



Generating change from below: what role for leadership from above?

Journal:	<i>Journal of Educational Administration</i>
Manuscript ID	JEA-07-2016-0074.R3
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper (Qualitative)
Keywords:	Teacher leadership, Change, Distributed leadership, Licensed leadership, Teacher professional development, Organic leadership

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Generating change from below: what role leadership from above?

Abstract:

Purpose: In recent years the benefits of distributed leadership have often assumed the status of an unchallengeable orthodoxy. There is a general acceptance that leadership is best when it is dispersed. In reality this is often little more than a form of 'licensed leadership' in which those working in subordinate roles can only exercise their leadership in tightly prescribed contexts. This article investigates the contribution of teacher professional development to promoting a more optimistic vision of teacher leadership and, ultimately, organisational change. It explores the role of leadership 'from above' in supporting classroom teachers to engage with and sustain change.

Design: The study, which was situated in the Republic of Ireland, employed a case study approach with 20 participants in five urban disadvantaged schools.

Findings: The article seeks to demonstrate how a professional development initiative was used to promote significant and sustained change in four of the five case study schools.

Implications: It argues that in order to understand sustained change in schools it is necessary to better understand the complex ways in which leadership from above can generate change agency from below.

Originality: This article offers a critical perspective in relation to mainstream distributed leadership theory and practice.

Keywords: teacher leadership, change, distributed leadership, licensed leadership, teacher professional development.

Introduction

The concept of change in education is inextricably linked with the idea of school improvement. This is often reflected in the scale and pace of policy changes as governments across the world strive to enhance pupil outcomes (Ball, 2013; Bell and Stevenson, 2006; Rizvi and Lingard, 2009). Improvement is increasingly characterised as raised performance in international assessments such as PISA (Sellar and Lingard, 2013). In a globalised world where knowledge is seen as central to securing competitive advantage then strong performance in internationally benchmarked assessments has become a key objective of policy. However these policy changes are taking place in a time of austerity and a culture of isolated privatism (O'Sullivan, 2011) which may make implementation difficult. Central to the implementation process is the pivotal role of leadership (Day *et al.* 2009) in managing change with much analysis about what leaders can do to progress the school improvement agenda. Investing in teachers as change-agents through supporting collaborative models of professional development may support school improvement. Within this article we conceive of professional development as the “processes, activities and experiences that provide opportunities to extend teacher professional learning” which is considered to be “the growth of teacher expertise that leads to improved student learning” (NSW, Institute of Teachers, 2012, p 3).

The objectives of this article are threefold: first, to explore the possible role of leadership in generating effective learning environments for teachers to engage with and sustain change; second, to explore the potential link between teacher professional development and institutional change; and third to demonstrate a form of ‘organic leadership’ where teachers may develop a collective responsibility for all pupils’ learning. It will demonstrate how a collaborative professional development initiative was able to bring about change in five urban disadvantaged schools in the Republic of Ireland (ROI) and it will analyse the pivotal role of principals in this process.

1
2
3 The article will describe the context of the study and the methodology employed
4 along with results which present a form of organic leadership which seeks to
5 integrate a 'change from below' approach with 'support from above'. The distinction
6 in this article between 'below' and 'above' seeks to reflect the experience of schools
7 as workplaces in which power is located within institutional hierarchies, formalised
8 through managerial structures. While it is generally accepted that those who are
9 more senior in the organisation have greater reserves of power than subordinates, in
10 terms of both authority and influence (Lumby, 2016), a deeper analysis of power and
11 the practice of leadership is required (Woods, 2016) . For example those who are
12 subordinate in such formal structures may also have the capacity to assert influence
13 and generate change (Sachs, 2003). This article is concerned with how 'above' and
14 'below' influences can be combined to create a powerful, and lasting, energy for
15 change. The potential is a form of organic leadership (King 2012) whereby teachers
16 may be empowered from above to develop their agency in ways that foster a
17 genuine collective responsibility for pupils' learning and where teachers may
18 transcend being functional implementers of the latest policy. As such, the article
19 seeks to challenge traditional and managerialist conceptions of leadership by making
20 the case for a teacher leadership (Muijs and Harris, 2003) that goes beyond being
21 'licensed' in which those working in subordinate roles can only exercise leadership in
22 tightly prescribed contexts. This article seeks a creative way through this tension
23 rhetoric and reality of distributed leadership by focusing on how leadership from
24 above can draw on professional development and professional learning to develop a
25 genuine teacher leadership from below. In so doing, it aims to help increase
26 understanding of teacher leadership as a concept, which has assumed a key role in
27 educational leadership literature, but often remains under-developed and under-
28 theorised (Torrance, 2013). The article aims to explore these concepts by focusing
29 on findings from Irish case studies which addressed two key issues:

- 30 • To what extent may leadership from above support teachers to implement and
31 sustain change?
- 32 • What factors may shape the changes in teachers' practice?

33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 **Research Context** 57 58 59 60

1
2
3 The article reports from a study carried out in the ROI where the international move
4 toward accountability and control is evident in The Education Act (Government of
5 Ireland, 1998, Section 5) and subsequent policies, under what Sugrue (2011, p 61)
6 refers to as a 'Technology of Control'. Examples of this include the Whole School
7 Evaluation Process and mandatory reporting of standardised test results to the
8 Department of Education and Skills (DES), parents and school boards of
9 management. The competing policy agendas of accountability and trust, teacher
10 autonomy and standardisation all have an impact on teachers' and principals'
11 professional learning experiences and practices with principals under pressure to
12 manage and yet lead, compete and innovate (Sugrue, 2011). How principals carry
13 out their role in the ROI depends on the context in which they work as two thirds of
14 primary school principals are teaching principals with a maximum of 22 days
15 administrative leave (Irish Primary Principals Network (IPPN), 2014). Noteworthy is
16 that this study took place in large urban schools with non-teaching principals in a
17 prevailing culture where isolated privatism is more valued than collective
18 responsibility (O'Sullivan, 2011). Since the 1990s there has been "an explosion of
19 related administrative and managerial tasks without any real change in the resource
20 capacity of schools" (IPPN), 2014, p 9). This is compounded by the lack of clarity
21 surrounding the role of the principal, the lack of leadership training – teachers are
22 promoted without adequate preparation for the role, poor administrative supports and
23 poor management structures (IPPN, 2014, p 12). A hierarchical system is outlined in
24 legislation which requires that teachers carry out the duties that are assigned to them
25 by or at the direction of the principal (Government of Ireland, 1998). In the absence
26 of a current legislative framework outlining the role of the principal, schools "are
27 expected to play a key role in maintaining the knowledge society and be a critical
28 element in the achievement of national goals" (IPPN, 2014, p 9).

