‘PRINCIPALED PRINCIPALS? VALUES-DRIVEN LEADERSHIP: EVIDENCE FROM TEN CASE
STUDIES OF “OUTSTANDING” SCHOOL LEADERS’

The intrusion of values into the decision-making process is not only inevitable, it is the
very substance of decision. (Hodgkinson, 1978: 5)

Introduction

This article, which explores both theoretically and empirically aspects of the ‘moral art’
of educational leadership (Hodgkinson, 1991), is based partly upon close observation of
10 ‘outstanding’ principals working in different kinds of school in England, each of which
was judged by separate teams of the government’s Office for Standards in Education
(Ofsted) inspectors as providing a high quality education. In arriving at such a judgement
about any school, inspectors look out for four things in particular: the degree to which the
school’s leadership and management is ‘effective’ and ‘efficient’, with emphasis on the
promotion of high standards of teaching and learning; the ‘effectiveness of the school’s
performance evaluation’; the way the school uses its human and other resources and
promotes ‘best value’; and how the school works with its governing body (Holmes, 2000:
49).

Recent research by Hay McBer (Forde et al., 2000; Hay Group, 2001) for the National
College for School Leadership1 (NCSL) reports that, at the heart of their ‘Model of Excel-
ence’, ‘is a core of strongly-held and enacted VALUES’ (their emphasis). The college’s
view of the essential qualities of school leadership reinforces this view in a series of propos-
itions which focus on values, creating an active learning community, and on the import-
ance of distributed leadership (NCSL, 2001). The more technicist and managerial view of
school leadership operationalized by the government’s inspection regime is thus slightly
at odds with the more values-driven view promoted by the college. The key question,
however, is how school leaders accommodate the possible tensions between these two
images of leadership, one of which is focused on ‘efficiency, effectiveness and perform-
ance’, the other on ‘values, learning communities and shared leadership’?

The aim of this article is to offer a series of operational images of how the ‘outstanding’
principals we investigated worked with the grain of this tension accommodation,
specifically by translating their educational values into management and leadership
practices.
In seeking to achieve this aim, we take for granted that school leaders are essentially ‘value-carriers’ (Greenfield, 1986), and that the kind of educational values they seek to reproduce in their leadership and management practices articulate with, and have consequences for, the quality of education provided by the schools within which they work. To that extent, we subscribe to the view that school improvement is not a technocratic science, but rather a process of seeking ever better ways of embodying particular educational values in the working practices, including management structures, of particular schools. We thus endorse the NCCL’s proposal that school leadership must be ‘values-driven’ (NCCL, 2001: 5), while daring, in the way that it does not, to suggest explicitly what these values might be and how they might be reflected in practice.

Educational Values and Models of Leadership

We begin this process of elaboration, however, by reflecting on the range of values that interpenetrate and underpin the two prescriptive models of school leadership that currently have pre- eminent status in England. By ‘pre-eminent’, we mean to refer to the extent to which these models feature prominently, in one combined guise or another, both in contemporary academic school management discourse and the programmes of study delivered by school leadership training providers in the same national context.

Transformational leadership models conceptualize school leadership along a number of dimensions, including building school vision, establishing commitment to agreed goals, providing intellectual stimulation, offering individualized support and explicated and encouraging high expectations for staff (Bass, 1999; Campbell et al., forthcoming). As this list indicates, this model of school leadership focuses on the people involved—relationships between them, in particular—and requires an approach that seeks to transform staff feelings, attitudes and beliefs. The implication too is that this model entails building a consensus among the staff group, grounded in a common commitment to seek improvement. Common commitment of this kind requires a conception of leadership that is neither linked to status nor embodied in the actions of any single individual, but rather dispersed or shared throughout the school and, as such, is available to everyone.

Transformational models of school leadership articulate with other approved models in the field, in particular those that emphasize inclusivity and greater teacher participation. They also underpin models of school leadership that stress the important psychological function that communicating positive invitational messages has for enabling individuals and groups to build and act on a shared vision of enhanced learning for pupils (Stoll and Fink, 1996). In addition, transformational models are informed by the suggestion that leadership status in schools cannot be assumed, but rather is more often conferred by followers when they perceive their values being fulfilled in the outlooks and actions of those occupying positions of leadership responsibility (see Gronn, 1999). Typical leadership actions associated with transformational models include: mobilizing commitment to an explicit educational vision that is corporately agreed; coaching and mentoring designed to support individuals and increase leadership capacity generally; visible dispersal of leadership responsibilities throughout the staff group whose members are trusted to initiate and complete tasks; and group decision-making that is highly participatory, open and democratic.

