importantly, it also suggests how it might be made easier! There are no easy answers or ‘magic bullets’ but understanding the nature of change and how we react to it can help us manage and lead it more effectively. It begins by asking the simple question – what is change?

4.1 What is change?

Change is by definition a natural and perennial part of life – if we don’t adapt and change or develop then we are unlikely to survive. The Greek philosopher Heraclitus (535 - 475 BC) said that ‘change is the only constant’, whilst more recently it has been said that ‘the only constant factor in contemporary society is the exponential increase in the rate of change’ (anon). Few would disagree with the above statements: if there is one thing that can be said about change with certainty is that there will be more of it tomorrow!

The recognition of the difficulty in leading and managing change is also not new, for as Machiavelli remarked, – in that seminal leadership book, – The Prince:

There is nothing more difficult to take in hand, more perilous to conduct, or more uncertain in its success than to take the lead in the introduction of a new order of things. (Machiavelli, 1532)

So what is change or that ‘new order of things’? Morrison (1998) in what is still one of the most comprehensive texts to discuss change and its management, defines change as:

A dynamic and continuous process of development and growth that involves a reorganisation in response to ‘felt needs’. It is a process of transformation, a flow from one state to another, either initiated by internal factors or external forces, involving individuals, groups or institutions, leading to a realignment of existing values, practices and outcomes (px).

On the other hand the related term innovation is ‘a matter of learning to do things differently in order to do them better’ (Hargreaves, 2003, p. 6).
Schools and colleges are continually changing and introducing innovations. Recent educational changes in many countries have been extensive and affected all areas of school life and age groups. In most education systems three main sources of change will be found: change required or encouraged by central government policy and legislation; change resulting from external inspections and evaluations; and changes initiated by schools themselves, sometimes from the head/principal and senior team (top down), sometimes from teachers and other staff and increasingly from students (bottom up).

Changes affecting schools may therefore be initiated at any of the decision-making levels in the education system:

- central/national (e.g. Ministry or Department, funding bodies, inspection agencies),
- local education authority, district or municipality,
- school (i.e. head/senior leadership team, governing body),
- faculty, department or sub-unit,
- individual teacher(s), and
- students or pupils.

Decision-makers at different levels within the system have differing ideologies and change agendas, based on differing perspectives on the goals of education and the means of bringing these about. This distinction between the origins of change is important and can affect its chances of success. An initiative that is adopted willingly, even though it may have arisen externally, is much more likely to be successful than one that is imposed externally or internally on unwilling staff.

There is a growing body of research which suggests that teachers in many schools perceive a lack of control and ownership over their work and although many welcome many change initiatives, concerns are often expressed about the pace and manner of change, insufficient support to meet these changes, and not being given the professional trust that they deserved. Also the number, speed and manner of implementation of change have added significantly to headteachers’ and teachers’ workload.

**Question 1:**

‘….we as teachers feel that we are constantly dealing with change, and yet, technology aside, we have much the same curriculum and classrooms as we had decades before’ (Breslin, 2011, p64). Do we? Is it also true of schools’ structure, function, teaching and learning?

There are many different types of educational change: they may relate to the curriculum (academic or pastoral), pedagogy, the organisation of teaching and learning, organisational structure or culture. Whatever the changes, they may be implemented rapidly or slowly (incremental) and they may be fundamental (radical or core) or peripheral (marginal). Thinking about the intended outcome of the change in relation to the change process can help assess how easy or difficult it will be to achieve. Figure 1 considers the types of change in relation to both outcome and process.

**Question 2: Change – its nature and origins**

Why do we need to change?  
Where does educational change come from in your system?  
Who are the main drivers for change within your institution?  
What are the main types of change you are familiar with?  
Is change always an improvement?
**Figure 1: Types of change**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROCESS</th>
<th>Transformation</th>
<th>Readjustment</th>
<th>Incremental</th>
<th>Evolution</th>
<th>Adaptation</th>
<th>Rapid</th>
<th>Revolution</th>
<th>Reconstruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Different change management strategies will be used at different times depending on whether simple or transformational change is needed. A useful conceptual model developed in the business literature is Wilson’s (1990) who differentiates between types of change (simple or transformational) and approaches to change (cooperative and coercive) which give rise to four distinct categories: participative evolution, charismatic transformation, forced evolution and dictatorial transformation (see Figure 2).

**Figure 2: Change strategies and conditions for their use (from Wilson, 1992)**

4.2 Why managing change is complex

The leadership and management of change is about moving or transitioning people, teams and organisations to a preferred future state. Change is complex because it concerns people more than content and ‘successful management is about managing successful change’ (Morrison, 1998). This means leading and managing people and this can be difficult without the necessary skills and qualities. Successful leaders of change are resilient and resolute, they are intelligent: emotional, contextual, and strategic. They are strategic thinkers able to ‘read’ situations and people and act accordingly. They have a clear vision, communicate well, are good listeners and remain positive (Day et al., 2011; Fullan, 2011).
Morrison states that:

Whilst one can plan for change in a careful way, in practice the plan seldom unfolds in the ways anticipated. People change things! People respond to change in a variety of ways. Some will resist, some will adapt, some will adopt an innovation. People will respond to the way in which they perceive the change. (1998, p. 15)

This raises important issues:

1. That it is hard to adopt a rational plan for change and see it through as planned, because people are unpredictable and can change things. Social reality is complex.

2. The way that people perceive change will affect the way that they respond. Therefore if they perceive that the change has been forced on them they may well resist it, particularly if they feel it is counter to their interests. It follows from this that it is important to ensure that people at least understand what the change involves and that ideally they should feel some involvement with, and ownership of, the change.

Managing change is a difficult and complex task for a number of reasons. Much organisational change is unplanned and unpredictable. Planned change needs to be balanced with continuity to maintain personal and organisational equilibrium. Most of the work of school managers is concerned with maintaining routine day-to-day activities, principally the teaching and learning programmes. Too much change leads to ‘initiative fatigue’ and ‘innovation overload’; too little leads to stagnation.

It is often assumed that planned change will be beneficial for those involved. Innovation, however, in altering existing arrangements, is both personally and organisationally threatening and brings losses as well as gains. Any change, however small, is likely to disadvantage one or more of those concerned.

Fullan (2001) talks about a number of concrete factors to keep in mind when considering change, for example, the use of resistance to good effect (redefining resistance so it’s seen in a positive and not negative light); the expectation of dips in the process; the requirement for reculturing; the need for pressure and support; that change takes time; and people need to understand the innovation and what it is trying to achieve. He puts complexity together with moral purpose and collaboration towards a common goal as his formula for successful change. As he noted in earlier work: ‘The crux of change is how individuals understand and experience the proposed change’ (1991). Those implementing change can often forget how others will feel as a result of it.

Leaders must try to empower staff by making explicit their own professional and educational values and sharing them. This way, an agreed collegiate culture can be created, encouraging a learning environment for all staff and pupils. Commitment and collegiality in others has to be developed, and leaders need to involve staff in decision making, allowing them to take ownership of their work, valuing them, and translating clear vision and purpose. The development of a collegiate culture or a culture of collaboration, consultation and shared decision-making is the most important factor for successful change. The process of change is as important as the change itself.

**Question 3:**

Fullan states that the process of change is as important as the change itself. Is it? Are there any exceptions to this rule?

Change is a complex, long-term and non-linear process, not a simple one-off event. In-depth and lasting change involves alterations in people’s attitudes, values and beliefs, and hence in the culture of the
school. Because of this, change is destabilising, often threatening for individuals and groups involved, and therefore frequently involves conflict. For these reasons rational models are inadequate for understanding and managing the change process, yet many 'theories' of change – and there is no shortage! - downplay this complexity and are little more than checklists.

**Question 4: Change theory – do you have a favourite?**

Explore the relevant literature or search the internet to locate a 'theory' of change (e.g. Fullan, 2001, 2011; Lewin, 1947; Kotter, 2002, 2006; Bridge, 2009; Egan, 2010; Beckhard and Harris, 1987). Consider the extent to which your chosen theory makes sense. Also, explain whether the theory is linear and rational or sufficiently nuanced to accommodate the complexity of the change process.

If leaders are to earn the respect of their colleagues, they need to provide clear direction which is based on educational ideologies and values that are shared by, or at least acceptable to, the majority. Without this they will fail to motivate staff or earn their trust.

The predominant leadership style set by the principal/headteacher and the senior team will be the key to the way in which change is managed. A number of change strategies and approaches will be called upon. A useful classification of change strategies was offered by Thurley and Wirdenius in the early 1970s: directive, expert, negotiating, educative and participative. Figure 3 outlines the main features of each as well as listing their advantages and disadvantages.

**Figure 3: Five change management strategies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIRECTIVE</td>
<td>Relatively fast</td>
<td>Ignores the views of those affected by change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPERT</td>
<td>Use relevant expertise. Small groups required. Relatively fast to implement.</td>
<td>Expertise may be challenged. Resistance of those not consulted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGOTIATED</td>
<td>Change recipients have some say. Resistance to change likely to be reduced (or areas of disagreement highlighted).</td>
<td>May be relatively slow. Anticipated change may have to be modified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATIVE</td>
<td>People committed to change</td>
<td>Relatively slow. Likely to require more resources and more costs involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPATIVE</td>
<td>Change more likely to be accepted. More people committed to change. More opportunities for individual and organisational learning</td>
<td>Relatively slow to implement. More complex to manage. Will require more resources. Increased costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FAST**
- Clearly planned. 
- Little involvement of others. 
- Attempt to overcome resistance

**SLOW**
- Exploratory. 
- Involvement of others. 
- Minimise resistance
We tend to look for instant results from change, but it may take many years before the results of large-scale change can be properly assessed, particularly where student outcomes are concerned. Our ‘maps of change are faulty’ (Fullan, 1993); they portray innovation as a simple, rational journey following a logical path from policy making to implementation. However, we can identify at least four main stages in the management of the change process: implementation; continuation or institutionalization; and outcomes.

The change process however is not a simple linear progression: it’s a two-way process and events at any stage may feed back to alter decisions made at a previous stage. Thus, in implementing a particular change there may prove to be unintended and unexpected consequences in practice, which lead us back to reconsider the original purposes of the innovation determined at the initiation stage. Similarly, the original purposes and plans for the innovation are interpreted and adapted by those putting it into practice, so the final outcomes may be very different from what was originally intended (e.g. Ball et al., 2012). There may be an ‘implementation gap’ between the intentions of policy makers at national level and what is actually implemented in schools and classrooms. Change is thus a long-term process not a simple event. Significantly, many changes fail to progress beyond the planning or early implementation stage. Those managing change have to deal with multiple changes, each progressing through the various stages noted above. The changes interact and impact on each other and may not be mutually compatible. Wherever the change originated, it has to be managed and that means dealing with people, both as members of teams and individuals.

4.3 Change and the individual

Change involves both the organisation as a whole and the individuals and teams within the organisation. The leaders and managers of change need to be aware of the emotional costs involved with change and to ensure that people have full information, time and real opportunities to talk things through. In an organisation where power is shared and devolved and people have some ownership of change, it is likely that change will be handled more smoothly and successfully than in a hierarchical, mechanistic organisation. Change is more likely to be successful when it is seen to be in line with the key purposes of the organisation, when it is clearly understood and well communicated.

Individuals vary in terms of personality and motivation and may be more or less welcoming of change for a variety of reasons. People react differently to the introduction of new ideas and initiatives, some are open to change and keen to be involved, others are resisters and may act as blockers.

Figure 4: The process of transition (from the National College programme Leading from the Middle)
Question 5: Where do you stand in relation to change?

Look at Fidler’s typology below and locate where you are positioned. Is your predominant attitude to change an advocate, willing follower, resister or blocker? Also does ‘the process of transition’ (a variant of the well-known ‘change curve’) shown in Figure 4 make sense to you or your colleagues?

Figure 4 and similar models of the transition process such as the change curve (originally based on grief and bereavement counselling) enable you to recognise where you and your colleagues are on the change journey and to be reassured that feeling anxious or upset is a natural and necessary part of the change process.

Fidler (2002, p.93) has identified the following typology of people faced with a major change:

- change drivers – these people tend to like change in general
- careerists – they may see a change as something that will improve their career prospects
- co-operatives – who have good will towards change and are generally supportive
- ambivalent – can see the good and the bad potential
- sceptical – unsure about the change or how it affects their own personal interests
- luddites – who oppose any change on principle
- resisters – who oppose this particular change.

Rogers (1962) developed a model for the adoption of change and for the diffusion of innovation, arguing that only a small percentage of staff are ‘innovators’, with a further third ‘early adopters’ and one-in-six ‘laggards’. In a later edition Rogers (2003) discusses the factors that are likely to affect take up, such as the complexity of the change and its benefits or advantages over existing systems.

Change forces us to step outside our comfort zone; so perhaps resistance is a natural reaction. Are most people inherently conservative preferring the status quo to a ‘new order of things’?

Question 6: Is resistance to change a natural response?

What are the main sources of resistance to change?
What strategies can school leaders draw upon to help reduce or overcome any resistance?

Individuals faced with change may feel:

- loss of status and control
- fear of the unknown
- lack of clarity of purpose
- uncertainty and ambiguity
- feelings of vulnerability
- lack of clarity on the benefits of the change
- reluctance to let go of the present
- threats to expertise and established skills
- the feeling of having surprises sprung
- fear of failure and threats to self-esteem
- admission that the present situation is unsatisfactory
- concern about the ability to cope
- fear of loss of control
- stress
- increased workload.
The main sources of resistance to change include:

- lack of trust – unsure about motives for change
- belief that change is unnecessary or not feasible
- economic threats
- fear of failure or failure to understand the problem
- loss of status and power – personal costs too high
- rewards – insufficient gains
- threats to values and ideals – not like the proposal
- resentment of interference
- anxiety – how will I cope!?

Strategies to help overcome resistance to change can include ensuring people are given sufficient information about the change and its desired effect; greater involvement in the design and implementation of the change; negotiating with staff if they feel they are going to lose out; and being supportive, listening to any doubts and concerns people may have and providing training as needed.

Training and development plays a key role in the change process – and not only at the implementation stage. When trying to implement change, anxiety and worry will be reduced if additional training is provided through various mediums such as peer mentoring, observations, shadowing, research, courses, etc.

The role that the individual can play in welcoming or resisting change is considerable, and this is an important element in the introduction of any change. Attitude and overall motivation to change may be positively linked to staffs’ sense of their own professionalism. However, critics of educational policy have pointed out that this sense of professionalism is being undermined through government initiatives. This may be resented by teachers and make them more resistant to change and therefore more likely to oppose any changes seen by them as part of a government’s managerialist or performative agendas discussed in previous chapters.

4.4 Managing resistance and conflict

Resistance is a natural response to feelings of 'loss, anxiety and struggle' (Bush and Harris, 2000, p. 19). Change for many is synonymous with extra work, pressure and stress. Resistance should therefore be anticipated as a natural part of the change process. A major reason for the failure of change however is a lack of attention to the process of change. It is very important to think through the change process carefully in order to reduce the number of negative side effects. Remember too, resistance can be used to good effect; it gets you to think through your ideas and to ask yourself ‘are we on the right track?’

However, when intending to implement change one will almost certainly be confronted not only with resistance but also with some kind of conflict. The ability to handle conflict is a key factor in successful change management. Dealing with conflict can often create a sense of fear but it is important to remember however, that conflict, like resistance, is an inevitable part of implementing change and that one must therefore understand its source, show empathy where needed and have strategies to deal with it.

When managed effectively, conflict and resistance, can be quite positive. As noted by Gold and Evans:

...well managed conflict can be productive and creative and can move a group of people or an organisation on to a far more productive phase than the one it was ‘stuck’ in before (1998, p.43).
Managing conflict is often synonymous with managing difficult people (Trapnell, 2012). Mismanaging those members of our team who create problems for it can impede change, but more drastically, impede development for that individual. When dealing with difficult people, Gold and Evans (1998, p.44) suggest that we should:

- Acknowledge uncomfortable feelings aroused in you by different persons, put them aside and work objectively.
- Separate person from problem.
- Take time – do not react immediately. Think about your next action to make it proactive.
- Plan your actions carefully – rehearse what you are going to say.

It is also important to ensure that we do not allow ourselves to become manipulative or aggressive.

4.5 Can change be managed successfully?

There are numerous ways to approach the leadership and management of change and the number of variables affecting it are endless but there are models, strategies and techniques which will help. This is no space to go into these tools in any detail here but a few are mentioned which can easily be followed up on the internet.

At its simplest managing change means recognizing the four Ps: purpose, picture, plan and part. The basic purpose for the change has to be clear and people need to understand why the change is needed. A picture needs to be painted of the outcomes of the change and this is part of the vision building process. We need to encourage ownership of the change or ‘buy in’. It is also necessary to produce and discuss an outline plan which should be included in the development or improvement plan. It will need to be modified during implementation. Finally, each person should be given a part to play in both the plan and the outcome itself – they need to know how they can contribute and participate.

Other tools and techniques that can be drawn upon that may help ensure a greater chance of success include diagnostic windows for identifying problems, commitment planning, SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats) analyses, force-field analysis (a diagnostic reality check on whether you can change a situation) and readiness, commitment and capability mapping. The Change Curve and the Change Equation are also helpful tools, the latter seeing successful change as made up of five components - vision, skills, incentives, resources and action plans - the omission of any one likely to lead to implementation difficulties.

Using such tools and techniques will help but they are no guarantee of success – after all we are dealing with people!

4.6 Conclusion

Educational leaders influence teams to work collaboratively, to share vision, to be motivated and to perform well. Leaders must try to empower staff by making public their own professional educational values and sharing them. This way, an agreed collegiate culture can be created, encouraging a learning environment for all staff and pupils (Bubb and Earley, 2010; Earley, 2013). Commitment and collegiality in others has to be developed, and educational leaders need to involve staff in decision making, allowing them to take ownership of their work, valuing them, and translating clear vision and purpose. The development of a collegiate culture or a culture of collaboration, consultation and shared decision-making is the most important factor for successful change. Trust, empowerment and engagement are
key components of such cultures where change is not seen as a threat or indeed as part of everyday practise.

It must be emphasised that change is a complex, long-term and non-linear process, not a simple one-off event and that the process is as important as the change itself. In-depth and lasting change involves alterations in people’s attitudes, values and beliefs, and hence in the culture of the organisation. Because of this change is destabilising, often threatening for individuals and groups involved, and therefore frequently involves conflict. For these reasons rational models are inadequate for understanding and managing the change process.

Finally, as Furnham (2005) states, re-working a well-known statement from the bible:

Organisations (and their leaders) must have the courage to change things they can change, the tolerance and adaptability to leave unchanged the things they cannot change, and the wisdom to know the difference. (p. 675)

This chapter hopefully contributes to the gaining of that wisdom – the wisdom to lead and manage change successfully!
5. POLICY RESPONSE: A CRITICAL ENGAGEMENT

This chapter aims to explore the concept of policy, and to consider what is meant by policy response. We adopt a “critical postmodern perspective” (Nudzor, 2009) on the implementation of policy, viewing policy as both an attempt to solve problems and an attempt to persuade social actors to subscribe to particular beliefs that delineate action. We share Ball et al's (2012, p. 8) conviction that 'few policies arrive fully formed' and that the processes of policy enactment 'involve ad-hocery, borrowing, re-ordering, displacing, making do and re-invention'. However, we also endorse Ball's (1993, p. 12) view that policies 'create circumstances in which the range of options available in deciding what to do are narrowed or changed'. Consequently, in this chapter we provide an analysis that acknowledges that policy is in part extemporized, and in part the attempt to promote a “de-stated” account of governance.

5.1 What is policy?

Understandings of policy have moved beyond viewing it as a discrete entity, merely the output of a political system, to understanding policy as a process that brings certain principles or ideas into practice (Ham & Hill, 1993). Ranson (1995, p. 440) highlights the purpose of policy for governments to 'codify and publicise the values which are to inform future practice and thus encapsulate prescriptions for reform'. This viewpoint is in keeping with Olssen (2004, p. 72) when he states 'Policy here is taken to be any course of action [...] relating to the selection of goals, the definition of values or the allocation of resources'. A connection is thus made between policy and governance, and more specifically understanding policy in relationship to 'the exercise of political power and the language [discourse] that is used to legitimate that process' (Olssen, 2004, p. 72). As Ball (1998, p. 124) contends, 'policies are [...] ways of representing, accounting for and legitimating political decisions'. Moreover, because of their nature they go to the heart of the relationship between the state and the welfare of its citizens (Hill, 1996). Thus the concept of policy is entangled with notions of public and social issues, the solutions to these, and the role of the state in providing these solutions. Education policy therefore represents an important site for the 'playing out' of political control and authority over the very nature of education, what is its purpose, how it manifests through structures and practices (for example through schooling, curriculum, pedagogy, etc), and what issues it prioritises and neglects (for example standards, equity etc) in different contexts of practice.

Because policy is bound up with a discourse of the state and the exercise of political power, education policy discourses that are supported by governments (either directly or indirectly) tend to dominate debate and prevail. In the global policy arena, over the last 30 years neo-liberal policy discourses have brought specific values and norms to the fore. Milton Friedman (2002, p.p. xiii-xiv), one of the most celebrated neo-liberal thinkers, boasted of the strategy of waiting patiently for a crisis to occur, developing neoliberal 'alternatives to existing policies' and keeping them 'alive and available until the politically impossible becomes politically inevitable.' In the wake of the economic crisis of the 1970s, proponents of neoliberalism have been invited by successive governments around the world to contribute to policy conversations around areas of concern (such as the performance of schools), and via these conversations neoliberals have incrementally marginalised more collective social welfare centred policy responses and ensured that the individualised neoliberal response is the “common sense” and ‘politically inevitable' position (Friedman, ibid). Consequently, Ozga and Lingard, (2007, p. 71) note that governmental discourses on equity in education frequently fail to feature, while at the
same time a ‘vocabulary of economy, efficiency and entrepreneurship is advocated as if the terms represented agreed values’. Such discourses seek to establish these values as ‘norms which could not possibly be refused and opposed by anyone not being out of his/her senses’ (Sender, 1998, p34). Clearly, such a process is not neutral; as Foucault (1977, p. 49) observes, ‘practices systematically form the objects of which they speak […] Discourses are not about objects, they do not identify objects they constitute them and in practice of doing so conceal their own invention’. Thus specific education policy discourses are deliberately and constructively (re)used, (re)emphasised and (re)iterated until they enter the public consciousness and become reified.

Moreover in a world of global exchange where countries are increasingly interested in learning about what other states are doing, so a particular discursive and generic international policy response by nation states and national governments can be identified. As Ball (2008) observes:

> An unstable, uneven but apparently unstoppable flood of closely interrelated reform ideas is permeating and re-orientating education systems in diverse social and political locations with very different histories. This convergence has given rise to what can be called a generic global policy ensemble that rests on a set of basic and common policy technologies […] marketisation, managerialism and performativity and […] the increasing colonisation of education policy by economic policy imperatives. (Ball, 2008, 39)

Marketisation relates to a move by countries to a system of provision in which decision-making and power is devolved to increasingly diversified types of educational providers drawn from both state, voluntary and private sectors, frequently located in a competitive environment in which recipients of education (students and parents) are given greater choice (Ball, 2008). The policy technology of managerialism is the increasing influence and adaptation of theories, models and techniques from business management into state sector institutions such as schools. Responsibility for the delivery of services is delegated within an organisation with a focus on quality, innovation, problem solving and customer/user satisfaction (Ball, 2008). Performativity is the state increasingly setting institutions a range of targets to be achieved against which they are held accountable and can be measured and compared. In so doing the state no longer directly intervenes in dictating what and how institutions must operate, rather it facilitates a process of indirect governance whereby the actions of institutions are determined by performance (Ball, 2008). Cumulatively, this discursively informed and constructed global policy ensemble of marketisation, managerialism and performativity of education, impacts on individuals, groups and institutions ‘to reconstitute social relations’ (Ball, 2008, pp. 42-43).

In this regard we borrow from Jessop’s (2002, p. 199) term ‘destatization’ to argue that neoliberalism has created a “de-stated” model of governance in many countries, in which individuals are given responsibility for social issues that were, under the previous social welfare model, considered to be the responsibility of the state. Under “de-stated” governance, the state no longer takes responsibility for such things as social mobility, but instead “manages”, or oversees, the operation of the free market which ostensibly delivers outcomes that are favourable to the interests of individuals. The new public management system of central regulation and decentralised operational management (Jones, et al., 2008, p. 22) places pressure on social agents to take responsibility for issues assigned to them by government, and we would contend policy, for example such as that on school leadership and equity, which obliges local school leaders to “govern” social justice in the free market society, is an example of this pressure.

### 5.2 What is “policy response”? 

The phrase “policy response” brings to mind a dialogue between policy makers, who devise educational targets and programmes, and policy implementers, who respond by putting these plans into action. In
recent years, the nature of this dialogue has been examined by researchers interested in socio-cultural dynamics, and in her review of conceptions of policy, Nudzor (2009) identifies three dominant paradigms: (i) the ‘problem-solving’ model positions policy as a ‘document of some sort’ that is created by policy makers and put into practice by implementers (ibid, p. 93); (ii) the ‘process model’ positions policy as ‘a site of struggle, negotiation and dialogue’, with the outcome (e.g. leadership strategies) co-created by makers and implementers (ibid, p. 91); (iii) the ‘theoretical eclecticism’ model positions policy as the ‘exercise of power and language that is used to legitimate the process’ and draws upon the problem-solving model and the process model (ibid, p. 93).

The theoretical eclecticism view of policy, which is favoured by Nudzor, features prominently in literature on power relations in neoliberal democracies. For example, Harvey (2009) describes how governments seek to persuade the populace to accept policy by embedding novel ideas within the existing discourse. He states:

For any way of thought to become dominant, a conceptual apparatus has to be advanced that appeals to our intuitions and instincts, to our values and our desires, as well as to the possibilities inherent in the social world we inhabit. If successful, this conceptual apparatus becomes so embedded in common sense as to be taken for granted and not open to question. (Harvey, 2009: 5)

If Harvey is correct, then policy on such things as school leadership and equity is accepted by implementers only if it appeals to their existing instincts and desires. As stated previously, marketisation, managerialism and performativity are the expression of the global neoliberal ideology, and it is this ideology that largely conditions our interaction with new ideas, articulating ‘new ways of thinking about what we do, what we value and what our purposes are’ (Ball, 2008, pp. 42-43). The widespread endorsement of neoliberal beliefs ensures that policy consistent with “common sense” is readily accepted or even goes unnoticed. For example, in their study of school leadership and equity in Canada, Goddard and Hart (2007) discovered that policy on leadership for social justice was being tethered to a “common sense” discourse of equality of opportunity that was, the authors claimed, detrimental to minority groups. Although visible to Goddard and Hart (2007), the consolidation of the majority group’s power through the implementation of policy on school leadership and equity was, it seems, invisible to the implementers. It appears, therefore, that if policy makers tether policy to extant “common sense” beliefs, then the ability of head teachers, teachers, governors and parents to interrogate and challenge policy is significantly undermined.

Lumby and Mujis (2013, p. 14) define the state not just as the formal government apparatus, but ‘as the will of the dominant majority that functions both to pursue advantage and to disguise self-interest at a cost to others’, and they claim that interest groups, such as parents and educators, may use policy in a way that ‘sustains current educational inequalities’. When thinking about policy, it is therefore necessary to consider the non-governmental “key actors” who are involved with its implementation, and the nature of their involvement. In their analysis of policy machinery, Bates et al. (2011, p. 41) identify how policy ‘ownership’ is considered to be crucial to implementation. This is because a dispersed, rather than top-down, model of implementation is more likely to ensure that various stakeholders (e.g. parents and local authorities) view policy as benign, rather than an alien interloper, and terms such as ‘influential stakeholders’ and ‘policy community’ (ibid, p. 42) are used to describe the multitude of individuals who must be “on-board” with a policy message in order for it to be embraced. Clearly, this view is consistent with Harvey’s (2009) account of the embedding of novel ideas. The conflation of policy with “common sense” and the cultivation of policy ownership is engineered through such things as consultations and conferences, and of course policy documents play a key role in recruiting stakeholders’ support. Interestingly, it has been argued that policy networks, which would include our own European Policy Network on School Leadership (EPCNoSL), ‘are displacing hierarchy and markets and developing as the dominant mode of governance and social organisation’ (Ball, 2012,
meaning that we ourselves are playing an increasingly important role in the formation of policy consensus.

Of course, we know that "unappealing" policy is often rejected in democratic societies (consider, for example, the public’s response to the UK poll tax in 1990, which led to riots and the eventual abandonment of this policy). Thus while it is important to acknowledge the discursive dominance and impact of neoliberalism on a national and global level, it is equally important to appreciate that the matching of policy rhetoric with practice is never straightforward. Policy response might be described as highly contextualised, complex and fragmented. In essence, there are no universal 'truths' about policy implementation, the journey from principle to practice - even if discursively framed in a particular way - is a contested one which involves institutions and individuals in a process of ‘creative social action’ (Ball, 1998, p. 270). This is a crucial point, as contestation provides a political space in which dominant policy discourses are not simply accepted unproblematically at face value, but may be challenged, nuanced, reformulated, and changed. For this reason, Braun et al. (2010, p. 549) talk not of policy response but 'policy enactment', which they claim 'involves creative processes of interpretation and recontextualisation – that is, the translation through reading, writing and talking of text into action and the abstractions of policy ideas into contextualised practices'.

At a school-based level this enactment process reveals the ways in which policy is never simply implemented but ‘interpreted’ and ‘translated’ in a context of time, space, and place. The premise underpinning this is that ‘policies do not normally tell you what to do, they create circumstances in which the range of options available in deciding what to do are narrowed or changed, or particular goals or outcomes are set’ (Ball, 1994, p.19). Such a standpoint on policy enactment is significant as it positions head teachers, teachers, governors, parents, and others engaged with educational reform as ‘key actors, rather than merely as subjects in the policy process’ (Braun et al., 2010, p. 549).

Consequently, while in no way wishing to diminish the power and influence of prevailing dominant neoliberal discourses in shaping education policy and national policy response, the remaining part of this chapter picks up on the notion of ‘creative social action’ (Ball, 1998: 270) to reflect further on the ways in which ‘policy, people, and places interact to shape how implementation unfolds’ (Honig, 2006, p.10) and policy responses occur. In so doing we draw on the education and political science literature, to offer Ten Policy Pronouncements.

- **Firstly**, history and culture are very powerful influences on policy and practice. Each nation or each region within a nation thinks and acts within its history, national ideology, and its own political sense of what is right (Whitty, 1995). Policy ideas are formulated, interpreted and acted upon differently within different nation states (van Zanten 1997).
- **Secondly**, social class, language, religion, ethnicity, the structure of political institutions and the nature of political culture affect the way in which policy is played out (Whitty, 1995).
- **Thirdly**, policy decisions are by their very nature highly political and may be shaped not least by the requirements of staying in office - governments are as much about staying in office and getting elected as achieving particular policy goals (Levin, 2001).
- **Fourthly**, policies may be shaped and crafted not on the basis of any evidence-based research but simply on the beliefs and commitments of policy-makers and their advisers. Fink (2001, p. 227), for example, cites a former UK Education Secretary’s admission ‘that major policy initiatives in England that have influenced countless pupils and teachers were based on personal whim and prejudice’.
- **Fifthly**, policy-making may be substantially shaped by symbolic considerations that may have little to do with the real effects of policies. For example, political talk and action might be intended to shape and then respond to politically created issues and problems as much as to any real practical concerns. Equally, political spectacle might be used to hide policies and actions that might have material advantages for some groups over others (Edelman & Stone, 1988).
● Sixthly, policy reforms may be crafted simply to focus on the politically salient; in other words what can be done instead of what might really make a difference (Cohen, 1995).

● Seventhly, policies that evolve from the political process are quite often unclear and ambiguous Levin (2001). As Walford (2003, p. 3) similarly notes, policy texts ‘contain divergent meanings, contradictions and structured omissions’. Moreover, they are to be interpreted and implemented often by institutions and individuals - such as schools and teachers - who have had no hand in their drafting or planning (Braun et al., 2010).

● Eighthly, and related to number four, the entire process of policy development and implementation takes place in a wider political context that is constantly changing, multi-faceted, and in a constant state of flux. At any one time there is thus a very high probability of low probability events occurring, which whilst they cannot be foreseen or planned for nevertheless can have a major impact on policy response and the implementation process (Dror, 1986).

● Ninthly, institutions such as schools possess considerable ability to resist or alter policies to fit their own dynamics or to maintain the status quo and to avoid change in response to external demands (Levin and Riffel, 1997). As Braun et al.(2010) state ‘policy practices are specific and contextualised. They are framed by the ethos and history of each school’. Moreover, schools are operating in a complex environment in which they are likely to be required to respond to multiplicity of policy demands and expectations simultaneously (Braun et al., 2010). Thus the nature of institutional interaction with policy at the local level is critical in determining policy response and framing its implementation (Darling-Hammond, 1990).

● Tenthly, policies are transformed by those who have to turn them into practice (Levin and Riffel, 1997). Key actors within institutions such as head teachers and teachers within schools have the capacity – even with nationally prescribed policy initiatives – to alter, shape and craft policy texts in accordance with their own professional and personal values, beliefs, understandings and goals (Braun et al., 2010). As Darling-Hammond (1990, p. 341) states:

> [we need] to understand that top-down policies can "constrain but not construct" practice; that local leadership and motivations for change are critical to policy success; that local ideas and circumstances always vary (therefore local agencies must adapt policies rather than adopting them); and that teachers' and administrators' opportunities for continual learning, experimentation, and decision making during implementation determine whether policies will come alive in schools or fade away when the money or enforcement pressures end.

5.3 Conclusion

In this chapter we have argued that policy discourses are currently dominated by neoliberalism, which seeks to normalise such things as managerialism, marketisation and peformativity so that they are accepted as "common sense" propositions. Various theorists (e.g. Foucault, 1977; Ball, 1998; Harvey, 2009) point out that this process of normalisation renders us receptive to further neoliberal policy that is compatible with existing ideas, values and beliefs in education, but that we are not necessarily powerless recipients of policy. Indeed, for example Friedman's (2002, pp. xiii-xiv) account of the incremental adoption of neoliberalism provides a model of resistance: by ‘keeping alive’ alternatives to managerial responses to social justice, educators are able to resist the wholesale adoption of policy on such things as school leadership and equity that promotes a "de-stated" account of governance. By utilising their power to interpret and reject managerialist solutions to inequity, head teachers, teachers, governors and parents – to name but a few of the key actors in education – are potentially in a strong position to carry forward policy that meets with their approval, and to reject that which does not. Of course this assumes a willingness and desire to keep alive alternatives to the prevailing ideology and in some national contexts a certain political space to do so.
PART II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP IN POLICY AND PRACTICE IN SELECTED EU COUNTRIES
6. EDUCATING SCHOOL LEADERS FOR EQUITY AND LEARNING: A REVIEW OF THE STATE OF AFFAIRS IN SELECTED EU COUNTRIES

In all EU countries matters of equity in access to education, equal learning opportunities and learning outcomes of pupils, irrespective of their socio-cultural background, rage, gender, health condition, etc, are attracting for over a decade now increased policy attention in EU and often become object of occasionally heated public discourse. Such discourse, particularly in the media, is often grounded on the results obtained from international large scale assessments but also from national level research. Issues of equity and learning outcomes are addressed through various strategies and reforms across EU; perhaps the most common policy response to these challenges is an increased emphasis on improving the quality of the teaching staff in schools; however, as we shall discuss further in this chapter, there is currently little emphasis on issues of equity in the discourse and practice related to the education, training and professional development of school leaders. This chapter offers an analysis of policy briefs from 15 EU countries that were drafted by EPNoSL partners, namely from Austria, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Latvia, Lithuania, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, and the United Kingdom.

6.1 The policy emphasis on equity and improved learning outcomes

In the case of Austria, TIMMS or PISA results have fuelled public debates about why the education system does not succeed in reaching high levels of academic achievement and why some groups of pupils (e.g. low socio-economic background pupils, pupils with an immigrant background) appear not having the same opportunities as other groups to succeed in the school system. These results and the discussion that followed their publication have put pressure on policy makers to act in order to address problems of low academic performance, particularly among socio-culturally disadvantaged groups of pupils. In Austria’s National Education Report 2012, social background and language competences were the two factors which were addressed in detail as significant negative factors on learning results and access to education. Overall, equity is a highly politicized issue in Austria. It should be noted that while equal access to compulsory education is articulated in Austria’s constitution, the fundamental right to education for all is not.

The new school quality programme for compulsory schools ("SQA" in grades 1-9) focuses on the learning of all students as a central quality issue. Under the current Minister of Education, equity is central in several reform efforts. A newly established Department for Diversity in the Ministry has
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1 Annexed in this report. The full bibliographic references cited in this chapter can be found in the related country briefs.
brought together all ministerial offices related to diversity and is focused on inclusion in policy, research and practice. Equity is also a main driving force of the lower secondary school reform in Austria. The “Neue Mittelschule” (NMS) was piloted 2008-2011 and mandated in April 2012. The new school form suspends tracking in compulsory lower secondary schools, although the fundamentally selective two-track system (4-year compulsory schools and 8-year academic-track schools) is still in place and requires parents to choose a school type for the lower secondary education for their children when they are around 10 years of age. Support and resources for the NMS reform and implementation are provided on all system levels. Furthermore, expert lectures on equity are also recorded and made available on Austria’s educational video platform BildungsTV and webinars open to all are being planned for the coming school year.

The issue of equity is also gaining a growing attention by the public and policy makers in France due to the publication of the 2009 PISA results which showed a gap in the achievement of pupils as compared to other countries. School drop-outs is also another issue which raises concerns in the policy making community and the public. Equity is largely considered the result of the work of educators who are called to reduce social inequalities through the transmission of knowledge to all and through the promotion of equal treatment in relation to school provisions.

Currently there is an intensive discussion in Germany about social injustice and the lack of equity in education. The Vodafone Foundation Germany has recently published a survey that was conducted by the renowned Allensbach Institute for opinion and market research.¹ The study gives a voice to those who are often somewhat excluded from the dominant political discourse on education – i.e. pupils and teachers - and focuses on social mobility, educational goals, opportunities and equity for pupils from different socio-economic backgrounds. According to this study, 61% of the teachers feel that, due to their different social backgrounds, not all children have equal opportunities in access and learning outcomes. As it was concluded, whereas in all societies the social background influences cultural interests and patterns of behaviour (like reading behaviour), in Germany the influence of social background is much stronger than elsewhere. Both teachers and parents who participated in the study agreed that factors having to do with family background are the main reason for some children having fewer learning opportunities than others. Above all, 84 percent of teachers and 79 percent of parents stressed the lack of interest on the part of parents in engaging with their own children. Teachers and parents also mentioned shortcomings in pupils' upbringing in respect of working conscientiously (77/76 percent), parents' failure to act as role models for their children (75/78 percent) and a lack of time on the part of parents to spend with their children (69/65 percent). This study – as various OECD publications before – points to considerable challenges for the education system in Germany. It is reasonable to argue that instead of shifting the responsibility to parents from lower socio-economic backgrounds for “deficits” in supporting their children, schools should provide equal opportunities for all children regardless of their social background. Therefore, promoting equity in schools is becoming a major field of work for political decision-makers, education authorities, school leaders, teachers and, last but not least, researchers. It should also be pointed out that in Germany, with the ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in 2009, the right to inclusive education in the general education system defined in Article 24 has become legally binding in Germany.

Article 24 postulates the right to inclusive education and the attendance of regular schools for disabled children. Currently, about 80 percent of all children with special educational needs are taught in special schools; only about 20 percent of them attend a regular school. However, there are large differences among the federal states. While in Bremen and Schleswig-Holstein 36 and 45 percent of children with special educational needs attend a regular school, 7 percent in Lower Saxony and 12 percent in Hesse do so. Overall, different states face different kind of challenges regarding the inclusion of children with special educational needs.

In the Netherlands during that past few years seven themes have been examined more closely from a policy perspective for further improvement: learning inside and outside the classroom: cross-links and responsibilities; targets and standards as a guarantee for accessibility; concentration and segregation within and between schools; systemic approaches and exclusion; responsibility for accessibility; integrated or specific accessibility policy; and lifelong learning and accessibility. The Education Council, an independent governmental advisory body, has repeatedly highlighted equity challenges in the education system. According to a 2011 exploratory study by the Education Council\(^1\), “the level of educational attainment of the parents is still the best predictor of the school career and the social success of children. The children of low skilled parents tend to follow a programme of education at a lower level than the children of highly skilled parents. This means that they are more vulnerable in the labour market. A low level of educational attainment is not only associated with poorer skills in language and arithmetic, but also poorer skills in foreign languages, a lack of flexibility and poor data processing skills”.

In Portugal, the traditionally grave problems of inequality in education opportunities and of low education attainment have been object of public discourse and policy reforms since two decades now. Legislation introduced from 1991 onwards (1991 – 2001 – 2011) focused on the need to respond to the diversified pupils’ needs, and specifically the needs of pupils coming from poorer social and familiar backgrounds who were frequently at risk of dropping out, of retention or even of schooling evasion. Organizational solutions to increase attendance and achievement were implemented, covering either the number of pupils per class, or the selection of teachers and class tutors to be in charge of specific programs oriented to improve learning, self confidence, motivation and achievement. Schools were also granted higher levels of autonomy, especially the ones serving socially deprived populations, so that they could find more adjusted solutions for these “priority territories”. Teachers followed specific training programs (specialized training) focused on curriculum management, didactics and testing, aiming at reinforcing their teaching competencies, as well as their scientific and pedagogical knowledge. The specialized training courses became part of the continuous education and training of teachers, having in mind either the mainstream pupils in regular courses, or pupils with specific learning needs. Equally, principals were offered courses in school management and administration to reinforce their competences (Decree-Law 95/ 97, 23rd April). These courses were established as prerequisites for Headship. Overall, issues of equity and improved learning outcomes were for two decades at the core of training and professional development for teachers and principals alike. The 2012 National Report entitled “The State of the Art on School Education” (CNE Report – 2013) indicated that “Portugal presents a complex educational situation. On one hand following a very positive evolution, we reached acceptable levels of education in the younger generations, either in terms of access and quality, or in
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terms of equity, showing a good capacity to recover in almost all domains. On the other hand, the still existing lower levels of education in the less younger population which mirrors the past educational policies “(p.8). According to the same report, “... it was made necessary to intervene and invest in almost all components of the education system: from buildings, to equipment, social support, teachers’ training, system restructuring, responding to a never seen demand for education. Nowadays, educational results are expressive in what concerns quality and equity in education and scientific and technological development. [...] The results in the international tests have clearly improved, either in terms of equity (PISA 2009) or in terms of quality, namely in math’s, reading and science in primary education (PIRLS and TIMMS 2011) (ibid., p. 9). The results of these international tests have become object of public discourse and have exerted pressure on schools to improve further on the learning outcomes of pupils. This pressure is placed specifically upon school leaders; they are demanded to become more accountable to parents, to the municipal councils of education and to the society at large. This has in effect raised the issue of the professionalization of school leaders and the need to improve their competencies by attending to more courses on school management and leadership.

