On records, the evolution of human development pays a considerable tribute to the relentless efforts made by generations of teacher educators set out to train academic leaders and teachers committed to the implementation of educational policies parallel to the mental edification of young students. Teacher educators, faced the challenges, overcame the obstacles, and refined the pedagogies of our educational system with many innovative approaches. As the world faces increasing uncertainties and adamant shifts of knowledge economy, it is apparent that education plays an ultimate role in creating adept and geared up citizens, to lead the way to the future. Designing and managing learning school organizations that can sustain a competitive advantage in this fast-changing environment demands transformative leaders primed and ready to the building of our intellectual capital for the future. Many books on teacher education, educational management and leadership have been written in the past, but most of them do not keep up with the fast-changing educational scene and only a few include future scenarios. This book presents the anticipated trends and demands of the new knowledge economy, and it aims to achieve its goals with the use of various tools, generative and collaborative efforts, increasing leadership capability in dynamic and complex contexts, articulation of cutting edge knowledge for educational advancement and creation of teams that foster learning organizations. This book brings together prominent and leading teacher educators and researchers from around the world to present their scholarship, theories and practice, case studies, state-of-the-art approaches and upshot predictions. This book embodies collective knowledge inquiry and represents professional conversations. The chapters provide information on recent trends and development in teacher education, the important role of educational management and leadership in educational transformations and promising practices for desired outcomes. The book is a critical and specialized resource that describes how transformative leadership can play an important role in achieving excellence in education. The topics covered are: Educational Leadership and Effective Teaching, Research in Transformational Leadership, and Professional Development and Social Capital Building in Schools. Truly, world-class schools are still a relative rarity. The words of introduction to this volume pose a puzzle in search of a solution. If the link is to be found between leadership and learning then it will require some radical rethinking of those two big ideas and what it means for schools in the 21st century. That is what this impressive collection of chapters, and leading edge thinkers, achieves.
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FOREWORD

There is widespread recognition that education is the key to the well-being of any society and that transforming schools and school systems is critical to sustained growth and success. Yet despite the many advances in information and communication technologies, truly world-class schools remain a relative rarity. Part of the reason for this resides in the nature and form of organisational structures that are no longer appropriate in the information age. The frontier of human productive capacity today is the power of extended collaboration, the ability to work across global and technological boundaries, and the ability to create and nurture learning organisations.

This form of collaboration inevitably brings challenges and opportunities. In particular, for schools and school systems, it demands the rethinking of current practices and developing alternative conceptions of leadership, professional development and pedagogy. It necessitates tackling the deep rooted problems of social inequality and educational disadvantage that so many countries have yet to resolve. It requires that we look much more critically at the forms of leadership practice most likely to secure long term transformation and change.

This book is a powerful compilation of research evidence from around the world that throws new light on a range of important issues. The chapters look at different aspects of educational change focusing particularly on the link between leadership and learning, both organisational and individual. The chapters look at the implications for teaching and learning arising from technological change and probe the forms of leadership needed to secure long term transformation. They demonstrate the importance of teacher learning as well as student learning and thus the importance of teacher education and professional development.

The book embraces a range of approaches, some of them offering new and critical insights into current practice. This amalgam of perspectives makes the book authoritative and relevant to policy makers and practitioners around the world.

Globalisation and rapid technological change pose significant and substantial challenges for schools and school systems. By sharing experience and analyses from around the world, this book offers those who work within schools and with schools some extremely helpful ways of understanding and meeting those challenges.

Geoff Whitty
Director
Institute of Education,
University of London
London, United Kingdom
PART I EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND EFFECTIVE TEACHING
ISSA M. SALEH AND MYINT SWE KHINE

1. TEACHER EDUCATION: EFFECTIVE TEACHING AND SCHOOL GOVERNANCE IN THE 21ST CENTURY

INTRODUCTION

The history of human development records the courageous efforts made by the generation of teacher educators to train the school leaders who are responsible to implement educational policies. They have endured the burden and challenges of the times and refine the pedagogies and education systems with many innovative approaches. As the world faces increasing uncertainties and shift to knowledge economy, education plays a larger role in creating productive society. Designing and managing learning school organizations that can sustain a competition in this fast-changing environment demands transformative leaders who would envision building intellectual capital for the future.

This book brings together prominent and leading teacher educators and researchers from around the world to present their scholarship, theories and practice, case studies, state-of-the-art approaches and future-oriented predictions. This book embodies collective knowledge inquiry and represents professional conversations. The Chapters provide information on recent trends and development in teacher education, the important role of educational management and leadership in educational transformations, promising practices for desired outcomes. The book is a critical and specialized resource that describes how transformative leadership can play an important role in achieving excellence in education. The topics that are covered in the book are: educational leadership and effective teaching, research in transformational leadership, and professional development and social capital building in Schools.

PART I EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND EFFECTIVE TEACHING

Part I begins with Chapter 2 by Leif Moos on school leadership between governance and student outcomes in knowledge societies. He discusses the structure and the relationship between state agencies and schools that came about as the result of the changes in public governance in many countries. He focuses in the Chapter the shift of governance from hard governance which he refers to it as legally binding regulations to soft governance which he refers to advisory, persuasive and sense-making methods. The author also discusses government use of indirect forms of
power (discourses, agenda setting, sense-making, and social technologies) instead of direct forms of power.

The focus of Chapter 3 is the impact of teacher leadership in students learning outcomes in schools. The author argues that the slow progress in student learning through teacher leadership skills in the United States. The Chapter look at the history of teacher leaders and contemporary models of teacher leadership in schools. For comparative purposes the author also looks at the role of teacher leaders in other countries. The author also explains how teacher leadership can promote the academic accomplishment of students.

In Chapter 4 the author outlines the key shifts that need to be done in educational leadership in order for education to be a ‘public good’. The author argues that new teachers have a more social and cultural awareness than the older generation of teachers. According the author, this fundamental change in new teachers has to do with ‘global interconnectedness’ and education being more than delivering ‘fundamental literacy and numeracy’. The author further supports her argument using a body of literature that suggests that new teachers are working with a ‘global epistemic outlook’ (Kyriacou & Coulthard, 2000).

In Chapter 5, Forrest Parkay and Mei Wu made reference to Generation YES model and presented the student-facilitated technology integration as a catalyst for creating school-based learning communities. They argue that school leaders and educational policy makers can benefits from students’ expertise on various technologies to transform schools into learning communities. The Chapter explores the impact of technology on education in the United States and compared with Chinese education and technology. They also argue that schools are not acting as “learning organizations.” (Hoy & Miskel, 2001; Hughes, 1999; Ubben, & Jensen, 2001)

The author discusses in Chapter 6 the history of leadership models and its implications. The author highlights’ early research findings of this model of leadership and school reform. The author is critical when he looks at the system we have in education today. He implies that we need a ‘revolution’ rather than ‘reform’ in the system. He supports his argument by using the saying of prominent figures in history and body of literature.

