Preface

The first *International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration* (Leithwood *et al.*) was published in 1996 and quickly became something of a best seller for reference works within education. Such success, we suggest, was at least partly due to the unprecedented global waves of concern for improving schools launched in the mid 1980's, combined with a widespread belief in leadership as the single most powerful contribution to such improvement. The roots of this belief can be found in evidence produced by the early "effective schools" research, although there is a "romance" with leadership[1] as an explanation for success in many non-school enterprises, as well.

During the two-year period during which this current handbook was being written, activity in the realms of school leadership, school improvement, and leadership development gained further momentum. The English government created its new *National College of School Leadership*, and several Asian nations announced new initiatives in leadership selection, preparation, and development. The (U.S.) *University Council on Educational Administration* announced a national commission on the development of future school leaders. Division A of the American Educational Research Association created a Task Force to help shape future research on educational leadership. Standards for the licensure and professional development of school and district leaders were widely implemented in many countries around the world. Many major foundations, during this same time, redirected significant proportions of their funds toward support for leadership research and preparation. As this small sample of a much larger set of initiatives indicates, belief in the power of leadership to improve education continues unabated.

We highlight this ongoing flurry of interest in educational leadership as something of a preemptive defense against those inclined to question the need for yet a second International Handbook on Educational Leadership only a few short years after publication of the first. Indeed, a growing body of research and writing has advanced the field during those intervening years. Some will also point to the AERA *Handbook on Educational Administration* (Murphy & Louis, 1999) as begging the value of this publication. But the largely North American, if not U.S., authorship and perspective of the AERA handbook stands in sharp contrast to the broadly international authorship and global perspective of the present manuscript. Some 11 countries are represented by the 55 authors of the 34 chapters in the Handbook. Readers of the two handbooks will find little that is redundant.

While the senior editors of this volume (Leithwood & Hallinger) helped to edit and author the first International Handbook, our strategy for ensuring new material and fresh perspectives was to invite, as both coeditors and chapter authors, well-regarded scholars who had, nevertheless, not contributed to the 1996 publication. The chapters of this 2nd Handbook are organized around six themes which capture insights about leadership and its development which have emerged over the past eight years. These themes include: leadership and school improvement; leadership in the creation of community; leadership in diverse contexts; organizational learning and leadership; the context for educational leadership in the twenty-first century; and leadership development.

---

[1] Meindl, J.R., Ehrlich, S.B., & Dukerich, J.M. (1985). The romance of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *30*, 78–102.

In our view, this second international handbook, mostly adds to, rather than replaces, the insights captured by its predecessor. The initial and this second volume provide authoritative and comprehensive reference points to the policy and leadership research communities, and a state-of-the-art compilation of insights and guidance for practicing educational leaders.

We are extremely grateful to Rosanne Steinbach for her extensive editorial work and to Vashty Hawkins for her skillful preparation of the manuscript.

Kenneth Leithwood
Toronto, Canada

Philip Hallinger
Bangkok, Thailand

February, 2002

3

Conditions Fostering Educational Change

PETER SLEEGERS
Department of Educational Sciences, University of Nijmegen, The Netherlands

FEMKE GEIJSEL
Department of Educational Sciences, University of Nijmegen, The Netherlands

RUDOLF VAN DEN BERG
Department of Educational Sciences, University of Nijmegen, The Netherlands

During the 1990s, large-scale reform efforts intensified as a strategy to implement educational innovations (Fullan, 2000). Evaluations of innovation efforts from past decades have made clear that these reforms have produced unsatisfactory results in many cases. In particular, we can conclude from this literature that changes in teaching practice are extremely difficult to accomplish. Within this context of intensifying educational reforms, it is important to examine the organizational potential for innovation and capacity of schools to realize large-scale innovations.

In the previous edition of this handbook, van den Berg and Sleegers (1996a) focused on building innovative capacity of schools and related issues. The chapter ended by stressing the importance of transformational leadership, incremental policy development, and teachers' personal concerns in the context of educational innovation and change. These conclusions were consistent with ongoing discussion within the school improvement and educational change literatures during the 1990s about the relevance of cultural-organizational aspects in schools and individual teacher issues for realizing innovation and change (cf. Fullan, 2000; Louis, Toole, & Hargreaves, 1999; Smylie & Hart, 1999). In this chapter, we further challenged a number of assumptions that had been taken for granted during the 1980s. These included, for example, the notion of the school as the unit for change and policymakers' emphasis on planned change (Louis et al., 1999).

During the 1990's, educational scholars started to plea for and use alternative perspectives to better understand the working of schools and teachers when realizing educational change. Similarly, attention in educational research has gone more and more to the conditions that foster the realization of educational

Second International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration, 75–102
K. Leithwood, P. Hallinger (eds.)
© 2002 Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers. Printed in Great Britain.

change within classroom practice (cf. Geijsel, Sleegers, van den Berg, & Kelchtermans, 2001; Leithwood, Leonard, & Sharrat, 1998; Marks, Louis, & Printy, 2000). These *conditions* may refer to the school organization, like school leadership or the school as a workplace. Other conditions refer to teachers' attitudes and behavior, such as teachers' professional development and teachers' commitment to change. Both school organizational and teacher conditions are believed to affect the extent to which teachers change their practices.

