School leadership and leadership development

Adjusting leadership theories and development programs to values and the core purpose of school

Stephan Gerhard Huber

Independent Research Group, Centre for Research on Education, University of Erfurt, Erfurt, Germany

Abstract This paper looks at the central role of school leadership for developing and assuring the quality of schools, as corroborated by findings of school effectiveness research and school improvement approaches. Then, it focuses on the growing importance placed on activities to prepare school leaders due to the ever-increasing responsibilities they are facing. In many countries, this has led to the design and implementation of extensive programs. In this paper, international trends in school leader development are identified. As regards the aims of the programs, it becomes obvious that they are increasingly grounded on a more broadly defined understanding of leadership, adjusted to the core purpose of school, and based on educational beliefs integrating the values of a democratic society.

School leadership and school effectiveness

The pivotal role of the school leader[1] as a factor in effective schools has been corroborated by findings of school effectiveness research for the last decades. Extensive empirical efforts of the quantitatively oriented school effectiveness research – mostly in North America, Great Britain, Australia and New Zealand, but also in the Netherlands and in the Scandinavian Countries – have shown that leadership is a central factor for the quality of a school (see for example in Great Britain: Reynolds, 1976; Rutter *et al.*, 1979, 1980; Mortimore *et al.*, 1988; Sammons *et al.*, 1995; in the USA: Brookover *et al.*, 1979; Edmonds, 1979; Levine and Lezotte, 1990; Teddlie and Stringfield, 1993; in the Netherlands: Creemers, 1994; Scheerens and Bosker, 1997; Huber, 1999a, offers a critical overview).

The research results show that schools classified as successful possess a competent and sound school leadership (this correlates highly significantly). The central importance of educational leadership is therefore one of the clearest messages of school effectiveness research (Gray, 1990). In most of the lists of key factors (or correlates) that school effectiveness research has compiled, "leadership" plays such an important part, so much so that the line of argument starting with the message "schools matter, schools do make a difference" may legitimately be continued: "school leaders matter, they are educationally significant, school leaders do make a difference" (Huber, 1997).

"Professional school leadership" is described as firm and purposeful, sharing leadership responsibilities, involvement in and knowledge about what goes on in the classroom. That means that it is important to have decisive and goal-oriented

participation of others in leadership tasks, that there is a real empowerment in terms of true delegation of leadership power (distributed leadership), and that there is a dedicated interest for and knowledge about what happens during lessons (effective and professional school leadership action focuses on teaching and learning and uses the school's goals as a benchmark).

School leadership and school improvement

Studies on school development and improvement also emphasise the importance of school leaders, especially in the view of the continuous improvement process targeted at an individual school (Van Velzen, 1979; Van Velzen et al., 1985; Stegö et al., 1987; Dalin and Rolff, 1990; Joyce, 1991; Caldwell and Spinks, 1992; Huberman, 1992; Leithwood, 1992a; Bolam, 1993; Bolam et al., 1993; Fullan, 1991, 1992a, 1993; Hopkins et al., 1994, 1996; Reynolds et al., 1996; Altrichter et al., 1998; Huber, 1999b offers a critical overview).

In many countries, the efforts made to improve schools have illustrated that neither top-down measures alone nor the exclusive use of bottom-up approaches have the effects desired. Instead, a combination and systematic synchronisation of both has proved most effective. Moreover, improvement is viewed as a continuous process with different phases, which follow their individual rules. Innovations also need to be institutionalised after their initiation and implementation at the individual school level, so that they will become a permanent part of the school's culture that is the structures, atmosphere, and daily routines. Hence, the goal is to develop problem-solving, creative, self-renewing schools that have sometimes been described as learning organisations. Therefore, the emphasis is placed on the priorities to be chosen by each school individually since it is the school that is the centre of the change process. Thereby, the core purpose of school, that is education and instruction, are at the centre of attention, since the teaching and learning processes play a decisive role for the pupils' success. Hence, both the individual teacher and the school leadership provided are of great importance. They are the essential change agents who will have significant influence on whether a school will develop into a "learning organisation" or not.

For all phases of the school development process, school leadership is considered vital and is held responsible for keeping the school as a whole in mind, and for adequately coordinating the individual activities during the improvement processes (for the decisive role of school leadership for the development of the individual school see, for example, studies conducted as early as in the 1980s by Leithwood and Montgomery, 1986; Hall and Hord, 1987; Trider and Leithwood, 1988). Furthermore, it is required to create the internal conditions necessary for the continuous development and increasing professionalisation of the teachers. It holds the responsibility for developing a cooperative school culture. Regarding this, Barth (1990) and Hargreaves (1994), among others, emphasise the "modelling" function of the school leader.

