EMSSA Leadership
Jan Arend Brands[1]
Version 2
01-02-2009

Concepts of Leadership
In many publications on the content of educational management training the same approaches and concepts on leadership are seen. That holds for the USA, the UK and other countries. Sometimes these concepts are presented rather neutral. At other occasions they are presented in a prescriptive way. Leaders to be successful should have a vision and leadership should be transformative, instructional, distributed, systemic, sustainable etc. Luckily principals don't have to be superheroes any longer[2] at least in the writing of some authors.

The main authors in the field are: Bates, Darling-Hammond, Fullan, Gunter, Hallinger, Hargreaves, Harris, Hopkins, Leithwood, MacBeath, Murphy, Ribbins, Seashore Louis, Sleegers and Spillane.

This paper starts with some reasons to be cautious in what is presented as common knowledge on leadership in schools. One of the reasons mentions systemic leadership

After that some attempts to map the field are sketched.
Next is dealt with:
- Successful leadership,
- Schools successful for whom? (social justice) including comments on transformational leadership
- Leading with a vision
- Distributed leadership
- Instructional leadership and
- Leadership by whom?

Sustainable leadership is mentioned in footnote 8.

Six reasons to be cautious
The concepts like transformative, distributed, instructional, systemic, sustainable leadership have to be used with cautiousness in Sub-Saharan Africa for a range of reasons.

1. Research in Western countries
The (seemingly) consensus on transformative, distributive and instructional leadership is mainly built on research in Western countries.

2. From description to prescription
Regarding distributed leadership one also has to be cautious. In research of Spillane it was described as something that happened in successful schools. Distributed leadership however rather quick became a norm for what to do as a leader[3].

---

[1] This paper is written to support LEAD-link in the development of new training courses on educational leadership and management. LEAD-link is a Sub-Saharan African network of organisations each having a leading role in the field of Educational Management Development in their respective countries (Sudan, Uganda, Tanzania, Zambia, Malawi, South Africa, Swaziland, Mozambique). The complete set of papers can be found on the website of LEAD-link. (http://lead-linknetwork.org/) and on the site of Jan Arend Brands (www.freeman.nl).
EMSSA is short for Educational Management Sub-Saharan Africa.

[2] When you meet the leaders in the places that are really getting the job done, they are not the kind of leaders that just turn things around by the sheer force of their personality. They are regular people. They are totally focused. They are totally relentless. But they are not these big outsized personalities and they are not the only leaders in their schools. Especially in the larger schools, the principals know that they can't get it all done themselves. Those are the places that improve. Leadership is not about one person, it's about building a shared commitment and building a leadership team. (Haycock in DeVita 30)
Good leaders don't just mouth the mantra — "teachers are the most important thing, teachers matter a lot." They actually ACT like teachers matter. (Haycock in DeVita 31)

[3] It seems to be a more general fallacy changing rather quick a (new, attractive) description or phenomenon into a prescription. Having a vision and a mission is another good example.

3. Success not guaranteed when implementing success factors
Research if done well tries to show relations between characteristics of leadership and outcomes (student results, satisfied teachers, in general: satisfied stakeholders).
When some characteristics that have a positive relation with outcomes are identified it is still not certain that training head teachers to show those characteristics in their leadership will guarantee positive outcomes also in their schools.
Much more research on turn-around management is needed to be able to do firm judgements. (De Vita p 10)

4. Transformation but not critical change
One also has to be cautious about transformational management. One might assume that for Western countries it is known what behaviour of leaders support the school in adjusting to new demands of stakeholders (students, parents, business world or government). But there are hidden limits to transformation. In the literature there hardly is a place for critical views on education. Views that reflect social injustices and that stimulate educational leaders to take an active stance to solve problems of equity. (But it is mentioned by Darling-Hammond in DeVita[4] and by Honig[5]). It is surprising that even concepts that start as being critical or normative end up as neutral.
A good example is systemic leadership that originated from moral just leadership (Fullan) and now in OECD publications ends up as just a new challenge for schools to partner with other schools and organisations (Hopkins). It was meant to challenge good schools to take responsibility also for less good schools taking responsibility for the region. It seems to end up as a neutral but challenging new task for school leaders to work on inter-organisational level[6].

5. Are 'normal' schools able to transform?
A focus on transformation is not surprising, but the question is whether it is justified. One could say that the attention for transformation originates from the fact that it is very difficult to change schools. Some schools (even under very difficult circumstances) are able to change. Most do not as expected or hoped for even when participating in a change project (see e.g. Waters). The question then is: Why should we train head teachers in behaviour that only few will be able to exhibit or will be successful with. And: What is do-able for a normal head teacher in difficult circumstances as is the case for many in Sub-Saharan Africa. Maybe less transformation and just a slice of educational leadership by giving some support to teachers in doing their job?

6. Not much is known on leadership in alternative schools
The last reason to be cautious about what is relevant leadership is that almost all research is done in traditional schools. There is not much research or thinking about leadership in alternative schools as described by Farrell, nor on the leadership in education of the future that in fundamental ways (amongst others by using ICT in a smart way) will not look like schools as we have them now.

Having presented these warnings, it hopefully still is at least inspirational to read about research on leadership in education and attempts to get a grip on what is happening between leaders, teachers and students.

Miles and Seashore Louis already in the 90s showed that good urban schools were relentlessly in trying to solve the problems of the children. Making a vision was the closing chapter reflecting on the work done instead of the first chapter trying to pull developments.

[4] Using a national principal survey and a set of state case studies, we found that states and districts have begun to develop policies that create these kinds of opportunities on a more equitable systemic basis (page 22)

[5] In Honig talking with Karen Seashore Louis on a New Agenda for Research in Educational Leadership Honig constantly refers to 'learning and equity' as the main goal

[6] It is humoristic and sad to recognise all the advantages presented now in the UK (like: more effectiveness – so managerial arguments) in the same way as was done in the Netherlands two decades ago when many schools were merging. Currently the disadvantages of that merging are seen and now one is heading for smaller schools again. But without doubt that will be smaller schools that have much more relations with other (welfare, security) organisations.

Mapping the field
Gunter and Ribbins (2002) did a great job in mapping the field of Leadership Studies in Education[7]. Inspired by Bolam and the critics on the terrain of research in the field (p364) they outlined two mapping typologies one based on knowledge domains and one focusing on the practice of leadership.

The five knowledge domains they define (with some examples) are:
- Conceptual (interested in concepts and values in leadership)
- Critical (revelation and emancipation of practitioners from social injustice and oppression of unjustifiable structures and processes of power)
- Humanistic (theorizing from the experiences and biographies of leaders and those being led)
- Evaluative (any research on the impact of leadership and its effectiveness and its role in school improvement)
- Instrumental (seeking to provide leaders with effective means to deliver goals)

Most of the research in the field is in the evaluative and instrumental domains in contrast with e.g. in the critical domain.

In the typology of the practice of leadership they use the "Ten propositions" generated by the Think Tank for the NCSL:
(1) be purposeful. inclusive and values driven
(2) embrace the distinctive and inclusive context of the school
(3) promote an active view of learning
(4) be instructionally focused
(5) be a function that is distributed throughout the school community
(6) build capacity by developing the school as a learning community
(7) be futures oriented and strategically driven
(8) be developed through experiential and innovative methodologies
(9) be served by a support and policy context that is coherent and implementation driven
(10) be supported by a National College that leads the discourse around leadership for learning.

By juxtaposing the five knowledge domains with the ten propositions 50 cells are created to map the field. So in cell 3,3 a question is: How have headteachers experienced their work in supporting teaching and learning?
And in cell 5,4: How do we train headteachers to be experts in the design and operation of instructions. Or in cell 2,5: Does distributive leadership maintain existing power relations or seek to restructure them? And in cell 4,9: How can policy be effectively and efficiently implemented in a school and how is it to be monitored and evaluated?

The publications of Gunter in principle can be very helpful to identify gaps in what is delivered in a training course or to characterise research proposals. It however is rather surprising that the publication was not the start of a discussion in the field. The article is not much cited either (xx to be controlled).

For this chapter it was chosen to concentrate on publications on topics that are widely discussed choosing publications that give a good overview of the research and opinions about that topic.