The transformational approach to school leadership suffers from one major limitation, however. For while it can contribute positively to such institution-level effects as
organizational learning, and has good repercussions for teachers’ professional commitment and job satisfaction, and possibly also for retention, there is no evidence to suggest that, on its own, it brings about anything but modest improved consequences for pupil outcomes. Which is where its complement, the *instructional or pedagogical leadership model*, comes into play. This model typically assumes that the critical focus for attention by school leaders should be the behaviours of staff as they engage in activities directly affecting the quality of teaching and learning in the pursuit of enhanced pupil outcomes. Central to this is the need for leaders to think critically about how to develop a greater capacity to articulate specific educational values around the teacher–learner transaction—that is to say, to consider ways their schools might better embody, in their actual work undertaken with pupils in classrooms, the aims expressed in their mission statements, which frequently give rhetorical allegiance to, among other things, the importance of enquiry-based and individualized learning approaches.

There are, of course, many *organizational* matters that school leaders can work at to enable improved learning to take place in classrooms. For example, they can control better the constraints on the amount of time pupils spend on particular tasks; they can also differently legislate for the number of pupils in particular classrooms and their mix of gender, ethnicity or ages; they can influence too the working patterns of teachers by rearranging physical space and ‘free’ time to promote new norms of collegiality and experimentation; and they can use discretionary resources (money, release time, etc.) to encourage and enhance innovative instructional activity. At the same time, they can foster agreement about the appropriate level of teacher-expectation needed to encourage higher levels of pupil motivation; and they can facilitate debate about what counts as a ‘good lesson’. What theories of learning are appropriate to the achievement of particular curricular objectives, and the form feedback received by pupils should take on what is acceptable performance in school.

School leaders who take seriously their instructional role are concerned to promote and develop their schools as learning systems or professional learning communities. In doing so, such leaders exemplify the qualities of good learners through undertaking themselves continuing professional development, and encouraging and enabling others to do the same. Indeed, becoming one of the school’s ‘lead-learners’ is a distinguishing characteristic of instructional leadership. So, too, is an open-minded, enquiry-based attitude to the education project which thrives on experimentation, though not as an end in itself, but rather as the means of developing ever better pedagogical strategies that are selected in order to bring about the learning goals the school has for its pupils (see Hopkins, 2001; Hopkins and Reynolds, 2001).

The *educational* values that provide the raison d’etre of these two models of school leadership are not difficult to disinter. They include (partly after Bottery, 1992: 186) the suggestion that leadership should be:

- transformative;
- dispersed, democratic even;
- invitational and consensual;
- visionary and optimistic;
- empowering and trusting;
- educative, for staff and students alike;
- consultative and respectful;
• inclusive and participatory;
• critical, sceptical and experimental.

However, the ultimate focus of school leadership practice—that is, the efficient and effective preparation of young people to be productive members of society—is, in the end, defined by the government, thus leaving school leaders in a position of what Wright (2001) terms ‘bastard leadership’. He notes:

Leadership as the moral and value underpinning for the direction of schools is being removed from those who work there. It is now very substantially located at the political level where it is not available for contestation, modification or adjustment to local variations. (2001: 280)

Wright argues that school leaders cannot exercise leadership over the values and direction of schooling, since these are decided at the political level. They are measured through performance (league) tables and inspection regimes that are nationally defined and not necessarily responsive to local circumstances. Thus, the transformational and instructional school leadership models can be applied only in relation to tightly defined goals which are set outside the schools and which take little account of the values and aspirations of those working within them as school leaders.

In a similar fashion, the models of effective leadership offered by both Ofsted (an outcomes-focused model) and the NCSL (a process-focused model) are also imposed from outside. And while, too, our own descriptions of these models include typical and appropriate behaviours, none of this analysis is empirically grounded, but rather, like the models themselves, expressed prescriptively. Accordingly, in a later section of this article, we provide a series of data-driven descriptive accounts of ‘leadership in action’ that exemplify in practice what the values outlined might look like on the ground. But, before that, we intend briefly to outline how we obtained these data and generated our accounts.