New demands on schools and school leadership

Of course, the school leader's role has also to be seen in relationship to the broad context in which the school is operating. As schools are embedded in their communities, and the country's educational system, and this again is embedded in society, schools and their leaders have to react to, to cope with and to support economic and cultural changes and developments. Sometimes they even have to

anticipate them, and sometimes to counteract the problems arising from some of these developments. Altered social environments at work and at home as well as a growing multi-cultural world based on the versatility of a pluralistic, post-modern and globalised society, result in an increase in complexity in many areas of daily life. The accumulation of knowledge (which is developing exponentially), an information market which is not easily manageable and which features an ever-increasing supply of extracurricular information opportunities (via radio, TV, print media and, most of all, the Internet) and a growing diversity and specialisation of the working environment are further aspects of this radical change (Naisbitt, 1982; Coleman, 1986; Beck, 1986; Naisbitt and Aburdene, 1990; Krüger, 1996). Hence, the school as an institution cannot any longer be regarded as simply imparting traditional knowledge within a fixed frame. Rather, it is becoming an organisation which needs to renew itself continuously in order to take present and future needs into account (Dalin and Rolff, 1990). This imposes the necessity on school leadership to consider itself as a professional driving force and mediator for the development of the school towards a learning organisation, an organisation which develops its own reforming and changing powers and re-invents itself (see, among others, Caldwell and Spinks, 1988, 1992; Fullan, 1993, 1995).

Additional stress within the range of tasks for school leadership is brought about by the changed structures of the education system, which inevitably strongly affect the individual school and therefore the role of school leadership as well. Tendencies towards decentralisation, transferring more decision power from the system level to the school level, result in an extended independence of school (Bullock and Thomas, 1997).

Besides decentralisation, there are increasingly corresponding efforts to centralise. There is a legislative movement towards stronger central influence and control by means of intensified accountability, quality control through school inspections or external evaluation, a set national curriculum with national standardised tests, which allow for a direct comparison of pupil and school performances, and so on.

Hence, the roles and functions of school leaders have changed in many countries of the world. As a result, school leaders are confronted with an altogether new range of demands and challenges.

A complex range of school leadership tasks

The managing and leading tasks of school leadership are both complex and interrelated, so that there is no clearly defined, specific "role" of school leadership, but at best a coloured patchwork of many different aspects. Some areas or role segments relate to working with and for people, others to managing resources like the budget. All are part of the complex range of tasks the school leader faces in the 21st century (Huber, 1997, 1999d).

International school leadership research already features a number of different alternatives for classifying school leadership tasks. Various approaches allocate school leadership action within various ranges of duties and assign responsibilities and activities to these (see the analysis of Katz, 1974, as an important "precursor" for classifications of management tasks, but also classifications of school leadership tasks, for example, by Morgan et al., 1983; Jones, 1987; Leithwood and Montgomery, 1986; Glatter, 1987; Caldwell and Spinks, 1992; Esp, 1993; Jirasinghe and Lyons, 1996).

The amalgam of "school leadership competence"

The extensive activity areas and role segments of school leaders presuppose substantial competences. Competence can be seen and defined in the context of the position to be filled, as the ability to effectively execute the activities and functions which are part of that position. It can be regarded as a fundamental characteristic of a person, which results in an effective and/or above average achievement. A holistic competence approach also takes into account values and expectations, attitudes and attributes, motivation, knowledge and understanding, abilities and skills, aspects of how one sees oneself, and of one's social role (Whitty and Willmott, 1991). Considering the complexity of school leadership tasks, it is reasonable to assume a complex competence structure, a multi-faceted amalgam of school leadership competence. It comprises social, personal, and administrative competences. Moreover, the emergence and application of competences depend on the context. Hence, they vary depending on the situation.

As to the range of management and leadership tasks, one can find detailed lists of competences required for holding a leadership position (Boyatzis, 1982; Boak, 1991; Esp, 1993; NEAC, 1995; Jirasinghe and Lyons, 1996).

Leadership theories

Given the manifold tasks and responsibilities of school leadership, as well as the necessary competences, school leaders might be propagated as a kind of "multifunctional miracle beings". But, nobody can safely assume that they are or will or should be the "superheroes of school". What may be deduced, however, is that their role can hardly be filled by persons with "traditional" leadership concepts. The idea of the school leader as a "monarchic", "autocratic" or "paternal" executive of school has increasingly been seen as inappropriate, but viewing a school leader as a mere "manager" or "administrative executive" is inadequate as well, despite the managerial pressures of the present situation.

As long as it is about seeing the school as a stable system where the existing structures need to be administered as well as possible to effectively and efficiently achieve fixed results, a static concept of leadership may work very well, with the school leader first and foremost ensuring that the school as an organisation functions well and smoothly. The term "transactional leadership" has been applied to this concept of steady state leadership: the school leader is the manager of the transactions, which are fundamental for an effective and also efficient work flow within the organisation. The daily organizational office proceedings and the administration of buildings, financial and personal resources, the time resources of staff, as well as communication processes within and outside of school are all included in this definition of "transactions" or "interactions". All this constitutes the daily routines of school leadership and should not be underestimated, since it represents parts of the workload required to create the appropriate conditions for teaching and learning processes to take place.