PART II RESEARCH IN TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP

The topic on teachers’ research, professional development, and educational leadership in school is presented in Chapter 7 by Jeroen Imants. The author starts by reviews of literature on practitioner research (Zeichner & Noffke, 2001). Then, the author describes a study to find out two research questions. The first one deals with to what extent do teachers deal with daily problems in student learning and educational processes by research related activities and the second question focuses on how can school leaders promote research related activities among teachers that are directly connected to problems in student learning and educational processes. The findings from the studies indicate that teacher show interest in practice based evidence about student learning results. The studies also
show that school self-evaluation and integral personal policy can contribute to the development of a research related activities among teachers and school leaders.

In Chapter 8 Ehrich and Cranston synthesize the current research, writing and theoretical insights regarding school leadership. They state that leadership is argued as a way forward to improve performance and practice in a variety of contexts including schools. They begin the Chapter by extracting several key themes and trends in educational leadership and report on the interviews carried out with ten prominent Australian leaders. The outcomes of the interviews suggest some ideas of imagining school leadership for the future, inspire new ideas and identify new dilemmas and reacting new solutions.

In Chapter 9 Mulford and Silins share the detail results of a large scale survey based research project that sought to examine the relationships among transformational leadership, organizational learning and teacher and student outcomes. The Chapter answers two fundamental questions. The first answer deals with whether the nature of the leadership and the level of organizational learning in school contribute to school effectiveness and improvement in terms of the extent of students’ participation in school, student academic self-concept and engagement with school. The second answer explains the nature of the relationship between non-academic students’ measures of participation in school, student self-concept and engagement with school and measures of student retention and academic achievement. They identify three factors in leadership and school effectiveness and improvement.

Chapter 10 is a case study that looks at a failed school. The author tries to do analyses using situation leadership theory as framework to understand the school (Hersey, Blanchard, & Johnson, 1996). The author also looks at the three variables of effectiveness which are causal variables, intervening variables and end result variables (Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994). For causal variables the Chapter looks at leadership style for the leader of the school and power bases utilized which was coercive power. Then, the Chapter looks at the intervening variables such as demographics, facilities, readiness levels, and academic weaknesses. After looking at intervening variables, the Chapter looks at outcome variables such as post graduation achievement, standardized test scores, and graduation rates. The author uses Lewin’s and Schein’s theory to give recommendations to make the organization more effective.

In Chapter 11 the authors look at the three things that mattered the most (according to the authors’ analysis) in McKinsey and Company released a report comparing education performance among nations of the world (Barber & Mourshed, 2007). The three things that the authors identify are: ‘(1) getting the right people to become teachers, (2) developing them into effective instructors, and (3) ensuring that the system is able to deliver the best possible instruction for every child’. The authors look at these findings and try to reflect at educational policies and practices found in nations with developed economies. The first half of the Chapter deals with the effects on teacher quality, the effects on instructional effectiveness and the effects on student performance. Finally, the authors look at how emerging initiatives are likely to ‘foster teacher quality, instructional effectiveness, and customization of student learning’.
Part III begins with a Chapter by Antoniou, Creemers and Kyriakides (Chapter 12) on integrating research on teacher education and educational effectiveness. The authors suggest that the research on teacher professional development addressing the effectiveness of different approaches can be used to improve the quality of teaching. They present two main research trends in teacher education and discuss their strengths and weaknesses. They demonstrate how findings of research on teacher professional development can be integrated with validated theoretical models of educational effectiveness.

Chapter 13 by Burstow on adding value to international professional development provides a fresh look into the teacher professional development. The author describes how the host school and visitors can take advantage of each other and suggests that visitors become proactive researchers, rather than passive observers in the host schools. At the same time the host school personnel need to be analytical about their own organization to facilitate the research effectively. To achieve this, the visits have to be arranged with more length and rigor. The Chapter offers a novel form of exchange where both observers and the hosts are engaged for mutual benefits.

Technology training and professional development of school leaders in the USA is presented by Hauer and Koutouzos in Chapter 14. This Chapter provides an overview of present and anticipated use of technology by school leaders and a description of current and emerging pedagogical approaches that can be used in the preparation of school leaders in the use of technology. The authors conduct extensive literature search and review the official documents related to policies, guidelines, and standards in the use of technology in schools and their implications to professional development for principals and school leaders. For example, they look at the work of Halverson, Grigg, Pritchett, and Thomas from 2007; Wells & Lewis from 2006; Lackney from 2005; McNabb from 2006; Kleiner, Thomas, & Lewis, from 2007 to mention a few. They conclude that there is a need for revisiting the role and preparation of school leaders in the use of technology.

Chapter 15 looks at some of the challenges that high school administrators and faculty encounter as they prepare “historical marginalized” students to compete in the information age. The author explores the leadership techniques and strategies that this administrators use to overcome the challenges. The author further discusses the effect of the ease of the accessibility of knowledge in this age. The author discusses the realization of school administrators that access to information is empowering to students.

The author in Chapter 16 looks at the concept and application of learner-centered leadership. He points out that the implications of learner-centered leadership to aspiring administrators and their professional development. According to the author:

Learner-centered leadership is based on a central belief in democratic schooling which places responsibility for learning with the multiple learners.
TEACHER EDUCATION

in educational settings: students, staff, teachers, administrators, families, and community members.

The author compares Learner-centered leadership to what he calls a standardization and efficiency. He argues that the latter is a misguided route for preparing learners and school leaders. He supports his argument by using a body of literature that says learners learn better when they control the conditions of their own learning (Danzig 1999a, 1999b, 2003; Danzig, Blankson, & Kiltz, 2007; Danzig, Borman, Jones, & Wright, 2007a, 2000b; Danzig, Chen, & Spencer, 2007; Danzig & Wright, 2007; Kiltz, Danzig, & Szeczy, 2004).

In Chapter 17 the author points out the importance of improving the social capital of students in high-poverty schools. The author acknowledges that this approach is economically costly. However, the author is convinced that it will be cost-effective in the long-term. She recommends that governments should adopt a multi-agency approach to the task, to provide integrated childcare, housing, education, health care and employment services for families of students who live in poverty. The author looks at the research that was done by Bransford, Darling-Hammond and LePage in 2005 from successful high poverty schools to support her argument that social learning opportunities are the root for achievement in those schools. She also looks at similar research that showed similar results by Mulford, Kendall, Ewington, Edmunds, Kendall and Sliins in 2007.

Chapter 18 covers several topics and critique recent Australian data that was released. Some of the topics are: ‘the global challenges facing Australia as a largely western nation located geographically in the dynamic Asian region; the moves to reform and restructure the curricula and pedagogical practices in the compulsory school sector, the impact these changes are having on teachers’ work lives and professionalism, the impact of ICT on teachers and students, and the recent initiatives by teacher education institutions to move to transformative educational practices in both initial preparation programmes and in Continuing Professional Development. The Authors also argue the perceived lack of clear links between the theoretical aspects and the practice of teaching using the work of Morris and Williamson (2000). Chapter 19 examines the notion why some teachers choose not to become head teachers. Also, the author contrasts the Scottish situation with international research findings. Within the chapter, the author also looks at two problems that were reported at Scotland Background Report which are lack of information on succession planning and teachers aspirations to become head teachers.