Casing the Case Studies

The study of leadership of schools in England, of which our case studies formed a central part, was funded by the Department for Education and Skills and lasted just over a year (Earley et al., 2002). It was set up largely to collect ‘baseline’ data about school leadership which could be used by the DfES and the recently established NCSL to inform their work. The research addressed a number of themes including: how different leaders understand their leadership roles and the value they place on them; the general attractiveness of particular school leadership positions; the quality of people’s preparedness for leadership positions; the degree to which principals or headteachers regard themselves as belonging to an evidence-based profession; the sources of ideas and inspiration that school leaders turn to in the course of undertaking their work; the degree to which ICT and the world wide web is used to both access and contribute to best practice evidence; and the level of school leaders’ awareness of the remit and role of the NCSL, and their perceptions of how they might become involved in its work.

In order to address these questions a research design was constructed which made use of a mixture of quantitative and qualitative data-collecting techniques, including case studies of 10 well-led schools. The case-study school visits were made chiefly to examine
and report on the specific ways in which outstanding leaders operated within particular contexts and it is the data derived from these visits that we report on here. The case studies consisted of visits to four primary (elementary), four secondary (high) and two special schools, located in contrasting settings, chosen on the basis of recent Ofsted inspection reports in which the schools’ leadership and management were highly rated. Their excellence in this regard was confirmed by telephone calls to local education authority (LEA) advisers. The case studies were not ethnographies nor did they involve the researchers in detailed observational work while on site. Rather they involved visits, on average lasting up to two days per school, during which interviews were conducted with key informants, including the headteacher, the chair of governors, members of the senior management (or leadership) team, middle managers and classroom teachers. Opportunities were also found to elicit informally the views of pupils. In addition, information was gathered from various documentary sources (e.g. school inspection reports and action plans, development and improvement plans, minutes of governing body meetings, governor reports to parents) and opportunities taken, when possible, to observe leadership team meetings. Finally, perceptions of and views about each school were sought from its ‘link’ or ‘patch’ LEA adviser, who was subjected to a telephone interview.

The data from each school were written up as 10 case studies with the intention of giving a vivid description of ‘leadership in action’ (see Earley et al., 2002). It is to this data source that we now turn.

**Leadership in Action**

Several themes about school leadership in action emerged from our data, some of them about the leadership of the school in general (including members of the governing body/school board, key parents and middle managers within the school) and some of them directly about the school leaders. This section focuses on the data we collected which seems to us to portray most clearly connections between the school leaders’ values and their leadership in action.

The school leaders in our case-study schools were clearly avoiding doing ‘bastard leadership’ by mediating government policy through their own values systems. We were constantly reminded by those to whom we spoke of the schools’ strong value systems and the extent to which vision and values were shared and articulated by all who were involved in them. Interviewees in three of the 10 schools used the name of their school as a descriptor for the way they do things, as in ‘K ... nites’ who had absorbed the supportive and egalitarian ethos of the school, or the ‘B ... way of doing things’ and the ‘E ... way’ which was meant to denote a liberal, broad-based and inclusive approach to education. In almost all the schools, staff commented on the importance of teamwork as a way of developing and sharing vision and values, and as a means of making sure that they shared the same values and adopted the same approach to the young people and to learning and teaching in the school. The whole idea of sharing and teamwork within staff groups could be difficult to foster at a time when external forces (e.g. pay differentials and performance management) could so easily encourage internal competition.

We were keen to explore the ways in which school leaders managed to promote and encourage such shared values. It seems to us that almost all of them retained, articulated and communicated their values by:
• working with, managing and even searching out change;
• paying careful attention to information management within the school—thus keeping staff constantly informed;
• working very closely and sometimes seamlessly with their leadership groups;
• developing leadership capacity and responsibility throughout their schools.

Working with Constant Change
Most of the school leaders described mediating change, negotiating it effectively and adapting it to fit the school’s values and ethos. Despite their different levels of acceptance of change, all the school leaders were clear that they responded to the changes they thought were important and necessary, fitting them into their own priorities for the school. They varied from those who went to look for new challenges and new ways of extending the role of the school, to those who were selective about chosen changes, and made sure that the changes enhanced what the school was trying to do.