The goal for this chapter is to examine the manner in which school organization and teacher conditions foster educational innovation and change. We seek to uncover issues that might challenge future research into conditions fostering educational change. To understand the change conditions, we first outline two opposite perspectives on innovation reflected in the research literature on school improvement and educational change: the structural-functional perspective and the cultural-individual perspective. We then review key conditions fostering educational change. This is followed by a discussion of multilevel modeling, the issue of heterogeneity, and the assumption of effectiveness regarding the study of change conditions. But first, the changing context of educational change is described because that context largely determines the shift of perspectives and consequent needs.

THE CHANGING CONTEXT OF EDUCATION

The current trend in educational innovation is fundamentally different from predominant approaches of the late 1970s and early 1980s (Lagerweij & Haak, 1994; Leithwood, 1994; van den Berg & Vandenberghe, 1999). During those decades, the purposes of change were largely known and agreed upon, and the practices intended to achieve those purposes were clearly specified. The innovations were based largely on research into effective instruction and aimed at the implementation of new teaching methods, texts and curricula. These innovations were designed to strengthen the weak bureaucratic and professional controls over schools. The impact of these innovations on the work of teachers was limited to clearly framed adjustments in their classroom behaviors or what is referred to as the core technology of education.

Compared to the change agenda of the 1970s and 1980s, recent trends in educational innovation are far more complex and uncertain. This is partly caused by the intensification of large-scale reform efforts as a strategy to implement educational innovation during the 1990s (Fullan, 2000). Large-scale reform involves the implementation of educational innovations in large groups of schools. Such large-scale reforms are in fact bundles of innovations and can be characterized by their complexity, multidimensionality, and need to accomplish several objectives simultaneously (van den Berg, 1992; van den Berg & Sleegers, 1996a).

Furthermore, during the 1990s there emerged a global trend towards greater social and economic complexity. Policymakers began to recognize an explicit and urgent need for educated citizens who can take responsibility for their health, behavior, and learning. As a consequence, large-scale reforms – already complex in nature – became directed at new, more complex forms of instruction and learning emerging out of constructivist theories of learning. These new approaches to teaching and learning depart from traditional ways of educating children and are less easily understood and implemented than traditional models of teacher-directed instruction. Apart from being experts in specific subject matter, these approaches place teachers in the role of expert coaches of the learning process.

The consequences for teachers can be highly disruptive (van den Berg & Vandenberghe, 1995). The new educational innovations ask them to achieve vaguely formulated purposes, and the desired teaching and learning practices are often more difficult to specify. In order to succeed with these new approaches, teachers must make fundamental, even radical, changes to their perspectives and practices. It should be no surprise that in this changing context many teachers feel insecure about the benefits of these innovations and their own role as teachers (Gitlin & Margonis, 1995; van den Berg & Ros, 1999; van Veen & Sleegers, 2001; van Veen, Sleegers, Bergen, & Klaassen, 2001).

Furthermore, these current innovations go beyond changes in the core technology of school, often referred to as *first order changes. Second order changes* that impact the functioning of the school as an organization are necessary in order to enable and support changes in the core technology of schools (cf. Cuban, 1988). Several research projects have suggested that in the absence of second order changes in the school's organization and culture, innovations that focus on the core technology soon disappear (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1992; Louis & Miles, 1990).

Hence, educational scholars have come to the conclusion that the almost exclusive focus on changing classrooms may explain the failure of past innovation efforts to achieve long-term effects on classroom practices and outcomes (e.g., Fullan, 1993; Lagerweij & Haak, 1994; van den Berg & Vandenberghe, 1999). Consequently, scholars now advocate that professional development at the teacher level should be accompanied by development of the school as a whole, and vice versa (D.H. Hargreaves, 1994; Leithwood, 2000; Senge, 1990). This seemingly straightforward conclusion has enormous consequences for the role of the school organization and leaders during the implementation of innovations.

In line with these evolving perspectives, our approaches to implementing educational innovation and change have also changed. Two opposing theoretical perspectives underlie our approaches to educational innovation and change: a structural-functional perspective and a cultural-individual perspective (Sleegers, van den Berg, & Geijsel, 2000; van den Berg, Vandenberghe, & Sleegers, 1999). To understand the focus of this chapter, it is necessary to clarify these perspectives.

THE STRUCTURAL-FUNCTIONAL PERSPECTIVE ON EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION

Over the past several decades, the structural-functional perspective on educational innovation has dominated in research, policy, and practice. The essence of this perspective is that educational change and effective implementation of innovations can be realized by changes in the structure of the school as an organization (Louis, 1994). Studies that reflect this perspective refer to organizational theories of control, economic rationality, and contingency (cf. Monk, 1989; Perrow, 1972).

Control theory emphasizes the role of school management and leads to the subsequent focus on the centrality of the principal's role in coordinating and controlling innovation efforts. The economic rationality approach of organizations puts the focus on student achievement as the final purpose of educational innovation. Contingency theories propose various situational constraints that impact on the capacity of the organization to routinize change as a technology. The goal of a structural functionalist approach is to describe the set of behaviors and conditions that lead to goal achievement for the organization.

These theories all express a view of human beings as rationally functioning creatures who can be steered towards desired behaviors by organizational structures and management. These theoretical propositions lead to a bureaucratic conception of the school as an organization with control and formalized routine as modes to achieve productivity targets. Within this model of school organization, the role of the principal becomes essentially managerial in nature (cf. Bacharach & Mundell, 1995). Innovation is construed as a strategy through which the school controls teacher behaviors towards achievement of desired outcomes of the organization. Systematic methods, top-down coordination, and managerial-organizational steering become central organizational design characteristics designed to foster the implementation of innovations. It is in this regard that Louis (1994) speaks of 'the paradigm of managed change'.