CONCLUSION

Many books on teacher education, educational management and leadership exist in the past. But most books do not keep up with the fast-changing educational scene and only a few include future scenarios. This book presents anticipated trends and demands of the new knowledge economy, achieving goals with the use of various tools, generative and collaborative efforts, increasing leadership capability in dynamic and complex contexts, enculturation of cutting edge knowledge for educational
advancement and creation of teams that focus in learning organizations. It is our hope that this book will be a useful resource for educators who wish to advance their knowledge in education leadership, practices and future research in transformative leadership and learning Organizations in the Information Age.
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ABSTRACT

Changes in public governance in many countries have brought new structures and relations between state agencies and schools. The states are – with inspiration from global trends and trans- and supranational agencies – being developed into hyper-complex and polycentric states with no single centre of power but with numerous means of influence and networks, where power is distributed and decisions are negotiated. There are isomorphic tendencies in governance at several levels in the ways hard governance (legally binding regulations) is being substituted or supplemented by soft governance (advisory, persuasive and sense-making methods). Many new forms of influences are thus being designed at state, local and organizational levels with strong tendencies towards the use of soft governance in the management of schools and in many cases also in the management in schools. Examples could be management by discourses, social technologies, networking and evaluation. One aspect of the internalisation of education – as demonstrated in the discourse of knowledge societies – is that the expectations towards schools practice and outcomes is changing and so is the expectation towards school leadership.

**Keywords:** Governance, School leadership, Isomorphism, Influence, Communication, Discourses, Social technologies, Negotiation

INTRODUCTION

An underlying hypothesis for this article is that governance in contemporary modernity show a general trend: Trans-national agencies, government from the national and local level and agents on practical levels are increasingly attempting to use indirect forms of power, such as discourses, agenda setting, sense-making, social technologies etc., instead of direct forms, such as prescriptions and instruction. Societies have become so complex that direct forms of power have become ineffective because surveillance, control, and sanctions are impossible to
administer, and because they are often not seen as legitimate forms of influence in democracies. There is thus a shift away from hard governance by regulation towards soft governance by persuasion.

I shall therefore discuss several examples of institutional isomorphism (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983) between trans-national, national and local institutions (agencies, governments and schools) based on either coercion from political pressure; on mimic of successful examples/practices; or on transfer of norms through professional communication of which this article also could be seen as an example.

Global influences

Governance theories (M. Dean, 1999b; Foucault, 1976/1994) have found that it is not possible to govern a nation, its institutions and individuals, by commands and economic and administrative regulations set down by legislation only. This understanding is being supplemented, or perhaps even replaced, by the understanding that societies cannot be governed from one point, i.e. the government. Governments and other authorities must scrutinise themselves as ‘leaders of leaders’ through indirect forms of power in ‘polyphonic setting’ (Pedersen, 2005). These forms are intended to influence the ways in which institutions and individuals perceive, interpret, understand, and act. The actions themselves become less important in this era. The values and norms behind them are more important from a governmental point of view because indirect forms of power attempt to influence the values and norms.

Paralleling that trend are supra- and trans-national agencies such as the OECD (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development) and the European Union Commission, which are – when it comes to education and its governance and politics – not commissioned to use direct forms of power and are therefore developing ‘soft forms of governance’. However, these agencies operate within the more general trend of globalisation.

Globalisation is an intricate pattern of changes in economics and the divisions of labour (e.g. the emergence of more than 50,000 massive trans-national companies loyal to their shareholders, and therefore able to force governments to shape their financial policies according to market logic), changes in communication (especially the Internet and other forms of split-second, global mass media), changes in politics (with only one global political system remaining) and changes in culture (Martin & Schumann, 1997). More recent areas where the global interdependencies show are the financial market and the climate problem.

One global effect is the trend towards neo-liberal and market politics (with a focus on decentralisation, output, competition, and strong leadership), as well as accountability politics (with a focus on re-centralisation and centrally imposed standards and quality criteria), in the public sphere. This trend is known as New Public Management (NPM) (Hood, 1991). These overarching tendencies influence the thoughts and actions of individuals in many countries, especially in the Europe, to prefer market logic (see later).
Barriers between nations in the areas of economics, industry and trade, and culture and communication have been torn down, and new relationships and new coalitions and liaisons have been formed. Some of these new relationships are ad hoc; some are more formal. Most of them have been established primarily to promote economic co-operation. The G8 (the coalition of seven plus one leading industrial country, includes France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the United Kingdom, the United States, Canada, and Russia), the World Bank, the OECD, and the EU (European Union) are just a few of these powerful agencies.

Over the past decade, these agencies have expanded their activities from economics to other spheres of life, such as education. Educational systems are also being sub-ordinate to market thinking. The primary objectives and charters of most of these agencies exclude them from making decisions about educational policies. Nevertheless, they have begun to focus on education, as it is often seen as a cornerstone for national and global economic growth in the so-called global knowledge economy (G8, 2006).

Supra- and Trans-national Influences

The OECD and EU Commission are two of the most powerful players in the global field of educational politics. They have not been positioned, up until now, to make educational policy decisions on behalf of member governments. However, this fact might change in respect to the EU because of the Lisbon Agreement. National policies are influenced by supra-national European Union policies “that create, filter and convey the globalisation process” (Antunes, 2006 p. 38). This influence is one of the purposes of the EU, but not the purpose for which it was originally intended. In the Lisbon Agreement, education is defined as an aspect of social services and is therefore within the range of Commission decisions and regulations (EC, 2000).

Since both agencies – and their member governments – were interested in international collaboration and inspiration, they developed alternate methods to influence the thinking and regulation of education in member states. The EU developed the ‘open method of coordination’ (Lange & Alexiadou, 2007), and the OECD developed a method of ‘peer pressure’ (Moos, 2006b; Schuller, 2006).

The EU Commission needed governance tools to influence public and private education within the member states. At the Lisbon EU Commission meeting, participants agreed to develop a flexible method based on reflexivity and indicators. This method, according to the meeting, had to include flexible governance tools that rely on ‘soft law’. The divide between EU hard and soft law is that with hard law and directives, the EU Commission can create legally binding obligations for states and individuals, whereas soft law can only be persuasive. The second feature of the open method is reflexivity: Member states and institutions should inspire each other through ‘peer reviews’ and policy learning, such as best practices. An important tool is a set of indicators described to enable the identification of ‘best practice’ (Lange & Alexiadou, 2007). It is worth mentioning here, that the indicators are rather vague and guiding and they therefore leave room for national
interpretation and thus for accepting to be accountable to the choices made at that level.

CERI (Centre for Educational Research and Innovation) is the OECD bureau that manages education and educational research. The OECD does not see itself as, nor was it established to be, a federal or super state with regulatory authority over its 30 sovereign member countries. Therefore, it has no formal power over member countries. However, the OECD/CERI was established as a powerful player in the globalisation of economies and thereby the restructuring of the nation states (Henry et al., 2001). Through this restructuring, it influences the policies and practices of member countries in ways other than regulatory means.

Both the EU and the OECD are very much in accordance with the decision of the WTO’s GATS agreement (WTO, 1998) to include education services in the areas of free trade thus transforming education to a commodity (Moos, 2006b; Pitman, 2008).