In Greece issues of equity and learning outcomes are framed within the wider logic of the historically excessive centralisation of the education system. This system was justified on the basis that it ensures equity in learning opportunities and outcomes because each and every school in the country is in principle no better or worse than other schools, given that all schools teach the same things, from the same schoolbooks, in the same pace, with the same, more or less quality of human or other resources. The results of PISA occasionally become object of public debates but only at a superficial level. What is attracting more the attention of the public, the media and the politicians is the level of average performance of pupils in Greece as compared to other countries; on the other hand, issues of equity in outcomes that arise from PISA results almost never become object of public discussion. Nevertheless, some trends observed in policy making in other EU countries, such as the devolution of some powers to regional authorities are gradually becoming object of policy reforms along with the highly politicised issue of the evaluation of the teaching staff. There are fears on the other hand that huge cuts in public education spending will effectively increase inequalities in opportunities and learning outcomes of children coming from a rapidly widening share of socio-economically disadvantages households.

In Sweden, even though low-performing schools are not targeted by the Swedish educational policy, policy-makers do seem to think that there are problems with Swedish schools. The status of the educational system is frequently debated in the media and schools are clearly on the political agenda: according to the poll survey performed by Swedish television at the national election in 2010, the schools’ issue was rated as the most important policy area among voters 1.

In Slovenia issues of equity are debated from the perspective of children’s rights but also the rights of teachers and parents. On national level, care for children’s rights is in the domain of the office of the Human Rights Ombudsman. In parallel, a number of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), such as the Amnesty International Slovenia (AIS), the UNICEF Slovenia, the EIP Slovenia – School for Peace, the Slovenian Association of Friends of Youth, the Association for Nonviolent Communication, and TOM – Telephone for children and youth. Discussion on problems of inequality can also be found in scientific

journals. For example, in the Sodobna pedagogika (Contemporary Pedagogy) journal within 2013 there are articles on concealed gender inequalities, cultural differences, immigrant students, Roma, justice in education, etc. Besides this also some books have been published on this topic (see, for example, Sardoč 2011; Trtnik Herlec and Urh, 2006). The Human Rights Ombudsman's annual reports show that in Slovenian schools the following children's rights are most frequently violated: the right to education; the right to safety; the right to freedom of expression; the right to freedom of conscience; the right to privacy, and the right to family life. With teachers the following rights can be endangered: the right to dignity; the right to freedom of expression; the right to freedom of conscience; the right to safety; the right to freedom of work. Regarding parents the following human rights can be violated: the right to responsible and independent parenthood; the right to privacy and the right to family life. As it becomes evident from the report, in Slovenian schools problems with the protection of human rights are most often related to safeguarding confidentiality, privacy, the right to safety, the right to quality education, the rights of children with special needs and of other children, teachers' communication with parents and with pupils, etc; however, also present is the problem of inclusion of all children, especially of those from other linguistic and cultural backgrounds.

In Latvia's education system equity and quality issues have been on policy agenda for some time now. In 2010 amendments to the Education Law introduced a new section entitled Prohibition of Differential Treatment. It states that "every person has the right to acquire education regardless of the material and social status, race, nationality, ethnic origin, gender, religious and political affiliation, state of health, occupation and place of residence". The Education Law also states that "if the prohibition of differential treatment or the prohibition to cause unfavourable consequences is violated, a person has the right to request elimination of the violation, to receive legal assistance in accordance with the Ombudsman Law, as well as to bring an action to the court". With the establishment of the Inclusive Education Reform Group by the Ministry of Education and Science in 2011 many important initiatives, including those from previous years, have been taken forward. It is expected that terms like 'inclusive education', 'school support team', 'individual learning plans', 'assistant teacher', etc., will not only be defined in the Education Law, but also appropriate financing for the implementation of inclusive education initiatives will be made available.

Furthermore, more special education needs pupils are now joining mainstream classrooms. In Latvia the number of pupils with special needs included in mainstream classrooms is increasing year by year: In the school year 2010/2011, 1,591 pupils were enrolled in regular classrooms; in 2011/2012 2,495; and in 2012/2013 3,219. Another example is the recent initiative by the Ombudsman of the Republic of Latvia to demand the integration of Roma pupils into mainstream classes rather than in separate classes.

In Latvia issues of equity and achievement are often addressed with the wider framework of school quality. A vital role in assuring quality is played by on-going and systematic internal and external
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1 See [http://www.sodobna-pedagogika.net](http://www.sodobna-pedagogika.net).
evaluation processes. The school quality evaluation system in Latvia is in place since 2004. The evaluation methodology is based on two closely interrelated evaluation dimensions – school self-evaluation and school external evaluation, focusing in seven key areas: Curriculum; Attainment; Teaching and learning; Support for Pupils; Ethos; Resources; Management, leadership and quality assurance. Equity issues are dealt with in most key areas, but directly they are addressed in the key area Support for Pupils. To evaluate this key area the five following evaluation domains are specified: Health care, safety, social assistance; Support in personality development; Career guidance; Support for the learning process; Support for pupils with special needs.

6.2 The changing roles and responsibilities of schools leaders

The Education Council in the Netherlands places emphasis on the professionalisation of teachers and in this wider framework addresses issues of school leadership. According to a 2013 report by the Education Council¹, ”pursuing values and thereby influencing the [school] environment presupposes a form of leadership in which teachers take initiatives and take on certain leadership tasks. This form of leadership, which is not delegated nor tied to a formal position, is sometimes called distributed leadership. Distributed leadership is primarily another way of looking at leadership – not only regarding leadership as a behavioural quality of the formal (school) leader, but chiefly as a role and a process coming about in cooperation between people. By whom this leadership is ‘assumed’ or ‘achieved’ is not predetermined, but may differ from situation to situation and from activity to activity”. What is however striking is that in this report issues of equity in pupils’ outcomes in relation to the professionalisation of teachers are not stressed, with the emphasis being on improving the quality of the everyday teaching practice and of the education system as a whole. Equity is only tacitly addressed under the wider umbrella concept of ‘quality’ and through the recognition of the need for teachers to respond to challenges stemming from the highly socio-culturally diversified pupil population.

In Portugal the roles and responsibilities of school leaders have changed as a consequence of reforms that granted schools greater autonomy, particularly those specified in the Decree-Law 115-A/1998, the Decree-Law 75/2008 and the Decree – Law 137/2012. As stated in these documents, the purpose was to grant progressively higher levels of autonomy to schools, to make the schools’ organization and governance more flexible, to cultivate an evaluation culture, to diversify the educational offer, to delegate competences for the organization of the curriculum, etc (D. L. 137 / 2012). Greater school autonomy meant that headship became much more demanding and the schools more complex organizations to manage. More responsibilities were assigned to different school actors, demanding from them to be “strictly professional”, in a school environment which enjoys an “increased autonomy, involving better conditions for improvement” and is “reinforcing the self evaluation and external evaluation cultures” (D.L.137/2012).

In Austria the introduction and gradual expansion of the "Neue Mittelschule" (NMS), a new school form which suspends early tracking (by the age of 10) in compulsory lower secondary schools, has been
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¹ See Education Council (2013), Being a Teacher, more focus on personal professionalism, p. 45. Available at: http://www.onderwijsraad.nl/upload/english/publications/exploration-being-a-teacher.pdf
accompanied by the establishment of a new type of school leaders, the Learndesigners who are expected to drive change and function as teacher leaders.

In France teaching and guidance are more at the centre of school management and administration than learning per se. Principals do not much intervene on learning issues even if the law has devolved some extensive powers during the last years, such as the power to “pedagogic and education steering”. Loose-coupled activities, despite some innovations in some schools, are the common everyday practice of many schools. The strict division between administration, care, and teaching impedes the development of horizontal relationships focused on learning and on supporting pupils.

However, principals are trained to develop self-evaluation of schools; this could have impact in the future on professional practices and it could initiate the beginning of a sort of transformational leadership. The challenge is to change the organization of schools to make them more autonomous, flexible, and open to stakeholders, to networking and to partnerships. Such changes would effectively result also in changes in the roles and responsibilities of school leaders. It is important to promote assessment and accountability, to enhance professional development, to sustain school improvement and to train principals for undertaking and distributing responsibilities in the management of teaching and learning.

In recent years school leaders in Latvia have experienced numerous new developments, e.g., changing paradigms in education, a shift from centralization to decentralization, introduction of information and communication technologies in education, etc. In a rapidly changing context introduced by these reforms school leaders have to look for new solutions to lead and manage education institutions. This challenge demands fresh, innovative and creative approaches as well as new competences to manage change. Parents expect the schools to provide high quality education for their children. Therefore, they demand that if a school does not meet these expectations it must be able to change to the desirable direction. These changes depend to a great extent on school leaders. Their role in attaining key education goals and providing opportunities for all students to learn in an inclusive environment has therefore become even more critical.

In Lithuania, a breakthrough in school leadership is expected by the implementation of the project “Time for the Leaders”, which was initiated by the Ministry of Education and Science in 2009. This project is implemented by the Education Welfare Centre together with the partners School Development Centre, ISM University of Management and Economics, as well as academics from other Lithuanian universities. During the implementation of the project “Time for the Leaders”, the idea that primarily an education leader is a learning leader is introduced to the Lithuanian education community; this leader must be ready to guide through the learning process, guide and manage people as well as an organisation. The project is based on the idea of leadership for the sake of learning; it means that leadership for supporting learning is realised through the establishment of challenging and equal conditions for the students, specialists and the whole system, where leaders persistently and publicly concentrate their own and others’ attention on teaching and learning.

In the Netherlands, the quality of school leadership is considered an important factor that determines the policymaking capacity of a school, also in relation to equity and achievement. In general the policy discourse is converging to an approach to the improvement of the quality of leadership in schools on the basis of a coherent package of measures. Such measures could include the formulation of professional standards and coaching regarding the expertise on advancing equity for learning in schools. Teachers should be encouraged to work in self-managing teams, for example, or to work together to develop innovative educational/pedagogical practices. It would also be good to introduce measures that reduce large school conglomerates into smaller sub-schools and teams in order to better cater for the needs of individual pupils on a more personalised manner. It is important, in this context,
that the board and management in all education sectors project an image of being at the service of the core education processes.

In Spain the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports (MECD) is promoting the concept that schools need trained and motivated teachers, because they are the key to the transformation of the school into a student-centred-learning environment. For the proper development of the school, a trained leading figure is required, able to manage the school at all levels (pedagogical, educational, administrative and financial), making it a competitive and innovative environment and, at the same time, capable of fostering social skills and integration. Under this perspective, the leader is expected to bring out the best of every member of the school community, and provide tomorrow's citizens with the quality education they deserve. To this purpose MECD aims to implement leadership policies anticipated to reduce dropout rates, enhance the quality of teaching and improve educational achievement.

The draft of the new Organic Law of Educational Quality Improvement (LOMCE), which has been negotiated and agreed by all the education counsellors of all of Spain's regions, in its article 122a states that: "the education authorities should facilitate the effective exercise of the management role in schools, providing the principals with the necessary management autonomy to promote and develop educational quality actions." In Articles 133 to 136, the competencies of the principals are more thoroughly defined, along with the selection process, the training required and, if applicable, the appointment and renewal. This law opens up the way to further specify what are the requirements necessary to educate and select principals.

On this basis MECD plans to organize a congress on Educational Leadership for principals of all educational levels, in order to open up the dialogue on what are the characteristics and functions of a good leader. Furthermore, an "Autonomy and Cooperation among Schools" Workgroup where leadership plays an important role, has been launched with representatives from all autonomous communities. This group involves discussions and knowledge sharing to facilitate the further specification of the law and the implementation of school leadership and educational autonomy policies, through policy action that is based on the characteristics, traditions and needs of all of Spain's communities. Finally, the possibility of creating an online platform that would foster contact between principals and help them to share experiences, concerns, expertise and to promote collaboration among schools, is being considered.

6.2.1 The role and responsibilities of school leaders and teachers in promoting equity and learning outcomes

In Slovenia, on the level of schools, school leaders are responsible for the implementation of children's rights. In the area of protecting children's rights they perform the following basic tasks: preventing violation of the rights of children and youth; taking care of the training of staff on children's rights; taking care of the promotion of human rights; analyzing the situation in the area of children's rights; cooperating with external partners, etc. More and more frequently schools decide to set up kind of 'safe points', where children and adolescents are offered safety and assistance in case of being exposed to violent treatment. An important part of teacher's work consists of introducing learners to children's rights, duties, responsibilities, and otherness, the themes that are included in the basic school syllabi, e.g. that of the school subject Society taught in the 4th and 5th grade of basic school or in the syllabus of the subject taught in grades 7 and 8 named Civic and patriotic education and ethics. This means acting rather on the level of prevention, while it is also a responsibility of all basic schools in Slovenia to have education plans ready. More often than not these are based on children's and human rights.

In Greece school leaders, according to the formal description of their duties and responsibilities defined by Ministerial decrees, are expected to undertake both administrative and pedagogic duties and responsibilities. Among the articles of the 2002 decree defining the tasks and general duties of school
principals some are directly referring to readership roles, such as “to guide the school community in setting high targets...”, “undertakes initiatives of educational and pedagogic character...”, “... encourages the initiatives of teachers, inspires and provides positive motivation”, “... to undertake initiatives that contribute to the nurturing of free, responsible, democratic and concerned citizens”, “undertakes initiatives ... to help new teachers in their teaching duties”. On the other side, school principals are not allowed to introduce changes to the typical school curriculum (attainment targets, subject matters, content to be covered and teaching hours), cannot choose the teachers employed in the school (these matters are exclusively at the hands of the Ministry of Education) and do not have budgets to manage. Among their duties that directly refer to matters of equity is the distribution of pupils in classes “... according to the principles of pedagogy, with no social exclusion”. The 2002 Ministerial decree does not directly mentions that among the responsibilities of principals should also be to improve the academic performance of pupils or to ensure that every pupil in the school has equal chances to improve in their learning irrespective of his/her family background. Finally, and more importantly, the 2002 Ministerial decree does not include among the duties of the school leaders the formulation of a whole school development plan. Overall, school principals are only partially expected to actually lead their school and there is no accountability on their behalf regarding their school's overall academic achievement or equity in learning outcomes.

The **United Kingdom** (UK) constitutes four nations: England, Northern Ireland, Scotland, and Wales. Consequently, as far as school leadership is contingent on political, economic social and cultural contexts, a generic perception on school leadership in relation to equity and learning is difficult to determine in the UK. This is largely because systems of governance and regulation (i.e. the arrangements for planning, funding, quality-assurance, regulating learning, and local administration) are differentiated. In Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales there are policy-making institutions and administrative bodies with differing degrees of autonomy from the UK Parliament in the development and implementation or education policy and training. In terms of legislation related to equality there are, however, statutory imposed legal obligations to which educational providers have a duty comply, such as the Equality Act 2010, which applies to England, Wales and Scotland (Section 153 of the act enables the Welsh and Scottish ministers to impose specific duties on certain Welsh and Scottish public bodies through secondary legislation). The primary purpose of the Act is to consolidate the complicated and numerous Acts and Regulations, which form the basis of anti-discrimination law in Great Britain. This legislation has the same goals as the four major EU Equal Treatment Directives, whose provisions it mirrors and implements. The Equality Act 2010 includes a specific chapter on education and a sub-section on schools. This sub-section places legal obligations on the responsible body of the school (for example the local authority, governing body, proprietor) not to discriminate on grounds of race, gender, disability, religion, belief and sexual orientation in terms of pupil admission and treatment, the way it provides education, the way it affords access to a benefit, facility or service, or excluding the pupil from the school. In Northern Ireland there exists a separate range of statutory anti-discrimination legislation these include: the Sex Discrimination (Northern Ireland) Order 1976; Disability Discrimination Act 1995; Race Relations (Northern Ireland) Order 1997.

Ostensibly, school leaders in the United Kingdom are bound by the above equality legislation, which is intended to inform and guide the professional decisions they make and the delivery of education in schools. Further, professional associations and trade unions in the UK (such as the National Association of Head teachers in England) may provide advice and guidance to schools on the drafting of their own equal opportunities policy to assist in their alignment with the national policy. The aim is that the adoption of a school-based policy will help the school identify, prevent, and redress unfair discrimination against disadvantaged groups. The school-based policy may include a statement of commitment to equality, detailed policy and procedures for implementation, and how the policy will be monitored, reviewed and evaluated. The drafting of such a policy is not mandatory and therefore without any nationally available data it is not possible to ascertain how many schools in the UK have such a policy or if they are acted upon once in place.
In the context of day-to-day practice, the current effectiveness and ability of school leaders in the UK to address equity and learning is arguably primarily shaped neither by statutory national policy nor school-based policy on equal opportunities, but by the values, vision, commitment and professional standards and skills of school heads. In instances where a more national and local authority controlled system of schooling operates, as in Scotland, prescribed national standards are available (implicitly/explicitly addressing notions of equity and learning), against which heads may benchmark their leadership qualities. Scotland has 32 Local Authorities that administer and run state education in a comprehensive system.

In England, with a stronger policy emphasis on institutional autonomy, the impetus to address equity and learning resides very much at the level of the individual school. Nevertheless, the national government is committed to a policy of raising standards, in part by improving the number of students who achieve the expected levels at the end of each key stage of learning. In order to help achieve this goal there is a drive, via school inspection, to ensure that school leaders are accountable for the progress of all pupils. Consequently, the school inspection body Ofsted focuses on the progress of those pupils identified as potentially belonging to vulnerable groups (i.e. those most likely to be at risk of not achieving the expected levels for various reasons) which include: pupils with special educational needs and disabilities; Looked After Children, or who are themselves young carers; pupils eligible for free school meals (and thus from low income families); minority ethnic pupils, including Gypsy, Roma or Traveller children, and all those for whom English is an additional language; lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender pupils; and those who belong to other groups who are vulnerable in particular schools or settings, either because they are in a minority or because their progress raises concerns.

In France, equity is largely integrated in the mission of educators to the reduce inequalities by the transmission of knowledge and equality of treatment in school provision. Legalism and republican ethos is strongly embedded in the mindset of principals and inspectors who share a common post-bureaucratic culture and vision. The principals have to promote republican values, the ethos of public services and equality of opportunity, and to support individualized learning of each student, to facilitate teachers to change their practices, to implement tools to support student learning, to develop the assessment of students, to work in partnership with inspectors, to validate the student basic skills, and to mobilise the “pedagogical board” in the school in order to facilitate school improvement.

In Germany the roles and responsibilities of principals are defined at the level of Länder. Therefore, there is not a unified approach regarding a principals’ job, particularly on issues of equity and achievement. It should however be pointed out that only the legislation of the state of Saarland mentions equity in the context of duties allocated to the school head. The head is expected to intervene when there is no fairness in learning opportunities.

### 6.3 Pre-service, induction and in-service programmes for school leaders in EU

In the European Union there is great variation in the ways prospective, new and in-service principals and other education staff with school management roles can get formal education and training related to the wider field of school leadership and in particular to issues of equity and learning outcomes. To a considerable extent, the national landscape regarding the organization, the providers, the content and the duration of formal education/training programmes for school leaders is shaped by the legislative framework which describes the academic qualifications that are required for someone to become school principal.

In Slovenia, the National School for Leadership in Education is the government institution established for training leaders in education. It runs different programs for principals and other leaders in
education in different fields. Leadership for learning is in direct focus or is implicitly addressed in most of the programs in offer. In Slovenia there are three phases in school leaders’ training: pre-service, induction phase and in-service. Leading for learning is part of pre-service and induction phase programmes. For in-service school leaders there are three one to two years programmes that are focused on leading for learning and equity. These programmes are described briefly below.

**Program: Headship Development**
The program is composed of four intertwined methods of work: three three-day modules, one one-day elective activities, mutual advisory work and project work. The goals of the program include:

- Deepen knowledge and develop individual skills for the educational leadership of school;
- Understand the role of the head teacher and modern trends, the needs of political, economic, social, legislative and culturally altered environment in which schools operate;
- Develop skills for self-evaluation and assessment of one’s own work, as well as for professional development planning with main focus on the efficiency of school leadership;
- Deepen the understanding and develop a critical view of innovations happening within the school and of participating in local and global trends, consequently ensuring flexibility and comparability of pupils;
- Train participants in order to be able to use, by means of modern analytical methods, the relevant data and research in their planning and decision-making;
- Confront one’s own practice with others in professionals;
- Focus leading in learning;

**Program: Leadership for Learning**
The program is intended for principals who want to improve their capacities to better promote the learning of their pupils. The program engages principals in workgroups of 8 to 12 participants and engages them in professional discussions on leadership for learning. The results of the programme are presented to other principals at professional conferences and in scientific papers.

**Program for Principal Certificate**
The aim of the program is to promote the professional development of principals in order to improve leadership in schools and kindergartens. The program participants gain knowledge and skills in the field of professional development and leadership:

- Know trends in the field of leadership and principals’ professional development;
- Understand the significance of the professional development of principals for leadership and leading learning;
- Understand various forms of professional development and participate in them;
- Ability to critically assess own leadership;
- Ability to plan and monitor own professional development;
- Ability to improve on own professional development and leadership practices;
- Understand the importance of being active in a professional community.

In Greece there is no undergraduate university programme of studies specifically dedicated to prepare future school leaders (at ISCED levels 5). Within the programmes of studies of university departments in the wider field of education (particularly those preparing primary education teachers) there are courses related to school management and administration. At ISCED level 6 there is one related MA programme offered by the University of the Aegean, Department of Sciences of Preschool Education and Educational Design, entitled “Educational Models and Development of School Units” (75 ECTS). The department of Home Economics and Ecology of Harokopio University, in the context of its postgraduate programme “Education and culture”, offers a specialty on “Administration and Management of Educational Units” (152 ECTS). In the academic year 2012-3 it enrolled 19 students. The department of
elementary education of the University of Western Macedonia offers a specialty programme entitled “Pedagogics and New Technologies” which leads to the postgraduate specialty diploma entitled “Modern teaching methods-Education of Educators-Educational policy and administration of education”. In the academic year 2012-3 this programme enrolled 9 students. The department of elementary education of the University of Thessaly offers a postgraduate programme entitled “Organisation and Administration of Education” (since 2005-6) (90 ECTS). In academic year 2011-2 it enrolled 30 students. The Department of Philosophy, Education and Psychology of the University of Athens offers a postgraduate programme entitled “Theory, Praxis and Evaluation of Educational Work” (120 ECTS). Among the 7 specialties offered one is entitled “Educational Policy and Education Administration”. In the academic year 2012-3 it enrolled 14 students. The Hellenic Open University (HOU) also offers a short training programme on “School Units Management” (22 ECTS). Also non-formal training programmes are occasionally available. Overall, the opportunities and choices available for postgraduate studies in topics related to the education and training of school leaders in Greece are rather limited.

Overall, the public education administration posts in Greece from individual schools to local, regional and central administration units of the Ministry of Education are staffed by teachers, the vast majority of whom have never been properly trained on education administration/management, let alone leadership. In order to address this reality, Law No. 3848 (article 11) defined that prospective school leaders should have obtained Level 1 (basic) certificate on ICT and have a certificate on “administrative competence” that can be obtained after participating in a respective training programme to be offered by the National School of Public Administration and Local Government. From the academic year 2012-3 this National School started offering a “short” version of a training programme to local and regional education administration directors. A Ministerial Decree in June 2012 defined the thematic units of the complete “theoretical” training, lasting 96 hours, as follows:

- Human resources management in education
- Organisation and administration of education as modern organization
- Evaluation in education
- Legal rules in administrative action in education
- Legislative framework in primary and secondary education
- Educational policy – European dimension in education

It should be noted that prospective trainees to this programme should have been employed for at least 7 years in public education (and no more than 32) and have already obtained the Level 1 (basic) certificate on ICT. The practical training will last 80 hours and will involve practice in administrative posts.

In Sweden principal leadership has been a frequent topic of attention in the school development arena for at least 4 decades. It is now becoming more and more obvious how education is negotiated and conditioned in and between three dimensions: politics – profession; national intentions – local conditions and public education – private education. The governing of schools has drifted from government towards governance, i.e. more interactive processes are being introduced with a new focus on performance measures. These radical changes of the educational scene call for another approach to train principals. Leadership training is often described as a key solution to educational shortcomings and is expected to provide a legitimate base for new leadership approaches and new forms for governing and regulating schools in a late modern society. In the following paragraphs we will concentrate on the new National School Leadership Training Programme for principals, that was launched in late 2009, in relation to equity and social justice.

The Swedish Parliament decided 1986 on a broader integrated programme of principal training, with the State and municipalities being given responsibility for different parts of the training. The
municipalities would provide a recruitment training programme and an introduction training programme, the State would provide a National Principals training programme and finally, universities were to offer continuing school leader training and master programmes. The purpose was to give principals a thorough understanding of the goals of the school, equip them with leadership skills that would stimulate the development of school activities:

- **The recruitment training programme for persons that wanted to become principals.** The training should give a broad view of different school leadership functions but should have a focus on the national goals for education. The Swedish Parliament’s purpose of introducing this programme also had three other goals. They wanted more women to become school leaders, more recruitment from outside the own municipality and to attract people from other educational backgrounds.

- **The introductory training programme was introduced to help new principals during their first years in office.** The main part of the education should be focused on the practical and administrative tasks of the principal, but it was also made very clear that the principals should be introduced in pedagogical leadership.

- **The National Principals training programme was to be given to all principals after about two years in office.** The programme ran during two years and comprised of around 30 seminar days. The purpose of the training was to deepen the principals’ knowledge and increase their understanding of the national school system, the national goals for the school and the role of the school in society and the local community.

- **The continuation school leader programme can simply be described as university courses for school leaders.**

The third programme - the National principal training programme - did function very well and one reason for this is that the State through the National Agency for Schools got the responsibility to organise the principals training and was given sufficient resources to run the programme at different selected universities. The forth type of programmes, academic master courses, have also been offered at different universities. Unfortunately these courses have not been able to attract a large number of principals for continued school leader education (Johansson, 2001)\(^1\).

In 2007, the new programme was outlined in a committee report – *Clearer leadership in schools and preschools – a proposal for a new training programme for principals* (Ds 2007:34). The following issues were identified when looking back on the previous programme:

- Legal aspects of managing and leading schools have not been paid enough attention.
- Issues about how the National goals can be followed up and evaluated as a basis for school improvement have not been prioritized enough.
- The differences between the different universities giving the programme are too big.
- The capacity is too small – principals have to wait too long before entering the programme.

On behalf of the Ministry of Education the National Agency for Education commissioned six universities in 2009 to run the programme. The programme which is mainly residential runs over 3 years with 36 meeting days and is open to principals, pre-schools principals and deputy principals who already are in service. For principals appointed after March 2010 it is compulsory to complete the programme within four years. The participants are expected to use 20% of their time studying. The course itself is free of charge, but the participants’ organizations pay residential costs, travel, literature etc.

New cohorts enter the programme twice annually and in May 2013 about 5,700 principals and deputy principals were enrolled and of these about 1,900 had completed the program. This is approx. 60% of all 8,000 principals and deputy principals that exists in Sweden. The intentions of the New Programme are described as follows (Skolverket, 2009): Principals need to understand both their own role and that of the school, share the fundamental values governing how the school works, and be able to transform these values into concrete actions. The National School Leadership Training Program aims to provide support for head teachers in carrying out their functions. The training program covers three areas of knowledge:

- Legislation on schools and the role of exercising the functions of an authority
- Management by goals and objectives
- School leadership

These areas of knowledge are crucial for the practical implementation of school leadership. They are closely linked to each other, and head teachers must be able to manage them simultaneously since they form parts of a complex interacting system.

The area Legislation on schools and the role of exercising the functions of an authority covers the provisions laid down in laws and ordinances. Emphasis is also put on how the school’s assignment is formulated in the national goals. The knowledge area Management by objectives and results covers measures for promoting quality which are required for the school to achieve the national goals of the education, and create the conditions for its development. The knowledge area School leadership covers how the work should be managed based on the national tasks of the head teacher and the principles set out in the steering system for bringing about development in line with greater goal attainment.

In relation to each of these areas described above, knowledge goals are formulated but in this context it is more important that there are also goals formulated in relation to:

Skills and abilities
On completion of the training, the head teacher shall:

- demonstrate the ability to apply knowledge of applicable legislation in the school area, as well as making assessments, and
- demonstrate the ability to communicate and apply knowledge of existing legislation in the school area.

---

1 Skolverket (2009), Goals of the National School Leadership Training Programme. SOU 2013:30 Det tar tid - om effekter av skolpolitiska reformer.
- demonstrate good ability to explain the goals of the school, make these clear, and transform them into concrete actions,
- demonstrate good ability to communicate the national goals,
- demonstrate good ability to use different tools and methods to follow up and evaluate results of their own school,
- demonstrate good ability to compile, analyze and interpret the school’s results,
- demonstrate good ability as the head and leader of school personnel in managing and delegating work in order to maximise the learning and development of pupils,
- demonstrate good ability as head and leader to motivate, initiate and manage the school’s development processes in a strategic way in order to encourage the interest of school personnel in learning and development,
- develop the ability to manage and resolve conflicts,
- demonstrate the ability to communicate future plans and visions;
- demonstrate good ability to communicate goals and results to pupils in the school, to personnel and parents,
- demonstrate the ability to apply the principle of the equal value of all people.

**Assessment ability and approaches**

On completion of the training, the head teacher shall:

- demonstrate the ability to make assessments in the area of school legislation with respect to the legal security of pupils, and relevant scientific, societal and ethical aspects.
- demonstrate good leadership abilities to integrate the school’s daily work with pupils’ results and development of quality in the school,
- demonstrate the ability to evaluate and communicate the school’s results as a basis for further development,
- demonstrate good ability as a leader to provide explicit focus on the national assignment of the school,
- demonstrate good ability as a leader and provide a democratic model to pupils and personnel by creating an open communicative climate,
- demonstrate ability as a leader clearly emphasizing the importance of cooperation,
- demonstrate ability as a leader by involving the participation of pupils and parents in the work of the school,
- demonstrate good ability as a leader by giving appropriate prominence to the values laid down in the school's steering documents.

In **Estonia**, Tartu and Tallinn Universities only offer special courses to prospective school leaders. These courses are usually attended by school principal candidates or those already serving as principals in a school. The tuition fees of courses are paid either by candidates or by the schools. These courses focus on leadership theories and practices, legal issues, school curriculum development, school finances, staff development, school improvement and utilize good practice examples.

In **Denmark** since 2003 some of the Institutions for Continuous Education offer a ‘Diploma in Leadership’ (DIL: 60 ECTS). In 2009 this diploma was supplemented/substituted by another diploma, the ‘Diploma of Public Leadership’ (DOL). The new ‘Diploma of Public Leadership’ (DOL) is subsidised by the Government through municipalities, so course fees are lower (approximately € 10,000 for the full diploma). Currently, 12 university colleges and academies are accredited to offer the full diploma. The following description takes as its point of departure the situation at the University College Copenhagen (UCC), but will also relate it to the general situation in the country. The ‘Diploma of Public Leadership’ is consisted of 6 compulsory (5 ECTS each), 3 optional (5 ECTS each) and one dissertation module. The compulsory modules are:
- Personal leadership: Leadership and communication
- Personal leadership: Professional leadership
- Leadership and staff: Leadership in dynamic relations
- Leadership and staff: Leadership in learning- and competences-relations
- Leadership and organisation: Organisation and processes
- Leadership and organisation: Organisation, governance and strategy

Each institution is certified to offer a number of modules. UCC can offer 20-30 modules. The dissertation (15 ECTS) usually involves empirical research and theoretical analyses.

The courses are described in curricula and study guides, following a competences format: Purpose, aims (knowledge and understanding, skills and competences) and content. Instruction in each module is given over 4 full days plus 2 study days, equalling to 33 lessons per module. Normally two modules are given per semester/half year, like 1 and 2, 3 and 4, 5 and 6. A full diploma therefore requires approximately 60 full days over a period of 2\(\frac{1}{2}\)-3 years. Adding to this is the individual study of at least 500 pages of literature from the curriculum list. The approach to teaching the modules can vary from one provider to the other. In UCC it is described as 'didactic':

'We are focusing on you investigating your practice and support you to gain experiences from your practice in order to qualify and develop your practice. This is the reason why we decided not to follow only one theoretical approach. We want you to be able to shed critical light on and analyse practice on the basis of diverse theories. We call our approach an 'eclectic approach' (From study guide for Personal leadership, UCC).

The above programme in public leadership is not targeting specifically to train school leaders. UCC has also a special diploma for school leadership. The compulsory modules are identical to the 'standard' diploma, - with standard curriculum and learning material - but the choice of modules is restricted to three modules within the specific institutional/professional area, such as the school. Those can be modules like: 'Educational leadership', 'Quality assurance and development and evaluation of the school', 'Leading leadership teams in schools'.

In Austria school heads have to go in for a probation period of four years, during which they are required to attend a 2-year part-time school management course. The successful completion paves the way for permanent appointment. In the national course curriculum (12 ECTS), the following content is stipulated:

- Leadership and Communication,
- Conflict Management,
- School Development (Development of teaching, staff and organisation, Quality Management),
- School and Public Service Law,
- ICT Management and E-Learning.

The concrete needs of the school heads in their specific situation is dealt with in further, optional modules: Administration and school administration, staff meetings, discussion leading and presentation, time and personal management, PR, quality development, etc. In addition, there are practice-based elements including forms of collegial coaching, which have an essential contribution to make to mutual support of the role of head. The initial training course is concluded by a project and a public presentation of its results.

In France the education of principals in secondary education schools is undertaken by a single institution: the Ecole Supérieure de l'Education Nationale (ESEN) which is a national college for the training of principals and inspectors. The ESEN is supervised directly by the French ministry of
education (its department of human resources) and it defines its content and training schemes according to the ministry’s regulations and priorities in education policy. Some Masters of management exist in universities (offered by department of education sciences) but they do not have the same legitimacy (and legacy) because the recruitment and selection of principals/inspectors in secondary education is made through a concours (exams leading to access to the position of civil servants) and the preparation for this concours is made by departments of further training within education local authorities. Only teachers (and pastoral carers) can take this exam provided that they have 5 years of teaching experience. In primary schools, the principal is a peer among the teachers selected directly by the body of inspection (there is no concours). In the primary schools the education of principals and of “pedagogical advisers”, inspectors in the support of schools, is made by local authorities, in partnership sometimes with universities (Graduate Schools of Education).

The training of principals/inspectors in secondary education is made just after the “concours” at the ESEN through a short period of in-class days when they are grouped by regions and the rest of the year they have to complete their service as deputy-principals in a school. They benefit from a local training by the local authority before the start of the new school year in their school and also from in-service training in another school. They have to make a training course in a company and abroad (or to realize a study on a foreign education system).

The training of secondary school principals is organized according to 4 principles:

- A common framework on school management, human resources, implementation of education policy, leadership in teaching and student guidance, professional communication, security of people and premises.
- An individualized professionalisation is based on a negotiation between the trainee and his/her trainers (peers) to define a sequential and personalized plan of learning.
- A continuous professional development linking the different levels (school, local authority, ESEN) and stages (preparation, exploitation, knowledge deepening).
- The micro-level is considered as the best place for professionalisation; the local authority prepares the professional situations, their analysis and formalization, the ESEN is providing higher levels of knowledge and skills.

In Latvia, the education law stipulates the responsible bodies for the provision to teacher and school heads of continuing professional development activities. The Cabinet of Ministers regulates the Procedures for the Improvement of Teachers’ Professional Competences and the Ministry of Education and Science is responsible for managing the implementation of continuing professional development (CPD) activities. Cabinet Regulations on Procedures for the Improvement of Teachers’ Professional Competences outline the main CPD areas. These have to do with innovations in:

- education and profession;
- in subject matters and subject matter teaching methods;
- in psychology;
- in classroom management;
- in special and inclusive education;
- in bilingual education;
- in applying ICT;
- in educational management;
- in school management; and
- in school quality evaluation.

According to the Cabinet Regulations all educators have to participate in CPD activities for not less than 36 hours during a three year period (funded by the State) in order to improve on their professional competences. Cabinet Regulations stipulate that CPD programs up to 36 hours ("A" type programs) can
be delivered by different bodies – Ministry agencies, universities, LLL centres, NGOs, schools, etc. CPD programs lasting 72 hours or more (“B” type programs) could be implemented only by teacher training institutions. To ensure program quality all CPD programs should be coordinated by the Ministry.

CPD programs can consist of several modules and school heads can choose modules from different programs to design CPD activities to suit their own needs. Besides the traditional CPD program activities school heads can participate in seminars, conferences, projects, non-formal education programs and spend up to 12 hours in a so called 'self-improvement and experience module'. During the last three years different CPD opportunities for school leaders are offered in the frame of several European Social Fund projects.

Program providers follow many different ways of CPD program implementation. The traditional way is a program consisting of theoretical (40% of the training time) and practical part (60%). Recently this traditional approach has been displaced by alternative professional development opportunities. For example, there are offered 1 to 3 days practice workshops for school leaders entitled "meeting the challenges of the 21st century education – how to make a tomorrow school today". These workshops deal with innovations in quality management related to school self-evaluation and development planning as well as with the creation of an inclusive and supportive environment in school. During the CPD activity entitled "a school teaches a school" there are school team exchanges; teams learn from each other and seek for solutions to common problems. There is also another CPD activity entitled "school leaders learning group". Besides the above mentioned CPD activities there is also available the "Directors Club" initiated by Swedbank Latvia for school heads. The aim of the club is to improve school leaders' competences for strengthening school capacity and ensuring a better learning environment for students. This initiative promotes cooperation among school leaders and is promoting good practices from enterprises. This is an opportunity for school leaders to get support in managing change at school. The Education Centre of Riga City Council provides also tailored CPD activities for school leaders in Riga's schools. The two most popular are: summer schools for the prospective and already servicing school leaders; and support from experienced school leaders.

In Lithuania universities currently offer the following courses designed to develop leadership competences:

- “Management and Leadership in Education”, course in the MA programme in Education by the Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences.
- “Management and Administration of Educational Institutions”, course in the MA programme in Management and Business Administration by the Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences.
- “Strategic Leadership”, course in the MA programme in Human Resource Management by the Kaunas University of Technology.
- “Leadership in Education”, course in the MBA programme by the ISM University of Management and Economics.
- “Information Management and Leadership”, course in the MA programme in Information Services by the Vilnius University.

School leaders and teachers who wish to improve their leadership competences in an informal way can choose in-service training courses offered by the Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences, or other educational centres. The informal learning programme "Leadership in Education" under the project "Time for the Leaders" is currently implemented by the ISM University of Management and Economics. This consists of four modules:

- Leader – an Autonomous Learning Pathfinder;
- Leader and Followers’ Relationship;
• Leader - a Learning Pathfinder;
• Leader in a Learning Organization.

In **Poland**, the Ministry of National Education in 1999 developed the framework programme of a *Qualifying Course on Educational Management* targeting to train school leaders. Among others, the Polish Association of Education Managers (Ogólnopolskie Stowarzyszenie Kadry Kierowniczej Oświaty, OSKKO) is an important stakeholder that promotes discussions on how matters of education and support for school leaders. Another important actor in the field of training of school leaders are the **Teacher Development Centres**, which are institutions, both public and private (there are about 400 such centres in Poland), that train teachers in various topics, such as pedagogies and core curricula, changes in the law, administration etc. Graduate or post-graduate (compulsory) programmes for school head teachers are also offered by public institutions, non-government organisations, higher education institutions and private institutes. It is also worth stressing that local authorities are obliged to finance CPD activities of teachers and principals (they have to spent at least 1% of their budget allocated to teacher salaries to finance such CPD activities). As a result, the training opportunities for head teachers are relatively rich; there are numerous seminars, conferences, training programmes and courses in various forms. Such CPD offers are very different from one another in terms of the content, teaching methods, and duration. It is not however popular to organise internship initiatives, real world learning situations, and cooperation in groups. Also the quality of the training programmes and their usefulness tend to vary, and they do not seem to exhaust the needs of school head teachers.

In Poland a person who applies for the position of a school head teacher must have completed a graduate or post-graduate programme in the scope of management or a qualifying course on management in education. The contents of the training programme must cover a number of fixed issues (including educational law, ways of designing the programme of an institution, management theory, psychological aspects, and school administration). The whole programme should demand no less than 210 learning hours. On the other hand, there are no formal requirements concerning the training and professional development of already servicing school head teachers, although a school principal who is a teacher, by virtue of being a teacher, is required to improve his or her qualifications and develop on an ongoing basis (it is not however specified how).

In April 2013 a new project ‘Leadership and management in education – designing and implementing the system of training and head teacher development’ was initiated. This project is run by the Centre for Education Development (CED) and the Jagiellonian University. CED is a national teacher training institution. This project will finish in June 2015. The aims of the project are:

- to carry out a diagnosis of the competences of school head teachers, current forms and methods of training and development of school head teachers in Poland and in other countries, and
- to design 3 models (training, development and supporting models) for school head teachers.

In the framework of this project CED and the Jagiellonian University plan to:

- test the new model of school head teachers’ training (100 people)
- test the new model of school head teachers’ development (300 people)
- test the new model of school head teachers’ support (500 people).

Qualitative research carried out by the *Educational Research Institute* (Diagnosis of the needs of school head teachers) indicated that head teachers highly appreciate formal and informal exchanges of knowledge, information, and good practices with other head teachers. Such knowledge and information sharing concerns primarily the management of the school as organisation. Special areas of interest are legal issues, human resources management, financial and school infrastructure management. Those areas were also identified as the most problematic ones, on which head teachers lack knowledge and
information. In general, head teachers indicated that they really lack support in the form of informal learning networks, and they are in need of meeting places where they could share experiences and discuss solutions to problems which they encounter in their everyday work.

