The Primary Review

... children, their world, their education

INTERIM REPORTS

PRIMARY SCHOOLS: THE PROFESSIONAL ENVIRONMENT

Liz Jones, Andy Pickard and Ian Stronach
Manchester Metropolitan University

Esmée Fairbairn FOUNDATION

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
Faculty of Education

PRIMARY SCHOOLS:
THE PROFESSIONAL ENVIRONMENT

Primary Review Research Survey 6/2

Liz Jones, Andy Pickard and Ian Stronach

April 2008

This is one of a series of 32 interim reports from the Primary Review, an independent enquiry into the condition and future of primary education in England. The Review was launched in October 2006 and will publish its final report in late 2008.

The Primary Review, supported by Esmée Fairbairn Foundation, is based at the University of Cambridge Faculty of Education and directed by Robin Alexander.

A briefing which summarises key issues from this report has also been published. The report and briefing are available electronically at the Primary Review website: **www.primaryreview.org.uk**. The website also contains Information about other reports in this series and about the Primary Review as a whole.

We want this report to contribute to the debate about English primary education, so we would welcome readers' comments on anything it contains. Please write to: **evidence@primaryreview.org.uk**.

The report forms part of the Review's research survey strand, which consists of thirty specially-commissioned surveys of published research and other evidence relating to the Review's ten themes. The themes and reports are listed in Appendices 1 and 3.

This survey relates to Primary Review theme 6, **Settings and Professionals**.

The authors are at the Institute of Education, Manchester Metropolitan University. Liz Jones is Reader in Early Childhood. Andy Pickard is Erasmus Co-ordinator. Ian Stronach is Research Professor.

Suggested citation: Jones, E., Pickard, A and Stronach, I. (2008) *Primary Schools: the professional environment* **(Primary Review Research Survey 6/2), Cambridge: University of Cambridge Faculty of Education.**

The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors. They do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the Primary Review, Esmée Fairbairn Foundation or the University of Cambridge.

PRIMARY SCHOOLS:
THE PROFESSIONAL ENVIRONMENT

The authors of this report for the Primary Review were charged with presenting an assessment of the current state of the professional environment of the English primary school. We decided to overview the salient issues, and then to identify a number of central themes whose understanding seemed to us to be of central importance. It was clear also that sustained empirical research of life inside primary schools, or indeed any schools, of the kind published in the 1980s heyday of ethnographical sociology is now limited. We found that what empirical studies did exist had also become more theoretically impoverished over the years. Atheoretical and simplistically evaluational approaches tend to dominate contemporary academic published writing. This is not to deny that there is significant and critical work being done by the likes of Pollard and Alexander (see, for example, Pollard & Triggs 2001 and, in the international comparative field, Alexander 2001). Nevertheless, there seem to be large enclaves of sponsored research that did not seem able or willing to critically contest the realities of contemporary schooling.

Against this general backdrop therefore, we have chosen to focus on two major themes in particular: teacher professionalism and the leadership of primary schools. Both, we would argue, dominate the recent history, current debate and future practices of primary schools. In that sense they provide a means of encapsulating the complexity of the contemporary professional environment of primary schools in a wholly dominant way. In addition, professionalism and leadership are central to the nexus between policy and practice in so far as primary teachers' and their co-workers' capacity to be or to become professional, and the capacity of head-teachers to deliver change in primary schools, has been the crucible into which policy has been poured.

Our own position on policy in primary education is broadly this: policy in this sector has been as bedevilled by a combination of 'moral panics' and 'policy hysteria' as elsewhere in education and beyond. There have been too many initiatives, too much short term response to media engendered scares, involving ever shortening cycles of reform, multiple innovations, frequent policy shifts, an increasing tendency for reforms to become symbolic in nature, a scapegoating of systems, professional and client groups, shifting meanings within the central vocabulary of reforms, an erosion of professional discretion, and untested and untestable success claims (Stronach & Morris 1994). These features were already present when the current government came to power in 1997 but they seem to have become a permanent feature of contemporary modernisation by New Labour. They relate to similar practices and theories developed in the US in relation to business philosophies and practices; hence our emphasis here on 'leadership styles'. Strang and Macy (2001), in their quantitative study of the Quality Control movement, write of 'fad theory'. They identify the following features of fads: a potentially extensive incubation period where a few firms utilise the innovation; a take-off period when popularity rises explosively; a short period of ascendancy marked by high levels of innovation usage; a period of rapid decline leading to a low equilibrium level of usage. Then, of course, the next fad comes along and the process is repeated. Particularly relevant to this review is Strang and Macy's finding that 'an artificial world of actors preoccupied with performance via success stories is a world of fad like waves of adoption and abandonment' (2001: 162). They found that 'fadlike vicissitudes are most robust *not* when innovations are worthless but when they have identifiable but modest merit' [their emphasis] (*ibid*.: 172). It is precisely policy of possibly 'modest merit' which we would argue has disordered notions of professionalism and leadership within the primary

sector, and it is that process which dominates this review of the professional environment of primary schools.

The nature of professionalism in primary schools

Our starting point is that the professional environment of primary schools cannot be understood without reference to the professional identities of the teachers and others who work in those schools, and their professionalism cannot be understood without at least some reference to the intense debate which now surrounds the issue of teacher professionalism. Thus this section of our report sets out to review some of the major parameters of the writing and research on teacher professionalism and to try to see where primary teachers sit within those configurations.

Issues of teacher professionalism and teacher professional identity are now evident in much research literature emerging from the USA, the UK and Australia. Recent educational reforms, and associated changes in working conditions and professional expectations, have meant that that the issues of teacher professionalism and professional identity are being contested at the level of both policy and practice (Sachs 2001). Moreover, these contestations take place against an historical backdrop of doubts about the professional status of teachers, especially those working in primary schools or in an earlier era, elementary schools. As Katz somewhat cynically noted a generation ago, 'Few professionals talk as much about being professionals as those whose professional stature is in doubt.' (Katz, in Etzioni 1969, cited in Stronach *et al.* 2002: 109).

These long standing debates about teacher professionalism have intensified in recent years as what counts as teacher professionalism has become the site of a struggle between various interest groups. Some would argue that it is in the best interests of government for teaching not to be seen as a profession, as it gives greater opportunity for regulative control of the (non-) profession. Others would suggest that, given the specialised knowledge base of teachers, the increased demands for professional standards and the greater demands for teachers to see themselves as knowledge workers, they have earned the status of being a profession in a more orthodox sense (Sachs 2001). Undoubtedly the extent of direct government intervention into the classroom has complicated teachers' own view of their profession as being about doing 'good in society' (Stronach *et al.* 2002). It is not just that professionalism implies a degree of autonomy and independent judgement, but that the 'goodness' of government policy itself can be contested. What, for the politician, can be a commitment to raising standards can, for their critics, be the imposition of a narrow, traditional curriculum.

Professional binaries and beyond

Sachs (2001) identifies three paradoxes in relation to current teacher professionalism. Firstly, the call for greater professionalism is occurring at a time when there is evidence that teachers are being deskilled and their work intensified. Secondly, while it is acknowledged that classrooms are becoming ever more demanding places, fewer resources per capita are being put into teacher education either in its initial or post qualification form. Thirdly, the teaching profession is exhorted to be autonomous while at the same time it is under increasing pressure from politicians and the community to be more accountable and to raise standards. These paradoxes, we would argue, have produced an academic literature which constructs binary oppositions in the ways in which teacher professionalism can be understood. The dominant thesis is one of 'proletarianisation' (Ball 1990; Maguire & Ball 1994; Ozga 2000; Avis 2003). As a consequence of policy reform, teachers have experienced an intensification of workload with an emphasis on technical competence and performativity. Centralising reforms have been represented as giving greater freedom but are actually acting to

deregulate and then re-regulate, a process which Du Gay and Hall (1996) terms controlled de-control. Within this context teachers are represented and encouraged to think of themselves as enterprising neoliberals (Walkerdine 2003), yet they are managed according to an ideology of professionalism which has the effect of de- and then re-professionalising them (Ozga & Lawn 1981).

In contrast with these rather gloomy appraisals, Dawson (1994) has drawn upon on an older Aristotelian version of the virtuous person to emphasise the continued opportunities for teachers to exercise professional autonomy, rooted in the collective values of the profession. Here there is an echo of what might be described as the traditional view of a profession.

Dawson sees this as an 'inside out' professionalism to be distinguished from the 'outside in' professionalism. The latter refers to the policy and accountability impositions, the former to the ethical codes teachers have culturally created for themselves. Dawson argues that imposed codes can never be sufficiently comprehensive to drive out inside/out professionalism. Teachers will continue to identify with their own sense of what is ethically and educationally appropriate for their pupils.

Stronach *et al.* (2002) have developed this 'inside/out – outside/in' concept still further. They are critical of the ways in which professionalism has been deployed in the literature, arguing that the term is both a reduction and an inflation in that teachers (and nurses too) are 'victims' destined to deliver others' prescriptions, and agents for social good. Thus analyses of professionalism become caught in a series of simple polarities: state control versus professional autonomy; traditional versus progressive; art versus science; and audit culture versus collective values and solidarities. The narratives which emerge from such analyses display similar polarising qualities – de-professionalisation or redemption. Their own analysis turns away from the fixity of such accounts into something altogether more fluid, more plastic, more dynamic, arguing for a more 'fissiparous emplotment' which keeps tensions and movement in play (Stronach *et al*. 2002: 114). They do this by 'reframing/unframing' professionalism ontologically (as an expression of an oscillating liberal self), as politically conflictual, as a symbolic hybrid of past and present, and as resistant to universalistic, essentialist and reductionist accounts.