These influences on policy and practices are not, like decision making, linear and straightforward. Lingard (2000) describes them as “mutually constitutive relations” between distinctive fields, or spaces. Lawn and Lingard claim that transnational organisations such as the OECD act as shapers of emerging discourses of educational policy as “expressed in reports, key committees, funding streams and programmes” (Lawn & Lingard, 2002). The main influence comes from the OECD setting the agenda (Schuller, 2006), both within the whole organisation – e.g. international comparisons such as PISA (Programme for International Student Assessment)(Hopman, 2008) and TIMSS (Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study) – and within individual member nations.

PISA has been discussed and criticised thoroughly: Stephan Hopman (2008) argues that the comparison is contributing to a move from ‘management of placement’ towards ‘management of expectations’ which takes the governance past New Public Management focus on ‘efficiency’ and outcomes to a new form, where the focus is on vague criteria that leave room for local interpretation and accept of accountability.

Another criticism has been made by Risto Rinne (2008) who claims that PISA has become the Global Doxa on indicators, ratings and league tables, even if the PISA methods and results can be challenged.

The CERI strategy – which involves more initiatives, not mentioned here – is explicated in the OECD publication *Education Catalogue* (OECD, 1998) as the strategy of ‘peer pressure’, that ‘encourages countries to be transparent, to accept explanations and justification, and to become self-critical’. (Ibid, p. 2).

*Hard and soft governance*: Both agencies distinguish between ‘hard governance’ and ‘soft governance’. The choice of terms is interesting because hard law stands for regulations that influence people’s behaviour, while soft law/governance influences the way people perceive and think about themselves and their relationships with the outside world. Soft governance therefore influences agents in much deeper ways. While these methods of influence might seem softer, or more educational, the effects of soft influence are harder and more profound.
The aforementioned approaches used by the OECD and the EU are similar to one another. Both approaches try to set the agenda for educational discussions and discourse. At the same time, they develop social technologies that influence educational policymakers and practitioners. The foundation of these social technologies is comparisons, including the league table constructed to show the results of PISA surveys, international thematic reports (e.g. Education at a Glance), indicators and benchmarks, best practice examples, and peer reviews based on frameworks and indicators.

The CCCI-model: These social technologies seem to follow the same pattern, the CCCI-model, as I name it here. They all build on the liberal core concept of citizen’s (or consumers’) choice that presupposes that citizens are given a screen, a background upon which to make their choices; therefore there must be comparisons between competitors and eventually there must be some kind of indicators that can function as yardsticks for making the selection, the choice. This CCCI model runs through most of the contemporary social technologies.

Towards Practice: New Public Management

The basis for soft governance is, as described, the neo-liberal marketisation of politics and education. This trend is often described as the New Public Management (NPM) that was intended to replace the government through regulation, beginning in the US (or New Zealand) in the early 1980s. The principles of NPM were to focus on market principles: Decentralisation from state to local authorities; strong, top-down management; emphasis on outcomes and economic incentives; competition between enterprises; and the diminishment of the power of labour unions to enable more flexible functionality (Hood, 1991). The enactment of NPM is different from country to country and from one educational system to other educational systems, so it is important to stress, that the picture drawn in the following is basically based on my Danish background. Many Danish features of NPM are however to be found in other countries as well. This is, I would claim, because the basic principles are derived from the same set of political and governance principles in neo-liberal (Global) politics.

In the beginning of the history of NPM, emphasis was placed on getting these features to work on an institutional level, but more focus is currently placed on the individual level. Economic incentives are given to individual principals or teachers; the need to be aware of marketplace demands is transforming into the need to be aware of individual customers, user choices, and the personalisation of services.

These characteristics are still in use, but others have been supplanting them for a decade. For example, some decisions are being re-centralised to the state (e.g. curriculums, criteria for success, indicators, evaluations, and accreditations) (see also: Hopman, 2008). The state and other similar authorities are making lower authority levels more accountable to higher levels in an attempt to satisfy political requirements for transparency and accountability in public sectors and institutions. Teachers are accountable to school leaders, schools to local authorities, and local
authorities to the Ministry of Education. The establishment of accountability is accomplished primarily through contracts between all levels of the educational system. Focus is also placed on national planning (curriculum), the testing of student learning outcomes, and the introduction of benchmarks and indicators used for comparisons at all levels. Many of these benchmarks and indicators are taken from international comparisons. These contracts leave it to lower-level agents to administer human and financial resources in ways that produce the desired and ever expanding goals. Student outcomes should increase year after year at a pace that agents believe they are setting themselves.

Two different strands of governance rationality and governance technology (Dean, 1999) – marketisation and accountability – provide a mixture of hard and soft governance aimed at the individual with indicators and accountability, etc. on the one hand, and contracts and decentralised decision-making about finances and work planning, as well as methods of practice, on the other. The complete picture shows the use of top-down government and an increasing focus on soft governance. The pivotal aspect here is the clarification of when room for self-steering and individual interpretations of a situation is available, and when steering outside the self takes over and sets the stage.

Many different theories and concepts of power and influence are being used in discussions about how governments at various levels regulate the relations between states, the public and private sectors, organisations and individuals. One reason for the abundance of concepts is that the many different theories compete with one another, and because many different aspects of societal life are covered. In the next section, these concepts will be systematised into a simple model.

Polycentric Societies

Another perspective on the societal, political and cultural development is a sociological and structural analyses of the living conditions in contemporary societies and cultures (Giddens, 1991; Kirkeby, 1998). Those analyses indicate that a basic condition for our lives is the hyper-complexity of societies (Thyssen, 2001 p. 28), which is evident in both an increase in complexity in terms of time (society is changing at a much higher speed than before), in terms of space (the number of actions involving communication has increased dramatically), in the global risks that are increasingly created by humans, rather than by nature (Beck, 1986) and the resulting contingencies and individualisation.

Another trend is that social relations are being lifted out of their local contexts of interaction and transformed into symbolic signs and expert systems, making society more differentiated and hyper complex. Yet another cultural trend is the continuous questioning of knowledge. Starratt expresses it in this way: “We have to accept the irony of knowledge – that it distorts in the very process of revealing reality- and understand that its pursuit requires that we perform a simultaneous act of deconstructing our knowledge even while we are constructing it” (2001 p. 346).
The personal effect is that individuals cannot find their identity in the grand narratives, in tradition. There is no objective world to be experienced. We create the world we experience through the language in which we recognize it and in our reflections.

In the complex society we strive to reduce complexity. One way of differentiation is transforming institutions into new organizations. For many years governmental institutions were state-run and managed according to rather detailed budgets and strict regulations. Now they have been transformed into organizations that must manage their own affairs and are accountable to authorities. The ways in which management and the ‘production of output’ are carried out is up to each individual organization. Site-based management of schools is one of these relatively new initiatives.

Another way of trying to reduce complexity is, as mentioned above, the tendency to focus on evidence based practice or ‘best practice’. Policy makers designate certain methods, materials or contents as ‘best practice’. In line with some centralization initiatives there are tendencies in educational policies towards demanding that educational systems as well as educational practice and leadership be based on rigorous evidence. The evidence that some of those politicians consider rigorous and preferable is evidence based on Randomized, Controlled Tests: RCT studies. This kind of knowledge is often thought to be valid all over the world but is contested in the educational professions (Hopman, 2008; MacBeath & Mortimor, 2001; Moos et al., 2005).