29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47 The study involved a collaborative professional development initiative which was
48 carried out in five urban disadvantaged schools, as categorised by the Social
49 Inclusion section of the DES. Collaborative professional development is defined as a
50 directive requiring one to have 'specific plans to encourage and enable shared
51 learning and support between at least two teacher colleagues on a sustained basis'
52 (Cordingley et al. 2004, p 2). In this study it refers to the 2007 initiative which
53 involved a classroom teacher, Special Educational Needs (SEN) teacher and
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 principal from each of the five schools engaging in collaborative professional
4 development over a period of eight to ten weeks, with the aim of improving the
5 literacy outcomes of pupils in 3rd class (average age 9) through the implementation
6 of Peer Tutoring (Butler, 1999; Topping, 1988). The initiative was funded and
7 supported by the Irish National Teachers' Organisation (INTO) (the largest Irish
8 teachers' union). Funding consisted of all materials, the support of project facilitators
9 and release time from school for teachers to engage with the professional
10 development initiative. Additional support was provided in terms of school visits from
11 a project facilitator during the implementation period and access to telephone and
12 email support. At the time a small-scale project evaluation was undertaken to assess
13 the perceived impact on pupil learning (King and Gilliland, 2009). In 2010 a further
14 study involved a return to the same five schools to explore the impact of the original
15 professional development initiative on teachers' professional learning three years on.
16 The rationale for this study came from the literature which has identified a paucity of
17 research centred on sustainability of teaching practices despite sustainability of
18 practices being pivotal for school improvement (Baker *et al.* 2004; Priestley *et al.*
19 2011).

20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 **The role of leadership in the change process**

33
34
35
36 While leadership is a complex and contested concept, it is widely acknowledged that
37 it can be exercised in a manner that can have a significant impact on promoting and
38 sustaining change (Fullan *et al.* 2005), and on the quality of teaching and learning in
39 classrooms (Day *et al.* 2009; Kervin, 2007). It is therefore not surprising that
40 leadership has been defined as 'a relationship of social influence' (Spillane and
41 Coldren, 2011, p 76) where teachers' state of readiness for change may be
42 influenced by the nature and quality of leadership ((National Council for Curriculum
43 and Assessment, (NCCA, 2010). However change is also personal and professional
44 and principals' sensitivity to this connection may be central to the success of new
45 initiatives or changes (NCCA, 2010). Difficulties may arise where there is a mismatch
46 between individual needs and those of the school or state, especially in a climate of
47 standardisation and performativity where changes within schools are often imposed
48 by principals through performance management (Bolam *et al.* 2005) or licensed by
49 principals in line with the school improvement focus. In these situations leadership
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 may be seen as the exercise of hierarchical power with teachers feeling like they are
4 'technicians carrying out someone else's policy' (Priestley *et al.* 2011, p 269) rather
5 than having autonomy in relation to their own professional learning relevant to the
6 needs of their pupils. Importantly, several researchers argue that teachers' primary
7 concerns are focused at classroom level rather than national or global policy
8 imperatives (Kitching *et al.* 2009). Therefore it is held that they need to understand
9 the need for change in order to engage with change.
10

11
12
13
14
15 Acknowledging teachers as being at the centre of decision making around change is
16 one of the key principles in understanding and engaging in adult learning (Knowles
17 *et al.* 2005) to result in teacher ownership and responsibility for pupil's learning. If the
18 focus is on teachers having agency then a social constructivist perspective on
19 learning is arguably necessary which aligns well with the current conceptualisation of
20 professional learning in Scotland which argues for increasing autonomy and
21 collaborative engagement (Kennedy, 2011). It is important however that this
22 collaboration is not in the form of 'contrived collegiality' (Hargreaves, 1994, p 196)
23 which arguably reflects a more licensed, contained form of collaboration contrived by
24 principals.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32
33 The actions of school leaders it is held may therefore have a significant impact on
34 teachers' engagement with school improvement changes. Acknowledging that it can
35 be very difficult for leaders to mediate the structures and constraints of external
36 pressures the literature suggests that it is possible to support teachers in meaningful
37 ways for lasting change and improvement. One such approach that has gained
38 prominence in recent years is that of distributed leadership (Tian *et al.* 2016) which
39 focuses on "interactions" where "influence and agency are widely shared" (Harris
40 and DeFlaminis, 2016, p 141). Distributed leadership theory offers the possibility of
41 a practical and democratic form of leadership structure in schools (Preedy, 2016)
42 where all teachers' strengths are valued and supported regardless of any formal
43 leadership positions they may hold. Acknowledging that while it is widely written
44 about in the international literature, it is nevertheless inadequately theorised
45 (Torrance, 2013; Tian *et al.* 2016) which has resulted in significant confusion in its
46 definition and manifestations.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 To facilitate the possibility of distributing leadership as conceptualised above,
4 professional trust and a shift in power from formal leaders to teachers in the
5 classroom is required, which can be very difficult in a climate of accountability,
6 control and performativity (Preedy, 2016). We describe this “dark side of distributed
7 leadership” (Harris and DeFlaminis, 2016, p 143) as ‘licensed leadership’ whereby
8 teachers are encouraged to exercise agency, but only to the extent that they serve
9 managerially determined and imposed targets. In these contexts there is often much
10 talk of leadership being distributed, and many school leaders may believe this is
11 what they are doing. However, the reality is that teachers may experience little
12 meaningful autonomy due to external accountability pressures promoting hierarchical
13 and centralised approaches to leadership. Leadership is distributed only as long as
14 those lower in the hierarchy work within parameters that have been defined for them
15 by those with superordinate power. This is the conclusion of Burns and Darling
16 Hammond (2014), based on their analysis of TALIS 2013 data, when they
17 highlighted the gap in perception between principals and teachers about the extent
18 to which each saw leadership as shared.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Hence, while the extension of leadership practices to all teachers is advocated in
32 theory and policy rhetoric the practice of distributed leadership may not reflect the
33 original aims (Torrance, 2012). Currently it is sometimes perceived as being ‘the
34 panacea to aid all that ail[s] education’ (Torrance, 2012, p 3), despite very few
35 empirical studies on distributed leadership in existence (Harris, 2008; Harris and
36 DeFlaminis, 2016). However, findings from Torrance’s small-scale empirical
37 research project undertaken in Scotland clearly highlight that the practice of
38 distributed leadership is ‘context specific, socially constructed, negotiated,
39 hierarchical’ and largely dependent on the principals’ endorsement and support
40 (Torrance, 2012, p 3), illustrating again that the reality is often little more than a form
41 of licensed leadership.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 Despite distributed leadership being valued by principals it is not so visible in a
52 reality where principals are accountable for learning and feel under considerable
53 pressure to deliver demonstrable results, usually in the format of standardised test
54 scores. Therefore in practice it seems to be limited to the school’s or department’s
55 priorities and as such may not reflect a genuine approach to leadership and change
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 from below. It therefore lies in contradistinction to a more organic form of leadership
4 that is less strategic and involves more freedom to be creative and take risks;
5 arguably essential components for school improvement despite it being challenging
6 for leaders to try to build capacity but focus on outcomes, and to innovate but avoid
7 mistakes (Bell and Bolam, 2010).
8
9
10