Several of the school leaders were generally proactive in their attitude to change, although for reportedly different reasons: one was good at ‘environmental scanning’, in order to anticipate ‘what is coming along and preparing ourselves for it, so that when it does happen it’s not such a shock’. Another told us ‘if you don’t do something different, you won’t move on’. In another school a member of staff remarked that the head was ‘good at saying “let’s take the good bits”’, but was reluctant to take up the latest government initiative (in this case, that of becoming a professional development or ‘Beacon’ school) because it was felt that one more initiative might cause them to ‘take their eye off the ball’. We also heard about a school which had taken on several new initiatives where the school leader explained to us that the new initiatives ‘make the school feel good about itself and give people a chance to raise their own game and learn’. Yet another case-study school leader used ICT to research and bring back new ideas to the school.

Several of those we interviewed described the process of mediating new initiatives through the school’s value systems as a reflective activity shared by all the staff: ‘We’re never stagnant . . . it’s because we never really leave things that long without review . . . we’re questioning all the time, it’s constant review’. Another school leader who believed that ‘change must be at the shop-floor if it is to be effective’ and was seen by the staff and governors as a visionary, did not believe in change for change’s sake—not all initiatives were considered to be good for the school, but all must go through a filtering process of ‘a healthy disrespect for change’. A school leader of a nursery and infants school protected her staff from multiple innovations by filtering external demands to try to ensure that ‘we do what we think is best for our children’. She thought that the self-confidence and assurance that had grown during her leadership tenure ensured that she was not ‘jumping simply because someone tells you to jump’.

Keeping Staff Informed
In our initial interview schedule, we did not ask about information management and meetings—we asked about how decisions were made in the school. But frequently we were told about the importance of meetings as decision-making spaces and about the amount of information made available to staff. Meetings can be seen as the visible manifestation of a school leader’s values system: clear ideals about respecting, transforming, developing and including staff can be evidenced by the importance given to meetings in a school and by the way they are run. The amount of information that is accessible to staff is also a
values-led decision—notions of secrecy and exclusion from information do not encourage trust and empowerment or even informed decision-making. Many of the school leaders saw resources (in which they included information) as key to the development of their schools, and they either secured information (about funding, research and evidence about new initiatives) themselves, or encouraged other members of their school community to do so.

School leaders and other staff in our case studies cited examples of how meetings and information were seen as important: in one special school, for example, we heard how teamwork was fostered and facilitated through meetings of the whole staff, team meetings and a programme of individual discussions between the school leader and all members of staff. The free flow of information within the school was referred to by many members of staff and was seen as contributing to the spirit of togetherness and the inhibition of any feeling of ‘them and us’. In this school, good communication was not left to chance—there were systems in place, such as the staffroom notice board, the circulation of minutes of meetings and the weekly staff briefings, in order to ensure that information and ideas were freely shared.

In a large secondary school, we observed a school leader showing her respect for her colleagues through the way she ran meetings: she constantly invited them to contribute their views, building consensus round the discussion and generally building agreement through the discussion. In another large secondary school, teachers were encouraged to conduct research and enquiry, and most appeared to share a thirst for knowledge and investigation in the school.

In a smaller school, the principal used several strategies for encouraging a shared sense of purpose: staff meetings for discussions and review ‘where we review things like what you say, what you do’; a termly agenda-setting staff handbook which also includes ‘little articles . . . depends on what the focus of the term is, or whether we’ve got problems or where we’ve got weaknesses’; and his way of spreading the use of ICT among his staff—‘we’ve just been given laptops—all the teachers. The head’s . . . putting planning sheets and school end of year reports and annual reviews, and everything’s on it’.

**Working Closely with Senior Management and Leadership Teams**

Almost without exception, the case-study school leaders seemed to work towards the development of a senior management team (SMT) or leadership group which was seen as strong and effective by the rest of the staff. However, this did not mean that they were not accessible to other members of the staff. Our case studies showed teams that were seen as strong, but consulting, respectful and listening. They managed to be separate enough to lead the school, but accessible enough to know how the school community wanted to be led.

The deputy head of a large primary school remarked that the school’s senior management team worked well together: ‘we’re all pulling in the same direction, sharing the same values’. The staff of that school held the head and deputy in very high esteem. Indeed, the relationship of mutual respect between the leadership team and the rest of the staff in the schools we studied was strikingly similar.