The data they produce on the basis of this deconstruction of the theories of professionalism emphasise the ways in which teachers 'juggle' between professional goals, vocational commitments, and collectivist and external pressures, including the press for corporate identities. They characterise these as 'ecologies of practice' on the one hand, and 'economies of performance' on the other, but they resist the notion of a professional resolution of these dilemmas common to other accounts of professionalism. For them there is an inevitability about outside/in colonisation of educational discourses but there is an inevitability too in teachers' inside/out capacities to ridicule and ignore their school and classroom manifestations. Teachers work in an in-between world and that is to be encouraged and supported.

What these accounts of teacher professionalism tend to have in common is an indifference to the specific location of teachers within the system. There is little attempt to distinguish between primary and secondary teachers. Instead they are presented as a rather amorphous mass, subjected to the same external pressures and with the same opportunities for accommodation and resistance. This is somewhat surprising given that the timing and form of media- and government-led critiques of the values, practices and achievements of teachers have varied between sectors. Secondary teachers stand charged with, variously, inflating A-Level grades, encouraging course work at the expense of examinations, neglecting Key Stage 3, and preferring to teach subjects at the expense of relevant vocational skills. Meanwhile primary teachers have favoured progressive teaching methods over more traditional ones,

have adopted wrong approaches to the teaching of reading and mathematics, and have generally failed the nation by neglecting 'basics'.

It may be that at times the virulence of these onslaughts overwhelms distinctions between the professionalism of primary and secondary teachers. The level of prescription is such that the shared sense of crisis around teaching is more significant than age range differences. Certainly a recent review of teacher status using questionnaire, interview and media survey data suggested that there are only marginal differences between the status afforded to secondary and primary teachers respectively (Hargreaves *et al*. 2006). Such was the finding from recent public opinion surveys (Everton *et al*. 2007). Linda Hargreaves found in research conducted in 2006, however, that 48 per cent of her sample regarded secondary teachers as having superior status (Hargreaves *et al.* 2007): a judgement that was supported from within the profession, and also extended to the differential perceived status of secondary as opposed to primary headteachers. Status is not synonymous with professionalism, being concerned with occupational ranking. Nevertheless, the two concepts are linked in that status is likely to be afforded to those occupational groups who are perceived to display ethical qualities, linked to rigorous training and a demanding knowledge base. The research findings suggested secondary headteacher occupational status was marginally higher than that of primary headteachers (8th and 10th respectively in a list of sixteen). Similarly, secondary teachers were ranked 12th and primary teachers 14th. In terms of occupational esteem (a measure of what occupational groups are deemed to deserve rather than their 'real' position), there was a similar differential with secondary headteachers moving to 3rd, primary headteachers to 4th, secondary teachers to 6th, and primary teachers to 7th. Possibly these differences reflect the higher regard for the professionalism of secondary teachers over that of their primary colleagues. The report authors, however, argue the opposite, seeing their findings as evidence of the erosion of the traditionally greater regard for secondary teachers. This in turn reinforces the implication of the literature on professionalism that teachers' sense of professional identity, including any feelings of crisis, is common to both our secondary and primary schools.

The research report also contains other findings of relevance to this review. On the whole the general public afforded more status to teachers than teachers did themselves. This was especially true of parents, who tend to have a high regard for the profession. Neither the quality nor the popular press give space to teacher status, but the former provides coverage of employment issues and government targets while the latter focuses on teachers' personal lives, especially if they appear before the courts. Teachers themselves have a complex view of their own status. On the whole they believe that their status was at its lowest in the 1980s and that there may have been some recovery in recent years. Most significant of all was the difference between the attitudes of teacher trainees and recently qualified teachers, who were among the most positive of all respondents to the researchers, and long-serving teachers who were the most pessimistic group when it came to teacher status. It is possible to speculate on the basis of this research, therefore, that a school with a high proportion of newish teachers, which offers places to teacher training students and has close relationships with its parents, will have a different professional ethos from a school without these features.

It is tempting to extend the previous point to argue that children in a school with a staff with a robust and positive sense of their own professionalism will benefit educationally. While this seems not unrealistic, research into primary education warns against such simplistic reductionism. Robin Alexander (1990: 72) argues that discourses within the primary world are as 'problematic as communication between the inhabitants of that world and those outside it'. Discourses within primary schools tend to be oral, pragmatic, contingent, nuanced, and alert to the affective dimension. This contrasts with the language of academia

and policy makers, which is typically written, apparently coherent and above all powerful. Again, there is a bifurcation in the professional languages of primary teachers. Alexander refers to their *public* representation of their world of the primary school as 'primaryspeak'. He contrasts the slogans and shibboleths of 'primaryspeak' with the more nuanced and dilemma-conscious private conversations of primary teachers where feelings matter – their own as well as the children's – where subtlety and realism puncture the notions of one-size-fits-all 'good primary practice'. Here Alexander draws on the classic Argyris and Schön distinction between 'espoused theory' and 'theory in use' (Alexander 1995).

Alexander's representation of the primary school is consistent with the views of teacher professionalism as set out by Stronach *et al.* (2002) and examined above. They replace the 'indefensible unitary construct' of professionalism with teachers as inevitably and invariably encountering dilemmas which are themselves a source of motivation. Ambiguity and uncertainty is at the heart of professional identity, with recollections of good teachers and good pupils; the pressured individual; the subject specialist; the kind of person as well as teacher the individual wants to be; the socialised apprentice; the coerced innovator; the convinced professional; the professional critic; and the sceptical pragmatist as 'shards' in which teachers can see themselves.

How then do these differing but inherently plural discourses contrast in ways of 'seeing' teachers and teaching measure up against the somewhat limited number of texts dealing with professionalism among those working with younger children? It is a genre which is dominated by the early years, which is hardly surprising given how recent policy initiatives (notably Every Child Matters, Sure Start and the commitment to 'professionalise' teaching assistants) have had their greatest impact on the early years sector.

As with the 'parent' genre of teacher professionalism in general, analysis is dominated by a sense of external control and loss of professional independence. Thus, like teachers everywhere, early years practitioners increasingly have to wrestle with demands for accountability, performativity and standardised approaches to their practice. This pronounced movement towards centralised control and prescription is seen as posing a potential threat to professional autonomy and morale (Mahony & Hextall 2001). Moreover, early years practitioners face these challenges from a position of some weakness in that the diverse nature of provision in the sector encourages practitioners to behave in diverse and isolated ways. There is a lack of unified identity or shared belief in themselves as a 'professional' group that is made especially difficult when faced, Osgood argues, with an exercise of power which is largely 'invisible'. This power is exercised through policy, workforce reform, constant surveillance and the normalisation of 'good' practice in ways so sophisticated and abstract that challenge or even negotiation becomes very difficult. Thus, Osgood (2006) argues, in a quest to conform to dominant constructions of professionalism, practitioners become regulated and controlled by disciplinary technologies of the self.

As if this was not enough for early years practitioners to face, Osgood (2004, 2005) also draws attention to the masculinist undertones of neo-liberalism and the economic rationale behind policy reforms in the early years. In recent policy reforms, the UK government has continued to state its intentions for early years practitioners to operate in entrepreneurial ways and to adopt commercial approaches to the management of provision (Sure Start Unit 2004). For Osgood, this neo-liberal discourse marginalises the ethic of care of central significance to early years practitioners, replacing it with a constructed professionalism which emphasises rationality, competitiveness, and individualism. Beliefs, it seems, no longer matter: it is output that counts, although teachers seek to hold onto the knowledge being displaced by the new orthodoxy. Interestingly, Osgood also suggests that this is not entirely a one-way street. The government itself has a fear of early years practitioners, whom

it sees as hyper-feminine and therefore unmanageable, unquantifiable and hence impossible for the state to regulate. This, of course, has not prevented it from trying to do so.

As we move closer to the professional ethos of primary schools, therefore, albeit by riding on the back of early years, it seems that teachers in the sector have experienced the same state-led challenges to their professional identities as teachers elsewhere. The prescriptions offered are also familiar. Osgood (2005) calls for resistance to the regulatory gaze by reasserting the ethic of care and emotional labour, acknowledging the unique nature and complexity of the work of early years practitioners in order to establish a different kind of professionalism. However it may be that, given the analyses offered by Stronach *et al.* (2002) and Alexander's (1990) account of the complex nature of primary schools, both discussed earlier, a less cataclysmic and confrontational version of primary professionalism might be appropriate. Francis (2001) certainly advocates a new agency model for early years practitioners which sees professional identities as negotiated, ambiguous and shifting in accordance with personal experience, beliefs and values, and includes aspirations about the kind of professional the individual wants to be.

It is clear from this review that the professional ethos of primary schools in the recent past has been dominated by the government's project to reconstruct primary teachers in a form which is amenable to the need to demonstrate that an investment in education brings economic and social returns. Whilst teachers might not disagree with the policy ends, they have sometimes disagreed with the means – and the ways in which these means redefine teacher professional identities. Nevertheless, their rejection has never been total. Some aspects of policy and coerced change have been welcomed, and certainly the opportunities for professional diversity are sometimes welcomed.