Successful leadership
Simkins in his article 'Leadership in Education: 'What Works' or 'What Makes Sense?'' (that also will be dealt with in the chapter on 'Problems that principals experience') makes an interesting comparison of the traditional view on leadership and an emerging view of leadership

[7] Three months later Richmon (2003) in the same journal presented an overview of 8 earlier attempts to organize the growing literature on leadership. They come up with an inventory of 35 Leadership Theories

The traditional view	*An emerging view of leadership*
Leadership resides in individuals	Leadership is a property of social systems
Leadership is hierarchically based and linked to office	Leadership can occur anywhere
Leadership occurs when leaders do things to followers	Leadership is a complex process of mutual influence
Leadership is different from and more important than management	The leadership/management distinction is unhelpful
Leaders are different	Anyone can be a leader
Leaders make a crucial difference to organizational performance	Leadership is one of many factors that may influence organizational performance
Effective leadership is generalisable	The context of leadership is crucial

Seven strong claims
Leithwood et all in a NCSL publication (2006) present seven strong claims as a summary of the key findings of a review of literature.
Leithwood: 'These claims are not all strong in quite the same way, as we shall explain, but they all find support in varying amounts of quite robust empirical evidence, the first two having attracted the largest amount of such evidence." (p 3)

1. School leadership is second only to classroom teaching as an influence on pupil learning.
2. Almost all successful leaders draw on the same repertoire of basic leadership practices. (Building vision; Understanding and developing people; Building the organisations; Managing the teaching and learning process).
3. The ways in which leaders apply these basic leadership practices – not the practices themselves – demonstrate responsiveness to, rather than dictation by, the contexts in which they work. (The four practices are used in a way sensitive to the context)
4. School leaders improve teaching and learning indirectly and most powerfully through their influence on staff motivation, commitment and working conditions.
5. School leadership has a greater influence on schools and students when it is widely distributed. (Evidence to support this claim 'is less extensive and in some cases less direct than that in support of the previous claims')
6. Some patterns of distribution are more effective than others. (And interestingly: 'There is no loss of power and influence on the part of headteachers when, for example, the power and influence of many others in the school increase).
7. A small handful of personal traits explains a high proportion of the variation in leadership effectiveness. ('This evidence warrants the claim that, at least under challenging circumstances, the most successful school leaders are open-minded and ready to learn from others. They are also flexible rather than dogmatic in their thinking within a system of core values, persistent (e.g. in pursuit of high expectations of staff motivation, commitment, learning and achievement for all), resilient and optimistic.')

The International Study of Successful School Principals
A year after the NCSL publication a special issue of International Studies in Educational Administration (2008) was devoted to the ISSPP – The International Study of Successful School Principals. The study was conducted in Norway, England, Denmark, Sweden, United States, Australia, Hong Kong and Canada. The study was designed to get a better understanding of and insights into what successful principals do to improve their schools regardless of context (as well as differences that result because of differences in context).

The study focussed on the repertoire of basic leadership practices identified by Leithwoord (see item 2 above), here formulated as: Setting directions; Developing people; Redesigning the organization; Managing the instructional program. (p 5)
In total more than 60 case studies were produced.

The special issue presents a secondary analysis of data collected from four of the eight nations (Norway, England, United States, Australia) and focusses on three themes that had not been explicitly considered in the initial framework: (1) instructional leadership in

enabling school success; (2) the extent to which schools had emerged as learning organizations; and, (3) the role of culturally responsive leadership in improving school-community relationships.

The result can be characterised as: What successful principals do can be strikingly different, not only in different countries, but also within countries. Leadership is a complex issue and avoiding one-size-fits all approaches is important.
'The actual enactment of successful school leadership does not always fit the normative ideas of some of the leadership literature' (p 68).

In the closing article Crow describes the "Dimensions of Complexity in Leadership Practices". Some examples:

- Leadership practices for instructional leadership involve both direct and indirect practices. Some principals know about pedagogy and subject content others lead e.g. by attracting and developing staff.
- Principals go along with external demands (being the enforcer of state accountability mandates) or buffer boldly the school from what is seen as inappropriate external demands
- Some principals have an internal focus on the teachers, others develop strategies for community involvement
- Successful principals do not ignore the managerial tasks but balance leadership and management tasks. What the right balance is might also be dependent on the phase of development of the school
- Successful principals tie care/respect for students with a focus on student learning.
- Principals differ in the level of integration of home cultures or community knowledge in their schools.

Effects of Organic Management on Student Achievement
Calling leadership practice complex already might be discomforting. Even more discomforting (given current preferences) is research from Rowan (2006). Miller and he analysed the "Effects of Organic Management on Student Achievement". Organic management is a shift away from conventional, hierarchical patterns of bureaucratic control. The research on it focuses on subjects like teachers' participation in school decision making, site-based management, teacher empowerment, teachers' professional communities and supportive school leadership. It is much in line with what Simkins sees as emerging views of leadership.

Surprisingly results of the analysis are that there is a lack of positive relationships between measures of organic management and measures of student achievement. Miller and Rowan conclude '.... the limited evidence in support of the hypothesis that organic management has positive effects on student achievement strongly suggests that organic forms of school management are not an especially powerful determinant of patterns of student achievement in elementary or secondary schools. (p 242)

Best Evidence Synthesize on Educational Leadership
Somewhat more positive seem to be the results of the Best Evidence Synthesize-study in New Zealand (Alton-Lee, Robinson) that are described in the rest of this paper. It however is considered challenging.
'The Educational Leadership BES in development is the most challenging of the BESs because of the complexity of the ways in which leadership mediates improved outcomes for diverse learners. This BES is due to go for international formative quality assurance in July 2007 (and still is under development). The focus is on principals but not only on principals. Educational leadership (and this BES) involves policy leadership, other forms of national leadership (for example, the NZ Education Review Office's role) and the leadership of senior teachers, deputy and associate principals, teachers and even students.

The Leadership BES being developed by a team of researchers at the University of Auckland (Professor Viviane Robinson, Dr Margie Hohepa and Dr Claire Lloyd) in consultation with advisors and sector stakeholder representatives is exploring what it is about leadership that makes a difference for students and teachers. Although it is early

days in the development of the educational leadership BES, and this is the most methodologically challenging BES to date, there are emergent findings of practices that have been found to be linked to stronger achievement or better social outcomes for students.

In findings to date are about nine leadership dimensions that appear to be particularly productive in making a difference for students. One of the emerging analyses for the Leadership best evidence synthesis has been reported by Robinson (2007) 57 at the International Confederation of Principals Conference.'

Table 1: Leadership Practices Derived from Studies of Effects of Leadership on Students

Leadership Practice	Meaning of Dimension
1. Establishing Goals and Expectations	Includes the setting, communicating and monitoring of learning goals, standards and expectations, and the involvement of staff and others in the process so that there is clarity and consensus about goals.
2. Strategic Resourcing	Involves aligning resource selection and allocation to priority teaching goals. Includes provision of appropriate expertise through staff recruitment
3. Planning, Coordinating and Evaluating Teaching and the Curriculum	Direct involvement in the support and evaluation of teaching through regular classroom visits and provision of formative and summative feedback to teachers. Direct oversight of curriculum through school-wide coordination across classes and year levels and alignment to school goals.
4. Promoting and Participating in Teacher Learning and Development	Leadership that not only promotes but directly participates with teachers in formal or informal professional learning
5. Ensuring an Orderly and Supportive Environment	Protecting time for teaching and learning by reducing external pressures and interruptions and establishing an orderly and supportive environment both inside and outside classrooms

Robinson (2007) notes that: The list of dimensions is unusual in that it does not include the typical distinction between leading tasks and leading people or relationships. This distinction has been eschewed here because close examination of the leadership indicators used in these studies shows that relationship skills are embedded in every dimension (p. 5.)
Although each of the practices shown in Table 1 has been found to be linked to stronger outcomes for students, all can be done in ways that are highly effective, not effective, or even counterproductive.

Schools successful for whom?
A story from Namibia
Namibia while preparing for independence and in the years thereafter worked with a concept of teacher education ITTP Integrated Teacher Training Programme that used critical practitioner inquiry as a major component.
The general idea was not to depend on common theories of teaching and learning but on students, while on apprenticeship, doing research in the actual teaching and learning in practice. From those experiences (and experiments) a Namibian theory on learning and teaching would be developed.
The ITTP was phased out as a separate teacher education programme, when a new national teacher education programme was developed and implemented as from 1993. This national programme was inspired by the ITTP and its practices. The programme, Basic Education Teacher's Diploma (BETD), was introduced at the four colleges in Namibia.