It was not always possible for the research team to be able to read the dynamics clearly within the senior management team, partly because the SMT did not articulate these to us, and partly because they sometimes worked so closely together that they would not have known themselves. This is an example of the synergy of the parts of the whole
achieving more together than in isolation. For example, the head of a special school commented: ‘It’s a bit like a machine—it’s my job in particular to come up with good ideas, or to encourage the deputy head and the senior co-ordinator to come up with good ideas’. Another member of the staff of that school told us: ‘the head and deputy head are the school leadership . . . the SMT is important, ultimately the headteacher is the boss, he makes the final decisions, he is responsible . . . it’s on his shoulders’. It was easier to trace the decision-making processes in this school because, although the principal worked creatively with his senior management team to ‘come up with good ideas’, he ultimately took and was seen as taking the final responsibility. However, in separate conversations with the school leader and his deputy, both of them stated that they did not always know which of them brought the new ideas to the SMT.

A large nursery and infants school we visited was led by a head and deputy head, neither of whom had a teaching timetable at that time (other than releasing colleagues). Both were highly visible around the school, they got on very well with each other and worked closely together as the senior management team. The rest of the staff saw them as strong and purposeful: ‘you don’t feel threatened by the leadership here—you’re moved forward and in a positive way’. It was clear that the head and her deputy worked very closely and were often almost interchangeable in their instructional leadership activities.

In an inner-city large primary school, the senior management team was made up of talented and committed teachers with high energy, where there was an over-riding ethos of consultation between the members of that team and between staff. It seems that this relationship was fostered by the school leader’s beliefs and management style: ‘a very personal type of leader. He practices what he preaches. He doesn’t say one thing and do another. He knows everybody and will go above and beyond the call of duty.’ Also, unusually for an inner-city school in England, the staff had been relatively stable and the school able to recruit and retain good teachers.

In the leadership team meetings of a large secondary Catholic school that we studied, individual members of staff were encouraged by the headteacher to exercise full responsibility for specific areas of school policy. This entailed collecting data, taking decisions, developing schema and acting as an advocate. The school leader reinforced and re-integrated what they offered and invited everyone to pool their knowledge for the benefit of the meeting and for the school as a whole. There was an emphasis in the meetings of mutual appreciation, manifest in the careful, courteous way in which individual reports were listened to and discussed.

**Developing Leadership Capacity in the School**

We were struck by the way the school leaders we investigated, without exception, paid attention to the development of leadership capacity throughout their schools. Middle managers and subject leaders were seen as experts by them as well as by the rest of the school staff. For example, we heard about middle managers who had been apprehensive and lacking in confidence upon appointment to their present posts. However, the senior managers’ reliance on them to manage their curriculum area gave them confidence, and shaped the rest of the staff’s perceptions of them as experts in their fields. Also noticeable in the case-study schools was the expectation, encouraged by their leaders, of continuing professional development for staff, both teachers and others. We make the connection here between expecting expertise from middle managers and supporting them, and other staff members, with forms of training and development (such as reflective conversations.
networking, role models and mentors) that are much wider and more informal than in-service courses, but which set up an ethos or culture where school leaders are prepared to take risks and to create a safe environment for others to do so.

In one large secondary school, the principal had given key roles and responsibilities to heads of faculty. Each had a devolved budget to run their subject area and was involved in appointing teaching staff. This challenged many of them, since these opportunities for leadership had not been delegated in the past. However, they welcomed the challenge and felt that the principal trusted and supported them in the process, empowering them and giving them space to take risks, to try new things and to challenge decisions. As one long-serving member of staff remarked: ‘The head trusts me to do more. His judgement is very sound. He does delegate—there is no doubt he’s a delegator. I feel so much more valued now.’ Staff at all levels within this school had opportunities for professional development: some were formal opportunities, others informal, such as being asked to lead on projects, to network and to work in other schools. Middle managers saw these opportunities as the most valuable form of professional development for taking on more senior roles. The fact that the school was widely networked within its locality and beyond gave staff and pupils the opportunities to experience leadership roles across a wide range of situations and school environments. The school itself was planning an ‘Aspiring Senior Managers’ residential course for staff.

Another large secondary school in our study had a strong tradition of in-service training, and ran a variety of in-school professional development programmes which included staff from other schools. Newly appointed staff were given individual mentoring sessions and were supported through the line-management system. Staff were developed by being involved in a range of initiatives and working parties, and often relatively inexperienced staff were promoted and given support for their roles. Staff were encouraged to think about career progression and were supported to take on responsibilities or to move to new schools if they chose. The principal commented that he ‘gets a vast amount of pleasure from bringing staff on’ and that he hoped they ‘never forgot learning their trade’ at that school.