Most accounts of these processes recognise the importance of primary school management to the tensions which surround the complexity of professionalism. Sachs (2001) sees professional identity as being shaped by the competing discourses of democratic professionalism and managerialist professionalism. The latter has been developed and mandated by the state on the basis of two claims: that efficient management can solve any problem; and that practices which are appropriate for the conduct of private sector enterprises can also be applied to the public sector. The latter has been advocated, among others, by Apple (1996), who sees the alternative to state control not as traditional professionalism but as a democratic professionalism which seeks to demystify professional work and build alliances between teachers and excluded constituencies of children and their communities. How the leaders of primary schools respond to these competing possibilities is what follows in this review.

The nature of leadership within the organisation of primary schools

We begin by citing a former Secretary of State:

> The grit in the oyster… is leadership. We need leadership at all levels – from the top of schools to every teacher and every member of the school team… in helping every pupil get the best out of their time at school.
>
> (Charles Clarke 2002)

The statement carries important implications. The choice of the word 'leadership' rather than 'management' carries with it ideological and practical baggage, which reflects much of the contemporary positioning on primary school headship and its consequent impact on the school environment. It also implies some distinction between management and leadership that is ripe with the same kinds of polarities we have discussed in relationship to the wider issue of professionalism. It also accepts as given that leadership is a generic issue: whether the leader is a primary or secondary head, they are the 'grit'.

More immediately the statement raises questions of a meaning kind: just what is 'gritty' about being a leader within the context of primary schooling? Does leadership have to involve traits that might be associated with 'grittiness' including, for example, determination, tenacity, courage, fortitude and bravery? And what kind of pearl is embedded within an expression such as 'the best out of their time at school?' In this section we want to prize open the construct of leadership and, in so doing, detail why it is that that it seems characterised by the same polarities examined in the previous section. Thus, on the one hand, a Minister for Education not only reveres it but perceives it as key to a school's success (see also Mortimer *et al.* 1988; Fullan & Stiegelbauer 1991; Southworth 1998) whilst on the other, it seems that we are currently experiencing a 'leadership crisis' (see Hartle & Thomas 2003; NCSL 2004) where deputy heads are reluctant to apply for promotion (Hayes 2005).

As Gronn (2003) indicates, the field's understanding of 'leadership' is grounded in highly dubious and problematic assumptions – a concern shared by Hopkins who notes that commentators tend to '… conflate their own views about what leadership should be with their descriptions of what leadership actually is and fail to discipline either position by reference to empirical research' (2003: 57). So whilst the literature might well be problematic – a point we shall return to subsequently – this has not impeded its growth. Indeed Simkins describes it as an 'explosion of leadership literature' (2005: 9) and one, moreover, that in recent times has been considerably driven by the school effectiveness and school improvement agendas.

Educational leadership is surrounded by the same need to unscramble the intersections between language, policy and practice as the broader discussion of professionalism. The language is mostly opaque, and meaning rarely stands still long enough to clarify either policy or practice. Indeed the term 'leadership' has been adopted relatively recently. In the early 1980s educational 'administration' was the well-worn vocabulary, so terms such as 'educational leadership' and 'school leadership' were much more muted than is the case at present (Gronn 2003). For us a key question is what changes, if anything, when commentators begin to privilege words such as 'leader', 'leading' and 'leadership' as discursive modes for representing reality, instead of previously favoured terminology such as 'manager', 'management' and so forth? Some commentators have queried whether anything is gained by differentiating between 'leaders' and 'managers'. Nicholls (2002), for example, proposes that formal position-holders are employed as managers and that members of this cadre who manifest the behaviour typically associated with leadership need simply to be thought of as more high profile managers than their peers.

Others do want to claim a distinction. Southworth, for example, identifies leadership as being '… about behaviour; it is action orientated, and it is about improving the quality of what we do' (1988: 8). Leadership, therefore, requires having vision so as to establish goals, and additionally having the capacity to work with colleagues so as to secure these – particularly that of children learning. Within this model, effective delegation is key (Dean 1990). Meanwhile, management '… is about keeping the organisation going. Leadership is about ensuring the organisation – the school – is going somewhere' (Southworth 1998: 8). For Terry, leadership is the activity of 'influencing people to strive willingly for group goals' (Terry, cited in Smith and Piele 1996: 2; see also Lawlor and Sills 1999).

As we have noted, contemporary literature on educational leadership focuses on effectiveness, improvement and change (see for example, Bennet *et al.* 2003; Harris *et al.* 2003; Riley & Seashore 2000; Gronn 2003). In this context the headteacher's leadership is commonly emphasised as 'crucial' (Sammons 1999; Chemers & Reezigt 1996; Harris *et al.* 1997; Mortimer 1998; Stoll & Fink 1996; Fullan 1993). It is highlighted as a means for securing

sustainable school improvement. Hall and Southworth (1997), in discussing primary headship, make a historical distinction between manifestations pre- and post-1988. The pre-period is framed by centralisation, heads as central and pivotal figures in school who had also exercised hegemony over general school policy. They refer to Coulson (1985), who argued that power and influence were seen as personal and individual in primary schools.

If one examines a version of the role of headteacher as outlined in DfEE/DfES/DCSF documentation (for example, DfEE 1994) then its possible to discern how, from a governmental perspective at least, there are clear overlaps between the two locations of 'leader' and 'manager'. Thus the head's duties include actions that might be associated with 'leadership', including for example formulating the overall aims of the school. One can also see how other duties, including the appointment of staff, might well fit into the leader's vision. Other responsibilities are couched in language that is associated with management speak, including for example *reviewing* the work and organisation of the school, culminating in *strategic planning*; *evaluating* teaching and learning; *supervising* and *appraising* teachers in terms of *performance management*; as well as *accounting* for financial and material resources of the school (Osborn *et al*. 2000). Some commentators have identified how successful leadership also seems dependent on traits such as 'flexibility', 'willingness to take risks' and 'effective relationships,' all of which might be summarised as 'grit' (Caldwell & Spinks 1998: 31).

Different dimensions and concepts of 'leadership' have emerged so as to respond to different sets of interest. For example: transformational leadership and transactional leadership (see Leithwood, Leonard & Seashore 1999; Silins 1994; Hallinger & Heck 1996; Gronn 1999); 'post-transformational' leadership (Day *et al*. 2000); moral leadership (Sergiovanni 1992); instructional/pedagogical leadership (see Stalhammer 1994; Hopkins *et al*. 2003); and also leadership in relation to learning organisations and organisational learning (see Leithwood, Leonard & Seashore 1999; Leithwood & Seashore 1998; Dixon & Ross 1999).

We, however, are concerned with whether such studies have the capacity to provide insights into the actual practices that occur within the kaleidoscopic life of primary schools. As Heck and Hallinger note, there is a need to 'separate what moves the field intellectually from what continues to spin it in ideological or methodological circles' (2005: 239). Moreover, as terms, both 'leadership' and 'management' can mask or even render invisible other explanatory factors, including individual predispositions, the inherent nature of tasks, workplace processes and the kinds of relationships that are possible. To lead infers that others will follow. As such, leaders are constructed as causal agents of work outcomes. Alternative perspectives on the role, however, might be to begin the analysis at the opposite or rear end where the task would involve combing back through the range of explanatory possibilities of which leadership may (or may not) turn out to be just one. As inferred above, Southworth's (1998, 2004) research edges towards this – particularly where he focuses on the influence of school size and context on headteacher leadership. Additionally Grace (1995), Day *et al.* (2000) and Webb (2005) explore 'leadership' from the perspectives not only of headteachers but also of those within the school, but these aside there appear to be 'only a few studies which have increased our understanding of leadership in English primary schools' (Webb, 2005: 69).

Changing times, changing styles: Bash Street Kids, Plowden's Child, Key Stage Children and Every Child Matters

In Figure 1 we have tried to summarise how significant shifts in educational policy have in turn provided the conduit along which various performances of leadership could be enacted.

1944-1980 **1967 Plowden Report** • Child-centredness and learning by discovery were two key messages from this report that entered into our collective 'received wisdom' • DES, LEAs and schools were partners. Change introduced by headteachers was evolutionary, involving serialised developments	• Consensus was a core principle. Each party could offer advice. Changes occurred through agreement. • Headteachers as 'educative leaders' involved in teaching and direct working relations with children and class teachers • Heads required to be 'exemplary' teachers
1986 Education Act • Surveillance and regulation operating both outside of and within schools • Marketisation of education	• Increased parental and community representation of governing bodies • Governors given power to modify the LEAs' curriculum policies to meet the needs of individual schools plus limited control of school budget • Governors accountable to parents through an annual report presented at an annual meeting
1988 Education Reform Act (ERA) • 'The Child' no longer referred to *per se*; primary schools segmented into Key Stages 1 & 2 • System of public school league tables. • Cooperation replaced with competition.	• Increased responsibilities of governing bodies • Schools assume responsibilities for own budgets • Governors can establish staffing levels • Governors may take school out of LEA control by applying for grant-maintained status
1988 The National Curriculum (NC) • Structural solutions through top–down regulations • Emphasis on systems, procedures and tasks to promote the efficient running of the school	• Emphasised the importance of curriculum management for all staff • Emphasised monitoring, reviewing and evaluating pupil performance • Placed the curriculum at the centre of management activity • 'Instructional leadership' seen as 'attractive' in terms of achieving compliance with government reforms, plus conducive to working within a narrow standards agenda • Raised questions in relation to whether NC stifled teachers' creativity and constrained school innovation.