6.3.1 Training programmes for school leaders and teachers targeting equity and learning outcomes

In 2006 in Slovenia, a project, funded partly by the European Social Fund, was carried out at the National School for Leadership in Education aiming at reducing occurrence of violation of human rights in school. A counsellor also participated in the project as representative of the office of Human Rights Ombudsman. The purpose of the project was to train school heads and teachers in systematically monitoring and implementing children’s rights in order to reduce the number of instances of violation of these in schools. The following objectives were stated: better knowledge and awareness of children’s rights by the professional staff in education; training of a number of school heads, deputy school heads and teachers; development of case studies on which professional staff would be trained in preventing and recognizing violation and in acting appropriately; and publicity. Based on the project results the National School for Leadership in Education developed new teaching contents for school heads in the area of children’s rights and active citizenship. For headship license candidates the National School for Leadership in Education carries out the non-compulsory course Human rights in school environment since 2006.

In Greece, given the highly centralised system of governance and the organisation of provisions to schools, teachers and school leaders are responsible for implementing the laws and the directives of the Ministry of Education which are assumed to ensure equality of access and treatment. Equality in treatment from a systemic level of policy is, among others, promoted by ensuring that the school staff, teachers and principals, have a minimum level of professional competencies. From this perspective, in the past decade there were introduced massive programmes for upgrading the competencies of teachers. For example, all primary school teachers who had graduated from teachers’ academies, which offered 2-year programmes of studies (in operation until 1988; they were replaced by 4-year university programmes), were effectively required to enrol to teacher training programmes offered by universities around Greece in order to obtain a university degree. Other massive teacher training programmes focused on basic ICT skills. Overall, the idea was that massive programmes of teacher training will in effect lead to improved quality of teaching and learning for all pupils, irrespective of their socio-cultural background. Given that school leaders are school teachers who, based on seniority and other criteria, serve for some period on this post, it was implicitly assumed that such training programmes will also help school leaders to improve on their capacities to manage schools, particularly in relation to pedagogy.

In Sweden three examples of special training for principals so that they become more capable to handle ethical matters better are described below. The first example dates about ten years back in time. The Principal Training Centres at the universities were asked by the National Agency for Schools to plan and do courses in relation to the basic democratic values in the curriculum. These courses were given over a period of four years and the purpose was that this subject focus should be integrated into the regular principal training programs. The next example of special training courses were training of principals on how different value systems, beliefs and perceptions can create different dilemmas for school leaders and educators in relation to how honour-related problems are interpreted and handled in school. The third example is related to old phenomena that have changed in character. Sweden during the last 50 years always had immigrant children in its schools. The number has lately increased a lot and the administration and the political leadership has also identified a new growing group immigrant children that are of school age and they are coming without their parents. Again, the Principal Training Centres were asked to provide training to principals on how to deal with this new situation. These three
examples all build on the administrative and political belief that good and informed school leadership is part of the solution for different challenges to our democratic system.

In the United Kingdom (England) as a result of the emphasis by the school inspection body Ofsted on the progress of those pupils identified as potentially belonging to vulnerable groups, one of the training programmes offered by the trade union ‘National Association of Head Teachers’ NAHT (2013) is entitled Leading on Learning for Vulnerable Groups - Changes, Challenges and a Chance to do Better. The course identifies the main issues and assists participants, through presentations, question and answer sessions, and small group discussions, to consider how a school might become more effective in meeting the needs of all its pupils, and especially those from vulnerable groups. The availability of such training throughout the UK, whilst commendable, is voluntary and does rely upon individual senior leaders identifying a need and deciding to enrol. Moreover, it should be emphasised that the provision of senior leader training on equity related themes in comparison to other areas of school concern is relatively limited. In a highly devolved system such as England’s – with no nationally collated data or evidence-based research - it is very difficult to ascertain the degree to which school leaders are undertaking such training, or addressing issues of equity and learning in their day to day practice.

In Austria, when looking at the curricula of the school management programmes, references to equity and learning are not given directly. The topic is more indirectly dealt with in the national quality programme SQA (general education) and QIBB (vocational education), where school heads have to deal with learning and development of individual students from an inclusive perspective. School principals and teacher leaders attend training and orientation programmes for the implementation and development of quality processes on the school level. A new master degree programme in school management will start at three higher education institutions in Austria, which will deal with particular approaches to diversity. In addition, the Leadership Academy for school principals and system leaders integrates the issue of equity by its leadership for learning approach.

Furthermore, diversity competence is central in the teacher education reform (PädagogInnenbildung NEU), which will be mandated this year and which will result in new curricula at teacher education institutions.

In 2012/13 the National Center for Learning Schools (CLS) was established to coordinate efforts and continue development of the “Neue Mittelschule” (NMS), a new school form suspends tracking in compulsory lower secondary schools. Equity is a central topic of CLS’s national network meetings and qualification programmes. A new teacher leadership role introduced with the reform, the so-called Lerndesigners, was established in order to function as teacher leaders and change agents. Lerndesigners are offered a 2-year qualification programme (12 ECTS) focused on equity and achievement. It is organized in the context of a joint MA programme between CLS and Pädagogische Hochschulen (Teacher Education institutes at regional level).

Finally, all NMS school heads have to attend to at least one national learning atelier or symposium per year with their Lerndesigners. In the current school year, the influence of social background and academic language competence were the main focus of all national events for the NMS.

1 See more at: http://www.naht.org.uk/welcome/naht-events/courses-list/keeping-on-top-of-the-send-agenda/
7. SCHOOL LEADERSHIP FOR EQUITY AND LEARNING – A SHORT OVERVIEW OF THE SWEDISH MINISTRY PERSPECTIVE

7.1 The school system vouch for equality

The Swedish education system has for years been an integral component of the Swedish welfare state. Sweden has nine years of free compulsory education from seven years old (grades 1 to 9). It provides a comprehensive education, with, in the main, all children following the same curricula determined by the Government. Upper secondary school, which also is free of charge, is voluntary and offer different programs, vocational programs as well as programs preparing for university studies. The school system focuses on providing equality of opportunities and equivalence of student learning outcomes irrespectively of where in the country the education is provided. There is a strong emphasis creating learning opportunities for improved knowledge for all students and by doing so also strengthen each individual student's social and civic skills and development.

Equality is a fundamental principle of the Education Act which is decided by the Swedish Parliament. According to the Education Act all children and youth shall have access to equivalent education, independently of gender, socio-economic factors, ethnic background and place of residence. Students in need of special support have also their right to adequate support.

It should be mentioned that equity and learning – linked to improved student outcomes is not an easy task to solve. The variation between high- and low-performing students as well as high and low performing schools and school districts has increased over time and studies tell us that there are concerns about equity and learning linked to the quality of student outcomes.¹

7.2 A decentralised school system

The Swedish school system is highly decentralised. The state (Parliament and Government) is responsible for national steering documents as the Education Act, ordinances and curricula. Sweden has a small Ministry but there are also agencies. The Swedish National Agency for Education prepare syllabi, work with school development on national level, follow up and evaluate schools in different areas and the Swedish Schools Inspectorate monitors for example that school organizers give their students equal opportunities to learn and achieve the national knowledge requirements in accordance with the national steering documents.

¹ Skolverket (2012), Likvärdig utbildning i svensk grundskola? (National Agency for Education), Rapport 374.
The school organizer has the responsibility for running schools and to see that school leaders and teachers are qualified for their profession and follow the national regulation. The organizers are responsible for allocating resources, organize and planning their school activities and follow up and evaluate on different levels. As mentioned above there should be equal possibilities for all students to learn and achieve the national knowledge requirements, which means students with different learning abilities but also school districts and schools with varying competencies and financial strength that will affect student learning outcomes.

7.3 School leaders are crucial

From a national perspective school leaders are crucial for guarantee the equivalence in learning opportunities and the students’ chances to learn as much as possible and get better and better outcomes of their work in the school. Different studies have shown the importance of the principals’ role for school quality and development.

The principal’s role has been strengthening in the Education Act which came into force in 2011 and the principal is mentioned 111 times in different paragraphs. The principals’ responsibility for students’ right to education, students’ possibilities to reach social and civic skills and the academic knowledge requirements is highlighted. As well as the principal’s responsibility to help and arrange support for students with special needs. It is of course essential components when we are talking about equity and learning – and improved student outcomes. It is stipulated that the pedagogical work within one school unit should be lead and coordinated by one principal. It is partially possible to distribute the leadership with other people in the staff who have sufficient competence and experience to fulfil tasks that the principal want to distribute for improving the learning environment.

The Education Act also states that all newly appointed principals shall take part of the compulsory Swedish National School Leadership Training Program which is given by six universities on master level. School organizers are responsible for sending the principals to the program. The national program should guarantee that all principals in our country have enough knowledge and proficiency within some important fields: legislation on schools and the role of exercising the functions of an authority, management by goals and objectives and school leadership.

The emphasizing of social and civic skills and academic knowledge together with equity and learning for better outcomes, in the Education Act and curricula, makes it very important that a principal can relate to and claim the national goals, improve education and support teachers in their teaching so they can give all students the best possible conditions to learn and reach the knowledge requirements. Teachers are of course key figures for equity and learning in “classrooms” in their teaching work together with the students.

---

7.4 To sum up

School leaders are very important for the quality of equity and learning and it is essential that there are professional school leaders in all schools. The Swedish regulation in the Education Act, ordinances and curricula and the Swedish National School Leadership Training Program decided by the Government is intended to guarantee and contribute to accountable and responsible school leadership for equity and improved learning outcomes for all students. But, it is still a challenge to reach total equity linked to learning and excellent student outcomes for all students and in all schools and school districts. The policy documents are there but the variation in learning structure and culture on the local level must be adjusted on a higher level than today for improved student outcomes.
8. THE STATE OF AFFAIRS ON SCHOOL LEADERSHIP IN FINLAND

The goal of this chapter is to highlight the academic underpinning on school leadership in Finland and, on such a base, classify the current policy and trends in this country.

8.1 Trends and tendencies in external expectations: policies, culture and governance

8.1.1 Trends in the overarching role of the central government with regard to school education

One can claim in line with Risku (2011) that even before the independence of Finland in 1917 welfare state governance was the prevailing trend in Finnish education policy. Central government considered education as a societal tool, and had a consistent aspiration to establish social equity in education. That can be considered as the primary goal in national educational policy at least till the 1980s, maybe even today.

Concepts of the welfare state governance like bureau-professional organisational regime, compliant and professionally autonomous mind-set, as well as distance in administration and professionalism can for the most part be connected with the trend. Social equity in education was created with the State's extensive central administration, which managed society, education system and local authorities in an intensive manner (Halila, 1949; Isosomppi, 1996; Nikki, 2001; Sarjala, 1982). Local administration and particularly local educational administration can be considered to have remained both thin and weak till the end of the 1970s. Furthermore, the State had to and did subsidize every educational reform with remarkable funding, and central government also gave local authorities plenty of time to meet the decreed requirements (Aho, Pitkänen & Sahlberg, 2006; Halila, 1950; Isosomppi, 1996; Kivinen, 1988; Kupiainen et al., 2009; Lappalainen, 1991; Peltonen, 2002; Sarjala, 1982 & 2008; Varjo, 2007).

The State can be regarded to have been able reach its goal of social equity in education at the end of the 1970s. By then the State had established strong enough local administration, including that of local provisions of education, abolished the parallel education system, and established the comprehensive education system. As all that took place, the world began to change in fundamental ways, and the welfare state governance as it had been operated could no longer meet the new demands (Risku, 2011 & 2013).

Already in the late 1970s there was a broad change in thinking towards distributing power from the State to local authorities and schools (Pihlajanniemi, 2006; Niemelä, 2008). Many of the international trends, like neo-liberalism, democratic individualism and New Public Management, had their impact on the public debate on how to develop the Finnish society (Laitila, 1999; Rinne, Kivirauma & Simola, 2002; Risku, 2013; Ryynänen, 2004; Varjo, 2007).
During the last 30 years the Finnish society has been fundamentally restructured. The relationship between the State and local authorities has been radically revised (Aho et al., 2006; Alava, Halttunen & Risku, 2012; Risku 2011 & 2013; Sarjala, 2008; Varjo, 2007). Municipalities have received constitutional autonomy and are today the main providers of public services, particularly concerning education. The State still determines the core aims and guidelines, but local authorities have a lot of autonomy to enact the aims and guidelines, and they seem to make good use of the autonomy too (Risku, 2013).

Hargreaves and Shirley (2009) name the present Finnish society as the model example of the so-called fourth way, which according to them is a novel approach, and not the welfare state governance model or marketing meta-governance model, or even a synthesis of these two approaches. In the fourth way there is steering from the top, but the system is built from the bottom, and both sported and motivated from the sides. Perhaps, one could claim that the Finnish society today includes several characteristics of the organic meta-governance model, as will be presented in more detail in the following section.

### 8.1.2 The powers that central government have over local government, and the powers that local government have independently of central government

Central government determines the overall national goals and the allocation of time for the various subjects, as well as the goals and core contents of the subjects. Local authorities make and approve their local curricula and a yearly work plans according to the national guidelines. Central government subsidizes local authorities through the statutory government transfer system. It is based on a unit price for each student. Central government decides on the unit price, which is to cover 34% of the operating costs of basic education, and 42% of those of upper secondary education. The subsidy is paid to local authorities as a lump sum and is not earmarked for any specific purposes. Local authorities have to cover the remaining costs themselves (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2013; National Board of Education, 2013).

The evaluation of education is based on the general framework for evaluation on education as determined by central government. There is no inspection system or pre-inspection of text books. (Minister of Education and Culture, 2013; Opetus- ja kulttuuriministeriö, 2012a&amp;b). The evaluation system consists of the international, national, provincial and local level, and includes many-sided information, not merely focusing on learning outcomes. The salient findings of evaluation are published (Opetus- ja kulttuuriministeriö, 2012b).

The National Board of Education is responsible for the national evaluation of learning outcomes (Opetus- ja kulttuuriministeriö, 2012a). Furthermore, a separate Matriculation Examination Board assesses the learning outcomes of all general upper secondary schools twice a year (Finnish Matriculation Examination, 2012). These agencies do not compile ranking lists, because they are considered unreliable (Kuusela, 2008). National evaluation is criticized for not paying attention to societal changes and to the actual situations of schools (Hannus et al., 2010).

Concerning both basic (96% in 2012) and general upper secondary education (92% in 2009), municipalities are the main education providers (National Board of Education, 2013; Statistics Finland, 2013). Municipalities have constitutional autonomy. According to the constitution, municipalities have to carry out the tasks decreed to them by law, but they may arrange their organisation with a lot of freedom and decide independently how to carry out the tasks mandated to them (Constitution of Finland, 1999; Kuntalaki, 1995/365). According to Kanervio and Risku (2009), municipalities also use their autonomy. In their survey, superintendents informed that they consider strategic decisions by the municipal council more important than strategic decisions by central government. Similar results have been obtained in principal studies (for example, Pennanen, 2006). Legislation seems to form the national framework, but what is ultimately done is decided at the local level.
Local authorities are obliged by law to evaluate their education, and to get external evaluation as stated in legislation (Opetus- ja kulttuuriministeriö, 2012b). Local evaluation is to develop education in the local level, and to connect local evaluation with the national one (Kupiainen et al., 2009; Lapiolahti, 2007). Local authorities often seem to have problems to use both national and local evaluations to develop their provisions of education (Lapiolahti, 2007; Löffström, Metsämäururinen, Niemi, Salmio & Stenvall, 2005; Rajanen, 2000; Svedlin, 2003).

8.1.3 The main central laws and regulations reflecting models of governance

In 1998, the then disjointed 26 separate education acts were aggregated into 9 acts, one for each different education form from primary to higher education (Aho et al., 2006; Souri, 2009). Thus, today Basic Education Act (628/1998) and General Upper Secondary Education Act (Lukiolaki, 629/1998) determine most issues in general education.

Concerning quality control, in the line of section 1.2, the Ministry of Education and Culture decides on the overall framework for evaluation on education in collaboration with the Finnish Education Evaluation Council, the Finnish Higher Education Evaluation Council and the National Board of Education. (Opetus- ja kulttuuriministeriö, 2012a&b; Ministry of Education and Culture, 2013). Local authorities, which also have the final responsibility for the quality of education, are mandated by law to evaluate their education, and to take part in external evaluation as decreed in legislation (Opetus- ja kulttuuriministeriö, 2012b).

As to competitive markets, Finland has not dived so deep in the free market ideology, particularly in basic education. The Basic education Act (628/1998) mandates local authorities to provide pre-school and basic education, and assign every pupil a place in the local school. Pupils, on the other hand, are free to choose their school. Geographical distances and the small number of private schools (4%) support the ideology of pupils attending basic education in their local schools with their neighbourhood peers.

The General Upper Secondary Education Act (Lukiolaki, 629/1998) gives education providers the right to obtain a license to provide upper secondary education from the Ministry of Education and Culture. As earlier stated, most general upper secondary (92% in 2009) schools are maintained by local authorities. Pupils who have graduated from basic education apply to secondary education through an electronic joint application system. Education providers decide on the admission criteria, which must treat all applicants equally and are most often based on the applicants’ basic education certificate. Applicants have the right to apply to whatever upper secondary education school they want to (National Board of Education, 2013).

The foundation of local empowerment is in the Constitution of Finland (1999), which grants municipalities the autonomy to organise themselves and decide independently how to fulfil the tasks legislation mandates to them. The Municipal Act (Kuntalaki, 1995/365) requires from municipalities to have a municipal council, an executive board, an inspection board and a municipal manager. Otherwise municipalities may decide freely on their organization. School empowerment can be considered to have its foundation in the local empowerment, but also in additional legislation. It is noteworthy that both the Basic Education Act (628/1998) and the General Upper Secondary Education Act (Lukiolaki 629/1998) oblige education providers, which in most cases mean local authorities and particularly the municipal councils, and not schools or their staffs as such (Souri, 2009). For example, concerning staff the acts mandate education providers to see to that every school has a principal who is responsible for the operations of the school, and a sufficient number of teachers and other personnel. In addition, the act obligates the education providers concerning the curriculum, education and evaluation, not the staff as such. Thus, nor the principals and teachers neither the superintendents serve the State but the education providers.
8.2 Translation of external expectations into internal meaning and direction

8.2.1 How do school leaders mediate external requirements with internal meaning?

According to the meta-analyses by Alava, Halttunen and Risku (2012) and Risku and Kanervio (2011), the role of Finnish school leaders has changed dramatically in the three last decades. Aho et al. (2006, 119) summarise the change as follows:

The role of school principals also has dramatically changed since 1990. Principals are not only the educational leaders of their schools but managers who are responsible for financing, personnel, and the results of their institutions. Previously, a school principal was an experienced, senior teacher who was promoted for good service to education. Today’s school principal must be a qualified leader who understands education development and has solid management skills to lead a school. Selection of new school principals is often based on procedures more typical of the private sector, with interviews and psychological tests to confirm the suitability of the candidate.

Principals in Finland today seem to be in the crossfire of many pressures. External requirements may initially come from central government, but as principals and teachers serve the education providers and not the State, the final external pressure comes from the education provider (municipal council, executive and school board), parents and more and more often from the media. This pressure meets the internal meanings, especially the need of teachers’ aspirations to develop teaching and learning according to the education acts and curricula. At the extreme, the principal’s position can be described as a ‘psychological minefield’.

As legislation does not determine principals’ duties in further detail and as local authorities’ contexts vary a lot, there is significant variation in principals’ job descriptions. In general one can say that the obscure legal status of principals appears to cause a lot of contradictions in their practical work. These contradictions involve principals’ time management (Karikoski 2009; Mäkelä 2007; Pennanen 2006) and well-being (Lehkonen 2009; Vuohijoki 2006; see also Suomen Rehtorit [Finnish Association of Principals] 2005). Contradictions are caused by the pressures the different expectations create (Ahonen 2008; Vuohijoki 2006) as principals try both to secure school operations according to the obligations set out in legislation, and to act as representatives of the education provider (Souri 2009; Lapiolahti 2007; Svedlin 2003).

All this calls for principals who have many personal qualities. To begin with, they must have a strong personality, high self-esteem, and the skills to mediate the external and internal pressures.

Internally, one of the key elements is to understand leadership in a new way: its role is to give teachers and all school staff a meaning to their work. Giving meaning to the work is a task which combines the work in action and the managerial guidance of the school. In detail, some of the issues related the problems are as follows.

As for the decision making, each municipality has a constitutional autonomy, and its organisation is stipulated by the ordinance of the municipality. Decisions on financing schools as well as on curriculum issues are often made by the relevant boards. School principals are consulted as experts, but the final decision is made in conformity with the municipal ordinance. An upper-level body has the right to assume the power to make the decisions.
Schools have a strong autonomy in terms of enacting instruction. As a result of the 2004 curriculum reform, goal-based and centralised control has become somewhat stricter in the Finnish education system compared to that of the 1994 national core curriculum. Principals have a very large scope of responsibility, which varies from one municipality to the other depending on the education provider’s ordinance. No external instrument has been developed for measuring a good principal. In Finland, trust is laid upon high-standard teacher education, principal training and continuing professional education taking place in the world of work.

The principal has the responsibility for the school’s work. The documents governing this work consist of the laws specified by the Government, national goals of education and lesson distribution as well as the national core curricula and ordinances issued by the National Board of Education. School- and municipality-specific curricula are designed by schools and education providers. In this process, the school plays an important role. The principal has the responsibility for setting up an annual plan on the basis of the curriculum, that is, the work plan for the school. Practical school work is organised on the basis of the curriculum, the yearly work plan and the financial resources available. A lot of this work is done in collaboration with the teachers, and this fact is one of the driving forces of the internal pressures in question.

The principal has a large influence on the selection of personnel. The principal either selects his or her personnel him/herself, or his or her opinion is very important when the selection is made by another authority. Financial resources are tied up to a great extent, because at a minimum three-quarters of a school’s expenses consist of personnel salaries and other related costs. Even though legislation is fairly broad, collective bargaining agreements of personnel are on the other hand very specific. This is another important example of the pressures between external and internal forces. Today, the schools are operating with reduced funding, which challenges the demand for better learning outcomes. Overcoming this pressure calls for excellent skills in pedagogic leadership.

8.2.2 How do school leaders negotiate and communicate meaning, vision and mission statements?

In the meta-analysis on school leadership and management by Alava, Halttunen and Risku (2012), it was found that a major re-orientation to school leadership is taking place in Finland. This includes the importance of understanding four developmental processes to construct the core of principal’s pedagogical leadership. The four developmental processes comprise of curriculum work, creating and leading a school culture which supports learning, defining the school vision in collaboration with the whole school community, and redefining the school mission. The four developmental processes are intertwined and have to be led by the school principal.

At present, naturally, not all principals are doing all the previous, but research shows that there is the need for this new kind of school leadership, and that change is on the way.

8.2.3 How do school leaders secure fostering ethical purpose like ensuring fairness, equity, justice and democracy?

In Finland, the basic right to education and culture is recorded in the Constitution of Finland (1999). Public authorities must secure equal opportunities for every resident in Finland to get education also after compulsory education and to develop themselves, irrespective of their financial standing. Legislation provides for compulsory education and the right to free pre-primary and basic education. Most other qualifying education is also free of charge for the students, including postgraduate education at universities.
The key words in Finnish education policy are quality, efficiency, equity and internationalisation. Education is a factor for competitiveness. The current priorities in educational development are to raise the level of education and upgrade competencies among the population and the work force, to improve the efficiency of the education system, to prevent exclusion among children and young people, and to enlarge adult learning opportunities. Special attention is also paid to quality enhancement and impact in education, training and research and to internationalisation.

The core values, quality, equity, justice, and democracy, are built in the Finnish society. The program of the present government also emphasizes equality, solidarity, and caring. These values can also be seen in the PISA results, which show the between-school variance is one of the lowest in the world, telling that most schools in Finland perform in the same level. This does not mean that school leaders have an easy job. On the contrary, these challenges are faced daily, for example in recruiting, in allocating work and resources inside the school, in student counselling and in special education.

Despite the strong role of equality in Finland, two risks are emerging. First, more and more emphasis is give to measurable learning outcomes. The demand comes both from parents but also from administration. This is also closely linked to the Finnish media's strong interest to rank the schools according to the matricular examination results. In general, educators in Finland do hate the ranking, because most often they do not measure what the media tries to emphasize, which school is ‘the best, the second’ etc. The pressure to emphasize on better learning outcomes as those are signalled by exams scores necessarily means lowering the emphasis to equity and equal learning outcomes. The school of standardized test is waiting just around the corner to land to Finland. And that would be disastrous to many of the dominant values of the Finish society. And, there is no guarantee for better learning outcomes, on the contrary.

The second risk in Finland can be seen in the latest PISA results. Although in Finland the variance of between the school results is one of the lowest, the gap started (slightly) to increase. This must be seen as a warning signal, and might anticipate changes in the PISA results in the future.

To clarify the importance of values and principles, some of the background factors to which Finland’s success in education builds on are the following:

**Equal opportunities**
The Finnish education system offers everybody equal opportunities for education, irrespective of domicile, sex, economic situation or linguistic and cultural background. The school network is regionally extensive, and there are no sex-specific school services. Basic education is completely free of charge (including instruction, school materials, school meals, health care, dental care, commuting, special needs education and remedial teaching).

**Comprehensiveness of education**
Basic education encompasses nine years and caters for all those between 7 and 16 years. Schools do not select their students but every student can go to the school of his or her own school district. Students are neither channelled to different schools nor streamed.

**Competent teachers**
On all school levels, teachers are highly qualified and committed. A Master's degree is a requirement, and teacher education includes teaching practice. Teaching profession is very popular in Finland, and hence universities can select the most motivated and talented applicants. Teachers work independently and enjoy full autonomy in the classroom.
Student counselling and special needs education
Individual support for the learning and welfare of pupils is well accommodated, and the national core curriculum contains guidelines for the purpose. Special needs education is integrated into regular education as far as possible. Guidance counsellors support upper grade students in their studies and choice of further education.

Encouraging assessment and evaluation
The student assessment and evaluation of education and learning outcomes are encouraging and supportive by nature. The aim is to produce information that supports both schools and students to develop. National testing, school ranking lists and inspection systems do not exist.

Significance of education in society
Finnish society strongly favours education and the population is highly educated by international standards. Education is appreciated and there is a broad political consensus on education policy.

A flexible system based on empowerment
The education system is flexible and the administration based on the principal of “Centralised steering – local implementation”. Steering is conducted through legislation and norms, core curricula, government planning and information steering. Municipalities are responsible for the provision of education and the implementation. Schools and teachers enjoy large autonomy.

Co-operation
Interaction and partnerships are built at all levels of activity. There is co-operation for the development of education between various levels of administration, between schools and between other social actors and schools. Education authorities co-operate with teachers’ organisations, pedagogical subject matter associations and school leadership organisations. This provides strong support for development.

A student-oriented, active conception of learning
The organisation of schoolwork and education is based on a conception of learning that focuses on students’ activity and interaction with the teacher, other students and the learning environment.

8.2.4 How are policies being implemented in schools?

The mechanisms and goals of educational administration have dramatically changed in Finland from the 1970’s. Back then the paradigm in educational administration was strictly top-down, bureaucratic, and it relied heavily on normative management. Due to the many changes in Europe and in Finland, also the paradigm in educational administration started to change. First gradually, but then more rapidly towards a new system, where powers were delegated to local education providers and schools, inspections were terminated and replaced by self-evaluation, and legislature was changed from ruling the operations of schools to the outcomes of schooling. The present paradigm in educational administration can be described as administration through information and knowledge (the earlier was administration through norms, rules and detailed instructions).

This all meant a dramatic change in the implementation of policies. Earlier, it was rather straightforward. The school leaders just obeyed the order and norms, managed, and passed the information requested. Today, the implementation of policies is very different. Naturally, there are the overall learning goals mentioned in the national core curriculum and the key strategies of the municipalities, but it is on the school leaders to position their schools in the changing world in the crossroads of various stakeholder demands.
The key element in implementing policies in this new situation is understanding the new role of information and knowledge, the importance of leading through knowledge, and leading competencies. And, this kind on policy implementation – actually future oriented visionary leadership - calls for totally new kind of leadership skills. Internally, the implementation is no more top down management, but strong participation and dialogue with the teachers and other school staff. It is no more inspections and evaluations of operations with no feedback to follow, but it is the work of making the future according to the guidelines of National Government Policies.

8.3 Understanding and empowering teachers and other staff

8.3.1 How do school leaders improve teaching and support teachers’ competence development in subject matters, pedagogy, classroom management, etc?

In Finland, to begin with, most teachers are highly qualified after having a five-year education towards a Master’s Degree. So, in general, the teachers do know their job when they enter the field. This means that the Finnish school leaders need not to be instructional leaders, which is the case in many other countries. But, although new and experienced teachers have earned their ‘driving license’ to teach in schools, they are constantly in need of improving on their competencies. They need to have the aspiration for continuous learning because the world is changing, students are changing and our understanding of learning is changing. And, added to that, the schools need to change. Therefore, in Finland, the school leaders’ support to teachers’ professional development arises from the premises mentioned above. There is the call for a new broad pedagogical leadership discussed earlier.

Principals do not have a responsibility to observe lessons, but the opportunity exists. Neither are there any external inspection systems or preliminary inspections of learning materials in the Finnish educational system. It is the principal’s duty to evaluate teacher performance according to the criteria approved by the evaluation provider. Typical evaluation criteria consist of mastery of the profession, pupil performance, renewal capability and the ability to cooperate. All this is done in order not to control, but to develop the competencies of the teachers.

8.3.2 How do school leaders create a culture of professional learning?

In the meta-analysis on school leadership and management in Finland by Alava, Halttunen and Risku (2012), several items could be seen in relation to building and leading a professional learning culture. First, the overall importance of school culture has become evident. One key aspect in the Finnish school culture has always been the teachers’ strong professional identities and strive towards student learning. Teachers also have a strong internal aspiration to learn new things. The only problem is that sometimes this aspiration is rather distant from the need of the development of the school as a whole.

Second, related to the topic is networking. Recent studies show that work in external networks has become one of the most important – and also time consuming – tasks for Finnish school leaders. This, added to appropriate internal networks, offers both a new forum for dialogue and also a place for organizational and professional learning.

The importance of developing professional learning in education has also been recognized by the National Board of Education. Just two years ago NBA launched the first development project for teachers’ professional development through mentoring. This project is called VERME, and it has received a substantial financial support from the government.
Linked to that is another initiative called OSAAVA, which allocated funds also for school leaders’
development. Mentoring and dialogue are some of the key approaches used in these programs. Still,
facilitated by the University of Jyväskylä, two major regional development programs have been
launched (one in Central-Finland, and another in Western-Finland). These projects work under the
notion of broad pedagogical leadership and they involve the superintendents, principals, management
teams, and teachers in a 4-5 year long effort.

8.3.3 How do they lead professional development?

As a rule (traditionally), teachers make plans for their professional development themselves. The school
mainly renders support to training that relates to actual development programmes (e.g. network-based
teaching, catering for special learning difficulties, etc.). Continuing professional education needs for
each teacher are estimated in an annual performance review with the principal. In these reviews,
training needs are assessed from the viewpoint of national development programmes, school level and
the needs of each individual teacher.

In addition to that, the efforts mentioned in sub-chapter 9.2 bring new challenges to teachers’
professional development. The effort most likely will bring about new challenges and developmental
needs to schools. Therefore, new developmental needs for teachers are apt to rise. In some cases there
might be the risk of conflict when the aspirations of teachers collide to the needs of the school.

8.3.4 How do school leaders ensure performance management, assessment and
evaluation?

When in Finland the paradigm of educational administration changed from inspection to self-
evaluation, also the performance management, assessment and evaluation changed. The change in
paradigm meant also a change from control and critique to support and development.

The process of self-evaluation is done every year, but each year it has a different emphasis. The
evaluation covers the student learning outcomes, but it also covers all the key operations of the school.
The evaluation process also involves widely the teachers.

In addition to performance management, securing overall quality has become a key focus in basic
education. Therefore, the National Board of Education has published quality criteria for basic education.
Noteworthy is that the concept of quality is also understood in a rather broad view on the basis of the
following topics:

Four quality cards were devised for the quality of structures:
- governance
- personnel
- economic resources
- evaluation

and six quality cards relating to the pupil:
- implementation of the curriculum
- instruction and teaching arrangements
- support to learning growth and well-being
- inclusion and influence,
- school-home cooperation
- safety of the learning environment.
The cards include a description, quality criteria and factors supporting operations. Each card contains criteria for both education providers and schools. The criteria serve regional and local operations (providers and schools).

### 8.4 Structuring and culturing schools

#### 8.4.1 How do school leaders build appropriate organisational structures?

The teaching staff’s municipal collective labour agreement lists tasks that must be delegated and that also are delegated in the same way in almost all schools. These tasks include among others: the role of form master/mistress, group counsellor tasks in upper secondary school, student union counselling, liaison teacher who acts as a liaison person in cooperation between the school and the municipality, maintenance of the school library, maintenance of school collections, arranging music performances, maintenance of audio-visual equipment, and being in charge of ICT, to mention just a few.

In every school there is a student welfare team; its ways of working and responsibilities vary slightly between schools and municipalities.

Responsibility issues are greatly dependent on the presence of a vice-principal or a deputy principal and what their tasks are. In any case, the principal takes ultimate responsibility.

Tasks can be delegated but not the final responsibility. When delegating tasks, their job descriptions must be clarified precisely. Responsibilities, duties and rights relating to any particular task must also be specified precisely. In Finland, the most significant degree of leadership delegation can be found in the vocational sector. The size of the school affects greatly the way in which tasks are delegated. In small schools, the significance of task delegation is different from that in larger schools because the structures differ from each other.

Every school must have a principal who is responsible for the school's operation. Certain responsibility areas have in some schools been specifically delegated to the vice-principal. Additionally various responsibility tasks have been delegated to teachers and/or teacher groups, to student welfare staff and to the school secretary and janitors. The delegated tasks vary in different schools depending on the school size, schooling form and culture. Leadership is becoming more and more delegated so that more attention will be paid to the expertise of different people in a school and their opportunities for inclusion.

When the education provider is a vocational education and training consortium, leadership styles and the consortium organisation vary. In a big organisation, there are the so called ‘profit areas’ within the consortium; in other words there are units accountable in terms of finances. A profit area may consist of one to six different educational institutions. Depending on the operating culture of a particular joint municipal authority, the functions are either congruent or totally separate. In a clearly defined, systematic organisation, the majority of functions have been unified, and are coordinated by one person. Examples of responsibility areas are guidance counselling, special-needs instruction, free-choice studies, core subjects, timetable programmes, principles of annual planning and on-the-job learning.
8.4.2 How do school leaders undertake decision-making?

Financing and resource allocation
The provision of schooling is based on financing from the state and municipalities. The central government transfers for education and culture varies from municipality to municipality but the portion to be financed by the municipality is always equal in size per citizen. Ultimately the municipality, being the schooling provider, makes decisions on allocating financing to any individual school or district. Within the schools, decisions on funds allocation are made based on different guidelines in primary and upper primary schools; decision making within any given school is in their own hands.

A teacher's workload is regulated by collective labour agreements in the form of hours per week (outlined below for basic and general upper secondary education):

- full-time teacher with tenure, depending on the subject 16–24 hours
- full-time teacher not less than 16 hours
- part-time teacher 1–15 hours

A teacher’s workload can vary from year to year; overtime is compensated separately. Principals are in an executive position and comply with general working hour regulations. Subject teachers’ weekly lessons vary between 16–23 hours. Class teachers’ weekly workload includes 24 lesson hours.

Unit prices of educational financing are paid directly to the schooling provider. In vocational schooling, unit prices depend on the particular vocational qualification. The number of student places are specified in the authority to provide education. Additional places are not paid for; a deduction is made for non-enrolled students. In multidisciplinary institutions, the schooling provider decides on funds allocation between different qualifications. Each schooling provider is paid a unit price in conformity with the number of students to cover all of the institution’s expenses. The principal is in charge of the institution’s total budget and monitors it. Within an institution, training managers can also be responsible for finances and can set up budgets for the areas he or she is in charge of, and can be responsible for monitoring them. Very strict bookkeeping is required from all schooling providers; it is checked by outside auditors.

In the private sector, the schooling provider is usually a foundation, limited company, organization or association. This sort of schooling provider receives the central government transfer for education for general education, initial vocational education and training, vocational adult education, special-needs education and liberal adult education on the same grounds as the public sector. Private educational institutions should have a board that represents the schooling provider, the principal being in charge of financial and operational planning, implementation and evaluation in the institution.

The private-sector teachers are entitled to change over to a total working time system and there has been some experimentation on this in the municipal sector, too. In this case, working time is the amount of weekly work corresponding, when applicable, to the working time of office employees, but indicated as the amount of lessons given. The amount of lessons included in the total working time varies in different sectors. The average amount of weekly hours is equal to 16-23 lessons. In addition to lessons, other work is also included in the working time; it can consist of different kinds of planning and development tasks.

Curriculum development and implementation
Any possible compensation paid for actual curriculum development work is determined by the schooling provider. In addition to weekly instruction and other tasks assigned to a teacher, he or she should participate for three hours a week in the school’s joint instructional planning, in subject-group
and issue-group meetings, in school-home cooperation and in tasks related to instructional planning and development of school work. The National Board of Education determines the national core curriculum and the implementation timetable. The municipalities determine their own specifications and applications, on the basis of which schools then design their own curricula.

In initial vocational education and training, uniform qualifications and national core curricula remain in effect, and they are followed everywhere in the country. The schooling providers design their own curricula based on these requirements. The practice varies from one provider to another. For example, in Central Finland all three vocational schooling providers have agreed common definitions of policy concerning vocational schooling curricula. Similarly, they have designed a congruent and common component for qualification-specific curricula (including policy lines on activities concerning the students). On this basis, each institution and schooling sector designs its own qualification-specific curriculum and the plans for its implementation. The institution principals are responsible for curriculum work that is organized through them in schools. Generally teachers are paid a separately agreed remuneration for curriculum work or this work is included in their teaching duties.

**Employment of school leaders**

The Teaching Qualifications Act 14.12.1998/986 regulates the selection of staff, and it is only possible to make an exception to the criteria, for the duration of one year, if there are no qualified applicants. There is no general evaluation system for school leadership; possible punitive measures are regulated by labour legislation and collective labour agreements. According to the regulations each school shall have a principal. Municipalities determine how they organise leadership and whom they appoint as principal. Each municipality makes its own decisions concerning professional development, evaluation and dismissal of their principals. Consultation with school staff when selecting a principal varies from one schooling provider to another.

Vocational principals are selected through a public application procedure in conformity with the qualification criteria. Training managers for schooling institutions are usually selected for a fixed period from among the teaching staff. The school budget also includes funds allocated for development work. In recent years, a lot of development money has been available through various development programmes. Most vocational institutions have a quality system and evaluation is performed based upon it. Regular audits are carried out in accordance with jointly agreed procedures, as well as annual leadership surveys. The students also participate in the audits, and they give feedback on their studies via various systems. The organisation and leadership systems of vocational institutions vary greatly. Each provider has been and is able to specify its own organisation. Similarly, the provider determines, among others, how the job satisfaction surveys are carried out.

**Selection of school leaders**

The selection process is regulated by the Teaching Qualifications Act. The condition of qualification is a university-level class teacher’s or subject teacher’s degree. An exception to these criteria can be made only in the absence of qualified applicants, and the exception can only take effect for one year. The municipalities are entitled to determine themselves how teacher selection is performed. These are the main ways: 1. the selection body, which is a politically nominated committee, 2. school boards, 3. the director of each educational department, and 4. principals. A reward system is being developed. Usually the dismissing body is the same as the selecting body, if any.

As a guideline, some sum of a school’s salary expenses are allocated for teachers’ professional development, which is used for continuing professional education. There is no national evaluation system for teacher work but the majority of schooling providers run their own self-developed evaluation systems. Punitive measures are regulated by labour legislation and collective labour agreements. In most cases, the school principal is responsible for teachers’ continuing professional
education and evaluation. Some schoolteachers have a fixed-term contract either because they are substitute teachers or because they are unqualified.

In the field of vocational schooling, the teacher selection process conforms to the conditions of qualifications as stipulated by the Act. In most cases, the schooling provider advertises for new teachers annually in spring. The conditions for qualification are, depending on the qualification title, as follows: a university-level degree, three years work experience and the completion of teacher’s pedagogical studies (60 ECTS/35 credit points). The teaching duty for a vocational teacher with tenure is 24.5 hours per week (commercial colleges are an exception), for a general subject teacher it varies between 20.5 hours and 21.5 hours per week. The teaching duty limit for a full-time teacher is 16 hours per week. Most of the vocational institutions follow a so-called period system. The year is often divided into five or six periods. When working in this system, a teacher’s working hours can differ from period to period. The pay is calculated according to the mean value of hours in the annual plan.

A subject teacher’s working time includes participation in joint planning work so that, depending on the practice in any particular school, 2–5 hours per fortnight per teacher are allocated to staff meetings, subject group meetings and negotiations.

Funds for professional development come from the school’s budget or, as in recent years, from development projects. Evaluation is performed in accordance with the quality system. Feedback is collected according to a plan drawn up for the school year so that each teacher receives student feedback for at least one period; this feedback is then discussed in performance reviews together with the teacher’s own self-evaluation.

**Student intake ('choice' and number), retention and promotion**

In the case of basic education, the municipality determines the child’s neighbourhood school but parents have the right to apply for an alternative schooling place in another school. At secondary level, the students are free to send applications to any school. The student (parents) chooses the school where he/she wishes to study.

Student intake to secondary level is carried out through a joint application system that is steered by the State Provincial Offices. After the completion of this joint application, an individual student or individual student groups can be admitted directly to the school. Student intake is effected from the whole territory of Finland.

**How does the private school sector differ?**

Any private school that was established before 1999 on the basis of an authorisation issued by the Government is entitled to 100% (more recently established receive 90%) financing which includes also a municipal transfer to education. In the private education sector, the terms of employment are the same as in the municipal sector, also the labour legislation is the same. In particular in newer (denominational or ideological) schools, the number of unqualified staff is larger both among teachers and principals. This is due to the fact that eligible candidates should be both qualified and suitable, the schools are usually small and the scope of duties is larger. Municipalities cannot appoint a private school as a child's neighbourhood school against his or her parents’ will if in this particular school education is based on a certain pedagogical system or religion. In most cases, private schools arrange at least an admission interview; admission tests (pupils’ suitability and parents’ commitment) are also used for selecting pupils.
8.5 Working with partners and the external environment: Systems leadership

8.5.1 Who are the main stakeholders that participate in this aspect of leadership activity?

Stakeholders and partners are more and more important in Finnish schools. Earlier, their role has been smaller, but nowadays many of them have developed in almost strategic alliances. For example in some high schools emphasizing entrepreneurship, collaboration with local enterprises has increased significantly.