The approach was supported by Sweden. Dahlstrom from Umea University made an important contribution throughout the years[8]. Recently there was a cry of distress from the

[8] ee the documents at his website The Global South Network (GSN) for Teacher Educators and Critical Practitioner Inquiry at http://www.pedag.umu.se/forskning/projekt/globalsouthnetwork/

National Institute for Educational Development Namibia (Paradigm Lost? The road ahead not so clear; CPI in the BETD). The teachers colleges are afraid of being merged with the University of Namibia, 'a long time arch rival of the BETD over its philosophical orientations' with the danger of being drawn 'back to traditional pedagogic practices that are regime centred and teacher centred' (Nyambe, p 1))

Dahlstrom blames neo-liberalism for such takeover happening:
Our findings show how neo-liberalism when entering the education arena reduces teachers to technical caretakers and transforms what was once introduced as progressive and critical practices of education into separated entities following technical rationalities. Teacher education is also silently transformed to develop students and teachers alike into consumers in the educational marketplace through the neo-liberal governmentality that turns people into tightly controlled individuals who persist in claiming to be free in a globalised world. (Dahlstrom 2007, p 2)

A story from the USA
Kozol vividly has described in a range of publication about the injustice built in in education in the USA. The titles of major books speak for themselves: '*Savage Inequalities; Children in America's Schools'* (1991) and '*The Shame of the Nation: The Restoration of Apartheid Schooling in America'* (2005).
Children in the worst socio-economic circumstance get the worst education. Budget for most of the attempts to change this for better end up (either unintended or intended) in schools that are in better situations. Side-effects of initiatives to change what happens in classrooms are narrowing the curriculum, teachers being overwhelmed with standards and objectives, teachers frightened training to the tests meaningless bits of knowledge, lunch- and playtime changed in learning time and principals being loaded with managerial accountability tasks.

Schools for the better educated having (economic) power?
Many more stories could be added e.g from the fight against apartheid in South Africa. The question here is: how much injustice is there in the system, what mechanisms create that injustice and is there a role for schools, principals and teachers to contribute to more justice. Those questions do not belong to the mainstream of educational management research or the content of educational leadership training.

Bates (2005) well describes the history of this perspective on educational administration. He starts with: 'Some two decades ago I called for a model of educational administration centered around '…the problem of the justice and fairness of…social and educational arrangements' (Bates, 1983:39). Mine was a lonely voice, apart from that of Bill Foster (1986) and a small number of similarly marginalised scholars, and the field continued to be dominated by the 'search for a knowledge base' rooted in a conceptual separation of educational and administrative issues and the pursuit of a 'value-free' science of educational administration'

Visitors to the AERA (at least in the nineties) could experience the marginalization. Partly that originated from the critical theory discourse. The publications were difficult to read, although there were exceptions (Freire)

'While voices such as …. Bourdieu (1977) were transforming the focus of the sociology of education around the complicity of educational practices in reproducing social inequalities; … and while others were listening to the voice of radical pedagogy directed in the service of liberation (Apple, 1982; Freire, 1970), educational administration as a field tied itself to the mast of its preferred (positivist) model of science and sailed on, refusing to be distracted by such siren voices.' (p 3).

'… as we know, conflict over curriculum, pedagogy and assessment is endemic in public discussions of education. But such issues are largely sidestepped in discussions of educational administration. For instance, while Freire's work on 'The Pedagogy of the Oppressed' (1970) has been widely influential in discussions over curriculum and pedagogy, it has been virtually ignored in educational administration.' (p 7)

Bates describes the problems caused by high stakes testing of 'one-size-fits all' curricula neglecting initiatives directed towards localization and choice, but he ends a kind of hopeful:
'Social justice in education, as elsewhere, demands both distributive justice (which remedies undeserved inequalities) and recognitional justice (which treats cultural differences with understanding and respect). But, given that cultures are always in the process of change, education is a key agency for negotiating cultural change through the exploration and negotiation of difference. Educational administration as a field can no longer escape the consideration of such issues as they are brought to the fore by the recognition of the failure of schools and school systems to ameliorate injustice in the distribution of resources and to recognise and celebrate difference as a means to social and cultural progress. We still need a model of educational administration centered around the problem of the justice and fairness of social and educational arrangements. Given the renewed interest in such issues, perhaps what was impossible twenty five years ago might now be achieved…'. (p 16)

An example: Transformational leadership seen through critical eyes
Gunter (earlier in 2001) in 'Critical approaches to leadership in education' presented a nice but worrying example on what happened with transformational leadership.
' Transformational leadership has been globalised as the means by which headteachers and principals can respond to the demands of reform to achieve appropriate and effective learning outcomes through turning the school into a 'high reliability learning community' (Leithwood et al. 1999 p 223). The model has its origins in non-educational settings (Burns 1978) where the emphasis is put on leader agency:

- Inspiration: motivating the subordinate through charisma;
- Individualism: focusing on the individual needs of subordinates;
- Intellectual stimulation: influencing thinking and imagination of subordinates;
- Idealized influence: the communication and building of an emotional commitment to the vision (Gronn 1996).

A central feature of transformational leadership is direction setting through the building and communicating of a commitment to a shared vision, and a positive response to high performance expectations (Leithwood et al 1999). This is to be achieved not just through structures and systems, but by enabling the follower to 'feel' the leadership:
Charismatic school leaders are perceived to exercise power in socially positive ways. They create trust among colleagues in their ability to overcome any obstacle and are a source of pride to have as associates. Colleagues consider these leaders to be symbols of success and accomplishment, and to have unusual insights about what is really important to attend to; they are highly respected by colleagues. (Leithwood et al 1999 p 57) (Cited by Gunter)

Transformational leadership now however is the subject of a range of important critiques (Gronn 1996, Smyth 1989, 1993), and as Foster (1989) argues:
…the concept has been denuded of its original power; transformational leaders are now those who can lead a company to greater profits, who can satisfy the material cravings of employees, who can achieve better performance through providing the illusion of power to subordinates. Transformational leadership has gone from a concept of power to a how-to manual for aspiring managers. (p 45-46) (Cited by Gunter)

Gunter:
'Transformational leaders exercise a disciplinary function which is overlain by optimistic 'aerosol' words (Smyth and Shacklock 1998 p 21) such as commitment, consensus, empowerment, quality, standards, excellence, and performance control, underpinned by a discourse about what can and cannot be said and done. Performativity demands ICT, human, and evidence-based auditing and communications systems that alter the *meaning* of teaching from professional ethics to statistical calculations about a teacher's worth. Hartley (1999) argues that through a process of 'reculturing' there is an integration of the emotional self with the organisation that prevents commitments to inconvenient and disruptive belief systems. In this way leadership is a form of seduction, and as Burrell

(1992) argues pleasure 'is seen as a reservoir of potential energy to be channelled, shaped and directed in the service of corporate goals' (p 66).

It seems that transformational leadership is less about educational leadership than leadership in educational settings. The particular demands of teaching and learning do not seem to shape its purpose, and the practice of it is not educative for leaders and led. Transformational leadership isn't really transformational at all but is a 'top-dog theory' that meets the needs of management control.'

To move forward Shields (2006) poses: 'Most educators can perform the more technical and rationale management activities with ease. But to succeed, they must not divorce these activities from important underlying questions about social justice…They must examine school programs to determine who is being advantaged or disadvantaged….become 'wide-awake' to the people with whom we live and work in schools, treating them with absolute regard, and involving them in value-based conversations about the purposes of education, the kind of society they want to live in and their role in its creation… Such conversations offer hope and optimism for the future, not only for individuals, but also for more deeply democratic society (p 79)

Leading with a vision
A good head teacher has a personal vision about the direction in which the school should develop (hopefully one that reflects the problem of social injustice).
Having a vision sounds attractive (it helps to choose the right problems and includes a hunch how to solve the problems) and almost obvious. The only problem for the principal than seems to be to ensure that teachers buy-in to her or his vision.

Current research operates from hypotheses that it is not as simple as that. Of course not.