11
12
13 The challenge for leadership is to have the courage to 'let go' of leadership and to be
14 willing to place their trust in their teachers' beliefs, values and judgements (European
15 Commission, 2010). However, this may be particularly challenging for principals
16 where teachers are often, and understandably, more concerned with what happens
17 in their own classrooms than at whole school or national level (Kitching *et al.* 2009)
18 often valuing individual privatisation over collective responsibility. This is evidenced
19 from findings from Pedder and colleagues' (2008, p 14) quantitative study with 329
20 responses from primary schools indicating that teachers are not inclined to link their
21 professional development with 'strategic benefits such as school improvement'. At
22 the same time, findings from a study in England indicated that in schools where
23 leaders understand the potential of professional development for school
24 improvement, it can result in real change (Opfer *et al.* 2011). However 'Professional
25 development does not just happen – it has to be managed and led' (Earley and
26 Bubb, 2004, p 80) or led and supported (NCCA, 2010). Principals can create
27 organisational capacity (King, 2011), which includes investing in teachers through
28 providing professional development and on-going support (Fullan *et al.* 2005) and in
29 schools as learning organisations, both of which are fundamental to the change
30 process (NCCA, 2010) and focus on educational leadership rather than performance
31 leadership (Torrance, 2012, p 12). Overall then, leading a grassroots approach, from
32 below, with top-down support from above may help to create a culture where
33 teachers feel trusted, capable of change (Bubb and Earley, 2008) and have high
34 levels of self-efficacy (Kitching *et al.* p 2009); all of which are necessary for lasting
35 change.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 52 53 **Professional development and institutional change** 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

1
2
3 Teachers have been acknowledged as change-agents in education practice 'through
4 whom the most significant impact can be made' (NCCA, 2010, p 20). Therefore,
5 focusing on teacher practice may be one of the most effective ways to make a
6 difference to school improvement which some deem to have the largest effect which
7 can be influenced (Hattie, 2003). Teaching practices can relate to what teachers do
8 in their classrooms, as well as their professional knowledge, skills, attitudes and
9 values (Evans, 2010). Central to this is the concept of teacher professional
10 development.

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18 While professional development is mandatory in many countries research has shown
19 that some teachers feel little or no motivation to change their practices as a result of
20 engaging in it (Bubb and Earley, 2008). In fact, many jurisdictions mandate a
21 particular number of hours of professional development that teachers must complete
22 with 'no requirement for teachers to improve their practice or even to learn anything'
23 (William, 2011, p 28). This may in part reflect a managerialist approach to
24 professional development, leading teachers to feel little connection with the
25 professional development they engage in. Rather they experience it as irrelevant to
26 their own perception of their professional needs (Stevenson, 2012). Alternatively it
27 may be reflective of the contested notion of professional development, with many
28 viewing it merely as 'input'. Rather than defining professional development by
29 activities, courses or experiences, a focus on outcomes from these experiences and
30 reflections on day-to-day classroom practices (Bubb and Earley, 2008, p 26), thus
31 emphasising professional development as a 'third-order activity' (Cordingley *et al.*
32 2003, p 14), is arguably more likely to result in improved pupil outcomes (King,
33 2014). In this way, conceptualising professional development as a third-order activity
34 highlights the importance of the three aspects of professional development: the
35 experience itself, impact on teacher practices and thirdly impact on pupil outcomes.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49
50 Many governments across the world continue to invest in teacher professional
51 development despite straitened times. Yet evidence of its impact remains difficult to
52 ascertain. This is evidenced in the Irish context where in the recent Literacy and
53 Strategy (DES, 2011, p 37) there was a call for "CPD courses to be accredited,
54 adequately assessed and evaluated" with still no guidance or clarity as to how this is
55 to be carried out.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 While there are no definitive characteristics to ensure a successful link will be
5 established between teacher professional development and enhanced pupil
6 outcomes, certain conditions have been accepted as being conducive to it (Guskey,
7 1991). One of these is the crucial role of school leadership (Opfer and Pedder, 2011)
8 where principals courageously support teachers as change-agents, allowing them to
9 identify their own professional development. This is reflective of a bottom up
10 approach with support from above providing genuine teacher autonomy and
11 facilitating the need for professional development to be related to individual teachers'
12 needs in their classrooms (Kervin, 2007). Enabling teachers in this way
13 acknowledges teachers' skills and values (Brain *et al.* 2006) and may help to
14 develop 'organic leadership' where teachers are empowered to take responsibility for
15 their own learning and that of their pupils. This lies in contradistinction to a practice
16 which reflects licensed leadership whereby principals use their "social tactics" to
17 convince teachers to work towards government-mandated policies (Diamond and
18 Spillane, 2016, p 150).
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 **Methods**

33 The study encompassed a small-scale qualitative research project involving five
34 case-study schools in the ROI to gain teachers' and principals' perspectives on the
35 impact of a professional development initiative which had been carried out three
36 years previously. It set out to explore the perceived short-term and long-term impact
37 in an effort to fill the research gap relating to sustainability of professional
38 development practices. Participant selection for the study was purposive as it
39 involved returning to the same participants involved in the original study. In 2007 five
40 schools were selected from 19 schools that responded to an advertisement in the
41 Irish National Teachers' Organisation (INTO) (teacher union) magazine inviting
42 schools to engage in a literacy initiative. Preference was given to those in designated
43 urban disadvantaged schools with a single class grouping that was not participating
44 in another literacy initiative. A total of 20 participants were interviewed, including 13
45 principals and leaders who were involved in the original project (seven of the original
46 participants no longer worked at the same institution) and a further seven who had
47 subsequently become involved. This included two new principals.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 An evidence-based theoretical framework was developed based on existing
4 evaluation frameworks and extant literature to assess impact of the professional
5 development initiative (King, 2014). This framework guided the research questions
6 which explored the perceived impact of the professional development in the short
7 and longer term along with how the school shaped changes in teachers' practices. .
8 What followed was an inductive approach to data analysis and an exploration of
9 themes within and across the five schools (Bryman, 2004) revealing leaders as key
10 factors shaping teachers' practices.
11
12