Theories of governance and governmentality can be used to interpret the two tendencies of hyper complexity and New Public Management: Neo-liberal societies develop new ways and technologies of governance (Peters, Marshall & Fitzsimons 2000), which rely heavily on the individual and the market as the basis for and the logic of public policy. They build on decentralizing/devolving management from the state to local levels, further on to local institutions (in the case of education, to self-managing schools), further on to teams of teachers, to classrooms (e.g.: classroom management techniques and project work), and to individuals (self-managing students).

It is, as Foucault calls it (1991) neo-liberal governmentalization: governmentality presupposes agencies of management but it also requires and gains the cooperation of the subjects involved. That is, according to Foucault, the case in every modern society. What is different is the logic or the rationale that seems to be governing the fields.

The new forms of public governance that are being developed as consequences of decentralization etc. produce new conditions for leadership in public institutions. Pedersen (2005) describe three aspects of the new forms of governance and leadership. Public institutions are being transformed into public organizations in loosely coupled networks, so leaders have to make collectively binding decisions via autonomy and leadership competencies. They have to create leadership in situations. The second aspect is: the regulation through rules is being transformed into economic technologies of governance, and that means that leaders have to point out the direction of the organization through strategic leadership and sense making (which Pedersen terms polyphonic leadership). Finally, the third aspect is:
the hierarchies in traditional public government are being transformed into self-leadership technologies and therefore, leaders have to communicate and negotiate decisions and meaning.

*Social Contracts*

One very important tool of governance is the social contract. There is a wide range of contracts, which can include quality contracts between schools, local educational authorities, and the Ministry of Education, is one example of a social technology. Contracts also exist within schools, such as annual plans developed by teacher teams or individual teachers, and the school leadership and individual student plans between students, parents, and teachers.

Specific contracts have been developed in public governance and organisational leadership and management over the past twenty years. They are part of public governance and thus part of the relationship between governments (and transnational agencies) and organisations and individuals. They are special in that the superior level defines the frame of resources, the values, and the indicators, while the acting level writes the contract to live up to the expectations and indicators. The plans, areas of focus, and methods are left to practitioners as long as they stay within the overall framework. Oftentimes, an aspect of self-evaluation is built into the contract.

The contracts leave many decisions to the practice level, where people must manage themselves as long as they remain within the given framework and values. This type of leadership means that organisations and individuals must take over the values and norms laid out by the superior level. They must do so to such a degree that they make them their own values. To the practitioners, a set of givens exists that includes frameworks, values and indicators as well as a set of choices to be made concerning how effective performance can be reached. The contracts are technologies for constructing premises based on value-decisions made at the superior level with assistance from the dominant discourses.

A subcategory to the technology of agency is relational technologies that are specialised ways of conducting meetings, interviews, school-parent communication and the leadership of, e.g. teacher teams and classrooms. Standards for such meetings, interviews, and management have often developed over time in practice, while others are introduced by authorities that prescribe or advise practitioners to establish more effective, appreciative communication. Frameworks and templates might seem, to the practitioners, to work beautifully, but they always contain a hidden set of values and norms that change the relationship between agents who participate in meetings and interviews.

‘Self-technology’, a term given to a wide range of technologies, is a concept that encourages agents to think and act as managers of their own lives, professional or not. As described earlier in this article, this kind of governance influences agents to think and act within sets of values and norms agreed upon by politics and society.
An Example: Network Management

In a number of Danish case study schools in the ISSPP project there is a growing focus on networks such as teacher teams. Teachers work in teams within the frameworks and directions given by, and often negotiated with, management. Management is conducted of the self-governing teachers at a distance. At the same time we see a number of social technologies. Many of those take the form of meetings: Education Council Meetings (all teacher staff and management meet regularly in accordance with school procedures), all staff meetings (teachers and other staff and management meet once or twice a year in accordance with requirements), team interviews (teacher teams meet with the principal), ‘employee development interviews’ (individual teachers met with principal once a year). There are also year plans (the year’s instruction for a class put together by teachers and submitted to the principal), student plans (plans for individual student’s progress) etc.

That means that management influence is less direct and more in the form of sense-making, setting agendas and institutionalized influence. Within their teams, teachers have to collaborate very closely and therefore have to invest their personality in their work. It is not enough that they invest their time and presence; they must be motivated and engaged because they must collaborate closely and because they are given responsibility.

One may say that the Danish schools are organized in networks of loose and tight couplings, and that the teachers are self-governed. Elements of this self-governance derive from the consideration that the teachers involved are professionals and as such are quite capable of governing themselves precisely because they are professionals.

Management is about mobilizing and strengthening the freedom of teachers in order to make it possible for them to govern themselves. The ‘conduct of conduct’ (Sorensen & Tøfting, 2005) aims at encouraging the teachers to participate in the school’s management functions, and to place that responsibility on them without the use of coercion. Management takes place through common values that govern the conduct of conduct in certain directions.

There are two central demands if we are to speak of network government. The first is the demand that management must influence all individuals at the school and form the possibilities and decisions that the individual chooses to use as his decision platform. Network government must relate to every individual teacher and strengthen their ability to act freely inside the decided framework that the school’s management team has built up.

Secondly the government must be economical in such a way that its goals can be realized with as sparse a use of resources as possible (Sørensen & Tørung, 2005). Both the loose and the tight organizational couplings in the schools are each in their different ways aspects of the reduction of organizational complexity for both the teachers and the management team. Leadership in networks at a distance presupposes a distant leadership, and the loose couplings are a means to produce this. This reduction of organizational complexity is, in fact, an example of economizing the management and leadership effort, in that the governing network draws on the participating members’ efforts, skills and experiences at the school.
A precondition for successful management of the teachers at a distance is that it is possible to make the teachers active contributors to the schools work and management.

The Field of Governance and Influences: A Communicative Perspective

Taking a communicative perspective on power and influences makes it possible to produce a comprehensive overview – a model - of contemporary forms of power and influences that captures the whole range of power being used by international and national agencies as well as agents in institutions. This model of influences situates and discusses the concepts of power and influence from different spheres of authority, ranging from trans-national agencies to national governments, further on to organisations and individuals. This model captures important aspects of the ‘hard’ as well as ‘soft governance’ situation as it stresses all three phases (premises, decision, connection) in the communication- and influence process (Moos, 2009). Diverse concepts are placed into the same model because a very high level of isomorphism in the use of forms of power and influence within many levels are apparent.

Based on Foucault’s post-structural perspective (1976/1994), influence and power are described as a network of relationships where the poles (the agents) are defined by the relationships they are a part of (Heiskala, 2001 p. 245). For example, the special relationship between motherhood and childhood defines the mother and her child. The mother would not be a mother without a child, and vice versa. Another example is prisoners and the guards. The relationship, not the poles, defines the aspects of power and influence. Power is therefore productive and relational.

Influence is communication between a minimum of two poles/agents. Thus, it is processes with numerous phases, beginning with the emergence or construction of the premises on which decisions are made, moving on to decision-making, and ending with the connection, i.e. how the communication is perceived, understood, interpreted, acted upon, or connected to by ‘the other agent’.