Ylimaki (2008) builds on Arrien's archetype of the visionary (leaders who act from their authentic selves by telling the truth without blame or judgment, who know and communicate their creative purpose or life dreams and actively honor the four ways of seeing (intuition, perception, insight, and holistic seeing). She suggests '…a new conceptualization of vision—namely, that vision is a dynamic interaction among inner human resources (e.g.,insight, intuition,and perception), an outward perspective, and the context of a particular visioning situation. There are four key elements in this definition. First, vision is an active, multidimensional process. Second, vision involves inner human resources of the visionary (e.g.,insight, intuition, and perception) as well as information gained from an outward perspective. Third, this outward perspective focuses on larger educational ideals as well as external research and policies. Finally, vision making is contextual and lies, at least in part, within the needs of particular schools and communities.'

Wassink et al (2004) add to the individual cognitive process of school leader the social interaction of the school leader with the colleagues. In that interaction the vision evolves and is made more explicit and specific. The vision of the school leader changes to something that is seen as worthwhile by the colleagues also. In together making sense of the current situation shared norms and standards are developed. These shared norms and standards are felt by the professionals as individual values from which they work.

Sleegers et al (2009) present a sense-making approach to problem solving processes of beginning school leaders. They investigate school leaders' problem framing and the situated and personal nature of that. That current circumstances and professional biographies affect the problem framing seems to be a useful additional approach for future research. They argue that differences in 'sense-making of the problems at hand is situated in their past experiences, the values of the former professional communities in which they were engaged, and the conditions of their workplace'. (p 2).

Another study relating the history of the principal with in this case the learning of the principal was done by McGough (2003). He sets 4 stages (Childhood, Teaching, Educational administrator, Regular principal) and 3 Catalysts (Into teaching, Into

administration, Into the principalship). His study 'presents evidence that the professional perspectives of the veteran school principals who participated in this project can be said to have a foundation in childhood exposures, to have been affected by an identifiable set of influences through specific phases of a professional perspective development sequence, and to have been shaped by an underlying story about oneself as a learner that threads through one's experiences and provides a sense of coherence over time.

Together these are arguments to assume that visions that work are dependent on personal capacities and the history of the school leader, on the (wider) context and that visions change over time while being made specific together with teachers.

Distributed leadership
It was Spillane who coined the concept of distributed leadership. While focussing on what school leaders actually do in practice to lead and improve a school he shows that more persons than the school leader are leaders in the school, whether formal, informal or acknowledged by the school leader. And it is even more complicated than that.

Spillane
Spillane et al (2004) discuss their notion of distributed leadership as it has evolved and continued to evolve based on their ongoing investigations of school leadership as part of the Distributed Leadership Study.
They start their AERA contribution noting:
'Over the past five years or more, distributed leadership has garnered considerable attention from researchers, educators and policymakers in the US and other countries including Australia, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom. Though the notion of distributed leadership is popular, a cursory examination of its usage suggests that it means different things to different people. Scholars and practitioners often use shared leadership, democratic leadership and distributed leadership interchangeably, suggesting that, at least for some, distributed leadership may be no more than a new label for a familiar phenomena. No doubt the popularity of distributed leadership has something to do with the ease with which people can appropriate it to cover familiar approaches to leadership.' (p 2).

In their own work: 'We attempt to make school leadership as a distributed practice more transparent. Our distributed leadership framework argues that leadership activity is distributed in the interactive web of leaders, followers, and situation, which form the appropriate unit of analysis for studying leadership practice. A distributed view of leadership shifts our concern from the individual leader to the web of leaders, followers, and situation that give form to leadership activity.' (p 2)

'We argue that a distributed perspective on leadership means more than acknowledging that multiple individuals lead ---though that is an important aspect---in the enactment of leadership functions and tasks … A distributed perspective presses us to consider the enactment of leadership tasks as potentially stretched over the practice of two or more leaders, followers, and their situation. It also involves understanding how leadership practice is stretched over the work of various school leaders and exploring the practice generated in the interactions among these people.' (p 6)

'Leadership activity involves three essential constituting or defining elements - leaders, followers, and situation. And, from our distributed perspective, practice is a co-production of all three. Leadership does not reside in any one of these elements; each is a prerequisite for leadership activity. Hence, the distributed leadership frame shifts the level of analysis from the individual actor or group of actors to the web of leaders, followers, and situation that give activity its form. By situation we mean more than tangible material aspects of the context – we mean the sociocultural context (including artifacts) that can embody the stable practices---the 'crystallized operations' (Leont'ev 1978) or the 'reifications of practices' (Wenger 2000)--- in work such as leadership.' (p 7)

Difficulties handling the concept of distributed leadership
How difficult it is to handle the concept is e.g. seen with Camburn et al (2003). They study distributed leadership in the context of elementary schools' adoption of comprehensive school reforms (CSRs), a subset of whole-school reforms. The study indeed is about distributed leadership but focuses only on (new) formally designed leadership positions, the creation of the organizational structure that formally designates leadership statuses in a school (called configuration) and the social processes that encourage incumbents of these positions to actively perform leadership functions (called activation). So this study is about active distribution while the interesting part of the concept of distributive leadership is on the patterns of (informal) leaders, followers and artefacts (like policies, programmes and procedures) that together define leadership in a school. This study strengthens opinions that distributed leadership is like collective leadership, co-leadership or community-creating leadership.

Distributed but the principal still a spider in the web
Moos et al describing two cases of the ISSPP studies in Denmark start their article with: 'Leadership literature shows consensus at large on the need for distributed leadership.'… 'Within the Danish educational system and among its practitioners education must be democratic and facilitate the development of democratic citizens. Schools in the ISSPP schools thus aim at relations between leaders and staff and between adults and students that are based on collaboration, participation and dialogue.
In the schools we thus see an intricate pattern of meetings and committees/teams/-groups: Teacher teams, self-managing teacher teams, a number of leadership teams serving different purposes, educational and developmental committees, the development of project work with students and so forth. The constructions are not identical from one school to the other, but patterns are similar: The decentralisation from state to school district to schools is being extended into schools, but at the same time the principals function as the spiders in a web (Gronn 2002 p. 659)'

In their discussion at the end of the article they conclude/question amongst others: 'Another aspect that we observed and heard of is that many teachers and heads of departments asked for the principal's advice or acceptance of their ideas. They often wanted a 'father's or mother's nod' before they carried their ideas out in practice….
The observations made in these schools led us to ask if there is a trend towards building relations in schools on affective rather then on cognitive sources (Moos 2003b, Warren 1999). If this trend increases one could ask if it eventually is going to undermine the rational community and the democratic relations and leave (too?) much power in the hands of a charismatic leader? More generally there seems to be a tendency for empowered employees to seek reassurance and acceptance from their leaders….principals are… beginning to grow into 'paternalistic/maternalistic dependency leaders' …because the teachers and department leaders draw them into that position'. (p 12).
This is a very interesting observation that characterises the complex dynamics of the relations between principals, other (in)formal leaders in the school and the teachers.
It is also interesting to note that the 'spider in the web' in Denmark seems to be quite different from the 'facilitator of teachers' in Norway.

Dispositions for co-creating leadership
Wasonga and Murphy (2007) talk about co-creating leadership dispositions. They define CcL as the proactive and dynamic process of engaging the full use of the organization's human potential. Unfortunately they discover that the first two of the three important dispositions (active listening, trust and trustworthiness, and patience) hardly are available in schools (indication of higher likelihood of sporadic practice or absence of…). They ask for courage in leaders to not only distribute leadership roles (fulfill role requirements and institutional expectations) but also to take into account personal need satisfaction being 'the result of participants recognizing that their input is valued and they are involved as co-creators through the practice of co-creating leadership dispositions.' (p 30).
Slater (2008) recently published an article on how 'leaders may use several communication strategies and skills such as listening, verbal and non-verbal behaviour, openness, and empathy to encourage shared leadership and thereby to build human and organizational capacity.' (p 67)

Collective leadership: wanted with reason?
Leithwood and Mascall (2008) (while studying the impact of collective, or shared, leadership on key teacher variables and student outcomes) found that collective leadership explained a significant proportion of variation in student achievement across schools. 'Higher-achieving schools awarded leadership influence to all school members and other stakeholders to a greater degree than that of lower-achieving schools. These differences were most significant in relation to the leadership exercised by school teams, parents, and students. Principals were awarded the highest levels of influence in schools at all levels of achievement. (p 529)
A most interesting implication is: 'Influence seems to be an infinite resource in schools. The more those in formal leadership roles give it away, the more they acquire.' That seems to be in line with Moos.
But of more concern for leadership development is: 'Recognizing that some form of leadership distribution has always been a necessary feature of school and other professional organizations, there is (as yet) no empirical justification for advocating more planful distribution of leadership as a strategy for organizational improvement beyond those important efforts to enlist the full range of capacities and commitments found within school organizations. (p 557)

Multi-level growth modelling in research on collaborative leadership and student outcomes
Hallinger and Heck in 1996 published a widely cited article about the effects of leadership on student outcomes. Recently they (Heck and Hallinger – 2009) published again a remarkable article: 'Assessing the Contribution of Principals' and Collaborative Leadership to School Improvement'
Their '…paper focuses on two issues: assessing the impact of "collaborative leadership" on school improvement outcomes and identifying the unique effects of the principals' leadership in contexts where leadership responsibilities are distributed more broadly.' (p 2).