13
14
15
16
17 It is important at this point to acknowledge the limitations of the study in relation to
18 researcher positionality and size. One of us was directly involved in the original
19 research looking at impact on pupils' outcomes in 2007-08. Some participants may
20 have cast the researcher as an insider (Mercer, 2007). At the same time, with the
21 focus on sustainability three years later, this arguably created some distance, whilst
22 for seven of the participants who were newer to the project there had been no
23 previous contact. Furthermore positionality issues were addressed by ensuring that
24 data analysis was conducted in a systematic and transparent manner (Lincoln and
25 Guba, 1985), with both researchers being engaged in a rigorous questioning of the
26 data and the conclusions being drawn.
27
28
29
30
31
32

33
34
35 The limited number of cases in the study means that there is no claim to
36 generalizability for findings, but rather additions to existing knowledge which may
37 provide new understandings regarding similar contexts. It is our view therefore that
38 the results, while drawn from ROI case studies, arguably have the potential for a
39 much wider application, and we expect and hope they will have a 'reliability'
40 (Hammersley, 1990) well beyond the specific contexts being described.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Results and discussion**

49
50

51
52 The results are presented under the following headings: School leadership- initiating
53 change; school leadership – implementing change; and school leadership-
54 sustaining change.
55
56
57
58
59
60

School leadership – initiating change:

Five schools (A-E) were involved in this professional development initiative. Significantly the initiative was brought to the attention of four out of the five principals by teachers. Two of these teachers had formal leadership roles in their schools while the other two were special educational needs teachers with no formal leadership roles. All four principals (schools B-E) were immediately willing for their school to take part in the initiative, thus reflecting the importance of what Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin (1995, p. 598) identify as ‘top-down support for bottom-up reform’; arguably reflective of a more optimistic view of distributed leadership. In School A the principal brought the professional development initiative to the attention of her staff and asked the literacy coordinator to support a class teacher and SEN teacher to engage with the initiative; thus reflective of a top-down approach where the principal has the authority and influence (Lumby, 2016).

The data from principals and teachers suggests a consensus about the literacy content being a motivating factor to participate in the initiative: ‘*We are a disadvantaged school so there is huge emphasis on literacy*’ (Principal, School D). Interestingly teachers only cited their own individual needs in relation to the initiative, consistent with the literature that posits that teachers are more inclined to view professional development benefits in terms of individual fulfilment (Pedder *et al.*, 2008), and that they are more concerned with what happens at classroom level than school or department level (Kitching *et al.*, 2009), arguably reflecting teacher leadership in terms of teaching and learning (Diamond and Spillane, 2016) instead of school improvement, the darker side of distributed leadership (Harris and DeFlaminis, 2016). This may also be seen as evidence of Björkman and Olofsson’s (2009) argument that alignment between teachers’ and principals’ priorities is a key driving force, providing strong supportive pre-conditions for capacity-building for change, suggesting mutual benefits for both principals and teachers. Added to this were the personal interests of principals and teachers: ‘*literacy was my hobbyhorse*’ (Principal, School B) and ‘*I’m very interested in literacy*’ (Principal, School A); ‘*to help my own teaching and learning*’ and to help gain security of tenure (Class teacher, School A) and; ‘*I was looking for help in how I could do that [help the children improve their literacy]*’ (Class Teacher, School E). Reconciling these interests is the challenge. Not only were principals interested in the product (literacy initiative), some

1
2
3 were thinking more strategically and saw this process as a 'vehicle' for introducing
4 collaborative practices between class teachers and SEN teachers in the school, thus
5 helping them enact their vision for their school (King, 2011). Therefore, principals
6 were happy to empower their teachers through distributed leadership (Tian *et al.*
7 2016) to do what they wanted them to do and felt they could not mandate:
8
9

10
11
12
13 *I think if you mandate it then you always get resistance.*

14 *I do think who's at the top is very influential* (Principal, School A).
15
16

17
18 Perhaps this is indicative of principals' agency where they were able to mediate the
19 structures to achieve their own goals, which in this instance are reflective of
20 departmental policy advocating collaborative practices. Top-down support in this way
21 may also raise the question of whether distributed leadership is only used when
22 principals' and teachers' aims are aligned arguably reflective of principals licensing
23 or legitimizing practices (Woods, 2016). While the above participants' perspectives
24 reflect the importance of aligning professional development with teachers' personal
25 and professional needs, they may also indicate a culture of 'new managerialism' with
26 a focus on teacher accountability and performativity; the darker side of distributed
27 leadership (Harris and DeFlaminis, 2016). However they also represent a situation
28 where teachers felt it appropriate to suggest engagement with the initiative,
29 irrespective of their role in the school: '*Martina* [pseudonym for the principal] *is great.*
30 *She's just very good for being open to ideas to try things*' (Class teacher, with no
31 formal leadership role, School B), reflecting bottom-up change with top-down
32 support, a more organic form of leadership).
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 *School leadership – implementing change;*
45