In fact, the structural-functional perspective is entirely consistent with the traditional way of thinking about management in industrial settings. Management is viewed as a necessary function to solve problems rationally through adaptation of structures and procedures. This mode of thinking was transferred to the field of education long ago and has lead to the so-called control-oriented approach to educational change as described by Rowan (1990; 1995).

The idea of the control-oriented approach is that student achievement can be improved by routinization of the schools' core technology through strengthening the schools' bureaucratic controls. This involves the development of a system of input, behavior, and output controls designed to regulate classroom teaching and to standardize student opportunities for learning. Such systems have restrictive and regulative consequences for teachers' discussions about methods to use and subject matter to choose. They strictly prescribe what teachers are supposed to do in their classrooms through the year.

According to Rowan, a control-oriented approach usually includes two strategies for improving education. The first strategy is to strengthen curricular controls by the standardization of curriculum purposes, materials, methods, and testing. The second strategy is to strengthen controls on teacher behavior by training, supervision, and goal-setting. Execution of such strategies presupposes strict coordination and steering on the part of the school management.

Research on Educational Innovation from a Structural-functional Perspective

Many studies have been executed from a structural-functional perspective. Studies into the schools' policy-making capacity form a good example (e.g., Hooge, 1998; Sleegers, 1991; Sleegers, Bergen, & Giesbers, 1994; see also: van den Berg & Sleegers, 1996a). Starting from the assumption that schools are rational and goal-directed, these studies made clear that school policy-making activities can be viewed as systematic and planned attempts to coordinate the functioning of a school. Furthermore, these studies assume that the school manager's key role is to maintain at least an oversight role with respect to implementation of the innovation.

This perspective emphasizes the manager's role in initiating the development of explicit policy, an active monitoring of the implementation of the policy, the creation of a formalized structure of consultation and communication, and the generation of a strategic view. Although active engagement of teachers in the policy-making process is also advocated, decision-making at the school level is generally reserved to the principal. This centrality attributed to the principal's role expresses a view of the principal as the manager of others.

Studies based on the results of school effectiveness research also largely reflect this control-oriented approach (Rowan, 1990). School effectiveness research traditionally focuses on understanding the factors of 'what works', i.e., factors at the pupil, classroom, school, and context level that explain student outcomes (Bosker, Creemers, & Stringfield, 1999; Teddlie & Reynolds, 2000). When carried over to the domain of school improvement, however, the same scholars tend to assume that the same factors which appear to *explain* educational productivity also function as the right arrangements to *improve* educational productivity.

School effectiveness researchers' concern for identifying explanatory factors is related to the desire to manipulate internal and external conditions of schools. This approach assumes that the goal is to improve the means-end operations of schools (Scheerens & Bosker, 1997). Meta-analyses of Scheerens and Bosker (1997) show how particular teaching methods such as cooperative learning and feedback influence school effectiveness. School organizational factors like achievement pressure for basic subjects, evaluation, educational leadership, parental involvement, and an orderly climate have also been studied from this perspective. Recently, there is evidence of increased efforts to make use of this body of knowledge about effectiveness factors within the school improvement community (Reynolds, Creemers, Bollen, Hopkins, Stoll, & Lagerweij, 1996).

Introduction

PHILIP HALLINGER, Section Editor
College of Management, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand

In the changing global context of education, policymakers and the public have rising expectations of education and its role in societal development. Continuing waves of reform have placed school leaders at the center of implementation efforts directed at school improvement. By all accounts this began in the early 1980's when a confluence of research findings and policy pressures refocused attention on the *leadership role* of school principals.

Early findings from studies of effective schools found that the instructional leadership role of the principal seemed to help explain differences in the effectiveness of schools serving the urban poor, especially at the primary school level. Simultaneously, research on school improvement was generating consistent findings concerning the importance of principals in the successful implementation of innovations. These findings found a friendly reception among policymakers eager for solutions to the problem of school reform. The waves of reform that started in the US in 1982 have since continued unabated and spread throughout the world.

This section of the *International Handbook of Research on Educational Leadership and Administration* includes chapters that focus specifically on *Leadership and School Improvement*. Although the papers come at the issue of leading school improvement in this new era from different perspectives, they address the same set of questions:

- What are the forces bringing change to the needs and requirements for school leadership in this era of rapid change in schools and their environments?
- How are change forces of globalization, technology, multi-culturalism, politics, and recognition of indigenous cultures changing the way we conceptualize leadership for schools in the new millennium?
- What are the emerging capacities needed by schools and their leaders in this changing context?
- What are key conceptual and empirical issues concerning leadership and school improvement that emerge from this new context?

Philip Hallinger (Thailand) and Ronald Heck (University of Hawaii) maintain the focus on leadership and change with a more specific look at leadership within the

Second International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration, 3–7
K. Leithwood, P. Hallinger (eds.)
© 2002 Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers. Printed in Great Britain.

school improvement process. Hallinger and Heck contributed a chapter to this same section of the first Handbook that reviewed the literature on principal leadership and school effectiveness. In that chapter they noted several avenues of indirect impact through which school leaders influenced school effectiveness. After reviewing studies conducted over numerous national and cultural contexts, they concluded that the most important of these avenues of impact were vision, school mission and goals.

