

31

Developing School Leaders: A Critical Review of Current Practices, Approaches and Issues, and Some Directions for the Future

STEPHAN GERHARD HUBER

Centre for School Development and Management, University of Bamberg

MEL WEST

School of Education, University of Manchester

THE IMPORTANCE OF LEADERS AND THEIR DEVELOPMENT

The headteacher plays a highly significant role in school management, being both focus and pivot at the centre of decision-making. Preparing, inducting and developing headteachers is a major responsibility of the education service. (DES, 1990)

This statement, published by the British Education Ministry, is one of the few assertions about the quality of schooling that is unlikely to be contradicted by teachers, school leaders themselves, politicians or parents. The pivotal role of the school leader¹ as a factor in effective schools has been corroborated by findings of school effectiveness research over the last two decades (see Rutter, et al., 1979; Edmonds, 1979; Brookover, et al., 1979; Mortimore, et al., 1988; Levine & Lezotte, 1990; Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993; Creemers, 1994; Sammons, et al., 1995). In most of the lists of key factors (or correlates) that school effectiveness research has compiled, 'leadership' plays an important part. Indeed the effectiveness lobby's original message that 'schools matter, schools do make a difference' has continued almost seamlessly into a sub-text that 'school leaders matter, school leaders also make a difference', as we have previously noted (Huber, 1997; West, et al., 2000). School improvement researchers have also demonstrated increasing recognition of the importance of school leaders for all stages of the school improvement process (see van Velzen, et al., 1985; Stegö, et al., 1987; Fullan, 1991; Leithwood, 1992; Caldwell & Spinks, 1992; Sergiovanni, 1994; Hopkins, et al., 1996; West & Ainscow, 1997). The school leader is most often cited as the key figure in the individual school's development, either blocking or promoting change, acting as the internal change agent, overseeing the processes

of growth and renewal. It is perhaps not surprising, in the face of so much attention being given to the role of school leaders in creating the conditions for an effective school, that there has been a parallel growth in the attention given to how headteachers or principals are prepared for this role. The training of current and future school leaders has thus become a major focus of professional development programmes in many countries.

Of course, the school leader's role has to be seen in relation to the broad cultural and educational contexts in which the school is operating. Since schools are embedded in their communities and in the particular national educational system, and these in turn are embedded in the particular society, schools and their leaders have to cope with, to support or otherwise react to the social, economic and cultural changes and developments taking place. Direct changes in the educational system have a particularly strong and to a large extent calculable impact on the school leader's role. But schools, and consequently the pressures and expectations on school leaders, also change as a result of more subtle and indirect forces in society – social, political and economic changes – that are gathering speed across the world as the pace of international development increasingly reflects global factors. These new conditions and demands certainly place new pressures on the leader and, though the new tasks and challenges can be viewed positively as bringing new opportunities, nevertheless there is some concern that what we are trying to do is to prepare leaders for tomorrow's schools using today's training content and methods. The key challenge, therefore, confronting those who plan for and design school leader training programmes, are first how to anticipate the range of knowledge, skills and competencies that the next generation will need and then how to find ways to equip them with these.

Clearly, the ever-expanding literature on school leadership is a major influence here. Of course, as we have previously observed (West & Ainscow, 1994), there is a danger that in approaching the headteacher role through the rhetoric of 'leadership' many writers have focused on style at the expense of substance. Schools may be more pleasant places to work if they are 'led' rather than 'managed', but often a preoccupation with the notion and language of leadership has been accompanied by a neglect of management activities that are central to effective school leadership. Despite this reservation, there is no doubt that studies of school leader behaviour have enriched our understanding of the role, and helped to shape the curriculum for school leader development in many countries. Accordingly, a brief summary of current thinking seems justified.

To a large extent, this focus on the relationship between leaders and work groups and the ways in which the leader can develop and harness the relationship has been reflected in the development of leadership theory generally – it is not a 'school' issue as such. Murphy (1991) suggests that thinking about leadership falls into a number of phases – building towards the current interest in the links between leader behaviour and organisational culture. We believe that these phases can be broadly classified as follows:

- Initial interest in the personal qualities and characteristics of 'successful' leaders that result in *personality* or *trait* theories of leadership.
- Increasing focus on what it is that leaders actually do: Are there some behaviours and approaches that are consistently associated with successful leadership? Such inquiries support the development of *behavioural* theories of leadership.
- Growing awareness that task-related and people-centred behaviours may be interpreted quite differently by different groups and in different contexts, prompting explanation of how the particular context might best be accounted for within a general theory, and resulting in a variety of *situational* approaches to leadership.

- Most recently, emphasis is put on the links between leadership style and the culture of the organisation: a movement away from the notion of leadership as *transactional* to the notion of leadership as *transformational*, having the potential to alter the cultural context in which people work.

It is this last phase that has had most influence on the debate about leadership in education over the past decade – with the (so-called) 'transactional' and 'transformational' approaches being explored in some detail in a number of countries. Inevitably, there seems to be a preoccupation with 'transactional' models in systems where strong central control has been retained, while in those systems where decentralisation has been most evident, considerable interest in 'transformational' models has emerged. It is worth briefly contrasting these two 'stereotypes' of the leadership role.

In the more stable system, where maintenance has a higher priority than development, and the school leader is seen as playing a major role in protecting and promoting the interests of the system, a transactional approach is frequently found. In such an approach, the emphasis will tend to be on the management of the school's systems and structures, on creating efficiency and effectiveness, and on achieving prescribed outcomes. The role of the transactional leader is to focus upon the key purposes of the organisation and to assist people to recognise what needs to be done in order to reach the desired outcomes. When the parameters for success are well defined, transactional leaders can be very effective. They may even be effective in bringing about certain kinds of organisational change – those where the parameters are very clearly identified, where conformity rather than creativity is valued, and where it is hoped to retain organisational structures and relationships despite changing (say) education content or method. Transactional leadership approaches, therefore, seem best suited to static school systems and communities.

It has been widely argued that complex and dynamic changes, such as the 'cultural' changes that are required for sustained school improvement, are less likely to occur as a result of transactional leadership (Beare, et al., 1989; Stoll & Fink, 1996). A model of leadership more congruent with the requirement of cultural change is that of transformational leadership. This style of leadership focuses on the people involved and their relationships, and requires an approach that seeks to transform feelings, attitudes and beliefs. Transformational leaders

not only manage structure, but they purposefully seek to impact upon the culture of the school in order to change the complexities that surround school-based change and to situate themselves at the heart of school improvement. Leithwood's (2000) recent book describes some excellent examples of what this might look like in practice. Consequently, both practically and conceptually, transformational leadership would appear to be consistent with a desire to bring about school improvement, rather than simply 'change' the school. But how are we to develop school leaders who can transform their schools in this way; what assumptions about the required knowledge, skills and understandings can be drawn on to shape a framework for the training and preparation of school leaders? One of the clearest conceptualisations of such a framework has been established in the United Kingdom. Here, a national curriculum for aspiring head teachers has been spelled out. This curriculum was developed in response to a set of National Standards for Headteachers, laid down in 1997. The standards:

set out the knowledge, understanding, skills and attributes which relate to the key areas of headship. They define expertise in headship and are designed to serve as the basis for planning the professional development of both aspiring and serving Headteachers. (DfEE, 1997)

The standards address five aspects of the school leader (headteacher) role: core purposes of the headteacher, key outcomes of headship, professional knowledge and understanding, skills and attributes required, and the key areas of headship. The emphasis on the need to produce a generation of heads who are able to cope with the ever-increasing expectations societies place on schools, and to ensure that heads see their local communities as active partners in this enterprise, is evident. So too is the recognition that new expectations and responsibilities are likely to require continuous personal development. The section on professional knowledge and understanding underlines this, stating that:

The knowledge and understanding required of headteachers draws on sources both inside and outside education. The specific knowledge and understanding required will change over time and will therefore need to be reviewed on a regular basis. (DfEE, ibid.)

In a similar vein, the section relating to key areas of headship proposes that:

Headteachers ... develop a strategic view for the school in its community and analyse and plan for its future needs and further development within the local, national and international context. (DfEE, ibid.)

The training curriculum is organised around four themes – the strategic direction and development of the school, teaching and learning, teaching and managing staff and the efficient and effective development of resources. The tone here is

strongly managerial – even the teaching and learning theme focuses on the generation and use of data about teaching and learning that can provide a basis for the monitoring, evaluation and improvement of performance. Practicality is stressed by location of tasks and development activities within trainees' own schools, linked to actual improvement efforts. The final phase of the programme looks, *inter alia*, at the role of vision-building in school leadership and, perhaps more tenuously, at 'future schools'.

What we see here has developed a long way from the embryonic school leader training activities (programme would be too grand a word) of twenty or so years ago, when heads might expect some guidance on paperwork, perhaps some training on timetabling or on curriculum planning, and a one-day course on staff selection. While the approach in the UK is relatively well developed (though not more so than in parts of the United States or Australasia) a similar trend can be discerned in many countries, as efforts to equip school leaders to deal with the management of the school as an organisation gather speed.