But, once rapid and extensive processes of change demand viewing and performing "change and improvement" as a continuing process, different conceptions of leadership are required. Here, "transformational leadership" is considered to point the way (Burns, 1978; Leithwood, 1992b; Caldwell and Spinks, 1992). "Transformational leaders" do not simply administer structures and tasks, but concentrate on the people carrying these out, that is on their relationships and on making deliberate efforts to win their

cooperation and commitment. They try to actively influence the "culture" of the school so that it allows and stimulates more cooperation, coherence and more independent learning and working. Here, "leadership" is emphasised over "management". School leadership, as it is understood here, is reputed to be particularly successful in school development processes. In addition, leadership concentrates on the results, the success of the teaching and learning processes, and on the relation between these outcomes and the specific processes which led to them.

Louis and Miles (1990) also distinguish between "management", referring to activities in the administrative and organizational areas, and "leadership", referring to educational goals and to inspiring and motivating others. For them, "educational leadership" includes administrative tasks like, for example, managing and distributing resources or planning and coordinating activities as well as tasks concerning the quality of leadership, such as promoting a cooperative school culture in combination with a high degree of collegiality, developing perspectives and promoting a shared school vision, and stimulating creativity and initiatives from others.

In contrast, Imants and de Jong (1999) try to comprehend "management" on the one hand and "leadership" on the other not as contrary poles, but as complementary ones. They regard their leadership concept "integral school leadership" as an integration of management and leadership tasks. This means that steering educational processes and performing management tasks coincide and overlap. The underlying understanding of "leadership" defines it as the deliberate "control" of other people's behaviour. Therefore, educational leadership means controlling the teachers' educational actions and the pupils' learning processes. Consequently, the central issue for a school leader is how to positively influence the teachers' educational actions and the "learning activities" of the pupils. Thereby, the combination of educational leadership and administrative management, which is often perceived as contrary by school leaders, loses its contradictory character.

Studies conducted in North America, especially in the field of school effectiveness, have emphasised the relevance of "instructional leadership" since the 1980s (Bevoise, 1984; Hallinger and Murphy, 1985). This leadership concept focuses most on those aspects of school leadership actions that concern the learning progress of the pupils. This includes management-oriented as well as leadership-oriented activities like a suitable application of resources for teaching, agreeing upon goals, promoting cooperative relationships between staff (e.g. preparing lessons cooperatively), but, especially, the evaluation and counselling of teachers during lessons through classroom observation, structured feedback, and coaching.

In the German-speaking context, the notion of "organizational education" (Rosenbusch, 1997) refers to the mutual influence of the school as an organisation on the one hand and the educational processes on the other hand. The core question of organizational education raises a two-fold issue: which educational effects do the nature and conditions of school as an organisation have on individuals or groups within the organisation – and vice versa, which effects do the conditions in and the nature of individuals or groups within the school have on the school as an organisation. Concretely speaking: how does school need to be designed in order to guarantee favourable prerequisites for education and support educational work? Hence, the influence of the organisation on the teaching and learning process needs to be acknowledged. Administrative and organizational structures have to be brought in line

with educational goals. This does not only concern the structure of the school system or the management of the individual school, but also the leadership style with aspects of the distribution of tasks and responsibilities among the staff. Hence, empowerment and accountability issues seem to be important and have to be considered seriously in the light of educational aims and goals. In the context of organizational education, school leadership action becomes educational-organizational action, and educational goals become superordinate premises of this action. This means that school leadership action itself must adhere to the four main principles of education in schools – that school leaders themselves assume or encourage maturity when dealing with pupils, teachers and parents, that they practise acceptance of themselves and of others, that they support autonomy, and that they realise cooperation. This adjustment of educational perspectives affects the school culture, the teachers' behaviour, and the individual pupils, particularly through the teaching and learning process on classroom level. Administrative and structural conditions have to be modified accordingly, and be in compliance with educational principles. Thereby, the unbalanced relationship (which is historically conditioned in many countries) between education on the one hand and organisation and administration on the other hand can be clarified.

This implies that school leadership needs to be based upon certain principles, which are oriented towards the constitutive aspects of a fundamental educational understanding (Rosenbusch, 1997):

- School leaders should adjust their educational perspective: educational goals dominate over administrative requirements, administration only serves an instrumental function.

- They should take the two levels of their educational work into consideration: first school leaders have to work with children and promote their learning, and second, as they also have to work with adults, they should promote adult learning as well. Hence, conditions of adult education and adult learning have to be taken into account. This has to have an impact on their leadership and management style, particularly in professional dialogues, when knowledge is shared, expanded, and created.