1992 – 1994 • Continuing emphasis on systems, procedures and tasks to promote the efficient running of the school • OfSTED inspections work at ensuring compliance – 'strong leadership provides clear educational direction for the work of the school'. • 'Performativity discourse' of assessment prevalent	• Only a minority of headteachers in other than small schools retained a regular teaching commitment • Curriculum leadership role delegated to deputy heads, senior management teams (SMTs) and curriculum co-ordinators
2003 The Primary Strategy (DfES 2003). • Standards for qualified teacher status; • Induction standards for beginning teachers; • Standards for crossing the performance pay threshold; standards for advanced skills teachers; • National standards for headship	• Pedagogical leadership = creativity and innovation in teaching.
2006/7 Every Child Matters Agenda • The child and the family identified as key in terms of economic prosperity and social stability. Education in conjunction with other agencies (multi-professionalism) perceived as instrumental in securing the normalisation of children and their families.	

Figure 1

Given such a map there might well be a temptation to 'read' the period from the mid-1940s through to the onset of the 1980s with rose-tinted spectacles, where a binary could be constructed between 'educative leadership' and 'instructional leadership' with the former being valorised over the latter. We are cautious of doing this, recognising that labels such as 'consensus', 'exemplary' and 'working relations' are not benign and that their presumed smoothness can work at concealing how traits such as manipulation and compliance might well be active (Gronn 2002, 2003). Moreover, as Webb (2005) reminds us, leadership is a value-laden concept and a range of factors will determine its interpretation by individuals. So, a headteacher's notion of leadership will be fashioned in part by historical expectations (see, for example, Hallinger 1992). In addition, the local community will also require certain kinds of leadership performances (see, for example, Day *et al*. 2000). So, presumably, the fictitious community in which the Bash Street kids were growing up might well have looked

to the school to discipline their unruly offspring. But they might also have had hopes that their children might better themselves or, to return to our opening quotation, 'get the best' in terms of education; within the comic strip this is signified by the mortarboard, an emblem associated with a 'classical' or academic education.

If we briefly return to the 1950s, it was evident that the status of headteachers was significant (DES 1959), but where 'status' came as a consequence of the individual's 'personality' rather than their skills to manage and/or lead (Southworth 1998; Bass 1990; Yukl 1998). The head's role was seen primarily as promoting the craft of teaching and ensuring the welfare and education of the children. Heads did carry out administrative tasks, but these were relatively basic (Bell 1996). As Figure 1 indicates, from the mid1940s through to the end of the 1970s the principle of consensus operated between primary schools, LEAs and the DES – with much of the burden associated with administration happening within this partnership and hence outside of schools. That said, in the latter stages of the seventies the notion of teachers having 'responsibility posts' emerged (DES 1978; Southworth 1988). This shift in school management gathered further momentum in the early eighties when the expectations surrounding the role of the deputy headteacher were increased (DES 1982; Southworth 1988), leading to a flurry of DES-driven in-service management courses.

It is interesting to note that the ideology embedded within the Plowden report (*Children and their Primary Schools*, 1967) has crucial similarities with that around which the current Every Child Matters agenda (DfES 2003) is located. The much-quoted sentence, 'At the heart of the educational process lies the child' encapsulates both the tone and the intent of the Plowden report. Similarly, as the terminology suggests within the Every Child Matters agenda, the young child (and her family) are perceived as central in determining not only that every child gets 'the best' out of schooling but additionally that this 'best' will also work at ensuring economic prosperity, culminating in the overall wellbeing of society.

Clearly the materialisation of both the aims of the Plowden report as well as those of the Every Child Matters agenda depended, and will depend, on a number of factors and, as we have implied, leadership might well be one of them. In terms of Plowden, the translation of its embedded ideology was for the most part undertaken where the favoured style of leadership was 'educative'. Attempts have been made above to identify the salient features of this particular discourse. Crucially, heads were more 'hands on' and so as a consequence were extremely well-placed to combine theory and practice where the 'realisation of an educational culture' was a real possibility (Grace 1995: 123). Alexander *et al.* are of a similar opinion when they note that, 'Actions speak louder than words and the head-teachers' teaching can and must exemplify their vision of what the school might become' (Alexander *et al*. 1992: 48; see also NCSL 2003). But to talk of 'their vision' does carry with it first the implication that they did indeed have a vision, and second they had the capacity to share this vision with colleagues. In some respects there appears to be an expectation that heads could operate as 'exceptional leaders' where as a consequence of individual deeds, sometimes perhaps of heroic proportions, a 'vision' of what a school might become could be materialised.

Currently 'exceptional leadership' (Thrupp & Willmott 2003) is part of the discourse of 'transformation' that is put to work in order to turn around organisations, including primary schools, who are in 'special measures' (that is to say, failing) so as to revitalise their performance in terms of set standards. In returning to the materialisation of the tenets of the Plowden report one can see how in order for these to become practice there would have had to have been a need for individually 'focused' leadership (Gabriel 1997). Exceptional focused leadership, besides having some strengths, carries certain weaknesses (Harris 2003). In terms of the latter, two unhelpful consequences can be identified. First, while highlighting the

presumed superiority of leaders, the idea of 'exceptionalism' serves to residualise non-leaders as 'followers' and can consequently contribute towards a culture of dependency. A second and potentially more damaging consequence in terms of organisational capability is that exceptionalism creates strong incentives for individuals to disengage from the pursuit of career roles that carry with them expectations of leadership. That is, if organisation members learn to associate leadership with the kinds of superlative, larger than life behaviour displayed by their high profile managers, they began to feel emasculated or disempowered (Gronn 2002). Such consequences, both in terms of trying to implement the ideas embodied in Plowden as well as roll out the Every Child Matters agenda, were and will continue to be toxic.

So how do you get teachers to sign up to a 'vision'? Whether it is a vision that is influenced by Plowden, where children are 'learning by acquaintance' or whether it is where children are perceived within a salvation narrative as exemplified by the Every Child Matters discourse it seems imperative that this is a collective endeavour where notions of 'distributed leadership' operate (Harris 2003). Indeed, as the National Standards for Head-teachers (DEE 1999) note, a headteacher needs to understand the expectations of the staff 'in order to secure their commitment to her vision' (Smith 2002: 25). But, significantly, Smith also points out that problems are likely to occur when it is the headteacher's vision of the school's goals that prevails, and in so doing negates interaction between staff where aims could be formulated together. But what are the consequences when visions are instigated from above rather than from within? In part the answer is the 'Key Stage' child.

The 'Key Stage' child: the radical reconfiguration of the organisation of primary schools and leadership

Above we have been able to make tenuous links between ideological conceptualisations of the child, as manifested in Plowden and within the Every Child Matters agenda. An identifiable missing link is the 'Key Stage child' who emerged in consequence of the 1988 Education Reform Act (ERA) and was fully fashioned within the terms of the National Curriculum (NC). 'Children' disappeared from the vocabulary of teachers to be replaced with the lexicon of 'Key Stage' where Key Stage 1 refers to the infant department and Key Stage 2 the juniors. To separate children into key stages is part of the overall apparatus of regulation and normalisation. The NC, with its prescribed content, is premised on the idea that learning is linear, where regular national testing of pupils is used as a measure of school and teacher effectiveness as well as pupil performance (Aubrey 2003).

The NC was part and parcel of the marketisation of education that was augmented by Thatcher's Conservative government. Besides transforming teaching and learning within the primary school it significantly altered leadership patterns. As observed by Grace (1995: 21) and further compounded by Figure 1, 'expectations in the role of the head-teacher have now moved substantially from the cultural and pedagogic sector to the marketing, financial and presentational sectors of schooling'. In effect, two dimensions – professional/educational and executive/managerial – have to be straddled, with some commentators seeing a dangerous emphasis on the latter (Dennison & Shenton 1990; Bottery 1988; Alexander 1992; Bell & Rhodes 1996).

The implementation of the NC centralised education. With its introduction, the realisation of government education policy became less reliant on leadership skills. Through a battery of performance management mechanisms, including the regular testing of children, the publication of tests results, plus OfSTED inspections, the compliance of teachers was secured. Effectively they were placed under a regulatory gaze and as a consequence were predisposed towards what Perryman describes as 'panoptic performativity' (2006: 150). The issue of whether teachers felt committed or otherwise to the NC was immaterial (Mahony &

Hextall 2001). As Bottery notes, given such a scenario, headteachers in England 'must see themselves as strategists for implementing external directives and as monitors, evaluators and managers of teacher and pupil standards which are defined elsewhere' (Bottery 2001: 210, cited in Hatcher 2005).

Given the unprecedented scale of interventions that primary schools had to endure following the Educational Reform Act, involving what Fullan describes as 'large scale tinkering' (1993: 2), it is unsurprising that leadership patterns were adjusted. In general, heads, whilst acknowledging the value and importance of a curriculum leadership role as advocated by Alexander *et al.* (1992) and reiterated by the National College for School Leadership (NCSL), found that it – together with a regular teaching commitment – could not be managed within the plethora of administration (Webb & Vulliamy 1996). It is not too surprising therefore that delegation became key.