Inevitably, given school leaders' high and increasing levels of responsibility, ensuring that they are adequately prepared for their role has become an alluring target for politicians. But, though agreement on the importance and urgency of training and development of school leaders is rapidly spreading, how best to tackle this seems to be determined locally, with few comparisons of international practice available. If the aim of training is to prepare school leaders for the pivotal role they play in the development of our schools, and to equip them with the necessary competencies to do their job (i.e., the knowledge, understanding, skills, abilities, and attributes), it seems likely that there will be some qualities that are necessary regardless of national context, some development practices that are useful across the range of school systems. In the remainder of this chapter, we try to tease out what these might be, by examining current practice in a range of countries.

TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES ACROSS THE WORLD

The following section provides an overview of the position of school leader development in ten countries representing current practice in Europe, in Asia, in Australasia and in the United States, selected from a recently completed comparative research project (see Huber, 2003). The methods used comprised two surveys, extensive documentation analysis, additional country-specific investigations, and working closely with experienced and established academics from these countries as validating internal experts. The following reports therefore reflect the situation as we found it in 2000/2001.

There are eight dimensions selected for comparison. Who provides the training programme is identified, whether it is a central state-run training college or universities or private providers; as is the target group, since some schemes focus

on those already in headteacher or principal roles while others embrace potential or aspiring school leaders earlier in their careers. Other dimensions relate to programme aims, programme content and the range of training methods and learning opportunities involved. A further three dimensions refer to programme pattern, that is the number of training days and the time span needed for the course programme, programme status, whether it is compulsory or voluntary, and what kind of relevance the programme has for career prospects. The final dimension looks at the costs of the programme, and whether these are borne centrally or by individual participants. These snapshots of 'practice' in the various countries are followed by a final section, in which similarities and differences that emerge from comparisons of some of the dimensions are summarised and discussed.

School Leader Preparation in Europe

France

The educational system in France is heavily centralised. The school leader, particularly the 'Principal', or 'Proviseur' in the secondary school sector, is seen as the director of a public institution and a representative of the state. The work emphasis has traditionally been on administrative tasks. However, in the last few years, the scope of site-based educational responsibility has been enlarged, bringing with it new tasks for school leaders. But still, the recruitment and preparation of school leaders are strongly centralised. Preparation is designed by the 'Centre Condorcet', according to government-provided standards and guidelines. The programme is carried out in a decentralised way by 28 regional, state-run academies, with slight differences depending on the region. Recruitment and training are interlinked. First the applicants have to go through a selection procedure driven by competition, 'le Concours'. Having passed it successfully, the preparation training programme, 'Formation au Premier Emploi' begins. This full-time programme, for which the candidates receive leave with full salary, is comprised not only of seminars and traditional teaching courses, but also an extensive internship scheme. After completing the programme they take over school leadership positions, most often as a deputy. During a two-year probationary period they undergo further support training, the 'Formation d'Accompagnement'. Having successfully finished the probation phase, there is a further range of training and continuous development opportunities, the 'Formation Continue'. This comprehensive and expensive qualification programme is to some extent a response to the fact that there is no middle management level in the French secondary school system, and hence the participants have rather limited previous experience in school leadership positions.

Table 1. Outline of the national programme for school leaders of secondary schools in France
National programme for school leaders of secondary schools

Provider	Centre Condorcet in Paris through 28 regional state academies
Target Group	future school leaders at secondary level, who have successfully come through the selection process and passed a written exam (now a dossier) and an oral exam
Aims	imparting of leadership and management skills in preparation for the task of leading a secondary school
Contents	Administration; School Law; Management Techniques; Budgeting; Teacher Evaluation; Interpersonal Skills; Leading Conferences and Staff Groups
Methods	modularised seminars at state academies interspersed with practical training in schools (with the school leader as mentor) as well as in companies and public authorities
Pattern	Phase 1: Formation au Premier Emploi: 24 weeks (ca. 120 days) within 6 months full-time directly after successfully passing the selection process; from January to June; timetabling: 4–6 weeks at an academy; regularly interspersed by a total of approx. 12 weeks internship in schools; 4–6 weeks practical training in a company, and 2 weeks practical training at a local authority; Phase 2: 'Formation d'Accompagnement': 21 days 1 or 2 day courses immediately after taking over as a (deputy) school leader during the two year probationary period
Status	mandatory; selection and training are interdependent: training cannot begin without first having been selected; both are preconditions for taking over a position as a school leader
Costs	unknown; state financed; participants get release time from school for the duration of the first phase

Netherlands

The Dutch school system is distinctly decentralised. The state is constrained to providing guidelines and creating a basic framework for schooling. The school is administered locally and possesses a high degree of autonomy. As to the development of school leaders, the state does not interfere at all. It is up to the individual school council employing the respective school leader to determine their expectations of the candidates' expertise. The provision of school leader training and development is driven by the market, which is characterised by diversity and choice. There is a wide range of providers and programmes, which differ in content and methods as well as quality; they differ in that sometimes they are preparatory programmes and other times they are programmes for experienced school leaders. However, at the primary school level, the Ministry of Education is indirectly involved in that they choose to finance the candidates participating in certain programmes offered by traditional teacher training institutes. What is remarkable in the Netherlands is that in certain programmes there is a very innovative approach to school leader development. For example, the programme 'Meesters in Leidingsezen' uses mainly 'peer-assisted learning', in which the participants build pairs who act as 'critical friends', to support each other intellectually and with daily tasks and challenges. Based on the concept of 'integral leadership' (Imants & de Jong, 1999), they are encouraged to develop 'cognitive

maps' of their schools. This process of cognitive mapping will then form the basis for concrete school development planning. The development of individual school leaders is integrated with the development of the individual schools. A different and especially extensive and renowned programme for both experienced and aspiring school leaders is offered by the 'Nederlandse School voor Onderwijsmanagement' (NSO). The NSO, which is a joint institution of five universities, uses a competency-based approach over a long programme of 176 study days with extensive time for internships and school-based projects, which leads to the academic degree of Master in Educational Management. The programme seeks to develop a broad range of competencies, starting with pedagogical and educational competencies, followed by counselling competencies and ending with 'controlling and organisational' competencies.

Table 2. Outline of Management- en Organisatieopleidingen of the NSO in the Netherlands
Example: Management- en Organisatieopleidingen of the NSO

Provider	Nederlandse School voor Onderwijsmanagement (NSO), a co-operation of five universities
Target Group	aspiring and established school leaders (and deputies), particularly at secondary level
Aims	development of competencies for leading schools and other institutions in the educational sector; improving the chances of the participants to get employed in a leadership position due to a formal qualification (certificate)
Contents	Context and Strategic Management; Organization Management; Operational Management; Theories of Management and Organization; Models of Educational Organizations; Organizational Diagnosis; Decision-Making; School Management and School Boards; Marketing and Public Relations; Contract Activities; Control of the School Culture; Leadership Styles; Personnel Management; Recruitment, Selection and Guidance of New Staff; Job Evaluation Interviews; Guidance of Sitting Staff; Labour-Relations and Collective Bargaining; Instructional Leadership; Curriculum and Instruction; Modularization; Productivity and Quality Care; Implementation of Innovations; Internal and External Guidance; Development and External Management Consultancy; Management Information Systems; Management of Information Technology; Facility Management; Financing and Budgeting; Selected Problems of School Management; Selected Practices of the School Leader
Methods	lectures, speeches, seminars, training sessions, consultations, role play and simulations, case study, peer counseling, readings, writing a study journal (documenting one's own learning process)/reflective writing, school projects/internship
Pattern	ca. 144 course days* (4 semesters with 21.5 hours contact time each) and additionally time for preparing and implementing the school project within the internship (4 semesters with 140 hours each), and time for literature research and readings, and for the assignments;
	timetabling; seminars: 20 hours per semester, every Wednesday (afternoon/evening); training sessions: 17.5 hours per semester, Friday and Saturday; supervision: 15–20 hours per semester; school project within the internship: 140 hours per semester
Status	optional; valued by the employing school body as the NSO is well renowned
Costs	ca. 7,200 euro (16,000 Dutch guilder) per participant; financed by the participants themselves (sometimes funded by the school budget)

*If there is no specification by the provider as far as the number of days is concerned, we converted the contact time in hours into the unit 'course day' taking 6 hours training as one day.