As in the study of Camburn (2003) they study an element added to the organisational structure. In their case school-community councils added as a consequence of a state-level mandate in the USA to increase school accountability, enhance leadership capacity, and improve student learning. In their article they use collaborative and distributed leadership interchangeable. (p 4). More close to Spillane they 'assert that school improvement represents a dynamic process in which the relationships among people, processes, and structures change over time. These changes bring about subsequent changes in the state of the organization over time. Thus, the empirical study of school improvement requires the use of dynamic models that take into account the changing relationships that evolve among relevant variables (e.g., context, leadership, educational processes, outcomes) over time. (p 7). Consequently Heck and Hallinger have developed a conceptual model that incorporates incorporates static and dynamic components of school improvement in one simultaneous model. In their research design they employ multilevel growth modeling for studying relationships among school context, leadership, school process and learning outcomes over a three-year period of time. Not without reason they are proud on this kind of research design and analysis portraying changes in relationships among variables in the model at several points in time. (…this is the first study of which we are aware that has located statistically significant, indirect effects of leadership on student outcomes with a *dynamic model* of school improvement – p 27).
Heck and Hallinger are very careful in their conclusions. They e.g. state that 'the findings provide interesting support for the belief that, over time, stakeholder participation in the school's decision-making structures can produce greater leadership capacity. Moreover, this increased leadership capacity appears to carry over to the development of professional capacity in key areas of the school organization that impact teaching and learning in positive ways.' (p 28).
And a most interesting implication: 'The implementation of policies designed to foster collaborative school leadership does not appear to lessen the importance of the principal's own leadership role. On the contrary, the task of building professional capacity and collaborative leadership requires principal initiative and ongoing support' (p 32)

Different meanings of distributed leadership
Mayrowitz presents a good description of what happened to the term distributed leadership since its introduction by Gronn and Spillane. He makes a distinction between
1. A theoretical lens for looking at the activity of leadership
2. Distributed leadership for democracy
3. Distributed leadership for efficiency and effectiveness
4. Distributed leadership as human capacity building

Major concerns of Mayrowitz are that: 'First, the term "attracts a range of meanings and is associated with a variety of practices" (…), and these significant discrepancies allow researchers to talk past each other. Second, it is unclear how well these usages connect to the goals of school improvement and the development of school leadership, two key objectives of the educational leadership field. (p 425).

He concludes:
'The strengths of each of these usages of distributed leadership sometimes also end up being their weaknesses. The descriptive, activity theory–based understanding has a strong conceptual underpinning, but the connections to school improvement and leadership development are diffuse. The normative understandings, pushing for democracy and effectiveness, might address the immediate concerns of school improvement and leadership development, but not all are strongly grounded in theory, and some of the formulations fly in the face of empirical evidence. The idea of distributed leadership as a human capacity development strategy, much like a professional learning community, has promise as a link to school improvement, but the empirical evidence is still too thin.' (p 431).

Sustainable leadership
Recently distributed leadership is extended to a component of sustainable leadership[9]. According to Hargreaves it is not sufficient any more to share leadership. Some of the colleagues should be prepared to take over when the principal for one reason or another quits his or her job. It would guarantee that the same vision and the same change programmes can continue.

Instructional Leadership.
Hallinger has been and is very influential in reflecting on and research of instructional leadership[10]. He puts himself in the tradition of several others[11]:
'Research conducted on change in schools by Gene Hall and others in the 1970's identified principal leadership as essential to supporting successful efforts by schools to implement change. Findings from this research were further reinforced by findings from researchers such as Edmonds, Brookover, Rutter and others who sought to identify the characteristics of "instructionally effective schools" -- schools whose students achieved beyond what might be expected given their socio-economic backgrounds.

[9] Sustainable leadership however is defined as more than this, in a way a bag full of quite different things: 'In summary, leaders develop sustainability by how they approach, commit to and protect deep learning in their schools; by how they sustain themselves and others around them to promote and support that learning; by how they are able and encouraged to sustain themselves in doing so, so that they can persist with their vision and avoid burning out; by how they try to ensure the improvements they bring about last over time, especially after they have gone; by how they consider the impact of their leadership on schools around them; by how they promote and perpetuate ecological diversity rather than standardized prescription in teaching and learning within their schools; and by how they pursue activist engagements with their environments.' (Hargreaves, Fink 2003) (p 10)
[10] Hallinger also is very influential in reflecting on International Leadership Development and Problem Based Learning. More or less in contrast with his other work he published also with Snidvongs (2005) 'Adding Value to School Leadership and Management: A review of trends in the development of managers in education and business sectors' reflecting on what education can learn from the business world on topics like Enterprise Resource Management, information exploitation tools, knowledge management, strategic management and the Balanced Scorecard, change management, project management, quality management and business reengineering as management methodologies, and Customer Relationship Management.
[11] http://philiphallinger.com/educational.html at 22-02-09

A key finding emerging from this research was the conclusion that instructionally effective schools had principals who gave more attention to the leading the curriculum and instructional program of the school. This picture of engaged instructional leaders contrasted with the portrait of typical principals whose workdays were characterized by a focus on "managerial" activities. This led to an increased emphasis in the USA during the 1980s on increasing the priority given to instructional leadership among principals. During the subsequent years, researchers, policymakers and practitioners have made progress in defining the instructional leadership role of principals and other school leaders, identifying key strategies, approaches and behaviors, and putting these into practice.

Halllinger 'developed the first research-based instrument for assessing principal instructional leadership, the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) 1982.' 'The scale has been used in studies of principal leadership throughout the world since 1982. It is the single most widely used measure of principal leadership over the past 30 years[12]. In addition, the scale has been for the purposes of staff development needs assessment and as part of principal evaluation systems.'
The PIMRS instrument has been validated as an instrument providing reliable results in studies of school leadership. The PIMRS assesses three dimensions of the instructional leadership construct: Defining the School's Mission, Managing the Instructional Program, and Promoting a Positive School Learning Climate (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985).

These dimensions are further delineated into 10 specific instructional leadership functions. Two functions, Framing the School's Goals and Communicating the School's Goals, comprise the dimension, Defining the School's Mission. Managing the Instructional Program incorporates three leadership functions: Supervising and Evaluating Instruction, Coordinating the Curriculum, Monitoring Student Progress. The third dimension, Promoting a Positive School Learning Climate includes several functions: Protecting Instructional Time, Promoting Professional Development, Maintaining High Visibility, Providing Incentives for Teachers, Providing Incentives for Learning.'[13]

Instructional leadership: Important but not easy to focus on
In their recent book MacBeath and Chen start with an overview of the difficulties seen in the other chapters:

- In China Feng describes leadership as more concerned with keeping order than learning.
- In Norway Møller describes the embrace of managerialism as squeezing the life and vitality out of learning
- In Canada Sackney and Mitchell report: We have found school leaders to be more concerned with accounting than with learning, with control than with teaching, with compliance than with risk-taking, and with public relations than with student experiences.
- In Neil Dempster's chapter we find Australian principals struggling to tease their way through the moral maze,
- Their counterparts in Taiwan, Malaysia, England and Italy also experiencing the weight and loneliness of individual leadership.
- Brotto and Barzano quote Ribolzi, a critic of the current Italian scene, who portrays the position of Italian heads as living a paradox similar to that of the "man supposed to find a black cat in a dark room on a moonless night", having to "guarantee system outcomes that have yet to be defined, in the absence of parameters to measure them and being clueless as to how to act to change them".
- Cluelessness might be an apt summary for what George Oduro describes in Ghana where headteachers arrive in their job through seniority but without guidance or