At the same time, however, the authors noted that limitations in this empirical knowledge base clouded their ability to clearly distinguish among these related constructs. In their contribution to this edition of The Handbook, *What Do You Call People with Visions? Vision, Mission and Goals in School Leadership and Improvement*, the authors seek to provide conceptual clarity and methodological direction to this topic. They review literature on vision, mission and goals from education, public and private sectors in an attempt to clarify the theoretical relationship between goals as a general construct and school improvement

The authors conclude that the constructs of vision, mission and goals indeed have different theoretical lineages. The different lineages reflect alternate assumptions about how people function in organizations and have different implications for leading schools. Further extending this discussion, the authors provide an illustrative analysis that seeks to show a promising direction for the future study of these constructs. The chapter concludes by reaffirming the theoretical and practical potential of this set of variables, but also for more systematic distinction among them in future empirical studies.

Louise Stoll, Raymond Bolam and Pat Collarbone (United Kingdom) have contributed *Leading for Change: Building Capacity for Learning*. The chapter is grounded primarily in the experience of school leaders in the United Kingdom where the context for school leadership has changed as radically and as quickly as anywhere in the world in the past decade. The changing structure of and expectations for schools has led to new challenges and dilemmas for those who would lead schools in the UK. Although the focus is on the UK context, the challenges and dilemmas will resonate with others throughout the world.

In particular Stoll and her colleagues describe and assess the impact of a dominant trend world-wide, the imposition of changes on schools from the external environment. This trend, which shows no signs of abating anytime soon, presents the challenge of creating coherence and meaning for leaders themselves as well as for the school's other relevant stakeholders.

The authors focus specifically upon change in two major respects. They examine how changes are affecting the role of school leaders as well as how they must lead change in their schools. The most significant changes they describe are political changes in the environment of schools. Here they argue that existing approaches to change do not sufficiently address the development of sustainable and ongoing learning. They suggest that it is the role of the leader as a "capacity builder" that is fundamental to developing learning in a complex, changing world. Capacity-oriented leadership entails several functions:

- ensuring learning at all levels;
- using evidence to promote inquiry-mindedness;
- building extended community;
- bridging community – dealing with the school-system interface.

Peter Sleegers, Femke Geijsel, and Rudolf van den Berg (Netherlands) continue this theme of leadership and change in their chapter, entitled *Conditions Fostering Educational Change*. In the previous edition of *The Handbook*, a chapter by van den Berg and Sleegers ended by stressing the importance of transformational leadership, incremental policy development, and teachers' personal concerns in the context of educational innovation and change. These implications were in line with an ongoing discussion within school improvement and educational change literature during the 1990s about the relevance of cultural-organizational aspects in schools and individual teacher issues for realizing innovation and change. In this discussion, the authors challenged a number of assumptions that were taken for granted during the 1980s and early 1990s. These included the schools as the unit for change and the emphasis on planned change.

The current contribution builds on this theme by examining school organization, school leadership and teacher conditions for what is known and unknown about the way they foster educational innovation and change. First, the authors explore the changing context of education. They then uncover some important issues that challenge future research into conditions fostering educational change. In order to understand the change conditions, they outline opposing perspectives on innovation reflected in the research literature on school improvement and educational change: the structural-functional perspective and the cultural-individual perspective. They then review the key conditions fostering educational change. This is followed by a discussion of multilevel modeling, the issue of interdependency, and the assumption of effectiveness regarding the study of change conditions.

Yin Cheong Cheng (Hong Kong Institute of Education) follows with a chapter on *The Changing Context of School Leadership: Implications for Paradigm Shift*. Y.C. Cheng's chapter was written in Hong Kong, which sits at the crossroads of Eastern and Western societies. This is an excellent vantage point from which to view the changing trends that are reshaping the role of school leaders.

Since the late 1980s there has been an explosion of school reforms, not only in North America and Europe, but also in Austral-Asia. Cheng thus notes many of the same change forces described in the first two chapters in this section:

- diverse and rising expectations for school education;
- need for human initiative and creativity in processes of teaching and managing;
- advances in information technology particularly;
- a trend towards decentralization of management in organizations (e.g., school-based management (SBM), collaborative management, school self-governance);
- privatization, localization, and globalization.

Even in Asia, once the bastion of centralized schooling, these changes now seem inevitable and are quickly becoming the mainstream. Cheng discusses these contextual changes and concludes that there is a need for a paradigm shift in school leadership.

The expected nature, function, scope, process, and context of leadership and even the target school constituencies to be influenced in such a new era become much broader and are substantially different from the past. This chapter reviews the features and trends of this changing context and seeks to re-conceptualize the nature of the paradigm shift in school leadership.

Maenette K.P. Ah Nee-Benham (University of Hawaii) and L.A. Napier take the notion of a paradigm shift one step further. In *An Alternative Perspective of Educational Leadership for Change: Reflections on Native/Indigenous Ways of Knowing*, Benham seeks to understand educational leadership through Native/Indigenous perspectives. The purpose of this chapter is not only to demonstrate a different paradigm for school leadership, but also to press for the inclusion of alternative frames in educational leadership discourse.

The chapter discusses leadership thought and praxis as conceptualized and practiced in diverse native/indigenous communities. Benham compares contemporary leadership constructs to traditional, native ways of knowing and thought. She builds on this by beginning a conversation on the implications of native knowing and thought on school organizations.

The result of this initial conversation is markedly different from the language of the other contributions. Benham asserts that a native/indigenous way of leading includes:

- Compassion and spiritual knowing that embraces the cultural and historical contexts of knowledge, leading, and learning;
- Goodness of spirit and mind, which locates action in relationships between self through the other;
- Belief and vision that expands ideas of usefulness, and collectivity and connectivity;
- Good words that links causality of language, thought, and action, and inspires self-determination and sovereignty;
- Place and time that honors land, place and knowing that is grounded on thousands of years of knowing.