- They should be more resource-oriented than deficiency-oriented: a new orientation towards promoting strengths instead of counting weaknesses is needed. So far, in many countries bureaucratically determined school administration has concentrated on avoiding mistakes, on controlling, detecting, and eliminating weaknesses instead of – as would be desirable from an educational point of view – concentrating on the positive aspects, reinforcing strengths, and supporting cooperation; it should be about "treasure hunting instead of uncovering defiencies".

- They should follow the "logic of trusting oneself and others": it is necessary to have trust in one's own abilities and as well as in those of the staff and others so that empowerment, true delegation, and independent actions can be facilitated. Then, mistakes can be addressed more openly.

- They should act according to the principle of "collegiality in spite of hierarchy": individual and mutual responsibilities have to be respected and appreciated although special emphasis is placed on a shared collegial obligation regarding the shared goals.

Rosenbusch (1997) states that the structural conditions need to be designed in a way that they facilitate opportunities for self-determination, independence and cooperation. This requires:

- a flat hierarchy of school management (with one or two levels);
- replacing linear decision-making processes with circular ones (by searching for specific solutions for the individual school cooperatively across the levels of hierarchy);
- immediate bottom-up-introduction of experiences gathered at schools into the decision-making processes of superior authorities;
- opportunities for the individual schools to create their individual profiles, for innovations and fast adjustment to general and regional social, economic, and cultural developments;
- a change in stipulations: instead of unnecessary regulations, more simplification and liberalisation;
- extended training, counselling, professional exchange, and support, focussing on the development of the individual school;
- introducing self-evaluations of schools in addition to external evaluations in order to enhance the professional feedback culture;
- establishing professional networks and learning communities: in addition to cooperation among teachers, also cooperation between schools and other educational institutions and others within the community; and
- clearly defined standards, competences, and responsibilities, as well as democratic principles and transparency.

Therefore, the leadership concept of "organizational-educational management" assumes a definition of "educational" which not only incorporates teaching and education processes with pupils, but also with adults, as well as organizational learning. Organizational-educational management is committed to educational values, which are supposed to determine the interaction with pupils and the cooperation with staff as well.

Consequently, the core principle of leadership action is "democracy" and "cooperation", both as an aim and a method. Due to the complex hierarchy within the school, democracy and cooperation represent an adequate rationale for actions concerning the intrinsic willingness and motivation of staff and the pupils for co-designing the individual school. However, cooperation is not only valuable as a means for reaching goals, it is a decisive educational goal in itself.

Implementing these ideas would result in a broad distribution of leadership responsibility to form a "community of leaders" within the school (Grace, 1995). This view is also taken by West et al. (2000), in their depiction of "post-transformational leadership". If the school is supposed to become a learning organisation, this implies the active, co-determining and collaborative participation of all (see also "shared leadership" or "distributed leadership"). The old distinction between the position of the teachers on the one hand and the learners on the other cannot be sustained, nor can the separation between leaders and followers. Therefore, leadership is no longer statically connected to the hierarchical status of an individual person but allows for the

participation in different fields by as many persons from staff as possible. This also extends to the active participation of the pupils in leadership tasks.

The delegation of decision-making power should not occur, however, in order to "bribe" the stakeholders into showing motivation, but for the sake of a real democratisation of school. Therefore, cooperation or "cooperative leadership" is not just a leadership style (like "consultative leadership", "delegative leadership" or "participative leadership") but reflects a fundamental leadership conception as a general attitude. This can also be named "democratic leadership".

Overall, this has decisive consequences for teachers' actions and for school leadership actions; it also needs to be reflected in the preparation and further development of those working in schools. Not only will the the selection and development of the educational leadership personnel benefit from this, but it should also affect the training of teachers, as teacher training most often in many countries only focuses on how to teach the chosen subjects. Teachers need to be trained for working within an organisation, too.

Leadership development

In view of the ever-increasing responsibilities of school leaders for ensuring the quality of schools, school leadership development has recently become one of the central concerns of educational policy makers. At first sight, there may appear to be an international consensus about the important role of school leaders and their development. On looking more carefully, however, it is apparent that a number of countries have engaged in this issue more rigorously than others. While in some countries discussions of school leader development are mainly rhetoric, elsewhere concrete steps have been taken to provide significant development opportunities for school leaders. Hence, a comparison of school leadership development opportunities in different countries is instructive.

The comparison referred to here draws on data from an international study of school leadership development[2] (Huber, 2003a, b, 2004). This project on school leadership development was based on researching, analysing, contrasting, comparing, and discussing programs of 15 countries in Europe, Asia, Australia/New Zealand, and North America. The report surveys the development models for school leaders in those countries. It describes international patterns in school leadership development and provides recommendations based on current trends. A broad variety of school leadership development approaches and models became apparent. In spite of differences in cultural and institutional traditions, there are common tendencies and trends throughout these countries. While some of them may be viewed as differences in emphasis, others may be so significant as to represent paradigm shifts. The largest differences are evident in those countries with longer experiences in school leadership development and school leadership research.