England and Wales

In recent years there has been increasing formalisation of the preparation of headteachers in England and Wales. While there have been training programmes available for some time, the piecemeal local arrangements have now been replaced by national schemes that target three groups: aspiring headteachers, newly appointed headteachers, and established headteachers. The largest of these programmes, the National Professional Qualification for Headship (NPQH), has been revised in the past year, three years after initial implementation. This programme, which is intended as a preparation for headship, is available to senior staff in schools who are nearing that point where an application for a headteacher post is possible. The revised scheme is arranged in three parts. There is a general expectation that programme members will take one year to work through stage

Table 3. Outline of the National Professional Qualification for Headship (NPQH) in England and Wales

Qualification for school leaders in England and Wales, Great Britain The National Professional Qualification for Headship	
Provider	approved centres contracted to the education ministry; in future, the National College for School Leadership is likely to play an increasing role in contracting to and quality assurance of providers
Target Group	teachers aspiring to headship, i.e. before application
Aims	providing the participants with leadership and management competencies in order to prepare them for headship
Contents	mandatory module: Strategic leadership and Accountability (developing a strategic educational vision committed to raising achievements; translating the vision into practice in order to secure high-quality teaching and learning; monitoring, evaluating and reviewing the effectiveness of a school; being accountable for the efficiency and effectiveness of a school to governors, staff, parents and pupils); additional modules: Teaching and Learning; Leading and Managing Staff; Efficient and Effective Deployment of Staff and Resources
Methods	self assessment, taught sessions, seminars, workshops, case studies, simulation exercises, group reviews and presentations; materials used include inspection reports, research findings, video materials etc.
Pattern	10–25 course days* (according to the number of modules) plus school-based projects, individual study and preparation of assignments within 1–3 years; timetabling; mandatory module: 180 hours (60 hours contact time and 120 hours for school-based projects, individual study and preparing for assignments); 3 further modules: 90 hours each (30 hours contact time and 60 hours for school-based projects and assignments)
Status	optional (from 2004 mandatory); very much welcomed by the employing committees at the individual schools
Costs	ca. 3,200 euro to 4,700 euro (2,000 to 3,000 English pounds) for each participant depending on the number of modules taken; different sources of funding are offered, but self-funding is possible as well

*If there is no specification by the provider as far as the number of days is concerned, we converted the contact time in hours into the unit 'course day' taking 6 hours training as one day.

Table 4. Outline of the state-wide programme for school leaders in Bavaria, Germany
Example: The Bavarian state-wide programme for school leaders

Provider	Akademie für Lehrerfortbildung und Personalführung Dillingen
Target Group	all newly appointed school leaders of all different kinds of schools
Aims	supporting school leaders in their new roles as key figures for assuring that their schools are run effectively within the framework of the central guidelines and implementing educational development processes proposed by the Bavarian State Department of Education
Contents	Course I: Reflection on one's own Leadership Role; Organisation and Administration of Schools; School Law; Course II: Leading Conferences; Leading Staff (leadership functions, styles and guidelines, management strategies); Communication Skills; additional themes are, e.g. team work, school programmes, etc.); Course III: Leading Staff (conflict management); School Improvement and School Quality (vision of a school, profile of a school, corporate identity, TQM-strategies); Environment-compatible Schools; Course IV: Representing the School to the Public; Working with Parents; Managing Stand-in Staff; Teaching foreign Pupils
Methods	seminars, lectures, team work, moderation techniques, role-plays, simulations, learning by doing, tasks, reflection time, excursions (to innovative schools and school systems abroad)
Pattern	15/20 course days within 1 year timetabling; Course I: 1 week in the summer holidays between appointment and taking over leadership; Course II: 1 week in November/December; Course III: 1 week in May/June; Course IV: 1 week decentralised organised mandatory
Status	
Costs	unknown, state financed

one and another to work through stages two and three. Depending on their experience, some the applicants are allowed to enter the programme directly into stage two following an assessment of their strengths and needs. The scheme for newly appointed headteachers, the Headteachers Leadership and Management Programme (HEADLAMP), offers a range of modules based in approved centres and covering management topics to those in the first year of headship. The programme for established headteachers, the Leadership Programme for Serving Heads (LPSH), was introduced in 2000 as the final piece in the jigsaw, ensuring that "updating" on management issues is available to all those who seek it. Currently, these programmes are widely accessible, due to a deliberate strategy to provide regionally based training opportunities, and the relatively generous funding available to pay for training, administered through Local Education Authorities but originating from central government. The government has made it clear that it expects NPQH to become a mandatory requirement in due course, so it is likely, once all headteachers have been through this route, that the HEADLAMP and LPSH programmes will alter to reflect this prior training. The scale of training activities is impressive. At the Centre for Educational Leadership at the University of Manchester, one of the country's major providers of these programmes, some 900 registrations for NPQH alone have been made here during the past three years. This thriving programme of headteacher training is supplemented by a certificate course in Educational Leadership and Consultancy, designed to promote the development of headteacher trainers, which also seems likely to become a national requirement in due course. The recently established National College for School Leadership is beginning to take shape, and is likely to oversee and coordinate future developments, collaborating with regional partners in the continuing development and implementation of national programmes.

Germany

In the Federal Republic of Germany, the responsibility for education is generally up to the Departments of Education of each of the 16 federal states known as the 'Laender'. However, the general structure of the school system and the roles of school leaders are quite similar in all these states. In many of them there is a move towards decentralisation and increased self-management of schools, within a centrally fixed framework. School-based decision-making is being introduced and school development initiatives at the individual school level have become important issues. School leaders, who are increasingly seen as central figures in the process of improving the school, are employed by each state as civil servants and in general have non-terminable (lifelong) tenure. The role of school leaders and the necessity of developing adequate training and development models are currently being addressed. A research project, which involved all sixteen German federal states (Huber, 2000; Rosenbusch & Huber, 2001), showed the following: the only common characteristics of school leader development models in the federal states are that all sixteen states offer training for newly appointed school

leaders, and that this training is offered by the respective state-run institute for continuing professional development of teachers. Only to a very small degree are other providers involved in school leader training. However, the programmes vary in several aspects. First of all, in half of the states these development opportunities for school leaders after they have taken up their posts are obligatory, and only five states have introduced additional pre-service orientation courses. Typically these last only a few days, and have not been made mandatory thus far. Secondly, they vary considerably as to the time-span, the total training days involved and the programme structure. Some of the states offer a programme that consists of only one basic course, lasting a week. Others have established development models of up to 40 days. In those states in which the training programme comprises 20 days or more, these programmes are either offered in intensive one-week periods (i.e., an induction weekend and then four one-week

Table 5. Outline of the Diploma in Educational Administration in Singapore
*Qualification for school leaders in Singapore
Diploma in Educational Administration*

Provider	National Institute of Education of Nanyang Technological University
Target Group	Teachers before application for principalship
Aims	Preparation of school principals for the creation of school as 'Learning Organisation' or 'Thinking School'
Contents	School as Learning Organisation; Principles of Management; Systems Leadership; Workplace Learning; Action Research and Evaluation; Problem-based Practice; Marketing; Educational Evaluation; Management of School Programmes; Curriculum Development and Change Implementation; Professional Development of Staff; Governance of Singapore; Educational Policy Making; Financial Management in School; Ethics of Management Decisions
Methods	Lectures, seminars, workshops, tutorials, mentoring
Pattern	ca. 58 course days*, and 24-week full-time school internships, and additional readings within 9 months full-time; timetabling; 21 weeks of seminars (286 contact hours per semester), 24-week school internships
Status	Mandatory
Costs	Unknown, state financed; salary will be paid throughout the programme

* If there is no specification by the provider as far as the number of days is concerned, we converted the contact time in hours into the unit 'course day' taking 6 hours training as one day.

Singapore

The school system in Singapore is driven by a strong central government policy, whose most important aims are achievement, efficiency and economic success.

The supervision and control of schooling in Singapore is done directly by the Ministry of Education. The schools and the teachers, as well as the pupils, are in competition with each other and are therefore under a great deal of pressure. Efforts to give the schools a greater degree of autonomy result in even higher levels of such pressure. Today, a slogan often used says Singapore is striving for 'Thinking Schools', to develop creativity and lifelong learning. The training programme for all school leaders, the Diploma in Educational Administration (DEA), was developed by the Ministry of Education with the National Institute of Education (NIE) of the Nanyang Technological University. (Though currently being revised, there is no plan to dilute or reduce the programme.) The explicit purpose of the training programme is to enable the participants to become leaders of 'Thinking Schools'. The programme consists of modularised courses and two four-week internships, with a mentoring attachment. During this nine-month full-time programme the participants receive their full salary. An explicit aim is to develop school leaders who regard schools as 'learning communities' and who establish management teams, to draw colleagues into leadership roles. This is supported by separate training for middle managers. This also means that every potential school leader – in Singapore there are also very standardised promotion procedures – will have received training when they were heads of departments earlier in their professional career. This emphasis on ensuring that extensive and standardised training precedes appointment is very much a feature of the Singapore education system.

periods) or offered in frequent, short and sequential one to three-day training sessions, in which they work in small groups to establish 'critical friendship teams'. Thirdly, the goals and guidelines of the development models are expressed in different ways, and in some states they have not been made explicit at all. However, a common trend is visible. Some years ago, the emphasis was put on administrative competencies, management skills, and the knowledge of school interpersonal competencies of the school leader, and towards school development. Emphasis is clearly given to the notion of 'leading by communicating', and towards seeing the role in terms of personal vision and influence. In the states of the former German Democratic Republic, however, topics like education law are still most popular with many school leaders, due to the political and organisational changes after the German reunification in 1989, which caused a good deal of uncertainty.