46
47 The literacy initiative was implemented in each of the five schools over a ten week
48 period (including a training period for pupils) and involved a class teacher and SEN
49 teacher collaboratively facilitating peer tutoring for pupils within the mainstream
50 classroom four days a week. The design of the initiative meant that both teachers
51 were involved in co-planning (for example, pairings of pupils and levels of readers),
52 co-presenting (for example modelling of procedures for pupils, monitoring their
53 learning), co-problem-solving (for example around books being too easy, pairings
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 not working out) and co-processing (for example formative and summative
4 assessment). Participants' perspectives strongly support evidence of principals
5 supporting teachers through creating organisational capacity for change (King,
6 2011), suggesting an interdependence between principals and teachers. This initially
7 involved principals securing a class teacher and SEN teacher willing to work
8 together on the initiative. All principals were aware of the importance of teachers'
9 willingness to engage with the literacy practice instead of mandating the practice in a
10 bid to lead to teacher ownership and lasting change. '*You're not going anywhere by*
11 *cracking the whip on anything like this*' (Principal, School D). This is interesting given
12 the external pressures of performativity and reflects the principal's awareness of the
13 importance of teacher motivation and willingness to engage with change.
14 Furthermore, principals provided time for teachers to collaborate for planning and
15 reflecting: '*we were facilitated in having the opportunity to do it [collaborate]...within*
16 *school time*' (Class teacher, School B) which teachers felt attached value to the
17 initiative. This non-contact time was moved to outside of school hours in subsequent
18 years. However teachers valued this planning and reflecting time and had no
19 problem engaging in it after school hours. Supporting teachers through provision of
20 time has been cited as important for successful implementation (Cordingley *et al.*
21 2003); a finding that is important given that the real problem in education is that
22 innovation after innovation is developed without really solving the problem of
23 implementation (Sahlberg, 2012).
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38
39 Creating organisational capacity was also reflected in four out of five of the principals
40 showing evidence of conceptual knowledge of the literacy initiative which they
41 developed through attendance at the professional development day, through
42 observing the literacy practice and in some cases participating in the initiative at the
43 first stage of implementation. This active participation in professional development is
44 consistent with the role of leadership (Robinson *et al.* 2009) identified as having the
45 largest impact on student outcomes. From this hands-on involvement principals were
46 more aware of the challenges during the implementation period and therefore were
47 better placed to offer support to teachers; indicative of a developing relationship
48 achieved by principals and teachers working together or transformational leadership
49 where leaders and teachers are united in trying to achieve their goals (Bass and
50 Riggio, 2006). However, in school A where the principal brought the initiative to the
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 attention of the literacy coordinator in a top-down approach, the practice did not
4 survive past its initial ten week implementation period. During the interview the
5 principal did not exemplify procedural or conceptual knowledge of the literacy
6 practice. She spoke in generic terms about her own knowledge and experience of
7 reading initiatives but did not refer to any specifics of the literacy initiative used in
8 this study. Furthermore she had no direct involvement in the professional
9 development day or the practice in the school, despite supporting teachers to
10 engage with it.

11
12 While all principals supported teachers in the initial ten week implementation period
13 further support was required for sustainability of practices for which little evidence
14 exists despite being crucial for school improvement (Baker *et al.*, 2004; Priestley *et*
15 *al.*, 2011). This study returned to the same five schools three years on to ascertain if
16 schools had sustained the practice and if so how they did so.

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26 *School leadership – sustaining change:*

27
28 In four out of the five schools the literacy practice was sustained, albeit it in different
29 ways. However, in school A, where the literacy practice was initiated in arguably a
30 more obviously managerialist approach, it was not sustained. Interestingly, it was
31 written into the policy as an initiative for literacy but the class teacher who wanted to
32 sustain the practice reported '*unfortunately it's not me who decides the learning*
33 *support [SEN] [timetable] in the school*', indicative of a lack of power and influence.
34 The principal felt it was not possible to timetable it as "*we all felt a little bit*
35 *submerged*"; '*We had to buy into those [other initiatives].*') and so the practice was
36 not licensed. This also highlights the pressure principals are under to perform and
37 yet provide teachers with freedom, to be creative and take risks, but avoid mistakes
38 (Bell and Bolam, 2010) which are essential components of school improvement.
39 Interestingly, very different versions of the impact of state-mandated literacy
40 initiatives being introduced were offered by the other four schools who saw
41 alignment between initiatives:
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53
54 *We have different initiatives at most levels . . . third and fourth*
55 *[class] would have the Peer tutoring . . . and it's for a set*
56 *number of weeks. It's just a matter of scheduling and I think*
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *different things suit the teachers at different levels* (Principal, School B)
4
5

6 Each of the four schools found the space within the constraints and scheduled the
7 initiative in subsequent years with one principal (School D) stating that '*if teachers*
8 *value it...then I'd be happy to support it*'. This is in direct contrast to the emerging
9 managerialism above, and more in line with a trust-based professionalism as
10 conceptualized by Harris and DeFlaminis (2016) with principals affording teachers
11 autonomy and trusting them in judging what works best for their pupils (Sahlberg,
12 2007).
13
14
15
16
17

18
19
20 Even more significant was that two of the schools had changed principals and the
21 practice was still sustained. The new principals clearly showed their conceptual
22 understanding of the initiative and their belief in it as a means of increasing
23 collaborative practices among teachers and enhancing pupils' learning. This raises
24 the issue again of principals being involved in teaching and learning and facilitating
25 awareness of practices at conceptual levels for sustainment (Baker *et al.* 2004;
26 Robinson *et al.* 2009). Principals showed evidence of empowering teachers to create
27 collaborative learning cultures and professional learning communities (King, 2011)
28 for example encouraging and facilitating teachers to become leaders themselves
29 through modelling practices for others (Goos *et al.* 2007), thus working towards a
30 collective responsibility for pupils' learning. This empowerment led to diffusion of
31 practices within each of the four schools with the number of teachers involved having
32 doubled since its inception three years previously. Principals also ensured that
33 teachers were not under pressure to participate. Interestingly a significant number of
34 teachers who tended to resist new practices and changes did engage with the
35 initiative having heard from other teachers how successful it was for their pupils in
36 their classrooms. Additionally principals did identify and hire staff that are open to
37 and value collaborative practices. What is highly significant about principals
38 supporting teachers is that they did not micromanage the practice despite having
39 supported it through timetabling, providing time and extra resources in subsequent
40 years. Principals trusted their teachers and the most significant outcome and
41 unintended consequence reported by all principals was the impact on teachers at a
42 collective level, with '*a bigger openness to working together and team teaching*'
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (School E), having 'a greater sense of team between support staff [SEN] and class
4 teachers' (School B), and collaborative practice now being 'part of what we do'
5 (School D). This cultural change marked a move from isolated privatism to collective
6 responsibility (O'Sullivan, 2011). The legacy of the professional development
7 initiative was much greater than the initiative itself with all schools reporting cultural
8 changes which it is argued is the real agenda for school improvement (Stoll and
9 Fink, 1996).