Following the publication of the School Teacher's Pay and Conditions of Employment document (DfES 1994), the role of deputy heads was more closely defined with part of their brief being to formulate the aims and objectives of the school, establish policies through which these could be achieved, manage staff and resources, plus monitor pupil progress. This policy document also stressed the management role of all teachers where, as an instance, there was now an expectation that teachers would participate at curriculum meetings and be actively involved in the overall administration and management of the school. Additionally, Senior Management Teams (SMTs) were evolved and by 1994 were part of schools' administrative and management fabric. Furthermore, in 1996 The National Professional Qualification for Headship was introduced by the Teacher Training Agency (TTA), which was followed in 1999 by the National Standards for Headteachers. These formed the basis for various leadership development programmes, including one for newly appointed headteachers, the Headteacher Leadership and Management Programme (HEADLAMP). Thrupp (2005) expresses a number of concerns about the introduction of national standards for headteachers, where as an instance it is felt that heads are becoming concerned that accreditation works at conformity and that there is a little critical thinking in relation to what is being taught. These training programmes are now under the auspices of the National College of School Leadership. Below we offer further details about this organisation.

Whilst one can see how it became necessary to delegate, there still remained the question of actually realising the NC within schools and the part leadership played in this. Webb notes that 'Instructional leadership' (Hopkins 2003), was 'found to be effective for bringing about change in line with government requirements' (Hopkins 2003: 85). But she further notes that, '…the pressure for conformity that it exerted fostered a school climate of fear and dependence on external guidance that stifled creativity'. However, for some teachers this notion of 'dependence' seems to have been reconfigured where there appears to be a clear sense of them welcoming the structure that the NC provides. Webb (2005), drawing on interviews with a small sample of primary teachers, identified that they perceived structures – including identifying learning goals as well as assessment techniques and recording pupil progress – as contributing towards 'improvements' in their teaching (p. 73).

Despite the climate of fear, or maybe even because of it, 'instructional leadership' has been favoured first by the Conservative government and then by New Labour – and in both instances this is because it is closely associated with raising standards (Leithwood *et al*. 1999). 'Instructional leadership' draws strength from, and is supported by, 'high reliability' systems to achieve their goals of improvement in pupil attainment (Hopkins 2003). Examples of a high reliability structure include the National Literacy Strategy (DfEE 1998) and the National Numeracy Strategy (DfEE 1999).

Winds of change?

Blair's New Labour government was elected in 1997. Those who had hopes that there might be some degree of relaxation in terms of centralised control of education would remain disappointed. One of the administration's first steps in terms of education was to introduce the 'Framework for Teaching' (DfEE 1998), of which a central element was the National Literacy Strategy. Both this and the National Numeracy Strategy which followed closely behind were directed towards raising standards. It is beyond our brief to go into close detail about either of these strategies but what is important to stress is that for some commentators they were clearly perceived as further erosions of teacher autonomy and expertise. As Gillard remarks, '…[the] Education Reform Act imposed a sterile, content based National Curriculum… [and] just when we all thought things could only get better, along came Tony Blair's New Labour Administrations. With their Literacy and Numeracy strategies, they've gone even further than the Tories, telling teachers not only what to teach but how to teach it' (Gillard 2007: 4). Similar complaints were found in teachers' responses documented between 1990 and 1996 in the Primary Assessment Curriculum and Experience project (Osborn *et al*. 2000). Additionally, there were very real concerns that a heavy emphasis on the core subjects (Literacy, Numeracy and Science) was to the detriment of subjects that included art, drama, music and ICT. Moreover, training programmes for teachers' continuing professional development (CPD) was also skewed towards core subjects, where, as Webb notes, CPD programmes were aimed to '… ensure that teachers assimilate the knowledge and skills developed externally and to train them in the adoption of prescribed best practice (p.22).

It is striking that government policy in relation to the primary curriculum and pedagogy has involved a kind of state nationalisation of curriculum, assessment and pedagogy, most notable of course through the Numeracy and Literacy strategies, but also through displacements that the basic curriculum inevitably involved. At first accountability was rigorously addressed to the 'standards' achieved by schools, expressed as enumerations of SATs, OfSTED scores and so on. Such dirigisme, as we saw, altered teachers' sense of identity and professionalism, but it also resulted in a much more subtle phenomenon. The job became less fun for teachers and pupils alike. The remorseless pursuit of grades had unhealthy effects on other educational goals; the impact of these degradations took a few years but by 2001 Secretaries of State were beginning to talk a new language of 'creativity', of 'emotional intelligence', 'personalisation' and 'self esteem'. 'Standards' were still important but there had to be more flexibility and less 'bog standard'. The displaced curricula of the 1960s and 1970s therefore began to creep back, transformed in interesting ways to a more neo-liberal incentivisation of pupils that would ensure 'global effectiveness' – a concern that had reached all the way down to early years as well as all the way up through Higher Education via the 2003 White Paper.

In Webb's (2005) views these shifts as outlined above could be accommodated within 'pedagogical leadership' (Sergiovanni 1998), which is characterised by leaders working with teachers so as to achieve shared commitments. It is reliant on the leader's capacity to build relationships and foster feelings of trust. However, the contradiction between the proclaimed intention of greater freedom for teachers and the continuing, and in some cases even stricter apparatus of centralised control over them has been noted by a number of commentators. Alexander, for example, refers to 'the Strategy's doublespeak on professional autonomy' as 'an ambiguity of intent – a desire to be seen offering freedom while in reality maintaining control' (Alexander 2004: 15; see also Richards 2004).

Summary

Recently, the concept of 'teacher leadership' has emerged in England (Muijs & Harris 2002; Frost & Durrant 2003; Day & Harris 2003). Elsewhere it is more familiar; in the USA and

Canada, for example, 'teacher leadership' is an accepted form of leadership activity where it has been demonstrated that the forms of teacher leadership and teacher collaboration have contributed towards school improvement (Harris 2003). Similarly Møller *et al.* (2005) found that leadership in Norwegian schools is almost entirely characterised by collaboration and team effort.

Within the context of English primary schools, however, the construct of 'teacher leadership' appears beset with a number of difficulties. A significant factor hampering its development as a model of leadership is the difficulty of viewing teachers as leaders within a hierarchical school system where leadership responsibilities are clearly delineated. Additionally, within schools the social exchange theory of leadership still prevails. Here, leaders provide services to a group in exchange for the group's approval or compliance with the leader's demands. The maintenance of the leader's power and authority rests on his or her continuing ability to fulfil follower obligations. Certain variations of this theory argue that by empowering their followers leaders can increase their own power (Kouzes & Posner 1995). In this sense, the leadership process is one of facilitating the personal growth of individuals or groups, which in turn brings greater benefit to the leader. This does however beg the question, if teachers were to be leaders, who would follow? What would the nature of the social exchange be and where would be the benefits? (Harris 2003)

Arguably questions such as these, plus others of course, should be encompassed within the work of the National College for School Leadership (NCSL). This was established in November 2000 and is generously funded by the DfES. It currently runs some twenty-four different school leadership programmes. In its short life it has become a 'major influence, arguably the major influence, on school leadership, management and administration in England and beyond' (Bush 2004: 243). There has been surprisingly little academic interrogation of the NCSL. Work that has been undertaken has included tracing its historical development, looking at its international role, considering its organisational features plus trying to assess its likely impact (see journal *Educational Management, Administration and Leadership* (EMAL) 2004). Whilst useful in their way such studies have had a mutual tendency to view the NCSL as a largely beneficial development. Weindling (2004) has shown that by 2002 the NCSL was funding 50 per cent of the UK research on educational leadership. Since a number of the contributors to the EMAL journal are strongly linked to the NCSL, the rather benign picture of the NCSL they paint may have partly resulted from a form of nepotism (Thrupp 2005). Similarly it was identified that school leaders who were surveyed in 2001 felt that the NCSL 'needed to show its independence and demonstrate that it was not simply another arm of the government or more specifically the DfES' (Earley & Evans 2004: 336).

It would appear that as we write primary schools in general have the potential to develop leadership models that are engendered from within individual organisations whilst simultaneously responding to external expectations. Certainly within the literature for educational leadership the discussions are located around the 'art of leadership', where inspiration, vision, non-hierarchical relationships, shared decision-making (see Anderson 2002; Harris 2003), collegiality (see Campbell 1996) and moral leadership have become prerequisites for success. Here leaders are regarded as capable in managing several competing tensions and dilemmas, and are above all people-centred and also 'invitational' (Stoll & Fink 1996). Such a leader is more likely to an 'enabler' rather than a 'controller'. There is cooperation and alignment between the values and visions of a leader and a follower. Webb's small-scale study (2005) has indicated that there are a few heads who are both evolving and testing out 'pedagogical leadership'. So, whilst standards still have to be

met and targets have to be achieved, such work is done where trust in teacher competence and faith in their professionalism to do the job are privileged.