Also, the collaboration inside a community’s other sectors, like youth work, social work, and even police, have become more as partners to the school. This is linked to the holistic thinking of the student’s ‘learning and growth path’ lasting all the way from pre-school to universities. This path travels in a vast network of actors who all have a significant role in it. This schools’ external work in networks, naturally, is a new and demanding task both for the teachers and the principal. In a wider sense, it is also a good example of shared leadership towards the stakeholders, just like there is shared leadership with teachers, students and parents.

Parents are usually strongly committed to a school’s work. In Finland, there are many parents’ associations affiliated to schools. Teachers and especially principals are expected to participate actively in all activities connected with their school. In bigger localities, the situation is a bit different because there are also separate cultural centres and other similar institutions. Yet the role of schools is not limited to traditional school activities alone; the facilities are used also for other community activities.

In smaller localities, many schools are also in charge of adult education centre activities and teachers and principals are a major resource in this. In recent years, upper secondary education for adults has been launched also in smaller upper secondary schools and it has become an important part of adult education activities in these communities. The principal’s role in establishing this type of upper secondary adult education is definitely decisive.

8.5.2 What are the main policy imperatives that frame the external relationship/interagency/inter-stakeholder work of school leaders?

Teaching work also involves more and more co-operation with different stakeholders and partners and pedagogical management in multidisciplinary co-operation networks. In addition, teachers are expected to play an active role in development projects, produce reports and follow effects. Teachers are not capable of meeting these demands and expectations on their own. It is absolutely necessary to develop schools collaboratively. In Finland, collective competence is not very strong as yet – our operational culture rests more on doing things alone.

The success of development is mediated by the nature and level of co-operation between all relevant stakeholders and their commitment and motivation – a national partnership. It is about building collaboration and interaction among administration, schools, working life, organisations, enterprises and associations involved in teaching and educational work. This partnership aims to develop new nationally important learning solutions and procedures.

At the same time, this involves creating new competencies, new products, services and overall solutions. The partnership aims to support and promote learning and competence such that schooling becomes more meaningful for every student. The quality of interaction between the stakeholders involved manifests itself as the ability to match different objectives, exchange and refine information, as well as develop staff learning and competence.
8.5.3 What structures are in place to enable this work?

In 2003, the educational legislation was revised by complementing regulations on pupil and student welfare. This legislation revision aimed at emphasising more explicitly the meaning of comprehensive child and youth welfare and that of a safe learning environment. The aim was to introduce in the educational legislation principles of early intervention and preventive action against problems relating to child and youth development. The definition of pupil and student welfare has the same content in legislation governing each particular educational structure.

Because of this, new internal structures have been developed in schools. They are usually called student welfare groups and their members are teachers, counselors, psychologists, and medical experts.

8.6 School leaders’ recruitment, preparation and development

8.6.1 What are the regulations and required qualifications concerning progression to becoming school leaders?

The Qualification Decree states three options: certificate in educational administration, university training equal to no less than 15 credit points (25 ECTS credits) or adequate familiarity with educational administration. Against the background of all the major changes taking place in Finland and internationally, also mentioned in this chapter, and against the background of the totally new requirements they imply for leadership in educational institutions, it is clear that the qualification issue must remain on the agenda of educational policy discussions.

Because there are lots of training providers offering quite different types of training programmes, it is often difficult for a person wishing to enter training and for selection boards to interpret what is the level of the training in question. Now practically all trainers speak about credit units and ECTS credits as well as about basic studies and about advanced studies even if it is not at all a question of university studies. In the future, attention shall be paid to the unification of principal training standards.

The requirements to qualify for school leader positions are regulated by the Decree on teaching staff qualifications 14.12.1998/986. In addition to being a qualified teacher for the particular school form, this Decree states also that a master's degree, adequate teaching experience and a certificate in educational administration, university training equal to no less than 25 ECTS units (15 credit points) or adequate familiarity with educational administration attained otherwise is necessary. If the educational institution provides education of more than one educational form or if the school leader has responsibility for a number of schools providing education of different educational forms, the school leader shall have a teacher's qualification in any one of them.

A person with an appropriate polytechnic degree can also qualify for a leader position in an educational institution providing initial vocational education and training. A person with a master's degree, adequate work experience from industry and a certificate in educational administration or university training in educational administration or adequate familiarity with educational administration attained otherwise can also qualify for a leader position in an educational institution providing education and training for further vocational qualifications and specialist vocational qualifications or other vocational further education and training. Because the leadership tasks in educational institutions have changed greatly and become broader in scope, the pressure also grows to consider both basic and continuing professional education of school leaders in a new light. The qualification requirements apply also to the private education sector but in particular in new small schools there are proportionately more unqualified principals.
8.6.2 How are school leaders recruited?

Because the Qualification Decree requires that any person to be nominated a principal should have a teacher's qualification for the education form in question, practically the only pathway to become a principal is through graduation from the corresponding university programmes. The case is different for directors of educational departments because usually the municipal ordinance requires only a master's degree and familiarity with educational administration. That's why this position can also be held by persons without teacher education.

According to a study by Kanervio & Risku (2009), in most cases principals are recruited through an open search. Some 10% of the nominations are done as internal replacements. In most municipalities (ca. 77%) the selection is performed by the board of education, municipal board in 9%, the superintendent in 7%, city council in 5% of the cases.

The most important criterion in making the selection is the formal qualifications. Very important factors are also training, leadership experience, and work experience.

8.6.3 Is equity of gender and ethnicity intended and how is it addressed?

According to the study by Kanervio & Risku (2009), gender plays no role in principal selection. There are no studies on the influence of the ethnicity.

8.6.4 How do potential leaders gain experience and professional learning opportunities before taking up leadership posts?

In principle, school leadership education can be divided into preparatory and continuing professional education. The qualification can be gained in two ways: either by attaining the certificate in educational administration (12 ECTS credits) or by completing university studies in educational administration (25 ECTS credits). It is possible to take the exam for the certificate in educational administration either directly or by first completing preparation studies for it.

The National Board of Education, who administers the test for the certificate in educational administration also facilitates training for it. Also, through the OSAAVA funding program several universities offer preliminary training for future principals, as well as to new principals. Some universities also offer the 25 credit university training program as mentioned in the statutes.

8.6.5 How are leadership competencies developed and maintained through continuous professional development (CPD)?

Support and induction programmes for school leaders vary to a great extent depending on the municipality and school-maintaining organisation. Getting support and induction is mostly a matter of one's own initiative or it is based on self-financed training. There are, on the other hand, Finnish educational institutions where the leaders are provided with, free of charge, the support they need, for example with aid for induction, mentoring, peer support and degree-targeted further and continuing professional education. Many education providers have already for years provided induction training for new school leaders.

Staff training in municipal educational administrations

In Finland, many education providers also provide staff training for municipal educational administration. This continuing professional education is free of charge for the participants if it is state financed. The incurred substitute, travel, accommodation and salary expenses must be paid either by
the participant's organisation or by the participant him/herself. Staff training of municipal educational administrators can be divided into:

1. Teachers’ self-motivated continuing professional education: The participant him/herself has the responsibility and power of decision, and he/she can get support for these studies from the state in the form of a study grant. The employer decides whether the person can participate in education during working hours.

2. Staff training of educational institutions: The educational institution’s maintaining organisation is the responsible party for this continuing professional education.

3. Staff training with educational policy components: The state has responsibility for steering and financing this continuing professional education. Continuing professional education with educational policy components contributes to the practical implementation of the decisions of the Parliament and the Government and the goals set by the Ministry of Education.

The aim of this staff training that is implemented partly with funds from the state budget is to support educational institution renewal in the focus areas with educational policy components that are listed in the state budget. The focus areas are determined annually, but a great deal of them are under development continuously for many years. State-supported continuing professional education is directed to support school-specific, regional and national development projects. Equal access to education in different parts of Finland is catered for as well as the fact that the education provision is targeted at principals, and other school leadership and teaching staff from all forms of educational institutions. Continuing professional education in school leadership is targeted at principals and other leadership and development teams in educational institutions.

The major part of government-funded continuing professional education provision for principals and teaching staff is concentrated on the focus areas that are annually specified in the state budget. This education is long-term training, that is, as a rule the scope comprises at least five ECTS credits. This continuing professional education provision is financed from the state budget and the training provision procurement is determined by the National Board of Education.

Continuing professional education for new principals
In education programmes for new principals funded by the National Board of Education, the content is determined by it. The executive group of the National Board of Education has procured new principals’ education for 200 principals annually. A new program called OSAAVA was launched in 2009 and a significant amount of money has been allocated to the continuous education of teachers and principals. The funds are allocated both directly via the National Board of Education, and locally through state provincial offices.

The education provision is funded from the state budget and it is free of charge for the participants. The employer compensates possible substitute, travel and accommodation expenses. The school leaders’ basic continuing professional education programme is targeted at principals and educational institution heads with other titles from basic education, upper secondary schools, vocational institutions, vocational adult education institutions and from institutions of liberal education.

The education provision serves to support the new principal with the development of professional dispositions, the adoption of different tasks and working ability. Support from colleagues and from professional cooperation networks are considered important parts of this training provision. The new principal’s personal development and the development of the work organisation in his/her educational institution are studied in parallel within the framework of this training provision. The training provision draws on recent research and evaluation development knowledge. Close guidance and
counselling is provided for setting up one's own continuing professional education plan and for continuous development of professional competence. In addition, guidance is provided for planning, managing, implementing and valuating a long-term communal development process in a work community. The following larger thematic entities are emphasised in the training programme content:

- Organisation, administration and finances of an education institution
- Educational institution curriculum and learning outcomes
- Personnel administration and management
- Strategic planning

Other continuing professional education for school leadership

In addition to school leadership basic education, the National Board of Education has allocated funding to numerous training modules that were proposed by the working group. During the last few years there have been, e.g.:

- new learning environments
- school leadership and information technology: strategies for using IT in teaching
  - practical IT skills
  - evaluation and quality strategies
  - strategic leadership
  - improving interaction skills
  - issues relating to student well-being, guidance and counseling and student welfare
  - mentor training
- principals' summer get-together

Funds allocated to school leadership education serve also to support extensive work community leadership, the introduction of formative evaluation methods and drawing on evaluation results in schools. Training programmes of this type are targeted at school development teams. The basic idea in continuing professional education is that it should be closely connected to other school work development projects. The education provisions draw on municipalities’, education providers’ and educational institutions’ own background, taking into account the challenges and opportunities created by regional development for educational institution development work. In addition, emphasis is placed on views of the future of education and visions of the evolution of society and the world of work. In school leadership education and training, it will also be important in the years to come to pay attention to networking between educational institutions, both nationally and transnationally. Also, cooperation with immediate surroundings must be taken into account in continuing professional education for all school forms.

Good personnel management is expected from any principal; extensive management of experts with a view to support the working ability of all staff. At the same time, it is important for the principal to take care of his/her own welfare and development. More and more development work, planning and responsibility for the pedagogical ideology of the work community are expected from the principal of tomorrow. Extensive knowledge of the development trends in schooling and society are a great help in this work. An exploratory approach to work and the utilisation of various evaluation results for school development help the principal to pilot his/her school in the sometimes unknown waters of the future. State-supported continuing professional education for principals aims to support and encourage principals in this demanding task.

The supply of continuing professional education in school leadership is very mixed and providers are numerous – from consulting companies to university continuing education centres. Courses are generally available for all those interested but, for example, big cities run their own in-house training programmes.
The Specialist Qualification in Management (JET) focusing on developing management competences has been very popular. It is provided both as training in an educational institution and as apprenticeship training. The programmes consist of preparatory training and a competence test. These programmes usually last for 2–2½ years and they are attended while at work. JET training programmes concentrate on leadership development in a very practice-oriented way. In 2004, about 700 students participated in training for the Specialist Qualification in Management in educational institutions and more than 7,000 students participated in management training in the form of apprenticeship training. However, it should be noted that we do not know exactly how many of them were principals and school leaders. Earlier, also, numerous 60 credit unit PD programmes were arranged but interest in them has been on the wane. This is partly due to the fact that the funding arrangements of the JET programmes have made them more affordable than the PD programmes.

Because the supply of training is very mixed and there are many training providers, practically no external evaluation of their effectiveness has been performed. In this respect, much depends on the self-evaluation performed by the training providers and the feedback system. The only institution providing actual university-level post-basic education in educational leadership is the Institute of Educational Leadership at the University of Jyväskylä. They started a 35 ECTS study programme in 2000. These studies are targeted at educational leaders already in a relevant post who aspire to develop their competences through practical leadership training based on university research. A Master’s degree programme in educational leadership is also offered by the University of Jyväskylä since 2007.

In Finland, about 30 doctoral degrees have been attained in educational leadership, which is quite a small number. A special doctoral program in educational leadership was launched in the Institute of Educational Leadership in the University of Jyväskylä in 2002. At the moment, there is a postgraduate doctoral student school also with the collaboration of the University of Åbo Akademi and the University of Helsinki.

### 8.6.6 How do school leaders engage with peer networks at local, national or international level?

The association of Finnish principals is a prominent, nationwide association also with strong local units. Most of the principals belong to the association and take part at least in local activities. Nationally, 2-3 annual meetings and training events are offered. Also, the association arranges trips both to ESHA and ICP meetings.

The Institute of Educational Leadership has an alumni of close to 1000 people. There are alumni meetings bi-annually with 200-300 attendants. The institute is also a forum to convene in various national and international events and seminars.
PART III: RESEARCH TRENDS AND FUTURE RESEARCH NEEDS ON SCHOOL LEADERSHIP
9. TRENDS AND FUTURE IMPORTANT RESEARCH TOPICS FOR COMPARATIVE RESEARCH ON SCHOOL LEADERSHIP - EQUITY AND LEARNING¹

9.1 Introduction

Over the past decade 2000-2013 there has been a significant increase in research studies on school principals across the northern European community. This chapter was designed to provide a comprehensive overview of this research orientation—its content, research designs, major findings, as well as our conclusions and recommendations for advancing research on school principals. We report on all published research with the terms principal and/or school leadership as keywords in the library systems and different search engine. School leadership was therefore superior over equity and learning. To be included in our literary review the authors needed to highlight the importance on school leadership in there thinking by using school leadership or principal as a key word for library search engines.

Helene Ärlestig and Olof Johansson provided an overview of current research studies by describing a broad national framework for research on school principals in Sweden. Scholars from Norway - Jorunn Møller, Denmark - Leif Moos, Finland - Mika Risku & Pekka Kanervio, Iceland - Börkur Hansen, England - Christopher Day, Germany -Stephan Huber, Poland - Joanna Michalak, and Latvia - Dainuvite Bluma and Ineta Daiktere review research on school leadership and the principalship from the past decade in each of their respective countries. Stephan Huber’s review of research also includes research from three other German speaking countries-Austria, Liechtenstein, and Switzerland. We would like to thank all the authors that have made research from their countries available for us to read in English! Probably this is the first time some of this research is presented to a wider audience. Next we consider factors that have contributed to research on principals in these countries over the past decade.

To begin, the European community as well as other countries around the globe has witnessed massive social, economic, and political changes that have stimulated policymakers and citizens to more closely examine the goals and purposes of their educational systems as they address daunting challenges brought about by these changes early in the 21st century. Such forces as globalization, increased economic competition within and among nations, increased migration, social networking and advances in technology, dramatic political changes in Eastern Europe at the end of the 20th century, international

¹ This chapter essentially extends chapter 14, mainly in the recommendations for advancing research on principals, authored by Olof Johansson & Paul V. Bredeson in: Olof Johansson (ed.), Rektor – En Forskningsöversikt 2000–2010. Vetenskapsrådets Rapportserie. 4:2011 (Principal – a research overview 2000 – 2010, The Swedish research council). Therefore, references that are made to summaries of research on school leadership and the principalship in the present chapter for various countries can be found in the text cited above. This text is available at: http://www.cm.se/webbshop_vr/pdf/2011_04.pdf
comparisons using measures of student attainments, PISA, for example, and increased demands for
good student outcomes and for accountability have intensified the work of educational professionals,
especially school principals. These demands have led to careful analyses of the leadership roles,
responsibilities, relationships, and work of school principals related to their effectiveness in meeting
the challenges through the quality of education provided in their schools.

Unlike in Australia, Canada, and the United States where scholarship on school principals is well
established in universities, education agencies, and research centers, the research efforts described in
this chapter indicate that in some countries the scholars are in the early stages of defining and setting a
coordinated agenda for examining principals’ work. There is great potential in European scholars
sharing their research on principals, notwithstanding important differences in educational structures,
cultures, histories, and local contexts. In the next section we identify major themes that cut across
research on principals in the countries represented in this chapter. Based on these reviews of research,
in the final section we offer our recommendations for advancing research on school principals within
the European community. We end by echoing Christopher Day’s assessment of research on school
leadership in England, we believe research on school principals is “alive and well” as presented in this
chapter. Our hope is that this chapter describing research on principals from 2000-2010 will clarify the
need for continuing excellent and well founded research and support the future development and
direction of this research and help to address the formidable challenges confronting school leaders,
teachers, students, communities, and policymakers.

9.2 Research on Principals -Major Themes

In this section we identify major themes that cut across the summaries of research on principals in
different national studies, cultures and contexts. While there are important differences in research foci
and findings on principals in each of the respective countries represented in this chapter, our purpose
here is to highlight common trends and to indicate where research findings suggest that scholars have
shared interests and thus might collaborate in cross-national research projects in the coming decade. In
addition, our discussion of cross-cutting themes helps to highlight existing strengths in contemporary
research on principals as well as indicate important areas currently not examined thereby giving
direction to future research efforts in the field. This can be done despite or maybe because of the
differences between the systems and their governing forms.

9.2.1 An Emerging Field of Study

From 2000-2010 there have been notable increases in research on principals across the European
community as represented in greater numbers of theses, dissertations, research reports, and
publications. Notwithstanding the rate of growth in research on principals across various countries, the
evidence provided in the summaries of research indicates this is still an emerging field of study in the
countries in this chapter. While there has been increased interest in and focus on the work and role(s)
of school principals, in most countries scholarship on school principals remains quite limited. Indeed,
studies of school principals represent a rather new field of scholarship in universities. The reasons for
the paucity of research are varied depending on the country. Joanna Michalak (Poland) and Dainuvite
Bluma and Ineta Daiktere (Latvia) describe how the political, social, and educational legacy of the Soviet
era over the past half century resulted in leadership and the principalship being separated conceptually
and in practice. Leadership traditionally was being associated with authoritarian government controls
and thus there were few salient questions for research. Principals were primarily appointed with the
approval of the Communist Party, thus party loyalty was a more critical selection criterion than
managerial skills and pedagogical expertise. Under this system there was little interest in research on
school principals. Stephan Huber notes that in German speaking countries (Germany, Austria,
Liechtenstein, and Switzerland) historically there has not been much research on school leadership.
What studies there were tended to be linked to research on education policy issues and school development projects. With a primary focus on other issues, the examination of principals' work and their leadership in schools tended to be tangential. Huber suggests that to establish legitimacy as a field of study within universities, researchers has yet to build a compelling case that school leadership and the work of principals is distinct from public administration for example.

Our authors suggest a number of reasons for the increased interest in research on school principals. For example, changes in national education policies often times decentralizing education systems, a steady wave of educational reform initiatives, increasingly challenging school environments, the effects of globalization, and rising demands for accountability have complicated and intensified the work of school principals and the staffs they lead. In Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland, and Iceland Jorunn Møller, Helene Årlestin & Olof Johansson, Leif Moos, Mika Risku and Pekka Kanervio, and Börkur Hansen describe the impact of external forces affecting schools and principals as well as the powerful internal dynamics of educational systems that have created new demands on principals. Thus, researchers in universities and state agencies have begun to examine more closely than in previous decades the work of school principals and its relationship to national policy goals and accountability for student outcomes both in terms of academic and social development. In England, where there is a longer history of research on school heads, and where a National College for School Leadership was established by the Labor government in 2001 research on principals got extra push forward through this new organization. Christopher Day attributes the persisting and current surge of research on principals over the past decade to the twin demands of greater school effectiveness and improvement coupled with greater recognition of the importance of social justice and equity in the education system. In Sweden the National Agency for Education devolved the responsibilities for principal training to ten selected organizations in 1976. At a second time in 1993/94 to only to six organizations was given the programme and around 1998 a third reorganization was made and the training was moved into the universities and 8 universities where selected. The fourth reorganization was done around 2009 and only 6 universities was declared to have the competence needed for the new programme. All the four reorganization have been linked to changes in the definition of the National Head Master Training Programme.. The creation of principal development centers was accompanied by increased numbers of principal trainers, some of them doctoral students. In these cases, there were research projects, papers, theses and doctoral dissertations completed. But still there is a call for more research at the principal training centres today. We find in this research overview research to report from the principal training Centres of Umeå, Uppsala and Karlstad.

9.2.2 Intensification of Principals' Work

In the 1990s education reforms rippled across various countries coupled with the devolution of authority to local municipalities and schools. Another major shift accompanying these reforms was in the training and on-going professional development of school principals which moved from The National Agency for Education to local development centers at universities. Coupled with these changes in national policies were increased calls for accountability for measurable student learning outcomes in the context of demanding educational environments. All of these demands are precipitated by increasingly diverse student cohorts, rising social conflicts in schools and communities, curricular changes requiring the use of new technologies, and demands for new knowledge and skills for the 21st century citizens. Together they have intensified the work of school principals and raised questions about the continuing effectiveness of traditional educational systems. In general, job descriptions for principals had been ill-defined and not clearly described in legislation or policy documents. Given the historic lack of research on the work of principals, as well as the qualities, strategies and skills all principals need to take on responsibilities for the array of education challenges, it is not surprising that principals themselves as well as policy makers and researchers found the lack of clarity and research evidence disturbing. As a result, greater emphasis on the role of principals in meeting these demands
stimulated growth of research on school principals and at the same time the policy demands on principals increased.

### 9.2.3 Obstacles to Principals’ Instructional Leadership

Though there are a few exceptions, for example work in England by Christopher Day and through researchers commissioned by the National College of School Leadership, research on principals as instructional leaders reported in this chapter is very limited. The reviews suggest several explanations. First, there is no consensus among researchers on just what the concept of instructional leadership means. It continues to be debated and operationalized differently depending on the researcher; this is true even in well-established leadership preparation programs and research centers in North American universities and in Australia. In the descriptive studies of principals' work, most school leaders have experience as teachers and bring their pedagogical experiences and expertise with them to the job. Nonetheless, Jorunn Møller explains in her review of research studies in Norway that the concept of instructional leadership receives little attention. Principals in Norway she shows do not believe that intervention in the classroom practices of teachers is one of their primary responsibilities. A discussion on this topic is valid also for Sweden. And then, as in all Scandinavian countries the discussion are under the heading of pedagogical leadership. In a sense this is a counter narrative to the Australian, UK and North American emphases on different forms of accountability in which principals are charged with ever increasing demands for supervision and merit based awards for teacher performance and student learning outcomes. Yet there are some indications of changes reported in one study in Norway where the findings describe important differences between veteran and new principals. In the reported study, new principals were found to accept accountability for learning outcomes and discourse about professional practices as an important dimension of their leadership work. Veteran principals (55 years and older), in contrast, tended to see their responsibilities more on the managerial aspects of school organization and its effectiveness.

Another reason that the concept of instructional leadership has only limited traction in the research and in principals’ work is anchored in powerful norms of professional autonomy of teachers and principals. Principals believe that it is the teachers’ responsibility to exercise pedagogical expertise to create appropriate conditions for learning for all students to succeed in their classrooms. Notwithstanding principals’ efforts to enhance educational quality and learning outcomes in their schools, strong norms of professional autonomy inhibit principals from supervisory practices that intrude on classroom instructional decision making and practices.

### 9.2.4 Legacies shaping Education and the Work of Principals

The unique history, structure, culture, policy environment, and context of the public system of education in each of the countries reviewed in this chapter have shaped the role of school principals. Accordingly, research on principals necessarily reflects these legacies. Though much can be learned from cross-national studies, examining the work of principals within each national, regional, and local context fills an important niche in this field of study. We can learn from international studies, however, simple translation, application, and transfer of the research designs, survey instruments, and research findings on principals in one setting into another are not sufficient, nor appropriate. Context matters and we quote Stephan Huber:

> There are obvious contextual differences in terms of leadership such as the extent of autonomy school leaders have within the educational system, their appointment and selection criteria, while less immediately obvious cultural differences make it even less likely that one could simply import findings from one context to the other without at least some adaption.
For example, in the United States where public education is under the constitutional authority of state
governments, a decentralized public education system with a strong tradition of local control
represents a major difference in context from European countries where national education agencies
predominate. Also, as we described earlier in this summary, the experiences of policymakers and
educational professionals in countries formerly under the control of the Soviet Union (Poland and
Latvia) have spent the past two decades trying to untangle the legacy of Soviet era structures and
policies that shaped public education and the work of school principals. As reported by Joanna Michalak
(Poland) and Dainuvite Bluma and Ineta Daiktere (Latvia), research on how these dramatic shifts in
governance, management, and control structures affect principals is beginning to emerge. The results
from these studies could probably bring more understanding to the complex relations in a school and
the function of the principal in relation to great changes in the political system for governing schools.

9.3 Research Design and Methods

The research on principals reported in this chapter is primarily qualitative and descriptive in nature.
Case studies, survey research with interviews and written questionnaires, life history, action research,
and observational studies are the favoured methodological strategies. Descriptive studies on principals
are important because they establish a baseline of data in the form of taxonomies, and classification
systems as a springboard for developing research agendas and projects that examine the work of school
principals. These studies also provide insight for developing survey protocols for larger mixed methods
studies and projects and suggest hypotheses to be tested using quantitative methods. While these
descriptive studies provide useful insights from principals’ and teachers’ perspectives, current research
designs as well as their size and scope too often limit researchers’ ability to address a number of
questions about the relationship between principal leadership and instructional practices, school
improvement and goal setting, student learning outcomes—academic and social, accountability, and
resources allocation to name a few.

In this chapter, there are only a limited number of researchers in each country whose research focuses
on school principals. In many cases, they are the pioneers in this field of study. Collaborative research
efforts exist, yet the most studies are carried out by individual researchers. This is especially true for
doctoral theses and these tend to be one-off studies and only some of the new researcher continue to
publish in the field as shown for Sweden.

Given that the majority of studies are qualitative in design, it should not be surprising that there are few
large-scale studies using quantitative research designs reported in these summaries of research. Though there are rich data sources of government data on resources, expenditures, educational inputs,
and learning outcomes, few researchers have used quantitative methods and large national or
international data sets to address fundamental questions on the relationship of principal practice to
teachers’ instructional practices, school climate and culture, work place environments, the efficacy of
policy initiatives, and school outcomes. The lack of large scale studies using rigorous quantitative
designs can also be explained by a lack of national funding for such studies and by individual researcher
preferences for qualitative research design or a mixture of both. Assembling research teams, setting a
research agenda on principals, creating longitudinal research designs, and carrying out and reporting
findings from these inquiries are resource hungry and require more than individual researcher interest.
It requires investment by national agencies in stabilizing research centres and providing support to
teams dedicated to do this research. To date, such research is greatly underfunded.
9.3.1 Little Attention to Principal Recruitment, Preparation, Selection, and Socialization

There is scant evidence in this review that researchers have paid attention to important policy agendas in understanding quality issues in relation to how principals are recruited, prepared, selected, and then socialized into their formal leadership roles in schools. Pre-service preparation and in-service development of principals traditionally has been primarily the responsibility of national education agencies and local municipalities. In Sweden, for example, once a principal has been hired in a local municipality, he/she is required to participate in a multi-year, university-based professional development program that equips principals with knowledge, skills, and tools to carry out their work successfully. Most important, these programs provide time for critical reflection on daily leadership practices and their outcomes. To date, research on the efficacy of these training programs is limited and there is not an extant body of research on principal recruitment, selection, and socialization. The exception in this chapter is research reported on the work in the National College of School Leadership initiative in England.

9.3.2 Research on Principals: A Cascade Effect

There is little doubt that the intensification of principals’ work and greater emphasis on the importance of the principal's leadership role has stimulated significant transitions in principals’ work in schools. In a highly dynamic social and political environment with increased pressure to redesign schools and professional practices in ways that best serve the needs of students and communities, the traditional roles of principals are in transition—being reshaped, redefined, and re-negotiated. Here again context is an important factor and how principals manage these external policy changes is an important quality marker on the principal. Research from Norway suggests that work role transitions tend to affect principals differently depending on their career stage. For example, as reported by Jorunn Møller, that the veterans, in contrast to newly appointed heads, appeared less influenced by the obligations to administrative work. It looked like their basic beliefs drove their actions despite the turmoil of what was going on other places. It is as if they want to retain the kind of psychological rewards they have got as teachers. It could be framed as 'keep in touch with the kids'. The mid-career and early career principals on the other hand tell stories about establishing professional accountability. Some are also welcoming managerial accountability, but they too want to retain the kind of psychological rewards they have got as teachers. The newly appointed school principals, on the other hand, did not know anything else but a climate of accountability. They seem to take it for granted, they welcome it, and relate it to being a professional. The discourses of leadership and accountability at municipal level have changed, but at school level managerial accountability has more a status of “anticipated future”. In Sweden – chapter 5 – we see very little research about accountability and very few studies on student outcomes but many studies describing the complex work of principals in a complex steering system. As principals re-negotiate and establish new professional work roles, they will need significant support from policymakers, teachers, and the communities they serve. Resources of time, money, and opportunity for professional development to acquire new knowledge and skills will be critical as principals develop new leadership identities.

9.4 Recommendations for Advancing Research on Principals

Based on the summaries presented in this chapter and our analysis of them, we use the themes that cut across research on principals to offer our suggestions for advancing studies on school leadership as a legitimate field of study within the European community. In addition, our hope is that these recommendations for further research are helpful guideposts for inquiry in each of the respective countries. We recognize that research in each country is at a different stage of development, some areas of study just emerging while others have a longer and richer history of inquiry on principals. Accordingly, local and national contexts as well as the present body of research on school principals will
determine next steps for advancing individual and collaborative research projects. Lastly, we believe this collection of summaries on research on principals from 2000-2010 provides fruitful directions for cross-national research projects.

Our recommendations are grounded in research informed assumptions. First, we believe the leadership role(s) of school principals will continue to be central to school development, improvement, organizational capacity building, and student learning outcomes in the future. After accounting for the quality of teacher instructional practices, school leadership is viewed as the second most important contributor to student development and learning outcomes. The mix of decentralization and centralization of education policies and governance has intensified the daily work of principals and demands on them for skilful management and transformational leadership will continue unchanged for some time. Given the centrality of principals to educational outcomes regardless of national/local contexts, research on principals and their work will clearly continue in the future. Continuing interest in research on principals will naturally yield more studies—masters papers, doctoral theses, and an array of various publications in scholarly and practitioner journals. For example, the growth of principal development centres with increasing numbers of masters and doctoral students in study and in training and development will supply fresh ideas and researchers in the field. However, it is important that there is a strategic overview which can lay foci for research, so that structure will replace the more incremental approach. The foci identified in this review either as promising or missing are described below. But, there is no silver bullet, no right answers expected from these studies suggesting prescriptive behaviours for school leaders. Research findings will inform leadership practices in schools in that they can be interpreted and applied uniquely within differing local, historical, cultural, and structural contexts. We will offer suggestions for advancing research on school principals based on evidence from this research overview. Some research topics are missing in the descriptions of research, others have clearly been described as areas with very few research publications. Next, we list key areas to advance research on school principals.

**Key area 1: important educational challenges in order to inform policy makers.** This kind of research can be commissioned from governments and consists of both the kind of research overview presented here but also targeted research on important policy questions. In the Stockholm area there have been riots among youngsters in the suburbs during the beginning of may 2013. Schools, cars have been set on fire and police and fire brigades attacked. Researchers have been asked but not able to give good answers to why this happens and what the motives are. Representatives from the police and media have tried to give the public at large information. Unemployment, feeling of being outsiders and problems in the school system have been mentioned. This situation describes the lack of research about the situation for young people and their relation to school and how school can address their situation. Ken Leithwood summarizes problems with failing schools.

**Key area 2: implementation processes in relation to national policy on the local governing structures.** It's also clear from our data that we have too few studies that discuss the process from law and policy down to the school level. What happens on the way and what characterizes the local governing structures that create good implementation results on the school level with improved student outcomes. Relating to the situation concerning equity and learning described above we can conclude that there is a lack of research about the effects of the implementation of the reforms of the school systems that have taken place the last 10 years. Especially the effect of the quest for accountability and it's impact on schools in challenging areas where the prerequisites are bad.

**Key area 3: effects of national policy on changes processes on the local school level.** What if any effect do the decisions on the national level have on the practical work on the school level and how long time does it take before effects of new policies can be seen and measured in student outcomes.
Key area 4: effects of international testing schemes on student outcomes. Many politicians argue that we need more basic education with a focus on academic learning in order to remain at the top of OECD’s PISA tables - a development that even the opposition today argues for. But are they right in their belief that striving for a top ranking in OECD’s PISA-studies contributes to and creates better schools for all students? These international measurements and statistics have contributed to school systems in which all policy makers demand accountability from the schools. And accountability on the policy level means school improvement on the school level. Of course the question is always how to create a better school or a better school district. And what ‘better’ means will determine the nature of new demands on schools. In all countries, they are expected to evaluate more, analyze their goal fulfilment and compare their effectiveness with other schools not only in their own school district but also in the country and internationally. How this trend affects the local school and the student outcome need to be analyzed much more. This is also a topic related to the quest for accountability. For Sweden the drop in PISA results are to a large extent (almost completely) explained by the decrease in test results for immigrant boys. This is a result of insufficient lack of equality between boys and girls, and children born outside and born in Sweden and what roles the principals’ and teachers’ have in this, should be covered by analyses in educational research. Supposedly the situation is similar in most other European countries.

Key area 5: effects on change processes in local schools in relation to the local governing structures. Principal effectiveness in high and low performing schools is important to study in order to understand what factors and relations that contributes to under-performing, so called “cruising schools”. Schools are part of a larger central and local governing system, in which there is a shared responsibility between different system levels. The state governs the schools and the actors on local levels implement the policies. Projects need to examine how local structures and cultures affect the performance of schools where the students have results clearly lower than expected. By studying cruising schools in this manner new knowledge about the steering and leadership processes related to school outcomes can be developed. Especially the problem with ghetto-like suburbs or other city areas as well as smaller municipalities with less resource to invest in their school systems should be dealt with. There is a tendency with mobility from these areas to schools with stronger positions concerning student intake and parent support.

Key area 6: principals and their decision making in relation to school governance. We know very little about how principals make decisions, how they record and document their decisions, and what information they have or collect before they make decisions. Many times school principals just lead by acting and take decisions as they go around in the school. The processes around principals’ decision making and its relation to school governance would be an important field to know more about. How do principals gather information about issues concerning social stratification, equity and learning. Do they and other staff understand differences in social status and how it affects learning and what decisions about students in need of special support do they take?

Key area 7: principal’s strategic decision making in relation to school improvement. Strategic decision making is a very vital part of systematic quality work in schools. There is very little research on this topic at present. Principals many times act in what researchers might define as strategic decision making. However, the principal generally does not document the decisions. Studies of how variation in principals’ strategic decision making processes affects systematic quality evaluations and school improvement processes would be very welcome. What strategies are developed by principals when it comes to the capacity of schools to take care of the problems that ‘outsider’ children, who cannot connect to the learning process, experience. We need more research on how principals can work to prevent obstacles to our democratic values. Why does bullying in some schools become a large problem while it in other schools it remains on a very low but still unacceptable level? How do principals think and how important is the democratic training that should be present in all schools for the well-being of the school? Research about the relation between different social strata/groups and the occurrence and extent of bullying and harassment between that s/g should be enhanced. How can principals lead to a
reduction of tensions between those s/g and have an understanding between them grow. And finally - in what way can this improve learning among all students in school how.

Key area 8: effects of principal training programs. Both principal training programs and in-service training are not analyzed in relation to the effect they have on the principals’ way of running his/her school. We don’t know for example if courses in capacity building lead to different role behaviours of the principal. There is a need for studies of different training programs and there effects. Studies would benefit from having a comparative design and be carried out in different countries. Important here is to question to what extent training programs address issues of equity and learning. If there are examples of programs that emphasize these topics, how does it affect the capacity of principal to decrease differences in learning between students from various backgrounds compared to principals that have followed programs that don’t stress these issues?

Key area 9: effects of the relation between principals and teachers on improved student outcomes. We discuss very often the principal and his/her role in student outcomes and at the same time we know that the teachers are most important factor for students' success. But we know very little from research on the relationship between the principal and the teachers and its impact on student learning and development outcomes. Can the principal, through building support and high expectations for the school, have an effect on the way teachers work with students and also on student outcomes? The principal and the teachers in school can carry different value structures concerning equity - the questions of class, sex and race - and they can have differing opinions of the importance for school to work to minimize attitudes based on assumptions that people who are of different class, sex or race have different value and that different children are worthy of a greater attentiveness and support. Conditions like this (and it could also be described the other way around) has to become a focus for research. The relation between principal and teacher cultures is in general understudied.

Key area 10: effects of school leaders’ behaviour on schools results analyzed with an organizational lens. In this research overview there are almost no studies that look on schools with a clear organizational lens. Looking at schools as organizations and explaining principals' behaviour in organizational terms would be an improvement to the field. And this is also a field that could gain a lot by having a comparative design with many countries. With this organizational lens it is much easier to discern group differences and stratification processes between people and pupils in a school than if you apply an individual perspective. Studies of equity and learning can therefore benefit from using organizational designs.

The research focus we have presented above highlights the need for large-scale mixed-methods research projects within and across the countries represented in this chapter. A large part of the studies reported in the summaries are one-off studies completed by masters and doctoral students. Notwithstanding the value of various individual research studies, coordinated research provides coherence as well as helpful conceptual, theoretical, and methodological frameworks to connect individual studies. Launching large scale research studies might also stimulate greater use of mixed methods in examination of principals’ work and its connection to school and student development.

At present, there is a paucity of quantitative studies on principals. Qualitative methods can provide rich descriptions and details about principals and their work. Yet within the academy and in many cases within existing political environments, quantitative studies are more appropriate for addressing critical questions, they will enhance the legitimacy of this emerging field of study, and such studies will provide useful data for policymakers and practitioners. Quantitative designs and methods will also provide frameworks for addressing questions regarding the effects of principal leadership on their school and the student outcomes, relationships between principals’ behaviours and tasks they find important and teacher practices, school culture, organizational trust, and the development of schools and the professional capacities.
To support large scale studies, especially those with longitudinal designs, there is a need for greater in
country and between countries funding. In most countries, our reviewers have reported lack of
sufficient resources to support research on principals. It is likely that the greatest percentage of
financial support will come from special research councils but also commissioned research grants from
government and municipal agencies should be most welcome. Thus, making a compelling case to
policymakers at all levels is crucial to garnering additional funding to support research on principals.

Studies on school principals will also benefit from cross/multi-disciplinary perspectives. Such
traditional academic disciplines as political science, history, sociology, psychology, and the learning
sciences, to name a few, have the potential of opening up new and fruitful areas of research on
principals.

In some countries, there are notable voids in research on principals. Still in other countries, there has
been only modest interest in particular areas of scholarship. We recommend that scholars begin to
address these issues to enrich and widen the scope of their inquiries. Four areas have been identified in
the research summaries. They include: 1) instructional leadership for improved teaching and learning,
2) principal recruitment, preparation, selection, and induction, 3) role transition, change leadership and
4) more explicit connections between principal leadership and various outcomes variables, e.g., school
development, organizational change, capacity building, and student learning outcomes. All these four
areas should be approached with a perspective of equity and learning. This is a main topic for schooling
today and schools as organizations and institutions must be studied also in relation to how their wider
social goals of contributing to a democratic society with equal opportunities are achieved.

It is also obvious from the data collected that context matters. Sharing conceptual frameworks,
methods, and data collection tools are important ways to broaden inquiry within each of these
countries and share insights on the principals and their professional work. At the same time, research
must always keep a disciplined perspective that provides a bifocal lens simultaneously selecting what
can be gleaned from cross-national studies while appreciating important differences in national and
local context.

Our final recommendation builds on the previous one. While we understand a general hesitaton to fully
embrace decades of scholarship on school leadership in North America, Australia and England for fear
of being overly influenced by its content, methods, and contexts, we believe that ignoring this extensive
body of research on principals is short-sighted and likely to result in efforts to reinvent the proverbial
wheel in scholarship on school principals. Learning from other researchers is important as the field of
study emerges within the European context. Researchers can be sensitive and attentive to history,
culture, and current contexts for educational policy and simultaneously learn from rich bodies of earlier
and present research and compare findings from different countries and contexts.
10. SCHOOL LEADERSHIP AND EQUITY: AN EXAMINATION
OF POLICY RESPONSE IN SCOTLAND

In this chapter we adopt a critical perspective on the implementation of policy on school leadership and
equity in Scotland, viewing policy as both an attempt to solve problems and an attempt to persuade
social actors to subscribe to particular beliefs that delineate action. As already stated in chapter 5, we
share Ball et al’s (2012, p. 8) conviction that ‘few policies arrive fully formed’ and that the processes of
policy enactment ‘involve ad-hocery, borrowing, re-ordering, displacing, making do and re-invention’.
However, we also endorse Ball’s (1993, p. 12) view that policies ‘create circumstances in which the
range of options available in deciding what to do are narrowed or changed’. In this chapter we provide
an examination of the implementation of policy on school leadership and equity in Scotland that
acknowledges that such policy is in part extemporized, and in part the attempt to make inevitable a “de-
stated” account of governance. The question of ‘what is policy response’ has been extensively discussed
in chapter 5 and therefore here we very briefly summarise some of our basic arguments. On this basis,
in the sub-chapters that follow we consider school leadership and equity policy response in Scotl
and, and ask what practices such policy does, and does not permit. Finally, we identify Scotland’s policy
implementers, and contextualise our proposal for an empirical enquiry into the Leadership Standards
for Social Justice in Scotland.