Among the intellectual leaders in the recent emergence of cross-cultural research in education are Allan Walker and Clive Dimmock. Their chapter, *Moving School Leadership Beyond Its Normal Boundaries: Developing a Cross-Cultural Approach*, provides further support for the perspective illustrated in the Benham chapter. Walker and Dimmock build a case for reinventing the field of comparative educational administration and leadership through considering the influence of societal culture on its conception and practice. Their argument is predicated on the need to expand understandings of educational administration and leadership beyond their narrowly conceived Western base and their over-reliance on decontextualized theory.

Although the reciprocal influence of organization culture on school leadership and other processes has now become an accepted and vital constituent of educational understanding and investigation, the influence of societal or national culture has largely been ignored. Equally, researchers have long acknowledged the influence on schools of political ideology, economic development, history and social phenomena, such as race, gender and class, but have generally failed to take cognizance of how culture shapes beliefs and actions in schools.

Drawing on literature from comparative and international management, cross-cultural psychology, comparative education and comparative educational psychology, Walker and Dimmock demonstrate the influence of culture on educational leadership and its related functions and processes. Their purpose is to establish a cross-cultural comparative approach on the emerging agenda of research and scholarship in the wider field of educational leadership and administration.

1

What Do You Call People With Visions? The Role of Vision, Mission and Goals in School Leadership and Improvement

PHILIP HALLINGER
Vanderbilt University

RONALD H. HECK
University of Hawaii at Manoa

VISION, MISSION AND GOALS IN SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT: CONCEPTUAL ISSUES

In this section we begin the process of unpacking the conceptual foundations of these related terms. We assert that until scholars distinguish more clearly among these terms and their underlying assumptions, it will be difficult to craft appropriate strategies for either empirical study or practice.

The Role of Vision in School Improvement

What do you call people who have visions? a) insane, b) religious fanatics, c) poets, d) mystics, e) leaders. Depending on your frame of reference, one or all of the above would be correct. After decades of mistrust concerning notions of charismatic leadership, a new notion of visionary leadership crept into popularity during the 1980's and 1990's. This was often termed "transformational leadership" by proponents (e.g., Bass, 1985; Leithwood, 1994). This approach to leadership sought to describe and explain the manner by which organizational and political leaders appeared to profoundly influence their constituencies. Its application has spread beyond the political arena into business and schools. A central facet of transformational leadership is the notion of vision.

Vision as an avenue of influence in school improvement

Personal vision refers to the values that underlie a leader's view of the world, and in this case, education. The use of the word vision is not accidental. A vision

Second International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration, 9–40
K. Leithwood, P. Hallinger (eds.)
© 2002 Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers. Printed in Great Britain.

enables one to see facets of school life that may otherwise be unclear, raising their importance above others.

The foundation of vision is moral or spiritual in nature. For example, the use of vision in religious contexts suggests the notion of a sacred calling from within the individual. While secular education disavows formal religious practice in schools, education itself remains fundamentally a sacred craft in which we offer service to others. Education is a moral enterprise (Barth, 1990; Bolman & Deal, 1992a; Deal & Peterson, 1990; Fullan, 1993; Fullan & Hargreaves, 1992; Hallinger, 1996; Sergiovanni, 1992).

A vision, by its nature is a source of inspiration for one's life work. It is *not* by nature measurable or bound to a timeline. It draws its power as a well-spring of personal motivation that can act as a catalyst to action for oneself and potentially for others.

Roland Barth (1993), among the most articulate proponents of vision as an inspiration for educational leadership, claims that personal visions grow out of the values we hold most dearly. He suggests several questions that may clarify an educator's personal vision:

- In what kind of school would you wish to teach?
- What brought you into education in the first place?
- What are the elements of the school that you would want your own children to attend?
- What would the school environment in which you would most like to work look like, feel like, and sound like?
- If your school were threatened, what would be the last things that you would be willing to give up?
- On what issues would you make your last stand? (Barth, 1996, personal communication)

The power of a personal vision lies both in its impact on one's behavior and its potential to energize others. A clearly formed personal vision shapes our actions, invests our work with meaning, and reminds us why we are educators. When a personal vision is shared by others, it can become a catalyst for transformation (Barth, 1990; Bolman & Deal, 1992a, 1996; Hallinger, 1996).

Empirical study of vision

The inspirational facet of a personal vision received the most attention in the earlier leadership literature, especially in the context of charismatic leadership. More recent scholarship in educational leadership, however, has identified additional avenues through which vision may have an impact on schools. This has focused on the transformational model of school leadership (e.g., Leithwood, 1994; Leithwood et al., 1998; Silins, 1994). For example, research on administrative problem solving links personal vision to expertise in problem solving and decision-making (e.g., Hallinger, Leithwood, & Murphy, 1993; Leithwood, Begley, & Cousins, 1990, 1992; Leithwood & Steinbach, 1995).

Teachers and principals make thousands of decisions daily, often without the data needed to make informed choices. Leithwood and colleagues found that leaders with clearly articulated personal values are often more effective problem solvers. When tackling the messy problems often faced in schools, the *visionary* leader's values became "substitutes for information" (Leithwood et al., 1992). Clearly defined personal values allowed principals to identify important features hidden within swampy problem situations. This provides a sounder basis on which to formulate solutions. It also enabled the principals to take a more consistent approach to solving diverse problems by linking problem interpretation to core values.