10
11
12
13
14
15
16 So despite a culture of performativity and standardisation, principals found spaces,
17 courageously trusted their teachers' values and opinions and gave them the time
18 and support to take risks as evidenced by one teacher's comment about what her
19 principal said: '*I trust you completely in what you're doing. You are the experts in this*
20 *area*' (Principal, School D). This echoes Priestley and colleagues' (2011, p. 270)
21 view arguing for engendering 'professional trust and a genuine shift in power to
22 those at the chalk face' for successful reform.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 **Conclusion – understanding the importance of organic leadership**

35
36
37 Results of the case studies considered in this article have indicated participants'
38 perspectives of how practices can be sustained and how cultural changes can be
39 realised in schools with appropriate educational infrastructure (Diamond and
40 Spillane, 2016); a 'grassroots approach' (Bubb and Earley, 2008, p 19) where
41 teachers, regardless of having formal leadership roles or not, were responsible for
42 bringing the literacy initiative to the principals coupled with principals support:
43 volunteering their schools for engagement in the initiative; showing teachers they
44 valued it; participating directly in the professional development project; and
45 facilitating the diffusion of practices to others by providing time and resources.
46 Despite being under external pressures in an emerging culture of standardisation,
47 accountability and performativity, principals claimed that they found the space to act
48 within the complexities of a rapidly changing education system. Such approaches
49 emphasise the importance of courage, and a willingness to take risks, as a feature of
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 modern leadership. It is also reflective of principals using their own agency to
4 mediate the structures in an approach best described as 'organic leadership'. These
5 findings add to the current literature on distributed leadership theory and leadership
6 theory in general in terms of further understanding of the "education infrastructure
7 (structures that support and constrain learning and teaching" (Diamond and Spillane,
8 2016, p 151).
9
10
11
12

13
14 What distinguishes this from other models of leadership is the symbiotic relationship
15 between support from above and the necessary element of leadership from below
16 where principals courageously trusted in and valued their teachers' opinions and this
17 was demonstrated through giving them genuine autonomy to pursue the initiative. In
18 this conception of organic leadership power is something that is shared, rather than
19 something that is released by one party, to be exercised by another, but only on
20 terms determined by the former. The result was much more than the sustainability of
21 a literacy initiative; but a powerful *collective responsibility* for pupils' learning. Whilst,
22 inevitably, principals possessed formal power, in the form of authority, power, in the
23 form of influence was best described as the outcome of a more collaborative process
24 of co-construction between formal and informal leaders. In this way teachers were
25 not only the product of their environment but were also its producers. Leadership
26 was less hierarchical, but rather was fluid and networked.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37
38 Results of the study conducted at the case-study schools highlight the significant
39 challenges of ensuring that change is not only implemented with success, but also,
40 crucially, sustained over time. Although each case had its own contextual specificity
41 we do believe the cases have important implications for policy and practice more
42 widely. In particular this research highlights the considerable possibilities that exist
43 when genuine teacher leadership is developed through collaborative PD. Such
44 approaches can seem counter-intuitive in environments where high-stakes
45 accountability often drives control and conformity. This provides a challenge for
46 policy-makers, and school leaders, to focus on creating the conditions in which
47 organic leadership can support teachers exercising leadership. After that they have
48 to learn to let go.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- Baker, S., Gerston, R., Dimino, J. A. and Griffiths, R. (2004), "The Sustained Use of Research-Based Instructional Practice: A Case Study of Peer-Assisted Learning Strategies in Mathematics", *Remedial and Special Education*, Vol. 25 No. 1, pp. 5–24.
- Ball, S.J. (2013), *The Education Debate (Politics and Policy in the 21st Century)*, Policy Press, Bristol.
- Bass, B. and Riggio, R. (2006), *Transformational Leadership*, 2nd edition, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, New Jersey.
- Bell, L. and Bolam, R. (2010), "Teacher Professionalism and Continuing Professional Development: Contested concepts and their implications for school leaders", In: Bush, T., Bell, L. and Middlewood, D. (Eds.) *The Principles of Educational Leadership and Management*, Sage, pp. 89–111.
- Bell, L. and Stevenson, H. (2006), *Education Policy: Process, Themes and Impact*, Routledge, London.
- Björkman, C. and Olofsson, A. (2009), "Qualitative Descriptions of Pre-conditions for Capacity-building in Schools", *International Studies in Educational Administration*, Vol. 37 No. (2), pp. 25–40.
- Bolam, R., McMahon, A., Stoll, L., Thomas, S., Wallace, M., Greenwood, A., Hawkey, K., Ingram, M., Atkinson, A. and Smith, M. (2005), *Creating and Sustaining Effective Professional Learning Communities*. RB637. Nottingham: DfES Publications. Available from <http://dera.ioe.ac.uk/5622/1/RR637.pdf> [Accessed 9 April 2017].
- Brain, K., Reid, I. and Comerford Boyes, L. (2006), Teachers as mediators between educational policy and practice, *Educational Studies*, Vol. 32 No. 4, pp. 411–423.
- Bryman, A. (2004), *Social Research Methods*. 2nd edition, Oxford University Press. Oxford.
- Bubb, S. and Earley, P. (2008), *From self-evaluation to school improvement: The*