The phrase “policy response” brings to mind a dialogue between policy makers, who devise educational
targets and programmes, and policy implementers, who respond by putting these plans into action. In
recent years, the nature of this dialogue has been examined by researchers interested in socio-cultural
dynamics, and in her review of conceptions of policy, Nudzor (2009) identifies three dominant
paradigms: (i) the ‘problem-solving’ model positions policy as a ‘document of some sort’ that is created
by policy makers and put into practice by implementers (ibid, p. 93); (ii) the ‘process model’ positions
policy as ‘a site of struggle, negotiation and dialogue’, with the outcome (e.g. leadership strategies) co-
created by makers and implementers (ibid, p. 91); (iii) the ‘theoretical eclecticism’ model positions
policy as the ‘exercise of power and language that is used to legitimate the process’ and draws upon the
problem-solving model and the process model (ibid, p. 93).

The theoretical eclecticism view of policy, which is favoured by Nudzor, features prominently in
literature on power relations in neoliberal democracies. For example, Harvey (2009) describes how
governments seek to persuade the populace to accept policy by embedding novel ideas within the
existing discourse. He states:

For any way of thought to become dominant, a conceptual apparatus has to be advanced that
appeals to our intuitions and instincts, to our values and our desires, as well as to the
possibilities inherent in the social world we inhabit. If successful, this conceptual apparatus
becomes so embedded in common sense as to be taken for granted and not open to question
(Harvey, 2009, p. 5).

If Harvey is correct, then policy on school leadership and equity is accepted by implementers only if it
appeals to their existing instincts and desires. Of course, we know that “unappealing” policy is often
rejected in democratic societies (consider, for example, the public’s response to the UK poll tax in1990,
which led to riots and the eventual abandonment of this policy). It appears, therefore, that
implementers (and indeed the “acted upon”) hold power in their relationship with policy makers, and it
is perhaps for this reason that policy makers court favour with implementers. Using the example of an
English policy document on teaching and school reform, Lumby and Muijs (2013, p. 14) demonstrate that such favour is sought through ‘linguistic strategies’ that position ‘both authors and audiences as adherents to admirable values; in favour of equality and champions of the disadvantaged’. For Lumby and Muijs (ibid) these ‘admirable values’ mask the ‘deceit that real change in education is the aim of the majority’, and that the real purpose of policy is to sustain an education system that enables the advantaged to extract benefit from state systems ‘at a considerable and unjustifiable cost to others’ (ibid). No doubt policy implementers would feel uncomfortable with policies on teaching and school reform that cast policy makers, teachers and head teachers as enthusiastic co-creators of social injustice, and it is therefore not surprising that Lumby and Muijs (ibid, p. 13) discovered instead a policy narrative of ‘outraged authors joined by worthy but downtrodden teachers and head teachers’.

Ball (1993, p. 11) points out that ‘Policies enter existing patterns of inequality’, and discourses on social phenomena are, according to Harvey (2009), tethered to extant “common sense” beliefs, (e.g. that we are all ‘in favour of equality’, Lumby & Muijs, 2013) which ensure that policy is readily accepted or even goes unnoticed. For example, in their study of school leadership and equity in Canada, Goddard and Hart (2007) discovered that policy on leadership for social justice was being tethered to a “common sense” discourse of equality of opportunity that was, the authors claimed, detrimental to minority groups. Although visible to Goddard and Hart (2007), the consolidation of the majority group’s power through the implementation of policy on school leadership and equity was, it seems, invisible to the implementers. It appears, therefore, that if policy makers tether policy to extant “common sense” beliefs, then the ability of policy implementers to interrogate and challenge policy is significantly undermined.

In summary, policy response might be defined as the interaction of a new idea with policy implementers’ existing ideology: the extent to which policy is accepted is determined by the level of resonance between the incoming idea and the beliefs, desires and instincts of its recipients, irrespective of whether this idea is, in actuality, detrimental to the interests of particular members of society. In the next section of this paper, we consider how policy on school leadership and equity is implemented in Scotland. It is not an easy task to determine how policy is translated into practice, as “policy is both contested and changing, always in a state of “becoming”, of “was” and “never was” and “not quite”” (Ball, 1993, p. 11). Nevertheless, we attempt to trace a route from the “source” of Scottish policy on school leadership and equity to the “estuary” of contemporary provision.

10.1 Starting the conversation about school leadership and equity in Scotland

Of course, an idea such as school leadership and equity does not have a single starting point, but is the product of the blending and clashing of other ideas, the origins of which are, in many cases, lost in time (Barthes, 2001). This means that we must select what may be considered to be an arbitrary starting point for our investigation of the implementation of school leadership and equity in Scotland. We therefore begin by looking back to 2006, when the Scottish Government asked the OECD to examine the extent to which all pupils in Scotland were receiving a high standard of education. This moment is significant, as it signals Scotland’s commitment to neoliberalism (discussed later). The resultant report, Quality and Equity of Schooling in Scotland (OECD, 2007) contains the following headline statement:

Children from poorer communities and low socio-economic status homes are more likely than others to under-achieve, while the gap associated with poverty and deprivation in local government areas appears to be very wide... Who you are in Scotland is far more important than what school you attend, so far as achievement differences on international tests are concerned. (OECD, 2007, p. 15)

The OECD report mentions the nascent Curriculum for Excellence, and expresses hope that this curriculum might address issues of equity in Scottish education: this suggests that a "conversation"
around pupils' performance was taking in place in Scotland at this time, and that the OECD was one of a number of voices contributing to this dialogue. In 2009 the Scottish Government invited Graham Donaldson to join to this conversation by conducting a review of teacher education in Scotland. In his ensuing report, *Teaching Scotland's Future* (Donaldson, 2011), Donaldson duly recapitulates the OECD's (2007) claim that, 'in Scotland, who you are is far more important than what school you attend', and that 'the school system as a whole is not strong enough to make this not matter' (ibid, 2011, p. 17). Seeking to understand and address this apparent weakness in the Scottish school system, Donaldson "replies" to the OECD by stating that 'the foundations of successful education lie in the quality of teachers and their leadership'(ibid, p. 2).

It should be noted that the Executive Summary of the OECD (2007) report does not include school leadership in its 18 Recommendations, and we might therefore argue that it was Donaldson who brought together the two conceptions of equity and school leadership. However, as demonstrated in the chapter on school leadership and equity in this report, the linking of these concepts is global and predates Donaldson's report by many years. Nevertheless, it was Donaldson's report that inspired the Scottish Government to establish the National Partnership Group (NPG) to implement his recommendations, making Donaldson (rather than earlier testimonies) the trigger for action. The NPG Sub-Group 3 duly declared that 'High quality leadership is crucial to improving the experiences and outcomes for learners' (NPG, 2012, p. 18), and proposed a Framework for Educational Leadership in Scotland. This framework, to be implemented from 2013, 'will offer high quality leadership opportunities to support a range of leaders, from aspiring to experienced, in identifying professional learning opportunities which will enable them to grow and develop as leaders' (NPG, 2012, pp. 18-19).

In order to support the Framework for Educational Leadership in Scotland, the General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTCS) published its own report, *Standards for Leadership and Management: supporting leadership and management development* (GTCS, 2012). As might be expected, the GTCS report refers to both Donaldson (2011) and the NPG (2012), claiming that that 'leadership is central to educational quality' (GTCS, 2012, p. 1) and that a commitment to social justice is part of a teacher's 'core' being (ibid, p. 4). The GTCS report may, therefore, be read as a reiteration and expansion of the ideas contained in Donaldson (2011) and the NPG (2012).

In order to appreciate the alacrity of the establishment of the concept of leadership in the discourse of Scottish education, we might consider the evaluation of the Flexible Route to Headship (FRH) pilot project, which was funded by the Scottish Government in parallel with the OECD's (2007) investigation into schooling in Scotland. The authors of this evaluation, which was conducted in 2007-2008, 'were unable to find any explicit statement about leadership or reference to a preferred leader prototype that informed the thinking behind the FRH pilot' (Davidson *et al.*, 2008, p. 12). Just a few years later, statements about leadership were ubiquitous.

So, we can see that by creating a dialogue around school improvement and inviting different groups and individuals to contribute to this conversation, the Scottish Government has played a key role in enabling the introduction of a novel idea (i.e. school leadership) to enter into, and thereby alter, the existing ideology of equity and standards. In the next section of this chapter, we look at policy on school leadership and equity in Scotland, in order to consider the practices that this policy makes possible, and what it prohibits.

**10.2 What may, and may not, be**

The Standards for Leadership and Management will supersede the Standard for Headship (GTCS, 2012, p. 2), and are intended to complement the fledgling Framework for Educational Leadership. The General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTCS) defines leadership as:
...the ability to develop a vision for change, which leads to improvements in outcomes for learners and is based on shared values and robust evaluation of evidence of current practice, [and the ability to] mobilise, enable and support others to develop and follow through on strategies for achieving that change. (GTCS, 2012, p. 2)

It defines management as ‘the operational implementation and maintenance of the practices and systems required to achieve this change’ (ibid, p.2). According to the GTCS, head teachers must commit to:

...the principles of democracy and social justice through fair, transparent, inclusive and sustainable practices in relation to: age, disability, gender and gender identity, race, religion and belief and sexual orientation. (GTCS, 2012, p. 4)

It is apparent, then, that the GTCS believes that school leaders have a responsibility for equity in Scottish education, and prescribes a set of practices to ensure that school leaders fulfil this duty. In order to understand how the GTCS has come to hold this belief, we might re-examine the “conversation” instigated by the Scottish Government, discussed earlier. As stated previously, the Scottish Government invited the OECD to conduct an investigation of Scottish schools, and since the OECD is a well known proponent of neoliberalism (Connolly, 2013), we may therefore assume that Scottish politicians were actively seeking neoliberal policy recommendations. This desire was fully satisfied: in its report the OECD (2007, p. 16) acknowledges that ‘deprivation intensifies the effects of family socio-economic status’, and that poverty is linked with poor educational attainment, but makes no policy recommendations around the eradication of poverty. Instead, the OECD suggests that equality of results might be obtained through management practices:

Schools should be able to build the mix of staffing they need to tackle the particular challenges they face and to offer programmes which best address these challenges. Greater management freedom in these two areas [the curriculum and teaching resources] needs to be part of a compact with local government which establishes expectations in exchange for autonomy, and encourages and protects innovation and risk-taking through an authoritative mandate. (OECD, 2007, p.16)

Thus, while the OECD itself acknowledges that educational underperformance is bound up with poverty, it ensures that the conversation about Scottish education does not involve discussion of non-neoliberal policy, such as the redistribution of wealth, by positioning school management as the solution to Scotland’s alleged problems. When Donaldson (2011) and others joined this debate, they too positioned school management as the solution to inequity, and thus implicitly ruled out other responses to social injustice, such as progressive taxation. Interestingly, the ease with which consensus coalesced around the idea that inequity is a problem that should be “managed” by school leaders indicates that the OECD’s managerial recommendations resonated with existing beliefs and values in Scotland. Arguably, this consensus validates Poulantzas’ identification of a new form of governance based upon the ‘combination of decentralised operational management and detailed central regulation’, which has come to be known as ‘the new public management’ (Jones et al., 2008, p. 22).

The re-imagining of social justice as a private matter that requires behavioural management, rather than a public matter that requires economic intervention, is consistent with the neoliberal belief that ‘there is no such thing as society’ (Thatcher,1987). However, the emergence of this new public management theory has not been accompanied by a slackening of government control over social policy. In fact, Jones et al.(2008, p. 22) argue that contemporary education policy is ‘tightly connected to state objectives’. Indeed, polices on such things as school leadership and equity, which leave intact
structural constraints on social mobility, may be described as the deliberate manifestation of a “winner takes all” conception of human interaction. According to Jones et al:

Governments seek undoubtedly to manage social difference, through educational and social programmes of many kinds, but the idea that high levels of inequality are both objectionable and eradicable has no place in policy. (Jones et al., 2008, pp. 23-24, italics in original)

Of course, policy documents do not proclaim that inequality is neither objectionable nor eradicable: as stated previously, policy makers take pains to ensure that policy appears virtuous, and it is perhaps a mistake to suppose that policy that denies social justice is simply imposed by government on the populace. Lumby and Muijs (2013, p. 14) define the state as not just the formal government apparatus, but ‘as the will of the dominant majority that functions both to pursue advantage and to disguise self-interest at a cost to others’, and they claim that interest groups, such as parents and educators, are able to use policy in a way that ‘sustains current educational inequalities’. By positioning education as a commodity that is bound-up with individual advantage, the ‘dominant majority’ (Lumby & Muijs, ibid) have cultivated receptivity to neoliberal education policy that erodes the interests of marginal groups and re-assigns accountability for social justice. We borrow from Jessop’s (2002, p. 199) term ‘destatization’ to argue that neoliberalism has created a “de-stated” model of governance, in which individuals are given responsibility for social issues that were, under the previous welfare model, considered to be the responsibility of the state, defined as the ‘formal government apparatus’ (Lumby & Muijs, 2013, p 14). Under “de-stated” governance, the state no longer takes responsibility for such things as social mobility, but instead “manages”, or oversees, the operation of the free market which ostensibly delivers outcomes that are favourable to the interests of individuals. The new public management system of central regulation and decentralised operational management (Jones et al., 2008, p. 22) places pressure on social agents to take responsibility for issues assigned to them by government, and policy on school leadership and equity, which obliges local school leaders to “govern” social justice in the free market society, is an example of this pressure.

In summary, policy must resonate with implementers’ existing ideology in order for new ideas to find a receptive audience, yet this ideology is carefully orchestrated, rather than accidental. Neoliberalism has not attained international approval through happenstance: Milton Friedman (2002, p.p. xiii-xiv), one of the most celebrated neo-liberal thinkers, boasted of the strategy of waiting patiently for a crisis to occur, developing neoliberal ‘alternatives to existing policies’ and keeping them ‘alive and available until the politically impossible becomes politically inevitable.’ In the wake of the economic crisis of the 1970s, proponents of neoliberalism have been invited by successive governments around the world to contribute to policy conversations around areas of concern (such as the performance of Scottish schools), and via these conversations neo-liberals have incrementally marginalised welfarist policy responses and thereby ensured that the neoliberal response is the “common sense” and ‘politically inevitable’ position (ibid). Thus while there is protest over some education policies, such as the vote of no confidence in English education reforms that was passed in 2013 by the National Association of Head Teachers (NAHT), neoliberal polices are largely accepted as a bitter but necessary medicine to cure an alleged malaise (Charteris-Black 2005).

10.3 From words to action

In order to understand how conversations about policy are translated into action in Scottish schools, it is necessary to identify Scotland’s key educational decision makers, listed below:

- Scottish Parliament: education is a devolved matter so is the responsibility of the Scottish Parliament, not Westminster (although Scotland is bound by UK policy on such things as discrimination).
- Scottish Government: has a Cabinet Secretary for Education and Lifelong Learning and two Ministers, one for Learning and Skills and one for Children and Young People.
- Education Scotland: an Executive Agency of the Scottish Government, which is charged with developing the Curriculum for Scottish Schools.
- Local Authorities: Scotland has 32 Local Authorities that administer and run state education in a comprehensive system (N.B there are no grammar schools in Scotland).
- The Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (COSLA): representative body of the 32 Local Authorities.
- General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTCS): a statutory professional regulatory body for teachers in Scotland. Teachers in state schools are legally obliged to register with the GTCS.
- Scottish Teacher Education Committee (STEC): eight Scottish universities (plus the Open University) are directly involved in teacher education in Scotland, and work together through STEC.
- Scottish universities: some of these deliver the Scottish Qualification for Headship programme (accredited by the GTCS). Aberdeen covers the North, Edinburgh covers the East and a consortium of Glasgow, Strathclyde and Stirling covers the West.
- Colleges Scotland: represents Scotland’s colleges of further education.
- Teachers Unions: the largest is the Educational Institute of Scotland (EIS), which represents teachers from pre-school through to Higher Education. The second largest is the Scottish Secondary Teachers Association (SSTA), which represents only secondary teachers.
- Head Teacher Unions: School Leaders Scotland (for secondary); The Association of Heads and Deputies (for primary).
- Scottish Council of Independent Schools (N.B. only 4% of Scottish pupils attend independent schools).
- The Scottish Negotiating Committee for Teachers (SNCT): a tripartite body consisting of the Scottish Government, the Unions (dominated by the EIS and COSLA, which determines teachers' pay and conditions.
- Think Tanks: as with most countries, Scotland has various “independent” think tanks, e.g. Reform Scotland and the Centre for Scottish Public Policy.
- Parents, who have two representative bodies: the National Parent Forum of Scotland and the Scottish Parent Teacher Council.

As we have seen, the Scottish Government has played a central role in developing policy on school leadership and equity in Scotland, but its thinking is informed by the other bodies mentioned above. In their analysis of policy machinery, Bates et al. (2011, p. 41) identify how policy ‘ownership’ is crucial to implementation. According to this theory, a dispersed, rather than top-down, model of implementation is more likely to ensure that various stakeholders (e.g. parents and local authorities) view policy as benign, rather than an alien interloper, and terms such as ‘influential stakeholders’ and ‘policy community’ (ibid, p. 42) are used to describe the multitude of individuals who must be “onboard” with a policy message in order for it to be embraced. Policy ownership is encouraged through such things as consultations (e.g. the GTCS has a Consultation page on its website, dedicated to soliciting and publishing views on policy) and conferences (e.g. School Leaders Scotland holds an annual conference), and of course policy documents such as Standards for Leadership and Management (GTCS, 2012) play a key role in recruiting stakeholders’ support.

10.4 An empirical study proposal

The GTCS (2012) report, Standards for Leadership and Management, sets out the Leadership Standards for Social Justice in Scotland. It would therefore be interesting to undertake research, as a strand of the research theme ‘Policy response - for equity and learning’ in WP4 of the second stage of EPNoSL, on the basis of, for example, interviews with head teachers and case studies, to discover how school leaders
are interpreting and implementing this policy. Without wishing to pre-empt research findings, we acknowledge Humes’ (2003) assessment of policy implementation in post-devolution Scotland:

Whatever the origins and implementations of educational policies, in the final analysis their success or failure depends on the expertise and commitment of individual teachers in schools and other educational institutions across the country. (Humes, 2003, p. 84)

Our discussion has shown how the commitment of individual head teachers is likely to reflect neoliberal ideology, which promotes the interests of the advantaged whilst appearing to champion the interests of the disadvantaged, yet even so there is scope for resistance to "common sense" assumptions about social justice. Ultimately, head teachers’ acceptance of the Leadership Standards for Social Justice in Scotland is dependent upon the resonance between their beliefs about social justice and the managerial solutions to inequity proposed by the wider policy discourse in which these Standards are located. According to Humes’ theory, if our empirical investigation reveals a lack of commitment to the Standards amongst head teachers, then this particular policy is likely to meet with resistance or be radically reinterpreted.
11. PRINCIPALSHIP AND STUDENT PERFORMANCE IN READING IN EU SCHOOLS WITH A HIGH INTAKE OF STUDENTS WITH LOW SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND CULTURAL BACKGROUND

11.1 Introduction

OECD’s Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) offers a unique set of data to researchers in the area of school leadership to explore the relationship between leadership and student performance across EU countries.

The PISA 2009 school questionnaire, which was completed by the school principals whose schools and students participated in the assessments, included a set of 14 statements about the management of schools. Principals were called to indicate the frequency of their activities and behaviors described in these statements during the last school year. OECD reporting on PISA 2009 makes use of the "leadership" index, which was constructed on the basis of principals' responses to these fourteen statements, in various analyses (OECD, 2010). According to OECD the leadership index "... combines their answers to evaluate whether or not principals are active in improving teaching practices and the working environment within the school" (ibid, p. 99).

In one level of analysis OECD reporting is focused on country mean performance differences on this index between lower secondary and upper secondary education, between general and vocational programmes, between public and private schools, and performance differences on the reading scale between the top and bottom quartiles of this index (ibid, Table IV.4.8, pp. 263-265). Regarding reading performance, students in schools where their leadership score was at the top quarter of the distribution performed significantly better only in Luxemburg and Spain among the EU countries. In contrast, students in schools where their leadership score was at the bottom quarter of the distribution performed significantly better in the United Kingdom, Slovenia, Slovakia, Germany and Estonia!

---

2 With statistically significant mean differences (in favor of upper secondary education students, meaning higher mean values on the leadership index) found only in the cases of Lithuania and Luxemburg among the EU countries.
3 With statistically significant mean differences in favor of vocational programme students in Austria, the Netherlands and Slovakia and in favor of general programme students in Belgium, Italy and Luxemburg.
4 With statistically significant mean differences in favor of private schools in Luxemburg, Portugal, Spain, and Sweden, and in favor of public schools in Slovenia and the UK.
In another level of analysis, correlations between the leadership index and other school-level learning environment composite indexes were performed (ibid, Table IV. 4.9, pp. 266-267). The analyses indicated that only in a few EU countries leadership was correlated in a statistically significant way with the indexes “teacher-student relations”, “disciplinary climate”, and “teachers’ stimulation of students’ reading engagement and reading skills” and in none of these countries this correlation was higher than ±0,1. These results show a negligible strength in the relationship between leadership and the indices named above. Furthermore, leadership was correlated with the index “student-related factors affecting school climate” weakly in Belgium, the Czech Republic, Ireland, Spain, and Sweden (r≤0,21) and moderately in only Luxemburg (0,49) among all EU countries. Finally, the leadership index was found to be correlated weakly with the “teacher-related factors affecting school climate” index in many EU countries, and moderately only in Luxemburg (0,47).

In a third level of analysis, a two-level regression model was tested where reading performance was regressed on all PISA learning environment and school climate (student and school level) composite indices. The results showed that before the socio-economic background of students and schools is taken into account the performance of students is positively related to higher values on the index of leadership only in Spain among the EU countries. In contrast, it is negatively related in Slovakia, Finland and Italy (see ibid, Table IV.2.13b, p. 186). After accounting for the socio-economic background of students and schools, reading performance is (negatively) related to leadership only in Italy.

The above findings regarding the relationship of leadership to other PISA learning environment and school climate variables as well as to student performance across EU countries are puzzling to say the least. From a wider perspective these findings challenge the rather common sense assumptions that “…leadership can contribute to improve student learning by shaping the conditions and climate in which teaching and learning occur” (Pont, Nusche and Moorman, 2008, p. 16)\(^1\) or that “school leaders can make an enormous difference to the quality of learning that goes on in school”.\(^2\)

In order to further explore how leadership might be related to student performance we decided to take a different perspective in analysing the data from the 25 EU countries\(^3\) that participated in the 2009 PISA round. In each country schools vary in many different ways which pose unique management challenges to principals and other school leaders. Apart from the school level (lower or upper secondary), the schools’ status in terms of administration and financing (public or private), and the programmes they offer (general or vocational), schools can also differ on the basis of various “demographic” characteristics such as their size (in terms of example the number of students enrolled or the teaching and other staff they employ), their location (for example schools in villages, in small cities, in metropolitan areas etc and in terms of their proximity to other schools), the gender composition of the students, their “human capital” characteristics (such as the qualifications of their teachers and supporting staff), as well as a number of other characteristics that are much more difficult to define, such as their history, academic status and reputation they enjoy, or their learning tradition.

---


\(^{3}\) Cyprus did not participate in PISA 2009. France did participate but school principals did not complete the school questionnaire.
Among the very different school characteristics that could be used to group PISA schools in order to base further analyses on the relationship between principal behavior and activity and student performance, in this chapter we chose to focus on the schools’ student intake in terms of their socio-economic and cultural background. We hypothesized that students in schools with a high intake of students coming from a less privileged socio-economic and cultural backgrounds will perform lower than their peers in schools with a lower share of such students. The assumption that directed this research hypothesis is that the intake of schools is, or should be, an important criterion to base policy initiatives on equity and learning in relation to school leadership, which is the major issue that the EPNoSL project is aimed to address. On this basis we further explored other dimensions, apart from average student performance, in which possible differences can be observed between students in schools with a high intake of students from disadvantaged backgrounds as compared to their peers in schools with a more privileged intake. Finally, we specifically focus on students in schools with a high share of students with disadvantaged backgrounds to further analyze the relationship between school leadership and student performance. In particular, instead of using PISA’s leadership composite index we chose to use in separate analyses each one of the fourteen statements on school management included in the PISA 2009 school questionnaire in order to explore possible mean performance differences in reading between students in such schools where principals report different levels of engagement with different kinds of management activities and behaviors. In brief, the main research questions posed were:

a) Are there any differences in average performance in reading, mathematics and science between students in schools with a high share of students with a disadvantaged background as compared to their peers attending to schools with a more privileged intake?

b) Are there differences in metacognitive strategies in reading between students in schools with a high share of students with a disadvantaged background as compared to their peers attending to schools with a more privileged intake?

c) Are there differences in structuring and scaffolding strategies that teachers use in language instruction between students in schools with a high share of students with a disadvantaged background as compared to their peers attending to schools with a more privileged intake?

d) Are there differences in terms of teacher shortages and the quality of school’s resources between students in schools with a high share of students with a disadvantaged background as compared to their peers attending to schools with a more privileged intake?

e) How student performance in reading varies according to the level of engagement in different kinds of management activities and behaviours of principals in schools with a high share of low socio-economic and cultural status students?

11.2 Methodology

The students’ score in the index of the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status (ESCS) was used to group the students within the bottom, the middle and the upper tertile of the distribution within each EU country. We used the relative within-country approach to the definition of (dis)advantage because EU-wide cut-points for socio-economic (dis)advantage would identify the vast majority of students in some countries as disadvantaged and most students in other countries as advantaged. This approach, on the other side, implies that the subsequent analyses allow only for within country comparisons and discussion and cannot be used for cross-country comparisons.
Using the distributions of ESCS index scores within each country following a simple cut-point procedure would have resulted in unequal groups sizes across countries, potentially introducing a source of error in the results. As it is noted in OECD (2011, p. 176),\(^1\) from which we adopted and extended the identification strategy we employ in this study, the distribution of the ESCS index is not sufficiently continuous in order to achieve equal group sizes across countries. Therefore, we used a random sub-sampling process: first a "pseudo" random number with a normal distribution with mean 0 and standard deviation of 1 was generated and then this random number was multiplied by 0.01 and added to the score of each student in the index of socio-economic background. The resulting distribution was sufficiently continuous for the cut-point procedure to be used to create three equal groups across countries. This procedure added an error component to the standard error which, however, was addressed using the plausible values approach by computing a set of five plausible socio-economic background group assignments for each student. On a subsequent step we created five new plausible value variables containing as values the share of low socio-economic and cultural status students in each school and in each country in the sample. On a last step, we used the plausible value variables in order to group students in schools with a low, medium and high share of low socio-economic and cultural status students. As "low share" we grouped those schools where less than 25% of their students were coming from disadvantaged backgrounds. As "medium share" the schools with a share between 25 and less than 50% and as "high share" the schools with 50% or over share of students coming from disadvantaged backgrounds. The cut points we used here were chosen having in mind that the student frequencies in each school group per level of principal's engagement in school management in each country should be sufficiently high in order to allow for further analyses.

In the analyses that follow first we explore the mean differences in students' performance in reading, mathematics and science between schools with "low", "medium" and "high" share of disadvantaged students, as well as mean differences on the dimensions identified in the research questions b, c, d and e. Finally we focus exclusively on students and principals in schools with "high" share of disadvantaged students, exploring mean differences in reading performance according to the level of the principals' engagement in the school management activities and behaviors described in the PISA 2009 school questionnaire.

### 11.3 How students’ performance varies according to the socio-economic and cultural intake of schools in EU countries?

As shown on the table below, in all 25 EU countries the higher the share of low socio-economic and cultural background students in schools the lower the mean performance of students in reading. In all national cases the mean differences are statistically significant at 0.05 level, except of the mean difference between students in schools with "medium" and "high" share of disadvantaged students in Finland. The most striking differences in performance within each country are observed between students enrolled in schools with "low" and "high" share of disadvantaged students. It is characteristic that in 19 EU countries the mean performance difference in reading between students in these two “types” of schools are over 85 performance units, up to over 152 units in the case of Bulgaria.

---

Table 1: Students’ mean performance in reading in schools with “low”, “medium” and “high” share of low socio-economic and cultural background students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNT</th>
<th>Schools’ share of students from low socio-economic and cultural status background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOW (≤25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEL</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGR</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZE</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNK</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EST</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRC</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUN</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTU</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUX</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVA</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLT</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROU</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVK</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVN</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not surprisingly, such differences in student performance by school student intake are also observed in mathematics and science. In all EU countries differences in student performance in mathematics are statistically significant at 0.05 level between all couples of school intake levels.
Table 2: Students’ mean performance in mathematics in schools with “low”, “medium” and “high” share of low socio-economic and cultural background students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNT</th>
<th>Schools’ share of students from low socio-economic and cultural status background</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOW (≤25%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MEDIUM (≥25%&lt;50%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH (≥50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>552 2</td>
<td>478 3</td>
<td>420 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEL</td>
<td>580 2</td>
<td>501 2</td>
<td>436 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGR</td>
<td>478 3</td>
<td>417 2</td>
<td>360 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZE</td>
<td>549 2</td>
<td>474 2</td>
<td>435 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>580 2</td>
<td>496 2</td>
<td>432 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNK</td>
<td>530 2</td>
<td>493 2</td>
<td>475 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>514 2</td>
<td>475 2</td>
<td>455 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EST</td>
<td>537 2</td>
<td>502 2</td>
<td>491 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>555 2</td>
<td>534 2</td>
<td>529 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>548 3</td>
<td>496 3</td>
<td>419 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>531 2</td>
<td>487 2</td>
<td>446 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRC</td>
<td>497 2</td>
<td>467 2</td>
<td>409 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUN</td>
<td>541 2</td>
<td>471 3</td>
<td>409 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>515 2</td>
<td>488 2</td>
<td>437 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>526 2</td>
<td>478 2</td>
<td>417 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTU</td>
<td>521 2</td>
<td>465 2</td>
<td>428 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUX</td>
<td>549 3</td>
<td>476 1</td>
<td>419 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVA</td>
<td>508 2</td>
<td>474 2</td>
<td>447 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLT</td>
<td>511 2</td>
<td>468 2</td>
<td>365 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>586 2</td>
<td>505 3</td>
<td>461 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL</td>
<td>518 2</td>
<td>486 2</td>
<td>474 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>528 2</td>
<td>480 2</td>
<td>435 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROU</td>
<td>460 3</td>
<td>415 3</td>
<td>385 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVK</td>
<td>551 3</td>
<td>475 3</td>
<td>443 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVN</td>
<td>564 1</td>
<td>480 2</td>
<td>430 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>529 2</td>
<td>488 2</td>
<td>459 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 16 EU countries the mean difference in performance between students in schools with “low” and “high” share of disadvantaged students is above 85 units, with the highest being in Germany (132 score points).

In science it is only in Finland and between students in schools with “medium” and “high” share of disadvantaged students that their mean performance is not statistically significant.
Table 3: Students’ mean performance in science in schools with “low”, “medium” and “high” share of low socio-economic and cultural background students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNT</th>
<th>Schools’ share of students from low socio-economic and cultural status background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOW (≤25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEL</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGR</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZE</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNK</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EST</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRE</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUN</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTU</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUX</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVA</td>
<td>516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLT</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROU</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVK</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVN</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>532</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, in most EU countries, the largest differences in mean performance in science are observed between students in schools with “low” and “high” share of disadvantaged students. In total, in 16 EU countries these differences are 85 score points or over, with the highest being in Malta.

The above findings suggest that the criterion of the share of the disadvantaged students in each school within EU countries can be used to inform policies targeting equity and learning performance in most EU countries, with the notable exception of Finland, where mean differences in performance in mathematics, science and reading between students in schools with “low”, “medium” and “high” share of disadvantaged students does not exceed the 21 score points. Relatively “homogeneous” in terms of performance in reading, mathematics and science by the three groups of schools also appear to be Poland (51 score points difference in reading between “low” and “high” and less in mathematics and science), Latvia (61 score points difference in mathematics between “low” and “high” and less in the rest), Denmark (59 score points difference in reading and less in the rest), Estonia and Spain (62 score points difference in reading and less in the rest). What is implied from the above findings is that in the vast majority of EU countries principals that run schools with a high share of low socio-economic and cultural status students are facing equity and learning performance challenges that are much more
complex and demanding than their colleagues in other schools. To further explore this issue we turned to other kinds of differences that may exist between students in schools with a different intake.

11.4 Mean differences in metacognitive strategies and structuring and scaffolding strategies in reading between students according to the intake of their schools

To explore such differences we used PISA’s index of understanding and remembering and the index of summarizing. The index of understanding and remembering was derived from students’ reports on the usefulness of the following strategies for understanding and memorising the text: A) I concentrate on the parts of the text that are easy to understand; B) I quickly read through the text twice; c) After reading the text, I discuss its content with other people; D) I underline important parts of the text; e) I summarise the text in my own words; and f) I read the text aloud to another person.

The index of summarizing was derived from students’ reports on the usefulness of the following strategies for writing a summary of a long and rather difficult two-page text about fluctuations in the water levels of a lake in Africa: A) I write a summary. then I check that each paragraph is covered in the summary, because the content of each paragraph should be included; B) I try to copy out accurately as many sentences as possible; c) before writing the summary, I read the text as many times as possible; D) I carefully check whether the most important facts in the text are represented in the summary; and e) I read through the text, underlining the most important sentences, then I write them in my own words as a summary.

The index of use of structuring and scaffolding strategies was derived from students reports on how often the following occurred in their lessons of the language of instruction: i) the teacher explains beforehand what is expected of the students; ii) the teacher checks that students are concentrating while working on the <reading assignment>; iii) the teacher discusses students’ work, after they have finished the <reading assignment>; iv)the teacher tells students in advance how their work is going to be judged; v)the teacher asks whether every student has understood how to complete the <reading assignment>; vi)the teacher marks students’ work; vii)the teacher gives students the chance to ask questions about the <reading assignment>; viii)the teacher poses questions that motivate students to participate actively; and ix)the teacher tells students how well they did on the <reading assignment> immediately after.

Higher values on the first two indices indicate greater students’ perception of usefulness of the two strategies. Similarly, higher values on the third index indicate a greater use of structured teaching.
Table 4: Students’ mean score differences in PISA’s index of understanding and remembering enrolled in schools with “low”, “medium” and “high” share of low socio-economic and cultural background students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean score in PISA’s index of understanding and remembering of students in schools with a low share of low SES students</th>
<th>Mean difference in PISA’s index of understanding and remembering between students in schools with a low share of low SES students and students with a medium share of low SES students</th>
<th>Mean difference in PISA’s index of understanding and remembering between students in schools with a low share of low SES students and students with a high share of low SES students</th>
<th>Mean difference in PISA’s index of understanding and remembering between students in schools with a medium share of low SES students and students with a high share of low SES students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CNT</td>
<td></td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEL</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5*</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGR</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZE</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNK</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EST</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRC</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUN</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTU</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUX</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4*</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVA</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLT</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROU</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVK</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVN</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4*</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mean difference statistically significant at 0.05 level.

As shown on the table above, in 12 EU countries, namely Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Germany, France, Hungary, Italy, Luxemburg, Netherlands, Portugal and Slovenia, there are statistically significant differences in the mean score in the index of understanding and remembering in favor of students in low SES schools as compared to high SES schools. This finding indicates that on average students in low SES schools (that is more privileged schools in terms of the socio-economic background of their students) make more use of the metacognitive strategies of understanding and remembering when reading a text as compared to their peers in schools with a socio-economically disadvantaged intake.
Similarly, in several EU countries, namely Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Germany, France, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Portugal, Slovakia and Slovenia, on average students in low SES schools make more use of the metacognitive strategy of summarising when reading a text as compared to their peers in schools with a socio-economically disadvantaged intake.

Furthermore, as shown on the table below, in some countries students in low SES schools are less well supported by their teachers through structured and scaffolding language teaching strategies as compared to students in schools with a more privileged intake.

Table 6: Students' mean score differences in PISA’s index of use of structuring and scaffolding strategies enrolled in schools with “low”, “medium” and “high” share of low socio-economic and cultural background students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNT</th>
<th>Mean score in PISA's index of use of structuring and scaffolding strategies of students in schools with a low share of low SES students</th>
<th>Mean difference in PISA's index of use of structuring and scaffolding strategies between students in schools with a low share of low SES students and students with a medium share of low SES students</th>
<th>Mean difference in PISA's index of use of structuring and scaffolding strategies between students in schools with a low share of low SES students and students with a high share of low SES students</th>
<th>Mean difference in PISA's index of use of structuring and scaffolding strategies between students in schools with a medium share of low SES students and students with a high share of low SES students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEL</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGR</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZE</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNK</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EST</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.61*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRC</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUN</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.44*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTU</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUX</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVA</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLT</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.53*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.51*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROU</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVK</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVN</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.38*</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.40*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mean difference statistically significant at 0.05 level.

Overall, the above results indicate that in the majority of EU countries principals in schools with a high intake of low SES students are likely to face more intense challenges of pedagogic nature given that their students tend not to perceive as useful, as compared to students in more privileged schools, the metacognitive strategies presented above. In some countries there is also the challenge to make language teachers use more often structuring and scaffolding language teaching strategies.
11.5 Differences in schools’ human and other resources between schools according to their student intake

Although, as we have seen, there are differences regarding the metacognitive strategies in reading and the structuring of language teaching between schools with low SES intake as compared to high SES intake in many EU countries, the analysis on principals’ responses regarding teacher shortages and the quality of schools’ resources shows that in almost all EU countries schools are enjoying similar levels of resources in terms of their quality and availability.

The index of teacher shortage was derived from four items measuring school principals’ perceptions of potential factors hindering instruction at their school. These factors are a lack of: i) qualified science teachers; ii) a lack of qualified mathematics teachers; iii) qualified <test language> teachers; and iv) qualified teachers of other subjects. Higher values on this index indicate school principals’ reports of higher teacher shortage at a school.

Table 7: Students’ mean score differences in PISA’s index of teacher shortage enrolled in schools with “low”, “medium” and “high” share of low socio-economic and cultural background students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNT</th>
<th>Mean score in PISA’s index of teacher shortage of students in schools with a low share of low SES students</th>
<th>Mean difference in PISA’s index of teacher shortage between students in schools with a low share of low SES students and students with a medium share of low SES students</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Mean difference in PISA’s index of teacher shortage between students in schools with a low share of low SES students and students with a high share of low SES students</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Mean difference in PISA’s index of teacher shortage between students in schools with a medium share of low SES students and students with a high share of low SES students</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>-0,2</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>-0,3</td>
<td>0,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEL</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>-0,4</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>-0,3</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>0,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGR</td>
<td>-0,5</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>-0,1</td>
<td>0,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZE</td>
<td>-0,3</td>
<td>-0,3</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>-0,6</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>-0,3</td>
<td>0,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>-0,1</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>0,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNK</td>
<td>-0,2</td>
<td>-0,1</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>-0,2</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>-0,1</td>
<td>0,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>-0,8</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>-0,1</td>
<td>0,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EST</td>
<td>-0,2</td>
<td>-0,2</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>-0,1</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>-0,4</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>-0,1</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>-0,1</td>
<td>0,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>-0,1</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>-0,2</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>-0,2</td>
<td>0,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRC</td>
<td>-0,7</td>
<td>-0,4</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>-0,4</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>-0,1</td>
<td>0,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUN</td>
<td>-0,6</td>
<td>-0,2</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>-0,1</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>0,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>-0,4</td>
<td>-0,2</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>-0,3</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>-0,1</td>
<td>0,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUX</td>
<td>-0,4</td>
<td>-0,4*</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>-0,5*</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>-0,2</td>
<td>0,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVA</td>
<td>-0,4</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLT</td>
<td>-0,3</td>
<td>0,4*</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>-0,1</td>
<td>0,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>-0,2</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td>0,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL</td>
<td>-0,8</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>-0,8</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>-0,1</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>-0,2</td>
<td>0,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROU</td>
<td>-0,8</td>
<td>-0,1</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>-0,2</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>-0,1</td>
<td>0,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVK</td>
<td>-0,4</td>
<td>-0,1</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>-0,3</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>-0,2</td>
<td>0,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVN</td>
<td>-0,7</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>-0,1</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>-0,1</td>
<td>0,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>-0,5</td>
<td>-0,2</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>-0,2</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>0,4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mean difference statistically significant at 0,05 level.
As shown on the table above, it is only in Luxemburg that principals in low SES schools have less problems with teacher shortages as compared to high SES schools. Furthermore, it is only in Malta and Luxemburg that principals in high SES schools report better quality of educational resources as compared to less privileged schools.

Overall, the above findings indicate that in the vast majority of EU countries principals in low SES schools are not facing more challenges regarding the staffing and the quality of educational resources as compared to principals in more privileged schools in terms of their intake.

11.6 Principals’ leadership and student performance in reading

As already mentioned, the PISA school questionnaire included a set of 14 statements which described school management activities and behaviours (see table below). The principals were asked to report the degree to which they were engaged with them (in the scale “never”, “seldom”, “quite often” and “often”) during the last school year. These statements were adopted from the first round of OECD’s Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) (2007-8) targeting lower secondary education teachers and their school principals.¹

Table 8: Statements in the PISA 2009 school questionnaire having to do with school management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I make sure that the professional development activities of teachers are in accordance with the teaching goals of the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I ensure that teachers work according to the school’s educational goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I observe instruction in classrooms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I use student performance results to develop the school’s educational goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I give teachers suggestions as to how they can improve their teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I monitor students’ work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>When a teacher has problems in his/her classroom, I take the initiative to discuss matters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I inform teachers about possibilities for updating their knowledge and skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I check to see whether classroom activities are in keeping with our educational goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I take exam results into account in decisions regarding curriculum development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I ensure that there is clarity concerning the responsibility for co-ordinating the curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>When a teacher brings up a classroom problem, we solve the problem together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I pay attention to disruptive behaviour in classrooms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I take over lessons from teachers who are unexpectedly absent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the table below, the percentage of students in schools whose principals reported that the activities and behaviours (as numbered above) occurred “very often” during the last school year per country is presented.

¹ See Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) (2009), Creating Effective Teaching and Learning Environments, First Results From TALIS, OECD Publishing.
The overview of the results show that in Finland only around 1 percent of the students attend to schools where principals agreed that they "very often" observe instruction in the classroom. Furthermore, in the same country only around 3% of the students attend to schools where principals agreed that they "very often" give teachers suggestions as to how they can improve their teaching and only around 7% to schools where principals "very often" use student performance results to develop the school’s educational goals. Finland appears to be a country where proportionally less students than in any other EU country attend to schools where principals report very frequent engagement in activities and behaviours described in 6 out of the 14 statements of the PISA school questionnaire. Overall, Finland has the lowest score in the composite leadership index, which was constructed in PISA 2009 by principals’ replies to this set of statements. This indicates that students in Finland attend to schools

---

1 Higher values on the leadership index indicate greater involvement of school principals in school affairs. This index has a mean of zero and a standard deviation of one for the OECD countries.