Personal vision has also been identified as an important facet underlying organizational learning (Caldwell, 1998; Hallinger, 1998; Leithwood, 1994; Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 1998; Senge, 1990). Within the model of a learning organization, the capacity of a school to learn new ways of thinking and practicing is tied intimately to its capacity to envision a new future. As Leithwood and colleagues note, "This dimension [vision] encompasses practices on the part of the leader aimed at identifying new opportunities for his or her school and developing (often collaboratively), articulating and inspiring others with a vision of the future" (p. 80).

Vision becomes an especially important condition underlying organizational learning during times of rapid change (Drucker, 1995; Hallinger, 1998; Kotter, 1996; Senge, 1990). Those changes that most influence schools today originate in the environment (e.g., technology, migration trends, system and government policies). This suggests that in the future principals and other school leaders will need to focus at least as much attention outside the schoolhouse as inside. School leaders must be able to discern emerging trends in the environment and link these future possibilities with past traditions within their organizations.

This will become an increasingly necessary function of school leadership as the pace and scope of change quicken in the environment of schools. Moreover, if responsibility for school management continues to devolve to the schoolhouse, principals will need to take on even more CEO-like functions. Primary among these is visioning: looking ahead to the future and scanning the environment for change forces coming to schools from the outside (Bolman & Deal, 1992a, 1992b; Deal & Peterson, 1990; Hallinger, 1996, 1998; Leithwood, 1994).

Caldwell (1998) draws a similar linkage between the personal vision of a school leader, school learning, and school improvement. He refers to a variety of data – quantitative and qualitative – suggesting the importance of vision, though he emphasizes the need to use a small "v" in referring to the concept. To support this view, Caldwell references research conducted by Johnston (1997) on "learning focused leadership." In the context of her case study, Johnston described the role of vision.

> *The principal was clearly influential but, at the same time, was regarded as a team player. She was particularly adept at demonstrating what the current reality was while exposing the school to a vision of what could be. She articulated the creative tension gap and indicated the way forward. In the process the school was infused with an energy and optimism not often seen in schools at this time. The idea that all within the school should be leaders captures the notion of leadership of teams.... (Johnston, 1997, p. 282; cited in Caldwell, 1998, p. 374)*

Caldwell (1998) also notes research conducted by Hill and colleagues (Hill & Rowe, 1996) that provides further support for vision as an important construct in understanding school improvement:

> *Hill contends that principals have a central, if indirect role by helping to create the 'pre-conditions' for improvement in classrooms, including setting direction, developing commitment, building capacity, monitoring progress and constructing appropriate strategic responses" (Hill, cited in Caldwell, 1998, p. 372).*

Several other studies have also demonstrated the role of vision in school improvement. For example, Mayronwetz and Weinstein (1999) determined that vision was important in the successful adoption of change. They found that redundant leadership performance by individuals in different organizational roles demonstrated a widely-shared vision for successful change efforts. Moreover, Leithwood and colleagues (1998) determined that vision building affected school culture. More specifically, leadership helped to foster the acceptance of group goals. Kleine-Kracht (1993) also found that one successful means of principal influence on the staff was through building consensus surrounding the school's program and its goals for improvement.

A vision can also identify a path to a new future, a strategic dimension of leadership. A vision can assist a leader in becoming a more effective problem solver by helping to sort and find the most important problems. Finally, a vision can identify the critical paths for change and organizational learning. Although, this discussion has focused specifically on the vision of the school leader, it is readily apparent that vision connects quite directly to the second related construct, organizational mission.

Organizational Mission in School Improvement

An organizational mission exists when the personal visions of a critical mass of people cohere in a common sense of purpose within a community. Several characteristics of a mission are notable here. First, like "vision," the word "mission" derives from the religious sector and connotes a moral purpose or sacred quest. The spiritual element of a mission fulfills a human need for meaning and purpose that transcends organizational types. It is the moral character of a mission that reaches into the hearts of people and engages them to act on behalf of something beyond their own immediate self-interest. The power of a mission lies in the motivational force of engaging in a *shared quest* to accomplish something special, not just in having a productivity target. In education, it is not uncommon for teachers to feel a "calling" to their work, again connoting a mission or moral challenge.

Mission as an avenue of influence in school improvement

In the general organizations literature, mission is sometimes referred to as *cathectic goals*. As suggested in the foregoing discussion of mission, cathectic goals are symbolic (Bolman & Deal, 1992a, 1992b, 1996). In theory mission serves as a source of identification and motivation for a group of participants (Deal & Peterson, 1990; Dornbusch & Scott, 1975; Hallinger, 1996).

Cathectic goals stand in contrast to *cognitive goals*, which describe timelines and measurable ends that may be achieved. A mission is first and foremost a symbolic expression of the organization's values (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Deal & Peterson, 1990; Peters & Waterman, 1982; Steiner, 1979). As a symbolic statement of purpose, the organization's mission is generally articulated in an overarching fashion. By doing so leaders can encompass a relatively wide range of organizational interests and values (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Bolman & Deal, 1992b, 1996; Deal & Peterson, 1990; Drucker, 1995; Kotter, 1996; Mintzberg, 1998; Perrow, 1968; Weick, 1976, 1982).