Hong Kong

In the course of the reforms in the educational sector, and above all due to the establishment of school-based management, the self-responsibility of Hong Kong's schools has increased considerably since the mid 1990s. However, this operates within a centrally determined framework. There is no tradition of training for school leaders before they take over leadership roles. However, since 1999, a Task Force has been set up to develop a conception of a comprehensive programme including preparatory components. So far, there have been two obligatory programmes developed. The first is a nine-day induction course, offered by the Education Department and aimed to provide newly appointed school leaders of all types of schools with a basic knowledge of school management theory and practice. The second programme is an obligatory continuous development programme for experienced school leaders in the primary sector. This course, School Management for Principals (SMP), introduced by the Education Department as a supportive measure after the establishment of more autonomy for schools, seeks to help school leaders come to terms with their new context. Decentralisation has meant a major re-conceptualisation of the principal's role and relationships, with 'soft' or people skills' being given much more attention. A particular issue has been of 're-orientation' of school principals without any parallel re-conceptualisation of the teacher's role. This creates additional complications for Hong Kong school leaders, who can be subjected to very different expectations from inside and outside the school.

Table 6. Outline of the Induction Course in Hong Kong, China
*Qualification for school leaders in Hong Kong, China
 Induction Course*

Provider	Education Department (ED) of Hong Kong
Target Group	newly appointed school principals
Aims	introducing newly appointed principals into their tasks and responsibilities promoting a re-conceptualisation of roles, relationships and responsibilities amongst staff groups
Contents	Hot Issues on Education Policies in Hong Kong; Roles and Functions of Secondary School Heads; School Vision and Mission; Communication, Application of IT in Education and School Visit; Performance Management; Prevention of Bribery, Managing Change; Empowerment; Working with Staff having Teaching/Emotional Problems; Education Ordinance and Education Regulations; Working as a Secondary School Principal; School Head as a Leader; Selection of Staff; School Finance and Accounts; Curriculum Leadership; Relationship between School Heads and Mass Media; Quality Assurance; Inspection; Code of Aid and Annual Estimates; Employment Ordinance; Crisis Management; Team Building; In-Service Exercise; Post-Course Action Plan and Evaluation
Methods	lectures by guest speakers, discussion, case studies
Pattern	9 days within 2-3 weeks; timetabling: 9 sessions of 3-6 hours
Status	mandatory
Costs	unknown, state financed

New South Wales, Australia

In the course of far-reaching reforms in education, the concept of 'site-based management' was introduced and, as a result, the individual responsibility of each school leader in New South Wales was increased and the range of school management tasks expanded. The Ministry of Education initiated a comprehensive qualification programme entitled 'School Leadership Strategy' (SLS), which is organised and implemented in a centralised way, but whose actual implementation lies in the hands of the regional Inter-district School Leadership Groups. This qualification is a multi-phased, systematic programme. It is based on an understanding that if a school is to function as a 'learning community' there is a need to distribute leadership both horizontally and vertically throughout the structure. The programme also attempts to respond to the different learning needs experienced at the different stages of the career through different training content and experiences. The School Leadership Preparation Program (SLPP) not only seeks to prepare the future school leaders, but also to help them to support faculty colleagues currently working within other functions of leadership in the school. For more senior staff the School Executive Program and Principal Induction Program serve as introduction to the different leadership functions for aspiring and newly appointed school leaders. Completing the cycle, the Principal Development Program and the School Executive Development Program, offer

Developing School Leaders 1085

continuing professional development to established school leaders, and also to faculty members with other leadership tasks. Individual learning needs are taken into account and prior learning is assessed and recognised. Methods are diverse and include 'shadowing' and 'peer-assisted learning', as well as the possibility of temporary exchange of leadership positions among the school leaders.

Table 7. Outline of the School Leadership Preparation Programme in New South Wales, Australia

<i>Qualification for school leaders in New South Wales, Australia School Leadership Preparation Programme</i>	
Provider	NSW Department of Education and Training through regional inter-district school leadership groups and partly involving other providers
Target Group	teachers aspiring to any leadership position in school or to principals' preparation for school leadership and other leadership roles in 'learning communities' etc.); Leadership for Enhanced Learning (e.g. cultural and ethical leadership, system thinking, etc.); Leadership for Effective Management (management tasks of the school leader)
Aims	Leading Learning Communities (e.g. cultural and ethical leadership, system thinking, etc.); Leadership for Enhanced Learning (e.g. create optimal learning conditions for the school); Leadership for Effective Management (management tasks of the school leader)
Contents	seminars, small team sessions, networking, various uses of electronic media, preparation and presentation of a learning portfolio and literature studies
Methods	ca. 14 course days and literature studies within 1-2 years;
Pattern	timetabling: one 'School Leadership Preparation Seminar'; 2 days; 3 'School Leadership Excellence Seminars'; 2 days each; additional integrated individually selected programme components for self-study or for small learning teams; 3 times 2 modules with 4 to 6 hours work time each
Status	optional; recommended for the application to a leadership position, not yet required
Costs	ca. 1,300 euro (2,400 Australian dollars) per participant; one quarter (60 Australian dollars) are taken over by the participants or their schools and three quarters (1,800 Australian dollars) are taken over by the Training and Development Directorate

New Zealand

After a particularly far-reaching programme of decentralisation, each school in New Zealand has been established as a more or less autonomous institution, administering its budget independently and with a high degree of control over its own decisions and destiny. The basis for this is the conviction that a market approach will lead to greater efficiency and higher standards. Whether or not this is true remains to be seen, but, in the meantime, school leaders are sometimes torn between their educational tasks and economic pressures, between the local school council, the staff and different groups of interest within the community. Market orientation also characterises the training and development opportunities for leadership personnel. There are no obligatory qualifications for school leaders or aspiring leaders, nor are there any government guidelines, prerequisites, or centrally fixed standards for these qualification programmes. Every potential

Table 9. Outline of the Principal's Qualification Program in Ontario, Canada

<i>Qualification for school leaders in Ontario, Canada</i>	
<i>Example: Principal Qualification Program of OISE/UT</i>	
Provider	Center for Leadership Development of the Ontario Institute of Studies in Education, University of Toronto (OISE/UT)
Target Group	Teachers aspiring a school leadership position, before application
Aims	Imparting to the participants the knowledge, skills and practices to enable them - to uphold the Standards of Practice in the Teaching Profession and the Ethical Standards of Practice in the Teaching Profession; - to build and sustain learning communities that support diversity and promote excellence, accountability, anti-racism, equity, partnerships and innovation; - to assume accountability for the achievement of all students and promote student success and life-long learning in partnership with staff, parents and the community; - to align and monitor programs, structures, processes, resources and staff to support student achievement; - to manage and direct the human, material, capital and technological resources for efficient and effective schools; - to initiate and facilitate change, and operate successfully in a dynamic environment that is characterized by increasing complexity; - to understand and apply education and student related legislation in Ontario and district school board policies that have an impact on the school, students, staff and community; - to liaise with educational stakeholders concerning all aspects of provincial and district school board issues and initiatives
Contents	Social Context; Staff Development and Teacher Supervision; Management; Leadership; The School and its Community; Initiation of Change; Implementation of Change; Institutionalisation of Change
Methods	Weekend seminars, reflective writing, Interactive Electronic Communication Projects, literature studies
Pattern	24 course days plus a 10-week attachment and literature studies within 1 year; timetabling: Part 1: six weekends (Saturday 8.30 to 4.30 and Sunday 8.30 to 5.00); school attachment: 10 weeks (altogether 60 hours); Part 2: six weekends (see Part 1).
Status	Mandatory; prerequisite for being employed as a school leader (the provider can be chosen by the candidates)
Costs	ca. 1,060 euro (1,390 Canadian dollars) per participant (Part 1 and Part 2 ca. 530 euro each) plus application fee ca. 40 euro (50 Canadian dollars); financed by the participants themselves (sometimes by local school authorities)

applicant can choose from the wide range of development programmes offered by the different providers. One example of a comprehensive, academically-oriented, university-based programme is offered by the Educational Leadership Centre of the University of Waikato. In addition to the academic programmes, such as the Doctor of Education, the Master of Educational Leadership or the Post Graduate Diploma in Educational Leadership, there are also a broad variety of in-service workshops and seminars, professional internet discussion groups, and counseling services available to school leaders. So, though there is no 'approved' training programme, there is nevertheless a very full range of training opportunities on offer to New Zealand school leaders.