Current trends and paradigm shifts in qualifying school leaders include:

- Central quality assurance and decentralised provision;
- New forms of cooperation and partnership;
- Dovetailing theory and practice;
- Preparatory qualification;
- Extensive and comprehensive programs;

- Multi-phase designs and modularisation;
- Personal development instead of training for a role;
- The communicative and cooperative shift;
- From administration and maintenance to leadership, change and continuous improvement;
- Qualifying teams and developing the leadership capacity of schools;
- From knowledge acquisition to creation and development of knowledge;
- Experience and application orientation;
- New ways of learning: workshops and the workplace;
- Adjusting the program to explicit aims and objectives;
- New paradigms of leadership; and
- Orientation towards the school's core purpose;

Comparing the programs aims

As far as the aims are concerned, most of the programs have an explicitly formulated set of aims. However, they vary in terms of differentiation and degree of abstraction. Some providers state the general function of the program, namely – quite tautologically – to qualify the (aspiring) school leaders for their leadership tasks. Others quite pragmatically focus on the preparation for concrete tasks. Various providers refer to their visions, guidelines, or frameworks. Others start from a vision of school and/or of leadership, or from a specific leadership conception. From these descriptions, the aims of their program are derived. Some go into the country-specific educational, political, and occasionally even the social situation. Others put their emphasis on the moral aspects of an understanding of leadership in a broader sense.

On the basis of an analysis of their foci, the goals can be differentiated according to their particular emphasis, that is, to the extent to which they:

- take into account the demands of the government (function orientation);
- start from a quite pragmatic preparation for the different tasks of school leadership (task orientation);
- aim explicitly to develop the competences of the individual participant (competence orientation);
- explicitly focus on the development of the individual school (school development orientation);
- aim explicitly at the change or development of mental concepts of the participants (cognitions orientation);
- build explicitly on a vision of leadership, a conception of leadership, or on a vision of school (vision orientation); and
- are distinctly oriented towards values (value orientation).

A clear grouping of the programs to a single criterion, however, is very rarely possible, most of the programs incorporate multiple foci, for example, some are task- and competence-oriented, or others are vision- and school development-oriented at the same time.

Here only a few examples can be given: The Canadian program providers combine task, competence, and value orientation. In the guidelines of the Ontario College of Teachers, it is stated for the Principal's Qualification Program that it is to make the participants able to lead efficiently and effectively within a context characterised by change and complexity. Hereby, the political, economic and social influences on the school in Ontario are to be taken into account. The program's goal is to develop the necessary competences, which are explicitly enumerated. The University of York formulates for its program on the basis of these guidelines that moral principles have to be included. The program aims to prepare school leaders to act in cooperative and relationship-oriented ways in the every day life of the school and to pursue the principles of social justice and equality.

Among the programs starting from a definite leadership conception or from a specific image of the profession is Meesters in leiddingsseven of the GCO fryslân together with the Katholieke Unversiteit Nijmegen in the Netherlands. It derives its goals from the conception of "integral leadership", which overcomes the contradiction of educational action on the one hand and administrative action on the other hand, instead, the two are integrated. The Educational Leadership Centre of the University of Waikato regards school leaders, despite all their manifold strains by market orientation and evolvement of administrative tasks, primarily as "educational leaders", that is as leaders with genuinely educational tasks and with an educational mission. The program is to help them to further develop their ability to reflect, their interpersonal competences, and their fundamental educational values as basic conditions and foundations for their profession. The College of Education of the William Paterson University of New Jersey has based its program on a conception of "transformational leadership". The participants should develop a personal vision and a personal leadership competence and should set up an understanding of how fundamental and continuous changes can be initiated and implemented within complex organizational structures.

The orientation towards a specific leadership conception or a vision of school and school leadership also can be found in the program of the Danish Laererhojskole, now the Danish Paedagogiske Universitet. It aims to develop competences in the fields of management and leadership within the country's specific context, that is a strongly decentralised school system. The program is based on the vision of a democratic and reflective style of school leadership, linked to the central activity of school, that is to impart democratic knowledge. Hereby school leadership has to orient its own leadership activities towards the key goals of the organization. Among these are to develop and secure a democratic self-definition of leadership and leadership activities. The program Foundation II of the California Leadership Academy is based on the vision of "pupil-" respectively, "learner-centred schools", in which successful and committed learning is facilitated. The prime task of the school leader is to help develop the school towards this aim. All the contents of this program are to support this. The School Leadership Preparation Program in New South Wales focuses as its goal a concept of school as a learning community. This fundamental idea dominates the macro-didactic considerations and can be found again in the contents (a broadly defined target group, a multi-phase and modularised curriculum and so on).