Certainly as we write the notion of 'teacher compliance' is key. The Department for Children, Schools and Families, the National College for School Leadership and the majority of academic theorists of educational management and leadership share the view that the compliance of teachers is most effectively accomplished by securing their commitment. Indeed, Hallinger and Heck (2003) state that 'achieving results through others is the essence of leadership' (p229) and that the role of the leader is to 'help others find and embrace new goals individually and collectively'. The favoured strategy in the most recent of school management discourses is the notion of 'distributed leadership'. It is, as Gross perceives it, 'an idea whose time has come' (2000: 333). Woods (2004) defines distributed leadership as an emergent property of a group or network of interacting individuals engaged in concerted action, creating a new organisational culture, based on trust rather than regulation, in which leadership is based on 'knowledge' as opposed to 'position'. Fullan affirms that 'strong institutions have many leaders at all levels' (Fullan 1993: 64) and, additionally, Harris (2003) makes the point that 'this mode of leadership challenges the conventional orthodoxy of the single, individualistic leader' (p75). As a form of management, distributed leadership also promises a way of coping with the immense amount of information that is generated and circulated in modern societies, and of maximising chances of identifying the most relevant information and new knowledge and turning these to practical effect. In short, it empowers the many eyes, ears and brains in the organisation rather than the few (Woods 2004). For Gronn (2000), distributed agency is not the agency of individuals but 'structurally constrained conjoint agency, or the concertive labour performed between followers by pluralities of interdependent organization members' (p28). Distributed leadership can take the form of spontaneous collaboration, role sharing or institutionalised means of working together such as a committee or team structures. As such, the distinction between leaders and followers is blurred where leadership is more appropriately understood as 'fluid and emergent rather than a fixed phenomenon' (Gronn 2000: 324). It reflects the view that every person, in one way or another, can demonstrate leadership (Goleman, McKee & Boyatzis 2002). This does not mean that everyone is a leader, or should be, but it opens up the possibility for a more democratic and collective form of leadership so that 'leadership is present in the flow of activities in which a set of organisation members find themselves enmeshed' (Gronn 2000: 331). As such, leadership can be separated from an individual, or their role or notions of status, and is primarily concerned with the relationships and the connections among individuals within a school (Harris 2003).

References

Alexander R.J. (1990) 'Core subjects and autumn leaves: the National Curriculum and the languages of primary education,' in B. Moon (ed) *New Curriculum – National Curriculum.* London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Alexander R.J. (1992) *Policy and Practice in Primary Education.* London: Routledge.

Alexander, R.J., Rose, A.J. and Woodhead, C. (1992) *Curriculum Organisation and Classroom Practice in Primary Schools: a discussion paper.* London: DES.

Alexander, R.J. (1995) *Versions of Primary Education.* London: Routledge.

Alexander, R.J. (2001) *Culture and Pedagogy: international comparisons in primary education,* Oxford: Blackwell.

Alexander, R.J. (2004) 'Still no pedagogy? Principle, pragmatism and compliance in primary education', *Cambridge Journal of Education* 34(1): 7-33.

Anderson, K. (2002) *The Antecedents and Influences of Teacher Leadership in Schools. An unpublished doctorial dissertation.* Ontario Institute of Studies in Education: University of Toronto.

Apple, M. (1996) *Cultural Politics and Education*. Boston: Teachers College Press.

Aubrey, C. (2003) 'Implementing the foundation stage in reception classes', *Child Education* 36–37.

Avis, J. (2003) *Work-based Knowledge, Evidence-informed Practice and Education*. London: Blackwell.

Ball, S. (1990) *Politics and Policy-Making in Education: explorations in policy sociology.* London: Routledge.

Bass, B. (1990) *A Handbook of Leadership: theory, research and managerial applications* (3rd edition). New York: The Free Press.

Bell, C. and Rhodes, C (1996) *The Skills of Primary School Management.* London: Routledge.

Bennet, N., Crawford, M. and Cartwright, M. (eds) (2003) *Effective Educational Leadership*. London: Sage.

Bottery, M.P. (1988) 'Educational management and ethical critique', *Oxford Review of Education* 14(3): 341-351.

Bottery, M. P. (2001) 'Educational leadership and political realities', *Educational Management and Administration* 30(2): 157-174.

Bush, T. (2004) 'Editorial; The National College for School Leadership', *Educational Management, Administration and Leadership* 32(3): 243-249.

Caldwell, B.J. and Spinks, J.M. (1998) *Leading the Self-Managing School*. London: Falmer Press.

Campbell, R.J. (1996) 'The National Curriculum in primary schools: a dream at conception, a nightmare at delivery', in C. Chitty and B. Simon (eds) *Education Answers Back*. London: Lawrence and Wisehart.

Chemers, B. and Reezigt, G. (1996) 'School level conditions effecting the effectiveness of instruction', *School Effectiveness and Improvement* 7(3): 197-228.

Clarke, C. (2002) Quoted in *Education Guardian*, Wednesday 30th October, 2002, www.guardian.co.uk

Coleman, M. (2002) *Women as Headteachers: striking the balance*. Stoke on Trent: Trentham.

Coulson, A. (1985) 'The managerial behaviour of primary school heads', *CORE* 9: 2.

Dawson, P. (1994) 'Professional codes of practice and ethical conduct', *Journal of Applied Philosophy* 11(2): 169-183.

Day, C., Harris, A., Tolley, H., Hadfield, M. and Beresford, J. (2000) *Leading Schools in Times of Change*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Day, C. and Harris, A. (2003) 'Teacher leadership, reflective practice and school improvement' in K. Leithwood and P. Hallinger (eds) *Second International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.

Dean, J. (1990) *Managing the Primary School*. London: Routledge.

Dennison, W.F. and Shenton, K. (1990) 'Training professional leaders: the new school managers', *Oxford Review of Education* 16(3): 311-320.

Department for Education and Employment (1994) *School Teachers' Pay and Conditions of Employment Document*. London: DfEE.

Department for Education and Employment (1998) *The National Literacy Strategy: framework for teaching literacy from reception to year 6.* London: DfEE.

Department for Education and Employment (1999) *National Standards for Headteachers*. London: DfEE.

Department for Education and Employment (1999) *The National Numeracy Strategy: framework for teaching mathematics from reception to year 6*. London: DfEE.

Department for Education and Science (1959) *The Schools' Regulations, 1959*. London: HMSO

Department for Education and Science (1978) *Primary Education in England: a survey of HM Inspectors of Schools*. London: HMSO.

Department for Education and Science (1982) *The New Teacher in School*. HMSO, London.

Department of Education and Science (1988) *The Education Reform Act*. London: HMSO.

Department for Education and Skills (2003) *Excellence and Enjoyment*. London: DfES.

Department for Education and Skills (2003) *Every Child Matters*. London: Stationery Office.

Dixon, N.M. and Ross, R. (1999) 'The organisational learning cycle', in P. Senge (ed.) *The Dance of Change*. New York: Currency/Doubleday.

Du Gay, P. and Hall, S. (1996) (eds) *Questions of Cultural Identity*. London: Sage.

Earley, P. and Evans, J. (2004) 'Making a difference', *Education Management, Administration and Leadership* 32(3): 325-338.

Everton, T., Turner, P., Hargreaves, L., Pell, T. (2007) 'Public perceptions of the teaching profession', *Research Papers in Education* 22(3): 247-265.

Francis, B. (2001) 'Commonality AND difference: attempts to escape from theoretical dualisms in emancipatory research in education', *International Studies in Sociology of Education* 11(4): 381-393.

Frost, D. and Durrant, J. (2003) *Teacher-led Development Work: guidance and support*. London: David Fulton Press.

Fullan, M. (1993) *Change Forces: probing the depths of educational reform*. Bristol: Falmer Press.

Fullan, M. and Stiegelbauer, S. (1991). *The New Meaning of Educational Change*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Galton, M. (1995) *Crisis in the Primary Classroom*. London: David Fulton Publishers.

Gabriel, Y. (1997) 'Meeting God: when organisational members come face to face with the supreme leader'. *Human Relations* 50(4): 313-342.

Gillard, D. (2007) Editorial, *Forum* 9(1 & 2).

Goleman, D., McKee, A., Boyatzis, R.E. (2002) *Primal leadership: realizing the power of emotional intelligence*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Publishing.

Grace, G. (1995) *School Leadership: beyond education management*. London: FalmerPress.

Gronn, P. (2000) 'Distributed properties: a new architecture for leadership', *Educational Management and Administration* 28(3): 317-338.

Gronn, P. (1999) *The Making of Educational Leaders*. London: Cassell.

Gronn, P. (2002) 'Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis', *Leadership Quarterly* 13(4): 423-451.

Gronn, P. (2003) 'Leadership: who needs it?' *School Leadership and Management* 23(3): 267-290.

Gross, M. L. (2000) 'Sustaining change through leadership mentoring at one reforming high school', *Journal of In-Service Education* 28(1): 35-49.

Hall, V. and Southworth, G. (1997) 'Headship', *School Leadership and Management* 17(2): 151-170.

Hallinger, P. (1992) 'The evolving role of American principals: from managerial to instructional to transformational leaders', *Journal of Educational Administration* 30(3): 35–48.

Hallinger, P. and Heck, R.H. (1996) 'Reassessing the headteacher's role in school effectiveness: a review of empirical research, 1980-1995', *Educational Administration Quarterly* 32(1): 35-44.

Hallinger, P. and Heck, R. (2003) 'Understanding the principal's contribution to school improvement', in M. Wallace and L. Poulson (eds) *Learning to Read Critically in Educational Leadership and Management*. London: Sage.

Hargreaves, L., Cunningham, M., Everton, T., Hansen, A., Hopper, B., McIntyre, D., Maddock, M., Mukherjee, M., Pell, T., Rouse, M., Turner, P., and Wilson, L. (2006) *The Status of Teachers and the Teaching Profession. Views from Inside and Outside the Profession Interim Findings from the Teacher Status Project.* DfES Research Report RR755.