2 The internal reliability of the leadership index for the EU countries ranged from 0.72 in the Netherlands to 0.96 in Greece and Luxembourg. See OECD (2012), *PISA 2009 Technical Report*, PISA, OECD Publishing, p. 309. http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264167872-en
were principals have overall the lowest degree of engagement in school management as compared to any other country in EU. In parallel, Finland has the top position in student performance in PISA 2009 assessments in reading, maths and science (see table below). Also the Netherlands which is ranked second in reading and mathematics and third in science has among the lowest leadership scores.

On the other side, proportionally more students in the United Kingdom (GBR) than in any other EU country attend to schools where principals report very frequent engagement in activities and behaviours described in 7 out of the 14 statements. In Romania the same applies for 6 of these statements. In the composite leadership index the United Kingdom, Romania and Bulgaria obtained the highest score among all EU countries. It should be noted that Romania and Bulgaria obtained the lowest mean scores among the EU countries in PISA 2009 reading, mathematics and science assessments.

Table 10: PISA 2009 mean scores in student performance on the reading, mathematics and science scale and the leadership index.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNT</th>
<th>READING</th>
<th>MATHEMATICS</th>
<th>SCIENCE</th>
<th>LEADERSHIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>2,9</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>2,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEL</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGR</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>6,7</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>5,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZE</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>2,9</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>2,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>2,7</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>2,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNK</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>2,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>2,0</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>2,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EST</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>2,6</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>2,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>2,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>3,4</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>3,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>2,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRC</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>4,3</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>3,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUN</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>3,2</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>3,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>3,0</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>2,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>1,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIT</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>2,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUX</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVA</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>3,0</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>3,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLT</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>1,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>5,1</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>4,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2,6</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>2,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>3,1</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>2,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROU</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>4,1</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVN</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>1,0</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>2,9</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>2,9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The results in reading, mathematics and science assessments were obtained from the tables I.2.3, I.3.3 and I.3.6 available by OECD at: dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932343285. The results for Malta are not included in the OECD tables and were calculated by the author. The same applies for the leadership composite index scores. France's school principals did not complete the school questionnaire.
On the basis of the results presented above it would be utterly misleading to conclude that strong school leadership may affect negatively student performance and therefore in order to achieve the results obtained by Finland or the Netherlands as well as by other top performing countries (such as Belgium or Estonia which also have a low leadership score), school leaders in other countries should try to engage less often with school management... After all, we have the example of Poland which has among the highest leadership scores and in parallel is among the top performing EU countries. What the above findings indicate is that the relationship between school leadership and student performance depends widely on the national context and is undoubtedly mediated and very complex.

In order to further explore this challenging issue we focused on the relationship between student performance and principals’ engagement in schools with a high share of socio-economically and culturally disadvantaged students (≥50%) (from now on we will call them “low socio-economic status schools”, and more briefly “low SES schools”). We did so by comparing the mean differences in the reading performance in such schools by the level of principals’ engagement in each of the activities and behaviours described in the 14 statements of PISA’s 2009 school questionnaire. We begin with the presentation of the results on the first school management statement.

In the second column in the table below it is reported for each EU country the mean score in reading of students in low SES schools where principals stated that during the last school year “never” or “seldom” “make sure that the professional development activities of teachers are in accordance with the teaching goals of the school” (from now on we will call these schools “low” principal engagement (L-PE) schools). In Latvia, for example, students in schools where principals tend rather not to check whether the professional development activities their teachers are engaged in accordance with the teaching goals of the school scored on average 520 in the reading scale. Latvia’s students in schools where principals “quite often” engage in such an activity on average score around 55 point less (see column 3) and in schools where principals “very often” do the same 79 points less (see column 5). Therefore, in “low” principal engagement (L-PE) schools regarding the orientation of teachers’ professional development activities Latvia’s students tend to perform on average much better than their peers in schools with “medium” (M-PE) or “high” principal engagement (H-PE). The same applies for students in “medium” as compared to “high” principal engagement schools. The asterisk denotes that these differences are statistically significant at 0.05. In several other EU countries a similar trend appears to be true. This is the case for the Czech Republic, Germany, Spain, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Italy, Luxemburg, Portugal and Sweden.
Table 11: Mean performance differences in reading of students in low SES schools by frequency level of principals’ efforts in ensuring that the professional development activities of teachers are in accordance with the teaching goals of their school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNT</th>
<th>Mean performance in reading of students in schools where principals “never or seldom” make sure that the professional development activities of teachers are in accordance with the teaching goals of the school</th>
<th>Students’ mean difference in reading performance between “never or seldom” and “quite often”</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Mean difference in reading performance between “never or seldom” and “very often”</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Mean difference in reading performance between “quite often” and “very often”</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>412 32*</td>
<td>5 21*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-11*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEL</td>
<td>423 -16*</td>
<td>6 8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGR</td>
<td>332¹</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-11*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZE</td>
<td>439 22*</td>
<td>3 15*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>461 47*</td>
<td>4 50*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNK</td>
<td>473 8*</td>
<td>3 17*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>456 7*</td>
<td>3 9*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EST</td>
<td>496 23*</td>
<td>5 48*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>523 -6</td>
<td>3 12*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>442¹</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRC</td>
<td>405 3</td>
<td>5 -51*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-54*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUN</td>
<td>352 -65*</td>
<td>5 -80*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-15*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>407 -35*</td>
<td>8 -36*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>451 36*</td>
<td>7 52*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTU</td>
<td>413 -5</td>
<td>4 -11*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUX</td>
<td>399 8*</td>
<td>3 -40*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-48*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVA</td>
<td>520 55*</td>
<td>3 79*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLT</td>
<td>307¹</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-46*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>454 5</td>
<td>5 12*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL</td>
<td>466 -5</td>
<td>6 -7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>448 11*</td>
<td>5 11*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROU</td>
<td>362¹</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVK</td>
<td>425 6</td>
<td>4 7*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVN</td>
<td>397¹</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-25*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>495 35*</td>
<td>4 50*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mean difference statistically significant at 0.05 level.

¹ This is the mean score of students in schools where principals reported that they were “quite often” engaged in the activity/behaviour. No principal in this country reported that (s)he “never” or “seldom” did so.

On the other hand, in Hungary we observe the opposite trend. Students in “low” principal engagement (L-PE) schools tend to perform less well in reading as compared to students in “medium” (M-PE) and “high” principal engagement (H-PE) schools. It is characteristic that students in H-PE schools scored on average 80 score points higher than their peers in L-PE schools. In Greece and Ireland a somewhat similar pattern is recorded. Students in H-PE schools regarding the professional development of teachers do much better than their peers in L-PE schools in Greece (51 points higher) and in Ireland (36
points higher). Furthermore, in Slovenia, Malta and Bulgaria students in H-PE schools tend to perform better than their peers in M-PE schools.

These two rather opposing trends are identified in all school management activities/behaviours across 19 EU countries.\(^1\) The dominant trend in 13 of these countries, namely in Sweden, Poland, Netherlands, Latvia, Italy, Greece, United Kingdom, Finland, Estonia, Denmark, Germany, the Czech Republic and Austria, in the majority of the school management statements\(^2\) there are statistically significant mean differences in reading in favour of students in low SES L-PE schools as compared to low SES M-PE and/or H-PE schools or in favour of M-PE as compared to H-PE schools (signified by red squares in the table below).

Table 12: EU countries where there is dominant the trend of higher mean student performance in reading in schools with less frequent principal’s engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School management statements</th>
<th>AUT</th>
<th>CZE</th>
<th>DEU</th>
<th>DNK</th>
<th>EST</th>
<th>FIN</th>
<th>GBR</th>
<th>GRC</th>
<th>ITA</th>
<th>LVA</th>
<th>NLD</th>
<th>POL</th>
<th>SWE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I make sure that the professional development activities of teachers are in accordance with the teaching goals of the school.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ensure that teachers work according to the school’s educational goals.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I observe instruction in classrooms.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use student performance results to develop the school’s educational goals.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I give teachers suggestions as to how they can improve their teaching.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I monitor students’ work.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When a teacher has problems in his/her classroom, I take the initiative to discuss matters.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I inform teachers about possibilities for updating their knowledge and skills.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I check to see whether classroom activities are in keeping with our educational goals.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I take exam results into account in decisions regarding curriculum development.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ensure that there is clarity concerning the responsibility for co-ordinating the curriculum.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When a teacher brings up a classroom problem, we solve the problem together.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I pay attention to disruptive behaviour in classrooms.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I take over lessons from teachers who are unexpectedly absent.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) The results are presented in separate tables in Annex II for each school management statement and country.

\(^2\) Provided that there are data available to compare.
At least one statistically significant mean difference ($p<0.05$) in reading performance in favour of students in low SES schools were principals reported less frequent engagement as compared to more frequent engagement, for example in favour of students in L-PE schools as compared to low SES M-PE and/or H-PE schools or in favour of M-PE as compared to H-PE schools. Therefore red colour signifies a) three statistically significant relationships, or b) two or one statistically significant relationship(s) with the other being not significant or non applicable because of lack of observations.

No statistically significant mean difference in student performance in reading between low SES L-PE vs M-LE schools and/or L-PE vs H-PE schools and/or M-PE vs H-PE schools.

At least one statistically significant mean difference ($p<0.05$) in reading performance in favour of students in low SES schools were principals reported more frequent engagement as compared less frequent engagement, for example in favour of students in H-PE schools as compared to low SES L-PE and/or M-PE schools or in favour of M-PE as compared to L-PE schools. Therefore blue colour signifies a) three statistically significant relationships, or b) two or one statistically significant relationship(s) with the other being not significant or non applicable because of lack of observations.

No comparisons between mean differences possible because of lack of observations.

Students in M-PE schools perform better than students in L-PE schools and students in H-PE schools (at 0.05 level).

Students in M-PE schools perform worse than L-ME and H-ME schools (at 0.05 level).

School principals in low SES schools, being quite experienced educators, we hypothesise that they know how “well” their students are doing as compared to other schools with a comparable and a more privileged student intake. In the countries included in the list on the table above principals seem to, in a predominant way, react with more frequent interventions in school life when they believe that their school is not doing as well in terms of student performance as other schools of similarly low SES student intake. In most of these countries principals who feel that their students are not doing so well they choose to increase monitoring of students’ work (except from Italy and Poland), they check more often to see whether classroom activities are in keeping with the schools’ educational goals (except from principals in Poland, Greece and the Czech Republic) and they pay more attention to the orientation of their teachers’ professional development so as to make sure that it is in accordance with the school goals (except from Greece, Poland and the United Kingdom). This is how we interpret why more frequent principal engagement in low SES schools is associated with lower student performance. This interpretation is further based on the hypothesis that the field of comparison that principals in low SES schools use in these countries tends not include schools that have more socio-economically and culturally privileged student intake (in which, as we have already shown, students on average perform much better than their peers in low SES schools). The “exclusion” from the tertium comparationis principals employ in low SES schools of more privileged intake schools, possibly further explains why better student performance is associated less frequent school management behaviours in low SES schools.

On other side, in low SES schools in six other EU countries, namely Spain, Hungary, Lithuania, Luxemburg, Slovenia and Slovakia, the dominant trend is the opposite. That is, in the majority of the school management statements, provided that there are data available to compare, there are observed mean differences in reading in favour of students in low SES H-PE schools as compared to low SES M-PE and/or L-PE schools or in favour of M-PE as compared to L-PE schools.
Table 13: EU countries where there is dominant the trend of higher mean student performance in reading in schools with more frequent principal's engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School management statements</th>
<th>ESP</th>
<th>HUN</th>
<th>LTU</th>
<th>LUX</th>
<th>SVK</th>
<th>SVN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I make sure that the professional development activities of teachers are in accordance with the teaching goals of the school.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ensure that teachers work according to the school's educational goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I observe instruction in classrooms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use student performance results to develop the school's educational goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I give teachers suggestions as to how they can improve their teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I monitor students' work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When a teacher has problems in his/her classroom, I take the initiative to discuss matters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I inform teachers about possibilities for updating their knowledge and skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I check to see whether classroom activities are in keeping with our educational goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I take exam results into account in decisions regarding curriculum development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ensure that there is clarity concerning the responsibility for co-ordinating the curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When a teacher brings up a classroom problem, we solve the problem together.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I pay attention to disruptive behaviour in classrooms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I take over lessons from teachers who are unexpectedly absent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At least one statistically significant mean difference (p<0.05) in reading performance in favour of students in low SES schools were principals reported less frequent engagement as compared to more frequent engagement, for example in favour of students in L-PE schools as compared to low SES M-PE and/or H-PE schools or in favour of M-PE as compared to H-PE schools. Therefore red colour signifies a) three statistically significant relationships, or b) two or one statistically significant relationship(s) with the other being not significant or non applicable because of lack of observations.

No statistically significant mean difference in student performance in reading between low SES L-PE vs M-LE schools and/or L-PE vs H-PE schools and/or M-PE vs H-PE schools.

At least one statistically significant mean difference (p<0.05) in reading performance in favour of students in low SES schools were principals reported more frequent engagement as compared less frequent engagement, for example in favour of students in H-PE schools as compared to low SES L-PE and/or M-PE schools or in favour of M-PE as compared to L-PE schools. Therefore blue colour signifies a) three statistically significant relationships, or b) two or one statistically significant relationship(s) with the other being not significant or non applicable because of lack of observations.

No comparisons between mean differences possible because of lack of observations.

Students in M-PE schools perform better than students in L-PE schools and students in H-PE schools (at 0.05 level).

Students in M-PE schools perform worse than L-PE and H-PE schools (at 0.05 level).

It can be hypothesised that principals in low SES schools in these countries tend to manage their schools somewhat proactively in relation to student performance. Having an understanding that their students are doing better (or having the ambition that they could do even better) than students in other low SES schools, they engage more frequently in school management behaviours and activities in the belief that these will contribute to further improvements in their students’ performance or that they will keep it at the already better level as compared to other low SES schools. Possibly also in the countries showing a “proactive school management” pattern, principals use a much wider field of
comparison which includes also more privileged intake schools where, as we have seen, students tend to perform better. Within this widened field of comparison principals in low SES schools where students do better than other low SES schools are engaged in more frequent school management behaviour because they understand that they do not do as good as students in schools with a more privileged student intake.

Finally, we have 6 more EU countries where no dominant pattern appears to exist between student performance and level of engagement of principals in school management (see table below).

Table 14: EU countries where there no dominant trend between mean student performance in reading by frequency of principal’s engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School management statements</th>
<th>BEL</th>
<th>BGR</th>
<th>IRL</th>
<th>MLT</th>
<th>PRT</th>
<th>ROU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I make sure that the professional development activities of teachers are in accordance with the teaching goals of the school.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ensure that teachers work according to the school’s educational goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I observe instruction in classrooms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use student performance results to develop the school’s educational goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I give teachers suggestions as to how they can improve their teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I monitor students’ work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When a teacher has problems in his/her classroom, I take the initiative to discuss matters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I inform teachers about possibilities for updating their knowledge and skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I check to see whether classroom activities are in keeping with our educational goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I take exam results into account in decisions regarding curriculum development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ensure that there is clarity concerning the responsibility for coordinating the curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When a teacher brings up a classroom problem, we solve the problem together.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I pay attention to disruptive behaviour in classrooms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I take over lessons from teachers who are unexpectedly absent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At least one statistically significant mean difference (p<0.05) in reading performance in favour of students in low SES schools were principals reported less frequent engagement as compared to more frequent engagement, for example in favour of students in L-PE schools as compared to low SES M-PE and/or H-PE schools or in favour of M-PE as compared to H-PE schools. Therefore red colour signifies a) three statistically significant relationships, or b) two or one statistically significant relationship(s) with the other being not significant or non applicable because of lack of observations.

No statistically significant mean difference in student performance in reading between low SES L-PE vs M-LE schools and/or L-PE vs H-PE schools and/or M-PE vs H-PE schools.

At least one statistically significant mean difference (p<0.05) in reading performance in favour of students in low SES schools were principals reported more frequent engagement as compared less frequent engagement, for example in favour of students in H-PE schools as compared to low SES L-PE and/or M-PE schools or in favour of M-PE as compared to L-PE schools. Therefore blue colour signifies a) three statistically significant relationships, or b) two or one statistically significant relationship(s) with the other being not significant or non applicable because of lack of observations.

No comparisons between mean differences possible because of lack of observations.

Students in M-PE schools perform better than students in L-PE schools and students in H-PE schools (at 0.05 level).

Students in M-PE schools perform worse than L-ME and H-ME schools (at 0.05 level).
In the countries on the table above we see many cases of statements where students in M-PE schools perform worse than their peers L-ME and H-ME schools (at 0.05 level) (green squares) or cases where students in M-PE schools perform better than students in L-PE and H-PE schools (yellow squares), as well as many cases with no statistically significant results. In the case of Belgium this result may reflect the fact that the French and the Flemish communities manage school affairs on their own therefore there may be also differences in the dominant school management traditions in the country as well as in the time principals are required to devote to clearly administrative activities. Bulgaria, Romania and Malta are the three least well performing countries in EU in the PISA 2009 assessments and maybe principals in these countries, particularly in low SES schools were students tend to perform considerably lower than these countries’ average PISA scores, are trying different things, on different levels of intensity, on how to manage their schools in order to improve the situation on the ground.

11.7 Discussion

In this study the hypothesis that the intake of schools related to the socio-economic and cultural background of their students is a critical factor for basing policy on equity and learning was supported by evidence from PISA 2009 showing that students in schools with a high share of students coming from low socio-economic and cultural backgrounds perform on average much lower than their peers in medium or high SES schools. Low SES schools pose therefore much more pressing challenges to school leaders as compared to other schools. This reality in almost all EU countries has or should have implications regarding the training, professional development, retention and replacement of school leaders in low SES schools. Yet the current discussion on school leadership seldom addresses this issue.

Our analysis of the relationship between principals’ leadership behaviour and student performance showed that this should not be discussed in terms of causality. More frequent leadership behaviours and activities in low SES schools are not associated with better performance in many EU countries and this does not imply that the principals in these countries are not doing their job well. Similarly in those countries were “stronger” leadership is positively associated with student performance in low SES schools it would be rather naïve to believe that principals are doing their job well. According to our interpretation of the findings, in the many EU countries there is a dominant “reactive school management” pattern among principals in low SES schools which uses as field of comparison other low SES schools in order to specify the level of engagement in various school management activities. In schools where principals believe that their students are doing less well than students in other low SES schools they also tend to exhibit more active engagement in school matters. Maybe, to go a bit further in our syllogism, this pattern reflects an underlying culture of school management, a kind of leadership tradition. The same could be true for the countries where, in the opposite direction, principals follow predominantly a “proactive school management” pattern, using perhaps a wider field of comparison which includes not only low SES schools but also more privileged schools and where more principals’ engagement is associated with better student results. All the above of course need further research to become able to confirm or reject.
PART IV: SCAFFOLDING POLICY DEVELOPMENT IN CULTURING AND STRUCTURING OF SCHOOL LEADERSHIP FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF EQUITY AND LEARNING
12. CRITICAL FACTORS FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF LLL STRATEGY AND POLICY UNDER THE SCOPE OF EQUITY AND LEARNING AND THE PERSPECTIVE OF SCHOOL LEADERS

The EPNoSL project is based on the premise that school leadership plays a central role for the improvement and reform of teaching and learning, educational policies and systems development, as well as school management and administration. School leadership is also essential for creating an all-inclusive education culture by overcoming individual and structural obstacles and inequalities. Therefore, according to the EPNoSL, school leadership is one of the most crucial factors in the implementation LLL strategies and initiatives aiming to promote equity and learning outcomes. This view is widely recognised by the policy community at EU and national level. Characteristically, according to the November 2009 Council Conclusions on the professional development of teachers and school leaders (2009/C 302/04),

**Effective school leadership is a major factor in shaping the overall teaching and learning environment, raising aspirations and providing support for pupils, parents and staff, and thus in fostering higher achievement levels. It is therefore of key importance to ensure that school leaders have, or are able to develop, the capacities and qualities needed to assume the increasing number of tasks with which they are confronted. Equally important is ensuring that school leaders are not overburdened with administrative tasks and concentrate on essential matters, such as the quality of learning, the curriculum, pedagogical issues and staff performance, motivation and development.**

Under this perspective, the EPNoSL project is aimed to identify and study in depth critical factors that may shape the capacity and potential of school leaders to exercise effectively school leadership in order to implement strategies and initiatives that are targeting to combat inequalities in access, opportunities and learning outcomes and promote learning performance.

In the previous chapters of this report, as well as the reports that have been produced during the first year of the EPNoSL project, insights have been offered regarding the (relative) importance of various factors that are considered as critical in policy implementation of LLL strategies having to do with equity and learning from the perspective of school leaders.

In this chapter an effort is made to reflect further and specify in more direct ways the factors that have emerged from the critical review of the relevant literature as well as the research and analysis reported in this volume, and suggest possible interrelationships between these factors. As it is understandable, **given the high diversity in the political, social, cultural and economic realities and traditions between and even within EU countries, some of the factors identified in this chapter may be less important than others in different countries or school education systems; it is also to be expected that the relative importance of different factors even in the context of a single country or education system may change with time or circumstances. Therefore, it should be made clear from the start that the scheme that is discussed here is neither exhaustive of the possible factors of some crucial importance to effective school leadership nor rigid regarding its building blocks and their interrelationships.** Furthermore, as the chapters on policy response and leading and managing change highlighted, **policy implementation is a complex and dynamic process in nature**
and therefore at different implementation phases it is likely that some factors may be proved more critical than others for its success. It is also important to note that different stakeholders in education and beyond may have divergent perspectives on what constitutes successful policy implementation. Top-down approaches to the promotion of equity and learning in schools tend to emphasize the degree to which the policymakers’ directives are put into practice. On the other hand, bottom-up approaches mean that local-level innovators, such as school leaders and teachers, respond to local needs and concerns regarding equity and learning in context-sensitive ways. However, even the most effective initiatives on the ground have to be evidently compatible to national and regional LLL strategies and initiatives in order to secure that they get political support and resources that would enhance their sustainability potential and diffusion. These two perspectives can result in very different understandings and outcomes. Definitions of what constitutes successful implementation can also vary depending on where actors are located in the power field of policy implementation.

In the context of EPNoSL critical factors in policy implementation are the building blocks of a specific LLL strategy or policy initiative on equity and learning that policy implementers, with school leaders being at the forefront of our analysis, can and even cannot control and manage in order to increase the chances of achieving its intended educational goals. In order to specify the scope of LLL policy strategies and initiatives on equity and learning in which critical factors from the perspective of school leaders (and effective school leadership) can be identified and studied further in depth, EPNoSL has proposed five research themes which reflect long-standing (or emerging) policy areas where in most, if not all, EU countries an on-going policy discourse is taking place during the past years, namely a) autonomy, b) accountability, c) distributed leadership, d) policy response and e) educating school leaders. These research themes contextualise our analysis of the critical factors in policy implementation from the perspective of school leaders, given that we are mostly interested in factors that appear to play a crucial role in most or all of the themes identified above.

The critical factors in policy implementation identified and discussed below are viewed from an “inner” and an “outer” perspective, although these two are not always easily distinguishable because of their interconnectedness. The outer perspective has to do with the ways each factor is assumed to play a critical role in policy implementation not just in one particular school but in a cluster of schools according to the organisation and management of schools in regions, education systems and whole countries. The inner perspective has to do with the ways each factor is assumed to play a critical role in policy implementation at individual school level.

12.1 Political commitment and priorities

As it was stressed in chapter 5, policies that evolve from the political process in democratic societies are quite often unclear and ambiguous and, policy texts often contain divergent meanings, contradictions and structured omissions. Also, different government departments and various pressure groups within and beyond the state apparatus struggle to secure the governments’ commitment to this or that purpose and prioritise what they believe it is important to be done. Furthermore, policy-making may be substantially shaped by symbolic considerations that may have little to do with the real effects of policies. For example, political talk and action might be intended to shape and then respond to politically created issues and problems as much as to any real practical concerns. Equally, political spectacle might be used to hide policies and actions that might have material advantages for some groups over others. Also, policy reforms may be crafted simply to focus on the politically salient. Within the wider context of political antagonism over how to distribute limited public resources, it is important that governments clearly recognise the need to combat inequalities in access, opportunities and outcomes of schooling and prioritise measures that are aimed to address this problem.
However, within EU different national governments are facing different economic challenges and circumstances and there is clearly the need to recognise that issues of equity in schools are likely to have become much more pressing in some of them after year 2008. The austerity measures that have been introduced by several EU governments, notably Greece, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Ireland and more recently Cyprus, as a response to the economic crisis as well as the slow or even negative economic growth have hit harshly their spending on education. This reality may send the message that education is not among the priorities of national and regional governments in times of crisis or economic downturn and that the deepening of inequalities such as those identified above, that is likely to be expected from horizontal cuts in public spending on education, has to be tolerated because of more pressing priorities. In such a context, central level policy strategies and initiatives that place more responsibilities and workload on the shoulders of school leaders and teachers, through, for example, reforms that enhance school autonomy, and held them accountable for the school results in terms of learning outcomes are likely to be met with suspicion by the world of education. This is because such initiatives may be translated as an effort by the governments to minimize the political cost of cuts in education spending and its implications on the ground by pointing the finger to schools. Overall, in those EU countries where cuts in education spending have been introduced there is a need to reformulate a wider consensus on the place of education in national policies and its role in the new economic environment. Such a consensus will also be helpful to orient school leadership policies and to establish priorities regarding equity and learning.

As the analysis of the PISA 2009 data presented in chapter 11 show, in several EU countries, and most prominently in Malta, Bulgaria, Belgium, Austria, Germany, Luxemburg and Slovenia, there are wide gaps in average student performance in reading, mathematics and science between schools with low, medium and high share of low SES students. The above findings indicate that in these countries there is clearly the need to reaffirm policy commitment and devote more efforts aiming to reduce such gaps. Among other things, policy commitment and prioritisation of action targeting schools with a high intake of low SES students has to be accompanied by a heightened focus on the specific needs and challenges that school leaders face in such schools in order to better inform school leadership policies. International cooperation and knowledge and experience sharing is also important. On this front there is a lot to be learned from the cases of Finland and Poland, but also of Latvia and Denmark, which managed to achieve both comparatively high average overall performance and low variation in the average performance of students in schools with low, medium and high share of low SES students.

At school level, as it was argued in chapter 2, school leaders and teachers, though often sincerely convinced of their commitment to equality, sometimes tend to prioritise other aims, such as maintaining their subject, the school’s prestige, their own daily professional survival. The causes of inequality are, as was already stressed, multiple and complex and not all under the control of educators, but school leaders have their own share in minimising or exacerbating the effects of economic inequality and exclusion within their schools. It is their determination to minimise these effects and the degree to which they prioritise this aim that is the foundation of action for equity and improved performance at school level.

12.2 Financial resources

One of the most crucial factors related to the implementation of LLL strategies having to do with equity and learning and the role of school leaders is spending on education, primarily public but also private. The level of spending, the sources of funding, the processes through which funding is becoming available to schools and the flexibility with which school leaders can use school funds to promote equity and learning are really important parameters to policy implementation. Across EU countries the level of public expenditures varies widely as percentage of GDP and it is to be expected that in countries where public expenditures are comparatively low less funds are becoming available to
schools to promote programmes and interventions, such as extra tuition for weaker pupils, greater variety of learning opportunities, meals to poorer pupils etc, that would scaffold school leaders and teachers’ efforts to promote equity and learning. The capacity of school leaders to implement such programmes is further threatened by drastic cuts in public spending on education that has been introduced in the past years by governments, particularly in Greece, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Ireland, Cyprus but also others. Things are becoming worse in countries hit by the economic crisis given that increased unemployment and cuts in salaries and pensions have reduced the capacity of many families to spend more on the education of their children and hence offer financial support to improve school services and infrastructure.

12.3 Policy coherence

As it was stressed, particularly in the chapter 1 and 11 of this report, socio-economic and cultural factors that cannot be controlled directly by school leaders and teachers can gravely affect equity and learning in schools. It is simply unreasonable to expect educators to ‘take responsibility’ for issues of material poverty that undermine pupils’ educational performance, particularly in schools with a high intake of low SES students. However, central and regional government policy on school leadership and equity often lays responsibility for both equality of opportunity and equity of results firmly at the door of principals and teachers. It should be stressed and become better understood by all stakeholders involved in policy making and implementation that in order to promote equity and learning in schools there should be a deepening of sectoral coordination between education policies and other government policies that target to improve the socio-economic situation of the most socio-economically disadvantaged regions and communities through, for example, welfare policies, employment policies, LLL policies etc.

The analysis of PISA 2009 data performed in chapter 11 of this report showed that in all EU countries that participated in the assessments, students in schools with a high share of low SES students tend to perform on average much lower as compared to students in schools with a medium or high SES intake. This reality poses considerable challenges to policy makers towards devising economic policies as well as welfare policies, employment policies, and LLL policies that would target the population of the communities with schools which exhibit a high share of low SES students. From this perspective, it is of critical importance in EU countries were austerity measures have been introduced as a response to the recent economic crisis, such as Greece, Italy, Spain, Portugal and Ireland, to take efforts so as to ensure that these do not further deepen inequalities in income distribution, especially in communities and regions where there was already a high share of low income households. Similarly, strengthening policy coherence in the form of coordinated action supporting economically disadvantaged communities and regions in other EU countries is of outmost importance. This is particularly the case in those EU countries where there are observed considerable gaps in average student performance in schools with a high share of low SES students as compared to students in schools with a more privileged intake, such as Malta, Bulgaria, Belgium, Austria, Germany, Luxemburg and Slovenia.

At school level policy coherence can be exemplified through coordinated leadership action involving the formulation of the school’s mission, development plans and priorities, school spending, curricula, staffing, professional development, extra-curricular and out of school activities, networking, engagement in community projects etc targeting specific school and community needs in relation to equity in access, opportunities, and outcomes and improved learning performance for all. At this level, given that the socio-economic and cultural background of students has been found to play a considerable role in student performance in many EU countries, leadership policy coherence particularly in schools with a high share of low SES students, is greatly enhanced through the deepening of involvement of schools in the local community, serving its needs as community learning centres.
12.4 Policy ownership

Another critical factor in policy implementation that emerged in several of the chapters in this report is policy ownership. Policy ownership can be conceptualised as a (perceived) state of belonging to, and responsibility for, the implementation of a strategy or initiative. As it was argued, a dispersed, rather than a top-down, model of implementation is more likely to ensure that various stakeholders (e.g. school leaders, parents, pupils and local authorities) view policy as benign, rather than an alien interloper, and terms such as ‘influential stakeholders’ and ‘policy community’ are used to describe the multitude of individuals who must be “on-board” with a policy message in order for it to be embraced. An initiative that is adopted willingly, even though it may have arisen externally, is much more likely to be successful than one that is imposed externally or internally on unwilling or unconvinced staff. The way that people perceive change will affect the way that they respond. Therefore if they perceive that the change has been forced on them they may well resist it, particularly if they feel it is counter to their interests. It follows from this that it is important to ensure that implementers at least understand what the change involves and that ideally they should feel some involvement with, and ownership of, the policy.

Policy ownership at school level can be greatly enhanced through distributed leadership and the widening of participation of school level stakeholders in decision making and in implementation of policies and projects aimed to promote equity and learning.

12.5 Empowerment of different stakeholders and trust in their professionalism

Policy ownership is supported and enhanced by the sharing of power between different stakeholders. Policy empowerment and trust in different “key actors” shapes the degree and the nature of their involvement in the implementation of a policy or initiative. In school education systems where power is more widely shared and devolved it is likely that the implementation of strategies and initiatives targeting to promote equity and learning will be handled more smoothly and successfully than in highly hierarchical systems.

At school level, as it was argued in this report, school leaders must try to empower staff by making explicit their own professional and educational values and sharing them. This way, an agreed collegiate culture can be created, encouraging a learning environment for all staff and pupils. Commitment and collegiality in others has to be developed, and leaders need to involve staff in decision making, allowing them to take ownership of their work, valuing them, and translating clear vision and purpose. Trust, empowerment and engagement are key components of collegiate cultures where change is not seen as a threat but as part of everyday practise.

12.6 Supportive shared dispositions to inclusive, non socio-economically segregated schools

Typically, in educational leadership and management discourse it is policy makers or family/society factors that are cited as maintaining inequality, and staff in schools depicted as constrained by the context within which they work. As it was argued in this report, this is a misleading assumption. Schools and school staff also play a part in creating, maintaining or increasing inequality. Beliefs about capacity to learn and how far it relates to innate ability or to effort and beliefs about the impact of families on early learning are culturally shaped. Very different assumptions about such issues are held in different cultures and correspondingly promote or inhibit learning. As it was stressed, failing to achieve equality in schools relates to issues of ethics and priorities. School leaders who attempt to shift school priorities and practices in fundamental ways usually encounter a modicum of support and a good deal of
resistance from teachers and from parents. Teachers may argue, for example, that dismantling tracking jeopardises teaching their subject, or any other subject. Leaders who recruit learners seen by others as problematic risk parents’ response to avoid their school. Flight from schools with a high percentage of immigrant learners has been noted in different countries. Above all, school leaders sometimes face a belief that some children are not educable or only educable with great difficulty. The children of immigrant families or of minority ethnic groups are more likely to be seen as having special needs than are other groups, reflecting deeply embedded prejudices that translate difference into disadvantage. In short, school leaders face unjust discriminatory convictions that underpin many teachers’ and parents’ judgements about what is right and possible in education. School leaders themselves are not immune from such beliefs. Those who, for example, give entry preference to learners with higher attainment, or who allocate the most inexperienced teachers to classes of those perceived as having lower academic potentials are enacting inequality. Unpacking one’s own culture and its assumptions about people and about learning may move school leaders out of their habitual thinking and behaviours, raising awareness of how they are shaped by gender, ethnicity, class and societal culture.

As it was shown in chapter 11, the intake of schools in terms of the students’ socio-economic and cultural background plays a critical role in student performance. It is likely that parents also understand that this is the case and, particularly in those EU countries where they have the right to choose the school for their children, is reasonable to try sending them to a school with a more privileged intake. This practice, to the degree that it is widespread, can effectively lead to segregated schools in terms of their intake. In other countries where parents are obliged to send their children to the nearby school, school segregation in terms of their student intake can be effectively achieved through moving to other places and neighbourhoods where they live wealthier and possibly better educated families. Overall, from a policy perspective the capacity of governments to devise policies that would promote schools with balanced student intake in terms of their socio-economic background is rather limited because of the complexity and the highly controversial nature of the issues involved. What they can do is to promote among the population the belief that all schools, irrespective of their intake and hence irrespective of the economic and social conditions in the place where schools are located, can promote equally well the well being and learning performance of students. Such beliefs can be established through strategies and coordinated policy initiatives that aim to reduce inequalities in income distribution from region to region and from neighbourhood to neighbourhood, to improve the standards of living in poorer neighbourhoods and regions, to enhance the quality and diversity of the services and infrastructure (schools included) available to the citizens living in such areas etc.

12.7 Sound scientific evidence supporting the design, implementation and evaluation of policies

As it was indicated in this report, policies and initiatives may be shaped and crafted not on the basis of research evidence but simply on the beliefs and commitments of policy-makers and their advisers. At the level of policy design sound empirical evidence can be proved of great help to top and middle-level policy makers as well as to school leaders, to, for example, identify areas where targeted policy initiatives are mostly needed and orient policy priorities, identify existing good practices, and indicate strategies that have been proved effective in the past given the context of their implementation. In the implementation of policies research evidence can also be very supportive. However, as it was indicated in this report, within the literature on school leadership and equity, there is paucity about the actual practice of social justice leadership, the capacities needed by school leaders to engage in social justice and the kind of guidance that is necessary for practitioners on how they might enact leadership strategies for social justice. As it was also stressed, the processes of policy enactment involve ad-hockery, borrowing, re-ordering, displacing, making do and re-invention. Overall, the
complexities involved between policy and implementation need to be better understood in order to ensure that the intended outcomes are indeed realised. Therefore, research evidence that would inform formative and summative evaluation of specific policy initiatives is of outmost importance. In the chapter of this report discussing the trends and important research topics for comparative research on school leadership there have been identified ten broad key areas where further research would offer support to evidence-based policies.

12.8 Human resources: school leaders’ capacity building

Throughout this report it was made quite clear that the capacities of school leaders but also of teachers is one of the most crucial factors to the implementation of policies promoting equity and learning performance in schools. However, as it was reported, in only a few EU countries school leaders have the opportunity to participate in pre-service, induction and in-service training programmes and other capacity building activities that are specifically aimed to enhance their knowledge and skills on how to deal with every day challenges related to equity and learning, and, even more importantly, to plan and implement strategies at school and local level that would target inequalities in access, opportunities, and learning outcomes. Repeatedly, research has found that those who lead training programmes feel that they do not have the time or skills or sometimes the necessity to address equality issues explicitly as a priority in leader preparation programmes and that leaders themselves see the issues as taken-for-granted, and not demanding specific attention. Leaders and those who prepare them should genuinely wish to equip themselves with the knowledge and skills that would allow them to tackle inequalities head on and to withstand the resistance they are likely to encounter in their school community.

Research evidence from PISA 2009 presented in chapter 11 also indicated that in many EU countries school leaders in schools with a high share of low SES students face more pressing challenges as compared to school leaders in schools with a more privileged student intake, particularly regarding the learning strategies of their students and also their learning performance in reading, mathematics and science but also in terms of student behaviour. In contrast in the vast majority of EU countries there were not recorded differences between students in low SES schools and more privileged schools in terms of teacher shortages in the schools, the quality of the schools’ resources, the disciplinary climate, students’ attitudes towards school, and teacher-student relations (as judged by principals or students depending on the PISA questionnaire). The above findings indicate that school leaders’ capacity building in schools with a high share of low SES student intake, in which as we have seen students perform on average much lower than students in more privileged schools, should be predominantly focused on matters of pedagogy and the quality of the learning processes in the school.
13. A PRELIMINARY EUROPEAN POLICY INDICATORS FRAMEWORK

In this final chapter of this report, a preliminary common European Policy Indicators framework is proposed to support policy development that is aimed to promote culturing and structuring of school leadership from the perspective of equity and learning. This framework is preliminary in the sense that it offers a basis, a first stepping stone, for discussion and negotiation between the EPNoSL partners and experts on indicators that policy can use to structure the development and implementation of context relevant school leadership cultures. The framework builds upon the critical factors on policy implementation identified and discussed in the previous chapter.

**Political commitment and priorities**
Practically, political commitment and priorities regarding the promotion of equity and learning can be signalled through various ways, many of which have to do with other factors and indicators identified in this report. For example, the level of funding that is actually available from various sources to set up and implement initiatives targeting equity and learning in schools is a strong indicator of the commitment and the priorities of the funding agents, such as the central government, the local authorities, the parents, NGOs or other for-profit and non-profit organisations. Commitment and priorities on behalf of school leaders and teachers can also be identified in actual everyday school practices and in the wider school culture. **Shared values and traditions that promote inclusive excellence in schools are good indicators of lasting commitment and prioritisation of equity and learning over other sometimes competitive demands that are made on school leaders, such as demands for complying strictly to the curriculum and the timetable.**

**Financial resources**
In times of economic crisis that has hit several EU countries and in the context of austerity measures taken by governments it is difficult to define a set of indicators that would be relevant to all. Public expenditures on education can offer such indicators but these are often too general or too vague in some cases to show reliably and validly how much of the spending is actually streamed to the promotion of equity and learning in schools. On the other hand, at the local and school level, indicators on the financial resources that are allocated to equity and learning can be much more reliably and validly identified. For example, **the level of local communities and schools’ funds that are made available to initiatives such as extra tuition for weaker pupils, greater variety of learning opportunities, meals to poorer pupils etc, can signal the financial capacity and commitment of schools to promote equity and learning.** Further, such capacity can also be signalled by the autonomy and the flexibility with which school leaders can manage the school’s financial resources to offer more and better learning opportunities, particularly to weaker pupils.

**Policy coherence**
Indicators of policy coherence on equity and learning in schools can be located in the complementarity and synergies of policies at national, regional and local levels which are targeting to support different kinds of disadvantaged groups, such as the unemployed, the low educated adults, immigrants, Roma and travellers, people with special needs etc as well as regions and communities that are faced with pressing socio-economic challenges such as high unemployment, low education attainment, high school drop-out rates and early school leaving, difficult housing conditions, and more generally low standards of living among the population.
Policy coherence at school level can be identified in leadership strategies and actions that orient the school life in its totality towards the goals of equity and improved learning performance. Coherence is evidenced in the synergies and complementarities between the school's mission, development plans and priorities, the school's spending priorities, curricula, staffing, professional development, extra-curricular and out of school activities, networking, engagement in community projects etc targeting specific school and community needs in relation to equity in access, opportunities, and outcomes and improved learning performance for all.

Policy ownership
One important set of indicators regarding policy ownership has to do with the degree and scope of responsibility that different level and different categories of stakeholders believe they have in the implementation of a given policy initiative.

Empowerment of different stakeholders and trust in their professionalism
An important set of indicators regarding empowerment and trust has to do with the formally defined and widely acknowledged power that stakeholders have to shape decision-making at different levels of policy, from planning to implementation and evaluation. Indicators of empowerment and trust can be located in the representation and voting rights that different stakeholders have in decision-making bodies, from the school level up to the central government level. Important questions are: do different groups of stakeholders have a formal role to play in decision-making and, furthermore, do they actually exercise their formal power to affect decisions? This is because empowerment and trust do not only have to do with rights but also with the degree to which these rights are recognised as important by those who have them and also with the degree to which they feel that their opinion matters.

Supportive shared dispositions to inclusive, non socio-economically segregated schools
Indicators of supportive shared dispositions to inclusive schools can be specified at different dimensions. Such dispositions can be identified in school leaders, teachers, parents and pupils' views regarding the importance and desirability to provide fair opportunities to all pupils, irrespective of their socio-cultural and economic background, gender, race, health conditions etc. Prejudices and negative stereotyping of pupils or families and even teachers and school leaders depending on their skin colour, their religion, their gender etc can also be indicators of the degree to which inclusiveness is a shared goal in a school.

Dispositions can also be traced in every-day school practices, for example in practices that allow or do not allow room for negative discrimination at various levels, from enrolment to allocation of resources, to behaviours that exhibit negative or preferential biases in the treatment of groups of pupils, teachers, parents or even school leaders, depending on criteria identified above.