The theoretical basis for understanding the power of mission lies in human motivation (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Bolman & Deal, 1996; Cartwright & Zander, 1968; Drucker, 1995; Handy, 1994). Organizational theorists posit the constructs of compliance and commitment as contrasting factors in human behavior (Mohr, 1973; Warriner, 1965). It is relatively easy for managers to force staff to comply with simple rules and regulations. However, in the absence of sustained pressure, individual and group behavior often reverts to its previous state or displaces the defined goal in favor of alternative goals (Grusky, 1959; Fullan 1993; Lindblom, 1959; March & Olsen, 1976; Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Perrow, 1968; Raia, 1965; Ridgeway, 1956; Warriner, 1965; Weick, 1976, 1982)

Achieving commitment to group goals, while more difficult, is generally viewed as a key factor in organizational effectiveness (Cuban, 1984a, 1984b; Drucker, 1995; Mohr, 1973;Kotter, 1996; Perrow, 1968; Senge, 1990; Steiner, 1979; Warriner, 1965; Weick, 1976, 1982). Where a mission exists, staff will take greater responsibility for managing their own behavior and making decisions consistent with common norms (Given, 1994; Jacobsson & Pousette, 2001; Jantzi & Leithwood, 1993; Larson-Knight, 2000; Leithwood et al., 1998; Senge, 1990; Silins, Mulford, Zarins, & Bishop, 2000).

This type of commitment to a shared vision of education has been a hallmark of the school effectiveness and improvement literature of the past two decades.

2
Leading for Change: Building Capacity for Learning

LOUISE STOLL
University of Bath

RAYMOND BOLAM
Cardiff University

PAT COLLARBONE
London Leadership Centre

In a rapidly changing environment, leadership for change is a complex undertaking. Leading change in schools concerns decisions about the changes that leaders wish to lead and how best to do so. It involves leadership of those things they do not want to lead but must lead. Finally, it concerns finding ways to connect these decisions coherently in order to make them meaningful to relevant stakeholders as well as for themselves.

In this chapter, we look at the changing world of schools from the perspective of school leaders. First, we consider fundamental societal changes that are influencing schools. We argue that these changes require school leaders to promote ongoing and sustainable learning in order to deal with the challenges of rapid and continuous change.

Next we address political changes that have occurred, often in response to these change forces, that affect schools in particular. Here we argue that existing approaches to change do not sufficiently address the development of sustainable and ongoing learning. We suggest that it is the role of the leader as a "capacity builder" that is fundamental to developing learning in a complex, changing world. Our analysis of change identifies four aspects or dimensions of capacity-oriented leadership:

- ensuring learning at all levels;
- using evidence to promote inquiry-mindedness;
- building extended community;
- bridging community – dealing with the school-system interface.

Having proposed these dimensions, we highlight the implications for the human side of the role. Finally, we acknowledge unresolved issues and challenges for

Second International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration, 41–73
K. Leithwood, P. Hallinger (eds.)
© 2002 Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers. Printed in Great Britain.

future research. While the chapter aims to provide an summary of the issues from an international scope of reference, the illustrations are drawn from the contexts with which we are most familiar, and from our own varying experiences in the area of school leadership[1].

CHANGE FORCES AND THE NEED FOR LEARNING

Our societies, in many ways, are dramatically different from 100 years ago. There are almost as many descriptions of the change forces as changes themselves. Whether viewed as "revolutions" (Dalin & Rust, 1996), "megatrends" (Beare, 1996; Naisbett & Aburdene, 1990), or "change forces" (Fullan, 1993 & 1999), the implications for education are profound.

The world is increasingly viewed as a global village. Twenty-four hour, worldwide news enables immediate participation in conflict, trauma and flood devastation across the globe. Family structures are changing as more women work outside the home, parents separate and people live longer. Disparity between the "haves" and "have nots" continues, with more than a twelfth of the world's population of over six billion living in absolute poverty, including 190 million malnourished children. Environmental deterioration continues, through local pollution, the threat of global warming, and loss of habitat. Climatic effects of the accumulating build-up of atmospheric carbon dioxide from the burning of fossil fuels are already being experienced as we witness flooding in low-lying areas of many countries. A fresh water shortage is likely within 20 years.

Global mergers have created giant global companies, frequently with the influence of mid-size countries. While technological advances make the world smaller, there is evidence of increasing personal isolation, problems of ownership of information, a distinct loss of privacy, and inequality of access to the use and benefits of technology.

Technology also affects people's type and location of work, with increasing opportunities to work from home or hotels around the world through online access. An increase in part-time jobs and 'portfolio' careers has implications for the expectation that people will have a job for life. Many people entering the work world can expect to change their occupation many times (Bayliss, 1998; Champy, 1997). All these trends have implications for adult and professional learning. In short, education faces enormous pressures for change from "out there": "The drivers of educational change are not always found in governmental policy. Rather, it is rapid and continual change in the wider society that makes an impact on education" (Hargreaves, 1998, p. 10).

Papert (1996) has suggested how three particular change forces exert influences on schools. First, the powerful industrial sector associated with the new technologies views education as a market place for their products. For example, the leisure and telecommunications industries use their expertise to develop new online learning technologies, connecting to schools, homes and other agencies.

Second, understandings about broader theories of intelligence and the socially constructed nature of learning lead to an awareness of the need for new approaches to learning. This, Papert has suggested, is accompanied by the realisation that in the long term the only genuinely marketable skill is that of learning itself. Learning and learning how to learn are essential future life skills. Furthermore, with knowledge readily available through technology in the home, libraries and other public places to which children and parents have access, school no longer controls "an accepted canon of knowledge".

Third, Papert identifies child-power as the most powerful change force of all. In the developed world, children appear to have increasingly less regard for school education, as it lags behind the society it serves. Surveys in the UK, for example, find that approximately a quarter of all students are dissatisfied with their schooling (McCall et al., 2001). Some are wholly disaffected with schooling and others may have "disappeared" from the formal system (Barber, 1996).