Table 8. Outline of the Master of Educational Leadership in New Zealand

<i>Qualification for school leaders in New Zealand</i>	
<i>Example: Master of Educational Leadership of the University of Waikato</i>	
Provider	Educational Leadership Center of the University of Waikato
Target Group	Educational leaders and individuals holding leading positions in different areas of the educational sector
Aims	development of the ability to reflect, interpersonal competence, and basic values as prerequisites for instructional leaders
Contents	mandatory: Resource Management and Issues in Educational Administration; Educational Leadership: Issues and Perspectives; Educational Leadership: Organizational Development; Educational Research Methods or Kaupapa Maori Research; optional: Educational Assessment; School Leadership and the Community; Educational Leadership for Social Justice; Developing Educational Leadership; Professional Education Leadership
Methods	lectures, seminars, work shops, email platforms as well as international study tours
Pattern	ca. 48 course days* (24 credit hours across 12 weeks = 288 hours) plus about 1600 hours of individual study; participation in online platforms and conduct of school projects within 2-4 years; timetabling: 8-3-hour seminars, either in the late afternoon or on Saturdays (2 per semester in full-time or 1 per semester in part-time); individual scheduling for part-time students is possible due to the online offer
Status	optional; seen as adequate qualification by the employing committee, the board of trustees of the school
Costs	ca. 4,000 euro (8,952 New Zealand dollars) for eight units; financed by the participants themselves

*If there is no specification by the provider as far as the number of days is concerned, we converted the contact time in hours into the unit 'course day' taking 6 hours training as one day.

School Leader Preparation in North America

Ontario, Canada

In the school system of Ontario, school leaders have to develop a co-operative partnership with local and regional groups, with the community, with municipalities and with industry, and, above all, with the school community council. School leaders are facing high-level expectations from these groups and the need

for adequate training and support is well recognised. Quite unusually, in Ontario there is self-regulatory organisation of the teaching profession, via the Ontario College of Teachers. The College's powers extend to the licensing of degrees, the development of professional standards and the accreditation of in-service training programmes following these standards. Moreover, it has established guidelines for the qualification of school leadership staff, which providers are obliged to follow if they want 'recognition' of the programme in the Ontario school system. The Principal Qualification Program (PQP), which is accredited on this basis, is offered by ten universities in Ontario. Hence the PQP, for example, offered by the Ontario Institute of Studies in Education at the University of Toronto (OISE/UT) and the one offered by York University do not differ significantly in content, though they do differ from a methodological standpoint. The programme of OISE/UT focuses around groups from different types of schools, which are

subdivided into small teams. Great emphasis is placed on process-oriented components. The small teams have a vivid exchange of the respective situations in their schools and current problems taken from one another's workplaces. This process seeks to guarantee a strong link with practice in what would otherwise be a fairly traditional 'academic' course. This is further reinforced by a school attachment or 'internship', which is a central feature of preparation for leadership in Ontario.

Washington and New Jersey, USA

The USA has a quite long and well-documented history of school leader development. Generally, the qualification of school leaders and school administrators lies within the responsibility of the university sector. For this, various states have set up standards and the universities of several states have joined in co-operation groups in order to guarantee a certain consensus and a high level of quality across state boundaries. The usual prerequisite for access to training is a university-based degree in education or educational administration rather than a specific portion of experience, since the majority of states link principal preparation into Master's degree study. The programmes for the Master's degree are typically one-year courses for full-time students and two to four-year courses for part-time students. University based elements consist mainly of lectures, but in a growing number of programmes great emphasis is also placed on internships in one or several schools. Internship offers an opportunity for the aspiring principal to partake in leadership tasks, supported by the school leader, who may also act as mentor. For such internship, however, the participants have to organise leave from their own schools and often they have to finance it as well; so desirable as this feature is, it is not as accessible as it might be.

The Danforth Education Leadership Program of the University of Washington, for example, was developed as early as 1987 with the financial support of the Danforth Foundation. Since then it has been continuously developed and modified. After a modularised academic course of study, the participants receive the Initial Principal Certification (IPC) accredited in the state of Washington or the degree Master of Education. The extensive internship experience is spread out over a whole school term (see Table 10).

To look at another example, the explicit goal of the educational leadership programme of the William Paterson University of New Jersey is to link the tasks of management and leadership in terms of a 'transformational leadership' model. Its focus is on developing networks among the participants, mentors at the schools and the team of trainers around real issues and problems to be found in the partnership schools. It also promotes close partnerships with the school districts around the university, in whose schools the internships take place. Candidates develop Individualized Leadership Plans (ILP) that focus on career goals and on building on their strengths as well as identifying areas where there is potential for improvement. The ILP becomes an action plan throughout the

Table 10. Outline of the Danforth Educational Leadership Program in Washington, USA
Qualification for school leaders in Washington, USA
Example: The Danforth Educational Leadership Program of the University of Washington

Provider	College of Education of the University of Washington, Seattle
Target Group	applicants for the position of Principal in the state of Washington
Aims	to enable candidates to work effectively towards the key goals of quality improvement, educational leadership, the further development of organisations, co-operation, the expansion of knowledge, and personal reflection as a part of educational responsibility
Contents	Understanding of the Culture of a School; 'Leadership'; the Moral and Political Dimensions of Educational Leadership in a Democracy; Organisational Learning and Evaluation; Staff Development and In-service Training for Teachers; Lesson Observation and Assessment; the Curriculum and Teaching; Multi-cultural Education; School Leadership and Support for Special Needs Children; Financial Competence; School Law; Work based on the Placement Experience
Methods	case studies, simulations, role-plays, interactive discussion, the completion of concrete leadership tasks during work experience, personal study
Pattern	ca. 98 course days* (39 credit hours of study over 15 weeks = 585 hours) and 120 days of practical experience (720 hours), and additional study time for reading the relevant literature and time to complete the necessary documentation, such as reports and the journal within 1 year; timetabling: blocks of several days of seminars at the beginning and the end; 6 hour seminars every Thursday; all day seminars on 10 Saturdays; 16 hours a week practical experience (4 days à 4 hours per day)
Status	mandatory; all programme elements are required (however the candidates can choose between different programmes by different providers)
Costs	ca. 9,200 euro (\$8,600 US dollars) for a course ending with the Initial Principal Certification and 11,800 euro (\$11,000 US dollars) with the additional degree of Master of Education; financed by the participants themselves (scholarships and district support are available)

*If there is no specification by the provider as far as the number of days is concerned, we converted the contact time in hours into the unit 'course day' taking 6 hours training as one day.

field experiences and, along with the Standards for School Leaders that underpin the curriculum, shapes the experiences and develops and nurtures the knowledge, skills and dispositions of candidates as they aspire to school leadership positions that require principal licensure. Candidates are visited regularly in the field by faculty advisers. Furthermore, both advisers and the teams of trainers are deliberately drawn from a variety of backgrounds and experiences in order to make available to trainees a wide range of perspectives (see Table 11).

Sadly, such extensive and expensive qualification programmes tend to recruit limited numbers of participants onto each course. It seems to exceed any financial possibilities to offer such programmes country-wide as a state-organised training programme for all future school leaders. This is unfortunate, as the programmes have a number of interesting features, relating to both content and methods.

Table 11. Outline of the Educational Leadership Program at William Paterson University of New Jersey
Example: The Educational Leadership Program of the William Paterson University

<i>Qualification for school leaders in New Jersey, USA</i>	
<i>Example: The Educational Leadership Program of the William Paterson University</i>	
Provider	College of Education of the William Paterson University of New Jersey
Target Group	applicants for school leadership positions that require principal licensure, especially those aspiring to the principalship in the state of New Jersey, but also teachers who want to improve their leadership competencies
Aims	competency in each of the Standards for School Leaders developed by the Council of Chief State School Officers and endorsed by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium; and a vision of school leadership that includes beliefs in democratic collaboration, diversity, equity, theory, critical inquiry, reflective practice, continuous improvement, student success, and ethical practice
Contents	Leadership in Learning Communities; Contemporary Issues in Schools and Society; Educational Research; Curriculum Design; Understanding Group Processes and the Psychology of Organizations; The Principalship; Clinical Projects in Educational Leadership (Action Research); Supervision and Evaluation; People, Programs and Performance Appraisal; School Management; Legal Issues; Policy, Field Experiences; Technology Competencies
Methods	case study, lecture/discussion, group problem solving, micro-conferencing technology, large and small group discussions, reflective inquiry through journal writing, problem-based learning activities, technology communications, action research, and field-based experiences
Pattern	ca. 90 days of course work* (36 'credit hours' = 36 semester hours over a period of 15 weeks = 540 hours) as well as 150 practice hours (30-40 hours per semester) within 2 years; timetabling: programme follows the semester structure of the university; additionally two one-week summer courses
Status	mandatory; candidates may choose to attend approved programs at other universities in New Jersey
Costs	ca. 10,000 euro (ca. 9,300 US dollars) per participant; financed by the participants themselves (reimbursement by local school districts is possible depending upon contracted agreements)

*If there is no specification by the provider as far as the number of days is concerned, we converted the contact time in hours into the unit 'course day' taking 6 hours training as one day.

OVERVIEW OF TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES

Although the programmes presented here are, in some cases, simply individual examples drawn from a range of provision rather than national models, these have been selected because they are firmly established and are locally regarded as indicative of 'best practice' in the particular countries.