Sound scientific evidence supporting the design, implementation and evaluation of policies
Indicators of this kind can be located in practices of policy formation, implementation and evaluation. To what extent policy formation is grounded on empirical research that is relevant and sound? To what extent there are synergies between groups of implementers and researchers during the implementation phase? Is the implementation of a policy monitored and assessed on the basis of sound evidence that would allow for informed decision-making at various phases and steps? Is there a formative evaluation phase put in place so that stakeholders will be able to know on the basis of evidence the degree to which a certain policy and its implementation succeeded in its original goals?

Human resources: school leaders' capacity building
Indicators of this kind can be located in the prior qualifications that school leaders need to have in relation to equity and learning achievement in order to apply for the job, in the induction training that is demanded from them to undertake and in the continuing professional development
activities that they are expected to engage in. Such indicators are focused on the established rules (for selection, career advancement etc) that are followed in each national context and level of education. Another set of indicators has to do with availability and access. Are there quality programmes on offer for school leaders and teachers specifically designed to raise their awareness, to promote their knowledge and skills and to cultivate their positive attitudes on issues related to equity and learning? How school leaders and teachers are enabled and motivated to participate in them? A third set of indicators has to do with the actual professional development practices of school leaders and teachers. What is the degree to which school leaders and teachers undertake such kind of training? Do they form formal or informal communities and networks aiming to promote their professional knowledge and skills on issues of equity and learning? How do they share their experiences and what are the different channels they use to discuss such matters? A fourth set of indicators has to do with the strength of the relationship between professional development needs and research. How new research findings become available to school leaders and teachers and what is their role in shaping the research agendas and actual research programmes according to their needs?
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ANNEX I: EDUCATING SCHOOL LEADERS FOR EQUITY AND LEARNING - COUNTRY BRIEFS

1. Austria
   Michael Schratz

Political Context
Equity is a highly politicized issue in Austria. While equal access to compulsory education is articulated in Austria's constitution, the fundamental right to education for all is not. International large-scale assessments such as TIMMS or PISA have revealed that the education system in Austria does not succeed in reaching the high levels of academic achievement it might have expected. The test results have led to both greater public awareness and discourse regarding the effectiveness of schooling as well as policy-making decisions to improve results in academic achievement. The results also showed that not all students have the same opportunities to succeed in the school system, which causes particular problems for certain student groups (e.g. low socio-economic background, migrant children).

In Austria's National Education Report 2012 social background and language competences were the two factors which were addressed in detail as significant negative influences on learning results and access to education, as well as in the analysis of standardised test results which were released in November 2012. Both documents are being leveraged to address equity issues on politically neutral ground. Expert lectures on equity are also recorded and made available on Austria's educational video platform BildungsTV and webinars open to all are being planned for the coming school year. The new school quality programme for compulsory schools ("SQA" in grades 1-9) focuses on the learning of all students as a central quality issue.

Under the current Minister of Education, equity is central in several reform efforts. A newly established Department for Diversity in the Ministry has brought together all ministerial offices related to diversity and is focused on inclusion in policy, research and practice. Equity is also a main driving force of the lower secondary school reform in Austria. The "Neue Mittelschule" (NMS) was piloted 2008-2011 and mandated in April 2012. The new school form suspends tracking in compulsory lower secondary schools, although the fundamentally selective two-track system (4-year compulsory schools and 8-year academic-track schools) is still in place and requires parents to choose a school type for the lower secondary. Intensive support and adequate resources for the NMS reform and implementation are provided on all system levels.

Leadership Education
In 2012/13 the National Center for Learning Schools was established to coordinate these efforts and continue development of the NMS. Equity is a central topic of the Center's national network meetings and qualification programmes. In addition to focused qualification in diversity and equity for the so-called Lerndesigners, a new teacher leadership role introduced with the reform, all NMS school heads attend at least one national learning atelier or symposium per year with their Lerndesigners. In the current school year, the influence of social background and academic language competence were the main focus of all national events for the NMS.

School heads have to go in for a probation period of four years, during which they are required to attend a 2-year part-time school management course. The successful completion paves the way for permanent
appointment provided. In the national course curriculum (12 ECTS), the following content is stipulated: Leadership and Communication, Conflict Management, School Development (Development of teaching, staff and organisation, Quality Management), School and Public Service Law, ICT Management and E-Learning).

The concrete needs of the school heads in their specific situation is dealt with in further, optional modules: Administration and school administration, staff meetings, discussion leading and presentation, time and personal management, PR, Quality development, etc. In addition, there are practice-based elements including forms of collegial coaching, which have an essential contribution to make to mutual support of the role of head. The initial training course is concluded by a project and the public presentation thereof.

When looking at the curricula of the school management programmes, references to equity and learning are not given directly. The topic is more indirectly dealt with in the national quality programme SQA (general education) and QIBB (vocational education), where school heads have to deal with learning and development of individual students from an inclusive perspective.

School principals and teacher leaders attend training and orientation programmes for the implementation and development of quality processes on the school level. A new master degree programme in school management will start at three higher education institutions in Austria, which will deal with particular approaches to diversity. Diversity competence is central in the teacher education reform (PädagogInnenbildung NEU), which will be mandated this year and result in new curricula at teacher education institutions. In addition, the Leadership Academy for school principals and system leaders integrates the issue of equity by its leadership for learning approach. Nonetheless, what Andreas Schleicher of the OECD has described as a “firewall between policy design and policy-making” is a phenomenon in education policy in Austria. On all levels, the implementation of evidence-informed policy and fostering of evidence-informed practice pose significant challenges for system developers.

2. Denmark
Lejlf Moos

The political landscape
The Government, and here first and foremost the Ministry of Finances; Local Government, representing the municipal employers of education and care institutions; the Danish Regions, employers of the hospitals, and the big trade unions, see all middle- or institutional leaders of ‘welfare’ services as one, homogenous group that can do with the same kind of education.

The Government was working on a major restructuring of the public sector that meant merging municipalities so instead of 271 there was 98 in 2007. This reform can be seen also in the light of the on-going effort to align Danish governance to the OECD’s New Public Management trends that intends to adapt public governance to neo-liberal Market Place logics of Globalization. It meant that school principals position in the public chain of governance was being changed: Relations were both loosened as school were transformed into organizations with some autonomy (within finances, operations and personal management) and at the same time relations were tightened with the demand for more control and reports on student’s outcomes (on curriculum, national standards and test).

Leadership education from 2003
From 2003 some of the CVUs (Institutions for Continuous Education) offered a Diploma in Leadership (DIL: 60 ECTS) and this education was in 2009 supplemented/substituted with another diploma, the Diploma of Public Leadership (DOL). The new Diploma of Leadership’ (DOL) is subsidised by the Government through municipalities, so course fees are lower (approximately € 10.000 for the full diploma). 12 university colleges and academies were accredited to offer the full diploma.
The following description takes as its point of departure the situation at the University College Copenhagen, UCC, but will also relate it to the general situation.

The ‘Diploma of Leadership’ is built of 6 compulsory, 3 optional and one dissertation module. The compulsory modules (5 ECTS each) are:

- Personal leadership: Leadership and communication
- Personal leadership: Professional leadership
- Leadership and staff: Leadership in dynamic relations
- Leadership and staff: Leadership in learning- and competences-relations
- Leadership and organisation: Organisation and processes
- Leadership and organisation: Organisation, governance and strategy

There are 3 Optional modules (each 5 ECTS). Each institution is certified to a number of certified modules. UCC can offer 20-30 modules.

The dissertation is individual within the aims and frames of the education (15 ECTS) and will normally include empirical investigations with theoretical analyses.

The courses are described in curricula and study guides, following the competences format: Purpose, aims (knowledge and understanding, skills and competences) and content.

Instruction in each module is given over 4 full days plus 2 study days, equalling 33 lessons pr. module. Normally two modules are given pr. semester/half year, like 1 and 2, 3 and 4, 5 and 6. A full diploma will therefor include approximately 60 full days over a period of 2 1/2 - 3 years. Adding to this is the individual studies of at least 500 pages of literature from the curriculum list.

The approach to teaching the modules can vary from one provider to the other. In UCC it is described as ‘didactic’:

'We are focusing on you investigating your practice and that you gain experiences from your practice in order to qualify and develop your practice. This is the reason why we decided not to follow only one theoretical approach. We want you to be able to shed critical light on and analyse practice on the basis of diverse theories. We call our approach for the eclectic approach.' (From study guide for Personal leadership, UCC)

UCC has a special diploma for school leadership. The compulsory modules are identical to the 'standard' diploma, - with standard curriculum and learning material - but the choice of modules is restricted to three modules within the specific institutional/professional area, like school. Those can be modules like: 'Educational leadership', 'Quality assurance and development and evaluation of the school', 'Leading leadership teams in schools'.

for equity and learning
When reading the description/curricula for this diploma, it is hard to find references to educational aims like equity and learning.
3. Estonia
Hasso Kukemelk

Why: The principal is responsible for teaching and learning process and other activities in school, the general state and development of the school (included staff), and for the legitimate and expedient use of financial resources.

Who: Tartu and Tallinn Universities offer special complex courses (240 hours/ 9 ECP of management training) → „Legal, Political and Economic Basics of the Management of an Educational Institution“. Tuition fees of courses are paid by candidates or by schools.

When: Usually before applying to the school head's position. Some cases a person is elected to the position (usually having long leadership experience in another field) and then starting the courses.

What: Leadership theories and practices, legal issues, school curriculum development, school finances, staff development, school improvement. Many good practices.

How: Open University system during a year.

Could you describe how equity and learning plays out in policy and how it is linked to school improvement?
In policy schools are equal based on local authorities governing. As financial possibilities are different in different local communities, then schools' possibilities to offer the best education to children are different. It is linked to school improvement directly too.

4. France
Romuald Normand

Why
The idea of equity is in progress in France according to the last PISA results which showed a gap in the achievement of pupils, particularly in the first stages of learning, compared to other countries. Dropouts are also at stake and a source of concerns for policy makers. The notion of equity is largely embedded in an attachment of educators to the reduction of inequalities by the transmission of knowledge and equality of treatment in school provision. Teaching and guidance are more at the centre of school administration than learning by itself. Legalism and republican ethos is strongly embedded in the mind of principals and inspectors who share a common post-bureaucratic culture and vision. The challenge is to change the organisation of schools to make them more autonomous, flexible, and open to stakeholders, networking and partnerships. The strict division between administration, pastoral care, and teaching impedes the development of horizontal relationships focused on learning and supporting pupils. Loose-coupled activities, despite some innovations in some schools, are the quotidian of many schools. So challenges are important to develop assessment and accountability, professional development and intermediary functions, to sustain school improvement and to train principals for taking and distributing responsibilities in the management of teaching and learning.

Who
The education of principals belongs to one institution: the Ecole Supérieure de l'Education Nationale (ESEN) which is a national college for the training of principals and inspectors. The ESEN is supervised directly by the French ministry of education (its department of human resources) and it defines its content and training schemes according to the ministry's regulations and priorities in education policy. Some Masters of management exist in universities (department of education sciences) but they do not have the same legitimacy (and legacy) because the recruitment and selection of principals/inspectors is made through a “concours” (selected exam to access to the position of civil servants) and the preparation for this concours is made by departments of further training within education local authorities. Only teachers (and pastoral carers) can take this exam after 5 years of seniority. In primary schools, the principal is a peer among the teachers selected directly by the body of inspection (there is no concours). Education of principals and "pedagogical advisers", helping inspectors in the support of
schools in the primary sector, is made by local authorities, in partnership sometimes with universities (Graduate Schools of Education).

**When/How**

The training of principals/inspectors is made just after the “concours” at the ESEN through a short period of days when they are grouped by regions and the rest of the year they have to complete their service as deputy-principal in a school. They benefit from a local training by the local authority before the start of the new school year in their school and also from in-service training in another school. They have to make a training course in a company and abroad (or to realize a study on a foreign education system).

**What**

The training of principals is organized according to 4 principles:

- A common framework on school management, human resources, implementation of education policy, leadership in teaching and student guidance, professional communication, securitization of persons and goods.
- An individualized professionalization based on a negotiation between the trainee and his/her trainers (peers) to define a sequential and personalized plan of learning
- A continuous professional development linking the different scales (school, local authority, ESEN) and stages (preparation, exploitation, knowledge deepening)
- The subsidiarity: the micro-level is considered as the best place for professionalization, the local authority prepares the professional situations, their analysis and formalization, the ESEN is providing higher levels of knowledge and skills.

According to equity and learning issues, the principal have to promote republican values, ethos of public services and equality of opportunity, and to support the individualized learning of each student, to facilitate teachers to differentiate their practices, to implement devices to support student learning, to develop the assessment of students, to work in partnership with inspectors, to validate the student basic skills as a certification, to animate the "pedagogical board" in the school to facilitate school improvement. Beyond these formal expectations, the French principal does not much intervene on teaching and learning issues even if the law has devolved some extensive powers during the last years as "pedagogical and educative steering". However, principals are trained to develop self-evaluation of schools and it could impact in the future on professional practices and it could initiate the beginning of a sort of transformational leadership.

**5. Germany**

Wolfgang Meyer

The Legal and Institutional Framework in Germany

In the Federal Republic of Germany the responsibility for the education system is determined by the federal structure of the state. The German constitution grants the sixteen states full responsibility for school education and this has led to significant differences in shaping the education systems of the Länder.

We find descriptions of the role and tasks of the school head in more or less detail in all state legislations. Mainly the position of the school head is defined, generally listing tasks and responsibilities in some detail.

Only the legislation of the state of Saarland mentions equity in the context of duties allocated to the school head. The head is expected to intervene when the equity of chances does not exist.
Educating School Leaders
In Lower Saxony the NLQ provides leadership training programmes for school heads, deputy heads and heads of department. Some of the courses are compulsory, as for newly appointed heads, others are voluntary.

Inclusive Education
With the ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in 2009, the right to inclusive education in the general education system defined in Article 24 has become legally binding in Germany. Article 24 postulates the right to inclusive education and the attendance of regular schools for disabled children.

About 80 percent of all children with special educational needs are taught in special schools, only about 20 percent attend a regular school. However, there are large differences among the federal states. While in Bremen and Schleswig-Holstein 36 and 45 percent of children with special educational needs attend a regular school, 7 percent in Lower Saxony and 12 percent in Hesse do so.

Lower Saxony Leadership Training for Inclusive Education
The programme comprises three modules and has been implemented in different regions of Lower Saxony to foster the cooperation of school heads in the sense of system leadership. The heads work on topics like analysing the status quo in their schools, they are trained in various aspects of change management and how to encourage and coordinate teamwork. The third module is about inclusive concepts of teaching and learning.

Social Justice
Currently there is an intensive discussion in Germany about social injustice and the lack of equity in education. The Vodafone Foundation Germany has just published a survey that was conducted by the renowned Allensbach Institute for opinion and market research. The study gives a voice to those who are often unheard in the discourse on education - students and teachers - and focuses on social mobility, educational goals, opportunities and equity for students from different socio-economic backgrounds.

61% of the teachers feel that, due to their different social backgrounds, children have no equal opportunity of chances. Whereas in all societies the social background influences cultural interests and patterns of behavior (like reading behavior), in Germany the influence of social heritage is much stronger than elsewhere.

Both teachers and parents agree: deficits in the parental home are the main reason for some children having poorer opportunities than others. Above all, 84 percent of teachers and 79 percent of parents stress the lack of interest on the part of parents in engaging with their own children. Teachers and parents also mention shortcomings in pupils' upbringing in respect of working conscientiously (77/76 percent), parents' failure to act as role models for their children (75/78 percent) and a lack of time on the part of parents to spend with their children (69/65 percent) as the main reasons.

This study – as various OECD publications before – points to considerable challenges for the education system in Germany. Instead of shifting the responsibility to parents from lower socio-economic backgrounds for “deficits” in supporting their children, schools should provide equal opportunities for all children regardless of their social background. This is a major field of work for political decision-makers, education authorities, school leaders, teachers and, last but not least, researchers.

References
OECD (2011a), Equity and Quality in Education: Supporting disadvantaged students and schools, OECD Publishing.

6. Greece
Andreas Kollias

In Greece there is no undergraduate university programme of studies specifically dedicated to prepare future school leaders (at ISCED levels 5). Within the programmes of studies of university departments in the wider field of education (particularly those preparing primary education teachers) there are courses related to school management and administration.

At ISCED level 6 there is one related MA programme offered by the University of the Aegean, Department of Sciences of Preschool Education and Educational Design, entitled "Educational Models and Development of School Units" (75 ECTS). The department of Home Economics and Ecology of Harokopio University, in the context of its postgraduate programme “Education and culture”, offers a specialty on “Administration and Management of Educational Units” (152 ECTS). In the academic year 2012-3 it enrolled 19 students. The department of elementary education of the University of Western Macedonia offers a specialty programme entitled “Pedagogics and New Technologies” which leads to the postgraduate specialty diploma entitled “Modern teaching methods-Education of Educators-Educational policy and administration of education”. In the academic year 2012-3 this programme enrolled 9 students. The department of elementary education of the University of Thessaly offers a postgraduate programme entitled “Organisation and Administration of Education” (since 2005-6) (90 ECTS). In academic year 2011-2 it enrolled 30 students. The Department of Philosophy, Education and Psychology of the University of Athens offers a postgraduate programme entitled "Theory, Praxis and Evaluation of Educational Work" (120 ECTS). Among the 7 specialties offered one is entitled “Educational Policy and Education Administration”. In the academic year 2012-3 it enrolled 14 students. The Hellenic Open University (HOU) also offers a short training programme on “School Units Management” (22 ECTS). Also non-formal training programmes are occasionally available. Overall, the opportunities and choices available for postgraduate studies in topics related to the education and training of school leaders in Greece are rather very limited.

The relative lack of availability of formal programmes for the preparation of school leaders in Greece can be briefly explained on the basis of the legislative frameworks governing a) the procedures and criteria for the selection of public education primary and secondary school leaders (officially identified as school principals and deputy principals, and principals and deputy principals of laboratory structures) and the teaching staff working in middle and top education management/administration...
posts, b) the duties and responsibilities of school leaders as defined by the related Ministerial Decrees\(^1\) and c) the wider excessive centralization of education administration.

Public education school leaders are appointed by the regional education authorities on the basis of a public procedure involving objective (prior experience and qualifications) and subjective criteria (interview). Prospective school leaders have to be members of the permanent teaching staff employed by the Ministry of Education and have at least 8 years of employment in the education sector, of which at least 5 years in a teaching post. Regarding their qualifications, teachers-prospective school leaders do not earn extra credits in their selection procedure if they have got formal or non formal education and training specifically on school management (see Article 13 & 14 of Law No. 3848\(^2\)). In particular, prospective primary school leaders are getting credit for a PhD or a Masters degree in “organization and management of education” but also for a PhD or a Masters degree in “education sciences”. The implication is that a candidate with a PhD in educational computing or didactics of mathematics gets the same credits as a candidate with a PhD in school management. Regarding secondary education school leaders (Gymnasiums, General Lyceums, Vocational Lyceums and Schools, and School Labs) the criteria are widened to include not only advanced degrees (Masters or PhD) in education studies but also advanced degrees in any specialty area among those taught in these education levels. The implication is that, on the basis of the Ministry’s of Education criteria for the selection of school principals, a PhD or Masters degree in school management counts the same with a similar level degree in programming or literature when it comes to secondary education schools. Therefore, there is no specific demand from teachers who want to become principals for formal education (ISCED level 5 & 6) studies in school management. Furthermore, non-formal education and training certificates in school management are not getting more credits than other education-related certificates of the same duration. Regarding their prior experience, teachers-prospective school leaders earn most of their credits from their years in employment as teachers (8 out of max. 14 credits) and some credits from their years spent in an education administration/school inspection post. The selection procedures to such posts, as with the principal’s post, do not require or give priority to those with a formal qualification or some kind of formal and/or non-formal training on education administration/management and leadership. Overall, the education administration posts from individual schools to local, regional and central administration units of the Ministry of Education are staffed by teachers, the vast majority of whom have never been properly trained on education administration/management, let alone leadership. In order to address this reality, Law No. 3848 (article 11) defined that prospective school leaders should have obtained Level 1 (basic) certificate on ICT and have a certificate on “administrative competence” that can be obtained after participating in a respective training programme to be offered by the National School of Public Administration and Local Government. From the academic year 2012-3 this National School started offering a "short" version of a training programme to local and regional education administration directors. A Ministerial Decree in June 2012\(^3\) defined the thematic units of the complete “theoretical” training, lasting 96 hours, as follows:

- Human resources management in education
- Organisation and administration of education as modern organization
- Evaluation in education

---

\(^1\) Government Gazette No. 1340, 16/10/2002 (353.1./324/105657/A1); No. 1180, 6/8/2010 (841/72/ΙΒ ΥΑ).

\(^2\) Government Gazette No. 1439, 71/Α’/19.5.2010.

• Legal rules in administrative action in education
• Legislative framework in primary and secondary education
• Educational policy – European dimension in education

It should be noted that prospective trainees to this programme should have been employed for at least 7 years in public education (and no more than 32) and have already obtained the Level 1 (basic) certificate on ICT. The practical training will last 80 hours and will involve practice in administrative posts.

School leaders, according to the formal description of their duties and responsibilities defined by Ministerial decrees, are expected to undertake both administrative and pedagogic duties and responsibilities. Among the articles of the 2002 decree defining the tasks and general duties of school principals some are directly referring to readership roles, such as “to guide the school community in setting high targets…”, “undertakes initiatives of educational and pedagogic character…”, “…encourages the initiatives of teachers, inspires and provides positive motivation”, “… to undertake initiatives that contribute to the nurturing of free, responsible, democratic and concerned citizens”, “undertakes initiatives … to help new teachers in their teaching duties”. On the other side, school principals are not allowed to introduce changes to the typical school curriculum (attainment targets, subject matters, content to be covered and teaching hours), cannot choose the teachers employed in the school (these matters are exclusively at the hands of the Ministry of Education) and do not have budgets to manage. Among their duties that directly refer to matters of equity is the distribution of pupils in classes “…according to the principles of pedagogy, with no social exclusion”. The 2002 Ministerial decree does not directly mentions that among the responsibilities of principals should also be to improve the academic performance of pupils or to ensure that every pupil in the school has equal chances to improve in their learning irrespective of his/her family background. Finally, and more importantly, the 2002 Ministerial decree does not include among the duties of the school leaders the formulation of a whole school development plan. Overall, school principals are only partially expected to actually lead their school and there is no accountability on their behalf regarding their school's overall academic achievement or equity in learning outcomes.

A deeper explanation of the lack of education and training programmes for school leaders in Greece can historically be attributed to the excessive centralisation of the education system. This system has traditionally been justified on the basis that it ensures equity in learning opportunities and outcomes because each and every school in the country is in principle no better or worse than other schools, given that all schools teach the same things, from the same schoolbooks, in the same pace, with the same quality of human or other resources. Under this logic, giving more power to schools to define what they want to do and how they want to do it and consequently introducing public accountability and competition among schools for resources from the central or regional authorities on the basis of their “performance” would result in pupils in different schools having unequal opportunities for learning and academic progress. On the same line of reasoning, training teachers to become school leaders under a management for outcomes mentality is a rather controversial issue in the context of political party antagonisms in public debates on education. This is because promoting the idea that schools need leadership on the one hand would unavoidably challenge the monopoly of political power of the central government and on the other hand would challenge the status quo in schools.

7. Latvia
Inta Baranovska, Guntra Kaufmane

WHY? Socioeconomic developments in the world and in the country call for changes in education policy and in the ways it is implemented. In recent years school leaders in Latvia have experienced numerous new developments, e.g., changing paradigms in education, shift from centralization to decentralization, information and communication technologies in education, etc. School leaders have to be able to meet
the challenges of the 21st century education. To respond successfully to rapidly changing environments, schools need to learn at least as quickly as the prevailing rate of change, otherwise they are forever playing catch up. School leaders have to look for new solutions to lead and manage education institutions. This challenge demands fresh, innovative and creative approaches as well as new competences to manage change.

Parents expect the schools to provide high quality education for their children. If a school does not meet these expectations it must be able to change and offer positive developments. These changes depend to a great extent on school leaders. Their role in attaining key education goals and providing opportunities for all students to learn in inclusive environment should not be underestimated.

WHO? Education law stipulates the responsible bodies for the provision of teacher and school heads continuing professional development activities. The Cabinet of Ministers regulates Procedures for the Improvement of Teachers' Professional Competences and the Ministry of Education and Science is responsible for managing implementation of professional development activities. According to the Cabinet Regulations all educators have to participate in further education to improve their professional competences not less than 36 hours during a three year period. This amount of professional development hours is financed by the government. Cabinet Regulations stipulate that CPD programs up to 36 hours ("A" type program) can be delivered by different bodies – Ministry agencies, universities, LLL centres, NGOs, schools, etc. CPD programs designed for 72 hours or more ("B" type program) could be implemented only by teacher training institutions. To ensure program quality all CPD programs should be coordinated with the Ministry.

CPD programs can consist of several modules and school heads can choose modules from different programs to design CPD activities to their own needs. Besides the traditional CPD program activities school heads can participate in seminars, conferences, projects, non-formal education programs and collect up to 12 hours in a so called 'Self-improvement and experience module'.

During the last three years different professional development opportunities for school leaders are offered in the frames of several European Social Fund projects.

WHEN? School leaders can participate in professional development opportunities offered by different CPD programs and projects. Training activities are organized in different times so that school leaders can select the most appropriate for them.

WHAT? Cabinet Regulations on Procedures for the Improvement of Teachers' Professional Competences outline the main CPD areas - innovations in: education and profession; in a subject and subject teaching methods; in psychology; in classroom management; in special and inclusive education; in bilingual education; in applying ICT; in educational management; in school management; and in school quality evaluation.

HOW? Program providers practice many different ways of CPD program implementation. The traditional way is a program consisting of theoretical and practical part in proportion 40:60. Recently this traditional approach has been displaced by alternative professional development opportunities. For example, 1-3 day practical workshops for school leaders “Meeting the challenges of the 21st century education – how to make a tomorrow school today”. These workshops deal with innovations in quality management related to school self-evaluation and development planning as well as creating inclusive and supportive environment in school. During CPD activity “A school teaches a school” school teams exchange and learn from each other experience and seek for solutions to common problems. Another CPD activity “School leaders learning group” is dealing with analysis and improvement of work.
Besides the above mentioned CPD activities there are also learning environment for school heads "Director Club" initiated by Swedbank Latvia. The aim of the club is to improve school leaders' competences for strengthening school capacity and ensuring better learning environment for students. This initiative promotes cooperation among school leaders and taking over the best practice from enterprises. This is an opportunity for school leaders to receive support in managing change at school.

Education Centre of Riga City Council provides tailored CPD activities for school leaders from Riga. The two most popular are: summer schools for the potential and already working school leaders; and shadowing of experienced school leaders.

Could you describe how equity and learning plays out in policy and how it is linked to school improvement?

In Latvia education equity and quality issues have always been on policy agenda. In 2010 amendments to the Education Law introduced a new section Prohibition of Differential Treatment. It says: “Every person has the right to acquire education regardless of the material and social status, race, nationality, ethnic belonging, gender, religious and political affiliation, state of health, occupation and place of residence.” The Education Law also states: “if the prohibition of differential treatment or the prohibition to cause unfavourable consequences is violated, a person has the right to request elimination of the violation, to receive legal assistance in accordance with the Ombudsman Law, as well as to bring an action to the court. A person has the right to request compensation for losses and remuneration for moral detriment. In the case of dispute the amount of moral detriment shall be determined by the court upon preference thereof.”

General Education Law in section 49 Special Education Programmes determines the purpose of special education: “Special education shall create the opportunities and circumstances for students with special needs to acquire an education appropriate to their health condition, skills and level of development in any educational institution, concurrently ensuring the pedagogical psychological and medical adjustment of the student and his or her preparation for working and living in society.”

By establishing an Inclusive education reform group in the Ministry of Education and Science in 2011 many important initiatives, including those from previous years, have been taken forward. It is expected that terms like 'inclusive education', 'school support team', 'individual learning plans', 'assistant teacher', etc., will not only be defined in the Education Law, but also appropriate financing for implementation of inclusive education initiatives will be made available.

One of equity considerations require that pupils with special educational needs are educated in regular, mainstream classrooms rather than in segregated settings. In Latvia number of pupils with special needs included in mainstream classrooms is increasing year by year: In school year 2010/2011 - 1591 pupils were included in regular classrooms; in 2011/2012 - 2495; and in 2012/2013 - 3219. Another example is the recent initiative from the Ombudsman of the Republic of Latvia to integrate Roma pupils into mainstream classes rather than organize teaching learning process in classes for Roma pupils only.

Every school aspires to provide its pupils with high quality education by constantly and purposefully improving its performance. A vital role in assuring the quality of this performance is played by an ongoing and systematic internal and external evaluation. Both processes are directed towards development and improvement of the school’s performance. Quality of education is not only an internal affair of a school. Responsibility for a high quality education must be assumed by all the stakeholders.

School quality evaluation system in Latvia is in place since 2004. Evaluation methodology was developed based on two closely interrelated evaluation dimensions – school self-evaluation and school external evaluation with an overall aim to improve quality of education.
School performance in Latvia is evaluated in seven key areas: Curriculum; Attainment; Teaching and learning; Support for Pupils; Ethos; Resources; Management, leadership and quality assurance.

Equity issues are dealt with in most key areas, but directly they are addressed in the key area Support for Pupils. To evaluate this key area the five following evaluation domains are established: Health care, safety, social assistance; Support in personality development; Career guidance; Support for the learning process; Support for pupils with special needs.

It can be said that school improvement has contributed not only to quality but also to equity in education, because improvement to a great extent depends on what we decide needs to be improved.
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8. Lithuania
Danguole Salavejiene

A breakthrough in school leadership is expected by implementing the project “Time for the Leaders”, which was initiated by the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania in 2009. This project is implemented by Education Welfare Centre together with the partners: School Development Centre, ISM University of Management and Economics, as well as scientists of other Lithuanian universities.

During the implementation of the project “Time for the Leaders”, the idea that primarily an education leader is a learning leader is introduced to Lithuanian education community; this leader must be ready to guide through the learning process, guide and manage people as well as an organisation. The project is based on the idea of leadership for the sake of learning; it means that the leadership for supporting learning is the establishment of challenging and equal conditions for the students, specialists and the whole system, where leaders persistently and publicly concentrate their own and others’ attention on teaching and learning. The individual level of a person is very important for the idea of leadership for the sake of learning; more specifically - moral values, existing and developing competences, determination and motivation to take responsibility and act accordingly.

Lithuanian universities currently have graduate degree programmes designed to develop leadership competences: “Management and Leadership in Education” in Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences, this is the course for MA in Edcology; „Management and Administration of Educational Institution” in Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences”, this is the course for MA in Management and Business Administration; “Leadership and Change Management” in Mykolas Romeris University, this is the course for MA in Human Resource Management; “Strategic Leadership” in Kaunas University
of Technology, the course for MA in Human Resource Management; “Leadership in Education” in ISM University of Management and Economics, the course for BMA; “Information Management and Leadership” in Vilnius University, the course for MA in Information Services. These programmes are designed for school leaders and teachers.

School leaders and teachers, or their teams who wish to improve their leadership competences in an informal way can choose in-service training courses in Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences, or other educational center.

The informal learning programme "Leadership in Education" under the project “Time for the Leaders” is currently implemented by the project partner ISM University of Management and Economics. The informal learning programme "Leadership in Education" consists of four modules: 1) Leader – an Autonomously Learning Pathfinder; 2) Leader and Followers' Relationship; 3) Leader - a Learning Pathfinder; 4) Leader in a Learning Organization. The introductory module is obligatory for those who want to study in one or several modules of this programme; they discuss the learning structure, requirements, testing frequency and self-managed learning principles in this introductory module.

There are four ways for the informal learning participant to realize this model and seek for evaluation (of education leadership competence acquired by informal learning process), recognition and MA degree:

Way I. The participant undergoes all "Leadership in Education" programme modules and series of tests. After each module the participants receive special certificates with the credits marked. The credits are accumulated and afterwards the MA thesis is defended. The participant receives MA degree after successful thesis defence.

Way II. The accreditation of earlier experience based learning (abbreviation – AP(E)L). In this case the participant gives facts and evidence on the earlier received competences, proves these competences and works on a thesis, after defending it, receives the MA degree. Those who wish to receive the MA degree in AP(E)L form must have BA degree or corresponding education degree; after studies they should have had not less than 100 academic hours of informal learning in programmes corresponding to the model of these studies and have not less than 4 years manager's experience. The candidate meeting these requirements may be registered for the evaluation of competences. If the candidate has all the competences necessary for MA degree, which are rated during the evaluation of competences, and if the candidate’s practical experience corresponds to the scope and nature of practical experience according to the programme modules, the candidate is granted the right to write a thesis and defend it. If the candidate does not meet the requirements mentioned (competences, scope and purpose of practical experience), an individual "compensating" learning programme is created and the consultant appointed. After this programme is completed, once again competences are evaluated. If the evaluation is positive, the candidate is granted the right to prepare MA thesis and defend it.

Way III. A combination of informal, self-managed and formal learning. The person learns in an informal way, does tests as required, but after some module decides to continue learning in a formal way. The credits received in an informal learning way are included into the overall formal learning programme. After finishing the studies, i.e. the necessary number of credits accumulated, the person has the right to write and defend the MA thesis. There is another possible way: the candidate learns in a formal way and after some time decides to finish the remaining modules in the informal learning way.

Way IV. A combination of informal, self-managed and AP(E)L. The candidate learns in an informal way and for part of the modules, provided in the informal learning programme, does the testing in the AP(E)L way. After testing the candidate writes and defends the MA thesis.
9. Netherlands
Huub Friederichs, Robert-Jan Simons

Why
It is the general Dutch view, formulated by the Education Council, that accessibility is the 'regular meritocratic procedure in education'. In other words, performance and capabilities are the leading factors in access to education. In addition, there need to be efforts towards equal opportunities as the core of accessibility policy, a minimum basic standard of attainment for all pupils, and the suitability of pupils should be important as the principle guideline in the selection process. Unjustified performance differences should be bridged and, if necessary, an access policy should be formulated for specific target groups.

In recent years 7 themes have been examined more closely for further improvement:
• learning inside and outside the classroom: cross-links and responsibilities;
• targets and standards as a guarantee for accessibility;
• concentration and segregation within and between schools;
• systemic approaches and exclusion;
• responsibility for accessibility;
• integrated or specific accessibility policy; and
• lifelong learning and accessibility.

Who
In the curricula of the 10 capacity building institutions on school leadership the subject of equity and accessibility to education has been taken care of, mainly in the form of exercising the formulation of school strategies and assignments in carrying out research on professional master level. Also seminars and summits are being organised on this theme.

In this respect: the government tries to accurately analyse which policy instruments can best be deployed. Sometimes this will mean government regulation, other times it will be better to delegate responsibilities and authorities to other stakeholders (school leaders). Apart from legislative measures, the government can also use other control mechanisms, such as inspection, convenants, subsidies, policy documents and consultation.

In general, as the OECD report Education at a Glance 2012 - OECD indicators, shows on page 500 et seq about decision making in the education system, that in the Netherlands many of the coherent organisational/management decisions regarding the further development of equity are taken at school level.
When
In recent years many studies resulting in policy recommendations for government and schools have been carried out.

What
The quality of school leadership is a factor that determines the policymaking capacity of a school. In general the Dutch are in favour of a coherent package of measures to raise the quality of leadership. Measures could include the formulation of professional standards and coaching regarding the expertise on advancing equity for learning in schools. Teachers should be encouraged to work in self-managing teams, for example, or to work together to develop innovative educational/pedagogical practices. It would also be good to strive internally towards a smaller scale, and to reduce large school conglomerates into smaller sub-schools and teams in order to have the right amount of attention towards pupils/students.

It is important, in this context, that the board and management in all education sectors project an image of being at the service of the primary education processes.

How
Like other countries and sectors, the education sector in the Netherlands is struggling with the question as to how it can improve its practical use of the research results regarding methods that have been proven effective. Various factors inhibit the exploitation of scientific research: the view that research is threatening the autonomy of the education world, the additional implementation time required, the fact that effects are often measured on a rather narrow scale and the high costs of research.

We would like to draw your attention to a report of the Education Council: *A school culture that unites.* Here the link is depicted between school culture and fairness, equity, reasonability, acting justly, etc.

10. Poland
Tomasz Kasprzak

Introduction:
The category of “School Leadership” refers in the Polish context mainly to the category of school head teachers. It is almost always tied to individuals, very rarely understood as a group endeavour. Nowadays one of the biggest weakness is lack of the support system for schools leaders. It is a reason why we modified structure of this text.

Legal framework:
A person who stands for the position of a school head teacher must have completed a graduate or post-graduate programme in the scope of management or a qualifying course on management in education. The contents of the training must cover a number of fixed issues (including educational law, ways of designing the programme of an institution, management theory, psychological aspects, school administration). The whole course must cover no less than 210 of learning hours. On the other hand,

---

1 See, for example, [http://www.onderwijsraad.nl/upload/english/publications/infrastructure.pdf](http://www.onderwijsraad.nl/upload/english/publications/infrastructure.pdf)
there are no formal requirements concerning the trainings and professional development of school head teachers, who hold the position, although a school principal who is a teacher, by virtue of being a teacher, is obliged to improve his or her qualifications and develop on an ongoing basis (it is not however specified how). The offer of trainings for head teachers is relatively large – the numerous seminars, conferences, training and courses in various forms – organised by both public institutions, non-government organisations, higher education institutions and commercial institutes. They are very different from one another in terms of the content, teaching methods, duration. It is not popular to organise internship initiatives, real world learning situations, cooperation in groups. Also the quality of the trainings and their usefulness tend to vary, and they do not seem to exhaust the needs of school head teachers.

What:
Qualitative research carried out by the Educational Research Institute (Diagnosis of the demand of school head teachers) indicated that head teachers highly appreciate formal and informal exchange of knowledge, information, good practices with other head teachers. It concerns most of all: management of school as an institution, in particular: with reference to legal issues, human resources management, financial and school infrastructure management. Those areas at the same time were identified as the most problematic ones and such, on which head teachers lack knowledge and information. In general head teachers indicated that they really lacked support in the form of informal networks of exchange of information and experience – places and meetings, during which they could share experiences and look for solutions to problems which they encounter in their everyday work.

Important actors:
The Ministry of National Education is responsible for the most important drafts of acts, as well as regulations related to the functioning of the school principal – with the method of recruitment and dismissal, the requirements posed for principal candidates, the scope of tasks and duties, salaries. In the case of educating school leaders - the Ministry of National Education in 1999 developed the framework programme of a Qualifying Course on Educational Management.

Another important actor in the field of the policy on School Leadership are Teacher Development Centres – institutions, both state and private, that deal with the training of teachers in the most diverse areas – both concerning teaching and core curricula, issues related to legal changes, administration and other issues (there are about 400 centres in Poland).

Graduate or post-graduate (obligatory) programmes for school head teachers are offered by public institutions, non-government organisations, higher education institutions and commercial institutes.

It is also worth stressing that local authorities are obliged to finance development and learning of teachers, including principals-teachers – they need to dedicate at least 1% of the funds dedicated to teacher salaries budget.

Discussions on educating and supporting school leader have been taken up, inter alia, by the Polish Association of Education Managers (Ogólnopolskie Stowarzyszenie Kadry Kierowniczej Oświaty, OSKKO).

New initiatives:
In April 2013 a new project ‘Leadership and management in education – designing and implementing the system of training and development head teacher’ was initiated. This project is run by the Centre for Education Development (CED) and the Jagiellonian University. CED is a national teacher training institution. This project will finish in June 2015. Aims of the project are:
to carry out a diagnosis of the competences of school head teachers, current forms and methods of training and development of school head teachers in Poland and in foreign countries to design 3 models (training, development and supporting models) for school head teachers.

In the framework of the project ‘Leadership and management in education – designing and implementing the system of training and development school head teachers’ CED and the Jagiellonian University plan:

- testing the new model of school head teachers’ training (100 people)
- testing the new model of school head teachers’ development (300 people)
- testing the new model of school head teachers’ support (500 people).

11. Portugal
Carmo Climaco, Ana Paula Silva

Why: The concern with the quality of the education provision and the preparation of school leaders is mirrored, at the political level, in the legislation issued along the last three decades (1991 – 2001 – 2011) focused on the need to respond to the diversified students’ needs, namely the ones that come from poorer social and familiar backgrounds, frequently at risk to drop out, of retention or even schooling evasion. Organizational solutions to increase attendance and achievement were implemented, covering either the number of students per class, or the selection of teachers and class tutors to be in charge of specific programs oriented to improve learning, self confidence, motivation and achievement.

Schools were granted higher levels of autonomy, especially the ones serving socially deprived populations, so that they could find more adjusted solutions for these “priority territories”.

Teachers followed specific training programs (specialized training) focused on curriculum management, didactics and testing aiming at reinforcing their teaching competencies, as well as scientific and pedagogical knowledge. The specialized training courses became part of the continuous education and training of teachers, having in mind either the mainstream students in regular courses, or students with specific learning needs.

Equally, School Heads were offered courses in school management and administration to reinforce their competences as school Heads, stressing the offer of educational management targeting students and local communities, in the perspective of lifelong learning and adults education (Decree-Law 95/97, 23rd April). These courses became requirements for Headship.

The pressure exerted on schools towards teaching and learning improvement as a result of international testing comparisons, which in turn exerted pressure on school leaders to account for students outcomes primarily to families, as well as to local communities, and specifically to municipal councils of education, and to society at large required offer and demand for courses on school management and leadership.

Who: School directors, intermediate leaders, heads of departments, coordinators of class tutors, class tutors, curriculum subject coordinators, project coordinators have been the target populations of new training programs, most of them offered as specialized courses involving Universities, Schools’ Association’s Training Centers, Higher Schools of Education, the Ministry of Education either in partnership with professional training enterprises or through its own central administration services.

When: Along the last three decades, as a consequence of school autonomy, and particularly with the issuing of the Decree-Law 115-A/1998, the Decree-Law 75/2008 and Decree – Law 137/2012.
What: As stated in these documents, the purpose was to grant progressively higher levels of autonomy and make schools organization and governance more flexible and suitable to better teaching and learning, “to greater effectiveness”, “to consolidate an evaluation culture”, “to differentiate the educational offer”, “to transfer competences for the curriculum organization”, classes constitution” (D. L. 137 / 2012). Headship was reinforced and schools became more complex. More responsibilities were assigned to different actors requested to be “strictly professional”, namely the intermediate leaders, as part of an “increased autonomy, involving better conditions for improvement” “and reinforcing the self evaluation and external evaluation cultures” (D.L.137/ 2012).