Since we completed our case studies, state education in England has continued to contend with problems of recruitment and retention of teachers, as well as issues of workload and low morale (e.g. PricewaterhouseCoopers, 2001). For ethical reasons, it seems that the school leaders we studied encouraged younger teachers to take on leadership responsibilities. Our case-study school leaders exemplify one way of encouraging energetic and committed teachers to stay in the profession by giving them the opportunity to take on leadership roles, but with support and professional development.

**Conclusion**

All school leaders have—or should have—values, but what is not always clear from the relevant literature, including that recently published by the National College for School Leadership (NCSL, 2001), is their precise nature. This literature notes how successful school leaders are driven by personal, moral and educational values and are able to articulate these with total conviction, creating a clear sense of institutional purpose and direction. Such individuals have a passion for the job. But what do their values look like? Are they, as some argue, increasingly managerialist and driven by market principles (e.g. Gewirtz and Ball, 2000; Grace, 1995), or is there still space for more ‘social democratic’
or ‘welfarist’ approaches? Are principals and other school leaders ‘able to maintain and articulate their values even in the face of government rhetoric exhorting a very different discourse’ (Campbell et al., forthcoming)? Indeed, is the whole debate sufficiently nuanced to reflect the complex nature of school leadership as it is currently enacted (Moore et al., 2002)?

Staff within our case studies were working in schools where the principals held a number of clear—and shared—educational values and beliefs. They were principled individuals with a strong commitment to their ‘mission’, determined to do the best for their schools, particularly for the pupils and students within them. They endeavoured to mediate the many externally driven directives to ensure, as far as it was possible, that their take-up was consistent with what the school was trying to achieve. Their leadership was clearly values-driven and evidence from the case studies provides insights into the nature of those values and how they were most likely to be exemplified. The origins of these values were not always clear (and this was not investigated as part of the research) but they might broadly be defined as social democratic or liberal humanist in nature. They were concerned with such matters as inclusivity, equal opportunities and equity or justice, high expectations, engagement with stakeholders, cooperation, teamwork, commitment and understanding. The case studies provide insights into how some of these values and beliefs were demonstrated through the words and deeds of school leaders. Related to these strongly held values, and mentioned by case-study interviewees, were the personal qualities of the school leaders. These included openness, accessibility, compassion, honesty, transparency, integrity, consistency, decisiveness, risk-taking, and an awareness of others and their situations.

The school leaders in our case studies remained committed to a set of strongly held values and a simple shift from ‘welfarism’ to the ‘new managerialism’ (Gewirtz and Ball, 2000) was not apparent. This is not to say that school leaders were unaware of the need to manage resources effectively, including human resources, and of the significance of parental choice and market forces, but that they were not fundamental. They were driven by a different set of values and these, as other studies of effective leaders suggest (e.g. Campbell et al., forthcoming, Day et al., 2000), were based on intrinsic values and not those imposed by others, including governments. Of importance was the wider educational, social and personal development of all pupils and staff. Effective or ‘outstanding’ school leaders are those who are able to articulate their strongly held personal, moral and educational values which may, at times, not be synonymous or in sympathy with government initiatives or policies.

Evidence from our case studies has been drawn upon to show how ‘values-driven leadership’ is embodied in particular ways of operating within schools. ‘Principled’ school leaders accordingly continue to exist. What is not so clear, however, is whether current developments in the English education system, notably the emphasis on school outcomes and performance targets, will enable the kinds of educational values underpinning the practices found in our case-study schools to continue and flourish. Or will ‘bastard leadership’ (Wright, 2001), or a variant of it, become pre-eminent, where leadership over the values and direction of schooling cannot be straightforwardly exercised as these are increasingly decided at the political level? Will the transformational and instructional school leadership models be applied only in relation to externally set goals that take little account of the values and aspirations of school leaders themselves? Fortunately, the
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evidence from our case studies seems to suggest that high performing schools are also those where there is ‘a passion for the job’ and that the role continues to be seen in terms of providing for the educational needs of all children rather than a privileged minority of them.

Note

1. The college was set up in 2000 by the government with the explicit aim of transforming leadership in English schools.
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