Hargreaves, L., Cunningham, M., Hansen, A., McIntyre, D., Oliver, C., Pell, T. (2007) *The status of teachers and the teaching profession in England: views from inside and outside the profession. Final report of the Teacher Status Project*. Research Report 831A. London: DfES.

Harris, A., Bennett, N. and Preedy, M. (Eds) (1997) *Organizational Effectiveness and Improvement in Education.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Harris, A. (2003) 'Teacher leadership as distributed leadership: heresy, fantasy or possibility?' *School Leadership and Management* 23(3): 313-324.

Harris, A., Day, C., Hopkins, D., Hadfield, M., Hargreaves, A. and Chapman, C. (2003) *Effective Leadership for School Improvement*. New York: Routledge.

Hartle, F. and Thomas, K. (2003) *Growing Tomorrow's School Leaders*. NCSL. [Available: http://www.ncsl.org.uk/media/F7B/95/randd-hartle-growing-leaders-full.pdf]

Hatcher, R. (2005) 'The distribution of leadership and power in schools', *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 26(2): 253-267.

Hayes, T. (2005) 'Rising stars and sitting tenants: a picture of deputy headship in one London borough and how some of its schools are preparing deputies for leadership', *Summary Practitioner Enquiry Report*. Nottingham: National College for School Leadership.

Heck, R.H. and Hallinger, P. (2005) 'The study of educational leadership and management: where does the field stand today?' *Educational Management Administration and Leadership* 33(2): 229-244.

Hopkins, D. (2003) 'Instructional leadership and school improvement', in A. Harris, C. Day, D. Hopkins, M. Hadfield, A. Hargreaves and C. Chapman (eds) *Effective Leadership for School Improvement*. New York: Routledge.

Hopkins, D. and Jackson, B. (2003) 'Building the capacity for leading and learning', in A. Harris, C. Day, D. Hopkins, M. Hadfield, A. Hargreaves and C. Chapman (eds) *Effective Leadership for School Improvement*. New York: Routledge.

HMSO (2003) *White Paper on Higher Education*. London.

Kouzes, J.M. and Posner, B.Z. (1995) *The Leadership Challenge: how to keep getting extraordinary things done in organisations*. San Fracisco: Jossey Bass.

Lawlor, H. and Sills, P. (1999) 'Successful leadership – evidence from highly effective headteachers', *Improving Schools* 2(2): 53–60.

Leithwood, K. and Seashore, L.K. (1998) 'Organizational learning: an introduction', in K. Leithwood and L.K. Seashore (eds) *Organizational Learning in Schools*. Lisse: Swets and Zeitlinger.

Leithwood, K., Leonard, L. and Seashore, L.K. (1999) *Changing Leadership for Changing Schools*. Buckinghan: Open University Press.

Maguire, M. and Ball, S.J. (1994) 'Researching politics and the politics of research', *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 7(3): 269-286

Mahony, P. and Hextall, I. (2001) 'Performing and conforming', in D. Gleeson and C. Husbands (eds) *The Performing School*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Møller, J., Eggen, A., Fuglestad, O., Langfeldt, G., Prethus, A., Skrøvset, S., Stjerstrøm, E., and Vedøy, G. (2005) 'Successful school leadership: the Norwegian case', *Journal of Educational Administration* 43(6): 584-594.

Mortimer, P. (1998) *The Road to Improvement: reflections on school effectiveness*. Lisse: Swets and Zeitlinger.

Mortimer, P., Sammons, P., Stoll, L., Lewis, D. and Ecob, R. (1988) *School Matters: the junior years*. London: Open Books.

Muijs, D. and Harris A. (2002) *Teacher Leadership: principles and practice*. [Available: http://www.teachers.org.uk/resources/pdf/teacher-leadership.pdf]

National College for School Leadership (2004) *Final Report*. Nottingham: NCSL.

National College for School Leadership (2003) *Sustaining Improvement in the Primary School: leadership programme for primary school leaders*. Nottingham: NCSL.

Nicholls, J. (2002) 'Escape the leadership jungle: try high-profile management', *Journal of General Management* 27(3): 14-35.

Osborn, M., McNess, E., Broadfoot, P., Pollard, A. and Triggs, P. (2000) *What Teachers Do: changing policy and practice in primary education*. London: Continuum.

Osgood, J. (2006) 'Deconstructing professionalism in early childhood education: resisting the regulatory gaze', *Contemporary Issues in Childhood* 7(1): 5-14

Osgood, J. (2005) 'Rethinking professionalism in the early years: perspectives from the United Kingdom'. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood* 7(1): 1-4

Ozga, J. (2000) *Policy Research in Educational Settings: contested terrain*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Ozga, J. and Lawn, M. (1981) *Teacher Professionalism and Class: a study of organised teachers.* London: Falmer Press.

Perryman, P. (2006) 'Panoptic performativity and school inspection regimes: disciplinary mechanisms and life under special measures', *Journal of Education Policy* 21(2): 147-161.

Plowden Report (1967) *Children and their Primary Schools*, a report of the Central Advisory Council for Education. London: HMSO.

Pollard, A. and Triggs, P. (2001) *What pupils say*. London: Continuum.

Richards, C. (2004, Feb 20th) 'It's sharp, but is it clever?' *Times Educational Supplement*: 21.

Riley, A.K. and Seashore, L. (2000) *Leadership for Change and School Reform*. London: Routledge.

Sammons, P. (1999) *School Effectiveness: coming of age in the 21st century*. Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Sergiovanni, T.J. (1992) *Moral Leadership: getting to the heart of school improvement*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Sergiovanni, T.J. (1998) 'Leadership as pedagogy, capital development and school effectiveness', *International Journal of Leadership in Education* 1(1): 37–46.

Silins, H. (1994) 'Leadership characteristics and school improvement', *Australian Journal of Education* 38(3): 266-81.

Sachs, J. (2001) 'Teacher professional identity: competing discourses, competing outcomes', *Journal of Education Policy* 16(2):149-161

Simkins, T. (2005) 'Leadership in education; "what works" or "what makes sense"?' *Educational Management, Administration and Leadership* 33(1): 9-26.

Smith, M. (2002) 'The school leadership initiative: an ethically flawed project?' *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 36(1): 21-39.

Smith, S. and Piele, P. (1996) 'Better preparation for educational leaders', *Educational Researcher* 25(9): 18-27.

Southworth, G. (1988) 'Looking at leadership: English primary school headteachers at work', *Education 3–13* 16(2): 53–6.

Southworth, G. (1998) *Leading and Improving Primary Schools: the work of headteachers and deputy headteachers*. London: Falmer Press.

Southworth, G. (2004) *Primary Leadership in Context*. London: Routledge.

Stalhammer, B. (1994) 'Goal-orientated leadership in Swedish schools', *Educational Management and Administration* 22(1):14 –25.

Stoll, L. and Fink, D. (1996) *Changing our Schools*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Strang, D. and Macy, M. (2001) 'In search of excellence: fads, success stories and adaptive emulation', *American Journal of Sociology* 107(1): 147-182

Stronach, I. and Morris, B. (1994) 'Polemic notes on educational evaluation in the age of "policy hysteria"', *Evaluation and Research in Education* 8(1/2): 5-19

Stronach, I., Corbin, B., McNamara, O., Stark, S., Warne, T. (2002) 'Towards an uncertain politics of professionalism: teacher and nurse identities in flux', *Journal of Education Policy* 17(1): 109-138.

Sure Start Unit (2004) *Childcare and Early Years Workforce Survey*. London: Sure Start Unit.

Thrupp, M. (2005) 'The National College for School Leadership: a critique', *Management in Education* 19(2): 13-19. [Available: http://mie.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/19/2/13. Accessed 03.01.07].

Thrupp, M. and Willmott, R. (2003) *Educational Management in Managerialist Times: beyond the textual apologists*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Walkerdine, V. (2003) 'Reclassifying upward mobility: femininity and the neoliberal subject', *Gender and Education* 15(3): 285-301

Webb, R. (2005) 'Leading teaching and learning in the primary school: from "educative leadership" to "pedagogical leadership"', *Education Management, Administration and Leadership* 33(1): 69-91.

Webb R. and Vulliamy, G. (1996) *Roles and Responsibilities in the Primary School: changing demands, changing practices*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Weindling, D. (2004) *Innovation in Headteacher Induction: case study research carried out for the National College for School Leadership*. [Available: http://www.ncsl.org.uk/media/F7B/95/randd-innov-case-studies.pdf. Accessed 03.01.07].

Welch, G. and Mahony, P. (2000) 'The teaching profession', in J. Docking (ed) *New Labour's Policies for Schools: raising the standards?* London: Fulton.

Woods, P. (2004) 'Democratic leadership: drawing distinctions with distributed leadership', *International Journal of Leadership in Education* 7(1): 3026.