Accordingly, though mindful of the risk of over-generalising, we feel it is useful to look across the various programmes and to attempt to 'classify' them in two ways, though we are aware that many other bases for comparison might be adopted.

The first of these involves situating the programmes in a simple matrix to explore the degree of centralisation. The second is concerned with the status given to practical experience within the provision.

We have classified the degree of centralisation against two axes, one relating to the level of central control over the education system as a whole, the other relating to the level of central government involvement in the design, delivery and accreditation of programmes. Using these axes, the programmes can be situated in a two by two matrix as shown in Table 12.

Table 12. Overview of the degree of centralisation/decentralisation of school system and school leader development approach

		<i>Approach to School Leader Development predominantly centralised entrepreneurial or using standards or guidelines</i>	
		<i>predominantly centrally controlled</i>	<i>B</i>
<i>Level of Central Control</i>	<i>predominantly centrally controlled</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>France; Germany; Hong Kong; Singapore</i>
<i>School Management</i>	<i>substantially devolved</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>Ontario, Canada; US examples; NSW, Australia; England and Wales</i>
<i>Netherlands; New Zealand</i>		<i>D</i>	

Looking at this matrix, we can see that in the predominantly centralised systems (such as France, Germany, Hong Kong and Singapore), there are also predominantly centralised arrangements for the development of school leaders. Programmes are standardised, closely monitored, mostly mandatory and national or federal governments maintain close involvement in quality assurance processes. Of course, there remain substantial differences in content and methods. In France, for example, candidates undergo a mandatory, centrally designed, intensive, half-year programme only after successfully negotiating a competition driven selection process. The programme precedes, but more or less guarantees, a leadership appointment. In Germany, it is the federal states that oversee school leader qualifications, and programmes are managed by the respective state-run teacher-training institutes, offered mostly after appointment, and differing from state to state in content, methods and duration, but nevertheless standardised within state boundaries. Central design and government involvement is especially evident in Hong Kong and Singapore. The former has a mandatory induction

programme immediately after appointment, while the latter is the most prescriptive of all, controlling selection and assessment and mandating a nine-month, full-time preparatory programme.

At the other extreme we locate New Zealand and the Netherlands. Here, there is considerable autonomy at school level, with local rather than national determination of school objectives and plans. Perhaps, then, it is not surprising that there is also a thriving local economy providing a range of training programmes and opportunities. In both countries, we see a broad variety of opportunities for school leaders, with considerable variation in content, methods, pattern and duration. We see that a range of providers – universities, advisory boards, professional associations, independent training organisations – compete in markets where state guidelines, standards and conditions for appointment or licensure are not prescribed.

Perhaps the most interesting group is comprised of the remaining examples – places where there are varying but significant levels of autonomy at school level, but where the general pattern and approach adopted in school leader development is substantially standardised. A paradox here is that despite the ‘prescription’ of programme length, content and so on, often (as is particularly evident in the North American examples) programmes are delivered by non-governmental agencies, such as universities. It is also common to find that though leaders or aspiring leaders have no choice regarding the framework and content of the programme, they can select from a range of providers and locations for their studies. In some instances (e.g., the examples from the United States), participation in an approved programme is mandatory, in others (England and Wales) notice has been given that it will become mandatory, while in the Australian example it remains optional. There are parallel differences in the status of the programmes though, by and large, those most closely following prescribed ‘standards’ and guidelines have established the greatest credibility within their own communities.

It seems that these examples show us how two major preoccupations of politicians can be accommodated; on the one hand school level decision-making and strong local involvement in the direction of schools, on the other, some guarantee that the government is ensuring a supply of suitably trained and experienced candidates will be available to manage the stock of schools. This is an attractive combination – autonomy with accountability, scope for local decision-making with central arrangements to quality assure those who might be making local decisions. Our feeling is that more countries will be moving into this quadrant of the matrix in the coming years, and that there is much to be learned from the practice already developed in those countries we have located there.

As a final point here, perhaps it is worth noting that even within the larger sample of more than twenty countries in our comparative study, we found no examples in the fourth quadrant (B) – it seems that we will see increasing central influence on school leader training, however power is redistributed within systems themselves.

The second area that seems instructive to look at is the distribution of the programmes according to the emphasis given to practical and school-based elements. Here too, we note that the examples we have outlined seem to fall into three groupings. If we conceptualise the training provision as being spread across two continua of course-based and experience-based learning opportunities, then it is possible to distribute the programmes according to the relative emphasis given to these two strategies. Table 13 shows how, for example, the emphasis changes from the programme in France (heavily experiential) to the programme in Hong Kong (substantially course-based). We are aware that by grouping the programmes according to their relative emphasis on experiential versus course-based learning, we risk simplification. For example, we have not taken into account whether the offers are made to teachers aspiring to leadership or to school leaders already ‘experienced’ in their role. Again, the different emphasis could be viewed in reference to the total amount or length of training available; since offering experiential learning opportunities inevitably means expanding the programme accordingly. Nevertheless, we feel that mapping the emphasis of training methods is useful, since it tells us something about the ways both the content and processes of school leadership are conceptualised locally (see Table 13).

Table 13. Overview of the emphasis of learning opportunities within school leader development programmes

	Course-Based Learning	Experiential-Based Learning
<i>Emphasis of learning opportunities within school leader development programmes</i>		
	centred around courses	centred around experiential methods

NJ; Ontario; England; New Zealand

NSW, Australia;

Germany; Hong Kong

The first group, which we refer to as ‘centred around experiential methods’ has adopted development programmes that feature some form of ‘internship’ – that is the placing of programme members in schools under the supervision and guidance of an experienced school leader who is able to offer support and advice. Clearly, this is a most powerful learning context, grounded in the realities and complexities of actual school leadership, yet offering a ‘safety-net’ as judgements and analyses can be developed without the constraints of individual accountability. Such an approach allows programme members to explore alternatives, and

encourages them to both discuss and reflect on their judgements. The third group, in contrast to the first, tends to rely on traditional, course-based learning, trusting individual programme members to make the link from the course and, perhaps from the workshop, to their workplace, from general 'theory' to their particular practice. The middle group offers a balanced or 'mixed-economy' – showing some emphasis on practical work and applications, but most often within the trainees' own school situations, and with the support of a mentor. At the same time, these programmes seem to offer a strong 'traditional' core of training sessions that are course based.

As we outline below, participants are showing strong preferences for the experimental or mixed approach, but this is always more difficult to organise and likely to be more costly. Nevertheless, we feel that there are important advantages arising from those programmes that seek to supplement activities in the training room with tasks in the school. We are also reminded here of the work of Joyce and Weil (1996) and Joyce and Showers (1995) on teaching styles within the school system – especially their finding that the development of complex, social skills amongst learners is most effective when complex, social models of teaching are used. Given the focus on complex personal and interpersonal skills within the majority of these programmes, and the fact that it seems likely that this finding is equally valid outside the traditional classroom, this implies that school leaders probably learn more about leading their schools by leading them than they do from 'courses' about leadership. The relevance of this approach for adult learners is underlined by Corder (1990). Despite the apparent benefits of systematically creating learning opportunities that match the desired learning outcomes, this does pose important questions for those schooled in traditional training activities – whether they are offered by parts of the system or by universities. Looking at training for education management, Mulford (1984) pointed out that while experiential approaches may be more effective for certain training outcomes, they also tend to involve greater levels of self-disclosure and risk for trainers and trainees alike. They also move the locus of 'control' within training away from the trainer. Further, Mulford reminds us that training strategies need to be considered in light of the characteristics of the learner and the context or setting in which training takes place, as well as the desired learning outcomes. This implies that a balance will always be needed, but moreover that this balance needs to be re-calibrated for particular learning groups within a given programme structure, rather than simply between different programmes with different target groups or objectives. Clearly, this has very significant messages for the training of trainers – an issue that has received much less attention than programme content or methods in the countries that we have reviewed.

nevertheless, this analysis prompts us to offer a number of generalisations about current trends in school leadership preparation emerging from this overview. For example, we see that across the programmes surveyed, increasing attention is being paid to the identification of specific programme aims and objectives – a move from the general to the particular in the planning of school leader development. We also note that in more and more countries, the emphasis within training is shifting from maintenance functions onto activities that promote school improvement and explicitly seek to raise standards of achievement. Similarly, we detect increasing emphasis being given to the development of the individual trainee, personal development rather than training for a role, with much greater interest in individual values and how these values act upon the culture within the school. We have also become aware of the growing interest internationally in so-called educational or instructional leadership models (see for example Hallinger, 1992; Sheppard, 1996) and their influence on training curricula (though we are not altogether convinced that this focus on the classroom does reflect school leader rather than school teacher priorities – it is the management and leadership of adults within the school community that we see as the central task). We have been greatly encouraged by the variety of practice to be found, and the creativity and commitment to experimentation among providers, especially with regard to training methods. Below, we describe some further trends in a little more detail.