The programs mentioned above take very clearly into account what Rosenbusch (1997) has demanded, that is an organizational-educational perspective, which means

to always start from the core purpose of school. Moreover, these conceptual leadership approaches are very much elaborated as instructional, transformational, integral, or democratic leadership.

Conclusions: adjusting the aims to leadership theories, values, and the core purpose of school

As indicated above, in this study, a decisive fundamental consideration has been found in some programs: it is the idea of new conceptions of school. Since there are so many changes in society, economy, etc., but also in the school system, the individual school has to become a "learning school" in a twofold sense. Besides promoting the learning processes of individuals, the whole school, as an autonomous organizational unit, has to learn, which means that it has to flexibly adapt to social, economic, and cultural developments, sometimes even precede them, but also counteract problems resulting from them.

The principle that school has to be a model of what it teaches and preaches (Rosenbusch, 1997) thus has consequences for school leader development. Training and development of school leaders has to be based on a clear conception of the aims of education in general and teaching-learning processes at school in particular. This idea has to shape the programs with regards to contents, methods, patterns in terms of timetabling, etc.

If the goal described above is to be realised, school leaders have to be qualified to understand the complexity of the system along with the different individuals and groups involved as well as the interactive and collaborative relationships between them. Additionally, school leaders need to be able to develop influencing relationships and "lead" proactively. Moreover, they need to be familiar with the potential "stumbling blocks" that may exist and how these obstacles can become challenges that will be overcome. School leaders have to be qualified to intervene appropriately whenever situations like these occur. School leadership must shape the school in a way that the teachers who work there can then ideally be more effective in supporting their pupils to achieve better learning outcomes. Hence, the school leader becomes a facilitator of change and someone who effectively supports teachers in their work with pupils. This requires reflection on the role, function, and goals of the school, and consequently on the role, function, and goals of appropriate leadership and management.

A consistent connection between educational and organizational action that takes into account both viewpoints would imply an even more stringent connection among aims. Development programs for school leaders therefore require a multi-stage adjusting of aims. The first question would be: what are the essential aims of education? From these, the corresponding aims for schools and schooling in general can then be derived: what is the purpose of school and what are the aims of the teaching and learning processes? Considering the perspective of the new field of "organizational education", one should ask: how does the school organisation need to be designed and developed in order to create the best conditions possible so that the entire school becomes a deliberately designed, educationally meaningful environment? This in turn would enable effective and substantial teaching and learning to take place as well as multi-faceted and holistic educational processes that would lead to achieving the schools' aims.

Moreover, if schools are considered learning organisations, this implies the stakeholders are empowered and collaboratively work together. Leadership is about empowering others as viable partners in leadership. Some colleagues call this "cooperative leadership" or "democratic leadership". Other concepts that have emerged are "organizational-educational management" (Rosenbusch, 1997), "post-transformational leadership" (West et al., 2000), or Huber's (2004) "integrative approach to leadership", which focuses the core purpose of school and adjusts school leadership to the aims of school integrating the different roles and expectations, but also emphasising the empowerment of the different stakeholders.

In a world of changing values and a broad range of different values, the development for educational leadership must not be subject to a technocratic management-oriented paradigm, but should be based on a value-centred paradigm. A more broadly defined understanding of leadership includes moral and political dimensions of leadership in a democracy. Leadership in a democratic society is embedded in democratic values, such as equality, justice, fairness, welfare and a careful and reflective use of power.

Leadership always implies some influence on others. It is essential to make the participants of development programs sensitive to that. They are to cultivate some awareness for the importance of dealing carefully and responsibly with power. Their educational aim has to be that pupils will develop to become independently thinking, self-responsible and socially responsible, mature citizens who grow beyond being led. Principles such as self-autonomy, respect of oneself and of others, and cooperation play an important part, as they also do in adult learning processes and in leadership in general.

Some of the programs make this an explicit theme, such as the one of the University of Washington:

> Quality leadership preparation programs must be organized around, and guided by, an explicit set of values expressed in the program philosophy and working assumptions. (Sirotnik and Kimball, 1996, p. 191)

The participants should reflect upon their own values in general, and upon their educational values in particular. In the end, the individual should be able to develop rather than simply be made "suitable" to fulfil a certain fixed school leadership role effectively. Besides, leadership must be made legitimate in society and above all to those who are "led". Power must be handled carefully, and the balance between influence and confidence has to be maintained. The main principles of education in schools have to be respected: maturity has to be encouraged when dealing with pupils, teachers, and parents, acceptance of oneself and of others has to be practised, autonomy has to be supported, and cooperation has to be realised. Development programs should be aligned to these beliefs.

Notes

1. The term "school leader" is in this paper used instead of principal, headteacher, administrator, rektor or other terms describing the person who is in charge of an individual school.