Constructing Premises

In the first phase, influence is present because of how premises are defined or produced, and by whom: Who (individuals, groups, institutions) defines the situation or the problem at hand? How is the dominant discourse on which decisions and actions are based created, or how is ‘the definition of reality’ constructed? How is the Organizational myth being constructed? (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; March & Olsen, 1976; Meyer & Scott, 1983; Røvik, 2007; Torfing, 2004). The dominant discourses (Moos & Krejsler, 2006) (Dean, 1999b), are publicly accepted means for selecting and acting upon legitimate problems and ways of thinking. The dominant discourse of what currently defines a good school is one example: Are good schools part of the struggle to help socialise children to become active,
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democratic citizens, or are they institutions that educate a work force for the labour market only? Another dominant discourse involves teachers and how they are viewed: Are they seen as civil servants in democratic societies, or as service providers in service institutions (Moos, 2006a)? This is where many of the initiatives taken by the trans-national agencies can be placed: The ‘peer pressure’ set the scene and forms the background for reflections and decisions in national governments and institutions and so does the ‘open method of coordination’.

When describing and analysing the construction of premises it is important to distinguish between structural and agent driven influences:

There are a number of ways that individual agents or groups of agents can influence the minds and interpretations of other agents. They can set an agenda through communications (Barach & Baratz, 1962); influence sensemaking and set the stage (Stacey, 2001; Weick, 2001); and enter into educational activities, negotiations, or other interactions (Spillane & Orlina, 2005). Some of these activities are also described as consciousness-controlling power (Lukes, 1974; Stacey, 2001; Weick, 2001).

The concept of discourses indicate that discussions of relations and governance are not ‘natural’, but are instead constructed over time as a result of struggles between stakeholders (M. Dean, 1999b; Foucault, 1983).

The constructive effect of the influences is the focus of this category, which covers setting the scene or stage (Weick, 2001) for decision making. The actions themselves (setting the agenda, sense-making, and engaging in discourses) are not seen as decisions, but as foundations for decision-making. However, the ingredients for the process of construction are the results of selections. These ingredients can be the agents’ selection of topics and ways of sense-making, the institutions’ – in a very broad sense – selection of foci for dominant discourses, and the selections made in complex organisations through processes of emergence beyond the control of individuals (Stacey, 2001).

Institutionalised premises and social technologies: Dean (1999, p. 166 ff.) discusses two interrelated technologies: 1) technologies of agency, which encourage agents to improve at participating, consenting, and acting through contracts, consulting, and the empowerment of partnerships; and technologies of performance (see the paragraph on ‘Connection.’).

Technologies of agency can also be called steering technologies: Planning and contracts (Andersen & Born, 2001): Pastoral leadership, teams, class room leadership and management, and empowerment and self-technologies.

Acts of law and societal structures, etc. are institutionalised influences, one special type of which is called social technologies. Routines, methods, work forms, and tools can be used as social technologies that are technologies with a purpose or a meaning. They are used to influence peoples’ behaviour and thought processes. They have hidden decisions and influences (from other places or other times) and are now forming premises for decision making. Some of these technologies evolve from daily practices while others are imposed or applied from outside the actual
practice. These methods might change over time, but at any given moment, they are ‘the natural way’ of working. They are not discussed, so the power invested in them is concealed. Other social technologies are being brought to the field of practice from the field of educational policy and are often described as ‘natural’ or ‘neutral’ tools for practitioners to use. Here again, power is concealed and therefore not discussed (Moos, 2007). Social technologies, therefore, are, in any circumstance, powerful but silenced forms of power.

**Decision-making**

Not a simple act, decision-making is a complicated procedure involving the selection of accepted and sufficiently important premises that are influential enough to be taken into account. The second kind of choice made in the decision-making process is how to continue the communication. Decisions can be made by agents, groups, and institutions and can result in a variety of actions, including legally binding acts of law, and orders or commands from a superior who can impose sanctions on the field and its agents. Decisions can also result in a new agenda for discussing or making decisions about the field, or for the description and regulation of new behaviours.

Also up for discussion is whether or not the starting point for decision making is a well-described problem, or if it is a solution at hand that only needs a problem (March, 1995; Røvik, 1998). The premises are the result of prior decisions, some of which were made on levels of influence above the actual level. However, agents at the actual level continue to interpret and alter these decisions through discourse.

Again it is important to distinguish between agents’ and structural decision-making: Agents make decisions: Commands, orders. This category, referring to Dahl (1961), is often called ‘direct power’. Direct power is the ability to have others perform a task they would not have done otherwise. The second category is when *decisions are built into structures*: Legislation, societal, social and financial frames. This category focuses on the decision-making process in terms of a narrower definition as well as the results of the processes, i.e. the decisions that force others to execute a task they would not have done otherwise. The institutional aspect can be framed in much the same way as the societal and organisational structures. They, too, are constructed because of political processes and power struggles that have sanctions attached to them. The agents’ forms of direct power also have the possibility of sanctions being attached to them. However, none of these forms can guarantee results unless they are viewed – or even identified – as legitimate forms by the people and groups affected by them. On the other hand, decisions construct the premises for new decisions. This construction is the case with management decisions that form the premises for employer decisions.

**Connections**

The third major phase of influence is the connection phase. Inspired by communication theories (Thyssen, 1997, 2003b), a communication is only viewed as communication if it ‘irritates’ the other pole to such a degree that it chooses to connect. The conception
that social systems (termed here as agents) are autopoeitic is the basis for this theory. These social systems are closed to the outer world and to communication from other agents. Communication can only attempt to ‘irritate’ them, disturbing normal ways of thinking to a degree that causes the agents to stop and reflect on, and possibly alter, their thought process. Whether or not the other agent is connecting can be difficult to detect since some reactions might occur long after the ‘irritation’ has taken place. On the other hand, there can be no mention of influence if the so-called influenced party continues living without changing behaviour or thinking anything. If the act of law does not change anything concerning citizen behaviour, or if army privates do not follow a colonel’s orders, then influence does not play a part. The ways in which connections are made become an important feature of the construction of premises for future decisions.

This description illustrates the relational nature of influences and decision making as well as the interconnectedness of all phases of the process – one phase building on the other in an ongoing process. Taking into account many more aspects of these processes is important. Agents at several levels, individual agents, groups, institutions, and societies, exist at each phase. This is also true for various media for communication, including, verbal and written discourses, oral communication, and artefacts (procedures, techniques, technologies, acts of law, and regulations).

One distinction is important to make here. The construction and influence of premises are often built into structures, technologies, or artefacts that hide the fact that they were constructed through the effects or products of power and decision-making.

Agents, organisations, and systems are normally interested in finding out whether or not their communication with other agents is effective. Do employers or colleagues connect to, hear, accept, and obey decisions by changing their perceptions, interpretations, or actions? Every special setting, situation and decision asks for different types of connections. The connection may be a nod of the head in conversations or corrections in an assignment.