Towards Coherent Provision

The first of these concerns is the general movement away from unconnected 'single issue' or 'single shot' training events towards a more carefully planned and altogether more coherent programme of school leader development. Typically, such programmes are offered over a sustained period of time to a stable group of trainees by a stable group of trainers. In the best examples, these programmes are available at several points in the school leader's career, beginning as training for middle management, continuing as preparation for promotion to senior posts and supplemented once senior leadership roles have been achieved to ensure regular and appropriate updating.

This recognition that the next generation of school leaders is already in our schools is an important one. True, few countries have been systematic in the preparation of the next generation of school leaders. But, many countries are beginning to understand that investment in development is necessary throughout the potential school leader's career. Waiting until school leadership posts have been secured before training may be too late, not least because the costs of underperforming leaders are borne by the teachers and students. It is encouraging therefore to see clear evidence that the whole business of leadership training is being tackled earlier and more systematically than in the past. Of course, there is still scope for single issue in-service sessions or focused training events, but it seems clear that the development of school leaders will be seen as

SOME CURRENT TRENDS

The comments we set out above, using the dimensions and descriptors previously outlined, are necessarily brief. (For a fuller account, see Huber, 2003.) But,

Towards New Collaborations and Partnerships

The second is the emergence, in many countries, of new partnership arrangements that have been formed to design, to implement, to monitor and even to evaluate school leader development programmes. Typically, the partners will include representatives from the employing organisations (whether national, state or local level), from educationalists in the university sector and, increasingly, from professional associations that represent school leaders themselves. Our studies suggest that much of the coherence that has been brought to school leader preparation programmes arises from the interaction of these groups, and the different perspectives they can bring to resolving the key issues of curriculum content and structure, of training methods and also of the timing and sequencing of the programmes. The growth of such partnerships has also, in many countries, fostered the development of a pool of accredited or acknowledged trainers. This, too, is an important development, since the credibility and currency of trainers has been a matter of debate in several countries in the past, and, as we intimate above, the preparation of trainers is likely to become an increasingly important issue in the future.

Bridging the Theory-Practice Divide

These partnerships have also contributed towards the next strand we identify, which is the drawing together of theory and practice within school leader development programmes. Again we see this as an important relationship, and one that has not always seemed easy to tackle. Though it may be axiomatic that we need continuously to develop theory in light of practice and that we need also to develop practice in light of theory, it has not always proved easy to hold these together. The relationship requires a partnership between those who work within our schools and those who investigate and research our schools. It requires mutual respect between these two communities and, where possible, the boundaries between the groups broken down. School leaders themselves seem to show a strong preference for what they describe as 'practical training', and that 'theory' is not always seen as valuable to the practitioner. However, we also see from our own work (West, et al., 2000) that school leaders find it much easier to generalise from their experience and repeat effective behaviours when they have a conceptual framework underpinning the decisions they are making. Theory and practice need one another – and need to be developed in tandem. We see increasing scope in the new partnerships for this to take place, as the programmes

Towards a Common Curriculum

A fourth area is the evidence that, despite international differences, some convergence of curriculum content is emerging – at least in relation to two crucial areas. These can be described loosely as teaching and learning issues and the personal and interpersonal skills of leadership. The focus on classroom practice – what Rosentbusch (1997) has called the 'core business of the school' (see also Elmore, 1996) – is increasingly recognised as a fundamental area for school leader focus and activity. Of course, it is unrealistic to expect that school leaders can remain up to date with the whole range of developments in teaching and learning, across the curriculum. At the same time, it seems reasonable to expect that school leaders will spend at least some of their time in classrooms, will give importance to discussions with teachers about their work and will have insights into the major trends and developments in teaching and learning that are taking place. It is by maintaining or developing their knowledge of classroom events that school leaders are able to understand and respond to the challenges (and, of course, the opportunities) that teachers come across daily in their classrooms. This also helps them gain insights into the quality of experience that their schools are providing for their students, and so is an important guide to establishing priorities for school improvement. Besides, the key activity of schools, namely teaching and learning (or 'education'), should be the starting point and the benchmark for measuring the quality of decision-making of school leaders and leadership activities in general. It is reassuring, therefore, to see that at, though, as we note above, how best to link together school leadership and classroom performance remains problematic.

Similarly, we can see that most of the programmes reviewed are giving emphasis to the development of personal and interpersonal skills. It has been assumed for too long that school leaders 'acquire' interactive skills through osmosis. Though they would not always identify (for example) communication skills as a priority for personal development, it is interesting how often teachers in the school will identify this area as one which lets their leaders down. The inclusion of explicit 'training' content related to personal competencies is accordingly another welcome development.

However, despite these generalisations, there remain some important differences between the programmes we have examined. Convergence in some areas of content is matched by divergence in others. The differences between systems and therefore the differences in what is required in terms of system-related knowledge, is one influence here. A second is the different levels of autonomy that school leaders have within the different countries (for example, regarding the recruitment of staff). Although there is an international trend towards decentralisation

and devolution of decision-making that may bring them closer together in time, presently this is not as advanced in some systems as it is in others, and so inevitably the school leadership training curriculum reflects this.

We also continue to see differences in programme patterns, lengths and intensity, and also in support arrangements. These are clearly areas where more investigation is needed, as the differences here are hard to explain away in terms of the programme goals.

A further area of difference is in the attitude towards assessment and certification. In some instances, the training programme functions as a professional qualification, a license to practice. At the other extreme, it may still be very much along the lines of a conventional Master's degree programme, albeit focused around the particular problems and issues of school leadership, but nevertheless undertaken on a voluntary basis with the initiative coming from the participant rather than the system. These differences project onto the status and currency that the training programmes enjoy locally. It is clear that the professional standing bestowed by completing a programme still varies from one country to another. In some countries, it can be seen as a passport to promotion; in others, it is simply one aspect of a portfolio that the individual assembles in order to increase their prospects of securing advancement. But perhaps most important of all are the differences in assumptions about the role of school leaders that we find in the different countries we have looked at.

To a large extent, these differences could be viewed as cultural. They are deep-seated and they pervade the school and the system as a whole. Such cultural differences mean that despite the patterns we see emerging as school leader preparation across the world seem to converge in a number of respects, there will probably continue to be significant differences in approach. It is these culturally rooted assumptions about what a school leader is and should do, that mean however much convergence we may find within training programmes, the expectations and, hence, the solutions will vary according to context.

LOOKING AHEAD

This chapter has drawn heavily on a recent comparative, international study (Huber, 2003), which pulls together descriptions of current practice from around the world and identifies commonalities and differences. Of course, this study offers a useful starting point, but still there is much to be done. Here we will restrict our comments on what might be done next to four issues, though we are aware that there are many more.

First, there seems to be little international work available on how school leaders are identified and selected for training. Though a few of the programmes that we have described control programme membership, the majority do not. This uncertainty about who and how programme membership comes about, is reflected in the subsequent selection of school leaders. In the United Kingdom, for example, the current centrally controlled programme brings no promise of

progression – indeed the majority of programme graduates in its first four years of operation have not been appointed to headships. The reality is that a majority never will. Of course, this is not of itself a bad thing – improving the quality of staff in schools through development opportunities is a worthwhile activity whether or not promotion follows. At the same time, there seems to be more confusion about how performance leads to programme membership and how programme membership leads to progression than there need be. Perhaps we need to begin to pool knowledge and compare systems for the identification and subsequent deployment of appropriate staff, as much as we need to focus on development programmes themselves.

Second, it is clear from the brief reviews of programmes here that there is further need to compare both the common and the distinct elements we find in the different countries, and to recognise that though a competency-based approach may have some advantages, there is still less consensus about what the key competencies are than there might be. In this regard, there appears to be a strong case for looking in more detail at the impact training has on the behaviour of school leaders, and the impact (in turn) their behaviour has on their schools. At present there seems to be much in the programmes that is based on assumption rather than evidence.

Third, it is apparent that the differences in methods offer further scope for comparison. Despite the problems of contextualisation, there are likely to be 'best methods' for a variety of desired training outcomes. We need to know more about the possibilities and about the efficacy of various approaches. In particular we need to know more about the matching of methods to learning outcomes, which strengthens the case for the sorts of evaluation of programme impact in the various countries that we refer to above.

Finally, we have become increasingly conscious during our own work in this field that the conception of school leadership, even taken internationally, is a rather narrow one. Perhaps there does need to be 'one supreme head' in each school. Maybe school leadership development programmes are about finding and equipping such individuals. But perhaps there are other alternatives – collective leadership, the development of whole teams of staff, the re-conceptualisation of the school leader's role as simply one part in a team, a team made up of leaders who all need support, training, development opportunities. It is this last issue which seems to us to challenge most forcibly the orthodoxy underpinning current provision, and which offers the most interesting avenue of exploration for the future.

ENDNOTE

¹The term 'school leader' is in this chapter used synonymously to or instead of principal, headteacher, administrator or other terms describing the person who is in charge of an individual school.