2. The methods used in this comparative research project comprised two surveys, extensive documentation analysis, additional country-specific investigations, and validation by experts in those countries.

References

Altrichter, H., Schley, W. and Schratz, M. (1998), *Handbuch zur Schulentwicklung*, StudienVerlag, Innsbruck.

Barth, R.S. (1990), *Improving Schools from Within: Teachers, Parents and Principals can Make a Difference*, Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, CA.

Beck, U. (1986), *Risikogesellschaft – Auf dem Weg in eine andere Moderne*, Frankfurt a. M.: Klett.

Bevoise, W. de. (1984), "Synthesis of research on the principal as instructional leader", *Educational Journal*, Vol. 41 No. 5, pp. 14-20.

Boak, G. (1991), *Developing Managerial Competences: The Management Learning Contract Approach*, Pitman, London.

Bolam, R. (1993), "School-based management, school improvement and school effectiveness: overview and implications", in Dimmock, C. (Ed.), *School-Based Management and School Effectiveness*, Routledge, London, pp. 219-34.

Bolam, R., McMahon, A., Pocklington, K. and Weindling, D. (1993), *Effective Management in Schools: A Report for the Department for Education via the School Management Task Force Professional Working Party*, HMSO, London.

Boyatzis, R.E. (1982), *The Competent Manager*, Wiley, New York, NY.

Brookover, W., Beady, C., Flood, P., Schweitzer, J. and Wisenbaker, J. (1979), *School Social Systems and Student Achievement: Schools can Make a Difference*, Praeger, New York, NY.

Bullock, A. and Thomas, H. (1997), *Schools at the Centre? A Study of Decentralisation*, Routledge, London.

Burns, J.M. (1978), *Leadership*, Harper and Row, New York, NY.

Caldwell, B.J. and Spinks, J.M. (1988), *The Self-Managing School*, Falmer Press, London.

Caldwell, B.J. and Spinks, J.M. (1992), *Leading the Self-Managing School*, Falmer Press, London.

Coleman, J.S. (1986), *Die asymmetrische Gesellschaft. Vom Aufwachsen mit unpersönlichen Systemen*, Beltz, Weinheim.

Creemers, B. (1994), "The history, value and purpose of school effectiveness studies", in Reynolds, D., Creemers, B., Nesselrodt, P., Schaffer, E., Stringfield, S. and Teddlie, C. (Eds), *Advances in School Effectiveness Research and Practice*, Pergamon, Oxford, pp. 9-23.

Dalin, P. and Rolff, H.G. (1990), *Das Institutionelle Schulentwicklungsprogramm*, Soester Verlag-Kontor, Soest.

Edmonds, R. (1979), "Effective schools for the urban poor", *Educational Leadership*, Vol. 37 No. 1, 15-27.

Esp, D. (1993), *Competences for School Managers*, Kogan Page, London.

Fullan, M. (1991), *The New Meaning of Educational Change*, Cassell, London.

Fullan, M. (1992a), *Successful School Improvement*, Open University Press, Buckingham, Philadelphia, PA.

Fullan, M. (1993), *Change Forces, The School as a Learning Organisation*, Falmer Press, London.

Fullan, M. (1995), "Schools as learning organizations: distant dreams", *Theory into Practice*, Vol. 34 No. 4, pp. 230-5.

Glatter, R. (1987), "Tasks and capabilities", in Stegö, N.E., Gielen, K., Glatter, R. and Hord, S.M. (Eds), *The Role of School Leaders in School Improvement*, ACCO, Leuven, pp. 113-21.

Grace, G. (1995), *School Leadership: Beyond Education Management*, Falmer Press, London.

Gray, J. (1990), "The quality of schooling: frameworks for judgements", *British Journal of Educational Studies*, Vol. 38 No. 3, pp. 204-33.

Hall, G.E. and Hord, S. (1987), *Change in Schools: Facilitating the Process*, State University of New York Press, Albany.

Hallinger, P. and Murphy, J. (1985), "Assessing the instructional management behaviour of principals", *Elementary School Journal*, Vol. 86 No. 2, pp. 217-47.

Hargreaves, D.H. (1994), "The new professionalism: the synthesis of professional and institutional development", *Teaching and Teacher Education*, Vol. 10 No. 4, pp. 423-38.

Hopkins, D., Ainscow, M. and West, M. (1994), *School Improvement in an Era of Change*, Cassell, London.

Hopkins, D., West, M. and Ainscow, M. (1996), *Improving the Quality of Education for all: Progress and Challenge*, David Fulton Publishers, London.

Huber, S.G. (1997), *Headteachers' Views on Headship and Training: A Comparison with the NPQH*, School of Education, University of Cambridge, Cambridge.

Huber, S.G. (1999a), "School effectiveness: was macht Schule wirksam? Internationale Schulentwicklungsforschung (I)", *Schul-Management*, Vol. 2, pp. 10-17.