[12] It is used in more than 125 studies conducted by doctoral students around the world. For an overview see Hallinger, P. (2008, March). A review of PIMRS studies of principal instructional leadership: Assessment of progress over 25 years. Paper prepared for presentation at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), New York. Hallinger however has to conclude: Despite its noted limitations, the body of research reviewed in this study is substantial in scope, depth and longevity. While it provides few answers to the questions that surround the principal's instructional leadership role, it does provide a useful base from which to build.
[13] http://philiphallinger.com/pimrs.html at 22-02-09

preparation of any kind for the complex tasks, which face them in running a school. (p 1)

MacBeath basing himself on Mulford presents as possible ways to explore for more attention on learning:

- much less emphasis on the organisational or managerial than has previously been the case;
- a rebalancing of the relationship between the political and bureaucratic and professional that gives greater weight to the professional;
- avoidance of 'the great man or woman' theory of leadership;
- ongoing, relevant supportive professional learning;
- data and other sources of information that provide schools with valid, reliable and easily administered ways of monitoring performance, diagnosing student learning difficulties, and implementing appropriate strategies. (p 14)

Educational leadership and student achievement
Wahlstrom reviewed a set of articles on the theme in Educational Administration Quarterly in October 2008. For each article, the authors conducted an analysis of data from the Learning from Leadership project, with the overall research question being, "What is the effect of educational leadership on student achievement?".
Wahlstrom when looking across all of the articles saw for themes emerge:

- Context is key in any attempt to view and manage leadership.
- Relationships between leaders and those being led are neither linear nor uni-dimensional.
- Belief systems, such as efficacy and trust, appear as powerful factors to enable leadership efforts to take hold.
- Most effects of educational leadership on student achievement are indirect.

Vernez et all (2007) reported for RAND corporation on 'Evaluating Comprehensive School Reform Models at Scale'
'Under pressure to improve student achievement, schools throughout the nation are increasingly turning to whole-school models of reform. Whole-school reform, often referred to as comprehensive school reform (CSR) is based on the idea that a school ought to have a coherent vision of, its mission and educational strategy that addresses every aspect of its operations. Hundreds of CSR models have been developed. All CSR models share the common focus of changing the "whole school." But they differ in their educational philosophies and prescribed practices in key areas such as curriculum, methods of teaching, forms of governance, and parental involvement. CSR is one of a limited set of interventions that the No Child Left Behind Act explicitly allows for schools that need to improve their performance.
To date, the nation has more than 20 years of experience with CSR. More than 8,000 elementary and secondary schools (mostly low-performing) have adopted a CSR model, and more than $2 billion of federal funds have been used to implement CSR strategies. Nonetheless, the potential of this school reform to improve student achievement and meet the No Child Left Behind goal of 100 percent proficiency in reading and mathematics by the year 2014 is unknown.'

CSR's effectiveness continues to be hotly debated. Research results have been mixed. Some studies have measured a modest improvement in student achievement; others have found no effect. A major short-coming of nearly all of these studies is that they fail to account for the extent to which schools have actually implemented their chosen model. (p xv)

In general the findings were:

- We found that none of the schools in our study had fully implemented all core components of the model they had adopted. We also found broad variations in the level of implementation across schools using the same model. … Overall, the level of implementation did not change with the length of time that a school had been using a model.

- Teachers' reported commitment to using their schools' adopted model was typically only lukewarm, notwithstanding the importance model developers place on teacher "buy-in." The level of teachers' commitment did not change with years of experience using the model. By contrast, principals consistently overrated their teachers' commitment to the model. …
- Model developers typically prescribe a high level of support to ensure that the model is implemented successfully. Such support includes external support (principal and teacher consultation with the model developers/consultants, teacher training, and ongoing professional development) and internal support (the appointment of a school staff member to facilitate and coordinate the implementation). However, most schools did not have the level of implementation support that model developers deemed necessary. …Similarly, both the prescribed levels of external assistance from model developers/consultants and the time allocated to an internal school staff member to facilitate and coordinate model implementation fell short.
- A higher level of support was associated with a higher level of implementation. However, different forms of support were associated with the implementation of different core components. … Finally, we found that schools tended to engage in the same types of activities regarding curriculum, methods of instruction, student groupings, governance, assessment of students, and parent involvement regardless of whether the school used one of the four models or not.
- And, on average, all schools engaged in these activities at the same frequency or level of intensity. However, a number of model-prescribed practices differed between types of model schools and between model schools and their matched nonmodel schools. (p xviii)

One might be inclined to think that a focus on learning is not easy to realise even with the support of a comprehensive CSR. It however also might be the case that choosing for a CSR has been done by relative weak principals just to solve an accountability problem.

A meta-analysis of school-level leadership and its effects on student achievement
McREL (Waters 2007) did a meta-analysis of school-level leadership and its effects on student achievement (Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003).
'This analysis began in 2001 with the review of more than 5,000 studies that purported to have examined the effects of principal leadership on student achievement. From these 5,000 studies, 69 were selected based on the quality of their design, rigor, reliability and relevance of data to the questions McREL was attempting to answer about school-level leadership. In all cases, the studies shared four characteristics:

- The dependent variable in each study was student achievement.
- The independent variable in each study was leadership.
- Student achievement measures were all quantitative and standardized.
- Measures of school-level leadership were all quantitative and standardized.

The 69 studies included more than 14,000 teacher ratings of principal leadership for 2,802 principals. Ratings of principal leadership were correlated with more than 1.4 million student achievement scores. To our knowledge, this is the largest-ever sample for conducting this type of analysis. The findings, conclusions, and technical notes from this meta-analysis have been published in School Leadership that Works: From Research to Results (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005). (p 2)
'The purpose of any meta-analysis is to determine relationships between dependent and independent variables. McREL's meta-analysis of research on school leaders examined the relationship between student achievement and school-level leadership. It produced three major findings.
First, we found a statistically significant correlation between school-level leadership and student achievement of .25, which translates to a one standard deviation increase in principal leadership behavior corresponding with a 10 percentile point difference in student achievement on a norm referenced test. No longer is there a question about the effect of leadership on student achievement. Clearly, leadership makes a difference.
Second, we identified 21 leadership responsibilities with statistically significant correlations to student achievement and 66 practices or behaviors for fulfilling these responsibilities.

With this finding, the concept of "instructional leadership" is no longer an abstraction or left only to theory. As shown in Exhibit 1[14], we now have a well-defined set of research-based leadership responsibilities and associated practices correlated with student achievement.' (p 3)

'The third finding in the meta-analysis was somewhat surprising. In spite of finding the average effect of student achievement correlated at .25, this study also found that not all strong leaders have a positive impact on student achievement. There were a number of studies in which principals were rated by teachers as strong leaders in schools with below average achievement.
While there are many possible explanations for this third finding, described as "the differential impact of leadership," two emerged as most plausible to the researchers. First, the effect of strong leadership could be mitigated if a principal is focused (and focuses the school) on practices that are not likely to impact student achievement. There are many practices and activities on which a principal can focus the attention, energy, talent, and other assets of a school. Not all of them have the potential to positively influence student achievement. They may be important in the running of a school, but not essential for improving achievement.
The second explanation for the differential impact of leadership is the order of magnitude of change implied by the principal's improvement efforts. Simply stated, even when principals focus on the right classroom and school practices, they must understand the implications these changes have for stakeholders and adjust their leadership behaviors accordingly.' (p 9)

'Following the meta-analysis, McREL researchers conducted a factor analysis. The purpose of a factor analysis is to reveal inter-correlations among independent variables and underlying "factor" structures that might not be easily recognized by researchers, but that could substantially enhance understanding of the independent variables.
Thus, the first purpose in conducting the factor analysis was to determine if there were inter-correlations among the 21 leadership responsibilities identified in the meta-analysis.
… The second purpose was to test the hypothesis that the "differential impact of leadership" might be related to a leader's understanding of their leadership initiatives as first- and second-order[15] change for staff and the shareholders.