REFERENCES

- Beare, H., Caldwell, B.J., & Millikan, R.H. (1989). *Creating an Excellent School*. London: Routledge.
- Brookover, W., Beady, C., Flood, P., Schweizer, J., & Wischikaker, J. (1979). *School social systems and student achievement: Schools can make a difference*. New York: Praeger.
- Caldwell, B.J., & Spinks, J.M. (1992). *Leading the self-managing school*. London: Falmer Press.
- Corder, C. (1990). *Teaching Hard, Teaching Soft*. Aldershot: Gower Press.
- Cremers, B. (1994). The history, value and purpose of school effectiveness studies. In D. Reynolds, B. Creemers, P. Nesselrodt, E. Schaffter, S. Stringfield, & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Advances in school effectiveness research and practice* (pp. 9–23). Oxford: Pergamon.
- DES. (1990). *Developing school management: The way forward. A report by the School Management Task Force*. London: HMSO.
- Edmonds, R. (1979). National standards for headteachers. London: Department for Education and Employment.
- Elmore, R.F. (1996). Getting to Scale with Good Educational Practice. *Harvard Educational Review*, 16(1), 1–26.
- Fullan, M. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. London: Cassell.
- Hallinger, P. (1992) The Evolving Role of American Principals: From Managerial to Instructional to Transformational Leaders. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 20(3), 35–48.
- Hopkins, D., West, M., & Ainscow, M. (1996). *Improving the quality of education for all: Progress and challenge*. London: David Fulton Publishers.
- Huber, S.G. (1997). Headteachers' views on headship and training: A comparison with the NPQH. Cambridge: School of Education, University of Cambridge.
- Huber, S.G. (2000). Qualifizierung von Schulleiterinnen und Schulleitern in den deutschen Bundesländern: Eine Synthese. Bamberg: Universitätsleichter Ergebnisbericht (mit Lander-Fragen-Matrix).
- Huber, S.G. (2002). School Leadership Development – Current trends from a global perspective. In P. Hallinger (Ed.), *The changing landscape of educational leadership development: A global perspective* (Chapter 17). Lisse, The Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Huber, S.G. (2003). Preparing school leaders for the 21st Century: An international comparison of Imanis, J., & de Jong, L. (1999). *Master your school: The development of integral leadership*. Paper presented at the International Congress for School Effectiveness and Improvement, San Antonio.
- Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1995). *Student achievement through staff development: A global perspective*. Leithwood, K. (1992). The principal's role in teacher development. In M. Fullan & A. Hargreaves (Eds.), *Teacher development and educational change* (pp. 86–103). London: Falmer.
- Leithwood, K. (Ed.) (2000). Understanding schools as intelligent systems. Stamford, CT: JAI Press.
- Levine, D.U., & Lezotte, L.W. (1990). *Unusually effective schools: A review and analysis of research and practice*. Madison, WI: National Centre for Effective School Research.
- Wells: Open Books.
- Mulford, B. (1984). On teaching educational administration. *The Journal of Educational Administration*, 22(2), 223–246.
- Murphy, J. (1991). *Restructuring schools: Capturing the phenomenon*. Beverley Hills, CA: Sage.
- Rosenbusch, H.S., & Huber, S.G. (2001). Qualifizierungsmaßnahmen von Schulleiterinnen und Schulleitern in den Ländern der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. *SchulManagement*, 4, 8–16.
- Rosenbusch, H.S. (1997). Organisationspädagogische Perspektive einer Reform der Schulorganisation.
- Rutter, M., Maughan, B., Mortimore, P., & Ouston, J. (1979). *Fifteen thousand hours*. London: Open Books.
- Sammons, P., Hillman, J., & Mortimore, P. (1995). *Key characteristics of effective schools: A review of school effectiveness research*. London: OFSTED.
- Sergiovanni, T.J. (1994). *Building community in schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sheppard, B. (1996). Exploring the transformational nature of instructional leadership. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 42, 325–344.
- Stegö, N.E., Grefen, K., Glatter, R., & Hord, S.M. (Eds.). (1987). *The role of school leaders in school improvement*. Leuven: ACCO.

Second International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration

Part Two

Editors:

Kenneth Leithwood

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, Canada

Philip Hallinger

College of Management, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand

Section Editors:

Philip Hallinger

College of Management, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand

Gail C. Furman

Washington State University, Pullman, Washington, U.S.A.

Kathryn Riley

Institute of Education, University of London, United Kingdom

John MacBeath

Faculty of Education, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom

Peter Gronn

Faculty of Education, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia

Kenneth Leithwood

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, Canada

and

Bill Mulford

University of Tasmania, Launceston, Australia



KLUWER ACADEMIC PUBLISHERS
DORDRECHT / BOSTON / LONDON

Table of Contents

vi Table of Contents

Preface <i>Kenneth Leithwood and Philip Hallinger</i>	ix	
		PART ONE
SECTION 1: LEADERSHIP AND SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT		
Introduction <i>Philip Hallinger – Section Editor</i>	3	
1 What Do You Call People With Visions? The Role of Vision, Mission, and Goals in School Leadership and Improvement <i>Philip Hallinger and Ronald Heck</i>	9	
2 Leading for Change: Building Capacity for Learning <i>Louise Stoll, Raymond Bolam and Pat Collarbone</i>	41	
3 Conditions Fostering Educational Change <i>Peter Steegens, Femke Geijzel and Rudolf van den Berg</i>	75	
4 The Changing Context of School Leadership: Implications for Paradigm Shift <i>Yin Cheong Cheng</i>	103	
5 An Alternative Perspective of Educational Leadership for Change: Reflections on Native/Indigenous Ways of Knowing <i>Maenette K. P. Ah Nee-Benham with L. A. Napier</i>	133	
6 Moving School Leadership Beyond Its Narrow Boundaries: Developing a Cross-Cultural Approach <i>Allan Walker and Clive Dimmock</i>	167	
		SECTION 2: LEADERSHIP IN THE CREATION OF COMMUNITY
Introduction <i>Gail C. Furman – Section Editor</i>	205	
7 Cross-Cultural Leadership and Communities of Difference: Thinking about Leading in Diverse Schools <i>Carolyn M. Shields</i>	209	
8 The Role of Professional Learning Communities in International Education <i>James C. Toole and Karen Seashore Louis</i>	245	
9 The Role of School Governance in the Creation of School Community <i>Robert G. Croninger and Betty Malen</i>	281	
10 Community as Curriculum <i>Robert J. Starratt</i>	321	
		SECTION 3: LEADERSHIP IN DIVERSE CONTEXTS AND CULTURES
Introduction <i>Kathryn Riley and John MacBeath – Section Editors</i>	351	
11 Cultural Isomorphs in Theories and Practice of School Leadership <i>Jeff Moos</i>	359	
12 Connecting School Leadership with Teaching, Learning, and Parenting in Diverse Cultural Contexts: Western and Asian Perspectives <i>Clive Dimmock and Allan Walker</i>	395	
13 Mission Integrity: Contemporary Challenges for Catholic School Leaders: Beyond the Stereotypes of Catholic Schooling <i>Gerald Grace</i>	427	
14 Lessons from Successful Leadership in Small Schools <i>Geoff Southworth</i>	451	
15 School Leadership and Self-Assessment: Guiding the Agenda for Change <i>William J. Smith</i>	485	
16 Boundary-breaking Leadership: A Must for Tomorrow's Learning Communities <i>Ian M. Robertson and Charles F. Webber</i>	519	

Table of Contents

vii

Table of Contents

viii

PART TWO
SECTION 4: ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING AND LEADERSHIP

Introduction	<i>Peter Gronn – Section Editor</i>	557	
17 Leadership and School Results	<i>Halita Silins and Bill Mulford</i>	561	
18 Strategic Leadership and Cognition	<i>Brian Fidler</i>	613	
19 Distributed Leadership	<i>Peter Gronn</i>	653	
20 From Team Work to Teamwork in Education	<i>Valerie Halfit</i>	697	
21 Enhancing Knowledge in Organizations: Developing Capacity and Capability Through Learning and Leadership	<i>Terri Seddon and Len Cairns</i>	735	
22 Organizational Learning, Organizational Problem Solving, and Models of Mind	<i>Viviane M. J. Robinson</i>	775	
SECTION 5: CONTEXTS FOR LEADERSHIP AT THE BEGINNING OF THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY			
Introduction	<i>Kenneth Leithwood – Section Editor</i>	815	
23 Scenarios for Leadership and the Public Good in Education	<i>Brian J. Caldwell</i>	821	
24 Leadership Practices for Accountable Schools	<i>Kenneth Leithwood, Doris Janzi and Rosanne Steinback</i>	849	
25 Postmodern Expressions of Educational Leadership	<i>Larry Sackney and Coral Mitchell</i>	881	
	<i>List of Authors</i>	1163	
	<i>Name Index</i>	1195	
	<i>Subject Index</i>	1199	
		1219	