- 1
2
3 *importance of effective staff development*, CfBT Education Trust, Reading.
- 4 Burns, D. & Darling-Hammond, L., (2014), *Teaching Around the World: What Can*
5 *TALIS Tell Us?*, Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education, Stanford,
6 CA.
- 7
- 8 Butler, F.M. (1999), "Reading Partners: Students Can Help Each Other Learn to
9 Read", *Education and Treatment of Children*, Vol. 22 No. 4, pp. 415–426.
- 10
- 11
- 12 Cordingley, P., Bell, M., Rundell, B. and Evans, D. (2003), *The impact of*
13 *collaborative*
14 *CPD on classroom teaching and learning*. In: Research Evidence in Education
15 Library. London, EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of
16 Education.
- 17
- 18
- 19 Cordingley, P., Bell, M. and Thomason, S. (2004), *The impact of collaborative CPD*
20 *on*
21 *classroom teaching and learning. Protocol: How do collaborative and*
22 *sustained CPD and sustained but not collaborative CPD affect teaching and*
23 *learning?* [online] London, EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit,
24 Institute of Education. Available from:
25 <[http://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/EPPIWebContent/reel/review_groups/CPD/cpd_protocol](http://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/EPPIWebContent/reel/review_groups/CPD/cpd_protocol2.pdf)
26 [2.pdf](http://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/EPPIWebContent/reel/review_groups/CPD/cpd_protocol2.pdf)>[Accessed 27 May 2014].
- 27
- 28
- 29 Darling-Hammond, L. and McLaughlin, M.W. (1995), "Policies that Support
30 Professional Development in an Era of Reform", *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol.
31 76, No. 8, pp. 597-604.
- 32
- 33 Day, C., Sammons, P., Hopkins, D., Harris, A., Leithwood, K., Gu, Q., Brown, E.,
34 Ahtaridou, E. and Kington, A. (2009), *The impact of school leadership on pupil*
35 *outcomes*, Department of Children, Schools and Families, London.
- 36
- 37 Department of Education and Skills (DES). (2011). *Literacy and numeracy for*
38 *learning and life*, DES, Dublin.
- 39
- 40
- 41 Diamond, J. B. and Spillane, J. P. (2016), "School leadership and management from
42 a distributed perspective", *Management in Education* Vol. 30 No. 4, pp.147-154.
- 43
- 44 Earley, P. and Bubb, S. (2004), *Leading and Managing Continuing Professional*
45 *Development*, Sage, London.
- 46
- 47 European Commission (2010), *Improving Teacher Quality: the EU agenda*. EAC.B.2
48 (2010) PSH. Brussels. Available from
49 [http://www.mv.helsinki.fi/home/hmniemi/EN_Improve_Teacher_Quality_eu_ag](http://www.mv.helsinki.fi/home/hmniemi/EN_Improve_Teacher_Quality_eu_agenda_04_2010_EN.pdf)
50 [enda_04_2010_EN.pdf](http://www.mv.helsinki.fi/home/hmniemi/EN_Improve_Teacher_Quality_eu_agenda_04_2010_EN.pdf) [Accessed 9 April 2017].
- 51
- 52
- 53 Evans, L. (2010), *Leadership for faculty development: confronting the complexity of*
54 *professional development*, presented at the annual meeting of the American
55 Educational Research Association, Denver, Colorado.
- 56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Fullan, M., Cuttress, C. and Kilcher, A. (2005), "8 forces for leaders of change",
4 *Journal*
5 *of Staff Development*, Vol. 26 No. 5, pp. 54–64.
6
- 7 Goos, M., Dole, S. and Makar, K. (2007), "Designing Professional Development to
8 Support Teachers' Learning in Complex Environments", *Mathematics Teacher*
9 *Education and Development*, Vol. 8 (Special Issue), pp. 23–47.
10
- 11 Government of Ireland (1998), *The Education Act*. The Stationery Office, Dublin.
12
- 13 Guskey, T.R. (1991), "Enhancing the Effectiveness of Professional Development
14 Programs", *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, Vol. 2 No.
15 3, pp. 239–247.
16
- 17
18
19 Hammersley M. (1990), *Reading Ethnographic Research*, Longman, New York.
20
- 21 Hargreaves, A. (1994), *Changing teachers, changing times: Teachers' work and*
22 *culture in the postmodern age*, Teachers College Press, New York.
23
24
- 25
26
27 Harris, A. (2008), "Distributed Leadership: According to the evidence", *Journal of*
28 *Educational Administration*, Vol. 46 No. 2, pp. 172-188.
29
- 30
31 Harris, A. and DeFlaminis, J. (2016), "Distributed leadership in practice: Evidence,
32 misconceptions and possibilities", *Management in Education*, Vol. 30 No. 4,
33 pp. 141-146.
34
- 35 Hattie, J. (2003), *Teachers Make a Difference. What is the research evidence?*,
36 presented at the Building Teacher Quality: What does the research tell us
37 ACER Research Conference, Melbourne, Australia. [online] Available from:
38 http://research.acer.edu.au/research_conference_2003/4/ [Accessed 9 April
39 2016].
40
41
- 42 Irish Primary Principals Network (IPPN) (2014), *Priorities for Principal Teachers- In*
43 *Clear Focus*, Liónra+, Cork, Ireland.
44
- 45 Kennedy, A. (2011), "Collaborative continuing professional development (CPD) for
46 teachers in Scotland: aspirations, opportunities and barriers", *European*
47 *Journal of Teacher Education*, Vol. 34 No. 1, pp. 25–41.
48
- 49
50 Kervin, L. (2007), "Supporting elementary teachers at the 'chalk-face': A model for
51 inschool professional development", *International Electronic Journal for*
52 *Leadership in Learning*, Vol. 11 No. 10 [online]. Available from University of
53 Calgary at: <<http://www.ucalgary.ca/iejll>> [Accessed 3 December 2008].
54
- 55
56 King, F. (2011), "The role of leadership in developing and sustaining teachers'
57 professional learning", *Management in Education*, Vol. 25 No. 4, 149-155.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 King, F. (2012), "Developing and sustaining teachers' professional learning: A case
4 study of collaborative professional development", Doctoral thesis, University of
5 Lincoln, Lincoln, UK.
6
- 7 King, F. (2014), "Evaluating the impact of teacher professional development: An
8 evidence-based framework", *Professional Development in Education*, Vol. 40
9 No. 1, 89-111.
10
- 11 King, F. and Gilliland, A. (2009), "Peer tutoring: An inclusive approach to supporting
12 reading: Case study in five disadvantaged schools", *LEARN, Journal of the Irish
13 Learning Support Association*, Vol. 31, pp. 50-61.
14
- 15 Kitching, K., Morgan, M. and O'Leary, M. (2009), "It's the little things: exploring the
16 importance of commonplace events for early-career teachers' motivation",
17 *Teachers & Teaching*, Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 43-58.
18
- 19 Knowles, M. S., Holton, E. F. and Swanson, R. A. (2005), *The adult learner*, 6th
20 edition,