These trends have also led to an erosion of respect for adults. This traditional societal norm, predicated on natural authority, no longer exists in many developed nations. "Secretlessness" also means that social and professional life is much more open than previously. Where naiveté used to protect children, today they are more aware of the world around them, but often lack the space to develop in a secure and safe environment.

All of these external change forces have massive implications for schools and their leaders. In short, they provide imperatives for educational change and, particularly, for learning. The change forces already described, however, are not the only imperatives faced by school leaders.

CURRENT CHANGES FACING LEADERS

Increasingly, school leaders work in a political context in which "restructuring" changes have been initiated by national, state or local authorities. System restructuring is often presented as a means of raising standards of achievement in response to concerns about economic competition. At the local level, however, restructuring poses school leaders with a potent dilemma: how to manage the implementation of an onerous external change agenda while simultaneously promoting school-initiated improvements that enhance their schools as learning organisations.

The task of managing this dual change agenda is necessarily contingent not only on the situation in each school but also on specific national reforms. For example, in many countries, governments decentralised school management tasks to the local or, occasionally, school levels (e.g., in parts of Australia and the United States). In contrast, however, in England there was a different approach to restructuring education. Local authorities lost power, schools gained some control in specific areas, and many powers formerly under local authority were centralised to national level (Karstanje, 1999).

Some countries, like Hungary (Balazs, 1999) and England (Whitty et al., 1997), introduced forms of neo-liberal deregulation. These measures sought to increase competition between schools in the belief that quasi-market mechanisms would promote quality improvement. Where policymakers sought to use market forces in the education process, evidence suggests that there has often been increased polarisation in school intakes. This can lead to a depression of performance in schools with higher proportions of working class or ethnic minority students with lower prior achievement (Lauder & Hughes, 1999). Clearly, the changing political context of schooling creates particular challenges for school leaders.

In many countries, notably England and New Zealand, "new public management" (NPM) techniques have been integral to the restructuring process. NPM was adapted from the private sector (Clarke & Newman, 1997; Levacic, 1999) and applied across the public sector in health, social services and housing, as well as education. Table 1 summarises some of the principal features of NPM using Ferlie et al.'s (1996) distinction between four types of NPM.

Table 1. Four Models of New Public Management and their Core Themes (Ferlie et al., 1996)

Model 1: The Efficiency Drive
- increased financial control and audit – more for less;
- stresses provider responsiveness to consumers;
- deregulated labour market and increased pace of work;
- new forms of governance.

Model 2: Downsizing and Decentralisation
- more developed quasi-markets;
- management by contract;
- strategic core and operational periphery;
- emergence of separate purchase and provider organisations.

Model 3: In Search of Excellence
- emphasises importance of organisational culture;
- highlights values and culture in shaping behaviour at work;
- emphasises how organisations manage change.

Model 4: Public Service Orientation
- concern for service quality for users (not customers);
- power shift from appointed to elected bodies;
- sceptical about markets in public services;
- distinctive public service tasks and values.

Hood (1995) has stressed the importance of checking generalised models of NPM against the findings of empirical research. His stricture is supported by an analysis of NPM and school restructuring in England and Wales from 1988 to 2001, under both Conservative and Labour governments. Compared to most other developed countries, these restructuring reforms were notable for their sheer scale and scope, covering all 25,000 schools. The main features, which display many of the characteristics of NPM, included the introduction of:

- local management of schools (LMS) (i.e., site-based management) with school level control over delegated budgets, student recruitment, strategic policy and planning;
- control over the hiring and firing of staff, staff development and the management of buildings;
- a national curriculum and national testing related to four Key Stages (i.e., for students aged 7, 11, 14 and 16) together with regular external inspections by a "privatised" inspectorate;
- a quasi- or wholly-regulated market in which parents as customers/consumers exercise choice and schools as providers compete for customers (i.e., students);
- the introduction of mechanisms designed to extend and inform parental choice (e.g., open enrolment and new types of specialist schools, the publication of "raw" annual test results – presented as school "league tables" by the media – and of inspection reports;
- the imposition, more recently, in primary schools, and moving into secondary schools, of centrally determined literacy and numeracy schemes in which time, content and pedagogy are specified;
- the mandated requirement for both primary and secondary schools to produce their own test score targets, especially in English and mathematics, within the framework of the national curriculum.

It is important not to exaggerate the impact of these developments on the capacity of school leaders to initiate and manage change or the extent to which these developments were actually consistent with NPM. Their implementation was often partial and differentiated and particular components were modified over time. For example, most rural primary and secondary schools have not experienced any significant degree of marketization. The national curriculum and testing systems were modified in response to severe criticism from the teaching profession.

Nevertheless, the reforms have undoubtedly transformed the culture of schools in these nations. In doing so, they have also created a new context for school leaders in at least two important ways. First the new policies have introduced extensive and radical changes into the roles and responsibilities of school leaders. No less significant is the substantial increase in the work-loads of teachers, largely due to the engendered "proceduralism" that has resulted from NPM.

Research supports these observations. A unique, 10-year, longitudinal study (Weindling, 1999) offered insights into the cumulative impact of the reform process on a cohort of British secondary head teachers. In 1987, 80 per cent of the sample said their role was very different from when they had started the job in 1982. In 1993, 90 per cent said their role had continued to change significantly over the previous five years. The main area in which they perceived substantial change concerned the introduction of Local Management of Schools (LMS).