Yukl, G. (1998) *Leadership in Organisations* (4th edition). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

APPENDIX 1

THE PRIMARY REVIEW PERSPECTIVES, THEMES AND SUB THEMES

The Primary Review's enquiries are framed by three broad perspectives, the third of which, primary education, breaks down into ten themes and 23 sub-themes. Each of the latter then generates a number of questions. The full framework of review perspectives, themes and questions is at www.primaryreview.org.uk

The Review Perspectives

P1   Children and childhood
P2   Culture, society and the global context
P3   Primary education

The Review Themes and Sub-themes

T1   Purposes and values
           T1a   Values, beliefs and principles
           T1b   Aims

T2   Learning and teaching
           T2a   Children's development and learning
           T2b   Teaching

T3   Curriculum and assessment
           T3a   Curriculum
           T3b   Assessment

T4   Quality and standards
           T4a   Standards
           T4b   Quality assurance and inspection

T5   Diversity and inclusion
           T5a   Culture, gender, race, faith
           T5b   Special educational needs

T6   Settings and professionals
           T6a   Buildings and resources
           T6b   Teacher supply, training, deployment & development
           T6c   Other professionals
           T6d   School organisation, management & leadership
           T6e   School culture and ethos

T7   Parenting, caring and educating
           T7a   Parents and carers
           T7b   Home and school

T8   Beyond the school
           T8a   Children's lives beyond the school
           T8b   Schools and other agencies

T9   Structures and phases
           T9a   Within-school structures, stages, classes & groups
           T9b   System-level structures, phases & transitions

T10   Funding and governance
           T10a   Funding
           T10b   Governance

APPENDIX 2

THE EVIDENTIAL BASIS OF THE PRIMARY REVIEW

The Review has four evidential strands. These seek to balance opinion seeking with empirical data; non-interactive expressions of opinion with face-to-face discussion; official data with independent research; and material from England with that from other parts of the UK and from international sources. This enquiry, unlike some of its predecessors, looks outwards from primary schools to the wider society, and makes full though judicious use of international data and ideas from other countries.

Submissions

Following the convention in enquiries of this kind, submissions have been invited from all who wish to contribute. By June 2007, nearly 550 submissions had been received and more were arriving daily. The submissions range from brief single-issue expressions of opinion to substantial documents covering several or all of the themes and comprising both detailed evidence and recommendations for the future. A report on the submissions will be published in late 2007.

Soundings

This strand has two parts. The *Community Soundings* are a series of nine regionally based one to two day events, each comprising a sequence of meetings with representatives from schools and the communities they serve. The Community Soundings took place between January and March 2007, and entailed 87 witness sessions with groups of pupils, parents, governors, teachers, teaching assistants and heads, and with educational and community representatives from the areas in which the soundings took place. In all, there were over 700 witnesses. The *National Soundings* are a programme of more formal meetings with national organisations both inside and outside education. National Soundings A are for representatives of non-statutory national organisations, and they focus on educational policy. National Soundings B are for outstanding school practitioners; they focus on school and classroom practice. National Soundings C are variably-structured meetings with statutory and other bodies. National Soundings A and B will take place between January and March 2008. National Soundings C are outlined at 'other meetings' below.

Surveys

30 surveys of published research relating to the Review's ten themes have been commissioned from 70 academic consultants in universities in Britain and other countries. The surveys relate closely to the ten Review themes and the complete list appears in Appendix 3. Taken together, they will provide the most comprehensive review of research relating to primary education yet undertaken. They are being published in thematic groups from October 2007 onwards.

Searches

With the co-operation of DfES/DCSF, QCA, Ofsted, TDA and OECD, the Review is re-assessing a range of official data bearing on the primary phase. This will provide the necessary demographic, financial and statistical background to the Review and an important resource for its later consideration of policy options.

Other meetings (now designated National Soundings C)

In addition to the formal evidence-gathering procedures, the Review team meets members of various national bodies for the exchange of information and ideas: government and opposition representatives; officials at DfES/DCSF, QCA, Ofsted, TDA, GTC, NCSL and IRU; representatives of the teaching unions; and umbrella groups representing organisations involved in early years, primary education and teacher education. The first of three sessions with the House of Commons Education and Skills Committee took place in March 2007. Following the replacment of DfES by two separate departments, DCSF and DIUS, it is anticipated that there will be further meetings with this committee's successor.

APPENDIX 3

THE PRIMARY REVIEW INTERIM REPORTS

The interim reports, which are being released in stages from October 2007, include the 29 (initially 30) research surveys commissioned from external consultants together with reports on two of the Review's many public consultations: the community soundings (87 regional witness sessions held during 2007) and the submissions received from organisations and individuals in response to the invitation issued when the Review was launched in October 2006. The research surveys are listed below by Review theme, not by the order of their publication. Once published, each report, together with a briefing summarising its findings and overviews and press releases for each group of reports, may be downloaded from the Review website, www.primaryreview.org.uk.

REPORTS ON PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS

Community soundings: the Primary Review regional witness sessions.

Submissions received by the Primary Review.

REPORTS ON THE SURVEYS OF RESEARCH AND OTHER PUBLISHED EVIDENCE

THEME 1:   PURPOSES AND VALUES

1/1   *Aims as policy in English primary education*, by John White, University of London Institute of Education.

1/2   *Aims and values in primary education: England and other countries*, by Maha Shuayb and Sharon O'Donnell, National Foundation for Educational Research.

1/3   *Aims for primary education: the changing national context*, by Stephen Machin and Sandra McNally, University College London and London Schools of Economics and Political Science.

1/4   *Aims for primary education: changing global contexts*, by Hugh Lauder, John Lowe and Rita Chawla-Duggan, University of Bath.

THEME 2:   LEARNING AND TEACHING

2/1a   *Children's cognitive development and learning*, by Usha Goswami, University of Cambridge, and Peter Bryant, University of Oxford.

2/1b   *Children's social development, peer interaction and classroom learning*, by Christine Howe and Neil Mercer, University of Cambridge.

2/2   *Primary teaching and teachers*, by Robin Alexander and Maurice Galton, University of Cambridge.

2/4   *Learning and teaching in primary schools: insights from TLRP*, by Mary James and Andrew Pollard, University of London Institute of Education.

THEME 3:   CURRICULUM AND ASSESSMENT

3/1   *Curriculum and assessment policy: England and other countries*, by Kathy Hall, National University of Ireland, and Kamil Øzerk, University of Oslo.

3/2   *The trajectory and impact of national reform: curriculum and assessment in English primary schools*, by Dominic Wyse, University of Cambridge, and Elaine McCreery and Harry Torrance, Manchester Metropolitan University.

3/3   *Primary curriculum futures*, by James Conroy, Moira Hulme and Ian Menter, University of Glosgow.

3/4   *The quality of learning: assessment alternatives for primary education*, by Wynne Harlen, University of Bristol

THEME 4:   QUALITY AND STANDARDS

4/1   *Standards and quality in English primary schools over time: the national evidence*, by Peter Tymms and Christine Merrell, University of Durham.

4/2   *Standards in English primary education: the international evidence*, by Chris Whetton, Graham Ruddock and Liz Twist, National Foundation for Educational Research.

4/3   *Quality assurance in English primary education*, by Peter Cunningham and Philip Raymont, University of Cambridge.

THEME 5:   DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION

5/1   *Children in primary education: demography, culture, diversity and inclusion*, by Mel Ainscow, Alan Dyson and Frances Gallanaugh, University of Manchester, and Jean Conteh, University of Leeds.

5/2   *Learning needs and difficulties among children of primary school age: definition, identification, provision and issues*, by Harry Daniels and Jill Porter, University of Bath.

5/3   *Children and their primary schools: pupils' voices*, by Carol Robinson, University of Sussex, and Michael Fielding, University of London Institute of Education.

THEME 6:   SETTINGS AND PROFESSIONALS

6/1   *Primary schools: the built environment*, by Karl Wall, Julie Dockrell and Nick Peacey, University of London Institute of Education.

6/2   *Primary schools: the professional environment*, by Liz Jones, Andy Pickard and Ian Stronach, Manchester Metropolitan University.

6/3   *Primary teachers: initial teacher education, continuing professional development and school leadership development*, by Olwen McNamara and Rosemary Webb, Manchester University, and Mark Brundrett, Liverpool John Moores University.

6/4   *Primary workforce management and reform*, by Hilary Burgess, Open University.

THEME 7:   PARENTING, CARING AND EDUCATING

7/1   *Parenting, caring and educating*, by Yolande Muschamp, Felicity Wikeley, Tess Ridge and Maria Balarin, University of Bath.

THEME 8:   BEYOND THE SCHOOL

8/1   *Children's lives outside school and their educational impact*, by Berry Mayall, University of London Institute of Education.

8/2   *Primary schools and other agencies*, by Ian Barron, Rachel Holmes and Maggie MacLure, Manchester Metropolitan University, and Katherine Runswick-Cole, University of Sheffield.

THEME 9:   STRUCTURES AND PHASES

9/1   *The structure of primary education: England and other countries*, by Anna Riggall and Caroline Sharp, National Foundation for Educational Research.

9/2   *Classes, groups and transitions: structures for teaching and learning,* by Peter Blatchford, Susan Hallam and Judith Ireson, University of London Institute of Education, and Peter Kutnick, Kings College, University of London, with Andrea Creech, University of London Institute of Education.

THEME 10:   FUNDING AND GOVERNANCE

10/1   *The funding of English primary education*, by Philip Noden and Anne West, London School of Economics and Political Science.

10/2   *The governance and administration of English primary education*, by Maria Balarin and Hugh Lauder, University of Bath.

The Primary Review is a wide-ranging independent enquiry into the condition and future
of primary education in England. It is supported by Esmée Fairbairn Foundation,
based at the University of Cambridge and directed by Robin Alexander.
The Review was launched in October 2006 and aims to publish its final report in autumn 2008.

FURTHER INFORMATION

www.primaryreview.org.uk

General enquiries: enquiries@primaryreview.org.uk

Media enquiries: richard@margrave.co.uk