How: through a broad offer of post-graduating studies, specialized courses (in specific subjects, methodologies and so on) meeting teachers identified professional needs, introducing supervision, monitoring and systematic performance evaluation for students, teachers and school leaders.


“Portugal presents a complex educational situation. On one hand following a very positive evolution, we reached acceptable levels of education in the younger generations, either in terms of access and quality, or in terms of equity, showing a good capacity to recover in almost all domains. On the other hand, the still existing lower levels of education in the less younger population mirror the past educational policies” (p.8).

...It was made necessary to intervene and invest in almost all components of the education system: from buildings, to equipment, social support, teachers' training, System restructuring, responding to a never seen demand for education. Nowadays, educational results are expressive in what concerns quality and equity in education and scientific and technological development. ... The results in the international testing have clearly improved, either in terms of equity (PISA 2009) or in terms of quality, namely in math’s, reading and science in primary education (PIRLS and TIMMS 2011) (CNE Report - 2013, p.9).

“Teachers have been the main constructors of progress in education – the pressure on schools concerning their responsibility for learning, forced new organizational and pedagogical practices, assumed as professional challenges.” (idem, p.10)

12. Slovenia
Majda Cencic, Andrej Koren

Equity and learning outcomes

Why:
Because school is understood as preparation for life and as society in miniature, its basic function being educating children and youth in line with generally accepted social values. In today’s society these should pursue multiculturality, tolerance, patience and coexistence of different social groups (Vršnik 2003, p. 146). While making these values a reality, in school practice we are often confronted with various forms of deviant behaviour that requires the school’s response to different kinds of violating the rights of children and adolescents (Trtnik Herlec, Urh 2006, p. 12). The most frequent form of deviant behaviour in school space is violence appearing in the form of concealed or hidden bullying individual children or groups of children and adolescents or even members of school teaching staff. Primarily intolerance, despise, stigmatisation, cynicism, sarcasm, gossiping, etc. prevail in this. Along with psychical and verbal violence physical and other forms of violence over children and adolescents should not remain unnoticed (ibid., p. 11).
Who:
On national level care for children's rights is in the domain of the office of the Human Rights Ombudsman. Simultaneously a number of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), such as Amnesty International Slovenia (AIS), UNICEF Slovenia, EIP Slovenia – School for Peace, Slovenian Association of Friends of Youth, Association for Nonviolent Communication, TOM – Telephone for children and youth (Trtnik Herlec, Urh 2006, p. 25).

On the level of individual schools headmasters are responsible for the implementation of children's rights. In the area of protecting children’s rights they perform the following basic tasks: preventing violation of the rights of children and youth; taking care of the training of staff on children's rights; taking care of the promotion of human rights; analysing the situation in the area of children’s rights; cooperation with external partners; assuring the functioning of student’s parliament, etc. (ibid., p. 26).

More and more frequently schools decide to set up kind of 'safe points', where children and adolescents are offered safety and assistance in case of being exposed to violent treatment.

What:
Human Rights Ombudsman's annual reports show that in Slovenian schools the following children’s rights are most frequently violated (ibid., p. 39): the right to education; the right to safety and corporal untouchability; the right to freedom of expression; the right to freedom of conscience; the right to privacy, and the right to family life.

With teachers the following rights can be endangered: the right to dignity; the right to privacy; the right to freedom of expression; the right to freedom of conscience; the right to safety and corporal untouchability or; the right to freedom of work.

To parents the following human rights can be violated: the right to responsible and independent parenthood; the right to privacy and the right to family life.

As evident from the report, in Slovenian school practice problems with the protection of human rights are most often related to safeguarding confidentiality, privacy, the right to safety, the right to quality education, the rights of children with special needs and of other children, teachers' communication with parents and with pupils, etc. (ibid., p. 16), also present, however, is the problem of inclusion of all children, especially of those from other language and cultural backgrounds (Trnavčevič 2007). Here the issues arise of the adequacy of language competence of children and adolescents from other environments for undisturbed participation in the teaching and learning process and of teaching staff's training for work with this group of children and adolescents.

How:
An important part of teacher's work consists of introducing learners to children’s rights, duties, responsibilities, and otherness, the themes that are included in the basic school syllabi, e.g. that of the school subject Society (Družba. Učni načrt 2011) taught in the 4th and 5th grade of basic school or in the syllabus of the subject taught in grades 7 and 8 named Civic and patriotic education and ethics (Državljanska in domovinska vزوja ter etika. Učni načrt 2011). This means acting rather on the level of prevention (Trtnik Herlec, Urh 2006, p. 11), while it is also a responsibility of all basic schools in Slovenia to have education plans ready. More often than not these are based on children's and human rights.

Funded partly by the European Social Fund in 2006 a project was carried out at the National school for leadership in education aiming at reducing occurrence of violation of human rights in school. A counsellor also participated in the project as representative of the office of Human Rights Ombudsman (Trtnik Herlec, Urh 2006, p. 11). The purpose of the project was to train school heads and teachers in systematically monitoring and implementing children’s rights in order to reduce the number of
instances of violation of these in school (ibid., p. 15). The following objectives were stated (ibid., p. 2006: 15-16): better knowledge and awareness of children's rights with professional staff in education; training a certain number of school heads, deputy school heads and teachers; developing case studies on which professional staff would be trained in preventing and recognising violation and in acting appropriately; and publicising.

Based on the project results the School for leadership developed new teaching contents for school heads in the area of children's rights and active citizenship (ibid., p. 16). For headship license candidates the National school for leadership in education has carried out the non-obligatory subject Human rights in school environment since 2006 (ibid., p. 27). Training school leaders is per se a contribution to this area, but it is not sufficient. Training teachers is equally important.

So far study programmes for teachers have not contained a specific subject that would explicitly include human rights. At the University of Primorska, Faculty of Education, Koper (UP PEF) students get acquainted with the problem of interculturality in the framework of the subject Interculturality in education carried out in the graduate study programmes Primary school teaching and Educational sciences. The first degree undergraduate study programme Educational sciences also includes the required subject Labour and social law (Pedagoška fakulteta 2013). In order to allow the idea of inclusion to get implemented in practice as well as possible, first of all from the perspective of teachers, the UP PEF also offers second degree postgraduate studies Inclusive Pedagogy.

Discussion on the problems of equity and inequity can also be traced in scientific and periodical print. Skimming various issues of the Sodobna pedagogika – Contemporary Pedagogy (2013) review, we come across articles on concealed gender inequities, cultural differences, immigrant students, Roma, justice in education, etc. Besides this also some books were published on this topic, for example Borota etc. (2011), Sardoč (2011), Trtnik Herlec and Urh (2006).

Training of school leaders
Following international trends in leadership, researches exploring the impact of headteachers on students achievement, and testing results in PISA there is a strong tendency in Slovenia in training headteachers to focus on leading for learning.

Who
National School for leadership in Education as governmental institution established for training leaders in education. It runs different programs for headteachers and other leaders in education in different fields. Leadership for learning is in focus or a hidden agenda in most of the programs.

When
There are three phases in headteachers training in Slovenia: pre-service, instruction phase and In-service lifelong learning. Leading for learning is part of pre-service, instruction phase programmes. In in-service there are three one to two years programmes that are focused on leading for learning an equity.

What
Program: Headship Development
The program is composed of four intertwined methods of work: three three-day modules, one one-day elective activities, mutual advisory work and project work. The goals of the program include:

- Deepen knowledge and develop individual skills for the educational leadership of school;
- Understand the role of the head teacher and modern trends, the needs of political, economic, social, legislative and culturally altered environment in which schools operate;
- Develop skills for self-evaluation and assessment of one's own work, as well as for professional development planning with main focus on the efficiency of school leadership;
• Deepen the understanding and develop a critical view of innovations happening within the school and of participating in local and global trends, consequently ensuring flexibility and comparability of pupils;
• Train participants in order to be able to use, by means of modern analytical methods, the relevant data and research in their planning and decision-making;
• Confront one’s own practice with others in professionals
• Focus leading in learning

Program: Leadership for Learning
The program is intended for head teachers who want to systematically dedicate themselves to the development of leadership for learning.

Head teachers are aware of the fact that obtaining leadership skills for teaching and learning can increase the efficiency of their schools. Thus they encourage the teachers to participate in activities improving teaching and learning while making an important contribution to a better and deeper knowledge of students.

The program enables headteachers to work in groups of 8 to 12 participants and engage in professional discussions on leadership for learning. The results and achievements of the programme are presented to other head teachers at professional conferences and in scientific articles.

Program for Headship certificate
The aim of the program is to promote the professional development of head teachers in order to improve leadership in schools and kindergartens. It is directed at personal professional development. The program participants gain knowledge and skills in the field of professional development and leadership:

• Know trends in the field of leadership and head teachers’ professional development;
• Understand the significance of the professional development of head teachers for leadership and leading learning;
• Understand various forms of professional development and participate in them;
• Ability to critically assess own leadership;
• Ability to plan and monitor own professional development;
• Ability to improve on own professional development and leadership practices;
• Understand the importance of being active in a professional community.

References


13. Spain
Mercedes de la Fuente, Paloma V. Rico Terrón

Why:
Schools need trained and motivating teachers, key to the transformation of the school into a student-centred-learning environment.

For the proper development of the school, a trained leading figure is required, able to manage the school at all levels (pedagogical, educational, administrative and financial), making it a competitive and innovative environment; but, at the same time, capable of fostering social skills and integration. To do this, the leader must bring out the best of every member of the school community, and provide tomorrow's citizens with the quality education they deserve.

Who:
Being aware of this, the Spanish State and specifically the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports, has undertaken a series of measures aimed at this purpose. The MECD wants, thereby, to implement leadership policies conducive to improved educational achievement, lower dropout and, therefore, to the continuity of the students within the educational system, and the improvement in the quality of teaching.

When:
These measures will be held over the coming months, being key to the development, implementation and achievement of the desired objectives.

What:
• The draft law LOMCE, which has been negotiated and agreed by all the education counsellors of all regions.
• Leadership Congress, to be held in the city of Madrid in the last quarter of the year.
• “Autonomy and Cooperation among Schools” Workgroup. It began last March with representatives from all autonomous communities, and it is intended to hold meetings every three months to share ideas.

How:
The draft of the new Organic Law of Educational Quality Improvement (LOMCE), in its article 122a states that: "The education authorities should facilitate the effective exercise of the management role in schools, providing the principals with the necessary management autonomy to promote and develop educational quality actions."

Then, in Articles 133 to 136, the competencies of the principals are more thoroughly defined, along with the selection process, the training required and, if applicable, the appointment and renewal.

This allows to further specify what are the requirements needed to provide the best principals, who will manage schools effectively, by making them quality educational institutions.
Other action for implementing educational leadership carried out by the MECD, is the organization of a congress on Educational Leadership for principals of all educational levels, which will inform, educate and work on the subject. It will address the characteristics and functions of a good leader, such as being accessible to the surroundings, motivate the educational process participants to be more active and, ultimately, create a school for everyone; and of course, it will show good practice that would illustrate it.

Third, an “Autonomy and Cooperation among Schools” Workgroup where leadership plays an important role, has been launched with representatives from all autonomous communities. This working group includes discussion, debate, learning and sharing of knowledge to facilitate the development of the law and the implementation of school leadership and educational autonomy policies, through effective action based on the characteristics of the entire Spanish territory.

Finally, the possibility of creating an online platform that would foster contact between principals and help them to share experiences, concerns, expertise... and to collaborate among schools, is being considered.

14. Sweden
Olof Johansson

Introduction
Even though high-need schools are not specified in Swedish educational policy, policy-makers do seem to think that there are problems with Swedish schools. The status of the educational system is frequently debated in media and schools are clearly on the political agenda: according to the poll survey performed by Swedish television at the national election in 2010, the school issue was rated the most important policy area among voters (Johansson, O, Nihlfors, E and Stark, E, 2013). In addition, there have been a number of educational reforms in recent years. The government has asked a commission to examine their effects on student results (Dir. 2012:53). A first commission report has been published and it states that a lot of the reforms will probably have effects on student results but for instance the new principal training program and the new teacher education program will take another 6 – 8 years before we can measure any effects (SOU 2013:30). There is also an ongoing investigation looking into the effects of the decentralization of schools from the state to the municipalities (Dir. 2012:84). After this short description of today's politics with some views on the contemporary school system and we will focus on the policy development after the Second World War.

Policy advance
The goals for the Swedish school system states that in pre-school and schools we shall together under democratic principles form the further and at the same time show respect and understanding for decisions and ideals of earlier generations. At the same time we must be open for what we need to teach all our children so they can be active as democratic citizens through their life span and in a society that we don’t know so much about but need to be prepared for in order to develop our democratic societies.

This is the model for the modern Swedish school system and it was formulated already in 1946 by the Swedish school commission: “From citizen in a democratic society we must demand an open and critical mind that gives resistance to undemocratic ideas. Democratic states have no use of unselfish masses of people. The democratic schools primary task is to develop free people for which cooperation is a need and creates happiness”.

From this text that were developed during the Second World War and published just after the peace came to Europe we can see that schooling was treated as a moral project. These formulations in the School commissions report are valid still today. Because of that school politics is always present and up for debate in the Swedish society (Johansson, O and Svedberg, L, 2013).
The ideas in the school commission were widely accepted in the parliament but at the time we had a school system that sorted children in relation to their maturity and theoretical skills in relation to different school subjects. It took another 15 years before we could see radical changes in the school system. In the early 1960-thies the school classes became the unit for all school children between year 1 and 9 and we got a 9 years compulsory school for all children. The children were still divided in some subject in relation to their maturity and theoretical skills. And in the new school law and the new curricula we can identify some of the thinking from the school commission. But the biggest change came when a new governing system was introduced in the public sector during 1990-thies. The old regulated system with lots of laws and regulations was abolished and replaced with goals and objectives defined by the political level for each public sector. The new governing system came into the education sector in 1994 when the government issued a curriculum that were adjusted to governing through goals and objectives. This 1994 curriculum clearly introduced that schools should work both with academic and social goals. The curriculum for Swedish compulsory school (where students usually begin at age six or seven and finish at age fifteen or sixteen) is divided into three sections: basic school values and the school mission; general educational goals and guidelines; and syllabuses and knowledge demands. These are determined by the government, except for the knowledge demands, which are injunctions set by the National Agency for Education. When it comes to basic school values, the curriculum states that the educational system shall be based upon democratic values. According to the school act of 2010 the purpose of the educational system is to enable all students to acquire knowledge and values and foster the development and will to learn within all students. The curriculum also states some of these values, such as care for the environment, freedom, integrity, gender equality, solidarity with the less fortunate. It connects principles such as sense of justice, generosity, tolerance and responsibility to “Christian tradition and western humanitarianism" but at the same time states that tuition shall be of non-religious character (Skolverket, 2011. Läroplan för grundskolan: 7). Some principles are emphasized, such as understanding and compassion; objectivity and versatility; and equal education in the sense that the tuition shall be adapted to fit the needs of each student. The curriculum also states the rights and obligations of students and their parents. Education shall be conducted in a democratic manner and students shall be actively involved in planning and evaluating their education (Skolverket, 2011. Läroplan för grundskola: 4) (Johansson, O, Nihlfors, E and Stark, E, 2013).

Principal training

So if this is the ideological background how is the principal training linked to these values. Principal leadership has been a frequent topic of attention in the Swedish school development arena for at least 4 decades. Leadership Training is often described as a key solution to educational shortcomings and is expected to provide a legitimate base for new leadership approaches and new forms for governing and regulating schools in a late modern society. Hence this section focus on the design and experiences in relation to equity and social justice we will concentrate on the background to the new National School Leadership Training Programme for principals that was launched in late 2009.

The Swedish Parliament decided 1986 on a broader integrated programme of principal training, with the State and municipalities being given responsibility for different parts of the training. The municipalities should provide a recruitment training programme and an introduction training programme, the State should provide a National Principals training programme and finally, universities were to give continuation school leader training and master programmes. The purpose was to give principals a thorough understanding of the goals of the school, equip them with leadership skills that would stimulate the development of school activities:

- The recruitment training programme for persons that wanted to become principals. The training should give a broad view of different school leadership functions but have a focus on the national goals for education. The Swedish Parliament’s purpose of introducing this programme also had three other goals. They wanted more women to become school leaders,
more recruitment from outside the own municipality and to find good people for the job with other educational backgrounds.

- The introductory training programme was introduced to help new principals during their first years in office. The main part of the education should be focused on the practical and administrative tasks of the principal, but it was also made very clear that the principal should be introduced into pedagogical leadership.

- The National Principals training programme was to be given to all principals after about two years in office. The programme ran during two years and comprised around 30 seminar days. The purpose of the training was to deepen the principals’ knowledge and increase their understanding of the national school system, the national goals for the school and the role of the school in society and the local community.

- The continuation school leader programme can simply be described as university courses for school leaders.

The third programme - the National principal training programme - did function very well and one reason for this is that the State through the National Agency for Schools got the responsibility to organise the principals training and was given sufficient resources to run the programme at different selected universities. The forth type of programmes, academic master courses, have also been given at different universities. Unfortunately these courses have not been able to attract a large number of principals for continued school leader education (Johansson, O, 2001).

In 2007, the new programme was outlined in a committee report – Clearer leadership in schools and preschools – a proposal for a new training programme for principals (Ds 2007:34). They identified the following issues when looking back on the previous programme:

- Legal aspects of managing and leading schools have not been paid enough attention.
- Issues about how the National goals can be followed up and evaluated as a basis for school improvement have not been prioritized enough.
- The differences between the different universities giving the programme are too big.
- The capacity is too small – principals have to wait too long before entering the programme.

On behalf of the Ministry of Education the National Agency for Education commissioned six universities in 2009 to run the programme. The programme which is mainly residential runs over 3 years with 36 meeting days and is open to principals, pre-schools principals and deputy principals who already are in service. For principals appointed after March 2010 it is compulsory to complete the programme within four years. The participants are expected to use 20% of their time studying. The course itself is free of charge, but the participants’ organizations pay residential costs, travel, literature etc.

New cohorts enter the programme twice annually and in May 2013 about 5700 principals and deputy principals were enrolled and of these had about 1900 finished the program. This is approx. 60% of all 8000 principals and deputy principals that exists in Sweden.

The intentions of the New Programme are described as follows Skolverket (2009):

Principals need to understand both their own role and that of the school, share the fundamental values governing how the school works, and be able to transform these values into concrete actions.

The National School Leadership Training Program aims to provide support for head teachers in carrying out their functions. The training program covers three areas of knowledge:

- Legislation on schools and the role of exercising the functions of an authority
- Management by goals and objectives
- School leadership
These areas of knowledge are crucial for the practical implementation of school leadership. They are closely linked to each other, and head teachers must be able to manage them simultaneously since they form parts of a complex interacting system.

The area Legislation on schools and the role of exercising the functions of an authority covers the provisions laid down in laws and ordinances. Emphasis is also put on how the school's assignment is formulated in the national goals. The knowledge area Management by objectives and results covers measures for promoting quality which are required for the school to achieve the national goals of the education, and create the conditions for its development. The knowledge area School leadership covers how the work should be managed based on the national tasks of the head teacher and the principles set out in the steering system for bringing about development in line with greater goal attainment.

In relation to each of these arias above knowledge goals are formulated but in this context it is more important that there are also goals formulated in relation to:

Skills and abilities
On completion of the training, the head teacher shall:
• demonstrate the ability to apply knowledge of applicable legislation in the school area, as well as making assessments, and
• demonstrate the ability to communicate and apply knowledge of existing legislation in the school area.
• demonstrate good ability to explain the goals of the school, make these clear, and transform them into concrete actions,
• demonstrate good ability to communicate the national goals,
• demonstrate good ability to use different tools and methods to follow up and evaluate results of their own school,
• demonstrate good ability to compile, analyze and interpret the school's results,
• demonstrate good ability as the head and leader of school personnel in managing and delegating work in order to maximise the learning and development of pupils,
• demonstrate good ability as head and leader to motivate, initiate and manage the school's development processes in a strategic way in order to encourage the interest of school personnel in learning and development,
• develop the ability to manage and resolve conflicts,
• demonstrate the ability to communicate future plans and visions;
• demonstrate good ability as the head and leader to motivate, initiate and manage the school's development processes in a strategic way in order to encourage the interest of school personnel in learning and development,
• demonstrate the ability to apply the principle of the equal value of all people.

Assessment ability and approaches
On completion of the training, the head teacher shall:
• demonstrate the ability to make assessments in the area of school legislation with respect to the legal security of pupils, and relevant scientific, societal and ethical aspects.
• demonstrate good leadership abilities to integrate the school's daily work with pupils' results and development of quality in the school,
• demonstrate the ability to evaluate and communicate the school's results as a basis for further development,
• demonstrate good ability as a leader to provide explicit focus on the national assignment of the school,
• demonstrate good ability as a leader and provide a democratic model to pupils and personnel by creating an open communicative climate,
• demonstrate ability as a leader clearly emphasizing the importance of cooperation,
• demonstrate ability as a leader by involving the participation of pupils and parents in the work of the school,
• demonstrate good ability as a leader by giving appropriate prominence to the values laid down in the school’s steering documents.

In Sweden it is more and more obvious how education is negotiated and conditioned in and between three dimensions: politics – profession; national intentions – local conditions and public education – private education. The governing of schools has drifted from government towards governance, i.e. more interactive processes are being introduced with a new focus on performance measures. These radical changes of the educational scene call for another approach to train principals.

We will mention three good examples of special training for principals so they should be able to handle ethical matters better. Our first example dates about ten years back in time the principal training Centres at the universities were asked by the national Agency for schools to plan and do courses in relation to the basic democratic values in the curriculum. These courses were given over a period of four years and were very successful and the purpose was that this subject focus should be integrated into the regular principal training programs. The next example of special training courses were training of principals on relation to how different value systems, beliefs and perceptions can create different dilemmas for school leaders and educators in relation to how honour-related problems are interpreted and handled in school. Our third example is related to old phenomena that have changed in character. Sweden has during the last 50 years always had immigrated children in our schools but the number has lately increased a lot and the administration and the political level has also identified a new growing group of young immigrants that still are school children and they are coming without their parents. And again the Principal Centre’s are asked to provide education for the new situation.

These three examples all build on administrative and political belief that good and informed school leadership is part of the solution for different challenges to our democratic system. We can against this background argue for that there is a clear interest in the Swedish society to link school actions to the ideas formulated after the Second World War: From citizen in a democratic society we must demand an open and critical mind that gives resistance to undemocratic ideas. Democratic states have no use of unselfish masses of people. The democratic schools primary task is to develop free people for which cooperation is a need and creates happiness.
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15. United Kingdom


UK legislation on equality
The United Kingdom (UK) constitutes four nations: England, Northern Ireland, Scotland, and Wales. Consequently, as far as school leadership is contingent on political, economic social and cultural contexts, a generic perception on school leadership in relation to equity and learning is difficult to determine in the UK. This is largely because systems of governance and regulation (i.e. the
arrangements for planning, funding, quality-assurance, regulating learning, and local administration) are differentiated. In Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales there are policy-making institutions and administrative bodies with differing degrees of autonomy from the UK Parliament in the development and implementation or education policy and training.

In terms of legislation related to equality there are, however, statutory imposed legal obligations to which educational providers have a duty comply, such as the Equality Act 2010, which applies to England, Wales and Scotland (Section 153 of the act enables the Welsh and Scottish ministers to impose specific duties on certain Welsh and Scottish public bodies through secondary legislation). The primary purpose of the Act is to consolidate the complicated and numerous Acts and Regulations, which form the basis of anti-discrimination law in Great Britain. This legislation has the same goals as the four major EU Equal Treatment Directives, whose provisions it mirrors and implements. The Equality Act 2010 includes a specific chapter on education and a sub-section on schools. This sub-section places legal obligations on the responsible body of the school (for example the local authority, governing body, proprietor) not to discriminate on grounds of race, gender, disability, religion, belief and sexual orientation in terms of pupil admission and treatment, the way it provides education, the way it affords access to a benefit, facility or service, or excluding the pupil from the school. In Northern Ireland there exists a separate range of statutory anti-discrimination legislation these include: the Sex Discrimination (Northern Ireland) Order 1976; Disability Discrimination Act 1995; Race Relations (Northern Ireland) Order 1997.

Ostensibly, school leaders in the United Kingdom are bound by the above equality legislation, which is intended to inform and guide the professional decisions they make and the delivery of education in schools. Further, professional associations and trade unions in the UK (such as the National Association of Head teachers in England) may provide advice and guidance to schools on the drafting of their own equal opportunities policy to assist in their alignment with the national policy. The aim is that the adoption of a school-based policy will help the school identify, prevent, and redress unfair discrimination against disadvantaged groups. The school-based policy may include a statement of commitment to equality, detailed policy and procedures for implementation, and how the policy will be monitored, reviewed and evaluated. The drafting of such a policy is not mandatory and therefore without any nationally available data it is not possible to ascertain how many schools in the UK have such a policy or if they are acted upon once in place.

In the context of day-to-day practice, the current effectiveness and ability of school leaders in the UK to address equity and learning is arguably primarily shaped neither by statutory national policy nor school-based policy on equal opportunities, but by the values, vision, commitment and professional standards and skills of school heads. In instances where a more national and local authority controlled system of schooling operates, as in Scotland, prescribed national standards are available (implicitly/explicitly addressing notions of equity and learning), against which heads may benchmark their leadership qualities. Scotland has 32 Local Authorities that administer and run state education in a comprehensive system.

Professional learning is built on the professional review process. This process involves teachers self-evaluating against the professional standards, developing as enquiring practitioners and evaluating the impact of their professional practice, ideally supported by trained mentors. To this end, Education Scotland operates a national database of professional learning opportunities; including those which encompass training on themes of inclusion and equity. Further, the Scottish government recently announced an Improvement Partnership Programme which aims to partner schools with similar demographic backgrounds but different academic results to help them learn from good practice.

In England, with a stronger policy emphasis on institutional autonomy, the impetus to address equity and learning resides very much at the level of the individual school. Nevertheless, the national
government is committed to a policy of raising standards, in part by improving the number of students who achieve the expected levels at the end of each key stage of learning. In order to help achieve this goal there is a drive, via school inspection, to ensure that school leaders are accountable for the progress of all pupils. Consequently, the school inspection body Ofsted focuses on the progress of those pupils identified as potentially belonging to vulnerable groups (i.e. those most likely to be at risk of not achieving the expected levels for various reasons) which include: pupils with special educational needs and disabilities; Looked After Children, or who are themselves young carers; pupils eligible for free school meals (and thus from low income families); minority ethnic pupils, including Gypsy, Roma or Traveller children, and all those for whom English is an additional language; lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender pupils; and those who belong to other groups who are vulnerable in particular schools or settings, either because they are in a minority or because their progress raises concerns.

As a result of this emphasis by Ofsted, one of the training programmes offered by the NAHT (2013) is entitled Leading on Learning for Vulnerable Groups - Changes, Challenges and a Chance to do Better. The course identifies the main issues and assists participants, through presentations, question and answer sessions, and small group discussions, to consider how a school might become more effective in meeting the needs of all its pupils, and especially those from vulnerable groups.

The availability of such training throughout the UK, whilst commendable, is voluntary and does rely upon individual senior leaders identifying a need and deciding to enrol. Moreover, it should be emphasised that the provision of senior leader training on equity related themes in comparison to other areas of school concern is relatively limited. In a highly devolved system such as England’s – with no nationally collated data or evidence-based research - it is very difficult to ascertain the degree to which school leaders are undertaking such training, or addressing issues of equity and learning in their day to day practice.
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Table 15: Mean performance differences in reading of students in low SES schools by frequency level of principals’ efforts in ensuring that teachers work according to the school’s educational goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNT</th>
<th>Mean performance in reading of students in schools where principals “never or seldom” make sure that teachers work according to the school’s educational goals</th>
<th>Students’ mean difference in reading performance between “never or seldom” and “quite often”</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Mean difference in reading performance between “never or seldom” and “very often”</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Mean difference in reading performance between “quite often” and “very often”</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-10*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEL</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>-14*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGR</td>
<td>338¹</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZE</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>30*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNK</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>8*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>-20*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-18*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EST</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>-14*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>461¹</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRC</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-22*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-28*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUN</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>-99*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-131*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-32*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>51*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>61*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTU</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>23*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUX</td>
<td>388¹</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-50*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVA</td>
<td>451¹</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLT</td>
<td>346¹</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>40*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>17*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-11*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>-31*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-24*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROU</td>
<td>356¹</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVK</td>
<td>405¹</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-16*</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVN</td>
<td>405¹</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-12*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>462¹</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mean difference statistically significant at 0.05 level.

¹ This is the mean score of students in schools where principals reported that they were “quite often” engaged in the activity/behavior. No principal in this country reported that (s)he “never” or “seldom” did so.
Table 16: Mean performance differences in reading of students in low SES schools by frequency level that principals observe instruction in classrooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNT</th>
<th>Mean performance in reading of students in schools where principals &quot;never or seldom&quot; observe instruction in classrooms</th>
<th>Students' mean difference in reading performance between &quot;never or seldom&quot; and &quot;quite often&quot;</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Mean difference in reading performance between &quot;never or seldom&quot; and &quot;very often&quot;</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Mean difference in reading performance between &quot;quite often&quot; and &quot;very often&quot;</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>8*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEL</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>-20*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGR</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>14*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZE</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>-19*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNK</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>-20*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-67*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-48*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EST</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>16*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>26*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRC</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>-12*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUN</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>-13*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-47*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-34*</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-12*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTU</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-9*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUX</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVA</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>26*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLT</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>23*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-17*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>-15*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>24*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-100*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-122*</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROU</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>46*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-30*</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVK</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>-79*</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-66</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVN</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>-47*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-59*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-12*</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-38*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-29*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mean difference statistically significant at 0.05 level.
Table 17: Mean performance differences in reading of students in low SES schools by frequency level that principals use student performance results to develop the school's educational goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNT</th>
<th>Mean performance in reading of students in schools where principals &quot;never or seldom&quot; use student performance results to develop the school's educational goals</th>
<th>Students' mean difference in reading performance between &quot;never or seldom&quot; and &quot;quite often&quot;</th>
<th>Mean difference in reading performance between &quot;never or seldom&quot; and &quot;very often&quot;</th>
<th>Mean difference in reading performance between &quot;quite often&quot; and &quot;very often&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>-34*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-54*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEL</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>-42*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGR</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>-65*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZE</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>-38*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>28*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNK</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>25*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>-15*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EST</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>17*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRC</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>61*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUN</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>-40*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>15*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTU</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>17*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUX</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>-48*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVA</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>-16*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLT</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>-31*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-52*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>-14*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>-16*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROU</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>-103*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVK</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVN</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>-61*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>25*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mean difference statistically significant at 0.05 level.
Table 18: Mean performance differences in reading of students in low SES schools by frequency level that principals give teachers suggestions as to how they can improve their teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNT</th>
<th>Mean performance in reading of students in schools where principals &quot;never or seldom&quot; give teachers suggestions as to how they can improve their teaching</th>
<th>Students’ mean difference in reading performance between &quot;never or seldom&quot; and &quot;quite often&quot;</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Mean difference in reading performance between &quot;never or seldom&quot; and &quot;very often&quot;</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Mean difference in reading performance between &quot;quite often&quot; and &quot;very often&quot;</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>-38*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-15*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23*</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEL</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGR</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-19*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-11*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZE</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>16*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-17*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-25*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNK</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EST</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>19*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>23*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>28*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-7*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRC</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-17*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-16*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUN</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>30*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-14*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>-44*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-14*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTV</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUX</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>-31*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVA</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLT</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>26*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-23*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-22*</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>16*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>-22*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-48*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-26*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROU</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>33*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVK</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-18*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-29*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVN</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>-19*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-43*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-24*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>27*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-53*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-81*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mean difference statistically significant at 0.05 level.
Table 19: Mean performance differences in reading of students in low SES schools by frequency level that principals monitor students’ work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNT</th>
<th>Mean performance in reading of students in schools where principals &quot;never or seldom&quot; monitor students' work</th>
<th>Students' mean difference in reading performance between &quot;never or seldom&quot; and &quot;quite often&quot;</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Mean difference in reading performance between &quot;never or seldom&quot; and &quot;very often&quot;</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Mean difference in reading performance between &quot;quite often&quot; and &quot;very often&quot;</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEL</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>51*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>54*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGR</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZE</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNK</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>-9*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EST</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>18*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRC</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>15*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUN</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>52*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-19*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>-23*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-29*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>11*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-11*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUR</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-16*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-18*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUX</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>-26*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-48*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-22*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVA</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>11*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLT</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>-12*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>23*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL</td>
<td>470¹</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-10*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-17*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROU</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>36*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVK</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-15*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVN</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>-64*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-73*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-10*</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>14*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mean difference statistically significant at 0.05 level.

¹ This is the mean score of students in schools where principals reported that they were “quite often” engaged in the activity/behavior. No principal in this country reported that (s)he “never” or “seldom” did so.
Table 20: Mean performance differences in reading of students in low SES schools by frequency level that principals take the initiative to discuss matters when a teacher has problems in his/her classroom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNT</th>
<th>Mean performance in reading of students in schools where principals “never or seldom” take the initiative to discuss matters when a teacher has problems in his/her classroom</th>
<th>Students’ mean difference in reading performance between “never or seldom” and “quite often”</th>
<th>Mean difference in reading performance between “never or seldom” and “very often”</th>
<th>Mean difference in reading performance between “quite often” and “very often”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEL</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGR</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>19*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZE</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>18*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNK</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>-14*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EST</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRC</td>
<td>408¹</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUN</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>14*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>19*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTU</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUX</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVA</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>20*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLT</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>-45*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-59*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>13*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>-29*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROU</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>57*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVK</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVN</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>50*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mean difference statistically significant at 0.05 level.
¹ This is the mean score of students in schools where principals reported that they were “quite often” engaged in the activity/behavior. No principal in this country reported that (s)he “never” or “seldom” did so.
Table 21: Mean performance differences in reading of students in low SES schools by frequency level that principals inform teachers about possibilities for updating their knowledge and skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNT</th>
<th>Mean performance in reading of students in schools where principals “never or seldom” inform teachers about possibilities for updating their knowledge and skills</th>
<th>Students’ mean difference in reading performance between “never or seldom” and “quite often”</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Mean difference in reading performance between “never or seldom” and “very often”</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Mean difference in reading performance between “quite often” and “very often”</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>-10*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-10*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEL</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGR</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>41*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZE</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>19*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>-23*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-15*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNK</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>15*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-10*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EST</td>
<td>465¹</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-17*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-22*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-35*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-13*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>39*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-7*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRC</td>
<td>416¹</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUN</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>-33*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-25*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>429¹</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-20*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>21*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTU</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>-7*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUX</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>12*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-40*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-52*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVA</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>51*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>58*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLT</td>
<td>341¹</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>23*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL</td>
<td>477¹</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROU</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVK</td>
<td>412¹</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVN</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>-13*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-63*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-50</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>28*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>49*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mean difference statistically significant at 0.05 level.

¹ This is the mean score of students in schools where principals reported that they were “quite often” engaged in the activity/behaviour. No principal in this country reported that (s)he “never” or “seldom” did so.
Table 22: Mean performance differences in reading of students in low SES schools by frequency level that principals check to see whether classroom activities are in keeping with school’s educational goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNT</th>
<th>Mean performance in reading of students in schools where principals “never or seldom” check to see whether classroom activities are in keeping with school’s educational goals</th>
<th>Students’ mean difference in reading performance between “never or seldom” and “quite often”</th>
<th>Mean difference in reading performance between “never or seldom” and “very often”</th>
<th>Mean difference in reading performance between “quite often” and “very often”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>0 4 -25*</td>
<td>5 -25*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEL</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>6 5 40*</td>
<td>5 34*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGR</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>30* 5 18*</td>
<td>5 -12*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZE</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>-15* 4 -12*</td>
<td>5 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>16* 4 47*</td>
<td>4 31*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNK</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>10* 3 28*</td>
<td>8 18*</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>-1 3 -16*</td>
<td>4 -14*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EST</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>24* 4 34*</td>
<td>3 10*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>10* 4 19*</td>
<td>4 8*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>30* 4 35*</td>
<td>4 6*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRC</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>7 5 9</td>
<td>6 2 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUN</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>-4 4 -32*</td>
<td>4 -29*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>-14* 6 16*</td>
<td>6 31*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>31* 4 26*</td>
<td>4 -4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTU</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>-13* 3 6</td>
<td>5 18*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUX</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>4 3 -41*</td>
<td>3 -45*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVA</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>18* 4 50*</td>
<td>4 32*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLT</td>
<td>330¹</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>-24* 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>18* 4 29*</td>
<td>6 11 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>-12* 6 -3</td>
<td>6 9*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>32* 4 47*</td>
<td>7 14 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROU</td>
<td>350¹</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>-14* 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVK</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>16 10 -24*</td>
<td>10 -41*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVN</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>-7* 3 -39*</td>
<td>3 -32*</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>10* 4 27*</td>
<td>5 16*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mean difference statistically significant at 0.05 level.

¹ This is the mean score of students in schools where principals reported that they were “quite often” engaged in the activity/behavior. No principal in this country reported that (s)he “never” or “seldom” did so.
Table 23: Mean performance differences in reading of students in low SES schools by frequency level that principals take exam results into account in decisions regarding curriculum development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Mean performance in reading of students where principals “never or seldom” take exam results into account in decisions regarding curriculum development</th>
<th>Students’ mean difference in reading performance between “never or seldom” and “quite often”</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Mean difference in reading performance between “never or seldom” and “very often”</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Mean difference in reading performance between “quite often” and “very often”</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEL</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-38*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-27*</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGR</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>29*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-14*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZE</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>-10*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-39*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-29*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-10*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNK</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-13*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-13*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-11*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EST</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>32*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-21*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-53*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>-19*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>20*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-11*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRC</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>97*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>101*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUN</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>37*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-17*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>32*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>9*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTU</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUX</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>-44*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-44*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVA</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>15*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLT</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>7*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-20*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-27*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>-8*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>-10*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROU</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVK</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-32*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-29*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVN</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>-18*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-39*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-21*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>49*</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mean difference statistically significant at 0.05 level.
Table 24: Mean performance differences in reading of students in low SES schools by frequency level that principals ensure that there is clarity concerning the responsibility for coordinating the curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNT</th>
<th>Mean performance in reading of students in schools where principals “never or seldom” ensure that there is clarity concerning the responsibility for coordinating the curriculum</th>
<th>Students’ mean difference in reading performance between “never or seldom” and “quite often”</th>
<th>Mean difference in reading performance between “never or seldom” and “very often”</th>
<th>Mean difference in reading performance between “quite often” and “very often”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>-25*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEL</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>-25*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGR</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>-52*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-56*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZE</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>-28*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNK</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>-13*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EST</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>12*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>-16*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>20*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRC</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>28*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUN</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTU</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>-52*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-45*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUX</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVA</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>45*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLT</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>13*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>13*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>33*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROU</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>52*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVK</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>28*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVN</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>-25*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mean difference statistically significant at 0.05 level.
Table 25: Mean performance differences in reading of students in low SES schools by frequency level that principals solve the problem together when a teacher brings up a classroom problem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNT</th>
<th>Mean performance in reading of students in schools where principals “never or seldom” solve the problem together when a teacher brings up a classroom problem</th>
<th>Students’ mean difference in reading performance between “never or seldom” and “quite often”</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Mean difference in reading performance between “never or seldom” and “very often”</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Mean difference in reading performance between “quite often” and “very often”</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>55*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>61*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEL</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGR</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>26*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZE</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>14*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>57*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>71*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNK</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>-33*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-18*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>-13*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-33*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-19*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EST</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>-21*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>55*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>57*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>8*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRC</td>
<td>446¹</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUN</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-12*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-13*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>443¹</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>-61*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-67*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTU</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUX</td>
<td>394¹</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-46*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVA</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLT</td>
<td>326¹</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-26*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>-21*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL</td>
<td>474¹</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>-43*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-26*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROU</td>
<td>370¹</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVK</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>-17*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-18*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVN</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-7*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>472¹</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mean difference statistically significant at 0.05 level.
¹ This is the mean score of students in schools where principals reported that they were “quite often” engaged in the activity/behaviour. No principal in this country reported that (s)he “never” or “seldom” did so.
Table 26: Mean performance differences in reading of students in low SES schools by frequency level that principals pay attention to disruptive behaviour in classrooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNT</th>
<th>Mean performance in reading of students in schools where principals “never or seldom” pay attention to disruptive behaviour in classrooms</th>
<th>Students’ mean difference in reading performance between “never or seldom” and “quite often”</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Mean difference in reading performance between “never or seldom” and “very often”</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Mean difference in reading performance between “quite often” and “very often”</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>15*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEL</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>18*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGR</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>51*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZE</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>11*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNK</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>14*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>16*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-18*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EST</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>17*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>-63*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-48*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRC</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUN</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>42*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>451¹</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>-70*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-79*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-10*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUX</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>-26*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-22*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVA</td>
<td>395¹</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-44*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLT</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>300¹</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-52*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROU</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVK</td>
<td>339¹</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-28*</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVN</td>
<td>424¹</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>42*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-30*</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mean difference statistically significant at 0,05 level.

¹ This is the mean score of students in schools where principals reported that they were “quite often” engaged in the activity/behaviour. No principal in this country reported that (s)he “never” or “seldom” did so.
Table 27: Mean performance differences in reading of students in low SES schools by frequency level that principals take over lessons from teachers who are unexpectedly absent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNT</th>
<th>Mean performance in reading of students in schools where principals “never or seldom” take over lessons from teachers who are unexpectedly absent</th>
<th>Students’ mean difference in reading performance between “never or seldom” and “quite often”</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Mean difference in reading performance between “never or seldom” and “very often”</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Mean difference in reading performance between “quite often” and “very often”</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEL</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGR</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZE</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>55*</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNK</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>11*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-11*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-22*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EST</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>22*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>-23*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-10*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRC</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>22*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUN</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>8*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>45*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-19*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>29*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-14*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-43*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTU</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-24*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-30*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUX</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVA</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>11*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLT</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>23*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-52*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-75*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-11*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>66*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-41*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROU</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>-15*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVK</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>12*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27*</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVN</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>-29*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>-12*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-27*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-15*</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mean difference statistically significant at 0.05 level.