The researchers were surprised by the results of this analysis.
First, they did not find sufficient inter-correlations among the 21 responsibilities to warrant eliminating or combining any of them. They found that each responsibility is distinct enough to include it in our set of 21 responsibilities. This finding indicates strong construct validity in the results of the meta-analysis.
Second, they found an empirical relationship between the 21 leadership responsibilities and change. That is, principals reported varying their emphasis of the 21 responsibilities based on their estimates of the order of magnitude of change associated with improvement initiatives. Specifically, we found that all 21 responsibilities were positively correlated with first-order change. This finding indicates that principals appear to evenly balance their emphasis of all 21 responsibilities when leading change perceived as routine or first-order.
The researchers were most surprised, however, by the second factor that emerged in this analysis: second-order change. Eleven of the leadership responsibilities correlated at a level of statistical significance with second-order change. As shown in Exhibit 2, seven were positively correlated with second-order change, and four were negatively correlated with second-order change.' (p 11)

[14] Exhibit 1 is very illuminating and a good start for thinking over learning goals or competences for the development of a training course.
[15] Some changes have greater implications than others for stakeholders. Although there are a variety of labels given to differing magnitudes of change (technical vs. adaptive challenges, incremental vs. fundamental, continuous vs. discontinuous), we use the terms "first-order" and "second-order" change to make this distinction. (p 10)

Positively correlated	*Negatively correlated*
• Knowledge of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment	• Culture
• Flexibility	• Communication
• Change Agent	• Input
• Ideals and Beliefs	• Order
• Monitor and Evaluate	
• Intellectual Stimulation	
• Optimize	

(p 12)

'This finding suggests that when leading second-order changes, principals emphasize the seven responsibilities in the left-hand column of Exhibit 2 while struggling to effectively fulfil the four responsibilities in the right-hand column.
This is not to suggest that these four responsibilities have a negative impact on second-order change. Indeed, fulfilling these responsibilities effectively will likely increase the prospects for successful implementation of second-order change initiatives.
Nor does this finding suggest that principals are not working hard to fulfill these responsibilities effectively. Rather, we think of this finding as the "unintended negative consequence" of second-order change.

Michael Fullan (2001) and others have written about "implementation dip" associated with second-order change. Declines in performance in schools (and other organizations) when struggling to implement changes requiring new knowledge and skills, that challenge prevailing norms, or conflict with personal values are well documented. The implementation dip is the experience of things getting worse before they get better. McREL's factor analysis offers some empirical validation of the implementation dip. It suggests that when schools undertake an initiative with second-order implications for most stakeholders, teachers may feel there is less cohesion and more fragmentation in the school and less clarity regarding the school's vision (culture). They may also feel like the principal is less accessible and less willing to listen to their concerns (communication). Furthermore, they may feel like they have less influence on the day-to-day functions and direction of the school (input). Finally, they may feel like patterns of behavior, communication, and decision making are no longer predictable (order). As stated earlier, this finding does not imply that principals are not attending to these responsibilities. Rather, it suggests that it is difficult to fulfill these four responsibilities effectively when leading changes with second-order implications for stakeholders—especially when they are heavily emphasizing the six responsibilities positively correlated with second-order change. This is what we mean by the "unintended negative consequence" of second-order change—the possibility that teachers' perceptions of a principal's effectiveness in these areas of responsibility will be negatively affected by second- order change.' (p 12)

Based on these findings Waters et al have developed a Balanced Leadership Framework which groups the 21 responsibilities into an organizing structure: Leadership, Focus, Magnitude of Change, and Purposeful Community. (p 15)

What effective leaders do
In a similar way Leithwood et al (and building on Waters and Hallinger) identify four broad categories of leadership practices and fourteen more specific categories

Setting Directions
- Vision
- Goals
- High performance expectations

Developing People
- Individualized support/consideration - Emotional understanding and support
- Intellectual stimulation
- Modelling

Redesigning the Organization
- Building a collaborative culture
- Structuring the organization to facilitate work
- Creating productive relations with families & communities
- Connecting the school to its wider environment

Managing the Teaching Programme
- Staffing
- Providing teaching support
- Monitoring
- Buffering staff from distractions to their core

'Four broad categories of leadership practices – and fourteen more specific categories - capture our review of the evidence about what effective leaders do. They do not do all of these things all of the time, of course; you don't have to create a shared vision everyday. And the way you go about each set of practices will certainly vary by context. If your school has been labelled as "failing" you are more likely to have to sell your vision to staff than developing it collaboratively – so you can get on with your turnaround mission. So what is contingent about leadership is not the basic or core practices but the way they are enacted. It is the enactment that must be sensitive to values and context, not the core practices themselves.' (p 43)

Leadership by whom?
With an increasing attention for the selection of the right people before they are admitted to leadership training, the question arises whether there are skills, dispositions or traits that are relevant for a good school leader but maybe are difficult to train.

Leithwood et al (2006) made an inventory of cognitive and emotional characteristics of successful leaders. They build on research on leadership in other organisations but also on research about the (new) content and skills to be teached in schools and new concepts of constructed and social learning.

'In sum, we can conclude from the evidence reviewed so far in this section that the cognitive capacities of leaders are quite important to their success. These capacities include general intelligence. Being intelligent almost always helps, especially with complex tasks in messy environments like schools. Successful leadership is also fostered by expertise in the solving of ill – structured problems, pedagogical content knowledge related to any curriculum reforms to be implemented in their schools and a rich understanding of how to help teachers acquire such pedagogical content knowledge themselves.' (p 73)

Regarding affective characteristics Leithwood reflect on personality, motivation, social appraisal skills and values. Regarding personality Leithwood sketches the 'big five' leader personality traits: emotional stability, extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, openness to experience. Day and Leithwood link 'successful leadership to several internal states beyond the big five, notably optimism, proactivity (perhaps one manifestation of extraversion), internal locus of control and nurturance. But there is relatively little evidence, at this point, linking most of these states or traits to successful school leadership.' (p 76)
'Leader self-efficacy was identified as an important antecedent to effective or transformational leadership' (p. 76)

Regarding motivation it was (in contrast with studies of other organizations) surprising that respondents were reported to have strong achievement needs, but there was no evidence among any of them of a need for dominance, power or affiliation. (p 79).

With regard to emotional understanding 'the evidence we reviewed indicates that social intelligence and emotional understanding have a moderate to strong relationship with leadership success.' (p 80).

With respect to values Leithwood summarizes two studies[16]:
Successful headteachers in the two studies appeared to have high levels of respect and concern for others and value their happiness, specifically the need for teachers to be happy, a set of basic human values. Among general moral values and beliefs, the two studies found modest amounts of evidence to suggest that successful leaders were empathetic and cared strongly about their students and staff. Their actions were also interpreted by their staffs as evidence of valuing equity and social justice. Day et al. (2000) found that their successful headteachers were perceived to have high levels of integrity and high moral standards. Although no explicit mention was made of courage, a value reported in earlier research, it would be plausible to attribute courage to the successful principals included in both studies; they worked in highly accountable policy contexts but continued to buffer their staffs from external demands which they believed would not be helpful to act on in their schools.

With respect to professional values and beliefs, evidence from the two recent studies closely approximates the findings of earlier research (Leithwood & Steinbach, 1995). Role responsibility values were evident among some of the successful principals, along with concerns for the consequences of their work, especially for students. These principals believed that a schools' focus should be on the best interests of students, that all children can learn and should succeed, and that all children have potential that should be realized.

A substantial amount of evidence in our international study indicated that successful principals' values and beliefs are social and political in nature, as reported in earlier studies. For example, Ling, Chia and Fang's (2000; quoted in Pittinsky and Zhu, 2005) research indicates that Chinese leaders who exhibit collectivist values tend to be favoured. The researchers found that four dimensions are usually adopted to describe the conceptualization of [successful] leadership: personal morality, goal efficiency, interpersonal competence, and versatility. Among the four dimensions, most leaders tend to give the highest ratings to interpersonal competence; this is 'consistent with Chinese collectivist values' (pp. 735-738). Successful principals were concerned about community involvement in the school, especially in its vision, had high levels of commitment to that vision, and believed that capacities possessed by people throughout the school should be used for the good of the students. Many of the successful principals in our international study also valued the participation of all stakeholders in school decisions.' (p 82).