21 Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann, Burlington, MA. (Original work published
22 1973).
23
- 24 Lincoln, Y.S. and Guba, E.G. (1985) *Naturalistic Inquiry*, Sage, Newbury Park, CA.
25
- 26 Lumby, J. (2016), "Distributed leadership as fashion or fad", *Management in
27 Education*, Vol. 30 No. 4), pp.161-167.
28
- 29 Mercer, J. (2007), "The challenges of insider research in educational institutions:
30 wielding a double-edged sword and resolving delicate dilemmas", *Oxford
31 Review of Education*, Vol. 33 No. 1, pp. 1-17.
32
- 33 Muijs, D. and Harris, A. (2003), "Teacher leadership: Improvement through
34 empowerment? An overview of research", *Educational Management
35 Administration and Leadership*, Vol. 31 No. 4, pp. 437-448.
36
- 37 National Council for Curriculum and Assessment (NCCA) (2010), *Leading and
38 Supporting Change in Schools*, Discussion Paper. [online] Available from:
39 [http://www.ncca.ie/en/Old%20Publications%20listing/Leading_and_Supportin
40 g_Change_in_Schools.pdf](http://www.ncca.ie/en/Old%20Publications%20listing/Leading_and_Supporting_Change_in_Schools.pdf) [Accessed 2 January 2011].
41
- 42 New South Wales (NSW) Institute of Teachers (2012), Continuing Professional
43 Development Policy - Supporting the Maintenance of Accreditation at
44 Proficient Teacher/ Professional Competence. [online] Available from:
45 [http://www.nswteachers.nsw.edu.au/ignitionSuite/uploads/docs/continuing%2
46 0professional%20development%20policy.pdf](http://www.nswteachers.nsw.edu.au/ignitionSuite/uploads/docs/continuing%20professional%20development%20policy.pdf) [Accessed 9 April 2017].
47
- 48 Opfer, V.D., Pedder, D. and Lavicza, Z. (2011), "The role of teachers' orientation to
49 learning in professional development and change: A national study of
50 teachers in England", *Teaching and Teacher Education*, Vol. 27 No. 2, pp.
51 443-453.
52
- 53 Opfer, V.D. and Pedder, D. (2011), "The Lost Promise of Teacher Professional
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Development in England”, *European Journal of Teacher Education*, Vol. 34
4 No. 1, pp. 3–24.
- 5 O’Sullivan, H. (2011), “Leading and Managing Professional Learning in Schools”, In:
6 O’Sullivan, H. and West-Burnham, J. (Eds.) *Leading and Managing Schools*,
7 Sage, pp. 111–125.
- 8
9
10 Pedder, D., Storey, A. and Opfer, V.D. (2008) *Schools and continuing professional*
11 *development (CPD) in England: State of the Nation research project report for*
12 *the Training and Development Agency for Schools*. [online.] University of
13 Cambridge, UK. Available from: <[http://www.tda.gov.uk/cpd-leader/effective-](http://www.tda.gov.uk/cpd-leader/effective-cpd/~media/resources/cpd-leader/effective-cpd-research/cpd_statenation_report_survey.pdf)
14 [cpd/~media/resources/cpd-leader/effective-cpd-](http://www.tda.gov.uk/cpd-leader/effective-cpd-research/cpd_statenation_report_survey.pdf)
15 [research/cpd_statenation_report_survey.pdf](http://www.tda.gov.uk/cpd-leader/effective-cpd-research/cpd_statenation_report_survey.pdf)> (Accessed 20 December 2010).
- 16
17 Preedy, M. (2016), “Distributed leadership: Where are we now?”, *Management in*
18 *Education*, Vol. 30 No. 4, pp. 139-140.
- 19
20 Priestley, M., Miller, K., Barrett, L. and Wallace, C. (2011), “Teacher Learning
21 Communities and Educational Change in Scotland: the Highland Experience”,
22 *British Educational Research Journal*, Vol. 37 No. 2, pp. 265–284.
- 23
24 Rizvi, F. and Lingard, B. (2009), *Globalizing Education Policy*, Routledge, London.
- 25
26
27 Robinson, V., Hohepa, M. and Lloyd, C. (2009) *School leadership and student*
28 *outcomes: Identifying what works and why*. [online] CUREE. Available from:
29 [http://www.curee.co.uk/files/publication/1260453707/Robinson%20Summary](http://www.curee.co.uk/files/publication/1260453707/Robinson%20Summary%20Extended%20Version.pdf)
30 [%20Extended%20Version.pdf](http://www.curee.co.uk/files/publication/1260453707/Robinson%20Summary%20Extended%20Version.pdf) [Accessed 3 January 2013].
- 31
32
33 Robson, C. (2002), *Real World Research*, 2nd edition, Blackwell, Oxford.
- 34
35 Sachs, J. (2003), *The Activist Teaching Profession*, Open University Press,
36 Buckingham.
- 37
38 Sahlberg, P. (2007), “Education policies for raising student learning: the Finnish
39 approach”, *Journal of Education Policy*, Vol. 22 No. 2, pp. 147–171.
- 40
41
42 Sahlberg, P. (2012), *How can research help educational change?* [online] Available
43 from <http://pasisahlberg.com/2012/04> [Accessed 9 April 2017].
- 44
45
46
47
48 Sellar, S. and Lingard, B. (2013), “The OECD and Global Governance in Education”,
49
50 *Journal of Education Policy*, Vol. 28, pp. 710-725.
- 51
52
53 Spillane, J. P. and Coldren, A. F. (2011), *Diagnosis and Design for School*
54 *Improvement: Using a Distributed Perspective to Lead and Manage Change*,
55 Teachers College Press, New York.
- 56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Stevenson, H. (2012), "Teacher leadership as intellectual leadership: creating
4 spaces
5 for alternative voices in the English school system", *Professional*
6 *Development in Education*, Vol 38, No. 2, pp. 345-360.
7
8 Stoll, L. and Fink, D. (1996), *Changing Our Schools: Linking School Effectiveness*
9 *and*
10 *School Improvement*, Open University Press, Maidenhead.
11
12 Sugrue, C. (2011), "Autonomy and Accountability", In: O'Sullivan, H. and West-
13 Burnham, J. (Eds.) *Leading and Managing Schools*. Sage, pp. 59–74.
14
15 Tian, M., Risku, M., and Collin, K. (2016), "A meta-analysis of distributed leadership
16 from 2002 - 2013: Theory development, empirical evidence and future
17 research focus", *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, Vol.
18 44 No.1, pp.146-164.
19
20 Topping, K. (1988), *The Peer Tutoring Handbook*, Croom Helm, London.
21
22 Torrance, D (2012), "Distributed leadership: challenging five generally held
23 assumptions. School Leadership and Management", presented at the annual
24 conference of the International Professional Development Association,
25 Birmingham, UK.
26
27
28 Torrance, D (2013), "Distributed leadership: challenging five generally held
29 assumptions", *School Leadership and Management*, Vol. 33 No. 4, pp. 354-
30 372.
31
32
33 William, D. (2011), *Embedded Formative Assessment*. Bloomington, IN: Solution
34 tree.
35
36 Woods, P. (2016), "Authority, power and distributed leadership", *Management in*
37 *Education*, Vol. 30 No. 4, pp.155-160.
38
39 Yin, R.K. (1994), *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. 2nd edition: Sage,
40 Thousand Oaks, CA.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60