The broad field of evaluation and assessment is currently undergoing basic transformations. National as well as local systems and organisations need documentation for the use of resources in the organisations in their jurisdiction. Leaders of organisations need documentation from their employees. An important aspect of the hunt for transparency involves finding out to whom agents and organisations should be accountable, and which values they should be accountable for. Schools must answer to a range of different accountabilities, i.e. a marketplace accountability that focuses on efficiency and competition, a bureaucratic accountability that focuses on outcomes and indicators, a political accountability that focuses on citizen satisfaction and negotiations, a professional accountability that focuses on professional expertise, and an ethical accountability that focuses on social justice (Firestone & Shipp, 2005; Moos, 2003). Schools must simultaneously answer to
all of these accountabilities, consequently creating numerous dilemmas for schools and school leaders.

The phases in this model of influence are very much interconnected and build on each other: Decisions are over time being developed into social technologies or they are forming the premises for new decisions. In many cases connections are being transformed into decisions or naturalized into social technologies. This interconnectedness of phases of influence is one point, I wanted to make in putting them into this one model. Another point is to illustrate that there are many forms of interplay between structural and cultural forms of influences, like finances or discourses, and agent-driven influences like sense-making or direct power. And yet another point is to underscore that influence is often hidden or concealed, but it is still based on decisions made at one point and by somebody.

Influence from a School Leadership Perspective

In leadership theory there is near consensus on the need for distributed leadership. There is an understanding that the principal cannot be sufficiently informed to make all decisions in a school, nor can she/he be present in all places and situations where decisions need to be made. This is eminently the case in classrooms, where teachers have to interpret demands, goals and situations and make decisions many times every lesson. It is also the case in teacher teams that meet to plan, evaluate their instruction or engage in professional development. If the principal is not present, she/he is excluded from making decisions (of course, she/he can construct the frameworks within which teams manoeuvre).

However, as Spillane and Woods et al. (Spillane & Orlina, 2005; Woods, 2004; Woods et al., 2004) note, distributed leadership can take many forms. At the core of their concept of leadership is the notion that leadership is not the actions of the leaders per se, but the interactions between leaders and other agents. Leadership is therefore ‘an influencing relation’ between leaders and followers that takes place in situations (that can be described by their tools, routines and structures). Leadership is about interactions that influence and that are understood to influence other persons.

From another theoretical perspective, a systems theory or social constructivist perspective (Thyssen, 2003a, 2003b), I would describe educational leadership in this way: ‘educational leadership is the communication about ‘Democratic Bildung’ and the conditions for that’ (Moos et al., 2007).

Setting direction for the school is one of the major tasks of school principals. This understanding is implied in the concept of leadership understood as: ‘Lead the way ...’ and ‘be at the head of ...’ It is also understood in this way in the research (Leithwood & Riehl, 2005), where it is found that successful principals set the direction for their schools: “… successful leadership creates a compelling sense of purpose in the organizations by developing a shared vision of the future, helping build consensus about relevant short-term goals and demonstrating high expectations for colleagues’ work.” (Leithwood, 2006).
One important aspect of school leadership tasks can be summed up in this way: Leadership is setting and negotiating directions, making sense: even though schools in some systems are managed in some detail when it comes to outcomes (standards, inspections and tests) they have to find the ways to achieve these outcomes themselves. They have to interpret demands and signals from the outer world and choose means by which they want to respond to them. It is a major challenge to school leadership to interpret signals and make them into narratives; communications about differences, which form the premises for the next decisions in the community (Thyssen, 2003a; Weick, 1995, 2001).

Another aspect of school leadership is designing and managing communities and empowering teachers: schools are organizations, held together by structures, but if they are to be effective and successful, they must also be communities, held together by a shared sense of identity and by sufficiently common norms (Bourdieu, 1990; Wenger, 1999). Classrooms and schools are social fields and education and learning take place in those social fields. Loyalty and commitment to the organization are not by any means an automatic starting position for any institution; building and deepening loyalty and commitment is therefore a leadership duty and mission. If staff and students are to behave loyally to their organization, leaders should make an effort to transform the organization, which is characterized only by a formal structure, into a community, which is characterized by all members being sufficiently committed to the ethos of the community (Kirkeby, 2002).

A meeting with the teacher team in one of the ISSPP-schools can serve as an illustration. Here the principal states: "As a teacher you are obliged continuously to assess the students’ attainment and to set new goals." At the same time she is working hard to have teachers focus on their own authority with students. A prerequisite for this transformation is to focus on the integrity of the organization: the ability to be both a convincing internal work- and life-frame and to appear reliable in the eyes of all stakeholders. Inspiration for discussing community and membership can be drawn from Etienne Wenger’s theory on how learning and identities are constructed within communities of practice (Wenger 1998). Identity construction is a dual process in a field of tension between our investment in various forms of belonging and our ability to negotiate the meanings that matter in those different contexts. The production is partly identification (investing the self in relations) and partly negotiability (negotiating meaning). These tendencies can be traced in both leadership webs, teams and in the project work in classes.

An Example of Self-Government

Michel Foucault (1991, 2001) presented the concept of govern mentality in order to describe the tendency for organisational techniques to merge increasingly with the personal features of employees and clients. In school terms this means that individuals are increasingly expected to manage professional challenges and developments by themselves. Teaching staff and students must express their personal commitment through their engagement in the organisation in ways that manifest personal competences, collaboration, involvement, initiative and pleasure.
As subjects, they are expected to allow themselves to be subsumed in the visions and targets of the organisation.

When it comes to participation, then, teachers in the ISSPP case schools find that they have many possibilities both at the school level, team level and classroom level. Participation is not an option; it is a requirement. The school wants them, body and soul. Seen through the lens of govern mentality, the conduct of conduct could be said to be omnipresent in strategies in all the Danish case study schools (Mitchell Dean, 1999a). Teaching and administrative staff participate in educational days that help to create a mutually shared language about the purpose and targets of the school and to foster a framework for interpreting the vision in the ‘right’ ways to move forward.

Many schools are organised as learning organisations with large elements of self-governance. There seems to be a general tendency to delegate the management of teachers’ teams to the teachers. In some cases this management is mostly about the implementation of the curriculum as regards specific subjects. In other cases there are examples of extensive self-governance among teachers within self-governing teams. Here powers of decision-making are distributed to the teacher teams, which not only plan their own teaching but also manage their budgets, which are typically more or less decentralised to departments with the exception of the deployment of substitute teachers and the administration of wages. This structure is an example of the departmentalised school where students typically feel that they can acquire influence through the student council.

The schools have action plans where school values and key priority areas are formulated. At a team level meetings are held regularly to create shared ways putting the vision into practice. The principals keep up to date with team plans by having group appraisal interviews at intervals, from which they get feedback, listen, give their approval and enter into dialogue with teams in order to be part of the process. At an individual level the principals make sure that they have committed employees by having individual appraisal interviews with each and every employee, usually following a detailed interview schedule that both parties partake in. The main focus here is on developing people. The appraisal interview is an opportunity for principal and employee to evaluate the preceding period and to express expectations and wishes for the time to come. It is also an opportunity for the principal to monitor whether employees are committed to the vision of the school, in that employees are obliged to justify how they operationalize that vision (Krejsler, 2007).