Huber, S.G. (1999b), "School Improvement: Wie kann Schule verbessert werden? Internationale Schulentwicklungsforschung (II)", *Schul-Management*, Vol. 3, pp. 7-18.

Huber, S.G. (1999d), *Schulleitung International*, Studienbrief im Studium "Vorbereitung auf Leitungsaufgaben in Schulen", Fernuniversität Hagen, Hagen.

Huber, S.G. (2003a), "School leadership development – current trends from a global perspective", in Hallinger, P. (Ed.), *Reshaping the Landscape of Educational Leadership Development: A Global Perspective*, Swets and Zeitlinger, Lisse, pp. 273-88.

Huber, S.G. (2003b), "International trend of school management. The complex range of tasks and responsibilities: an international perspective", *Journal of the Japanese Association for the Study of Educational Administration*, Vol. 45, pp. 212-30.

Huber, S.G. (2004), *Preparing School Leaders for the 21st Century: An International Comparison of Development Programmes in 15 Countries*, in the Series Context of Learning, Chrispeels, J., Creemers, B., Reynolds, D. and Stringfield, S. (Eds), RoutledgeFalmer, London.

Huberman, M. (1992), "Critical introduction", in Fullan, M. (Ed.), *Successful School Improvement*, Open University Press, Milton Keynes, pp. 1-20.

Imants, J. and 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, TX.

Jirasinghe, D. and Lyons, G. (1996), *The Competent Head: A Job Analysis of Heads' Tasks and Personality Factors*, The Falmer Press, London.

Jones, A. (1987), *Leadership for Tomorrow's Schools*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.

Joyce, B. (1991), "The doors to school improvement", *Educational Leadership*, pp. 59-62.

Katz, R.L. (1974), "The skills of an effective administrator", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 52, pp. 90-102.

Krüger, H-H. (1996), "Strukturwandel des Aufwachsens – Neue Anforderungen für die Schule der Zukunft", in Hesper, W., DuBois-Reymand, M. and Bathke, W. (Eds), *Schule und Gesellschaft im Umbruch*, Weinheim, Beltz, pp. 253-76.

Leithwood, K.A. (1992a), "The principal's role in teacher development", in Fullan, M. and Hargreaves, A. (Eds), *Teacher Development and Educational Change*, The Falmer Press, London, pp. 86-103.

Further reading

Fullan, M. (1992b), *What's Worth Fighting for in Headship*, Open University Press, Buckingham, Philadelphia, PA.

Hallinger, P. (2003), "Leading educational change: reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership", *Cambridge Journal of Education*, Vol. 33 No. 3, pp. 329-51.

Hallinger, P., Leithwood, K. and Murphy, J. (Eds) (1993), *Cognitive Perspectives on Educational Leadership*, Teachers' College Press, New York, NY.

Huber, S.G. (1996), *Dovetailing School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, Department of Education, University of Cambridge, Cambridge.

Huber, S.G. (1999c), "Effectiveness and Improvement: Wirksamkeit und Verbesserung von Schule – eine Zusammenschau. Internationale Schulentwicklungsforschung (III)", *Schul-Management*, Vol. 5, pp. 8-18.

Huber, S.G. and West, M. (2002), "Developing school leaders – a critical review of current practices, approaches and issues, and some directions for the future", in Hallinger, P. and Leithwood, K. (Eds), *International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration*, Kluwer Academic Press, Dordrecht, pp. 1071-101.

Johansson, O. (2003), "School leadership as a democratic arena", in Begley, P.T. and Johansson, O. (Eds), *The Ethical Dimensions of School Leadership*, (Chapter 12), Kluwer, Deventer.

Liebel, H. (1992), "Psychologie der Mitarbeiterführung", in Gabele, E., Oechsler, W. and Liebel, H. (Eds), *Führungsgrundsätze und Mitarbeiterführung: Probleme erkennen und lösen*, Gabler, Wiesbaden, pp. 109-61.

Schön, D. (1983), *The Reflective Practitioner*, Basic Books, New York, NY.

Schratz, M. (1998), "Schulleitung als change agent: Vom Verwalten zum Gestalten von Schule", in Altrichter, H., Schley, W. and Schratz, M. (Eds), *Handbuch zur Schulentwicklung*, StudienVerlag, Innsbruck, pp. 160-89.

Southworth, G. (1998), *Leading Improving Primary Schools: The Work of Head Teachers and Deputy Heads*, The Falmer Press, London.

Van de Grift, W. (1990), "Educational leadership and academic achievement in elementary education", *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, Vol. 1 No. 3, pp. 26-40.

West, M. and Ainscow, M. (1994), *Managing School Development*, David Fulton, London.

West, M. and Ainscow, M. (1997), *Tracking the Moving School: Challenging Assumptions, Increasing understanding*, paper presented at the European Conference on Educational Research, Frankfurt, September 1997.