Major publications from the last years are:

- Alton-Lee, Adrienne (2007), 'Making a Bigger Difference in Desired Educational Outcomes for Diverse Learners through Collaborative Cultures of Inquiry and Development', Pacific Circle Consortium,
- Bates, Richard (2005), 'Educational Administration and Social Justice', Annual Conference of the Australian Association for Research in Education,
- Briggs, Ann R.J. (2008), 'Educational leaders as partners: new models of leadership?', CCEAM,
- Camburn, Eric, Brian Rowan, and James E. Taylor (2003), 'Distributed Leadership in Schools: The Case of Elementary Schools Adopting Comprehenive School Reform Models', Educational Evaluaton and Policy Analysis, 25 (4), 347-73.
- Shields, Carolyn M. (2006), 'Creating Spaces for Value-Based Conversations: the role of school leaders in the 21st Century', International Studies in Educational Administration, 34 (2), 62-81.
- Crow, Gary M. (2007), 'The Complex Landscape of Successful Principal Practices: An International Perspective', ISEA, 35 (3), 67-74.
- Dahlström, Lars (2002), Post-apartheid teacher education reform in Namibia - the struggle between common sense and good sense, (Pedagogiska Institutionen, Umeå universitet).
- Dahlstrom, Lars (2007), 'Consequence of Pedagogy: a personal narrative adding up to Critical Practitioner Inquiry',
- Darling-Hammond, Linda (2007), 'Excellent Teachers Deserve Excellent Leaders', The Wallace Foundation's National Conference, 4-7.

[16] (Day et al., 2000; Day & Leithwood, in press)

- DeVita, M. Christina (2007), 'Leadership: The Bridge to Better Learning', The Wallace Foundation's National Conference, 4-7.
- Foster, W (1989), 'Toward a critical practice of leadership', in Smyth, John (ed.), Critical perspectives on educational leadership (Routledge), 39-62.
- Freire, Paulo (2000), Pedagogy of the Oppressed, (Continuum).0826412769
- Fullan, Michael G. (2003), the Moral Imperative of School Leadership, (Corwin Press).0-7619-3872-9
- Gunter, Helen (2001), 'Critical approaches to leadership in education'', Journal of Educational Inquiry, 2 (2), 94-108.
- Gunter, Helen and Peter Ribbins (2002), 'Leadership Studies in Education: Towards a Map of the Field', Educational Management & Administration, 30 (4), 387-416.
- Hallinger, P. and J. Murphy (1985), 'Assessing the instructional leadership behavior of principals', Elementary School Journal, 86 (2), 217-48.
- Hallinger, Philip and Ronald H Heck (1996), 'Reassessing the principals role in school effectiveness: A review of empirical research, 1980-1995.', EAQ, 32 (1), 5-44.
- Hallinger, Philip (2008), 'Methodologies for Studying School Leadership: A Review of 25 years of Research Using the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale', AERA,
- Hallinger, Philip and Kamontip Snidvongs (2008), 'Educating Leaders: Is There Anything to Learn from Business Management?', Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 36 (1), 9-31.
- H, Heck Ronald and Philip Hallinger (2008), 'Assessing the Contribution of Principals' and Collaborative Leadership to School Improvement',
- Honig, MI and KS Louis (2007), 'A New Agenda for Research in Educational Leadership: A Conversational Review', Educational Administration Quarterly, 43 (1), 138.
- Jacobson, Stephen L. and Christopher Day (2007), 'The International Successful School Principalship Project (ISSP)', ISEA, 35 (3), 3-10.
- Kozol, Jonathan (1991), Savage Inequalities; Children in America's Schools, (New York: Crown Publishers, Inc).
- Kozol, Jonathan (2005), The Shame of the Nation: The Restoration of Apartheid Schooling in America, (New York: Crown Publishers, Inc).
- Leithwood, KA and C Riehl (2003), What We Know about Successful School Leadership, (National College for School Leadership).
- Leithwood, Kenneth, et al. (2006), 'Successful School Leadership: What It Is and How It Influences Pupil Learning',
- Leithwood, Kenneth and Blair Mascall (2008), 'Collective Leadership Effects on Student Achievement', EAQ, 44 (4), 529-61.
- Leithwood, Kenneth et al. (1999), Changing Leadership for Changing Times, (Open University Press).335195229
- Macbeath, John and YC Cheng (2008), Leadership for Learning, eds. Townsend, Tony and Ira Bogotch, (Education Leadership and Leaders in Contexts, Rotterdam: Sense Publishers).
- Mayrowetz, David (2008), 'Making Sense of Distributed Leadership: Exploring the Multiple Usages of the Concept in the Field', EAQ, 44 (3), 424-35.
- McGough, David J. (2003), 'Leaders as Learners: An Inquiry into the Formation and Transformation of Principals' Professional Perspectives', Educational Evaluaton and Policy Analysis, 25 (4), 449-71.
- Miller, RJ and B Rowan (2006), 'Effects of Organic Management on Student Achievement', American Educational Research Journal, 43 (2), 219.
- Moos, Lejf, John Krejsler, and Klaus Kasper Kofod (2006), 'Successful Leadership as Distributed Leadership - Danish experiences with new systems of governance', ICSEI,
- Nyambe, John (2008), 'Paradigm Lost? The road ahead not so clear: CPI in the BETD',
- OECD, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2008), Improving School Leadership: Volume 1: Policy and Practice, (OECD Publishing).9264044671
- OECD, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2008), Improving School Leadership: Volume 2: Case Studies on System Leadership, (OECD Publishing).9264033084

- Pont, Beatrice and David Hopkins (2006), 'Approaches to System Leadership: Lessons learned and policy pointers', Volume 2: Case Studies on System Leadership (Improving School Leadership), 253-74.
- Ribbins, Peter and Helen Gunter (2002), 'Mapping Leadership Studies in Education', Educational Management & Administration, 30 (4), 359-85.
- Richmon, Malcolm J. and Derek J. Allison (2003), 'Toward a Conceptual Framework for Leadership Inquiry', Educational Management & Administration, 31 (1), 31-50.
- Seashore-Louis, K and MB Miles (1990), 'Improving the Urban High School: What Works and Why', *New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University*,
- Simkins, T (2005), 'Leadership in Education:'What Works' or'What Makes Sense'?', Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 33 (1), 9.
- Slater, Lorraine (2008), 'Pahways to Building Leadership Capacity', EAQ, 36 (1), 55-69.
- Sleegers, Peter, et al. 'School leaders' problem framing: a sense-making approach to problem solving processes of beginning school leaders (draft)',
- Spillane, J and JZ Sherer (2004), 'A distributed perspective on school leadership: Leadership practice as stretched over people and place', Unpublished draft at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Association, San Diego. CA, 1-9.
- Vernez, Georges, et al. (2006), 'Evaluating Comprehensive School Reform Models at Scale: Focus on Implementation',
- Wahlstrom, Kyla L. and Karen Seashore Louis (2008), 'How Teachers Experience Principal Leadership: The Roles of Professional Community, Trust, Efficacy and Shared Responsibility', EAQ, 44 (4), 458-95.
- Wasonga, TA and JF Murphy (2007), 'Co-creating Leadership Dispositions', ISEA, 35 (2), 20-32.
- Wassink, Hartger, Peter Sleegers, and Jeroen Imants (2004), 'Leiding geven tussen denken en doen: alledaagse denkprocessen van schoolleiders', Onderwijs Research Dagen,
- Waters, Tim and Greg Cameron (2007), 'The balanced leadership framework: Connecting vision with action',
- Ylimaki Rose M. (2007), 'Instructional Leadership in Challenging US Schools', ISEA, 35 (3), 11-19.
- Ylimaki, Rose M. (2006), 'Toward a New Conceptualization of Vision in the Work of Educational Leaders: Cases of the Visionary Archetype', EAQ, 42 (4), 620-51.
- Zeichner, Kenneth and Lars Dahlstrom (1999), Democratic Teacher Education Reforms In Namibia (The Edge, Critical Studies in Educational Theory), (Westview Press).0813390621

Questions for the curriculum development of the Sub-Saharan African head teacher course

- Which of the concepts on leadership seem to be worthwhile to use in a training of prospective head teachers in Malawi, South Sudan, Uganda, Tanzania?
- Which concepts would you avoid?
- Which other reasons do you see (apart from the six mentioned) to be cautious with the concepts presented?
- Do you think the seven strong claims hold for Sub-Saharan Africa also?
- Is education leadership for social justice a topic to be discussed in a future training?
- Are you selecting trainees or would you select trainees and if so what criteria are you using/would you use?