Obviously, there are certain differences in the ways these structures of govern mentality are implemented. However, the tendency for organisational structures and the personal qualities of staff to be increasingly interwoven appears across schools in Denmark. The following represents a mapping of the extensive network of organisational structures at the North School that are aimed at committing students, parents and staff to a particular culture and vision with a wide variety of organisational strategies:

At the top the school board consists of parents, teaching staff and student representatives. The principal acts as secretary, and a parent representative acts as chair. The board meets once a month and makes decisions of principle.
Regular staff meetings serve to assemble all teaching staff as well as other staff in order to foster a sense of belonging while at the same time providing a venue to disseminate information. These allow the school’s vision and targets to be constantly reiterated and give an opportunity for informal talk about this particular school’s culture.

Group as well as individual appraisal interviews serve as opportunities for teaching staff to legitimate and debate their thinking, actions and expectations and to receive the management’s blessing that these are in line with organisational priorities.

There are Educational Council meetings for all educational staff three to four times a year, where common strategies for developing and interpreting visions and targets are elaborated and strengthened. Beyond that there are a number of more specialized committees. The Educational Development Council, for example, meets six to ten times a year in order to co-ordinate the educational development priorities at the school.

Weekly collaborative meetings take place within the individual teaching teams. Apart from that, there are gatherings focusing upon curricular issues as well as conferences on reading skills and the like, at which management staff, relevant teaching staff as well as a school psychologist are present.

Furthermore at the centre for students with special needs there are regular meetings between the school psychologist, the management team and the teachers of that specialised section of the school.

This list only serves to illustrate the advanced form of social technology constitutes by this extensive network of meetings and coordinative efforts. In Foucauldian terms one would talk of an intensive governmentality structure allowing a co-ordination of organisational technologies and demands with individual subjects’ wishes and expectations as to what they think is expected of them.

The Purpose of Schooling: ‘Democratic Bildung’ – Participation and Critique?

The education politics and discourse in some contemporary educational systems focus on schools task being to make children acquire basic skills like literacy and numeracy. A good example is the US program ‘No Child Left Behind’ (Hopman, 2008). In many places, however, the education vision is broader than this. Where politicians recognise that all societies need to prepare the next generation to take over. The families, local communities and schools socialize children and youths to be competent and willing to take over the skills, knowledge, norms and values of the society they are living in. Many societies and educational systems used to build on the understanding that schools were the major cultural institution that societies established and maintained because they wanted to make sure that the next generation of citizens was brought up and educated to take over, maintain and develop their society.

Thus, educational purposes were often described in broader terms: schools should educate students to become enlightened, participating, active and collaborating citizens. The European, Continental understanding of ‘Democratic Bildung’ therefore
aims at maturity, reflexivity, social judgment, aesthetic and political consciousness and competence of action. Schools therefore had to strive for social justice, equity, empowerment and community. These notions still live in schools in most places, but are not always furthered on the level of politicians and administrators.

The discussion of ‘Democratic Bildung’ can be taken back to the era of Enlightenment when philosophers and politicians started contesting medieval traditions and fundamentalism. We saw new approaches to religion and to science: the firm belief in divine knowledge was transformed into the everlasting doubt – contingency – and critique that should become the cornerstone of modern science (Beck, 1986). In the same movement human beings were dragged out of their traditional collectives and made autonomous individuals, capable of taking care of their own life in collaboration with other citizens in communities.

Along this line of argument one can claim that education for democracy must build on two pillars in order to facilitate the upbringing/‘Bildung’ of young people: On the one hand it is enlightenment, the acquisition of knowledge and skills, and on the other hand, it is participation in communities.

Democratic education is described by Biesta (2003) as ‘creating opportunities for action, for being a subject, both in schools and other educational institutions, and in society as a whole.’ (Biesta, 2003)(p. 59). Besides the opportunity for action, participation, I find that the most important concept related to democracy is ‘critique’ because it gives a more precise direction to the concept of deliberative democracy.

In line with this understanding I find that Beane & Apple (1999; Furman & Starrat, 2002) and Woods (2005) describe the central concerns of democratic schools as: 1) the open flow of ideas that enables people to be as fully informed as possible, 2) the use of critical reflection and analysis to evaluate ideas, problems, and policies, 3) the welfare of others and the ‘common good’ and 4) the concern for the dignity and rights of individuals and minorities.

For Dewey, who has been a great inspiration for many theorists as well as practitioners, democratic schooling meant that democracy was lived through participation in the everyday practice of school life:

What the argument for democracy implies is that the best way to produce initiative and constructive power is to exercise it. Power, as well as interest, comes by use and practice ... The delicate and difficult task of developing character and good judgement in the young needs every stimulus and inspiration possible... I think, that unless democratic habits and thought and action are part of the fibre of a people, political democracy is insecure. It cannot stand in isolation. It must be buttressed by presence of democratic methods in all social relationships. (Dewey, 1937, page 345)

Dewey (1916 in; Mulford & Moreno, 2006) saw ‘deep’ democracy as involving respect for the dignity of individuals and their cultural traditions, reverence for and proactive facilitation of free and open inquiry and critique, recognition of inter-dependence in working for the common good, the responsibility of individuals to
participate in free and open inquiry, and the importance of collective choices and actions in the interest of the common good.

It is useful to position the view of democracy that is used by Dewey, Beane & Apple: the concept of participatory democracy, which seems to be the most appropriate and useful concept in regard to schools and education. Closely linked to the concept of participatory democracy is the ideal of the ‘better argument’. The rational ideal calls on the participants to strive to build communication on the ideal of the better argument that prevails without the use of coercion (Habermas, 1984, 1987). This ideal refers to communicative relations among participants that – to the extent possible – seek mutual understanding and aim at minimizing the exercise of dominance within institutional relations that must necessarily be asymmetric and embedded within particular organizational structures.

When the forms of influence and power used in schools changes from hard governance towards the indirect forms of influence in soft governance: the premises constructing aspects like setting the stage, sense-making, setting the agenda, negotiating etc. there may be more room for participation and deliberation, for consensus and conflict, for disagreement and agreement, for reciprocity and for critique – for Democratic ‘Bildung’? This may be so, but not necessarily. That depends on a number of circumstances that shall only be sketched here: Negotiations can give all parties room for deliberations and autonomous sense-making, but we must remember that negotiations are forms of social relations and thus always include power. Whether the actual negotiations are productive in terms of ‘Democratic Bildung’, participation and critique, depends on the legitimacy of the communication: Are the arguments accepted by all parties involved with good reasons? (Thyssen, 1997).

Another aspect, that needs to be taken into account is, that the contemporary soft governance asks participants to govern themselves – which can of course include participation and deliberation – but this is accompanied by the requirement to take over the full responsibility for the plans and actions (Krejsler, 2005) – very often based on the values and norms, prescribed by the upper hand in the contract, the employer/government/authority.

NOTES
1 From the Danish part (with John B. Krejsler and Klaus Kasper Kofod) of the ‘The International Successful Principal Project’ (ISSPP) with Christopher Day, University of Nottingham (England), Ken Leithwood, OISE/Utoronto (Canada), Jorunn Møller, University of Oslo, (Norway), Olof Johansson, University of Umeå (Sweden), David Gurr, The University of Melbourne and Bill Mullford, The University of Tasmania (Australia). (Leithwood & Day, 2007).
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